JOURNAL OF

THE TRANSACTIONS

OF

The Victoria Institute,

OR,

Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

Secretary: E. WALTER MAUNDER, F.R.A.S.

VOL. XLVI.

LONDON:

(Published by the Institute, 1, Central Buildings, Westminster, S.W.)

1914.

551ST ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN THE ROOMS OF THE INSTITUTE ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 16TH, 1914, AT 4.30 P.M.

MR. WILLIAM J. HORNER TOOK THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the preceding Meeting were read and confirmed.

The SECRETARY announced that Mr. H. C. Hogan had been elected as a Member, and Mr. Swinfen Bramley-Moore and Mr. A. Montague Newbegin had been elected as Associates.

The CHAIRMAN then called upon the Rev. J. J. Lias, M.A., Chancellor of Llandaff Cathedral, to read his paper.

IS THE SO-CALLED "PRIESTLY CODE" OF POST-EXILIC DATE? By the Rev. CHANCELLOR J. J. LIAS, M.A., CHANCELLOR of LLANDAFF CATHEDRAL.

BEFORE entering into a critical examination of the portion of the Pentateuch, called of late "the Priestly Code," it seems necessary to preface my analysis by some preliminary observations.

First of all, we have heard a great deal from some quarters about the final results of modern scientific criticism. But is criticism one of the exact sciences; and if not, can the word "scientific" be properly applied to it? Science is knowledge, but if knowledge be not exact, at least as far as it goes, it is not knowledge. The value of physical science lies in the certainty of its results when once reached; and this certainty, be it observed, is attained by the practice of testing theories by comparing their results with observation. A vast number of observations, combining a number of various factors in the result, produce practical certainty. This is the inductive method, so often misunderstood. It does not, as some have supposed, consist in taking guesses for granted. The guesses are, it is true, assumed as a basis of reasoning; but only when the results of this process have been found to agree with observation are those results accepted as true. The apparent failure of some physical sciences to secure exact results is due to the premature publication of those results. Until all the conditions of a problem of vast range

have been sufficiently examined, no satisfactory results can be attained. The comparative failure, again, of metaphysics as a science is that it so often is made to rest, not on facts, but on hypotheses; and that its conclusions have not always been tested by a comparison with facts. The science of psychology, when sufficiently advanced, will possibly do more to establish the laws of mental phenomena in a few years than has hitherto been effected in countless centuries.

Critical investigation, then, as it is not at present thoroughly scientific in its processes, cannot yet be represented as exact in its results. Speaking generally, there is a very wide divergence in the conclusions of historical critics, and a still wider one in those of literary critics. And when we approach the criticism of Scripture, the divergences are greater still: first, because the enquirer, who believes himself to be a man of science, persists in ignoring necessary factors in the problem he sets himself to solve; and also not unfrequently takes extremely wild and arbitrary assumptions as his bases of reasoning. Thus, Wellhausen declares that he alone, in the long list of analytic critics whose researches have come down to us, has arrived at certainty in his results, because "he has added historical to literary criticism." But what does he call historical criticism? His method consists in a liberal use of the argument *e silentio*, and rests on the assumed right of the critic to strike out from the authorities with which he deals every statement which is not reconcileable with his preconceived opinions. His ultimate conclusions are therefore very far from being unassailable. The argument *e silentio*, for instance, has been used in Archbishop Whately's celebrated *jeu d'esprit* to prove that the Allies never entered Paris in 1814, because no reference to the event is to be found in the Parisian journals of the next day! The truth is that the more obvious an historical fact, the more often it is passsed over *sub silentio*, because its existence is taken for granted. Obviously such methods of investigation would make history impossible.

A third eccentricity of the so-called scientific investigator is the assertion that the "Priestly Code," though a post-exilic production, is not only a "codification" of laws which had long been in existence, but that it also contains additional laws and ceremonies which were brought into existence after the return of the Jews from captivity. This extraordinary expedient is adopted in order to explain away the mention in the previous history, should it occur, of any laws which it has been found necessary to include in the Priestly Code. But as the critic has, so far, never attempted to tell us which provisions of that Code

are, and which are not, post-exilic, his methods cannot possibly lead to any satisfactory result.

So much for the "scientific criticism" of which we have heard so much of late. It not only establishes nothing, but it makes all attempts to establish anything impossible. It makes a great show of learning and ingenuity, but the learning is beside the point, and the ingenuity is wasted. For true inductive processes we must have ascertained *facts* on which to rely; the destructive criticism, now in vogue in the field of Scripture, first destroys all the facts, and presents us with undemonstrated propositions in their stead.

Before I proceed to deal with the phenomena of the Priestly Code as evidence of its date, I must explain what is meant by the "Priestly Code." The phrase is an invention on the part of the modern critic; we critics of the older school contend that there is no such thing, but that what has been so called is an integral part of the Law of Moses. When separated, by a process highly ingenious but altogether inadmissible, it consists of a series of extracts from the Five Books of Moses, based on the principles indicated above. Sometimes it consists of chapters, or portions of chapters, forming passages of considerable length, but more often it is made up of scraps of three or four verses, or even sometimes of half or a third of a verse said to have been introduced by a late editor into a compilation of his own from the works of earlier authors. But the whole Book of Leviticus forms part of it. It would take up too much time for me to go into details, but these may be found in Dr. Driver's *Introduction*, or in any other book professing to describe the latest form which criticism of this kind has assumed. I may add that an important discovery has lately been made by Mr. Harold Wiener in connection with this subject to which I will presently refer.

I shall now proceed to show (1) that the alleged characteristics of the Priestly Code are, scarcely any of them, post-exilic; and (2) that the marked post-exilic Hebrew of Ezra and Nehemiah display characteristics which are as markedly absent from the Priestly Code.

