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

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

Investment ethics tell sublimely on our immortal destinies. Oh, the best investment of our money is in "bags that wax not old"—"treasure in heaven that faileth not." A painted thing at Monte Carlo was overheard saying to another: "Me and the duchess has made a pot." The fellow-gamblers out of whom they made it will hardly be ready to welcome those two into "the eternal tabernacles." We were best to invest our money in making friends with it that will do that; not in making men our tools with it, or our flatterers with it, or our envious rivals with it, or our fair-weather companions with it; *i.e.*, making them in the end our victims with it and our enemies with it.

The reader will suspect a sermon if I enlarge on the best uses for money. But it belongs to the ethics of investment to remember that we may turn orphans into our advocates with it, make the widow's tears plead in our behalf with it, cause the famished to call down a benison on our meals with it! St. Martin invested a tattered man with half his cloak, and in the visions of the night saw Christ wearing it in the skies. Poetry, romance, no doubt; but I hope we need not empty all romance and poetry even out of our ethics!

Invest your money in doing good for Christ's sake, and you will have heaven for a safe, angels for cashiers, God for your banker, and One to welcome you when all the institutions, financial and other, of this world are "suspended, pending reconstruction," to a "city" of such unearthly wealth that jewels are laid down there as foundations for gate-posts, and gold is of so small account that they pave the streets with it, and trample it beneath their feet!

S. BALLARAT.

ART. II.—THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH.

No. XIII.

WE have now arrived at chap. xvii., which, we are told, belongs exclusively to P. It records the establishment of the rite of circumcision, and this, of course, is a "priestly" question, and must be described by the priestly writer. So obvious is this that neither Wellhausen nor Professor Driver think it necessary to give any other reasons for assigning this chapter to P than that the "promises to the patriarchs" in P are "*limited to Israel itself.*" There is, it is true, a distinct promise to the "patriarch" Abraham in this chapter, which, so far from being "limited to Israel itself," refers to Ishmael.

But that, of course, goes for nothing. Then we are told[1] that the "style of this chapter is formal and wearisome. It is the style of a priest." Here is another judicial *dictum*, which it were, of course, presumptuous to question. One might ask why the style of a priest should be more "formal and wearisome" than that of another man. Or one might be tempted to indulge in unprofitable reminiscences of books written by "priests" which were neither "formal" nor "wearisome." One's memory might recur to a book written by one "of the priests that were in Anathoth," in which some benighted persons have discovered eloquence and power of a very high order. Or our thoughts might stray in another direction. They might stray, for instance, along the "formal and wearisome" pages of Mr. Fripp's "Priestly History Book," where the narrative of Gen. xvii. is given. And they might fancy that they found there some passages which were even picturesque and striking. Or one might exchange "literary" for "historical" criticism. One might ask whether it were by any chance possible that the institution of circumcision were actually handed down among the Israelites at the instance of Abraham, their forefather. One might express a wonder whether there were any trace of the custom before the return from the Captivity. And, if so, one might further wonder whether any authentic record of the establishment of the custom had been handed down, and, if not, why not? One might further inquire why, if there were any earlier and more authentic record of its establishment, especially if it were really Abrahamic in its origin, that record was not preferred to one written fourteen hundred years after the event? *Some* origin of the custom of circumcision there must have been. And if criticism can discover for us a more accurate one than that which P has given us, by all means let it be done. At present, however, it has *not* been done. Again, as the redactor has enriched his pages with some lively, and even dramatic, details, it might be asked what was the irresistible magic of the priestly writer's "formal and wearisome" style here which induced the redactor to quote that particular portion of his narrative *verbatim?* Moreover, one might be tempted to argue that there are frequent and unquestionable — even by modern critics — references to the custom of circumcision as existing among the Jews at an early date. The reason, therefore, why the redactor selected this particular narrative when others were open to him may not seem particularly clear. But what boots it to reason thus? "The critics are agreed." The last word of scientific research

[1] Fripp, "Composition of the Book of Genesis," p. 164.

has been spoken. This chapter is part of the "Priestly History." It is "formal and wearisome." And it was written after the return from the Captivity, and embodied, at a later date, in a history of Israel which was ultimately received by the Jewish people.

