

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

less bound together by their negations. None of them believe in the unity of the Triune Godhead, or the expiatory sacrifice of the Redeemer, or the fallen nature of man, or the inspired supremacy of Holy Scripture. None of them believe that Christ founded on earth a Catholic and Apostolic Church, or that He ordained a special order for the ministry of the Word and Sacraments, or conferred an inherent grace on Holy Baptism and Holy Communion. None of them believe, with Arius, that the Christ was of like essence with the Father; nor, like Socinus, that heaven and hell are separate worlds. On the other hand, very few of them consider Christ either as a myth in the sense invented by Strauss, or as the kind of amiable Rabbi whom, according to the dramatic fictions of M. Renan, death has made Divine.

JOHN W. DIGGLE.

(*To be continued.*)



## ART. II.—THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH.

### No. XIX.

I HAVE not yet seen the new "Dictionary of the Bible." But if it be true, as has been stated, that in it Professor Ryle has placed the composition of Deuteronomy in the reign of Ahaz, the opponents of Wellhausen and his school have reason once more to congratulate themselves. Just as in the case of the New Testament, the followers of German critics of the Old Testament are being forced slowly backward in the date they are compelled to assign to its various books. Originally Deuteronomy was supposed by Wellhausen and his school to have been written shortly before its supposed discovery in the Temple. Professor Driver's theories in regard to the Pentateuch in general have already been described by Professor James Robertson,<sup>1</sup> as "a set of critical canons quite different from those of Wellhausen," and I have quite independently remarked on his recent description of Deuteronomy as a "compilation," not a composition, of the age—or somewhere about the age—in which it appeared, as a new departure. And now its composition, or, it may be, compilation, has been driven backward from the reign of Hezekiah to that of Ahaz. All this is an excellent omen of the prospects before those who would criticise the critics. It were, however, much to be wished that the "intelligent students" in our Universities

<sup>1</sup> "Early Religion of Israel," Preface, p. x (first edit.).

would depart from the attitude they have assumed, so admirably described by Dr. Salmon in his recent work on the text of the New Testament. It may be all very well "to accept the [alleged] new discoveries" with "little examination and less knowledge, believing that one is ranging one's self on the side of learned progressive research against fossilized bigotry."<sup>1</sup> But one is bound at least to read and to examine the arguments of those who apply the same methods to the critics of the Old Testament that these critics do to the Old Testament itself.

To proceed with our examination of the alleged sources. We may pass over chaps. xxix., xxx., as containing little to our purpose. In chap. xxix. vers. 24, 29 are apparently assigned to P because שפחה, not אמה, is the word used. Of course this is pure assumption.<sup>2</sup> Whether the probability of the assumption is greater than the improbability that the redactor would have been likely to have interrupted his transcription of JE here in order to introduce from P the utterly unimportant details in vers. 24, 29, may be left to the reader to decide. The narrator, however, of the "eighth or ninth century B.C." in xxx. 3, 4, 9, 10, is evidently aware that Bilhah and Zilpah have been previously mentioned by his successor of four centuries afterwards.<sup>3</sup> The phenomena appear, therefore, to point, here as often elsewhere, not to transcription from two different MSS., but to unity of authorship.

Coming to chap. xxxi., one cannot but see the importance attached to Bethel by *all* the writers who are supposed to have been used for this narrative. Why this general agreement on such a point, when we are told that the object of the later writers was to glorify *Jerusalem*, and when we know that Bethel had long, at the time when even J and E wrote, been the centre of an idolatrous worship on the part of the followers of Jeroboam? It is remarkable, moreover, that this prominence of Bethel in early history is witnessed to by the

<sup>1</sup> "Some Criticisms of the Text of the New Testament," p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> It is rather awkward for the critics that שפחה suddenly appears in xxx. 18 in a continuous selection from JE. But criticism is equal to the occasion. שפחה in this verse is the redactor's insertion! See also note on p. 519 of the CHURCHMAN for 1898 on "ama" and "shipcha," as Wellhausen calls them.