(1) Some introductory remarks may be needed before we go into detail. The delimitation of the so-called Priestly Code was first made when Wellhausen and Kuenen were contending that Ezekiel was "the father of Judaism," and that Ezra had in his hand the completed Pentateuch when he read it before assembled Israel.* Circumstances have since led their disciples to postdate

* Ezra, ix, 3.

their "Priestly Document." It is remarkable, by the way, how often "the fixed and unalterable conclusions of modern scientific criticism" have had to be altered and unfixed. Prof. Driver and his followers now deny that the Pentateuch was completed until after the return from the Captivity. Prof. James Robertson has complained of the want of frankness with which this change has been adopted.* Made as it has been, it would elude the attention of any but the closest observers. But Nemesis is always waiting for us. The slightest change in the elaborate house of cards, so often built up and knocked down again by the analytic critics during the last few centuries, brings it once more to the ground with a crash. In the days of Wellhausen and Kuenen, when Ezekiel, as we have seen, was regarded as the practical inventor of the Law of Moses, the words and phrases said to be characteristic of "P" would naturally appear in the book, written by its "founder." Now it has become entirely post-exilic in its origin, and the theory that Ezekiel, not Moses, was the "founder" of Israelite institutions has been dismissed to the limbo into which so many exploded theories have already disappeared. Many of the alleged characteristic expressions of "P" are not found in the post-exilic writings, and are not characteristic of the post-exilic period.† Therefore the theory so laboriously built up falls to the ground. Were "P" indeed post-exilic, it would undoubtedly betray distinct traces of its origin. No such distinct traces exist. Thus the phenomena presented by "P" are not inconsistent with its Mosaic origin. The occurrence of its phrases in the later Hebrew may be accounted for by the fact that the later Hebraists, Ezekiel for instance, were diligent students of the Mosaic law. And the same diligent study would account for the fact that even the post-exilic prophets, though betraying their date by the use of foreign words,‡

* *Early Religion of Israel*, Preface, p. x. His words are noteworthy: "Statements such as these I have quoted amount in my opinion to a set of critical canons quite different from those of Wellhausen, and Dr. Driver would have been no more than just to himself if he had (as König has done) accentuated the difference."

† Prof. Driver (*Introduction*, p. 138) says that "Ezekiel's book contains clear traces that he was acquainted with 'what the critics now call the Law of Holiness' (Leviticus, xvii-xxvi)," therefore "P" contains laws which were made before and after the Return from Captivity. Can the critics tell us which are the earlier laws and which the later? If they can, why have they not done so? And until they have done so, of what use is their discovery?

‡ *Pachadh*, for instance in Haggai, i, 1, for "governor" *shebat* (Zechariah i, 7), the name of a month.

could cast their prophecies into the earlier and purer Hebrew form, whilst simple narrators, like Ezra and Nehemiah, betray, as will be hereafter seen, the fact of their long sojourn in a strange land at every step. "P," of course, has its narrative passages, as well as its legal specialisms. But *never once* does the "Priestly Code" fall into any expression which betrays Babylonian or Persian origin, as the returned exiles continually do.*

I.—We proceed to discuss the critical question in detail. The words and expressions specially characteristic of "P" are stated by Dr. Driver to be 45 in number, beside geographical terms. These last need not be discussed. To avoid wearying my hearers and readers by technicalities unfamiliar to them, I shall only discuss some of the most significant instances; I shall relegate some more to the notes, where the reader can investigate them, it he pleases, at his leisure. For the rest I must refer those who read this paper, or hear it read, to two papers in the American *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January and April, 1910.† I must also premise that although I and II Chronicles are allowed on all hands to be post-exilic books, a formal analysis is impossible; because, as Prof. Driver declares, Hebrew historians were compilers, and their method of compilation consisted almost entirely in transferring bodily to their pages the passages they extracted from those whose works they used. Therefore, as the Chronicler tells us that he quotes many pre-exilic authors, some portions of his narrative must have been written by himself, and some, ages before his time.‡ This would make a linguistic analysis of his work practically impossible, though it might be a useful exercise for the critic in a region where we possess some information whereby to test his assertions.

1. *The Name of God.*—As everyone who studies the subject knows, this has been, and sometimes still is, represented to be

---

* English law terms now in use frequently take us back to the days when French was the language of the law courts, but Haggai and Zechariah, Ezra and Nehemiah, use words denoting offices of state and the like, which are indubitably of Babylonian or Persian origin.

† London Agent, C. Higham & Son, Farringdon Street.

‡ I showed years ago in *Lex Mosaica* that this statement of Dr. Driver is far from correct. But he has continued to repeat it. If he is right, I am justified in regarding Chronicles as full of exact quotations, though Dr. Driver asserts (without proof) that the Chronicler did *not* use the authorities he pretends to follow. As a fact, he sometimes introduces, bodily, portions of Kings, and sometimes re-writes them. We may take it, therefore, that he has dealt with his other authorities in the same way.

the determining test by which the documents are to be separated. But this test has really been abandoned long since, both by Hupfeld, and Dr. Driver himself. Moreover Dr. Driver, in his analysis, "excepts" Genesis xvii, 1 ; xxi, 1b. This is simply a confession of failure. How can "Jehovah" occur in two verses of "P" when the basis of reasoning is the supposed fact that the author of "P" is an Elohist? It is also asserted that, as soon as the Priestly Codist gets to Exodus vi, 2, where Elohim reveals Himself as Jehovah, the former strict use of Elohim ceases. But Elohim still continues to be used; only, after this revelation of the Covenant Name of God, the use of Elohim ceases to be a distinction of authorship. But then, how can it be contended that it ever *was* a distinction of authorship? The ideas involved in the Name Jehovah may as well be supposed to have been projected by a later author into history of the past as employed in the later history.

2. There are 11 words or expressions out of the 45 adduced, which only occur in "P." Obviously they constitute no proof that "P" is post-exilic.*

3. There are 9 which only occur in "P," Ezekiel or Jeremiah. These give no countenance to the post-exilic theory of "P's" origin. The two prophets may have been, and there is very little doubt now that they were, quoting a document of the Mosaic age. This disposes of 20 of the 45 instances, and thus materially diminishes the evidence that "P" is a post-exilic fragment.

4. Dr. Driver, once or twice, strangely describes the "Deuteronomist" as deriving his use of such a word as *mīn* (translated "kind" in Genesis i and elsewhere) from "P." As the "Deuteronomist" is asserted to have preceded "P" by some two or three centuries, it is difficult to see how this could be. Dr. Driver makes the same remark about the word *sheretz*, "to abound" or "swarm," which occurs (noun and verb) frequently in the Pentateuch.†

5. There are 12 words or phrases said to be characteristic of "P" which occur elsewhere, and are therefore not characteristic of "P." Some are said "to occur in poetry,"—a good argument for the very early origin of "P," but none for its being post-exilic. Everyone knows how often poets, whatever their

* Some of these occur in Chronicles, but for reasons already given are not counted.

