

AUTHORSHIP AND DATE

OF THE

BOOKS OF MOSES

**Considered**

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO PROFESSOR SMITH'S VIEWS.

BY

THE REV. WILLIAM PAUL, D.D.,

BS1225  
4.P32

Library of the Theological Seminary.

PRINCETON, N. J.

*Division* \_\_\_\_\_

*Section* \_\_\_\_\_

THE  
AUTHORSHIP AND DATE  
OF THE  
BOOKS OF MOSES

**Considered**

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO PROFESSOR SMITH'S VIEWS.

BY  
THE REV. WILLIAM PAUL, D.D.,  
Minister of Ganchory-Debenick.

ABERDEEN:  
LEWIS SMITH, 3 M'COMBIE'S COURT, UNION STREET.  
DAVID WYLLIE & SON, BOOKSELLERS TO THE QUEEN.

1878.

ABERDEEN :

A. KING AND CO., MUSIC, CLASSICAL, AND GENERAL PRINTERS,  
CLARK'S COURT, 2 UPPERKIRKGATE.

## P R E F A C E.



I HAVE written the following Pamphlet, in order to bear my humble testimony to the authenticity of that blessed book, whose truths have become the dearer to me, the nearer I approach to the period in which I hope to see their realisation. It would be peculiarly gratifying to me if others should derive the benefit in reading that I have had in writing the Pamphlet. The more carefully I study God's Word, the more I love it; and the greater satisfaction I have in proclaiming its blessed truths to others. One cannot study with due care the Old Testament Scriptures, without additional appreciation and better understanding of the truths of the New. That it may do good to others, is my earnest wish and prayer.

THE AUTHOR.

THE MANSE, BANCHORY-DEVENICK,  
*23rd May, 1878.*



# THE AUTHORSHIP AND DATE OF THE BOOKS OF MOSES.

---

## ON THE BREVITY AND CONCISENESS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES.

THE attentive reader of the Scriptures, especially of the earliest Books, cannot fail to be struck with their brevity and conciseness. They contain much important matter—historical, doctrinal, and practical—comprehended within a very small compass. Of their contents, part was written for the special instruction of God's people in times and circumstances widely different from the present, and part for the instruction of mankind in all time to come. They contain a history of the human race, commencing with its origin, and especially of a godly seed, with an account of its training, actions, and destinies. References are also made in the earliest periods of the world to an ungodly race, with which that seed was brought into contact, and to their influences upon one another, whether for good or evil. The Scriptures subsequently reveal, and gradually develop, divine truth, for the instruction of a chosen race, first limited to a single family, and afterwards to a single nation, which sprang from that family, placed under a peculiar dispensation, which, though imperfect and temporary, was preparatory to one that was perfect and final, through which all the nations of the earth were to be blessed.

As the Old Testament Scriptures embrace a period of about three thousand five hundred years, and as the historical matter occupies but a small portion of them, the narrative must necessarily be extremely brief. The facts stated are consequently often stripped of details and explanations, which could not have

been inserted without swelling out the sacred volume to an inconvenient bulk, quite unsuitable to its design. The great leading facts are given upon divine authority, and upon what is all but universally regarded as sufficient evidence, and challenge universal faith. In absence, therefore, of a knowledge of the circumstances, or of explanations which would have made all clear, Scripture criticism does not warrant the supply of omissions from the critic's own imagination, and the dealing with the record so supplemented in a manner suited to his own preconceived and erroneous views. The Apostle John states that Christ did many miracles besides those which were recorded, "but these," saith he, "are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, ye might have life through His name". We may apply this principle of selection to the Scriptures generally, and hold, that from the mass of historical facts and circumstances which had any bearing upon Scripture truth, what is sufficient for the faith and instruction of God's people has been recorded, and expressed with such conciseness as to render the divine record convenient for the perusal and edification of the reader.