<sup>3</sup> One must have the eye of a hawk to avoid making a slip occasionally. And if one *does* make a slip, others have the eye and the swoop of the hawk, and are down upon one at once. I had forgotten for the moment that my argument as to ver. 4 has been anticipated by the usual convenient expedient of assigning the first part of ver. 4 to P. The assignment is a little astounding. First of all, there is no ground, literary, historical, or "stylistic," for it; next, in ver. 9 the parallel passage in regard to Zilpah is *not* assigned to P.

author of the later chapters of the Book of Judges,<sup>1</sup> parts of which are admitted to be of early origin. Here, then, we have the post-exilic writer once more in possession of early authentic information, and once more, like Balaam, blessing that which it is supposed to have been his intention to curse.<sup>2</sup>

I must refer my readers to the Kautzsch and Socin for the strange and altogether arbitrary division of chap. xxx. 1-4 between JE and the redactor, because I do not understand our latest school to insist on the accuracy of this division in all its detail. It is remarkable enough, in the eyes of any genuine critic, to find that *four words only* ("and God remembered Rachel") in ver. 22, in a continuous narrative (in which, by the way, the words "Jehovah" and "Elohim" are *not* indications of authorship), are supposed to have been taken from P. What *criterion* "stylistic" or other, has established this fact we are left to imagine. We proceed to xxxi. 18,<sup>3</sup> where the words "and all his substance which he had gathered, the cattle of his getting, which he had gotten in Paddan-Aram, for to go to Isaac his father in the land of Canaan," are detached from a continuous narrative of E, and assigned to P because of the words רכש and "Paddan-Aram," which are supposed to be characteristic of P. With Paddan-Aram I have previously dealt.<sup>4</sup> As to רכש, the statement that it is characteristic of P is a mere assertion, incapable of being proved. If it *can* be proved, let the proof be given. As to Paddan-Aram, we have a similar severance of a brief passage in chap. xxxiii. 18 from a continuous narrative simply because it contains the word Paddan-Aram, and for

<sup>1</sup> Judg. xx. 18, 26. Professor Driver thinks it difficult to separate the older from the later part of chap. xx. None but an early writer, however, would have given prominence to Bethel.

<sup>2</sup> Since the above was written, I have observed in the *Church Gazette*, March 4, 1899, a statement that "Jacob's conduct is of a piece with what we know of *bætulion* worship in other places." The critics really cannot be allowed to employ contradictory arguments to strengthen their position. In patriarchal times the form of worship would naturally be determined by the *cults* of surrounding nations, and if Jacob were here following the precedent of "*bætulion*-worship," the fact makes for the genuineness of the history. But if the whole history has been "*worked over*" in the interests of Judaism, the whole strength of the later redactors would have been employed to remove all traces of these earlier cults from it. If the writer of the article above cited be correct, he has brought forward a strong argument for the authenticity of Genesis.

<sup>3</sup> It may help us to have P's continuous narrative here: "And when Rachel saw she had no children, and she gave him Bilhah her handmaid to wife. And God remembered Rachel and all the substance which he had gathered, the cattle of his getting," etc.—an interesting and truly consecutive narrative.

<sup>4</sup> CHURCHMAN for September, 1897, pp. 618-620, and for January, 1898, p. 175.

