Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

Buy me a coffee — https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

PATREON — https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal — https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

IS THE SO-CALLED " PRIESTLY CODE " POST-EXILIC?

BY REV. CHANCELLOR J. J. LIAS, M.A.,

HAYWARD'S HEATH, ENGLAND.

II.

IT may be well, before entering into an analysis of the post-exilic books, to make one or two preliminary observations. As regards Ezra and Nehemiah, their authenticity is supported by a tradition of more than two thousand years, during which they have been believed to be autobiographical sketches of the work of the persons whose names they bear, in the restoration of the temple and walls of Jerusalem. A tradition which has so long held the field would naturally, when disputed, be regarded in all other departments of historical research, as authoritative enough to throw the *onus probandi* on those who dispute it, especially as the contents square remarkably well with the tradition. But the critic always contrives, with great but often unsuspected dexterity, to throw the *onus probandi* on the shoulders of those who are in possession. We are now told that the books in question are " a compilation made by an author . . . . writing long after the age of Ezra and Nehemiah themselves, on the basis, partly, of the authentic ' memoirs ' . . . . of those two reformers, and partly of other materials." [1] This description of the sources displays the usual ingenuity of the critics. It admits the genuineness of the pas-

---

[1] Driver, Introd., p. 511.

sages which it would be difficult to assign to other writers, and disputes those in which the writer resorts to the *oratio obliqua.* The reason is given in the usual oracular fashion. Thucydides, it is admitted, makes a similar " change from the 1st to the 3rd person, and *vice versa.*" But he does this " at wide intervals in his work." Such a change " is not probable in nearly contiguous sections." Dr. Driver, strangely enough, manages to forget the vast difference between the history of Thucydides and those of Ezra and Nehemiah, the first being a history of Greece on a large scale, whereas the two latter are short biographical notices by the authors of their own special work in the rebuilding of Jerusalem and its Temple. But *aliquando bonus dormitat Homerus.* Dr. Driver nods here in a note, recalling some other momentary lapses into a hazardous originality of which mention was made in the former paper: " The change from the 3rd person to the 1st in Thuc. 5, 26 arises manifestly from the nature of the fact to be narrated." Exactly. But why then should not the changes from the first person to the third in Ezra and Nehemiah " arise manifestly from the nature of the fact to be narrated "? Dr. Driver gives no answer whatever to so natural a question. Then we are informed that " the treatment of the history " is " uneven." Is it usual to question the authenticity of a history because its " treatment " is " uneven "? How about the Saxon Chronicle, which is now bald and curt, now abounding in detail, and now bursting unexpectedly into song? Have these facts discredited it in the eyes of later historians? Next " there are long periods in which the narrative is silent." Well, why not, if those periods contained nothing to the author's purpose? Ezra, moreover, passes over " an interval of sixty years *immediately before Ezra's own time* [the italics are Dr. Driver's]." This, we are told, is " not credible if the writer were Ezra himself."

though it is " perfectly natural if the writer lived in an age to which the period B.C. 516–458 was only visible in a distant perspective." Again we may ask, Why not, if this period contained no events which Ezra cared to relate? The writer's object is clearly to give us his own experiences, with just so much preface as may serve to make them intelligible. Why should the author write a connected history of events about which he was not likely to care two straws? " Cross-examination to character " is a constant trick of the " Old Bailey barrister " when he wants to discredit a witness, and it is much used by the biblical critic.

Dr. Driver's third reason is amusing from its exquisite *naïveté:* " In certain parts of the two books the *personality* [his italics] of the writers is very prominent "; while " other parts shew much less force and originality." Would any one suppose for a moment that Ezra would relate the events in the first six chapters, describing events with which he had personally nothing to do, in the same vivid manner as his own personal experiences? Does Dr. Driver expect Ezra and Nehemiah to show as much " force and originality " in their genealogies, in catalogues of names and numbers, as in the general narrative? Will he commit himself to the statement that Ezra viii., which, though it refers to matters with which Ezra was personally conversant, is in the *oratio obliqua,* is not as full of striking and picturesque touches as the rest of the story? Or does the Professor expect Nehemiah to throw as much " force and originality " into his narrative of the doings of his antagonists [1] as he does in referring to his own? Then " the books contain internal marks of having been compiled in an age long subsequent to that of Ezr. and Neh." One of these is the words " king of Persia," which would be an " unnecessary addition

[1] As, for instance, in chap. iv.

during the period of the Persian supremacy." [1] This objection
Dr. Driver seems to have taken bodily from Ewald without ex-
amining it, as, of course, he ought to have done. "All are "
critical " fish," it would seem, if they come into his " net." Had
he done so, he would have seen that the expression was nat-
ural enough in the mouth of Ezra, who had come up to Jerusa-
lem *from Babylon,* where the King of Persia would still be re-
garded and spoken of as a foreign and distant conqueror. And
he also would have found out — indeed he has actually chron-
icled the fact without observing it — that the expression is
never once found in Nehemiah, who was one of Artaxerxes'
household. Nehemiah even speaks of his master in one place
as "Artaxerxes king of Babylon." This is quite as natural on
his part as Ezra's mention of " Cyrus king of Persia " was on
his. Professor Driver might also have discovered that in Ezra
i., which is evidently written throughout by one hand, the
words " Cyrus king of Persia " and " Cyrus the king " are
used indiscriminately, a fact which entirely disposes of Dr.
Driver's distinction between Ezra's personal use of the words
" the king " and the expression " king of Persia " used by the
compiler. Then a few additional sentences, evidently added
some time afterwards by a transcriber, are paraded as proofs
that the histories as they stand are not written by Ezra and
Nehemiah, but by the compiler of a later date. Considering
the various and important functions which, in the case of the
Pentateuch and the historical books generally, are assigned
to the compiler or " redactor " when it pleases the critics, it is
a little hard that a transcriber in later days should be authori-
tatively declared incapable of adding the name Jaddua to a list
of high priests, or even of mentioning the last of the Persian

[1] His list of the places where " King of Persia " appears is drawn
exclusively from Ezra.

kings, in a list of names such as that found in Nehemiah xii.,
and of adding a reference to the " days of " Ezra and Nehe-
miah, though in the transcriber's time " long past." I need
not detain the reader with the discussion of any more of these
minutiæ which, in the eyes of the modern critic, are supposed
capable of whittling away a carefully preserved tradition of
twenty centuries' duration. The same tradition, be it remem-
bered, has handed down the belief that Ezra was the author
of Chronicles. Such a supposition has much to support it.
But in that case, the " other parts " of Ezra and Nehemiah
might very well " exhibit close affinities with the style of the
Chronicler," on the supposition that they were written by
the Chronicler himself, — a small portion of them perhaps
(though there is no necessity for this assumption)— by his
fellow-worker and intimate friend.

I come now to the analysis of Ezra's style, which it will be
most convenient to the reader to take chapter by chapter.[1]

Chap. i. 1.   The expression " to stir up the spirit " (*hĕghîr
ruach*) does not occur in the Pentateuch save once in Deuter-
onomy.   The Hiphil voice (as here) is used, but not in connec-
tion with the spirit of a man.   In the sense of *stirring up*
generally, it is found only in the Psalms and Prophets.   The
expression " to cause a voice to pass over " (i.e. make a proc-
lamation) is one of the comparatively few instances of a simi-
larity of style between P and the later Hebrew; the expression
occurring only in Ex. xxxvi. 6; 2 Chron. xxiv. 9; xxx. 5;
xxxvi. 22, and here.   But of course we cannot say whether the

[1] It may be as well to explain that no attempt will be made to
adopt the latest fashion of transliterating Hebrew consonants. For
there is no finality in it, and it appears *de rigueur* for each writer to
adopt a system of his own. '*Ain* is represented by *gh*, because this
guttural, as used by the Arabs, is quite capable of pronunciation by
Englishmen.

