
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

loyalty, to regard cardinal truth from those different points of view which represent the spiritual attitudes of differently-constituted minds.

ART. II.—THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH.

PART VIII.

ALTHOUGH I have not yet arrived at Gen. x., I may be allowed to call the reader's attention to the "fingers of a man's hand" which have written the approaching downfall of the whole structure of German criticism of the Old Testament. As Professor Sayce has repeatedly testified, that criticism will ultimately receive its *coup de grâce* from the discoveries of archæology. The hand is that of the famous archæologist, Professor Hommel, who has lately (in the *Academy*) informed the world that Gen. x. 6 could only have originated in the reigns of Thutmes (or *Thothmes*) III. and his successors at a time *considerably before the Exodus*, inasmuch as it speaks of Canaan as the younger brother of Mizraim, or Egypt. Professor Hommel believes the genealogy to have followed political rather than racial distinctions. Professor Driver, following his German authorities, assigns this document mainly to P in the fifth century before Christ. There is, speaking roughly, about a thousand years between the two dates—a sufficiently wide discrepancy to suggest a little hesitation before accepting the P theory as conclusively settled, especially when we consider the kind of arguments to which the School of Kuenen and Wellhausen are accustomed to resort in order to the establishment of their positions. The archæologists may build wrongly, but at least they build upon facts. The German School build upon inferences which are themselves very largely based on assumptions.

I turn now to the consideration of the linguistic features of Gen. viii. The first point which strikes us is the arbitrary separation by the critics of verses 2*b*, 3*a*, from P's narrative, which is supposed to go down to the word "stopped," and be resumed again at the words "and at the end of the hundred and fifty days." There seems no sufficient reason for this. The word כָּלָא, translated "restrained," is not peculiar to JE. It occurs in the Niphal or passive in Exod. xxxvi. 6, which is assigned to P. And in the Kal or active voice it appears in JE in Numb. xi. 28, and in P in Gen. xxiii. 6. If the word "rain" (גֶּשֶׁם) is supposed to be a characteristic of JE because it occurs in chap. vii. 12, we may observe that it also occurs in

Lev. xxvi. 4, which belongs to P.[1] It is obvious that, under these circumstances, the arguments for unity of authorship outweigh those for plurality in this passage. There is absolutely not a shred of proof that verse 3*a* belongs to JE more than to P; and some ground for the contrary conclusion in the fact that the expression "went on returning" is found here and in verse 5 (P).[2]

The fact that this construction with the two infinitives recurs again in verse 7 (JE), is a very strong proof that the whole passage is by one author. The use of חסר again in the sense of "abate," "become less," is evidently the *original* use. The sense to *come short*, or *lack*, found in Gen. xviii. 28 (JE), and Exod. xvi. 18, and also in Deuteronomy, is obviously derived from the former. The fact, therefore, that חסר is used in its original sense only here, in verses 3, 5 (P), points to this passage as *early* Hebrew. Yet we are now told that it is post-exilic. Another point may be noted, the remarkable copiousness of vocabulary in this history of the Deluge. We have "flood," "flood of waters," "waters of the flood," "waters," "rain," "fountains of the great deep," "windows of heaven." But with the exception of these last two expressions (and one of these recurs in slightly altered phrase, the word "great" being omitted), this varied phraseology is characteristic of *both* narratives. Thus both narratives are derived from one source, Babylonian tradition, and are both distinguished by great variety of diction. Yet we are told that they come from two perfectly different sources. And, as may easily be seen by comparing the analysis here with the methods adopted in Wellhausen on the composition of the Pentateuch, the grounds on which the separation is effected are not one whit more cogent than the arguments here adduced—the archæological argument being for the moment neglected—for unity of authorship. But if we are to set aside the traditions of centuries and of a whole nation, we ought surely to have a vast preponderance of argument on the negative side.

Why Noah should have sent forth the raven (JE) unless he had felt the ark ground (P) seems a little puzzling, for JE says nothing whatever about the ark resting anywhere, but only of the waters returning off the earth. And observe once more the copious vocabulary of the prosaic P, who uses here *three* different words for the returning of the waters to JE's one. This copiousness of vocabulary should have induced the critic surely to have assigned a considerable part of the passage to JE. But in truth, as has just been remarked, the *copia verborum* applies to the whole passage.

[1] נשם is by no means a common word in the Old Testament.

[2] See Gesenius, "Heb. Gr.," 128, 3.