As the first eleven chapters of Genesis contain the only record of the Creation, and of a subsequent period of about two thousand years, nothing could be looked for but a meagre outline of the general features of the history which connects the earliest periods with the era of Abraham. Brief, however, as the narrative is, it contains information of the highest moment. It is introduced by the important statement that "in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," which is immediately followed by the brief but remarkable account in the second verse of the condition of the world immediately preceding the existing creation, which singularly harmonises, as will afterwards appear, with the corresponding geological era separating the tertiary from the post-tertiary epoch; and in the third and subsequent verses of the first chapter an account is given of what is called the Adamite creation. In the narrative which immediately follows that



creation, an account is given of the institution of the Sabbath, and of marriage; of man's primeval state of innocence, of his trial, of his fall, and of its consequences; of the promise of a Deliverer; of the institution of sacrifices, and of the division of beasts into clean and unclean, with reference to sacrifice. An account is also given of the progress of human degeneracy, of the Deluge and its consequences, of the confusion of languages, and of the dispersion of mankind into different countries; of the rise and progress of various nations, which afterwards made a figure in the world, and of their settlements in different parts of it. Within the same portion of the Word of God are likewise found genealogical tables, which serve for chronological dates, and furnish information of the births, ages, deaths, and in some cases brief references to the history and characters, of the most noted individuals who preceded the Deluge and the Abrahamic era.

We find at the same time that God, who is introduced in the first chapter as Creator of all things, is represented as superintending the works of His hands, acting as the holy, wise, and bountiful Governor of His creatures, showing in His dealings with His sinful children that in the midst of justice He remembered mercy; and that while His name and memorial was even then the Lord God merciful and gracious, He would by no means clear the guilty. Allusions to all these events are found in the New Testament, and traditions respecting them, distorted to a greater or less extent, in the records of heathen nations; and they form, though greatly corrupted, the basis of much of the heathen mythology. These early facts are the more interesting and instructive in that they likewise form the basis of the different dispensations of the Covenant of Grace, and shew the links which connect together the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian dispensations.

In most cases bare statements of the facts are alone given, without explanation or reference to circumstances, which might be highly interesting and instructive. The mode adopted, as we have said, was necessary to keep the sacred volume within a

reasonable compass, and is an exercise of the understanding, in the investigation of truth, and of faith in receiving the statements of God's word upon His own authority.

No full account is given of the history of the antediluvians ; of God's dealings with them ; of the revelations made to them ; of the duties enjoined upon them ; of the religious rites and ceremonies imposed upon them ; or of the precise nature and aggravation of the sins which subjected them to all but universal annihilation. Everything, however, has been revealed which is requisite for the establishment of faith, and for the guidance of conduct. Much has been withheld from us, which it would greatly interest us to know, but of which we have obtained no information. We must, therefore, read the Word of God with faith, as regards both its form and its matter. From the brevity and conciseness with which the facts are necessarily recorded, it is not to be wondered at that there are many things hard to be understood. Some of them are explained in subsequent portions of the Scriptures ; others rest solely upon the authority of the Divine Record in which they are found. For example, the prophecy of the woman's seed bruising the serpent's head, which in all probability was made intelligible to our first parents by communications which have not been recorded, might have been unintelligible to us had not the promise gained additional light from other revelations respecting the person and work of the Redeemer. We acquire insight into the reason of the institution of sacrifice by the light of the Jewish ceremonial, and by its typical reference to Christ, who was offered up as a sacrifice upon the Cross, "the just for the unjust". And we can only by the same means, along with what is said of it in the New Testament, assign the reason why Abel's sacrifice was accepted and that of Cain rejected. The *rationale* of sacrifice is the suffering of the sinner by substitute, and the sprinkling of the victim's blood upon the offerer is an acknowledgment of the great principle, established in God's Word, and recognised among all nations, that without the shedding of blood there can be no