Chronicler and Ezra took the expression from P or *vice versa.* Ezra was a " ready scribe," i.e. one well versed in the Hebrew Scriptures; and, as we have seen, he probably *was* the Chronicler. *Miqtab* in the sense of a royal decree is confined to Chronicles and Ezra.

Ver. 2.   The expression " God of the heavens " is found only in Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, Jonah, and Ps. cxxxvi., one of the later Psalms.

Ver. 4.   The expression " to lift up " (*nasa*), in the sense of *help,* or *encourage,* occurs only in this book (see also viii. 36).   In Esther and 1 Kings ix. 11, it seems to mean only " to provide."

Ver. 6.   The expression " to strengthen the hands " of persons appears first in Judges.   But with the preposition *in,* which is used here, it is, I believe, without parallel elsewhere. (For *nadab* *in* the sense of offering freely, see ii. 68.)

Ver. 8.   The expression " to give *upon,*" instead of " *into,*" is not an unusual Hebrew idiom.   But it does not seem to occur in P.   *Gizbar* for " treasurer " is used only here, in the Aramaic portion of Ezra, and in Daniel.   It is not found in P — not even in the Egyptian portions of the narrative.

Ver. 9.   The word *agarbal* for " basin " is found only in this book.   Yet it *never* once creeps in when P recounts similar offerings.   Precisely the same is to be said of the " slaughtering-knife " mentioned here.

Ver. 11.   Here the material of which a thing is made is represented by the preposition *l'.*   In P it will be found that no preposition is used in such a case.   Also the word *golah* (" captivity " or " captives ") does not occur in P, though the *idea* of captivity is quite familiar to him.   The word is distinctive of the later Hebrew, and occurs first in Amos.   The word " bondage " (*ghabdah*) is the usual word in Exodus.

The latter word is used in the post-exilic writers chiefly in the sense of " work " or " service." Ezra's use of it in the sense of " bondage " is clearly due to his familiarity with the word in the Pentateuch (see ix. 8, 9). But the technical word for the captivity in Babylon is *golah.* How is it that P never slips into it? *Golah* in the sense of captivity seems not to be older than Second Kings.

Chapter ii. consists almost entirely of names. But the word *Medinah* for " province " or " district " was invariably described as an exilic or post-exilic word by the older school of lexicographers. It occurs in this sense only in Esther, Daniel, Nehemiah, and Ezra; though in the wider sense of " country " it is found in Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Ezekiel. The expression " sons of the province " is also unusual.

In verse 62 two unusual words occur: *cathab* in the sense of " register " — found only in Ezekiel, Ezra, and Nehemiah; *mithjachash,* " a register " — found only in Nehemiah, Chronicles, and here. Neither of these occurs in P.[1]

In verse 63 the word *Tirshatha* appears for " governor." Such a word might not impossibly have found its way into a document of the presumed age of P. But it has not done so.

In verse 65 the words for " singing men " and " singing women " are peculiar to the post-exilic books. In 2 Sam. xix. 36, different words are found.

The word for " mules " (ver. 66) first occurs in First Samuel. It is *not* in P.

In verse 69 the coin called a *Daric* (after Darius) is mentioned. P keeps clear of any such word. Also the *maneh* (the Greek *mina*), found in Ezra and Nehemiah; also in First Kings and Ezekiel, — not in P or the older writers.

The *Nethinim,* or attendants on the priests in the discharge

[1] Introd., p. 502.

of their office, are frequently mentioned in the post-exilic books. The word appears nowhere else. P (Num. viii. 19) represents the *Levites* as undertaking these duties. He " knows nothing " of Nethinim. It probably became the appellation in later days of those who filled the place of the Gibeonites, whom Joshua condemned to be " hewers of wood and drawers of water " for those who served the sanctuary, and whom Saul slew (2 Sam. xxi. 1).

Ver. 68. *Nadab* in the Hithpahel voice occurs only in Judges in a special sense and in the post-exilic books.[1] P uses the substantive *n'dabah* with a suitable verb. Why does he *never* use the word usual when (*ex hypothesi*) he lived and wrote?

Ver. 69. The word for " treasury " (or " treasure ") first occurs in Deuteronomy, then in Joshua (JE according to the critics), and then becomes common. But P never uses it. Darics and minae have been mentioned above. The shekel, the coin best known to P, disappears, and its place is supplied in the post-exilic books by coin of which he " knows nothing."

Ver. 70. " Porters," or rather " gate-keepers," are mentioned frequently in the post-exilic books. The word used here occurs first in 2 Kings vii. A different form occurs in 2 Sam. xviii. 26. The Pentateuch, as the sober critic will have expected, knows nothing of the word in any form, though it is difficult to explain why it never occurs in the writings of a man, or set of men, living as late as the exile. The reason is obvious. No gate-keepers were wanted in the Wilderness; so the word was not wanted either. But a man writing in exilic or post-exilic times would have used it without thinking whether or no there were likely to be gate-keepers to the Tabernacle in the Wilderness. If it is not — as it is not — to be found in P,

---

[1] So Driver, Introd., p. 504.

considering the contents of that supposed volume, that is strong evidence for the Mosaic origin of P.

Chapter iii. presents us with additional evidence. Thus *nagagh* is used of the " arrival of a time " only in the exilic or post-exilic writers; as Ezekiel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Esther, and Daniel. Its earlier meaning in P, as in other writers, is " touch " or " strike."

Ver. 3. *M'konah,* " base," does not appear to occur until First Kings. *Makon,* the *masculine* form, appears in Ex. xv. 17, but in the sense of " place." In this verse occurs a strange and unusual idiom, which indicates unfamiliarity with the Hebrew language natural to men who were born and bred in a foreign land. " They set up the altar upon its foundation [or the bases] *in the fear upon them from* the people of the lands."

Ver. 4 contains another unusual construction, " day *in* day," instead of the usual " day, day." This construction is found in Ezra vi. 9, an admittedly Aramaic portion of the book. Thus the construction is Aramaic, not Hebrew (see also 1 Chron. xii. 22). It does not seem to occur in P. The words translated (in R. V.) " as the duty of every day required " are also very unusual.

Ver. 5. The verb *qadash* in the Pual is found here, in Isaiah once, in Ezekiel once, in Second Chronicles twice, — *not in* P.

Ver. 6. The Pual of *yasad* is found only here, in First Kings, Zechariah, and Haggai.

Ver. 7. *Rishon* for " permission " is an Aramaic word which occurs only here.

