

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

Advance notes are also cashed at the Home. When a man is about to join a ship the law allows the master of the vessel to advance him one month's wages, and no more, so that he may purchase his kit and pay any debts. The Home charges 5 per cent. discount and gives the balance in cash, a great boon to the seamen, for at the numerous other places where advance notes can be cashed the discount is higher and a kit has to be purchased. These dealers, therefore, get two big profits on one transaction. Asiatic seamen are beginning to see this, and it adds to their appreciation of the Home to know that there is no necessity for their going to such dealers.


Many Asiatics come to the Home year after year, in spite of wily land-sharks' endeavours to lure them elsewhere. As I was quitting the building there was a gray-bearded little man from Goa standing on the steps.

"When did you first come here?" General Chamier said to him.

"As soon as it was opened," he answered promptly, and then, turning his sharp little eyes on me, declared with evident pride, that during those forty-three years he had always paid for his board. Once he left the Home indebted to the extent of £1 5s., but the first thing he did on returning to England was to pay the bill in full. And what he said was quite true.

I have not written as much as I should have liked about the missionary work of the Home for Asiatics at the present day, as when I visited the Institution the missionary's house, which adjoins it, was empty. Mr. C. Haupt, who for twelve years had worked with much success for the Home, had resigned his position through ill-health and returned to Germany, his native land, and his successor had not then been appointed.

HENRY CHARLES MOORE.



ART. V.—NOTES ON GENESIS XXXIV.

SOME time back I wrote a paper on Genesis xxxiv., discussing the probability of certain theories as to its origin which have found currency of late. I propose to pursue this inquiry by examining the linguistic features of the chapter. I ask pardon if the investigation prove somewhat technical, but I will endeavour to make it as clear as I can.

According to some of the critics who assume to have settled, down to half or a quarter of a verse, what part of the Book of Genesis was written by one author, and what by another, the author of the Priestly Code is responsible for the following words at the commencement of Genesis xxxiv. : "And Dinah,

the daughter of Leah, which she bare unto Jacob, went out. And Shechem, the son of Hamor the Hivite, the prince of the land." It will be observed that the words "to see the daughters of the land" (לראות בנות הארץ) are omitted here; they are assigned to JE.¹ What "stylistic criteria" enable the critic to make this separation, or why the editor should have turned aside from the narrative before him to insert them, is not very clear. The words thus assigned to JE are not particularly characteristic. So Professor Driver assigns the whole passage to P. Another curious circumstance is that Kautzsch and Socin (I take the information from Mr. Bissell's "Genesis," printed in colours) assign the words "saw her" to J. But in the Hebrew "saw her" is one word, and it *precedes* the words which, in English, follow it.

Therefore once more *one single word*, and that word so common a one as the words "saw her" are in English, is severed from a consecutive narrative, and assigned to another author than the rest. We have a right to ask those who make this demand on our intelligence on what grounds their assertion is based. It may further be remarked that, on Professor Driver's authority, we are bound to believe that the nominative case in ver. 2 is taken from one author, and the verbs following it, "saw her and lay with her, and defiled her" from another. The editor or compiler of this singularly composed narrative must have been a psychological phenomenon.

But to proceed. In ver. 3 we have the word "damsel" in the *masculine* form—a peculiarity only found in the Pentateuch—assigned in the first part of the verse to P, and in the second to JE. In other words *both* these authors use a form of the word only found in the Pentateuch.¹ As one of them wrote four or five centuries later than the other, this is at least a singular coincidence. Is it not far more probable that the Pentateuch is, after all, what it has been generally believed to be until the present century, the earliest book in the Bible, and that the common gender used for "youth" and "maiden" alike is an archaic use?

Then we find *another* word—a rare one, which only occurs three times in the whole Old Testament—used for maiden in ver. 4. The use of a different and remarkable word is generally supposed by the critics whom we are criticising as characteristic of a separate author. But this, too, as well as the other, is here assigned to the post-exilic priestly author. So that we have this author (P) using one rare word in one verse, and another rare word in the next verse, and the other author

¹ The feminine form of the word is only found in the Pentateuch in Gen. xxiv. 61 in the plural, and the singular feminine in Deut. xxii. 19.

using the first rare word in a passage which occurs between the two selections from P. And all this in the two verses 3 and 4 of this chapter.¹ Is it not fair to contend that the new criticism is just a little capricious?