† As to the word *mīn*, it is obviously a technical word, corresponding to the technical word *genus*, as now used by zoologists, and was doubtless thus used by Ezekiel.

country and language, make use of archaic words, which have long fallen out of use in conversation or ordinary narrative. Sometimes the text of the passages outside "P" in which the word occurs, is said to be "doubtful." Though a "doubtful" text is not necessarily corrupt, it is certainly worthless in controversy. One word, "congregation" (*ghedah*), is said by Dr. Driver to be "rare in the other historical books." But, as the other historical books were written long after Israel had settled in Palestine, there was every reason why the use of the word should have become rare.

6. The words peculiar to "P" are thus reduced to 13 in number. It is scarcely worth while to discuss all these in detail. One of them, said "not" to be "the usual word" for "half," does occur in Nehemiah. This might have furnished an argument had it not been confessed that the word appears in I Kings xvi, 9. Concerning a second expression out of the 13, Dr. Driver adds in a parenthesis, that he does not give "a complete enumeration" of the passages in which it occurs. Then how does it come in as an argument? A third word (*recush*) "substance" or "possessions" and the cognate verb not only occurs in "JE" as well as in "P" but it occurs several times in Genesis xiv, of which the critics have denied the genuineness, assigning it to a special document thoroughly inconsistent with the rest of the narrative.* It does occur in the post-exilic narratives, but is *not* peculiar to them and P.

II.—I propose now to reverse my former process, and to show that post-exilic historians (Chronicles excepted for reasons above given) contain a large number of words and phrases entirely absent from "P." I fear that space will prevent me from going further than an analysis of Ezra, and indeed the subject is, as a rule, too technical for a general audience. I will first give a brief analysis of each chapter, and then proceed to comment on some words and phrases which present points of special interest. But I shall be obliged by the rules of the Institute to stop short

---

* The case of Genesis xiv is a very unfortunate one for the critics. Many of the names mentioned occur in contemporary tablets, such as Amraphel, Arioch, Ellasar, Tidal. The word translated "nations" (*goim*) also appears in the tablets. *Kedur* and *Lagamar* (Chedorlaomer) appear in the tablets, though not together. Worse than all, Genesis xiv seems to hint at the subsequent subjugation by Amraphel of his former leader Chedorlaomer. It should be noted that the vowels were seldom introduced in the early oriental texts. The only possible line of defence is that the names are not, and cannot be, the same, but the vehemence with which the defence is made suggests that the position is not too defensible.

before I come to the end of these. I have already hinted that the prophecies of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, are, as a rule, written in the ancient Hebrew. But when they touch on historical names and offices, they use post-exilic names for them. "P" never, by any chance, does this. If they could not avoid it, how did he manage to do so?

Chapter i.—In Ezra i, 1, occurs a word, which, in the sense used here, is only found in "P" and the post-exilic books. This is nearly all the evidence the critics have found in their favour. *Per contra,* there is in this verse a word, meaning a royal decree (lit. "a thing written") which does not occur in "P," or in any pre-exilic book (admitted to be such) in this sense. In the Pentateuch it means "a writing." The rest of the chapter contains as many as ten expressions which are not found in "P." Some of them are altogether post-exilic; some occur only in the exilic or post-exilic writers; some are found as early as Judges. Instances of peculiar turns of expression are more important than single words. They point to alterations in the style of a language, which indicate a difference in date,—alterations such as Americanisms and "journalese" are now making in the once grand old English language, and may be found by the score in every copy of our daily papers. The changes in the use of prepositions, one of which occurs in this verse, into which "P," had he been a post exilic-writer, would have been sure to slip, are among the most significant signs of transition in a language.* One of the words used is Aramaic, and occurs also in the portion of Ezra which is written in the Aramaic. Aramaic was the language of the country outside Judea, and was kindred to Hebrew and to the Babylonian language. Another word is "probably" of the same origin.

Chapter ii consists chiefly of names. But the words for "province," two words for "register" (lit "writing,"—not quite the same word as in i, 1); the word *Tirshatha* for "governor,"† the words for "singing men" and "singing women," are peculiar to the post-exilic books. The word for "mules" appears first in II Samuel. "P" never slips by accident into any of them,—not even in his Egyptian history, which bears marks of close acquaintance with Egypt and its customs. Surely these facts demand some notice from the critics, though so far it has not been accorded to them. The *Nethinim* are mentioned in this

---

* The Greek of the New Testament displays traces of the tendency to similar changes which have become fixed in modern Greek.

† See Nehemiah frequently.

chapter. They were probably the substitutes for the Gibeonites, whom Saul slaughtered. (II Samuel xxi, 1, 2; see also Joshua ix, 23–27.) "P" "knows nothing,"—a favourite phrase of the German critics—of the Nethinim. Another point, too, demands further consideration. "P" "knows nothing" of *porters* (or *gatekeepers*). Of course not, for they were not wanted in the wilderness. The word here used occurs naturally enough in the historical books. But how was "P," who, we are told by the critics, made so many, and such terrible blunders, able to keep clear of it? He had, we are asked to believe, considerable powers of invention. Why did he not invent gatekeepers? The word for "*treasury*," used here, occurs in "JE," though never in "P." It is therefore probably a word of the Mosaic period. Also a verb meaning "to give willingly" occurs in Judges and the post-exilic books. "P" always uses a substantive and a suitable verb for such gifts.

Chapter iii.—Fifteen words which are not in "P" occur here; some of them date as far back as I Kings. Six of them are peculiar grammatical turns of expression, or words used in new senses. Two are Aramaic, and one of them is found in chapter vi, 9, the Aramaic portion of the book. One or two of them are very unusual constructions, and give considerable trouble to the translator. One is found in Isaiah lxv, in the post-exilic authors, and in Numbers xiv, but in this last the passage in which it appears is assigned by the critics to "JE." Now, as in Numbers xiv, verses 1, 2 (in the main), 5–7, 10, 26–38 are assigned to "P," it seems difficult to understand why this particular verse was not also assigned to him, as it would have made an additional argument for the post-exilic origin of that portion of the Pentateuch. Obviously, the fact was not discovered, or doubtless the passage in question would have been assigned to "P."