Ver. 8. The use of the Hiphil of *ghamad* is very noticeable. It is used in the sense of " appoint " only in First Kings and *in the post-exilic books,* and perhaps some of the Psalms. In P it is used only in the sense of " place " or " set " (i.e. " cause to stand "). Here, then, we have a marked divergence in

style between P and the post-exilic books. *Natzach,* again, in the sense of " presiding " or " conducting," is confined to the post-exilic books. It does not seem ever to have had the significance of " setting forward," as suggested in the Revised Version (margin). See also the next verse.[1]

Ver. 9. *K'echad,* " as one," is regarded by authorities held in esteem until set aside by the modern school of criticism, as altogether a post-exilic expression. In earlier authors, " as one *man* " is the usual construction. It is found in Num. xiv. 15. But the critics have divided this chapter as follows: P, verses 1, 2 (in the main), 5–7, 10, 26–38 (in the main). Thus verse 15 is ascribed to JE. The impartial reader will naturally ask for some reason for this arbitrary division. But he will ask in vain.[2] To all fair-minded reasoners the phenomena will be

[1] So Driver, Introd., p. 504.

[2] It may be well to supply a proof of this assertion, so as to clear one's self from the reproach of being as dogmatic as the critics themselves. Wellhausen tells us that " it is perfectly clear that JE in Exodus and the following books, as well as in Genesis, is an entirely independent historical work, and not merely a completion of Q." (Comp. des Hexateuch, p. 63.) Wellhausen, it should be explained, denotes P by the symbol " Q." " This," he goes on to say, " is more distinctly the case than in Genesis." In a note he tells us that in the separation of " Q " he follows Knobel and Nöldeke. He puts the words " Knobel and " in a parenthesis, no doubt to imply that he follows the latter more completely than the former. But he does *not* say that the delimitation of JE, and therefore of course of " Q," is very different in Knobel from that for which he himself is responsible, because Knobel does not assume the priority of Deuteronomy to the Priestly Code, a theory which Wellhausen himself was the first to broach, and it necessitated an altogether new delimitation of the authorities. He gives, as usual, no references to either Knobel or Nöldeke; and it may be remarked, in passing, that this " hunt-the-slipper " method of quoting one's predecessors is very common in German commentators. It saves them a good deal of trouble, no doubt. But it certainly gives other people a good deal. And most impartial persons will think that it leaves much to be desired. He goes on to tell us that JE " will not only not be incomplete and disconnected " — a very lucid way of putting

regarded, so far as they go, as affording a presumption that Num. xiv. belongs altogether to the earlier Hebrew. The expression occurs in ii. 64; vi. 20; in Nehemiah, Second Chronicles, Ecclesiastes, and Isa. lxv.

Ver. 10. The Pual of *labash,* " to clothe," is found only in First Kings, Second Chronicles, and here — five times in all. It is *not* in P. The word translated " cymbals " appears once here, once in Nehemiah, and once in First Chronicles.[1] The expression translated " after the order of " (lit. " upon the hands of ") is confined to the post-exilic writers. It is *not found* in P. The intelligent reader will not need to be reminded that these peculiarities of idiom are just the things into which a later author would slip without noticing that he had done so.

one's point, certainly — but that to abstract " Q " from the rest of the story is the only way to produce a satisfactory whole. Then (p. 103) we learn from him that, in Num. xiv., verses 3, 4 = JE, and also some parts of verses 1, 2. The same is the case with verses 8, 9. As concerns verses 26–38 it is impossible to remove verse 31 (= Deut. i. 39) without making the connection of the whole fall to pieces. For we can understand " them " in verse 30 only from the expression " your children " in verse 31, and this leads on to " them " in verse 32, which cannot itself be disconnected from verse 33. And yet he tells us that " Q " must be confined to verses 26–29, 34–36; that the " integrity " of verses 27, 28, is doubtful; and he further fancies that verses 29–33 [he prints 20–33!], 39–45, are not altogether from one source. If this is a " scientific " proof, one may well wonder whether there be such a thing as science at all, or that any one pays the least attention to it. Dr. Driver tells us that he was strictly " limited in space " in consequence of " the terms of his agreement," and that therefore he could often give only results. It has probably been a good thing for his reputation that this was the case. Had he put forth 360 pages of the absolutely unproved assertions which form by far the greater part of Wellhausen's treatise which has just been quoted, people would have had some idea of the absolutely unscientific character of the modern criticism of the Pentateuch.

[1] So Driver, Introd., p. 506.

Ver. 11.   The use of the preposition *l'*, " to," with the verb " to praise " is peculiar to Chronicles and Ezra. The ordinary construction omits the preposition, as in the expression " Hallelujah " (" praise the Lord "). Then the earlier Hebrew uses the Niphal, not the Hophal (as here), of *yasad*, in the sense of laying a foundation. See Ex. ix. 18 (which, however, is assigned to JE).

Ver. 12.   The construction of the words translated " when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes," in the Revised Version, is very involved and unusual, and (as may be seen by referring to the margin of R. V.) is by no means easy to understand. It suggests the idea of one to whom the language of his country has become unfamiliar. No such passages can be produced from P.

Ver. 13.   The older authorities regard the use of *nakar* here as peculiar to the post-exilic writers. The construction with *'ain* and the participle is also somewhat unusual.

Chapter iv. gives us one or two more instances of a similar sort.

Ver. 4.   The use of the Piel of *bahal* here in the active sense of " troubling " or " terrifying " other people is characteristic of the later Hebrew. In the earlier Hebrew the verb is used in the Niphal in the intransitive sense, of being afraid.

Ver. 6.   The word *malkuth* for " kingdom " is employed with *great frequency* in the post-exilic writers. But in the earlier Hebrew it is rare. In the Pentateuch it occurs only *once,* and that once, it may be well to notice, is in *Balaam's prophecy.* This suggests that Balaam spoke in a dialect closely akin to that spoken by Israel in those early times, and that we have a pretty nearly *verbatim* report of his utterances. At least there is as much foundation for this theory as for most of the " may be's " and " probably's " of the critics — uncer-

tainties on which they generally proceed at once to build as incontestable truths. The word *never occurs in P*, but comes into use after Israel had become a kingdom. As the critics never lose an opportunity of pointing out small blunders in an often formidable case made out by their adversaries (when they condescend to reply to them, which is not very often), and of endeavoring in this way to create a prejudice against them, it may be well to point out that Moab was a kingdom when Balaam delivered his prophecy — and a kingdom well known to him. The word *sitnah* in the sense of " accusation " for the sake of preventing persons from doing a thing is kindred to the verb " oppose "; whence Satan, the adversary. This word *never occurs in P* nor are any of the kindred words found there. But in Num. xxii. 22, 32, the words " adversary " and " withstand " (or " oppose ") are found. And they occur frequently in the later Hebrew; as, in Chronicles, Zechariah, and the Psalms. Whence, on the principles of the critics themselves, we may venture to draw the conclusion that P " knows nothing " of such a word, and therefore P is one of the earlier writers in the Old Testament.

Chapters iv. 8–vi. 18, inclusive, are in Aramaic. They are chiefly composed of original documents, with a sufficient amount of explanation to make them intelligible. This explanation may have been written by Ezra, to whom Aramaic was of course familiar, or by some other scribe well acquainted with the facts. We proceed, therefore, at once to vi. 19, where the post-exilic Hebrew again awaits us.

Ver. 19. *Golah.* (See above, on i. 11.)