no other reason whatever.<sup>1</sup> And those who have so severed it have failed, in spite of their claims to be the only scientific critics, to notice the two significant facts, (1) that the passage *was not written in Canaan*, and (2) that it was written for those who were ignorant of Canaanitish geography. No Israelite of post-exilic times could have been ignorant that Shechem was in Canaan. Israel in Egypt, or in the wilderness, might very possibly have been so. Moreover, P's narrative is a little startling here. In xxxiii. 18 Jacob starts "to go to Isaac his father. In xxxiii. 18 we find that P has brought him suddenly to Shalem, or Shechem. Here, once more, we have not the whole of P's narrative, but find a very serious *lacuna* instead. J brings him to Succoth. E assumes, for what reasons we know not, that he has arrived at Shechem. JE, again, knows nothing of Jacob's arrival at Shechem. At least, nothing is *said* about it. Yet in chap. xxxiv. both P and JE agree in stating that he *was* there. Again we ask, *Why* is this? And why was a short passage from P inserted here instead of the obviously parallel narrative of J or E? J brings Jacob to *Succoth* (xxxiii. 17), and E finds him at Shechem, encamping before "the city" (clearly Shechem), of which we have no mention in his narrative, but only in the extract from the post-exilic writer of four or five centuries later. Once more, then, we are confronted with a whole set of facts which demand some explanation, but have received none. Nor ought chap. xxxi. 47, which gives both the Hebrew and Aramaic names of the "heap of witness," to be passed over. Kautzsch and Socin assign it to the post-exilic redactor. But how did he know the Aramaic name of the heap of witness? And if he *did* know it, what reason had he for mentioning it? He was writing long after the events he recorded had passed away. No one was likely to care in the least, in post-exilic times, what the Aramaic name was. On the other hand, if we are here following the course of an

---

<sup>1</sup> Here again it may be well to give P's narrative consecutively. I follow on from the place where I left off (see last page): "which he had gathered in Paddan-Aram, for to go to Isaac his father in the land of Canaan. And Jacob came to Shalem [or "came safe and sound to"], a city of Shechem, which is in the land of Canaan, when he came from Paddan-Aram." Then follows the story of Dinah. It is obvious that the probability of the insertion of the story of Dinah between the statement that Jacob started to go to his father (xxxi. 18) and the statement that he came to him (xxxv. 27) becomes smaller in inverse proportion to the amount of detail usually contained in the history. For the continuity of P, see last paper. The character of P's narrative, taken as a whole, demands a vast deal more investigation than it has as yet received. The more one examines the subject, the more one feels that the critical analysis has not been accepted on objective, but on subjective, grounds.

authentic narrative, the touch is natural, and marks the full information of the writer.<sup>1</sup> The allusions to the oath by the "fear of Isaac," too, in chap. xxxi. 42, 53, seem altogether unintelligible, unless they are of very early date. Here, again, is an indication of the ancient *cults*, of which, on the critical theory, it was the object of the redactor to obliterate every trace. On the traditional theory all is natural and probable.

We proceed now to chap. xxxiv. The treatment of this chapter is so elaborate that the only way to display it is to put JE and P into parallel columns. It will be seen that the redactor pieces together his narrative in a very remarkable, not to say eccentric, manner. The result does credit to his ingenuity. But one is a little inclined to wonder why he gave himself so much trouble, when two presumably coherent narratives lay before him. And the separate narratives are, to say the least, extraordinary, and appear to demand a great deal more critical examination than they have at present received. Let the reader carefully study each of them in detail :

## CHAP. XXXIV.

*JE's Narrative.*<sup>2</sup>

"To see the daughters of the land. Saw her, and he took her and lay with her and humbled her. And his soul clave unto Dinah, the daughter of Jacob, and [he] spake kindly to the damsel. Now Jacob heard that he had defiled Dinah his daughter, and his sons were with his cattle in the field, and Jacob held his peace until they came. And the sons of Jacob came in from the field when they heard it, and the men were grieved, and

## CHAP. XXXIV.

*P's Narrative.*

"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, and he loved the damsel. And Shechem spake unto his father Hamor, saying, Get me this damsel to wife. And Hamor, the father of Shechem, went out unto Jacob to commune with him. And Hamor communed with them, saying, The soul of my son Shechem longeth for your daughter. I pray you, give her unto him to wife. And make ye marriages with us ; give your daughters unto us and take

<sup>1</sup> I am not an Aramaic scholar, but it might be interesting to inquire whether "Jegar-Sahadutha" is Aramaic of the third or fourth century B.C., or whether it is ancient. In Exod. xx. 6 the Targum has Samech instead of Sin, as here, in the word "Sahadutha."

