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

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

laws of His human nature, so likewise He encountered temptation and trial in order that, being in *all things* made like unto us, He might for us and in our nature overcome temptation, and thus through temptation be made perfect.

But also this trial was necessary to the perfection of His human sympathy; necessary in order that He might be a faithful and merciful High Priest; necessary that, having suffered being tempted, He might be able to succour them that are tempted. For we must feel that Divine succour is not enough. The poor crushed, bleeding human heart craves the sympathy of a heart like its own. It cannot rest on the arm of Omnipotence if it does not know whether that Omnipotence can be touched with a feeling of its infirmities. And there is nothing more precious in the record of our Lord's agony in the garden than the assurance that it gives us of His perfect sympathy with us—of His sympathy with us in our loneliness, and His sympathy with us in our sorrow.

To conclude, let me say that if we cannot fully understand the agony in Gethsemane, yet we can at least adore the love, we can at least catch some glimpse of the greatness of the sacrifice. That my sin occasioned this awful sorrow gives me at least some measure of the exceeding sinfulness of sin. That He, the Holy One of God, should have identified Himself with my sin, borne it in His own body, put it away by the sacrifice of Himself; that to redeem me the Son of God Himself was made sin in my flesh—this is a revelation of the love of God which must touch any heart not altogether callous and insensible. And I can thankfully lay hold of this fact even if I cannot interpret it; I can feel the love; I can cast my soul upon it for life or for death; I can say, "He loved me, and gave Himself for me."

J. J. S. Perowne,
Bishop.

Art. II.—THE BOOK OF GENESIS.

THE publication of Dr. Driver's book on Genesis, in the series called the "Westminster Commentaries," edited by Dr. Lock, prefaced by what we would venture to call a somewhat diplomatic utterance from the general editor, coming as it does after a long interval, during which no leading commentary on this book, which has continued to hold the field, has appeared in England, will naturally arouse a fresh interest in the many debatable subjects which gather around its treatment, and perhaps call for their reconsideration or their retreatment on other lines.

One thing we may be quite sure of—that in the treatment of the subject in hand, neither the general editor nor the editor of this particular book would tolerate anything but reverential handling of a book which both alike would declare to have manifest in it "the presence . . . of the purifying and illuminating Spirit of God" (p. xi).

The only remarks we feel inclined to make about Dr. Lock's prefatory note are with reference to the words he puts into the mouths of the scientific student and the historical student. No doubt the book "touches science, archæology, and history" (p. vi). What, then, are the students of these subjects to say? We should be inclined to put the statements into a somewhat different form:

1. The scientific student may say: "This is certainly not a scientific manual in any sense of the word; its account of natural phenomena does not claim to be scientific, and is clothed in other than scientific language. You must not look in it, then, for scientific statements." This is obvious, just as it is clear that the connection between proper names and the explanation given of them is not governed by the rules of scientific philology. It is much more of the nature of paronomasia.

At the same time, the non-scientific man must not be alarmed by some of the statements made on behalf of science. Science has not arrived on all points at absolute truth. It has very often to use working hypotheses from which to start. Those hypotheses do sometimes break down, and even when they do not there may be something behind them still to be discovered which may tell us more, and give us higher and more absolute knowledge than the hypotheses do.

2. It is a little rash for the historical student to demand adequate *contemporary* support before commencing to build. Let it be as limited as you like as to time and place, but there surely must be some room for tradition and what it tells us. The amount of scope you may give to tradition will vary, but, after all, a considerable amount of history would have to be blotted out if we were only allowed to use "adequate contemporary support." And then comes in the question: "What do you mean by adequate?" Various views are taken of the same events in history by various historians, very often because they have been biassed by their own predilections, or for some other reasons, in favour of one "contemporary support" rather than another, and have held that to be adequate. Therefore the statement put into the mouth of the historical student (p. vii) wants safeguarding.

3. Dr. Lock does not put any statement into the mouth of the archæological student. It is difficult, perhaps, to distin-

guish between him and the historical student. We do know, at any rate, what the archæological student must not say. Sometimes his monuments or other archaic remains will appear to tell a story different from that of the Bible. The great temptation is for him to rule that the monuments must be right and the Bible wrong. This he must not do; and we are entitled to ask him to maintain a judicious suspense as between conflicting records. It is what we are obliged to do even in the present day when during a state of war conflicting accounts of the same event, officially narrated, reach us from the opposing sides.

In this and following papers it is proposed to discuss some of the subjects that must necessarily come up for discussion in any treatment of this most important portion of our Bible. I propose to deal with these subjects very much in the order in which they occur in Professor Driver's book, and to begin with the

Structure of the Book.