remission of sin. Even from the very brief account of the sacrifices of Cain and Abel, we cannot doubt that much had been communicated to them on the subject of sacrifice which has not been made known to us by the narrative in the fourth chapter of Genesis. The language of Cain in our translation, "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted?" throws no light upon the subject. The sense of the original is more fully brought out in the Septuagint version, "If thou offerest well," that is according to the prescribed rites and ceremonies, "thou shalt be accepted". Cain's offering, it appears, was neither of the right kind, nor offered after the appointed manner. It was not composed of animal victims like Abel's; it was not offered in faith; it was not presented according to the prescribed rites. Great attention was paid by the heathens to the appointed rites and ceremonies in the offering of victims, and the sacrifice was without efficacy if these were neglected; the victim was then said to be "*vitio mactata*"—not sacrificed according to the prescribed forms. Among the Romans, when the auspices were not properly taken at the *comitia* for the election of the magistrates, those chosen were said to be *vitio creati*—informally elected—and were compelled *abire magistratu*, to vacate the office. From what has been said, it may fairly be concluded that after the Fall instructions were given to Adam and his family regarding the offering of sacrifices, both as regards the victims themselves, and the ceremonies to be observed when they were offered.

The brevity of the account of the Creation in the first chapter of Genesis, and the absence of explanations, which might have made all clear, have occasioned most of the controversies which have arisen upon that subject; but the light of science in recent times has been found to confirm, and not to contradict, the Scripture narrative.

The account of the Deluge is in some respects very circumstantial, but there are many particulars respecting it of which no information has been given. We have no means of knowing

whether the expressions *all* and *every*, as applied to the earth, and to the animals which were taken into the ark, are to be understood in their universal or restricted meanings, for restricted meanings of both are conformable to their usage in the Hebrew Scriptures, as will afterwards be pointed out ; nor is there any information given us as to the manner in which the animals were collected, and stowed in the ark, and fed. No account is furnished of the population of the antediluvian world, of the religious knowledge possessed by those who lived in that period, or of the warnings given them of the consequences of their sins. We are not hence to conclude that up to the time of the Flood the antediluvians lived in a state of ignorance and barbarism, for intimations are given of their knowledge of several of the arts of civilised life. And whilst it is said that "all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth," it is said of some that they "walked with God". And what is here gathered from the brief intimations given in the antediluvian history is confirmed by other parts of the sacred records, where it is said, that "by faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain ;" that "by faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death;" and that "by faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house". It is said also by the Apostle Jude, that Enoch prophesied to warn the ungodly in his times of the consequences of their sins, and by Peter, that Noah was "a preacher of righteousness".

These general statements are sufficient to convince us, that the antediluvians did not sin in ignorance of their duty. Up to the time of Abraham, indeed, no precise account is given of the nature and amount of the religious instruction communicated to the world. There is much said of Abraham's faith and obedience, but nothing of the knowledge upon which his faith and obedience were founded. We are not, however, warranted to argue that no such knowledge was possessed by him. A proof of this is incidentally introduced in a communication to

Isaac after his father's death. In that communication God confirms to Isaac the promise made to his father in the following words: "And I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, and will give unto thy seed all these countries; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and *kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws.*" The way in which these words are introduced plainly refers to communications of the divine will previous to the times of Abraham, made for the instruction of mankind as to the manner of serving and glorifying God. What is said about God's Spirit striving with man in the antediluvian era implies a continuance in sin in defiance of the obligations of known duty. There is no instance on record of God's executing special judgments upon mankind who were sinning in ignorance of His law.