<sup>2</sup> The words are taken from Professor Bissell's "Genesis printed in Colours." I have not the Polychrome Bible at hand.

they were very wroth, because he had wrought folly in Israel in lying with Jacob's daughter, which thing ought not to be done. And Shechem said unto her father and unto her brethren, Let me find favour in your eyes, and what ye shall say unto me I will give. Ask me never so much dowry and gift, and I will give according as ye shall say unto me, but give me the damsel to wife. And the young man deferred not to do the thing, because he had delight in Jacob's daughter, and he was honoured above all the house of his father. . . . Two of . . . Simeon and Levi, Dinah's brethren. And they slew Shechem with the edge of the sword, and took Dinah out of Shechem's house, and went forth. And Jacob said to Simeon and Levi, Ye have troubled me, to make me to stink among the inhabitants of the land, among the Canaanites and the Perizzites; and I being few in number, they will gather themselves against me and smite me, and I shall be destroyed, I and my house. And they said, Should he deal with our sister as with a harlot?"

our daughters unto you. And ye shall dwell with us: and the land shall be before you; dwell and trade ye therein, and get you possessions therein. And the sons of Jacob<sup>1</sup> answered Shechem and Hamor with guile, and spake [because he had defiled Dinah, their sister] and said to them, We cannot do this thing, to give our sister to one uncircumcised, for that were a reproach unto us. Only on this condition will we consent unto you: if ye will be as we be, that every male of you be circumcised, then will we give our daughters unto you, and we will take your daughters unto us, and we will become one people. But if ye will not hearken unto us, to be circumcised, then we will take our daughter and be gone. And their words pleased Hamor and Shechem, Hamor's son. And Hamor and Shechem his son came unto the gate of their city, and communed with the men of their city, saying, These men are peaceable with us; therefore let them dwell in the land and trade therein, for, behold, the land is large enough for them; let us take their daughters to us for wives, and let us give them our daughters. Only on this condition will the men consent unto us to dwell with us, to become our people, if every male among us be circumcised, as they are circumcised. Shall not their cattle and their substance and all their beasts be ours? Only let us consent unto them, and they will dwell with us. And unto

---

<sup>1</sup> See JE (ver. 7).

Hamor and Shechem hearkened all that went out of the gate of his city, and every man was circumcised, all that went out of the gate of his city. And it came to pass on the third day, when they were sore, that the sons of Jacob<sup>1</sup> took each man his sword and came upon the city unawares and slew all the males."<sup>2</sup>

We will take what is supposed to be the older narrative first. It commences in the middle of a sentence, "To see the daughters of the land." If we wish to fill up the gap in the sentence, we are driven to a narrative four or five centuries later. Once more we ask for some reason why the redactor used his authorities in this remarkable manner, and what, conceivably, his early authority had here that he preferred the later one. There is no obvious reason, "stylistic" or other, why the words "And Dinah went out" should be at least four hundred years later than "to see the daughters of the land." And it is surely not altogether unreasonable or unscientific to demand a full statement of the grounds on which this division has been made. Next, somebody, we know not who, "took her and lay with her." That this person was Shechem we never learn from JE at all. It is not by any means too intelligible from JE's narrative as it stands *who* has "wrought folly in Israel in lying with Jacob's daughter." There are indications in vers. 11, 26, that Shechem is the offender, but nothing more. Once more we are obliged to have recourse to the narrative of four or five centuries later to supply the blanks in the older narrative. Another strange *lacuna* appears in ver. 19: "The young man deferred not to do the thing." What thing? No "thing" has been mentioned. Grammatically, in JE's narrative, it means to marry Dinah. Once more the redactor fills up the deficiencies in JE from the far later narrative in P. Why? Had JE the same or different details? In either case the resort to P for all the salient features of the narrative, especially as he is known to be "formal and wearisome," needs some explanation. Can it be that JE, as in chap. xvii., "knows nothing" of the obligation of circumcision? Whether this be so or

<sup>1</sup> See JE (ver. 7).