Ver. 21. *Badal* in the Niphal is found in the sense of separation only in the post-exilic books. It is found in P, Num. xvi. 21 (though it is not certainly in the Niphal), but not in the

sense of separation for moral reasons, but simply of physical removal.[1]

Chap. vii. 6. *Mahīr,* "ready" or "skilled," is a word which occurs only in this passage, in Ps. xlv. 2 (Heb. — a *ready* writer), in Prov. xxii. 29, and Isa. xvi. 1. The verb seems to be found in this sense only in Isa. xxxii. 4, though it occurs very frequently in the sense "to haste," "to be rash," "to be precipitate." Such facts as these should be taken into account when deciding on the number of contributors to the book usually known by the name of Isaiah. But though what some may think undue stress is laid on such considerations when it suits the modern critic, they are altogether ignored when it is found more convenient to take that course. Such is what is called "scientific research" in these days! The word *bakashah,* "request," occurs only here and in Esther. The words "hand of God," "good hand of God," "hand of God for good," in the sense of God's superintending providence blessing a work, are found only in the post-exilic books. *All* these words and expressions might have flowed very naturally from the author of P. But he "knows nothing" of them.

Ver. 9. *Y'sud* for "began" (lit. "was the foundation of" — see R. V. marg.) is quite an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον.

Verses 12–26, inclusive, are in Aramaic, being a copy of Artaxerxes' letter. Our next instance occurs in verse 28. The word translated "counselors" does not appear until 2 Sam. xv. 12. *Why* not? Because in the times to which earlier books relate there were no kings, and therefore no king's counselors. P "knows nothing" of them. Therefore P was written early in the history of Israel. This conclusion may of course be disputed. But it has at least some logical foundation, which is

[1] A reference to Driver's Introduction will show that the assignment to authors in Num. xvi. is of the usual arbitrary kind.

more than can be said for three-fourths of the conjectures of the critics.[1]

Chap. viii. 15. " I viewed the people," etc. The Hebrew here has a *preposition* before the nouns (as we say, " I looked *on* the people and the priests "). This is peculiar, I believe, to the later Hebrew. It is a sort of construction we should certainly find in P, were it an exilic or post-exilic book. The word translated " view " in the Revised Version properly means " to take note of," " to understand."

Ver. 16. The word translated " teachers " here (it is the part. Hiphil of the last-mentioned word) is a word of the later Hebrew, and is found only in Psalms, Proverbs, Isa. xxviii., lvii., and in the acknowledged post-exilic books.

Ver. 17. The Hebrew construction in the words " I sent them forth unto Iddo " does not seem to be found save in Isa. x. 6 and the post-exilic books.

Ver. 18. The phrase " man of understanding " is of the later Hebrew. The word translated " understanding " first occurs in First Samuel. Elsewhere it is found only in Proverbs, Psalms, Job, and the post-exilic books. When P wishes to express the idea, the word *t'bunah,* a derivative of the words discussed above under verses 15 and 16, is used. The word here used is *not used* in P, — another sign that P is not of exilic or post-exilic origin.

Ver. 25 (also ver. 26, 29, 33). " I *weighed.*" This word occurs chiefly in the later Hebrew. It occurs in P. But, unfortunately for the critics, it also appears in Ex. xxii. 22, a part of the so-called " Book of the Covenant," which some of the less advanced members of the critical school allow to be the work

[1] If we were to add to this investigation an inquiry into all the passages in the historical Scriptures alleged to have been brought into conformity with P by the redactor, this argument would be much strengthened.

of Moses. Thus the word is found in the *oldest part* of the
Old Testament, as well as in P, and therefore, as far as this
particular word is concerned, there is no evidence against the
Mosaic origin of P. *T'rumah* is used frequently in P, and not
infrequently in Ezra and Nehemiah. It does not occur (ap-
parently) in JE. But the breast of the critic must not swell
too high on account of this, for *it appears in Deuteronomy*.

Ver. 26. (For " upon their hands," see above on iii. 10.)

Ver. 27. The *caphorim* or " tankards " (they were vessels
with a lid, and were apparently used when offerings of the
first-fruits and the like were made — see Deut. xiv. 26 ; xv. 19,
20) are met with only in First Chronicles and Ezra — never in
P. These tankards are described as of value amounting to
(see i. 11) a thousand *darics.* (See ii. 69.) The word trans-
lated " bright," referring to brass, occurs only here. A word
from the same derivative occurs three times in one passage in
Leviticus, of *yellow hair.* The word translated " precious" oc-
curs only in the later Hebrew and in Gen. xxvii. 15 ; but not
in P.

Ver. 29. *Shakad* in the sense of watching is found here, in
Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Daniel. In the
Pentateuch (including JE and P) it is used only in the sense
of the almond tree and its products. Thus JE and P are com-
bined as against the later literary use of this word.

Ver. 30. *Qabal* is found only here, in Chronicles, Esther,
Proverbs, and Job; a word of the later Hebrew, though not
exclusively post-exilic ; *not found in P.*

Ver. 31. (For " the hand of the Lord upon," see above,
ver. 26.)

Ver. 35. The word *tzippir,* " he-goat," replaces the older
saghir here, in Dan. viii., and once in Second Chronicles. It is

found in the last verse but one of the Aramaic passage iv. 8–vi. 18. P *does not use it*.

Ver. 36. The word *dath* occurs for " law " in the blessing of Moses (Deut. xxxiii. 2 — a poetic passage), though there is another reading there. Elsewhere it is found only here and in the book of Esther. The word translated " satraps " is found only here, in Esther, and in the Aramaic. It is not found in P, not even in the Egyptian portion of the history, where it might not unnaturally have crept in for want of a better word. So it is with the *pachavoth*, the governors of subordinate rank. This word occurs only in First and Second Kings, in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, and Esther. It is interesting to note that it also appears in *Haggai* and *Malachi*. The use of the word ranges from the time of Solomon to the latest of the prophets. But it does not appear in P.

Chap. ix. 1. Here we unmistakably find the Niphal of *badal* (see vi. 21).

Ver. 2. The verb *nasa*, " to lift up," " to bear," when used of *taking a wife*, is of the later Hebrew. Older lexicographers tell us that it is found only in Second Chronicles and Nehemiah. The earlier expression is *laqak*. The latter is not only found as far back as Judges and Ruth, but is also the use of the Pentateuch. Neither JE nor P uses the later expression. The critical school have stopped many crevices, and it must be allowed that they have displayed incredible diligence in so doing. But their position is so vulnerable that it has been impossible for them to close up all the avenues by which a shot may enter. This is one of them. The imagined JE and P here " take up " their joint " parable " against them. Then the expression " holy seed " is found only here and in Isa. vi.[1] Had there been a post-exilic author of P, and he had ever heard it,

---

[1] Supposed to be the genuine work of Isaiah.

it *must* have found its way into his writings. The Hithpahel of *gharab* is found only in the later Hebrew in the sense "to mingle" in which it is used in this verse. And in the sense of mixture *by marriage* it is found only *in this verse*. It is for the critics to explain why the word never occurs in the numerous passages of the Pentateuch (including P) which speak of intermarriage. Once more, the word *sagan* for "prince" or "ruler" appears only in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and in Ezra and Nehemiah; *another expression* into which P never slips. The word *maghal* in the sense of "trespass" is one that appears only in the acknowledged post-exilic writers, in Ezekiel, once in Job, *in P,* and in the *last chapter of Joshua,* which [1] is supposed to be taken from an "uncertain source." To assign this last passage to P now would surely make it too plain that the critics "depended upon their imagination for the facts," and upon some hitherto undiscovered logical processes "for their arguments." Had the assignment been made at first there would have been an argument here for the post-exilic origin of P of which the critics would most certainly have made use.