Chapter iv.—The use of *bahal* actively, for "terrify" (Piel and Hiphil), is a mark of the later Hebrew. The word *malkuth* for "kingdom" is rare in the earlier Hebrew, but frequent in the post-exilic writings. It occurs in Balaam's prophecy. Was that a case of early Aramaic?

From iv, 8 to vi, 18, the text is in Aramaic. We therefore proceed to vi, 19. The word *golah* for "captivity" has been already discussed. *Badal*, when implying moral separation, is not used in "P," where it means physical removal (Numbers xvi, 21, where, however, the assignment to author is of the arbitrary kind so frequent with the critics).

Chapter vii.—In the first nine verses,—of which the first six

consist almost wholly of names,—we find three unusual expressions which are not found in "P." The first is found in the Psalms, the Proverbs, and in Isaiah xvi, 32; and though the *word* occurs in "P" and in the earlier Hebrew, it is used in a different sense. The other two are only found in the post-exilic books. All three words and expressions relate to quite ordinary ideas, but the words for expressing them have become different in the post-exilic period. One is the "hand" or "good hand" of God. All these expressions might obviously have occurred in "P," but they never do. Verses 12–26 are a copy of a letter of Artaxerxes in Aramaic.

Chapter viii.—One word in this chapter does occur in "P" and the later Hebrew, but it also appears in what the critics call the "Book of the Covenant" (Exodus xx–xxiii), which the more moderate critics (they are by no means all agreed) assign to the Mosaic period; so it cannot be used to prove that "P" is not of Mosaic origin. Another word which occurs frequently in "P" and in the later Hebrew occurs also in Deuteronomy, which the critics consider to have been written some three centuries before "P." Thirteen other expressions, some of them very peculiar post-exilic idioms, or clearly post-exilic words, are found in this chapter; "P" never uses them.*

Chapter ix.—Here occurs the only other instance (*see* chapter i, 1) of an expression which is confined to "P" and the post-exilic writers. It may be dismissed as purely acccidental. *Per contra,* many and most remarkable instances of peculiar words and expressions of the post-exilic period, including the use, or rather misuse, of prepositions, occur in this chapter. I am sorry that the limits to which I am confined do not permit me to particularize them. They are most significant. Some of them may be due to a corrupt text, though they are far more likely to be due to the mistakes of men who had learned to speak the kindred Babylonian language or the Aramaic dialect.† One of them is admitted by Dr. Driver to be "a distinctively late idiom," and "common in post-Biblical Hebrew." Again he neglects to tell us that it never occurs in "P." Several of these passages,—and there are a good many elsewhere,—have

---

* One of them appears in some copies of Moses' Song (Deuteronomy xxxii, 2), but there is another reading. One relating to governors of subordinate rank appears in I and II Kings, in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Haggai and Malachi, but never in "P."

† I have treated them at length in my paper on this subject in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for April, 1910.

evidently given much trouble to the Revisers of the Authorised Version.* Some of them can only be the result of the attempt to write a language with which the writer was imperfectly acquainted. In his notes on Ezra iii, 3, 4, Prof. Driver remarks that expressions there noted appear in the Aramaic portions of Ezra. Ezra, therefore, was acquainted with Aramaic,† and was unable to refrain from introducing expressions from it in his attempt to write pure Hebrew. Strange and unintelligible expressions appear continually throughout the book. But in chapter ix they are very numerous, and unusually interesting to a student of Hebrew. But I am afraid, did I enter into further detail, it would weary those unacquainted with Hebrew.

III. I have not attempted to analyse Nehemiah, Esther nor the post-exilic prophets, nor the other books which are supposed to have been written subsequent to the exile, for reasons already given. These latter are largely poetic, and poets, as we know, are apt to use archaic terms. But Prof. Driver has given in his *Introduction*, a list of words and idioms peculiar to the books of Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles, and I propose to conclude with some remarks upon that list.

It consists of about 50 words and turns of expression. Out of the 108 words and turns of expression in Ezra already passed in review,‡ only two are peculiar to it and to "P." Of Dr. Driver's list, consisting of about 50 words and turns of expression "distinctly post-exilic," as he admits some of them to be, and "common Aramaic words," as he admits others to be, only one is peculiar to the post-exilic writers and "P." It is true that Dr. Driver contends that there are two, but he forgets that the passage (Numbers xiii, 27) in which the second word occurs is assigned by himself to "JE," while Joshua xxii, 16, 31, which he also cites, is assigned by him to an "uncertain" source. Therefore, in this case the word is common to the Pentateuch ("JE" and "P"), "an uncertain source," and the post-exilic authors. So that the general conclusion to be drawn from the enquiry is that, of the admittedly post-exilic words and phrases, no more than one in about 50 is common only to the post-exilic

* As may be seen in their marginal notes.

† Unless we are "scientific" critics of the school of the later critics of Isaiah, and divide the writer of the book of Ezra into ten or twelve different persons.

‡ Many of them are found in Prof. Driver's list, which, however, I did not consult before writing my remarks on them.

authors and to "P." And in the one exceptional case, the post-exilic writers might have had the completed Pentateuch before them, and have been quoting it. All this tends to confirm the traditional theory that "P," as well as the rest of the Pentateuch, was written before any other books.

Nor is this all. In spite of all this elaborate study of words altogether absent from the earlier books, and of the numerous involved, foreign, and sometimes quite unintelligible constructions, noted by Dr. Driver in the post-exilic books, he never once drops a hint that none of these expressions appear in "P."* Is this because he is so obsessed by the idea that "P" is post-exilic, that it never occurs to him to notice any fact which throws doubt on that theory? It is at least fair to point out that observers who can only see the particular side of the case which they have elected to take are not thoroughly qualified for their task.

