

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

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 *The Churchman* can be found here:

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

THE
CHURCHMAN

DECEMBER, 1899.

ART. I.—THE WITNESS OF THE HISTORICAL SCRIPTURES TO THE ACCURACY OF THE PENTATEUCH.

THE preliminary remarks in the two former papers appeared to me to be necessary to mark out the lines on which the criticism of the Old Testament documents should and should not proceed. I pass on now to the task which I have proposed to myself, namely, the examination of the methods of the German school in dealing with the documents which contain Hebrew history subsequent to the settlement in Palestine. First of all comes the Book of Joshua. Both parties are agreed that in its present shape it is subsequent to Deuteronomy. The most cursory glance at its contents will serve to establish this. There is the closest possible relation between the contents of the two books. It follows, therefore, that at whatever period Deuteronomy was written, Joshua must have been written not long after. If Deuteronomy, though written some time previously, remained unpublished till the reign of Josiah, the Book of Joshua must have been compiled after the reign of Josiah had come to an end. Accordingly, Professor Driver, to whose "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament" I shall mainly confine myself, as having been written to popularize as far as possible in England the results of German research, gives the following résumé of the conclusions reached in regard to the composition and authorship of Joshua. It "consists, at least in large measure, of a continuation of the documents used in the formation of the Pentateuch." In the first twelve chapters "the *main* narrative consists of a work, *itself also in parts composite*, which appears to be the continuation of JE," though it is doubtful whether J and E are its component

parts, or whether it was the work of the person who combined J and E, but here, "perhaps, permitted himself the use of other independent sources." A rather complicated skein this, one would think, to unravel without risk of failure. In the remaining chapters, "*especially in the topographical descriptions*, the work of P predominates." But this is not all. Before JE was combined with P, the former "seems to have passed through the hands of a writer who expanded it in different ways, and who, being strongly imbued with the spirit of Deuteronomy, may be termed the Deuteronomic editor." "The parts added by this writer" may, as a rule, be "readily recognised by their characteristic style," and their chief aim is to "illustrate and emphasize the zeal shown by Joshua in fulfilling Mosaic ordinances, especially the command to extirpate the native population of Canaan. Now, in the first place, it will not be out of place to ask what proof there is—I go further: I ask what probability there is—that an analysis of a document into such a variety of component parts can possibly be performed with even approximate success. If the task be possible, let its possibility be shown by experiment. Inductive methods of reasoning, however reasonable or probable, are never regarded by men of science as established until they have been applied to a given case, and have been found to succeed. The assertion that so intricate an analysis as this can be carried out without risk of mistake is one which must be admitted to make a very considerable demand upon our faith. Granting—though in my essay in "*Lex Mosaica*" I have given reasons for the belief that it was by no means the invariable rule—that the Hebrew historians, as a rule, were mere compilers, it would be necessary that the documents thus combined should be far more widely removed in date and style than it is contended that they are if the component parts are to be separated with any approach to success. It is only marked divergencies in style and diction which criticism can safely pronounce upon, as every literary critic well knows. The more delicate shades of difference cannot be pointed out with any approach to certainty. Take the first twelve chapters. It is admitted that in these the Book of Joshua, as it stands, is a continuation of the Pentateuch as it stands. But there is a "main narrative" which "in parts is composite." What its component parts are, be it observed, is not quite clearly settled. This "main narrative"—and which *is* the "main narrative" modern critics, however closely agreed, do not appear able to tell us precisely—underwent a revision, either in the reigns of Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, or Zedekiah, or possibly during the Captivity, in which "Deuteronomic" ideas were carefully