No one who reads the book, and considers what it claims to be, can help admitting that, whether, putting out of consideration some few later insertions, it was written by Moses, or in part by someone quite or nearly contemporary with him, or is a composite production gradually put together, it must in all reason have had authorities or sources behind it. It could scarcely be contended that all the information contained in it was a matter of directly Heaven-sent revelation. This is not the way in which God has ever dealt with men. He makes use of men and of men's works as they are. At the same time, this does not exclude a Divine revelation of things which could not have been known in any other way. If, for instance, there is an authentic account of the beginning of all things—we are not at present saying whether there is or is not—but if there is, it cannot be anything else than a Divine revelation. If it is not, then it is a fiction of the human mind.

But we have been tempted into a digression from our present subject. There are two ways in which a history based upon previous sources can be constructed. A historian can take those sources and construct from them a harmonious whole, which, however, will still bear traces of its origin. This is the natural process, and one which is constantly made use of. His own personal bias will lead the historian to make some features of his narrative preponderate, while others will be more in the shade. That is the way in which modern historians work, and it is the way in which the Books of Kings

and Chronicles were compiled, though at different dates. The Books of Chronicles have a sacerdotal tinge about them, and deal exclusively, or almost so, with the affairs of the kingdom of Judah. On the other hand, the Books of Kings have in many sections the atmosphere of the Northern Kingdom about them, and do not deal with much matter which the sacerdotalist editor of the Chronicles has introduced into his work. But both works alike profess to be based upon previous chronicles and records. Each compiler has made his selection, and that, too, from various authorities and in such a way as to suit what the Germans call his own *tendenz*.

But there is another possible way of constructing a history, and that is more what we may call a scissors-and-paste method. According to it, one document is taken after it has been in existence, we will say, for a hundred years, then it is cut up into paragraphs after a second document has been written, and parts of the second document are wedged in between paragraphs of the first, whilst others are pasted over parts of the first, so that you can only guess whether there is a superimposed portion over an underlying one, or whether there is merely blank paper below the portion of the second document. After another century this process is repeated again, and later insertions still are made. And all this is done, and a later compiler or redactor smooths over the points of junction between the pasted fragments, and the whole work is accepted as if it had always been the same, and not a word is breathed about the multifarious processes that the final work has undergone, lasting up to or even past (?) the time when a translation of the whole is made into another language in which the only difference of any importance is a dislocation in the order of six chapters out of 187.

This is in effect the treatment that has produced the Pentateuch according to the current view of to-day; and so well was the final editing done that about 2,000 years from the date at which the Pentateuch is certainly known to have been in existence in its present form had to elapse before a suspicion of such a state of things began to arise.

The reasons for the persistent advocacy of this view are not far to seek, and some of them have more to do with the contents and structure of the other books of the Pentateuch than with Genesis. It will not do to allow that the great lawgiver's powers of foresight were so great that he could look forward from the wandering nomad existence of the wilderness to a settled state, and in parts of his code provide for circumstances very different from those which were provided for at the beginning of his legislative period. It would not do to allow that St. Stephen was right when he said that "Moses

was instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," even though it is E. (the second, in point of time, of the sources) that tells us that Moses was brought up as if he were of royal blood, and, therefore, in a country like Egypt, would receive a considerable education.

The facts that "(1) the same event is doubly recorded; (2) the language, and frequently the representation as well, varies in different sections" (p. iii.), may be true, but that does not oblige us *per se* to make the earliest of the documents, which is the source of the Pentateuch, date only from the ninth century B.C.

The question of real or apparent differences in these duplications is a separate matter altogether. The various uses of the Divine names are susceptible of more interpretations than one, and, judging by the way in which they are translated in the LXX., point either to a more varying use of those names in the Hebrew text before it was settled as we have it, or, perhaps, to a modernization to make it agree with the current use of the time when the Hebrew text was settled. But this, again, can be discussed without any *à priori* view as to date, as can the phraseology. And with regard to phraseology, it must be remembered that the Hebrew Bible gives us the whole of the extant Hebrew literature of the period, on any mode of reckoning, to which it belongs, and therefore a discussion of phraseology must have its limitations, from the nature of the case. Such a modernization as we have mentioned above is quite within the region of possibility in phraseology, as in other matters, and is certainly indicated in no obscure way in the account of the reading of the Torah by Ezra and his companions (Neh. viii. 8), and perhaps traces of it may remain in some of the variants given in the Massoretic Bible.