Ver. 3. The word *marat* occurs in the active *sense* "to pluck" only here, and in Nehemiah and Isaiah. In the passive sense of "bald" it occurs in Lev. xiii. In what is obviously its *original* sense ("polished") it occurs in Ezekiel and First Kings. It cannot be said that there is any stylistic affinity between P and the post-exilic authors here. The idea of *baldness* is connected with the original sense of the word (i.e. "polished" or "smooth"). It is perhaps going too far to ask the reader to note that the participle Poel of the verb *shaman* is found only here and in the next verse, though the participle Piel is found in Daniel.

Ver. 4. The adjective *chared* ("fearing" or "trembling")

[1] See Driver, Introd.

is first found in Judges. It is found once in First Samuel, twice in Isa. lxvi., and again in Ezra x. 3. In First Samuel it is used with the preposition *ghal*, " upon," for that of which people are afraid. So in Isa. lxvi. 2. In Isa. lxvi. 5 it is used with *el*, " towards." But in each case in Ezra it is used with *b'*, " in "; *this use not found in P.* Then we have the preposition *ghad*, " up to," joined to the preposition *l'*, " to." In this verse it refers to *time* — " up to the time of the evening oblation." In verse 6 it refers to *place*, even to the heavens. This use of the two prepositions is *confined to the later writers. It is not found in P.* But it *is* found in the portions of Ezra assigned to a different hand by Professor Driver (see iii. 13 — " even to a far distance ").

Ver. 5. The word *taghanith*, " fasting " or " humiliation," is found only here.

Ver. 6. The adverb *l'maghalah* is here used as a preposition. This seems *peculiar to Ezra. Ashmah* for " transgression " is by many scholars regarded as an *infinitive* when it occurs in Leviticus, and is supposed to be first used as a substantive in Amos. But the critics may be allowed to score this doubtful point,[1] and assert that, except in Amos, the use of the word is confined to the post-exilic period. Even then they must admit that it is not *peculiar* to that period.

Ver. 7. The use of *b'*, " in," for " to " (" to the sword," etc.), is at least unusual, and probably late. The preposition *l'* is generally used in this sense. And in the sense " in consequence of " (" for our iniquities," R. V.) it apparently comes under the " Beth pleonastic " use which Gesenius is inclined to regard as " a solecism of the later Hebrew." He could not have said this had he found it in P, because he believed in the

[1] In Driver, Introd., p. 504, the doubtful point is not scored.

antiquity of the whole Pentateuch. *Bizzeh* for "spoil" is peculiar to the later Hebrew. It is found in Ezekiel, Daniel, Second Chronicles, Esther, Ezra, and Nehemiah.

Ver. 8. The words *m' ghat regagh,* "a very short time," are found only here, in Isa. i. 9; xxvi. 20. The word *t'hinnah* in the sense of "grace" (usually *hēn* in the Old Testament) is found only in Josh. xi. 20 and in this passage. (According to Professor Driver, Josh. xi. 16–23 belongs to D². Perhaps at some future time this assignment may be thought to require revision. As it seems to depend chiefly on assertion, there will be little difficulty in making the change. Anyhow we have a connection here, so far as criticism is concerned, between Ezra and D²; *not with the post-exilic P.*) The word *michyah,* here and in the next verse, in the sense of "reviving" seems unique. It is found in Gen. xlv. 5, but it may be the participle Hiphil there. And Gen. xlv. 5 is not assigned to P. The word *ghabduth* here is peculiar to Ezra (see next verse). But this is only a Massoretic distinction, and is found only in the pointed Hebrew. Still the Massoretes *did make* the distinction. Possibly, however, they did not understand their own language.

Ver. 9. The expression "to make waste places to stand" appears to be unique. The verb is applied to the House of the Lord in ii. 68. Then there is the word *gadēr,* "wall," "inclosure." This word meets us in Num. xxii. 24, which, the reader may note, is *not in P.* It does not often occur, but is found chiefly in the later Hebrew.

Ver. 12. The preposition *l',* "to," after the verb *yarash* in the Hiphil seems peculiar to Ezra.

Ver. 13. The same may be said of the very peculiar expression "Thou hast refrained *to* below *from* [1] our offenses."

Chapter x. begins with a triumph for the critics. The word

[1] This is the literal translation of the Hebrew.

translated " made confession " (R. V.) occurs only in the acknowledged post-exilic writers (Ezra, Neh., Dan., and 2 Chron.) and P (Lev. v. 5; xvi. 21; xxvi. 40; Num. v. 7). The participle Hithp. of *naphal* in the sense of " casting one's self down " appears only in Deuteronomy and Ezra. It occurs in the active sense of " falling upon " in Gen. xliii. 18.

Ver. 2. *Yashab* in the sense of " cohabitation " is found *nowhere but in this chapter* and once in Nehemiah.

Ver. 3. *Yatza* (Hiph.) in the sense of " put away " (lit. " sent forth ") *is found only here*. The word *ghatzah* in the sense of " purpose " or " will " is found only in the later Hebrew.

Ver. 6. The word *lishkah* (see also viii. 29) is found first in 1 Sam. ix. 22 as a " dining-room." Afterwards, save in Jer. xxxvi. 12, it is apparently confined to chambers *in the Temple,* sometimes large enough to accommodate visitors (Jer. xxxv. 2). The priests sometimes ate their share of the offerings in them (Ezek. xlii. 13). The history of the use of this word tends to show that it *was unknown to* the writers of the Pentateuch and Joshua, whether they be J, E, P, or the Deuteronomists; and that these writers were, *all of them*, among *the earliest* writers of the Hebrew language.

Ver. 9. The preposition *l'*, " to," is here used in the sense of " within," a somewhat unusual sense. So, again, *b'*, " in," of the day of the month is unusual. The more usual phrase is *l'*, " to." *This last construction is that found in P* (Gen. vii., viii., and Ex. xii.). *Raghad* (Hiph.) in the sense of " fearing " is found only once here and once in Daniel; *not in P*.

Ver. 12. The construction " So, according to thy word upon us to do " is very unusual. It may either mean as in the Revised Version or " so will we do even as thou hast bidden us." The form of expression in Ex. xix. 8; xxiv. 3, 7;

Josh. i. 16 (let the reader note that the critics ascribe these passages to P, JE, and D² respectively) is " all that Jehovah saith (or commandeth) to us we will do." In Deut. v. 18 a somewhat different form is used. Second Kings x. 5 approaches more nearly to JE, P, and D². In Jer. xlii. 20; xliv. 17, a different idiom is used. The involved form in Ezra is obviously a foreign idiom, contracted in Babylon. It will be seen that, as far as this construction is concerned, it gives *no support* to the critical position.

Ver. · 13. *Abal,* here translated " but," is so used only in the *later* Hebrew. So at least say the older authorities; and they are not confuted by modern scholars, but are simply waved aside. In early Hebrew *abal* means " certainly." These characteristics of the earlier and later Hebrew have escaped Professor Driver in his list of peculiar expressions in Chronicles. Had he examined the matter, he would have seen that here, as elsewhere, JE and P display traces of the *early, not* the late, Hebrew (see Gen. xvii. 19 (P) and xlii. 21 (JE)).