worked into it. P, too, the work of the post-exilic scribe, has also been worked into it. And yet, after these repeated revisions of the original story, this continual introduction of foreign matter, some, at least, of the component elements of this "main narrative" can be unerringly detected and precisely pointed out by the modern critic! We invite the attention of historical experts to these marvellous results of modern critical analysis. We ask them whether anything so exact, so perfect, so amazingly complete, has ever been heard of in any other branch of historical or literary research. If it be possible thus accurately to distinguish these entirely unknown and otherwise unheard-of sources of Hebrew history from one another on purely subjective grounds; if we are able to show by this scientific analysis how utterly incorrect and untrustworthy Hebrew history is in its present shape, what surprising results may not be expected if these methods be applied to the history of other countries? We await this application with interest and anxiety. Meanwhile we are content to say that while the general historic and literary grounds on which this analysis rests are such as have just been described, the linguistic criticism which is added can only be adequately characterized by the favourite German word *willkürlich*. It is arbitrary to a degree. There is one other point which must not be passed over. This subjective analysis of the contents of Joshua, added to a few historical difficulties pointed out by the critics, yields results so certain, so entirely beyond question, that they have no hesitation in saying that a good many details of this composite narrative, handed down for so many ages as national history, are utterly untrue. They have been appended to the narrative in order to "illustrate and emphasize" the obedience of Joshua to commands which never had been given! They are, in fact, simply pious frauds. And this statement depends, be it further observed, not on any direct evidence whatever, critical or otherwise, but simply on the conclusions reached in regard to the date of Deuteronomy, which have already been mentioned. But in order to reach these conclusions, we must remember that it has been found necessary to set aside a considerable portion of the history which has come down to us, and which we have no ground for rejecting beyond the fact that it does not square with the views which have been put forward in Germany. When this is removed, as De Wette naïvely says about sundry statements in Chronicles, a great many difficulties in the way of the theory disappear—a very convenient way, truly, of arriving at the facts of a history! Another difficulty, moreover, attends the theory. Deuteronomy was not published till the reign of Josiah. The opposition to Deuteronomic

principles during the succeeding reigns was, as we learn from Jeremiah, one of the chief champions of Deuteronomic views, very bitter. How, then, can we account for the insertion of these daring and unscrupulous fabrications into the history of Joshua's campaigns? The motive, no doubt, was excellent. The moral and religious principles embodied in Deuteronomy are unassailable. Nevertheless, this effort to foist into the Jewish history a number of incidents which had no foundation in fact must surely have exposed the authors to considerable opposition. How is it that in books which teem with accounts of the violent party antagonisms raging in Judah towards the close of the monarchy we have not a single hint that these antagonisms were exacerbated by a policy so likely to create difficulties as that of trying to falsify Jewish history? How did Jeremiah and his supporters contrive to silence their opponents? How was it that these opponents, with Jewish history at their back, were unable to silence the Deuteronomists? Would not such efforts to falsify history have led to dissensions among the Jews of the Captivity analogous to those which arose among the Frankfort refugees in the time of Queen Mary? Again, we are reminded of the controversy with Rome. There is nothing so like the history of this alleged Deuteronomic movement as the history of the Forged Decretals. But Rome, with all her sagacity and all her strength, with all there was to support her in the conditions of the age, did not succeed in her attempt to palm off these forgeries on the Church. We may not unreasonably ask, What were the conditions under which Jeremiah and his coadjutors succeeded where the Roman Pontiffs failed? And as regards the remaining chapters of Joshua, where we are bidden to discover the hand of P, it may not be unreasonable to ask where this writer found the "topographical descriptions" in which his work abounds. In preparing a commentary on Joshua, which I published some years back, I had occasion to go very carefully over those descriptions, and I found them confirmed by modern discovery, in many cases down to the minutest detail. If written before the separation of the ten tribes, when Israel was under one head, this would be intelligible enough. But how could a Jew living in or near the age of Ezra or Nehemiah find the opportunity for a careful topographical survey of Palestine under the political conditions described as then existing? How could anyone do so after Moab had repossessed herself of the territory assigned to the tribes of Reuben and Gad?¹ It is a remarkable feature

¹ Cf. Num. xxxii. 3, 34-37 with Isa. xv., where the territory of Reuben and Gad has become Moabitic. See also Judg. xi., especially vers. 22 and

of the kind of criticism with which we are dealing that when confronted with such difficulties as these, it calmly and loftily ignores them, and proceeds serenely on its way, content to have demonstrated categorically that the persons who suggest them are unfamiliar with Wellhausen and Kuenen, and are absolutely unacquainted with Budde, Kittel, Riehm, and a host of other minor lights of modern criticism. For a time perhaps arguments of this kind may appear to superficial thinkers to be crushing. But sooner or later those who affect to have given us a history of Israel when, in fact, they have only taken it away, will have to face the questions, What was the actual history of Israel on the theories which you have elaborated? What answer have you to the difficulties in which those theories involve you?