Another instance of inconsistency is in the assignment of ver. 5 to JE by Kautzsch and Socin and Professor Driver. Professor Driver, it is true, admits that it is a little difficult to arrive at a satisfactory analysis of this chapter. He may well say so, for pretty nearly each critic has a different scheme. But if the use of a particular word is characteristic of a particular author, what has Dr. Driver to say to the occurrence of the word *defile* (טמא) three times in this short narrative—once (ver. 5) in J and twice (vers. 13 and 27) in P, or, as Kautzsch and Socin assert, in the redactor? Authorities whom Professor Driver usually willingly delights to honour, but whom in this instance he has deserted, contend that טמא is a ceremonial word characteristic of the priestly writer. This kind of criticism is common in the German critics, and is apparently on as sound a foundation here as anywhere else. Why, then, do many abandon it here? Wellhausen, though he does not scruple arbitrarily to rearrange the text, characteristically ignores the question of נער as a feminine altogether, and skates very warily over טמא. So distinguished an Oriental scholar can hardly have overlooked these very palpable facts. Why, then, does he not attempt to deal with them? Simply from the practice, so common among German commentators, of laying the utmost stress on things, however slight, which seem to support their theories, and of ignoring all, however strong, which make against them. I must once more point out, at the risk of wearying my readers by repetition, that this is not scientific investigation, but very eminently the reverse.

Again, in ver. 5 there is a linguistic fact which, if it does not count for much, yet as far as it goes tends to support unity of authorship. שרר in the Hiphil does not often occur in the Pentateuch,² but when it does it is found about as often in JE as in P. Another point appears to have escaped the critics, in spite of their industry. It is that עצב in the Hithpael only occurs twice in the sense to *grieve* in the whole Bible, each of these times in Genesis—once in JE (vi. 6), and once in P (xxxiv. 7). This is another instance of the one-sidedness of the critical processes, another indication that they are prompted by the desire to establish a theory rather than to ascertain a fact.

¹ This rare form occurs *twenty-two* times in the Pentateuch, and not elsewhere. It cannot, therefore, be a copyist's blunder.

² Never in Joshua or Deuteronomy.

Once more, it would appear that the expression "folly (נבלה) in Israel" in regard to sins of the character here described, which occurs here and there in the sacred books, is far more likely to have been derived from this passage, supposed to have been written by a person of recognised weight and authority, than that the writer of the "eighth or ninth century B.C." should have taken it (perhaps) from Judges, or 2 Samuel, and that Jeremiah should have taken it from him. One does not, of course, regard such a point as proved, but many a critical "proof" has a far slender thread of probability to depend on.

In ver. 8 we have the rare word חשק, expressing *loving desire*. It seldom occurs elsewhere in the Bible. Its appearance here constitutes a link of connection between P and Deuteronomy, where it appears three times in the same sense. It only occurs three times in that sense in the whole of the rest of the Scriptures. Surely this fact is quite as strong evidence for identity of authorship of P and Deuteronomy as any that can be adduced for diversity? If the argument for the cumulative force of the linguistic evidence in favour of the separate authorship of P be pressed, we have here a proof that cumulative evidence may be produced on the other side. Then, we are told (ver. 10) that אהוה is a characteristic of P; but if so, then רכוש, which has much the same meaning,¹ ought surely to be characteristic of a different author. But both, it does not appear for what reason, are regarded as marks of the same author. The verb סחר (*to trade*) only occurs *four* times in the whole Bible, of which *three* are in the Book of Genesis and *two* in this chapter. Gen. xlii. 34, where it occurs again, is ascribed to JE. Here, then, we have another and no slight indication of unity of authorship of this book. Ezekiel, whose close connection with the Priestly Code is much insisted on, has נתן *for to trade*, though he uses the substantive kindred with סחר *for merchants*.

מרה, again, in the sense of endow (verb) and dowry (noun) only occurs five times in the Old Testament.² But it is found here (JE) as a noun and three times as a verb in the Book of the Covenant (Exod. xxii.), and the noun only once beside, in 1 Sam. xviii. 25. Once more, therefore, we have a possible indication of identity of authorship between JE and the Book of the Covenant, and one more among the many proofs of the antiquity of the language at least of the Book of the Covenant

¹ The one word signifies what is *grasped*, the other what is *gathered*.