We pass over verses 6-12 (assigned to JE) with the simple remark that another proof of the copiousness of diction in this passage is given us by the employment of yet another word (קלו) for the abating of the waters in verses 8, 11. Verse 13 is divided, and the first part assigned to P and the second to JE, for no apparent reason except that the dates are to be assigned to the dry and formal post-exilic narrator. But the critics have overlooked the fact that the *same* word (חרבו) is used for "were dried" in *each* portion of verse 13, and a *different* word in verse 14. The evidence would therefore point to the contrary conclusion, namely, to the two parts of verse 13 being by one hand, and verse 14 being by another. Moreover, the word used for "dry" in verse 14 (P) is used in verse 7 (JE). Once more we must venture to pronounce the assignment of the narrative to its separate authors here to be *willkurlich*—arbitrary. It rests upon a foregone conclusion. It lacks anything which can reasonably be termed proof.

We have already discussed the phraseology of verse 17. But we have in verse 19 (P) to observe a remarkable word, משפחה (family), for the more usual מין (kind) here. As מין, we are told, is a word specially characteristic of P (though it also occurs frequently in Deuteronomy), it would seem reasonable to expect that the occurrence of משפחה here in the unusual sense of *species* or *kind*, would have led the critics to assign it to some other author. This, however, is not the case, although verses 20-22 *are* assigned to JE. The reason for this is the use of the word "Jehovah" in the passage, which is believed to mark it off as the work of the Jehovist. Some remarkable facts, however, will be elicited by a consideration of the passage. First, there is the fact that the distinction between clean and unclean beasts is known to JE and P alike. There must therefore have been some law defining the difference in existence when JE was written. But the first record of a law to that effect, on the critical theory, is in Deuteronomy, which is held to have been written *after* JE. This will serve to explain why Deuteronomy, which we were told was *composed* between the reigns of Hezekiah and Josiah, is now said to have been *compiled* about that date. *Some* definite regulations regarding ceremonial and sacrifice—though to whom they were owing we have, according to the critics, no information — were clearly already in existence before the "earliest book of Hebrew history" was written. Before the "eighth or ninth century B.C.," it was already unusual to offer beasts in sacrifice which were regarded as ceremonially unclean. How can this be, if Wellhausen is right in telling us that no special regulations for sacrifice existed in Israel before the

appearance of the Priestly Code? The same conclusion follows from the "sweet savour." We find it denoting sacrifice acceptable in the eyes of the gods in the early Babylonian account of the Deluge which was quoted in the last paper. It was evidently then the customary phrase for a sacrifice acceptable in the eyes of the gods. The date of this account is supposed by the archæologists to be B.C. 2350. But we are to believe that nearly two thousand years elapsed before the technical Babylonian phrase, already known to JE in the "eighth or ninth century B.C.," became the accepted technical phrase for Jewish propitiatory sacrifices, as we find it in Lev. i.-iv., Num. xv., etc. Which is more likely, that the phrase was handed down through the whole course of Jewish history, and was finally adopted after the return from Babylon, when Babylonish religious words and ideas, as well as the religious phrases and ideas of unregenerate Israel, stank in the nostrils of the party which was resolved to establish a strict and exclusive worship at the one sanctuary, or that the phrase which we now know was in use in Abraham's native land, should have been handed down by him to his descendants, and take its place in the ritual prescribed by the founder of the Israelite polity?

Our next point will be the mention of the "burnt-offering." It is one of the commonplaces of the German criticism, though toned down a good deal, and rendered extremely indefinite among the English disciples of the School, that the minute and exact regulations for Divine worship which we find in the Priestly Code were unknown in early times. Wellhausen goes so far as to contend that the Priestly Code represents Moses as being the originator of all sacrifice, but Dr. Baxter, in his reply to Wellhausen, has disposed of that absurd statement. Moses no doubt rendered more definite the regulations which had been handed down among the descendants of Abraham. But there is no ground for the pretence that they were ever supposed to have originated with him. This theory has to meet the difficulty that a definite ritual, approaching that laid down in Leviticus, was already known to the Jehovistic writer of the "eighth or ninth century B.C." For Noah does not offer a *sacrifice*, the generic name of which is זבח. He offers a *burnt-offering* (עלה), the special characteristic of which is that it is *wholly consumed*, and having been thus converted into smoke, is supposed to have "gone up" (for this the Hebrew name implies) as a propitiatory or eucharistic offering before God. This "burnt sacrifice" is said in Lev. i. 17 to be "an offering made by fire of a sweet savour unto Jehovah." And the writer of the "eighth or ninth century B.C." was already

acquainted with the same ceremonial and the same ideas of its acceptability in the eyes of God. He represents, it is true, Noah as having already the same idea of sacrifice before him. It is of course possible that the writer of the narrative may have coloured his account by his own religious conceptions. But the upholders of the theory mentioned above have to explain how it was that this defined idea of the virtue of the burnt sacrifice had obtained a firm hold on the writer of "the earliest book of Hebrew history."