I have introduced these remarks because they appear to me to involve important principles of biblical criticism. The conciseness and brevity, the antiquity, the absence of collateral history upon which any reliance can be placed, the figurative style of the language in which the Old Testament is written, the peculiar state of society and of the manners and customs of the earliest periods of the world, cannot but present difficulties in the interpretation of the word of God which no doubt could be easily removed by explanations which it is now impossible to obtain. To these must be added difficulties which arise out of principles which Scripture critics of the advanced school adopt as applicable to the interpretation of the Bible as an inspired record. These critics form to themselves conceptions of what Scripture should contain, and of what God, as they imagine, ought to do, without sufficient attention to what the Scriptures do contain, and to what God has actually done. There are difficulties and obscurities in the word of God which it is now perhaps impossible to unravel and elucidate, and therefore, as I have said, God's word must be read with faith in regard to both its matter and form. And in the reading and

interpretation of it there is great scope for the exercise of faith, candour, and love of the truth. The brevity and conciseness of the narrative often create difficulties in the interpretation and elucidation of God's word, principally in regard to the historical matter contained in it. But if facts are distinctly stated, without mention of the circumstances necessary for their explanation, the critic is not warranted to expunge or deny whatever he thinks inconsistent with his own views, and to denounce what he objects to as unworthy of credit.

### THE MIRACULOUS IN NATURE AND IN GRACE.

Had all the facts of geological science, which have in recent times been disclosed, been revealed by God Himself, and rested upon no other authority than His Word, unbelievers and sceptics, we may well imagine, would have ridiculed the communication. If revelation had declared that, at a certain period of time incalculably remote from the present, no form of life existed on the earth, and that in three successive periods, different kinds of *flora* and *fauna* appeared, rising by gradual steps from the lowest forms, and dying out at the close of each period, having finally reached a close approximation to those of the present era; and if these facts had rested solely on the authority of revelation, Moses might have anticipated the prophet in his complaint, "Who hath believed our report?" But as men of science admit these facts to be truths, supported by incontestible evidence, we might reasonably suppose that their strange and miraculous character would have prepared them to receive, without any strain upon their faith, the revealed doctrine, that "In the beginning," that is, antecedently to any of the geological periods, "God created the heavens and the earth"—and that all that followed was the work of His hands.

Supposing, then, that we had none of the evidence of preceding creations, and revolutions in the earth, which geological

science has disclosed, is it not likely that we should have had many more sceptics than we have at present, who would deny the Mosaic account of the creation. But God has brought these facts to light by the discoveries of science, and thus rendered the statements of the first chapter of Genesis more easy of acceptance by those to whom they would otherwise be a stumbling block. The whole order of the Mosaic creation is evidently analogous to those which preceded it—the waters bringing forth the moving creature that hath life, great marine monsters, winged fowls, cattle and creeping things, and beasts after their kind, and finally man in God's own image, after his likeness. Is there then, we ask, a greater strain upon our faith in believing the account given by Moses of the existing creations, which are visible to our senses, than in believing what geologists teach us, involving, as it does, as much of the miraculous element as the former.

If the Lord's hand is thus conspicuous in the works of creation and providence in times past; if he had a great purpose to serve by the revelation of Himself to the human beings whom He created; it surely need excite no surprise, if we hear of manifestations of Himself to His people, in carrying out His purposes of grace. The analogies in the former case justify the belief that He will do the same in the latter. It was to be expected, then, that in carrying out the purposes of His grace, miraculous interpositions would be resorted to, when it was found that these purposes would have been otherwise frustrated.

Soon after their creation, the man and the woman made after the image of God, fell by transgression from their high estate, a circumstance which altered their nature and destiny, and rendered a course of procedure necessary for their recovery, by a train of events, in which divine interpositions occurred, which go under the name of miracles. These may be divided into two classes, viz., the physical, and the religious or moral. Of the former are the Flood, the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, and the passage over the Jordan under Joshua. Of

the latter are the special revelations of the doctrines and duties necessary to be believed and practised. These, originally communicated to the most ancient of our race, seem to have been so far lost, that additional revelations were made to a single family, of which Abraham was the head, and subsequently to his descendants, at sundry times and in divers manners, till the Jewish dispensation gave place to that of the gospel of Jesus Christ, in whom all the kingdoms of the earth have a common interest.