Ver. 14. *Zaman* in the sense of an " appointed time " is altogether *post-exilic.* *Gheth* is the word used in the earlier Hebrew, *including P. Ghir vaghir,* " city and city," is, according to Professor Driver, a " distinctively late " idiom,[1] and first occurs in Deut. xxxii. 7. This passage is, however, poetical, and the idiom of poetry and prose is, in all languages, distinct.[2] And the Professor has not remarked that *in P* the idiom *does not appear to be found.* As has already been remarked, the copulative conjunction is *omitted* in the earlier Hebrew. We have *ghad l'* twice in this verse for " until " (see above, p.317).

Ver. 15. *Ghamdū ghal* is an expression which has given

[1] Introd., p. 505.
[2] Professor Driver admits this in Introd., p. 504. He says that *hamôn* is " only used exceptionally in early prose."

trouble to our revisers, and is therefore not good Hebrew. In verse 14 *ghamdū l'* means " to be appointed over." Here it probably means the same. But it is not usual.

Ver. 16. In this verse we find *l'*, " to," with the word month, not *b'* as in verse 9. The natural inference from this is that Ezra was using the vernacular to which he was accustomed in verse 9, and the *literary* style here, and in the next verse. The form *daryosh,* " thresh out " or " examine into," is unusual. And what is remarkable is that here there is *no* Massoretic note of direction to the reader.

Ver. 19. To " give the hands," as a sign of good faith, is apparently a phrase of the later Hebrew. I have been unable to trace it in P. *Ashēmīm,* " again," is a peculiar expression, translated " being guilty " in the Revised Version. It is certainly not usual in early Hebrew, nor do I remember finding it in P.

Ver. 44. This last verse of the chapter ends with a most unusual construction, which once more has given considerable trouble to the translator. Literally it runs, " And there are from them [the pronoun is in the masculine] wives, and they [again masculine] placed children." The meaning seems pretty clear. But the idiom is altogether foreign. I can recall nothing in the remotest degree like it in P. It is, of course, for the critics to explain how the post-exilic writer, as most of them now consider P to be, could so entirely free himself from the words and idiom of the men of his generation.

The number of words and expressions peculiar to the post-exilic period examined above is 108. Of these, *only one* is to be found exclusively in P and the acknowledged post-exilic authors. It is obvious that at a period in Jewish history which resembles the Reformation there would be the same studious attention to the ancient Scriptures as there was in the

sixteenth century. The word in question is unquestionably a technical word for " to make confession," and its post-exilic sense is found only in authors who are described as well acquainted with the Mosaic Law. Obviously, then, this one point of contact between P and the post-exilic authors proves nothing in favor of the modern critic.

Professor Driver has given, in his " Introduction," a list of the words and expressions peculiar to the later Hebrew. A brief examination of these may fitly conclude the present paper. It will be unnecessary to analyze the other post-exilic writers in detail, because this has been largely done already. And we may await for a long time the only rejoinder on the part of the critics that can satisfy the genuine investigator, namely the discovery of a post-exilic author who writes in the same style as that of P. I must premise that the foregoing analysis of the contents of Ezra was written before consulting Dr. Driver's book, though the references to that book at the bottom of the page were appended after perusing it.

The first point to notice in Dr. Driver's list [1] is that it contains twenty-six words and phrases exemplifying the characteristics of the Chronicler, Ezra, and Nehemiah, and twenty instances of peculiar " syntactical " usages, and of the unusual employment of prepositions. Of this former class, Dr. Driver mentions only two as found in P, — a proportion of one in thirteen.[2] But he has forgotten to note that one of these words occurs in Num. xii. 27, which is in JE, and in Josh. xxii. 16, 31, which are assigned by Dr. Driver to an " uncertain source." They are, therefore, *not* peculiar to P. The other, " expressed by [their] names," which appears only six times in the Old Testament (in Num. i. 17, in Chron., and in Ezra), may very well be an instance of quotation of the Law of

---

[1] See Introd., pp. 502 ff.   [2] *Ibid.*, p. 105.

Moses by the "ready scribe" to whom Chronicles as well as Ezra has usually been attributed. Of the other class of peculiarities *not one* is found in P. Joshua xiii. 5, in which one of these peculiarities is found, is assigned to D².[1] Surely this point is one that demands careful study before any definite pronouncement is made in regard to the period at which a work was composed. The latter class of usages (i.e. those of a "syntactical" character) is one into which no writer of a period could help falling, because it would not occur to him to notice that they *were* peculiar. Dr. Driver further omits to note that the peculiarities he mentions are common to the parts of Ezra which he attributes to a compiler and the parts which he believes to be the work of Ezra himself. Dr. Driver next remarks on the "work of the compiler" being "constructed upon a traditional basis." This, he adds, "may be reasonably supposed." Hence the conclusion may fairly and logically be drawn that the author or compiler of P, though, like the other compiler, "constructing" his work "on a traditional basis," would naturally fall into similar "peculiarities and mannerisms" as his brother "compiler" and characteristic of the post-exilic period. The absence of the later and abbreviated form (*sh*) of the relative pronoun in Ezra (save on *one* occasion), Nehemiah, and the whole of Chronicles but 1 Chron. v. 20 and xxvii. 27, no doubt displays a desire to adopt the style of the older Hebrew as far as possible. Yet we find the writers quite unable to shake themselves entirely free from modernisms. We have, therefore, the right to expect that precisely the same characteristics will be found in P. *They are not.* And it is for the critics to explain why they are absent.

We proceed to examine Dr. Driver's list of characteristics of the later Hebrew found in Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah.

[1] Introd., p. 506.

Some of them have been noticed above. The numbers are those of Dr. Driver's " Introduction." His list will be found on pages 502–507.

No. 2. *Larob,* " abundantly." " In the earlier books," Dr. Driver tells us, " the usage here and there approximates." He gives a slightly different use of the expression from Judges vi. 5 ; but *none from P.* Is P then one of the " earlier books "? For it does not even " approximate " to the usage of the post-exilic period.

No. 3. With *maghal,* " trespass," we have already dealt. According to the critical theory, it occurs in that sense not only in P, but in JE and another earlier author (so far as we know). No correspondence of usage with P is therefore made out. The verb and noun are both referred to in the passage in another part of his work to which Dr. Driver here refers his readers. Even there, however, it is admitted that the verb is found in Deuteronomy.

No. 4. *Ghamad* (in the Hiph.) in the sense of " appoint " we have already commented upon (see above, on iii. 8). But why Dr. Driver refers us to ii. 68, in which it has the sense of " to cause to rise up," " to erect," is not clear.

No. 5. Dr. Driver admits that the expression " house of God " for " house of the LORD " is post-exilic. But he does not even attempt to explain why it is not found in P.

No. 6. Dr. Driver admits *hakên* (Hiph.) in the sense of " establish," " prepare," to be post-exilic. It occurs in Ezra iii. 3, and also in vii. 10. But Dr. Driver does not ask his readers to note the fact that the former passage is, in his opinion, written by the compiler, and the second *by Ezra himself.*

No. 7. The use of *darash* has already been commented upon. Dr. Driver admits that the sense in which it is used in

the later Hebrew is a " weakened one." But he has not pointed
out any traces of that " weakened sense " in P.

No. 8. He sees a " distinctive " use of *chazaq* (Hithp.) in
the sense of " strengthen one's self." It had not, I confess, oc-
curred to me. But though I have no desire to contradict him,
it would be worth inquiring whether P is one of " the earlier
books " in which the " use is rarer and more distinctive."