<sup>2</sup> "Hamor and his son," in ver. 26, is now assigned by Kautzsch and Socin to the redactor, as are also vers. 27-29 and the words in brackets above in ver. 13.

not, what, once more we ask, was "the thing" which Shechem "deferred not to do"? Do not the phenomena point to the conclusion that P can be no more satisfactorily separated from JE than J from E?

Then the introduction of Simeon and Levi is a little abrupt and peculiar. Why should the mention of these be confined to JE? Was it because of the priestly functions assigned in the Priestly Code to the tribe of Levi? If so, why did the redactor, a disciple of the priestly party, rescue this fact from the oblivion to which his master P had consigned it? For the redactor has taken special trouble to drag Simeon and Levi in. They appear not only in JE's narrative, but in Jacob's song. Wellhausen, it is true, discovers a contradiction here which shows, in his opinion, that two narratives are combined. Simeon and Levi, he tells us, after they have slain *Hamor* and Shechem ("Hamor and his son" is now, as we have seen, assigned to the redactor by Kautzsch and Socin), go off with Dinah. After they have gone off, they return (ver. 27) and plunder the town. Then Simeon and Levi are alone spoken of in ver. 26, whereas *all* the sons of Jacob are spoken of in the next three verses.<sup>1</sup> Then, ver. 30 agrees with ver. 26, because "*Israel in corpore*" will have nothing to do with the violent proceedings of Simeon and Levi. Lastly, it is absurd to suppose that two individuals could overcome a town and slay its defenders. On these irrefutable grounds the division is effected. Just as if it were not a special characteristic of early Hebrew to give emphasis by repetition;<sup>2</sup> as if "Jacob" in ver. 30 must mean a tribe and not a person, while Simeon and Levi must mean themselves alone and unaided; as if anyone could possibly imagine that Simeon and Levi stormed Shechem themselves, without any followers; and as if, under the circumstances mentioned in what is assigned P, a very small troop would not have been sufficient to make victory certain. If, we may add, Simeon and Levi resorted to no such stratagem, how could victory have been secured at all, especially if there be any historic truth in the statement that all the tribes of Israel were not united in this summary act of vengeance? It should be noted, moreover, that the narrative as we now have it was known to the author of Jacob's song. Surely such criticism as that of Wellhausen is not so absolutely conclusive

<sup>1</sup> The words "sons of Jacob" are used by JE in ver. 7, by P in vers. 13 and 25, and by the redactor, according to Kautzsch and Socin, in ver. 27. Ordinary critics would see in all these traces of the same hand.

<sup>2</sup> Even the critical analysis cannot get rid of this characteristic, and it is admitted that it is found to a considerable extent in P, a post-exilic writer!

that we are debarred from examining, and cannot possibly be justified in rejecting, it. Moreover, Wellhausen's assignment of the portions of the narrative to their sources has no finality about it. Kautzsch and Socin assign vers. 27-29 to the redactor, thus destroying the premises on which Wellhausen's division rested. But it is not an uncommon practice with the new critics to disavow the premises on which their conclusion rests, and to retain the conclusion notwithstanding.

It is further worthy of note that it is the *redactor* himself who has here, brilliant and far-sighted as he often is, created the contradiction on which Wellhausen relies; for it is he who has introduced from JE the words "two of" Jacob's sons, "Simeon and Levi," while in ver. 27 he follows P in saying "the sons of Jacob." Could not the redactor, with the two alleged contradictory narratives before him, have observed the contradiction Wellhausen has brought to light? If not, was there no post-exilic critic capable of pointing the fact out to him? And if he had perceived it, would not he have corrected it?

The next noticeable point is that JE represents Simeon and Levi as taking Dinah out of Shechem's house. But JE "knows nothing" of her ever having been in it. The words "to see the daughters of the land" detached, as by the critics they are detached, from their context, are not sufficient to imply that she had entered the house of Shechem. Before we can get Dinah into Shechem's house in any reasonable way, we must put together again the dismembered narrative, and then the whole becomes intelligible. In fact, the alleged pre- and post-exilic narratives presuppose one another so continually and so plainly here that it is impossible to separate them. In other words, the narrative here is homogeneous, the division of it into JE and P an ingenious fiction. Jacob's language again, in vers. 30, 31, is more reconcilable with the destruction and spoliation of the city than with the mere murder of Shechem himself—a very light matter in days such as those, and, though not unlikely to cause a blood-feud with the Hivites of Shechem, most unlikely to embroil Jacob with the Canaanites and Perizzites as well.