We proceed to a more detailed criticism of the critical position. Chap. i., according to Professor Driver, is "in its present form the composition of D²," *i.e.*, the disciple of Deuteronomy, who undertook, for the purposes of his sect or party, to refashion the history of Joshua in accordance with their ideas. That this chapter is in close connection with Deuteronomy is so obvious that it cannot possibly be denied; accordingly it is not denied. But there are not wanting signs that the German view of this chapter, which Professor Driver dutifully accepts, is due to the theory on which Deuteronomy is dealt with, rather than to an impartial analysis of the phenomena the chapter presents. Thus, in ver. 4 the supposed Deuteronomic description of the boundaries of Israel's inheritance has a closer affinity to P's post-Deuteronomic account of those boundaries (Num. xxxiv. 3-12) than it has to the passage in Exod. xxiii., which is generally supposed by the German school to be one of the earliest portions of the Pentateuch, known to them (but to them only) as the "Book of the Covenant."¹ The phrase "the great river, the river Euphrates," is found, it is true, in Gen. xv. 18 (attributed to JE). But the other phrase, "the great sea," occurs only in the account of the border assigned to P (Num. xxxiv. 6, 7). Of the reasons which induced the last redactor to thrust in a passage here which is based on portions of twelve verses from P, when he had a passage more suitable to his purpose ready to hand in JE, we are as usual without information. Moreover, the allusion to the "land of the Hittites" (ver. 4), a race which we now know to have established one of the predominant empires in the neighbourhood of Palestine in early times—an empire overthrown as early as the days of Rameses II.,

26. Was all this history a Chauvinistic tale, invented to claim for Israel a dominion she had never possessed?

¹ See Driver, "Introduction," pp. 28, 33, 115.

the Pharaoh of the oppression—has rather the flavour of high antiquity than of the late period to which this portion of Joshua is assigned; while the phrase “this Lebanon” reminds us of the poetic phrase “this Sinai” in Deborah’s song, and is thus once more characteristic of the very early, rather than of the later Hebrew. There is also in ver. 7, in spite of its obvious Deuteronomist origin, a touch which recalls Num. xxvii. 23 (attributed to P), for there only is recorded the special charge given by Moses to Joshua, though there is a passing allusion to it in Deuteronomy (xxx. 7), where also an independent version of the charge is given, which “knows nothing” of any obedience to the Law such as is spoken of here.¹

Chap. ii. is said to present few traces of the style of Deuteronomy; it is, therefore, we presume, to be attributed to JE. But there is a marked Deuteronomic touch in chap. ii. 11 (*cf.* Deut. iv. 39) which is extremely difficult to explain, unless the passage was originally written by someone equally acquainted with the whole Pentateuch, or, at the very least, by one to whom JE and D were equally familiar. Professor Driver mentions the Deuteronomic character of vers. 10, 11, but he does not attempt to explain it. Yet this is exactly one of the points on which explanation is needed. How can these undeniable references to various parts of the Pentateuch be explained except on the supposition that the whole of it was in existence when Joshua was written? Professor Driver does not notice the repeated use of the striking word “melt” (מָלַח), which occurs twice in this chapter in the sense of melting with fear. This phrase scarcely ever occurs in this voice and sense elsewhere in Scripture. But one of those passages is Miriam’s song (Exod. xv. 15), and there it occurs in connection with the word “inhabitants” (יֹשְׁבֵי), just as in Josh. ii. 24. The point is, it may be confessed, a nice one, but it is not more so than many of the points from which far-reaching consequences are drawn by the German school; at least, it is, in common with a good many other facts which that school is inclined to ignore, an indication of a close similarity in style between the Book of Joshua and the Pentateuch as a whole, which tends, so far as it goes, to support the traditional view that the books of Moses and of Joshua are the earliest books in the Hebrew Canon. I cannot undertake a discussion of the linguistic phenomena here; but a careful examination of the passage by a competent critic uncommitted to foregone conclusions will, I venture to assert,