We are concerned in the present paper with Genesis alone, and we think we may take it that there are no passages in it which "reflect the ideas and embody the institutions which were characteristic of widely different periods of Israelitish history" (p. xvi). At any rate, Dr. Driver's Introduction does not give us any, for it allows, as is no doubt generally allowed, that certain isolated verses (*e.g.*, Gen. xxxvi. 31) may have easily been marginal notes that have found their way into the text. It is, of course, one of the difficulties of the treatment of part of a greater subject that such a point must be left undiscussed; but, we repeat, there is nothing in Genesis, putting these isolated verses on one side, and remembering how limited the whole extent of Hebrew literature is, to necessitate such a late date as the ninth century B.C., to say nothing of later dates still.

With regard to the name Yahweh, Dr. Driver makes this allowance—that it is probable that, "though not absolutely new in Moses' time, it was still current previously only in a limited circle" (p. xix). The present writer's view is that in the pre-Mosaic times "Yah" existed side by side with "Elohim" (Exod. xv. 2); that on the emerging of the Jewish people as a nation the name was at first יהיה, a form which agrees with (1) the explanation of the name given in Exod. iii.; (2) the archaic reproduction of it in the Hexaple; (3) the abbreviated form in Hebrew manuscripts of the tetragrammaton; (4) its appearance, it may be, in Isa. xxxviii. 11, where dittography has been invoked to explain the occurrence of יהיה, and that only later did the form יהיה become יהוה.

So far as Genesis is concerned, then, the origin of the book may be due to several sources, but there is nothing to compel us, treating that book by itself, to give it a later date than the traditional one.

If, then, we allow that Genesis has within it evidence of having been based upon previously existing documents or records, we have next to investigate the question whether those documents, as used by the author of this book, present us with a harmonious whole or are discordant in the story which they tell. The following are

Alleged Discrepancies between the Sources.

1. The narratives of chaps. i. 1 to ii. 4*a* and ii. 4*b* to 25. The first discrepancy mentioned is this: "The earth, instead of emerging from the waters (as in i. 9), is represented as being at first *dry* (ii. 5)—too dry, in fact, to support vegetation" (p. 35). It would scarcely be gathered from this statement that in chap. i. 9 the command is "Let the *dry* land appear," and that the first meaning given to the root verb from which the adjective is derived in the new Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, on the title-page of which the Oxford Professor of Hebrew's name appears, is "to be dried up without moisture" (the word which is used in chap. viii. 14 of the surface of the earth after nearly two months' exposure to the atmosphere after the flood, the word for its state when first it was exposed being a different one; see chap. viii. 13). The united idea of the two passages is something like this: The appearance of land from out of the waters; its saturated condition prevents growth; then its gradual drying, which if it had continued indefinitely would equally have prevented growth; then the mist, which makes a regular growth of herbs and plants possible. We have nothing to do here with what science may

have to say as to the process indicated. What we do say is that the two accounts are not contradictory.

The second discrepancy alleged in this same narrative is that "the first step in the process of filling it with living forms is the creation of man (ii. 7), then follows that of beasts (verse 19), and, lastly, that of woman (verses 21 *et seq.*) —obviously a different order from that of chap. i." (p. 35). But surely there is nothing of the systematic order of creation intended here. Just as much of the creation work as is needed for the immediate purpose is mentioned, and no more. Thus, when the naming of the animals is to be recorded, as their creation has not been mentioned already by this source, it is now set down. The various clauses of chap. ii. 19 are not necessarily contemporaneous. If we insert the personal pronoun before the word "brought" in the Revised Version—as we have a perfect right to do—this is made clearer. "The Lord God formed," etc.—that is one transaction. "And [He] brought them," etc.—that is another. We need not labour the question about the place in order of the creation of woman, for the Professor admits that, *if it stood alone*, it is capable of reasonable explanation. The only other point is the different conceptions of God. But so long as the two conceptions do not contradict or exclude one another, both are admissible. After all, if one source says "God said," and the other "God breathed," is not the language in both cases anthropomorphic, and do not both postulate a mouth for God? And if the narrative be read without prejudice, we cannot see that the Divine presence is "locally determined" within the limits of the garden. Certainly, in a later chapter ascribed to the same source (J.) the Lord is present and converses with Cain.

2. The number of animals taken into the ark, seven of each clean kind, two of every kind clean and unclean. Here, again, it is surely clear that the lesser number does not exclude the greater in particular circumstances, and that, in fact, such a greater number was imperatively necessary if the rite of sacrifice, which already subsisted (iv. 4), was to be kept up immediately on the exodus from the ark, otherwise the perpetuation of the various species could not have been secured. The two narrators, therefore, had two distinct objects in view—one thought simply of the providential perpetuation of animal life, the other of that and of the dutiful service of God which was required to be carried out.