The facts here briefly stated, give rise to the following observations. In point of numbers the Jewish nation, in its most flourishing state, was very small in proportion to the greater part of the nations of antiquity. The Jews are designated frequently in holy writ, as a stiff-necked, perverse, and rebellious people. They were not equal to many other nations of the world in regard to their advancement in intellectual attainments and in the arts of civilized life, and they were generally despised by their neighbours. But notwithstanding all this, they were the only people in the world, who had right notions of the attributes and perfections of God. And they had, from the period of God's revelation of Himself to Abraham, a succession of holy men, to reveal, to teach, and to enforce God's laws upon them.

How then is the religious knowledge and condition of the Jews to be accounted for, as contrasted with that of all the other nations of the world? The portion of the patriarchs and Jews who lived under the influence of the revelation they possessed, highly surpassed the greatest and best of the men of antiquity in their knowledge of God, and in the godliness thence resulting. The gods of the heathens were represented as possessed of certain virtues, but were all of them addicted to the most flagrant vices, and were worshipped by impure rites and practices. Compare the purity of the holy Scriptures, and their tendencies, with the doctrines and tendencies of heathen mythology. Can this be accounted for in any way, but



by the acknowledgment of a miraculous element ; in other words of special revelations, made to the patriarchs, and their descendants, such as are described in holy writ. And are we to disbelieve the miracles in holy writ, wrought for such important purposes, and to regard every passage in which they are found, unhistorical, while we believe all the miraculous and providential arrangements carried out throughout the whole of the geological ages and systems ? God forbid.

### WAS MOSES THE AUTHOR OF THE BOOK OF GENESIS ?

I hold that he was so, on the following grounds—

1. That according to the uniform voice of antiquity, Moses was regarded as the Author of the Book of Genesis.

2. That it was never, till a comparatively late period, ascribed to any other Author.

3. That no other individual of the time had such means and opportunities of procuring the materials necessary for its composition.

4. That there is no good ground for believing that any other individual had the same personal qualifications for such a task, in the times in which he lived.

5. That there is evidence, within the book, that it was not written antecedently to the period in which Moses lived.

The above is a brief statement of the grounds upon which it is held that Moses is the Author of the Book of Genesis, in the same sense as the writer of any history in the present day may be said to be the Author of it, though it contains facts, the whole of which were antecedent to his own times.

What, then, it may be asked, are the probable sources from which Moses obtained the materials necessary for the composition of the Book of Genesis ?

Moses was neither an eye nor an ear witness of any of the facts recorded by him in the Book of Genesis, nor could he

have received the information, necessary for its composition, from eye or ear witnesses. What is contained in it, must have been communicated to him by immediate inspiration (but no such claim is made by him), or by oral tradition, or by public monuments, or written documents, by means of which the facts necessary for his purpose, were preserved till his own times, in a more or less perfect state, and arranged, or recast under the guidance of the Divine Spirit. I am inclined to think that Moses drew his information, partly from tradition, and partly from early documents, which were preserved by the Israelites to his own times, and that the means of information he so obtained were turned to account, under the direction of the Holy Spirit, so that the Book of Genesis, like all the other Scriptures, was given by the inspiration of God. The longevity of the antediluvians must have been favourable to the traditional transmission of the facts of antediluvian history; and the subsequent history being principally confined to the concerns of a single family, we can conceive that they might, from their remarkable nature, have been more carefully and easily preserved, than historical events in other circumstances spreading over such a long period of time.