¹ It may be further observed that in Josh. xi. 15 we have Exod. xxxiv. 11, 12 (P), combined with Deut. vii. 2. “Vers. 10-23,” says Professor Driver oracularly, “belong to D²” (“Introduction,” p. 101). Then, how did “D²” interweave a passage from the later P into his history?

yield quite different conclusions to those which Professor Driver has reached.

In dealing with chaps. iii. and iv., we are, if Professor Driver is to be believed, face to face with a more intricate literary phenomenon. The "complex nature" of these chapters "is apparent from the following considerations": (1) That "after it has been stated (3, 17) in express terms that the passage of the Jordan was completed, the language of 4, 4, 5, 10^b implies not less distinctly that the people have not yet crossed—in fact, at 4, 11, the narrative is at precisely the same point which was reached at 3, 17"; (2) that "4, 8, and 4, 9, speak of two different ceremonies, the location of stones, taken from Jordan at *Gilgal*, and the erection of stones *in the bed of the river itself*"; and (3) that "3, 12 is superfluous, if it and 4, 2 belong to the same narrative."¹ We have here a very good illustration of the way in which the German school is wont to erect a pyramid upon its apex. We do not contend that the narrative is not a compilation, but only that the reasons given are not sufficient to show whether the narrative is a compilation or not.

First of all, in regard to (1). It is clear, from an examination of the passage, that when Israel² had passed over (see chap. iv. 1) the twelve men from the various tribes were ordered to *return* to the midst of Jordan (or to the place where the waters reached and the priests stood—iii. 15), and thence, *in the presence of* (לפני) the priests and the ark (chap. iv. 5), they were to take up twelve stones from the river. These stones were eventually deposited at Gilgal. After they had been taken out of the river, the priests and the ark passed over (ver. 11). It may be remarked, as corroborating this view, that the words, "out of every tribe a man," which occur in vers. 2, 4, though they are supposed to be taken from different accounts, are precisely the same in each. In regard to (2), we have to ask, Why *should* there not be two different ceremonies and two different memorials—the one to mark the point of crossing, the other to commemorate the event? It may be further observed that the first set of stones were *not* erected "in the bed of the river," but at the "brim," as ver. 15 shows, *i.e.*, the place to which the waters reached during the overflow.³ In regard to (3) we have only to suppose the course of the narrative to have been interrupted. The *choice* of the men was made before:

¹ "Introduction," p. 98.

² Not the priests, as yet.

³ See my commentary on Joshua, where this question is discussed, and where I have noted the fact that the LXX. and Vulgate render "twelve other stones."

but when the crossing was actually accomplished, the men were ordered to take up the stones from the river, which were to serve as a memorial of the crossing. I do not go so far as to assert that the German view of the passage is altogether impossible and untenable; I only maintain that it affords too slender a basis on which to rest this elaborate theory of compilation at a later date. There is absolutely nothing in the diction of the passage to warrant it; and it is absurd to assume, on the one hand, that Israel up to the time of Solomon was not a literary people, and then to require, on the other, that the Hebrew narratives of a century or two later should attain a perfection of style and composition such as is expected—though not very often attained—even in this age of critics and reviewers. *Anacoloutha* and inelegant repetitions are found in the pages of the best writers of antiquity; but it is not usual to assume this fact as a ground on which to pronounce their writings to be compilations from various authors. Nor is this all. The supposed Deuteronomic narrative in these chapters (for the redactor is supposed only to have picked out, for reasons which are not specified, chap. iv. 13, 19, from P) bears signs of intimate acquaintance with the *whole Pentateuch*, including portions which, if Professor Driver be right, were *not in existence at the time*.