The fact, once more, that Ezra, unlike many other post-exilic authors, never uses the well-known post-exilic abbreviation *sh* for *asher* ("which"),† may be accounted for by the fact that he was a "ready scribe," and was therefore more familiar with Hebrew than most of the other writers of his period. The occurrence of the definite article for the relative pronoun, however, pronounced by Dr. Driver to be very unusual, and of doubtful occurrence elsewhere, is a construction found only four times in Chronicles and twice in Ezra. That it is absent from "P" is, as usual, a fact not noted. Moreover Dr. Driver adds that "Hardly a verse occurs written by the Chronicler himself which does not present singularities of style, though they are frequently of a kind which refuses to be tabulated." Peculiarities of style then are admittedly a characteristic of the post-exilic historians. Can it be a sound criticism which fails to observe that no such eccentricities have ever been detected in "P"?‡

---

* I have gone into a detailed examination of Dr. Driver's list in the article already named.

† It occurs frequently in Judges, where it is obviously a provincialism. The book was probably written by a northern Israelite.

‡ I find that I have neglected to remark on the fact that the post-exilic writers have quite a different coinage from that of "P" and writers of earlier date. The earlier writers ("P" included) know of nothing but shekels. The post-exilic authors occasionally speak of *darics* (coins of Darius). The Chronicler himself ventures on this point to introduce the more modern word into his narrative of earlier days. There are two such words used in Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah. One of them, that used in Chronicles, might mean the Greek *drachma*.

IV.—A few general remarks may conclude this paper. We commenced with the assertion that criticism, as at present conducted, is not one of the exact sciences, and that if on some points it may claim to be exact, those claims are confined within very narrow limits indeed. The instances given in this paper will be held by many of my hearers to confirm this assertion. And the way in which Wellhausen and his followers use what they call "historical" criticism, by adding which to literary they claim to have arrived at indisputable conclusions, will be regarded by most historical critics as altogether unique. The real fact is that, as the late Prof. Orr has reminded us, the authors of the latest form of analytical criticism, Graf, Wellhausen and Kuenen, were convinced that what is called "the supernatural" has no existence. It is on that basis that their enquiry is conducted; but, as I trust we have seen,* an inquiry on that basis requires canons of historical criticism which are altogether inadmissible. Consequently, so far from being "scientific," the methods employed are the very opposite. The destructive critic, moreover, in assuming the impossibility of the supernatural, makes assumptions which have always been strongly contested, have frequently been disputed by scientific investigators, and at the last Meeting of the British Association were largely declared to be unnecessary and unreasonable. The presuppositions that every religion was evolved from fetichism, and that it advanced through animism and polytheism to monotheism, are not only shown to be incorrect by a scientific thinker so well known as the late Mr. Andrew Lang, but they can only be maintained by striking all assertions to the contrary out of the Old Testament Scriptures, and by turning their contents inside out and upside down. Their strongest and most solemn affirmations on religious matters are contradicted, and declared to be forgeries of a far later date,† The majestic Mosaic Law, with its extraordinarily minute foreshadowings of the Life and Teaching of the Redeemer of mankind, is, we are told, not Mosaic at all, but is "evolved" out of the most

---

* See above, pp. 64, 65.

† See Pentateuch, *passim*, as to the fact that the whole civil, legal and ecclesiastical polity of Israel originated with Moses. As to the fact that the Old Testament asserts that from the first the religion of Israel differed fundamentally from that of the surrounding nations, *see* Deuteronomy v, 14, 15; viii, 19, 20; xi, 28; xiii, throughout; xvi, 2, 7; xviii, 9, 12, 20. Also Leviticus xviii, 2, 24–28; xx, 22–24, 26; Exodus, xxiii, 23, 24 is admitted to be Mosaic by many critics who deny the authenticity of the rest of the Pentateuch.

unpromising material possible, and at a period of Jewish history the most unlikely to give an opportunity of such "evolution" as could well be imagined. The most glorious poet-moralist that ever appeared in this world, every chapter of whose prophecy is stamped with the characteristics of his unique personality, is split up, to the edification of youthful pupils in "Colleges and Schools," into eleven or twelve different individualities of different dates and divergent mental characteristics. The wonderful passages in which the history of the Coming Messiah was foreshadowed, first vaguely in the Pentateuch, then more definitely in the Psalms, in the four greater prophets and in some of the minor ones, are with extraordinary insistency and ingenuity assigned to persons who have never existed, or declared to refer to events which never occurred. It was only natural that the superstructures erected on so sandy a foundation would prove very unsafe, and, as Mr. Harold Wiener has lately shown, the critics had reckoned without their host. They neglected textual criticism; they built their imposing critical structures on the Massoretic text, and lo! it has deserted them in their need. Even the author of the Commentary on Isaiah to which I have adverted has, as I understand, admitted lately that some, at least, of the critical work must be done over again. Thus the edifice, which has been constructed with such infinite care and pains, will have to be taken down, and some equally insecure fabric, we may be pretty sure, erected in its stead.

It could not be otherwise. True scientific investigation does not start on assumptions of infallibility; nor does it decline to recognize the labours of men in a far distant past. It does not scornfully refuse to be criticized; on the contrary, it recognizes the criticism of the critic to be a necessary mode of arrival at truth. It does not ignore the discoveries of others: it examines them, and, when fully established, incorporates them into its system. The "traditional" critic, who is often in these days laughed out of court, has made discoveries recently, as well as others, and he is quite as anxious to arrive at truth as anyone else can be. We shall never advance swiftly and securely in the criticism of Scripture until critics of all schools make endeavours to understand one another, and are willing, in a spirit of brotherly emulation, freely to exchange opinions on all questions which tend, directly or indirectly, to increase our knowledge of the Divine Scheme for the education of the world.