² Some give Ps. xvi. 4 this signification; but the more probable translation by far is "hasten."

and of JE.¹ Then אָמַן, in the sense of *consent*, occurs only *four times in the Old Testament*, of which *three* are in this chapter. The probabilities, therefore, instead of inclining towards the very intricate partition between JE and P which the critics have adopted, point very strongly indeed in the direction of an early and authentic tradition of Dinah's fall, handed down either orally or in writing, in the exact form in which the compiler has inserted it in his history. רָחַב יָדַיִם (broad of hands, ver. 21), though it is found in the later Hebrew, has once more all the appearance of an early phrase, though it never became obsolete. It has already been observed that the reference to the gate of the city has also a primitive appearance. After the time of David we hear comparatively little of it. It would be a pure assumption, absolutely incapable of proof, to assert that P uses it here to impart an archaic flavour to his story. Yet similar assertions to this are often made, and not unfrequently believed, though everything in the shape of proof be wanting. In ver. 23 קָנִין is regarded as a characteristic of P. Thus, we have *three* words for the same idea of possession, all of which are assumed to be characteristic of the priestly author; רָכַשׁ (gathering), אָחַז (with the idea of grasping, seizing *by force*), and קָנִין (acquisition). It suits the critics here to assign all these phrases to one author. Had it suited them to assign them to *different* authors, they would unquestionably have done so, and would have had at least some ground to go upon in doing it. That they have done otherwise is yet another illustration of the utterly arbitrary methods to which they have resorted. בָּטָח, again (ver. 25), occurs only here in the sense "boldly,"² and used adverbially without the prefix ל, it only occurs eight times in the Old Testament. Three of these are in the Pentateuch, one here, and two in Deuteronomy. לִפְיֵי חֶרֶב (with the edge of the sword), once more, is a phrase of the early Hebrew. It occurs *twenty-eight* times in the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges, and only six times elsewhere. It occurs thirteen times in the Book of Joshua alone, three times in Deuteronomy, three times in the rest of the Pentateuch. Of these it is assigned here to the priestly, in Exod. xvii. 13 and Numb. xxi. 24 to the prophetic (JE) writer. Possibly this proves nothing. But we may reply that such considerations as these are held to prove anything when it suits the

¹ The mention of dowry, however, seldom occurs in the Old Testament. Another word occurs in Gen. xxx. 20 (JE) for dowry. This should be the sign of another author.

² In Judg. viii. 11, 1 Sam. xii. 11 the sense appears to be "in security," a *passive* sense. Here it has a more active signification, "without fear."

critics to use them for that purpose. It is not sound criticism to allege facts when they make for your case, to ignore them when they make against it. One complaint against the critical school is, not that they criticise the Old Testament, but that their criticism is unfair and one-sided. In ver. 28, again, there is surely a touch of local colour in the mention of the "sheep and oxen and asses." We do not hear in the later history, when civilization had advanced, of asses as spoil in the sacking of a city. The whole tone of the passage savours of a primitive and pastoral age, when not only flocks and herds, but beasts of burden, formed the whole wealth of those who possessed them. What touch of genius enabled the returned fugitives from Babylon to catch so completely the tone of days long past?

I have devoted this paper to linguistic considerations. I will only add that in Jacob's lament, attributed to JE, that he and his were "few in number," falls in precisely with the stratagem to which Simeon and Levi resorted in order to equalize the strength of the combatants. Here, again, one of the delicate undesigned coincidences on which considerable stress was laid in days when a sounder criticism was in vogue results, if the critics are right, from the juxtaposition of two discordant narratives. The improbability that this should be the case amounts almost to impossibility. It is not, however, by any means the first instance, as has been shown in these papers, in which such an improbability has been introduced by the alleged critical discoveries.

Thus the phenomena of this chapter, when critically examined without any preconceived theories, do not support the marvellous mosaic postulated by the German school in this chapter, but lead to the conclusion that the author of Genesis has embodied, almost word for word, an ancient and perhaps authentic tradition of the early history of his race. It may be further remarked that in Gen. xlix. (Jacob's song), which, we are told, has been ascertained to have been "incorporated by J from an independent source," there is a reference to this history. As J was combined with E "approximately in the eighth century B.C.," J must of course have been written earlier. As J's narrative incorporates Gen. xlix. from a different source, that must have been written earlier still. Consequently, even on the theory of the German school itself, there is very early traditional authority for the occurrence related here. The poetic tradition and the linguistic features of the narrative, taken together, constitute strong evidence for the authenticity of the narrative as we have it.

J. J. LIAS.