Another difficulty, however, meets us at the outset. The priestly writer is an Elohist. But the writer tells us that it was *Jehovah* who "appeared to Abram." This might seem a little staggering to the ordinary mind. But it is marvellous how easily difficulties disappear when one is properly trained in the school of modern critical research. We are to "read 'Elohim,'" says Mr. Fripp. And his masters say so, too. No reason is given; nor does it seem that any reason is needed. The obstinate literalist might no doubt be absurd enough to contend that the principle is one which, if applied generally, would be fatal to all theories about Jehovistic and Elohistic writers whatsoever. But this is only another instance of his stupidity and obstinacy. "The piece is Elohistic," as Wellhausen would say (and he *does* say such things when it suits him). So Jehovah is a mistake for Elohim, and the question of authorship is thus satisfactorily settled.

Not quite, however, even yet. For, once more, it is a characteristic of the priestly writer that he is "less anthropomorphic" than JE. Professor Driver,[1] however, is good enough to admit that the latter writer speaks of God as "appearing" to men, and he labours to show that such "appearances" are "less anthropomorphic" than "angels or dreams." One would have thought just the contrary. An appearance in a dream, or a message by an inferior being, is not "anthropomorphic" at all in the sense in which the word is here used, that of God Himself assuming a human shape. But one must not dispute with a modern critic. Nevertheless, it is quite certain that "appearances" of Jehovah are regarded as common in Genesis, whether in JE or P, whereas after the time of Abraham it came to be believed that none could "look on God and live."[2] This, once more, tends to confirm the view that the sources of Genesis are older than those of any other book of the Old Testament, and even that it was really written before the rest. One almost trembles to write such a sentence in the last decade of the nineteenth century; yet

[1] "Introduction," p. 121.

[2] Gen. xxxii. 30; Exod. xxxiii. 20; Deut. v. 24; Judg. vi. 22; xiii. 22. It is a remarkable proof that this part of the Pentateuch is drawn from extremely early sources—that the appearance of God excites no fear until the time of Jacob. It may be noted, too, that the words in ch. xvii. 1 and in xviii. 1 are the same (יהוה יראה), no small sign of unity of authorship.

one is slightly encouraged, perhaps, by the recollection of how funny the late Mr. Matthew Arnold thought it, thirty years ago, of the "Bishops of Winchester and Gloucester" of his day (the latter, one is happy to say, is Bishop of Gloucester still) to speak of God as a Person; and how absurd it was, in his eyes, to fancy that the "Fourth Gospel" could possibly have been the work of the Apostle St. John.