V.—I cannot refrain from adding a very few words on the general effect of such criticism, as I have been describing, on

Christian faith and morality. I have met with earnest believers in Revealed Religion, who have said to me that they did not care at what time the various books of the Old Testament were composed or compiled, because their contents were of such a nature that they compel every pious and godly person to bow before them as the voice of the Eternal God. The critics, too, have frequently endeavoured to gloss over the real tendencies of their criticism by arguing that it leaves the value of Scripture unimpaired or even enhanced by the light that is thrown upon them. But is this so? What is that "light"? It reveals to us, if the critics are to be believed, a volume which deliberately and perseveringly states what is untrue, because it has been deliberately and perseveringly forged in the interests of falsehood, which, in this particular case, happen to coincide with the interests of true religion. Any intelligent man, reading the Pentateuch as it stands, must feel that it distinctly asserts two propositions: first, that Moses was the ultimate source of the contents of that volume; and next, that he and he alone was the author of the civil and religious code which Israel has handed down to subsequent ages. The critics tell us that both these statements are false. I have no objection to concede that "JE," as a portion of the volume is called, may claim to be exempted from the accusation of deliberate falsehood. Its authors may have collected to the best of their ability the unwritten traditions they found existing in their respective neighbourhoods some hundreds of years after the events narrated are supposed to have occurred. But the critics at least give us to understand that none of these traditions had any solid foundation, and that in the main they must be pronounced contrary to fact. And no excuse, at least, can be made for the author of Deuteronomy and for "P." The former, we are asked to believe, deliberately composed his book in the name of Moses in the reign either of Ahaz, Hezekiah, Manasseh or Josiah, in order that he might lay the foundations of a monotheism in which his forefathers had never believed, and carefully smuggled his book into the Temple, in the hope that it might be found there, and that this might lead to the idea that it was really an ancient document! So also we are asked to accept the postulate that the author of the Priestly Code knew perfectly well that Moses had not given the instructions contained in Leviticus; but so long as he could make the Jews believe that he had done so, it did not matter in the least whether his statements were true or false. Then again, we are asked to take it for granted that a large number of scribes gave

themselves to the task of interpolating and fusing all the histories in order to bring them into line with the forgeries of their own time. The morality of these proceedings is on a level with the probability that so shameless an imposture should ever have led an undeniably great nation astray. We are in the habit of reading the Scriptures in public at our worship. But can any man with a spark of honesty in his composition who believes in these astounding theories, ever read these books in the congregation without telling the poor deluded creatures who are listening to him, that they must not for a moment imagine these stories to be true?

Moreover, having got so far, critical science is compelled to go further still. It now tells us that the Gospel of St. John, composed, as the liberal critic Harnack has admitted, within ten years of the period to which the Christian Church has for eighteen centuries assigned it, does not, as it pretends to do, contain the teaching of Christ; that it was deliberately forged in the name of the Apostle who leaned on His breast at the Last Supper; and that the Christian Church was tricked, no one knows how, into accepting it, and handing it down as genuine.* And yet Irenæus, who was the disciple of Polycarp, who was the disciple and personal friend of St. John himself, speaks of that Gospel as one of the four foundations on which the Gospel message to the world is based. It is not likely that I shall read another paper before the Victoria Institute; but the last words I am likely to speak here may well be a protest, in the Name of the God of Truth, on the part of one who has been a minister of Jesus Christ for 55 years, against such theories of the composition and transmission of books which, from at least three centuries B.C. to the twentieth century after His Coming, have been acknowledged by the Christian Church either to be authentic histories of the works and words of our common Master, or of the preparation for that Coming. It is a strange way of recommending Him to the present and to future ages, to contend that He, Who was the Truth as well as

---

* Criticism which boasts that it is "scientific" does not scruple to ignore the fact that it must have been altogether impossible in the first two centuries of the Christian era to launch forgeries upon so unique a society as the Christian Church. Not only were the members of that society drawn closely together by mutual offices of love, but, as the Acts of the Apostles clearly shows, the constant mutual communication between its members in every part would make the detection of a forgery immediate and inevitable.

the Way and the Life, has allowed His character and message to be obscured by falsehood and forgery, and that for the truth about Him He has left us to the researches of scholars who do not, and cannot, agree among themselves as to what He did or said.

Discussion.

Mr. Harold Wiener regretted that he had been so busy since he had received his copy of Chancellor Lias' important paper that he had had no time to examine into the details of his linguistic argument, but the opinions of the critics in this respect had undergone great changes from time to time. For instance the word *recush*, referred to on p. 69, occurred in Genesis xiv, which had been generally ascribed by the critics to post-exilic times, but a recent critic, Sellin, now ascribed it to pre-Mosaic times; the widest range possible. But indeed the linguistic argument of the critics rested on sand. Professor Eerdmans, the pupil and successor of Kuenen, after prolonged study of it, had been forced to discard it altogether. Inferences that had once been accepted as not mere theories, but immutable facts, were untenable, since the remains of Hebrew literature were much too scanty to supply the means of dating single words.

But he would wish to turn from the argument drawn from language and ask them to consider the substance of the Priestly Code. Did it bear the marks of the post-exilic period, or lend itself to late surroundings? The dress throughout was purely of the desert life. It might be said that the originator of the Code tried to project himself backwards into desert conditions, and give his laws a desert setting, but if they looked beyond the mere phraseology, to ascertain what was the heart of the Code, they found conspicuous the duties of the Levites. One whole tribe was set apart for work connected with the Sanctuary—he would not use the word "tabernacle" as that was assuming the issue to some extent. The chief duties of the Levites were to take down, pack up, carry from place to place, and set up again the Sanctuary and its furniture. What sort of relation had this to the circumstances of the men of either the exilic or the post-exilic age? How could such laws possibly apply to the second Temple? We must presume some degree of intelligence in the forger of the Code, but if we lay aside

Deuteronomy, the Code assigns nothing else for the Levites to do. The book of Chronicles represents the completed Law in action according to the Wellhausen school, but if we compare its statements about the Levites with the rules of P, we find that, according to the latter, many of the duties assigned by the Chronicler to the Levites would have been visited with death by the author of P!

If we take the Priestly Code alone, the priesthood is represented as being very simply constituted—one man, the High Priest, and his sons. If we turn to the first book of Samuel, to the account of Eli, we find that the High Priest has patronage and emoluments at his disposal:—"Put me, I pray thee, into one of the priest's offices that I may eat a piece of bread." There is no organization corresponding to this state of things in P. Further, Leviticus refers to a primitive time when men slew their own sacrifices. Later on, under the kings, when the people were more civilized, this duty was delegated to others, and Ezekiel complains that heathen were employed to kill the sacrifices. Throughout P, the congregation is evidently within a stone's throw of the Sanctuary. Thus in Leviticus xvii it is assumed that animals can be brought to the door of the Sanctuary for sacrifice, and in P if any man is ill or ceremonially unclean in the first month of the year, he is to keep the Passover in the second month. How would such provisions fit a period when there was a large diaspora in Babylon and Egypt? So with the provisions for leprosy. How was it possible for a man in Babylon in post-exilic days to bring a garment suspected of leprosy to Jerusalem, for the priests to examine it? A very striking case is that of the daughters of Zelophehad. This must have been a case of common occurrence, when a peasant died and left no male heir; it could not have been left to be regulated many centuries later by a forger. The inheritance of Zelophehad was confirmed to his daughters, but it was objected by the other members of the tribe, that if these married out of the tribe, the inheritance would pass away from the tribe; so it was enacted that they must marry within their own tribe. How could this law have been laid down after the exile when the tribes had ceased to have a separate existence?