No. 9. *Malkūth,* " kingdom," is, we are told, " very rare
in the *older language* [my ital.] ; which uses *maml'kah,* or
sometimes *m'lûkah,* instead." Here Dr. Driver omits to tell
us that the latter of these two words is a later one than the
former; that *m'lūkah* appears first in First Samuel, that
maml'kah often appears in the Pentateuch, and has once es-
caped by *just one verse* from being included in P — not im-
possibly because the word *m'lakah* happened to occur in it.

No. 11. (See above, on viii. 30.) Dr. Driver admits that
qabal is " a common Aramaic word." And beside its appear-
ance in Chronicles and Ezra, he tells us that it appears only in
Prov. xix. 20; Job ii. 10; Esth. iv. 4; ix. 23, 27, and in the
Aramaic of Daniel. He says nothing about its non-appearance
in P.

No. 13. *L'maghalah* in the adverbial sense of " upward "
is apparently peculiar to Chronicles. As has been stated above,
its use *as a preposition* seems peculiar to Ezra (see above,
on ix. 6).

No. 14. *Artzōth* in the sense of " lands " is asserted by Dr.
Driver to be peculiar to Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Ezekiel,
and P. Of course it is as reasonable an explanation of this
fact, that the " ready scribe " who wrote Chronicles and his
own book, and was in as close touch with Nehemiah as Aaron
with Moses, was responsible for reverting to the language of

the more technical parts of the Mosaic Law, as that the use of *artzōth* in this sense is invariably post-exilic is a late one.

No. 15. *Mabīn,* "understanding," is found in Chronicles and Nehemiah and in Ezra viii. 16. Dr. Driver, who takes care to emphasize *every* correspondence he can find between the post-exilic authors and P, — and there are three or four at the most, — does not tell us that in Ex. xxxi. (JE), xxxv., xxxvi. (P), and in Deuteronomy, the word used on a similar occasion is *t'bunah.* The Pentateuch knows nothing of *mabīn* in this sense.

No. 16. *Hallēl v'hodoth,* "praising and giving thanks," is peculiar to Ezra (iii. 11) and Nehemiah.

No. 17. *Hodoth* for "joy" is "an Aramaic word," and peculiar to Nehemiah, among the Hebrew writers, though it is found in the *Aramaic* of Ezra vi., and of the cognate verb in *E* (Ex. xviii. 9). Once more, it is *not found in P.*

No. 18. *Canagh* in the sense of "humbling" is a word of the later Hebrew; but it is *not in P.*

No. 20. The use of *r'kush* is described as "somewhat peculiar" by Dr. Driver. It certainly is very "peculiar" indeed, if it is to be regarded as a post-exilic word. For it also occurs (as Dr. Driver admits, Introd., p. 275, No. 17) in JE! Note, therefore, that *rekush,* though found in P, is not a word characteristic of the post-exilic period.

We now come to Dr. Driver's list of "singular syntactical usages." Before entering on this it may be well to note in reference to these usages, and specially so far as the use of prepositions is concerned, that they are almost invariably *common to* the Chronicler, Ezra, and Nehemiah. This, as far as it goes, tends to prove these four books to have been written at the same period, and, if not by one author, yet in the same locality and by men acquainted with one another. And

these constructions, be it farther observed, are precisely of the kind into which a post-exilic writer, such as P is supposed to be, would fall without noticing it.

No. 27. " Sentences expressed peculiarly (without a *subject,* or sometimes without a *verb*)." Ezra iii. 3 has been already mentioned as one of these constructions. It may be well to remark: (1) that Dr. Driver finds this sort of construction only in Chronicles and Ezra; and (2) that he gives *no instances of it from P*.

No. 28. " The inf. constr. used freely almost as a substantive." This is found *twice* in Ezra, *once* in Nehemiah, and occasionally in First and Second Chronicles. A somewhat similar construction appears in Esth. i. 7. No *such* construction has been adduced from P.

No. 29. The construction " day *in* day " has already been referred to (Ezra iii. 4). Dr. Driver mentions that it occurs in the Aramaic portion of Ezra, but does not emphasize the facts: (1) that the construction is one into which a writer well acquainted with the Aramaic would naturally fall when writing in Hebrew; and (2) that its absence from P would therefore indicate that its author had *no* acquaintance with that language.

No. 30. The omission of the relative appears *once* in Ezra, twice in Nehemiah, and occasionally in poetry and in Chronicles. No trace of this usage has been found in P.

No. 32. The preposition *l',* " to," " with the infinitive at the end of a sentence " occurs occasionally in Chronicles, and once in the book of Ezra (iii. 5), — a noticeable link of connection between the two. Note further that this use is not common to the Chronicler and Ezra, but to the former and the compiler, thus tending to prove identity between the Chronicler and the latter compiler. The absence of the construction from Nehe-

miah, as far as it goes, tends to indicate that the compiler of
Ezra was neither Nehemiah himself nor the compiler of Ne-
hemiah.[1]

No. 33. *Amar l',* " to say that . . . ," in the sense of " prom-
ising " or " purposing." It is only fair to note that here Dr.
Driver's references point in the direction of a connection be-
tween Chronicles and Nehemiah. Ezra does not seem to have
an instance of this construction. But the instance is appar-
ently a solitary one in Nehemiah. Dr. Driver goes on to say
that the construction appears " sometimes also in early He-
brew." But he does not tell us where.

No. 34. *Ghal yadē,* " at the direction " or " appointment
of." (See above, on iii. 10.)

No. 35. *Ghir vaghir.* (See Ezra x. 14.) Found *once* in
Ezra, *once* in Nehemiah, and frequently in Chronicles and Es-
ther. Save in the case of *dōr vadōr* (Deut. xxxii. 7), the
idiom, Dr. Driver tells us, " is a distinctively late one," and
" common in post-Biblical Hebrew." All the more surprising
that it is *not common in P.*

No. 36. The occurrence of the definite article in the place
of the relative pronoun is, Dr. Driver tells us, "very singular,
and of doubtful occurrence elsewhere." It appears only *four*
times in Chronicles and *twice* in Ezra. But one of these last
appearances is, according to Dr. Driver, in the *genuine me-
moirs* of Ezra, and the other in the *work of the compiler,*
though it must be admitted that Dr. Driver's account of the
latter (see pp. 516, 517) is hedged round with so many restric-
tions and reservations that it is rather difficult to understand
who wrote the passages referred to. One certainly should be
awed at the mathematical exactness with which the modern

---

[1] This appears to be Dr. Driver's opinion. See Introd., pp. 517,
518.

critic arrives at his conclusions through a maze of the most bewildering details. The only thing to be compared with it is the calculations from which the weight, distance, and finally even the position of Neptune were inferred from the perturbations in the orbit of Uranus. Literary criticism must obviously from henceforth take its position among the exact sciences. But what a pity it seems unable, nevertheless, to settle the great question of the authorship of Shakespeare's plays as infallibly as it has settled that of the Pentateuch!

No. 37. Dr. Driver is clearly right when he says that in such a sentence as we find in ix. 1, " the older language would either prefix *vay'hi* [" and it came to pass "] or place the infinitive *later* in the sentence." But it is really *very* unkind of him to favor us with a specimen of " the bottomless perjury of an *et cetera* " in his citations from Genesis on this point, as in his " Gen. xix. 16; xxxiv. 7, etc." Surely a fine opportunity has been lost here of showing us the literary and *late* characteristics of the post-exilic P.