The next point which strikes one as remarkable is this: God appears unto Abram at what the historian, be he Moses or P, or whosoever he may be, evidently supposed to be a critical moment, and announces that he is "El Shaddai." Wheresoever else these words occur in the Pentateuch, with one exception, which will presently be noted, they are assigned, as the reader will be prepared to expect, to P. But it is strange that the word "Shaddai" only occurs elsewhere twice in the Psalms, once in Isaiah, twice in Ezekiel, once in Joel, twice in the Book of Ruth, *twice in the history of Balaam*, and *very frequently in the Book of Job*. Now, P is, as we are told, distinctively the book of the covenant with Israel. And the word "Shaddai" scarcely appears in the exclusively Hebrew portion of the Old Testament at all. Naomi, who had long been a stranger in a strange land, uses it. It is a favourite word in the mouth of the accursed heathen prophet Balaam. And it is specially used in a book the utterances of which are placed in the mouth, not of Jews, but of denizens of the land of Uz. It appears strange that this word should be seized upon by P, of all writers, as the special title of the covenant God of Abraham, when the evidence, as Dean Plumptre, in his "Biblical Studies," intimates, points to its having been, like El Eljon, a term in use by the Semitic nations generally. It is stranger still to find a late writer, such as P, recording in Exod. vi. 3 the substitution by El Shaddai Himself of Jehovah, or Jahveh, for His former title, and to find as a fact that throughout the Hebrew Scriptures, with the exception of the Book of Job, the word Jehovah, or Jahveh, *has* supplanted it—that is to say, that the Jews have preferred a name of later origin to that which, though it was common among kindred nations, was also the special title by which the covenant with Abraham was dignified. It would be strange indeed for a post-exilic writer to assert the substitution of a well-known name of God for one which, if the critical theories are correct, never had obtained at all in earlier Israelite days. It is, of course, perfectly futile to hazard a suggestion, in view of the perfection to which the art of Biblical criticism has been brought among us. But had it not reached that pitch of perfection, one would have been tempted to see here the utterance of a very early writer indeed, who had access to sources containing some

very special and accurate information. El Shaddai was doubtless the name by which God was known to the monotheists in Ur of the Chaldees. At least, it seems to an ordinary mind as nearly certain as it can be that a late Jewish writer, composing his work with the whole of the Hebrew Scriptures before him, would hardly have represented God, at the moment of His entering into His solemn covenant with Abraham, and instituting the rite of circumcision as a sign and pledge of it, as introducing Himself to Abraham by a name by which, so far as the history bears witness, He was not generally known to the Israelitish people. If it be argued that the name here given is expressly set aside in Exod. vi. 3, we may still ask where the post-exilic historian got his facts from if he be writing authentic history, and, if not, why he sets up a title one moment only to fling it down the next?

The next point, though it is a slight one, is not altogether void of significance. In ver. 3 God is said to "speak" to Abraham. As He had just before been said to "appear" to him, the anthropomorphic character of the section is heightened. And once more the passage suggests a source of very high antiquity rather than the more spiritual conceptions of God which years of religious education and experience had developed among the Jews of the post-exilic era. Then, again, it may be well once more to point out that, in spite of the alleged composite nature of the sources of Genesis, *before* ver. 5 Abraham is always Abram, and after it always Abraham, from whatever authority the story is supposed to have been derived. The same may be said of Sarah. Now, if P here derived its history from JE, P is here not an independent narrative. How, then, does the critic know that the redactor is giving us an undiluted extract from P? And if he did not, how was it that the redactor avoided the mistakes in spelling into which he was so exceedingly likely to fall? Does not the fact that *never once*, by any chance, after this chapter, do we find Abraham called Abram bear witness to a care in treating the authorities, and in the transmission of the text, which, according to the critical hypothesis, was not actually taken; for had it been taken, it would not have been so easy, as the critic declares it to be, to point out the gaps and seams and patches in the work. Moreover, in Isa. li. 2, written *ex hypothesi* before P, we have the names Abraham and Sarah, not Abram and Sarai. Thus, P is at least not the original source of the narrative in chap. xvii.

Our next point is the actual evidence for the early origin of the rite of circumcision, and of the covenant founded thereupon. It is remarkable how very seldom indeed the rite of circumcision is mentioned in the Old Testament. It would