Professor Eerdmans has dealt with Leviticus lately in "Das Buch Leviticus" [1912], and however far we may be from accepting his construction the study contains a great deal of very valuable material.

The only criticism that he would make on Chancellor Lias' paper was this, that the critics would always shuffle out from an argument resting on the linguistic basis.

Mrs. MAUNDER pointed out that the critics ascribed the Priestly Code to the time of Artaxerxes Longimanus, when the Zoroastrian faith was in full vigour. The Jews had then been under Persian rule for 80 years, whereas they had been under Babylonian for only 50. If this were the date of the Priestly Code, we ought to find some traces of, or reference to, the Magian and Zoroastrian doctrines. We do find such traces in the book of Tobit, the keynote of which is the pious action of Tobit in burying the body of a murdered countryman; the author assuming that the burial customs at Nineveh in the days of Sennacherib were the same as he had experience of some centuries later at Rhagae and Ecbatana. Now in the whole of the Priestly Code we have no hint of the knowledge of such a custom as the exposure of the corpse to be devoured by birds and beasts, the fundamental practice of Zoroastrianism. We find from the Talmud that the later Jews imbibed a number of superstitions concerning devils and demons from the Persians; there is no trace of any of these, either by way of recognition or condemnation, in the Priestly Code. In the Zoroastrian idea, the north was the abode of devils; it was forbidden to pour out, even one's household water, towards the north, lest it be taken as a libation to them. But P orders in Leviticus i, 11, that the priest shall kill the sacrifice before the altar, "northward" before the Lord.

Canon R. B. GIRDLESTONE hoped that so far from this being Chancellor Lias' last paper to them, he would live twenty years longer and give them many more. He had been very glad to see that Mr. Wiener was there, and to hear what he had said; especially as he belonged to the Israelite people. He was right in saying that they must consider the setting of the Code as well as its words. If they took Leviticus as a whole, and as a member of a still greater living whole, then they could see how admirably it fitted together. But on the other hand he was not willing to surrender the linguistic argument, which was most precious. They found in the Pentateuch old words, a definite coinage that vanished in the later books. When they compared the books of Samuel and Kings with Chronicles, and tested the Hebrew, sentence by sentence, they found that the Chronicler, whilst quoting from Samuel and

Kings, often varied individual words, substituting for the older one the word current in his own time. It was often extremely difficult to tell the date when a word originated ; when, for instance, did the words "slump" and "meticulous," which are now current, first come into use ? But sometimes a word marked a date distinctly ; if, for instance, we found in a book purporting to have been written a hundred and fifty years ago, the word "boycott," we should feel suspicious. So the use of the "talent" as meaning a man's gifts, could not well be earlier than our Lord's parable. The omission of a word proved nothing, unless the context had required it to be used ; there must have been something suitable to introduce it. Sometimes, however, there were two words for one thing, as, for instance, there were two words in the Hebrew for a "sickle," the one used in the earlier documents, the other in the later. So with the "shewbread" ; the first name for it, described its use ; the second word, which might be more fitly rendered "rowbread," referred to the arrangement of the loaves in rows. Again the name of David is differently written in Samuel and Kings from that in Chronicles ; in the first there are but three letters, in the last there are four. There are also dialectic differences ; here in London there is a very distinctive dialect, one that he was thankful he had never been able to acquire—the Cockney dialect. Arabs at the present day have no p in their alphabet, and the Ephraimites were unable to say "shibboleth." Leviticus is a book of Ritual, not of History, and abounds in technical words which need accurate translation. They run through the Old Testament. Whence came the word *Ephah* if not from Egypt ? What has happened to the familiar Tabernacle of meeting between Leviticus and Ezekiel, so that whilst it is found dozens of times in the one book it is only in what may be called an antiquarian note in the other (chap. xli, 1) ? How is it that the "sheep" of Leviticus are conspicuous by their absence in Ezekiel ? Similar questions *may* be asked—and *will* be asked about other words. They need patient study and will repay it. So will the terms of the great prophetic chapter (xxvi) if they are traced through the other books.

Mr. E. WALTER MAUNDER drew attention to the statement in the first chapter of Genesis that the sun and moon were for "seasons," as well as for signs, and for days and years ; "seasons" meaning times for solemn assembly for the worship of God. In the

ceremonial law the sun and moon were for "seasons," in this sense. The sun, by its rising and setting, gave the seasons for daily worship; the moon by its appearance as "new," the season for monthly worship; sun and moon together, by the full moons of spring and autumn, the seasons for the two great annual feasts of Passover and Tabernacles. This system was raised to a higher plane by the sanctification of the seventh; the seventh day was the Sabbath, the day of worship; the seventh month was pre-eminently the month of worship; it opened with the Feast of Trumpets, its tenth day was the great Day of Atonement; the seventh year was the Sabbatic year. And the week, whether of the day or of the year, was itself raised to a higher plane;—the week of weeks in days from the morrow after the Sabbath of Unleavened Bread, was the Feast of Pentecost; the week of weeks in years terminated with the blowing of the trumpets of Jubilee after the High Priest had pronounced the solemn absolution of the people at the close of the Great Day of Atonement. This was the time of "the restitution of all things"; the nation was cleansed from its sins, the Hebrew slave regained his liberty, and the alienated inheritance returned to its former owner. But this period of a week of weeks of years is a "restitution of all things" in the calendar; to use an astronomical term, it is a luni-solar cycle. The Jewish calendar was then regulated by actual observation; the month began with the actual observation of the young crescent in the sky; the first month of the year, Abib, the month of green ears, was that when the barley was sufficiently ripe for offering. But it would occasionally happen that the sky would be cloudy at the beginning of a month; then some rule had to be followed; and the priests had only to ascertain what was done in the corresponding month of the corresponding year of the preceding Jubilee period, to know what they should ordain.