It is possible that a yet more minute examination might reveal a good deal else to excite suspicion of the infallibility of the critics in their division of this chapter. We turn, however, to the supposed narrative of P. "Formal and wearisome" as, *ex hypothesi*, that narrative is, it is here quite as lively, if not a little livelier, than the narrative of JE. We really have a right to ask, in the interests of scientific discovery, that P shall keep up the character science has ascertained to be his. If he be not legal and precise, or at least a good deal more

legal and precise than his competitor, *cadit quæstio*, we have no *data* on which we can rest the severance of his narrative from the rest. This, however, is a question we will not further discuss, but leave it to the reader. There is no difference in the *Hebrew* style here. We are often told that even the *English* reader can discover the difference between the two writers. The case of this chapter is one in which the English reader is quite as capable of judging as the Hebrew scholar.

But to proceed to detail. Not to insist on the grammatical absurdity of such a sentence (with which, at present at least, the redactor is not held to have interfered) as "And Shechem, the son of Hamor the Hivite, the prince of the land, and he loved the damsel," there are serious gaps in P's narrative, which we are supposed to have almost, if not quite, *in extenso*. Dinah, for instance, is said to have been the daughter of Jacob by Leah. But the previous passage, in which this piece of information is to be found, is taken, so the critics tell us, from JE's narrative by the redactor. P up to this point "knows nothing" of Dinah. Of Leah, too, P "knows nothing," so far, except that Laban gave her Zilpah for a handmaid. He "knows nothing" of her marriage, nor of her bearing children to Jacob, though, it is true, he in a very slovenly fashion brings these things in later on (chap. xxxv. 46). Of course he *might* have assumed the truth of JE's narrative here. But *did* he? In page 171 I have given P's narrative as separated by the critics.<sup>1</sup> At first sight it seems as if Laban had only given Rachel to Jacob as his wife, and had solaced Leah, his eldest daughter (if P supposed her to be the elder), by making her a present of a "shipcha." It is true that P *afterwards* (in chap. xxxv. 46) mentions the sons of Leah. But that is to put "the cart before the horse." Either we must suppose that, in the original P, chap. xxxv. 23-29 *preceded* his narrative in chap. xxxiv., or we must postulate another *lacuna* in a history which we are told is given us *in extenso* or nearly so. But to proceed. Dinah, we are told by P, "went out." Went out whither and whence? Why should she *not* go out? And what had her "going out" to do with Shechem? The combined narrative makes all clear. But what ground can there possibly be for severing the words "to see the daughters of the land" from "went out"? Then, in ver. 6,

<sup>1</sup> And very odd the printer found it. No wonder his proof was returned to me scored with queries! For I must confess it very much resembles the well-known *jeu d'esprit*, "She went into the garden to cut some cabbagees to make an apple-pie," etc.

P tells us of a private conference between Hamor and Jacob concerning the marriage of their children. But in ver. 8 Jacob is suddenly multiplied into the plural number. Hamor is communing with "them." Thus P, though he "knows nothing" about it, is obviously acquainted with the return of Jacob's sons from the field. Dinah, too, is no longer "thy," but "your" daughter. If the aid of the redactor should be summoned to plaster over this crevice (Kautzsch and Socin have not discovered the need of him), this step will also obliterate all signs whereby we can arrive at the distinction of authorship. For the unseparated narrative here runs most smoothly and naturally. And it is an undesigned coincidence—that is to say, it is in strict keeping with all we learn of him elsewhere—that the timid Jacob does not venture to arrive at any conclusion without the presence and countenance of his sons. As JE tells us, the patriarch "held his peace until his sons came." It was they, not he, who dared to be "wroth" at the "folly" Shechem had "wrought in Israel," by "dealing with their sister as with a harlot." Once more, it is only the narrative as we have it that brings this out clearly, though the touches which indicate Jacob's character are to be found equally in both portions of it. But surely all this is very surprising, if the separatist theory be true. Surely, the more carefully the history is examined, the less probable that theory appears.