surprise most readers of the Bible if they were told that the direct references to circumcision are more numerous in the New Testament, after the rite had been set aside, than in the Old Testament. But this is simply an illustration of a well-known historical law, that the better known a custom is, the fewer, as a rule, are the references to it. From this it follows that the key of the critical position, the few references to the Tabernacle worship in the early historical books of the Old Testament, and to the Temple worship in the later ones, is extremely assailable. There can be little doubt, however, that the rite of circumcision, however few the direct references to it in the history, was in use among the Israelites from very early times. We are unable to cite Gen. xxxiv. because passages there which relate to circumcision are carefully assigned to P, apparently on the hypothesis that to P must belong all references to circumcision as a sign of the Abrahamic covenant. We will not anticipate the discussion on chap. xxxiv. beyond remarking on the close connection between ver. 14 (P) and Josh. v. 9, in which the critics do not appear to recognise the hand of P. It would seem that to be uncircumcised was a reproach among Israelites and Egyptians alike, and that both Gen. xxxiv. 14 and Josh. v. 9 are early and authentic references to this fact. The word ערל (uncircumcised), used as a term of reproach in ver. 14 of this chapter, is found in the same sense in Judg. xiv. 3 and xv. 18; in 1 Sam xiv. 6, xvii. 26, 36, xxxi. 4; 2 Sam. i. 20, as well as frequently in the prophets. Thus, various authors, none of them considered of late date, record the fact that to be uncircumcised was regarded by Israelites a reproach, and seem to justify the inference that the performance of the rite imparted a peculiar character to, and had bestowed certain special privileges on, those who underwent it. The action of Zipporah, again (Exod. iv. 24-26, assigned to JE), implies that there was an obligation to perform the rite, that it had been neglected, and that serious penalties (*cf.* Gen. xvii. 14) were attached to its non-fulfilment. Thus there is every reason to suppose, from the indirect hints of the various Old Testament writers, and all the more because they *are* indirect, that P is here relating an authentic incident. If so, from whence was it derived? If JE "knew nothing" of it, who did? If it were authentic, *why* did JE "know nothing" of it? Why may not the custom of circumcision have been thoroughly well known to JE, and why, therefore, may not the narrative of chap. xxxiv. be more largely due to JE than the critics are inclined to allow? While, on the other hand, if P is romancing here, if he is making up an *ex post facto* story in order to invest the rite of circumcision, a

mere habit borrowed from the Egyptians, with a factitious sanctity, why did he not go further? How is it that he gives us the least chance of arguing that Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, all forgot or neglected to circumcise their children?[1] How is it that the redactor, who has been, as we are given to understand, so busy in refashioning the later narratives, so as to induce his readers to believe that worship at the One Sanctuary was an ancient Mosaic precept, and not an invention of later times, has not introduced a single reference to the practice of circumcision in the subsequent history, and that even 'priestly" writers, such as Jeremiah and Ezekiel, never by any chance allude to circumcision as a sign of the Abrahamic covenant. That Ezekiel, the "father of Judaism," should so strangely have forgotten his fatherhood as to make no allusion to the most significant rite of the religion of which he was the inventor, is remarkable indeed. On the other hand, the moral significance of the rite is eloquently indicated in Deut. x. 16. The significance of this passage is striking indeed if we have here the words of the great Lawgiver, addressing, on a solemn occasion, the posterity of Abraham; while, if it be the language of a compiler in the reign of Hezekiah or Manasseh, and if it refer to a rite which was not as yet recognised as involving any sense of consecration, the language is strained and in no very particularly good taste.[2] Thus, the Old Testament writers, by their silence as well as by the occasional hints they undesignedly let drop, confirm the view that, by whomsoever and at what time soever this passage was written, the rite of circumcision was established under the circumstances, and for the objects mentioned in this chapter, namely, to mark out Israel as a peculiar covenant people of God. More minute criticism of the chapter must be deferred to another paper.

J. J. Lias.

Art. III.—THE POPES INFALLIBLE TEACHERS OF MORALS.

THE Head of the Roman Church became in the course of ages a highly composite personality. He was a patriarch, a temporal sovereign, a feudal over-lord, a public patron, a private doctor, a personal Christian, the assumed or assuming Head of the West and then of Christendom, and claiming finally absolutism in things spiritual, while throughout a large

[1] We should note that Gen. xxi. 24, 25, is arbitrarily separated from JE's narrative *because* there is in it a mention of Isaac's circumcision.

[2] Jeremiah quotes this passage in ch. iv. 4.