We conclude our remarks on chap. viii. (1) with what is evidently a quotation of Gen. iii. in verse 21 with the word קלל substituted for ארר. This, if it suited the critics, would be adduced as a sign of different authorship, though in this case both are assigned to JE, and (2) with the anticipatory mention of the covenant not to destroy the earth mentioned in chap. ix. If, as is alleged, chap. viii. 21 is the work of JE, we find once more the two narratives substantially identical. Why was one preferred to the other here? and what real reason is there why they should not be the work of the same hand?

The first seventeen verses of chap ix. are supposed to belong to P. In verse 3 we have the expression ירק עשב, which also occurs in P in Gen. i. 30. But ירק, which occurs very seldom indeed in the sense of everything green[1] in the Old Testament, occurs also in Exod. x. 15 and Num. xx. 4 (JE). Here, again, were we critics of the German school, and had we an hypothesis to maintain, we should discern clear signs of a common instead of a separate authorship. As it is, we have only to remark that it is curious how the use of certain words is declared to be significant when it is desired that they should be so, and of absolutely no consequence when it is not. Once more we may note how Gesenius points out the peculiar use of איש for "each" here and in Gen. xv. 10 (JE), another delicate trace of unity of authorship. In verses 4-6 we have two important principles laid down—first, that "the blood is the life";[2] and, secondly, that the murderer is to be put to death. Was the first a principle inherited from the earliest times and laid down by the founder of Jewish institutions? It would seem so, for we find the unlawfulness of eating the blood fully recognised and inwoven with the story so as to make its detachment difficult in 1 Sam. xiv. 32-34. Or are we to suppose that this last was a later insertion, and that it was really first introduced by the Deuteronomist (xii. 23-25), ratified in the Priestly Code (Lev. xvii. 10-14), and introduced

[1] The Masorites distinguish between יֶרֶק and יָרָק.

[2] נפשׁ, *ψυχή*, the principle of our animal life.

here and in 1 Sam. xiv. to emphasize the prohibition? We may further remark that if these additions to the narrative were really made with a dogmatic purpose, they appear to have been very capriciously added, and in many cases to have been likely to have altogether failed in their purpose, from the want of any special emphasis laid upon them. We should, *e.g.*, be disposed to expect this precept to have been brought in very frequently into the history if it were introduced for dogmatic purposes at all. But if we believe these books to have emanated from Moses' authority, all seems plain and intelligible. Nothing would be more likely than that he should give special prominence to such a command uttered on so solemn an occasion. And with regard to the duty of putting a murderer to death, it appears in what critics of the German school regard as the earliest portion of the Pentateuch, the Book of the Covenant (Exod. xx.-xxiii.). Why should this not have been a precept handed down traditionally among the descendants of Abraham as having been given at the very dawn of post-diluvian civilization—a lesson learned from the disorder and violence which had reigned before? The expression to "require (דרשׁ) blood at anyone's hands" is found here, where it is assigned to P, in Gen. xlii. 22 (JE), in Ps. ix. 5, and in Ezek. xxxiii. 6. Which is more probable, that the Psalmist and prophet were quoting a striking passage in the Pentateuch, or that the Psalmist, Ezekiel, and P made use of a somewhat obscure expression in JE? We will leave the point with one further remark, that the earliest portion of the Pentateuch, allowed to be such by the critics, recognises the necessity of slaying the beast which has slain a man (Exod. xxi. 28). Is the passage before us the cause or consequence of this provision at the very starting-point of the Mosaic law?