3. The two promises of a son for Sarah—one to Abraham by himself, a second a reiteration of the promise to Abraham which Sarah overhears in the tent-door. The following statement is made about the two passages involved (xvii. 16-19,

xviii. 9-15): " . . . The terms used in xviii. 9-15 clearly showing that the writer did not picture any promise of the same kind as having been given to Abraham " (p. iii.). We certainly cannot follow this. The second promise to Abraham is more definite as to time than the first; and the asseveration " I will certainly return unto thee " (verse 10) contains an implied allusion to something that has preceded. Moreover, on the second occasion Abraham neither laughs nor expresses any incredulity. We are also told that there is " an accompanying double explanation of the origin of the name *Isaac*." This is pure assumption, for the name " Isaac " is never mentioned in the second narrative, though in both cases laughter is mentioned; and husband and wife received the announcement of the birth of a son on the occasion of their first hearing it, as was perhaps natural, in much the same spirit.

4. As to the motives used to persuade Jacob to depart from Canaan and their discrepancy, there is surely a lack of knowledge of human nature. Have we never ourselves tried to influence a person towards a course of action by suggesting first one motive and then another when the first suggestion has failed of its object? Can we not imagine Jacob's saying, when flight from his brother's wrath is suggested to him, No brother of mine is going to drive me away from home; and yet, when another motive is suggested—that of getting a wife for himself—his being ready to go?

5. As to double explanations of proper names, Jacob might well look upon his second vision as confirming what he had already expressed belief in that the place was the house of God—Bethel. And as to the name " Israel," what is indicated is perhaps that Jacob had not accepted the use of the name the first time of its being given; at any rate, we find Jacob called Israel almost immediately after the second occasion (xxxv. 21).

6. Lastly, it is stated that " in xxxii. 3 and xxxiii. 16 Esau is described as already resident in Edom, whereas in xxxvi. 6 *et seq.* his migration thither is attributed to causes which could not have come into operation until after Jacob's return to Canaan " (p. iv). Here, again, the extremely wandering character of the life of patriarchal times, as described throughout in Genesis, is ignored. Nothing is said—at any rate, in the earlier passages—of permanent settlement. In the first Esau is for the time in Seir; in the second he is on his way to Seir. It is only the third that speaks of anything but temporary residence.

After careful examination, then, of the alleged passages, we cannot admit that there is anything in them which compels us

to admit that any one is contrary to any other, though they may very probably be derived from different original documents.

HENRY A. REDPATH.

(*To be continued.*)

ART. III.—DR. GIFFORD'S "EUSEBIUS."[1]

THIS remarkable work will rank with the few really great editions of patristic literature produced by our generation. In point of thoroughness it may justly be compared with Lightfoot's "Ignatius"; and if in the historical reference it is inferior to Lightfoot's epoch-marking volumes, this is due to the fact that, primarily, the editor's object was simply to give an accurate rendering of the "Præparatio Evangelica" into English. We are glad that Dr. Gifford's first scheme became changed as his work went on, for, as he is careful to explain, the further his translation advanced, the more imperative he felt it to revise the original text. We owe it, perhaps, mainly to Dr. Sanday of Oxford that Dr. Gifford was induced to gird himself to the task of producing a fresh recension of the Eusebian text. That his work in this direction should have resulted in the writing of a commentary is not surprising, though it is surely a matter in regard to which scholars may feel just satisfaction. It is certainly safe to assert that one of the most valuable and interesting literary monuments of the fourth century has, at length, been dealt with in so sound and masterly a fashion. Scarcely any valuable contribution to the understanding of Eusebius's work, whether made in England or on the Continent, will be sought for in vain within the pages of this sumptuous edition. While it is never safe to predicate finality for any work of the kind, we may be pretty well within the mark in saying that Gifford's "Eusebius" will hold its own for the next century as the one indispensable edition.

Before proceeding to give a brief account of the contents of this *magnum opus*, a word or two may not be out of place as to Dr. Gifford himself.[2] Graduating at Cambridge in 1843

[1] "Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicæ Præparationis," libri xv.: ad codices manuscriptos denuo collatos recensuit Anglicè nunc primum reddidit notis et indicibus instruxit E. H. Gifford, S.T.P., olim archidiaconus Londinensis. Tom. I.: Textus, libr. i.-ix.; II., libr. x.-xv.; III., IV., libr. Anglicè redditi; V., Notæ. Oxonii: E typographeo Academico, 1903. Price £5 5s.

[2] I am indebted to Professor J. E. B. Mayor, of Cambridge, for courteously sending me a valuable note (reprinted from the *Cambridge Review*, October 29, 1903) relative to Dr. Gifford, both as man and writer.