What connection has this with the date of the Priestly Code? Just this. This system could only work as long as the Jews dwelt in the narrow compass of their own land, for the Jubilee cycle was not nearly accurate enough for use after they were scattered from Media in the north to Syene on the Nile in the south. But we know that they then had some means of arranging their calendar, for a number of commercial contracts have been found at Syene, bearing both Egyptian and Jewish dates. As we know the Egyptian calendar, the Jewish dates can be interpreted, and it appears that the

Jews were then able to predict the new moon. This they probably did by means of the luni-solar cycle for 19 years that gives us the Golden Number of the rules for finding Easter, in our book of Common Prayer. The present Jewish calendar is founded on this same Metonic cycle, as it is usually called. The dates of these contracts extend from the reign of Xerxes to that of Darius Nothus, so that the very period of the supposed origin of P is covered. It is clear that the Jubilee cycle was not, and could not have been, used for dating these papyri; and that once the 19-year cycle had been discovered, no new ceremonial system based on the 49-year cycle, which was only fitted for a small country, would have been invented amongst the Jews of the Dispersion.

Dr. THIRTLE remarked that when examining the claims of the Priestly Code, we are compelled to consider other aspects of analytical theory as it regards the Pentateuch. Then we find that the entire budget of critical speculation goes together—and thanks to the labours of scholars in many lands, it is all going together in another sense!

Mr. Harold Wiener, to whom we have just listened, has put criticism "off its feet" in regard to its prodigious inferences from the distribution of the Divine designations.

In the Pentateuch we have the priesthood and offerings; in the so-called "Code" the same features appear. The difference lies here, however: while the Pentateuch exhibits the institutions in relation to Moses, the law-giver of Israel, criticism represents them as coming on the scene after the time of the great prophets. The confusion is not one of documents merely, but of the objective content of history, as it relates to the ways of God in dealing with the Israelitish nation.

A short time ago, Rev. Iverach Munro read before the Institute a paper on the Samaritan Pentateuch and its problems. We do well now to recall that the facts of that well-known recension of the Pentateuch supply an unanswerable case against the post-exilic date of the Priestly Code, and for that matter of any part of the early books of the Bible. The schismatic history of the Northern Kingdom of Israel demands the institutions—that is, the material content—of the Priestly Code centuries before the exile. Without the aspect of schism, joined to that of rebellion, we cannot understand Israelitish history, either as regards the Ten Tribes or the Two.

The Rev. F. E. SPENCER said: I desire to apply as briefly as may be the scientific inductive method to the books of the Chronicles, and, I believe with the good will of Chancellor Lias, to draw conclusions from this method which may supplement what has already been said.

The Chronicles divide into parts, of which the sources are either given, or may be inferred. I propose to offer an argument, which may be called an argument strictly from what is called source criticism. The sources of the Chronicles are fairly certain. They consist of ancient genealogies; lists extracted from the archives which began with David; speeches and histories derived from prophetic writings contemporary with the events; a Psalm sung at the bringing up of the ark; and other like things taken from old contemporary documents. The Chronicler selects these with a clear purpose, hands them on in a manner which clearly evidences, as Graf has proved, one hand, and adds reflections of his own. As certain of these ancient documents are longer or shorter extracts, forty-five in number, from Samuel and Kings, we may clearly trace the hand and manner of the Chronicler in transcribing them, and arguing from this, and from treatment which is exactly on the same lines which we find in the other parts, we may infer that the way in which he has handled documents now inaccessible to us resembles his manner of treatment of Samuel and Kings. I think we are all along on completely safe ground. We are not forcing an hypothesis, but examining facts and explaining them. We have the advantage in this investigation of help from Girdlestone's Deuterographs, Davidson's very thorough researches, Graf's monograph, and Kittel's Critical Hebrew Bible. Davidson's researches are of peculiar value in this matter. They date from 1862. They are quite free from prejudice, without the slightest apologetic leaning, and have no hypothesis to serve. Davidson also, in the Chronicles, is comparatively free from that infusion of vinegar which vitiates his otherwise valuable Introduction for the ordinary reader. Graf, in 1866, is bent on a hypothesis, but is still scientifically valuable.

To gather up then the result.

We find we have clear reason for attributing complete honesty to the Chronicler. Throughout he is compiling ancient sources. He did not invent David's speeches. He was not competent to do so. He only modernised them. I think the more reasonable account of

the Psalm, very expressly said to have been sung at the bringing up of the ark, is, that the Chronicler is correct to his source. It was so sung. And the constituent parts of it were, either before or after, taken up into the official Psalm-book in a different way, *i.e.*, it was either adapted from existing Psalms, or taken up into Psalms 96 and 105 later.

The Chronicler all along modernises and explains every one of his ancient sources. Perhaps the most striking instance is when in I Chronicles xxix, 7, he calculates the offering of David's princes in darics, which were certainly not the Davidic currency. Nor did the Chronicler think so himself. We have the authority of Buhl for saying the word means darics, the Persian currency. It will not be necessary to labour the point that the Pentateuch discovers not a trace of this modernising and explaining. The Torah, on the contrary, is allowed on all hands to hand on traces of a much more ancient past in words and things. A large part of it is only applicable to a camp in the desert. In the Chronicles much is altered. But none of these alterations, modernisings, or explanations have invaded the Pentateuch text in any way, though there are traces of later editing here and there.

I hold, therefore, that it is a good and scientific inference that these facts point to the Pentateuch having come down to the Chronicler's time as a sacred deposit—far too sacred to be tampered with—from the ancient times, which its own witness professes.

If P was only recent in the Chronicler's time, or if P was only then coming into being, traces of the Chronicler's method and style, which was the method and style of his time, would infallibly have been found in it.

Mr. MARTIN L. ROUSE thought that no evidence of chronological custom should be based upon the Assouan papyri, since, to his mind, the genuineness of those documents was open to question.

Prof. LANGHORNE ORCHARD congratulated the Institute upon this important paper, read to them by a distinguished scholar who knew so well how to yoke learning with logic, and harness them both in the service of truth. They all hoped that he would be spared to give them yet other papers as valuable as this, for which they heartily thanked him.

The Meeting adjourned at 6.30 p.m.