This supposition is, however, applicable only to the leading facts. Tradition could hardly have preserved the minute details found in the book of Genesis, comprising long genealogical tables, with the names, births, deaths, and characters of the persons spoken of, and in some cases with historical references to them. These could hardly have been kept clear and exact by tradition, whereas any kind of writing, hieroglyphic, &c., would have preserved all. I see no difficulty that lies in the way of the supposition that written documents, or other monuments of the early history of the world, were in existence long previously to the time of Moses. The advances made by the antediluvians in the arts of civilized life cannot be accounted for but upon the supposition of a certain amount of knowledge of these arts, directly communicated by God. Had man, after

his creation, been left in a savage state and without the immediate gift of speech, and dependent on the exercise of his own understanding, reason, and ingenuity alone, for the provision for the wants and comforts of life, it is impossible to say how long he would have continued in that state, nor can we see how in such a state he would have answered the ends of his creation. The difficulty of imparting religious truth or a sense of moral obligation to a savage, or of instructing him in the arts of civilized life, is well known. To obviate such difficulties, man was created in knowledge, as well as in righteousness and holiness. It is not probable that he completely lost his knowledge with his original righteousness, and that he was left after the Fall in no better state than that of a savage. That this was not the case is shown in the clearest manner by the accounts in the antediluvian history found in the book of Genesis. We hear much of the great wickedness that prevailed in those times, but nothing of the manners and habits of savage life. The pursuits of husbandry and pastoral life were not only followed from the earliest periods, but these occupations were then kept separate, and held by different individuals, for we read in the book of Genesis that Cain was a tiller of the ground, and Abel a keeper of sheep. The city which Cain built, however rude, supposes some mechanical knowledge and the use of some mechanical implements. The invention of the harp and organ by Jubal, and the working in brass and iron by Tubal Cain, show an advancement in the arts and sciences which could not have been expected at that early period had man been left entirely to his own resources. The building of Noah's Ark proves the same thing. Where, then, is the improbability of there having been monuments in those times, which were generally intelligible, or even written records, by which the facts of antediluvian history contained in the book of Genesis might have been transmitted to distant ages. The facts that occurred between the period of the Deluge and the Call of Abraham are very few, and might have been preserved in the same way; and the history of

Abraham and his immediate descendants, and of the collateral branches of his family, might have been preserved by Isaac, Jacob, and members of the family of the latter, most probably by Joseph. These documents probably came into Moses' hands in a more or less perfect state of preservation, and received from him the alterations and additions of which they stood in need—those which were perfect being left as he found them, and those that were not so having been rendered perfect by him. Some of the materials consequently would require no alteration; some more, and some less, according to the condition they were in when they were put into his hands, and in the latter case, tradition, supplemented by immediate revelation, would supply all that was wanting. In this way the whole of the materials of the book of Genesis might have been compiled, arranged, altered, or re-written by Moses, under the inspiration of God. It is no bar to the genuineness of the book of Genesis that Moses, in its composition, availed himself of documents previously in existence, or that the book itself is interspersed with original documents furnished to him, which were the writings of eminent servants of God who preceded him. It does not affect the genuineness of the works of any profane author that there are embodied in them certain public documents preserved from the periods to which they refer, or fragments from authors who were contemporary with the characters, and had personal knowledge of the facts which they relate. It does not affect the genuineness of the book of Ezra that, instead of describing the purport of the decrees of the King of Persia in favour of the Jews, he inserts in it the originals, nor that of the gospel of Luke that he received the whole of its contents from eye and ear witnesses.

PROFESSOR SMITH'S THEORY OF MORE AUTHORS  
THAN ONE OF THE BOOK OF GENESIS.

It is upon such grounds as I have stated that Moses, till a comparatively late period, has been uniformly regarded as the author of the book of Genesis.

But Professor Smith says that "it has been clearly seen after Astruc, that the respective uses of *Jehovah* (LORD) [as rendered in the authorised version of the Old Testament] and *Elohim* (God) as the name of Deity, afford a criterion by which documents can be dissected out of the book of Genesis, and that the manner in which the names are used can only be due to differences of authorship". He says further that "this is now generally admitted, for the alternation corresponds with such important duplicates as the two accounts of the creation, and is regularly kept up through a great part of the book, by unmistakable peculiarities of language and thought". As matters of fact, it appears that in certain portions of Genesis the word *Elohim* is used exclusively for the name of God; that in others the terms *Jehovah* and *Elohim* are combined; that in others the term *Jehovah* is used exclusively; and I trust to be able to show that in others the terms *Jehovah* and *Elohim* are used indiscriminately, and without any distinction in the ideas conveyed by them, so that the one name might be substituted for the other.