It is unfortunate, too, that one of these citations should have been taken from Gen. xxxiv., where the assignments of verses are, as we have already seen,[1] more arbitrary than anywhere else. Could not Dr. Driver have given us an opportunity of seeing for ourselves whether P in this respect symbolizes (as he certainly does) with the " older writers " here? But perhaps Dr. Driver saw the ice labeled " Dangerous " here, and therefore skated over it as fast as he could!

No. 38. We have already referred to *ghad l'* (see above, on ix. 4). So we have only to note that Dr. Driver's list gives us many examples from the Chronicler, one from the compiler of Ezra, and one from the dubious portion of the book men-

[1] See my first paper (Bibliotheca Sacra, January, 1910, pp. 37 ff.).

tioned above, none from Nehemiah, one from " D²," but *none* from P!

It is needless to follow the Professor in his remarks on the various uses of *l'*, " to," by the later writers. They occur exclusively in Chronicles and Ezra, save *one* instance from Nehemiah. *Not* one of them is found in P. For " singers," " gate-keepers," and " cymbals," see above.

We have now gone through our investigation. We have studied the words and phrases in the Pentateuch asserted by the critics to be peculiar to P, and have found scarcely one of them to be characterisfic of the post-exilic period. We have selected one post-exilic book, and we have found that the words and phrases peculiar to the post-exilic writers are in *no single instance* to be found in P. We have examined the words and phrases alleged by Dr. Driver to be characteristic of the Chronicler, and therefore of later date. *None* of these characteristics are shared by P. An examination of Ezra has been virtually an examination of Nehemiah also, for the references to that book have proved that there is a very close correspondence in style between the two authors, thus marking them out as contemporaries, if not something more. There is every reason to believe, therefore, that a similar examination of Nehemiah will produce the same results. If called for, such an examination shall be made. But there seems little need, under the circumstances, to inflict it upon the reader. We may very fairly assume provisionally that it will yield similar results, especially as no critic has as yet discovered any special correspondence between Nehemiah and P, or indeed between the latter author and *any* of the admittedly post-exilic writers. Thus the probabilities seem very great indeed that the facts the critics profess to have dis-

covered are not really facts at all, but simply conclusions from the critical theories. *Scientific* research in these days, as we all know, is built on induction, and induction consists in generalization from facts. The old fashion of laying down principles and then squaring the facts to those principles, has been universally abandoned — save by the biblical critic, who has returned, *in that one branch of scientific research alone,* to the old exploded fashions. For what is his fundamental principle of procedure? He first lays down his axiom " There can be no supernatural." From this follows, " as a thing of course," that there can be no miracles and no prophecy, save so far as able and far-seeing men may be able to foresee coming events in a purely natural manner. Thus we arrive at the necessary conclusion that every narrative postulating miracles must have been written at a considerably later date than the events it sets itself to record,[1] and every prophecy requiring anything beyond the ordinary foresight of a man of exceptional capacity must have been written after the event, or else have reference to some other event or sequence of events than that — or those — which it has been supposed to foreshadow. Therefore the Divine education of the Israelites must have proceeded on exactly the same lines as the Divine education of other peoples. It commenced with fetichism, and advanced, through animism and polytheism, to its final monotheistic development. It may be well to note, in passing, that this history of the evolution of monotheism is strongly disputed by many contemporary investigators of repute. They believe monotheism to have been the original belief of mankind. But " science " — that is, science of the kind we are considering — takes no heed of such reactionary thinkers as these. She proceeds on her ma-

---

[1] It may be well to note that even this syllogism is hardly legitimate. The supernatural may have been inferred by a contemporary writer from a series of remarkable though purely natural events.

jestic march, flinging aside with magnificent scorn all the facts
which do not correspond with her preconceived ideas, to her
foregone conclusion, the non-existence of the supernatural.
What matters it if, in her sublime realization of her ideal, she
has constructed a history the like of which was never known
since the world began — the history of a people which de-
serted all its cherished traditions at the bidding of a monothe-
istic sect; asked no questions, suggested no difficulties, but
slavishly substituted forgeries for facts, and then studiously
interpolated them into its genuine histories at the bidding of
the sect aforesaid?[1] As these " scientific " conclusions are in-
disputable, the methods of such science must necessarily be in-
fallible. When it publishes its analysis of the Pentateuch, and
assigns without deigning to produce proofs, and yet with the
claim to absolute inerrancy, the various portions of that book
to their respective authors and dates, who shall dare to dispute
its verdict? When it splits the work of perhaps the most sub-
lime and original author the world has ever known into a
dozen portions, of various dates, and by various hands, what
can we do but sit mute before the inscrutable wisdom which
has settled so knotty a point?[2] When the authentic history of
Israel has been recovered from the interpolations of the Deu-
teronomist or Deuteronomists, and the countless emendations
of the priestly caste, and made to tell the simple — and alto-
gether unintelligible — story of the purely natural evolution

　　[1] The critical theory which holds the field at present is compelled
to inform us, though it wisely keeps the alleged fact as much as
possible in the background, that *all* the history which has come down
to us has been systematically revised and falsified by adherents of
the Deuteronomist and the compiler, or compilers, of the Priestly
Code, in the interests of their preconceived ideas.

　　[2] The English reader of Isaiah is quite capable of discerning that
the style of that book is homogeneous throughout, and entirely un-
like that of any author, known or unknown, in any language what-
soever.

of Israel's religion, what can we do but fall down and worship the skill with which so difficult and delicate a problem has been achieved? If the despised traditionalist should venture to ask *how* it was that so miraculously unique a history could have been naturally evolved under precisely the same conditions as those of the surrounding nations, in whose history nothing of the kind occurred, or was even approached, his objections, obviously, are most successfully refuted by a contemptuous silence. He has elected to be a child; and children, as we all know, must not ask questions. Yet questions, we may be quite certain, will be asked, and when it is found that even the conclusions of the biblical critic can be met and exploded, not on *a priori* grounds, but on purely critical lines, his last fortress, his affectation of intellectual superiority, will have been stormed, and he and his "indisputable results of modern critical research" will pass together into profound and unlamented oblivion.

I feel compelled to add a few words by way of postscript, because I have charged the critics above with founding their criticism on the principle that there can be no supernatural, and no miracles. I find, and I am very pleased to find, that they are, many of them, rather sensitive under such an accusation. But, as Professor Orr has reminded us in the London *Churchman* for July, in his review of a recent work of the Canadian Professor Jordan, their leaders Graf, Kuenen, Wellhausen, Duhm, Stade, are anti-supernaturalists. And we all know that "a man is known by the company he keeps." But, as I have frequently remarked, it is a very common feature of the English disciples of the critics above named to accept the conclusions of their leaders, while disavowing the principles on which those principles were reached. This is hardly a logical

method of procedure. Neither does it seem very consistent for men to utter empty phrases of reverence for the Old Testament and of admiration for its high morality, when they have been busily engaged in demolishing the historical and moral foundations on which that reverence for it and that belief in its inspiration have hitherto rested. I cannot take up any more space on this point. But I may be permitted to add just this, that I shall have more respect for these disclaimers when I find literary and historic criticism taking the same shape as that which I have presumed to call in question, in the case of the histories and literature of the nations into which the belief in the supernatural does not enter. At present the methods of the biblical critic are strictly confined to Holy Scripture. They are laughed to scorn when applied to authors of any other age or country but that which we have been considering. When those methods have become universal, it will be fair to speak of them as " scientific," and not before.