I proceed to establish this assertion. First of all, we find the ark of God treated with the utmost reverence (chap. iii. 4). When we seek for the source of this reverence, which amounts to an almost superstitious dread, we find it in Exod. xix. 12 and Num. x. 3—*i.e.*, in P. It is true that no definite rules are there laid down for the treatment of the ark. But it is obvious from this narrative that certain principles had already been laid down which had produced a profound effect, if not on the Israelites, yet at least on the mind of the writer of this history.¹ If this history be, as we are informed, Deuteronomic, and if P be post-exilic, we are entitled to ask how it is that traces of a feeling which finds expression first in the legislation of P are already present in the Deuteronomic narrative of Josh. iii. It may be that criticism will have to revise its utterances, and tell us that there are distinct traces of P in this chapter. Or we may be loftily informed that, as usual, we have utterly failed to understand the clear and definite statements of the new critics that P is only a “codification of pre-existing usage.” We would only take leave very humbly to suggest, on the one hand, that a criticism which

¹ This reverence for the ark is once more shown in the history in 1 Sam. iv. and v., which, according to Professor Driver, is not particularly late. But the Books of Joshua and 1 Sam. are here shown to postulate the same principles. Whence were these principles derived?

revises its conclusions so frequently—for Wellhausen and Kuenen regard P in an altogether different light, as we have already seen—cannot certainly lay claim to infallibility; and that if this story of the reverence due to the ark were really concocted in post-exilic times, a certain period must be allowed in which P's ideas should have time to take root, which would bring down the publication of this history to a very late date indeed. Or, if the other alternative I have suggested be adopted, we have only to remark that though the assertion enables the critic to evade criticism, it proves him to be utterly unable to come to any definite conclusions. If all that he can tell us is that P was *published* after the exile, we reply that it does not matter in the slightest when P was “published,” if, published or unpublished, its ideas were accepted and its regulations in operation long before the exile. But the whole theory which has elaborated the Priestly Code depends upon the assumption that the principles on which it proceeds were *not* accepted by the Jewish people previous to the exile. If this assumption be exploded, will the critics tell us on what assumptions their theory of the Priestly Code henceforth depends? Then we find the “priests and Levites” bearing the ark, and an allusion to this fact in Deuteronomy (xxx. 9, 25). But the regulation on which this fact depends is only found in P (Num. iv.).¹ Then, in chap. iv. 7, we have once more a phrase characteristic of P, the word “memorial” (זכרון)—see Exod. xii. 14, Num. xvi. 40.² Another phrase characteristic of P is the “ark of the testimony” (iv. 16; cf. “ark of the Covenant,” iii. 3—a phrase found only in JE in the Pentateuch). The word “testimony” (עדות) is found exclusively in P. The word is generally supposed by the best authorities to mean *precept* or *law*, not *testimony*, though this is not absolutely certain, and Deut. xxx. 25, 26 would seem rather to point the other way. But unquestionably the phrase ארון עדות is characteristic of P, and it is here found, as well as the phrase which is *not*

¹ It may be said that the *priests* are here and in Deuteronomy said to bear the ark. The reply is obvious. The word כהן cannot be in any way restricted to the duties of the sons of Aaron. The word has no special sacrificial signification; it may refer to any persons specially set apart for special functions. See Gesenius, *Lexicon*, and *Thesaurus*, *in loc.* Just in the same way our words “minister” or “clergyman” may be applied to bishop, priest, or deacon.

² Save in Exod. xiii. 9, where it is found in JE. If this passage be compared with Num. xv. 39 and Deut. vi. 8 and xi. 18, we have another instance of the homogeneity of the Pentateuch in history and phraseology. The word זכרון occurs frequently in the Pentateuch (JE and P), and very seldom elsewhere in the Old Testament.

characteristic of P (chap. iii. 3), in a passage which is supposed to be Deuteronomic.¹ If the redactor altered iv. 16 to agree with P, why did he not also alter iii. 3? What conclusions can we draw from this but that the author of Joshua had the whole Pentateuch before him when he wrote?