Then, again, it is P who records the ferocious dealings of Simeon and Levi with the male inhabitants of Shechem. But he does not give us the slightest hint of any dishonourable conduct, or even overtures, on the part of any one of them to Dinah. Save in the part of ver. 13 assigned by Kautzsch and Socin to the redactor, P "knows nothing" of any outrage offered to Dinah. All we are told is that Shechem loved Dinah, and was anxious to make all kinds of sacrifices to marry her. It is, to say the least, a little unusual to receive honourable proposals of marriage and perpetual amity in quite so ferocious a manner, especially on the side of the weaker party. Here, at least, P's narrative must have suffered some serious omissions, or it is a scandal to Jewish history and literature, and would have been felt to be such by the Jews themselves. Criticism clearly here has invented a number of difficulties which do not exist in the story as it stands. Then, in regard to the general reasonableness of the story, we have to thank Professor Driver once more here, as in chap. xxvii., for departing from his usual custom and giving a reason for his division of chap. xxxiv. Whence he derived his argument it is impossible to say. It does not appear in Wellhausen's "Komposition des Hexateuchs." If it is Professor Driver's own,

he is hardly to be congratulated upon it. It proves that, although he may be an admirable authority on the reconstruction of a corrupt Hebrew text, as a judge of the historical probability of a narrative he is, if this be original criticism of his own, about the worst authority conceivable. We have heard him on Rebekah.<sup>1</sup> Let us listen to him on Shechem and Dinah. "The motives and aims of the actors seem not to be *uniformly the same*. In vers. 3, 11, 12, Shechem himself is the spokesman, and his aim is the *personal* one of securing Dinah as his wife; in vers. 8-10 (*cf.* 16, 21-23) his father Hamor is spokesman, and his aim is to secure an amalgamation between his people and Jacob's."<sup>2</sup> Were it not that Dr. Driver is invariably serious, one might suspect him of a little sly humour here, at his reader's expense. His *naïveté* is so exquisite. Can he tell us of any marriage in which it is not, presumably at least, the desire of the intended bridegroom to possess the lady, and in which, if the relatives are satisfied, it is not because they consider it a "good match"? This remarkable passage in Dr. Driver's "Introduction" might be described as one of the curiosities of criticism. And as such it must ultimately come to be regarded. If otherwise, then for the future, whenever we hear people say, "Everybody is delighted about it. He is so fond of her, and the family are pleased because it is such an excellent connection for them," the critical faculty of the hearers should be aroused, and they should set to work to find the "sources" of this want of "uniformity" in the description of "the motives and aims of the actors." The truth is that while a vivid, or, rather, a diseased, imagination has busied itself in the manufacture of divergencies, these alleged divergencies are creatures of the imagination alone. They have no existence in sober and solid fact. The theory is wanted to satisfy the preconceived ideas of its inventors. And the facts are tortured into agreement with it.<sup>3</sup>

J. J. LIAS.

<sup>1</sup> CHURCHMAN for January, 1899, p. 172.

<sup>2</sup> "Introduction," p. 15.

<sup>3</sup> Professor Green, in his "Unity of the Book of Genesis," pp. 388-398, shows how each critic of this chapter has a different analysis of its contents. Under these circumstances, it is a little bold, perhaps, to offer to the student *any* analysis at all as established. Professor Green adds (p. 396): "The critics have thus demonstrated that it is possible to sunder this chapter into parts, each of which, taken separately, shall yield a different narrative, and that this can be done very variously and with the most remarkable divergence in the results. Now, which are we to believe—Dillmann, Wellhausen, Oort, Kuenen, Merx, or Delitzsch? [The division in the text is that of Kautzsch and Socin.] They each profess to give us the original form or forms of the story, and no two agree. Is it