A fresh argument for the early date of this chapter may be drawn from Isa. liv. 9, 10. There is a clear allusion there either to this passage or to chap. viii. 21. But investigation shows that the allusion is to this passage. For in chap. viii. 21 we have simply God's own resolution, if afterwards proclaimed and ratified by the declaration in the passage before us. In the former passage God is speaking to *Himself* (אל-לבו). In the latter he is making a covenant with His people. And to that covenant Isaiah is clearly referring. It is true that modern criticism claims to have demonstrated that Isa. xl. to lxvi. were written at Babylon; and it cannot be denied that here the critics have something beyond mere assertion or ingenious special pleading to support their arguments. But at least we cannot escape the conclusion that the supposed unknown writer in Babylon *had P's narrative before*

him. For Isaiah speaks of an *oath* and of a *covenant.* And the solemnity with which the covenant is repeatedly mentioned here may fitly be described in the words "I have sworn" (נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי). Then we may further remark that the *repetition,* which we are so frequently told is the sign that two different accounts are combined, is found here, where verses 1-17 are taken from P. Indeed, it is confessed that repetition is a feature of P's style.[1] Why, then, may not the repetitions in the Pentateuch be regarded as characteristics of the style of one author? There are at least repetitions enough in this passage—compare verses 10, 15; 9, 11, 15, 16; 12, 17; 13, 16. Had it suited the critics to point it out, there is as much evidence of "recurring features," and of the combination of two or more sources in this account of the covenant, as in that of the Deluge itself. But there is more which remains to be said about this covenant. If Mr. St. Chad Boscawen is to be believed, it finds a place in the early Babylonish account of which mention has already been made. Professor Sayce, it is true, translates the words, "he turned towards us and stood between us; he blessed us." But Mr. St. Chad Boscawen renders "he turned towards us and established himself to us in a covenant."[2] And the translation seems a reasonable one. But what is unreasonable, on the hypothesis that Mr. St. Chad Boscawen's translation is correct, is that we should find the mention of this covenant in a writer who would have every reason for rejecting an account contained in the records of a cruel, a hostile, and an idolatrous people.

The passage which follows is taken from JE, we are told. Why? If repetition is characteristic of the author of the Pentateuch, he would have been very likely to have repeated himself here. On the other hand, if the redactor had copied the names of the three sons of Noah before (chap. v. 32), there was no need to have copied them again. Nor is this all. JE seems here to have copied P. For he says emphatically that Ham was the "father of Canaan," a fact which P has quietly embodied in his genealogy in chap. x. 6.[3] Moreover, P once more states that the nations of the earth were "divided

[1] Driver, "Introduction," p. 122.

[2] "The Bible and the Monuments," p. 129.

[3] A more recent authority finds in this passage a "redactional addition." The history of the changes in critical opinion, as one theory after another had to be abandoned, would be instructive, if somewhat dry reading. And it would do much to explode the notion of the infallibility of experts which has taken fast hold of some among us. It may be observed, however, that what the latest phase of subjective criticism makes into a "redactional addition," Professor Hommel, on archæological grounds, assigns to a period long anterior to Moses!—another reason, one would think, for suspending one's judgment at least a little longer.

in the earth after the flood" (x. 32), while here JE states that the "earth" was "overspread" by them. It seems hardly possible to contend that these passages are independent of one another. And if not independent, then, as far as these particular passages are concerned, the whole theory goes to the winds. Nor is it easy to see what particular proofs can be offered, as distinct from guesses or assertions, that the critics have rightly divided these particular passages, and rightly indicated their date and author. That the relations between the Jehovist and Elohist in verses 26, 27 are close enough to justify the theory that J and E are practically one narrative we are not disposed to deny. But that there are any cogent grounds on which a portion of this passage can be shown to belong to the pre-exilic, rather than the post-exilic, Elohist, we are disposed respectfully to deny. At least, we may suggest that whatever grounds there are should not be left in books such as Wellhausen's not very convincing treatise on the "Composition of the Hexateuch," but should be stated for the benefit of a wider circle of readers than are likely to consult that work.

ART III.—MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

THE late Archbishop, not long before his death, mentioned to a friend the maintenance of the ancient marriage laws of the Church as one among three questions which were causing him particular anxiety. He alluded, no doubt, primarily, if not exclusively, to the attack made upon these laws in reference to marriage with a deceased wife's sister. For, as regards the re-marriage of divorced persons, no one will affirm that the law of our Church is at present in a perfectly satisfactory state, and ought to be maintained as it actually exists. Whatever divergent views we may hold on the subject, all Churchmen will admit that it requires amendment of some sort. But the law of the Church as regards marriage with a deceased wife's sister has substantially remained unaltered for centuries. It is clear, consistent, and well-defined. It admits of no refinements or gradation of opinion. Only two views are possible upon it. At the same time, its maintenance is unmistakeably threatened. Last year the House of Lords, by a substantial majority, passed a Bill for legalizing these marriages from a civil point of view, with no adequate reservation of the right of the Church to hold an independent