Proceeding to chap. v., we find the so-called Deuteronomic narrative built upon JE and P alike, both these authors being equally the foundation of the narrative, though we are asked to believe that the latter was not yet written. For there are, as may easily be seen, references to Exod. xii. 6, Num. ix. 5, xiv. 29, 31, 33, which are assigned to P, as well as to Num. xiv. 23, which is assigned to JE. The author of this chapter clearly had the whole narrative in Num. xiv. before him, though we are asked to believe that a good deal of which he makes use was not yet written. In fact, he must have had the whole Pentateuch before him, for he has also made use of Deuteronomy, *e.g.*, Deut. i. 3, 39, and ii. 7, 14, 16. We should not fail to notice the word "reproach," (חִרְפָּה) which hardly ever occurs in the historical portions of the Old Testament, but is found once in JE (Gen. xxx. 23), once in P (Gen. xxxiv. 14), and the Prophets, the Psalms, and the later Hebrew. It is but a slight matter, but it implies a recognition of an ethical condition, impressed on Israel by patriarchal tradition and the law of Moses, but not fully comprehended between the days of the "elders who overlived Joshua," and those in which the principles of that law had been developed under the influence of the prophets.

Professor Driver, however, does allow that some portions of chap. v. are derived from P.² These are verses 10-12. If we proceed to ask why, we find that it is for no other reason than that reference is undeniably made to Exod. xii. 6, xvi. 35, and Num. ix. 5, which have been assigned to P. The assignment, then, of the passage to P here depends not upon the phenomena presented in this passage, but upon the inclusion of the other passages within the limits of P. There is no interruption of continuity in the narrative here—nothing to suggest, and most certainly nothing to explain, the introduction by the redactor of extraneous matter into it. Nor is this all. There is a good deal—for, under the circumstances it is a good deal—to suggest the contrary. The narrative here is particularly connected and flowing. In fact, it will not bear separation. Ver. 9 first tells us how the place where the reproach of Egypt was rolled off from the Israelites was called

¹ It is singular that Professor Driver, who says that עֲרִיבָה (congregation) is never found in JE or Deuteronomy, does not include עֲרִיבָה in this category, though he might have done so.

² "Introduction," p. 99.

Gilgal, and the next verse carries on the history and relates how the Israelites were encamped there and proceeded to keep a passover. But there is more to follow. Gilgal is described as being "in the plains of Jericho," from which the transition to ver. 13 (JE), which speaks of Joshua as being "by Jericho,"¹ is quite natural. There is thus nothing whatever but the necessities of a theory to support the idea that vers. 10-12 have been taken from another author, and every possible feature in the construction of the narrative to suggest the contrary hypothesis.

J. J. LIAS.



ART. II.—THE PROTESTANTISM OF OUR GREAT ENGLISH DIVINES.

I. RICHARD HOOKER.

WHEN the Tractarian movement first began, its leaders had no idea of going beyond the standing ground of the English seventeenth-century divines; but Dr. Newman, who resolutely seized on and held the direction of the movement, had not a mind that was evenly balanced. Full of enthusiasm, he embraced with all his heart certain principles of thought and action, and he carried them out to their extreme limit, regardless of other principles, equally true, which should have qualified them and restrained their application. Pusey followed Newman up to a certain point from personal love of the man, and so for a time did Keble, till he found and acknowledged that he was misled, and drew back. Newman's influence pushed the older Tractarian movement beyond its original aim; and as to the new medievalist party, it looks with as much contempt on the Anglicanism of the seventeenth century as on the Protestantism of the eighteenth century. Nevertheless, the defenders of medievalists, who, without being disloyal themselves, throw their shield over medievalism, are to a great degree induced to do so from a belief that ritualism, as it exists at present, is historically justified by being a legitimate successor to the Caroline school of divinity. It will be the purpose of the present short series of papers to show that this is a mistake; that the Caroline theology, while fighting Puritanism, was, nevertheless, Protestant to its core, and that, until the present day, there has never been any ecclesiastical party or any recognised theologian that did not firmly and thankfully stand by the

¹ 3 must mean "by" or "near" in this passage.