I shall endeavour also to show that there are no duplicate accounts either of the Creation or the Deluge, that there is no difference of style in the book of Genesis which can warrant the attribution of the book to three different authors, as required by Professor Smith; and that any difference of style is only due to difference of subject. Further, that Professor Smith has no warrant for calling the *Elohistic* documents the *priestly* narrative of the *Elohist*, the *Jehovistic* the *prophetic* delineation of the *Jehovist*, or for introducing a third author, or for asserting that

these three authors embody *three* tendencies, which are not only personal but national, and which constantly appear in other parts of Hebrew literature, and that up to the book of Joshua, all three run side by side.

As Professor Smith attaches great importance to the meaning and usage of the words Jehovah and Elohim, and thence draws most important, but, as it seems to me, unwarrantable conclusions, it is of consequence to settle, in as far as possible, these important points.

There seems to be no doubt whatever about the early origin of the term Elohim, or the period of the introduction of the term Jehovah, although that has been questioned. According to the best lexicographers, Elohim, which is a plural form, has no more simple word in Hebrew to which it can be traced, but seems to be cognate with an Arabic root expressive of *fear* or *dread*, hence "worship," "adoration," and by metonymy the object of worship and adoration, Deity. Agreeably to this notion, in Genesis xxxi. 42, 53, God is called "the fear of Isaac"—the great being whom Isaac feared. The word *Jehovah* has included in it the idea of existence, and hence that of self-existence, and so comes to mean the self-existent One. As, however, I mean to show that there is no difference in Genesis in the usage of the words Jehovah and Elohim, I shall defer further consideration of these words till I treat of the manifestation of Jehovah to Moses in Exodus iii. 14, 15, and vi. 3, when the usage of the two names becomes distinct and precise, and very different from what it is in Genesis, and from what Professor Smith considers it to be.

As I have indicated, Moses may have had before him a document containing an account of the Creation, as it is found in the first chapter of Genesis, and up to the end of verse third in the second. In this passage the term Elohim only is found. In the second chapter, from verse fourth to the end, which is *not a duplicate* of the Creation, as maintained by Professor Smith, excepting in as far as reference is made to the creation of Adam

and Eve, but contains *additional* particulars in regard to the planting of the garden of Eden, to the tree of knowledge, and to the prohibition regarding it; to the naming of the creatures previously created, and to the manner of the formation of the woman; to the ordinance of marriage, &c. In this chapter mention is for the first time made of the word Jehovah, but the reason why it is here connected with Elohim seems obvious, namely, to shew that the creation in chapter first, and the facts recorded in chapter second, are attributable to the same supreme Being, with the additional name of Jehovah, and this identity of the two names is kept up from the fourth verse of chapter second to the end of chapter third. The above is a probable, and it seems a sufficient reason why, in this particular passage, Jehovah and Elohim are connected together. There is no ground here for maintaining that there is a difference of meaning in the words Jehovah and Elohim. If there is, what is it? Can the higher critics say whether the passage in question refers to the *priestly narrative* of the Elohist, or to the *prophetic delineation* of the Jehovist? I hold that it has not been proved to be a duplicate of chapter first.

So much for Professor Smith's first duplicate; let us now turn to the second, as it is called, contained in the description of the Deluge. I acknowledge that I have looked for it in vain. I find that nearly three of the chapters of Genesis are taken up with the account of the Deluge, but I cannot find but one account of it; nor can I find evidence that what is said of it is made up of the union of three different accounts. The substance of chapter VI., as stated in the heading of our common Bibles, is—  
v. 1—The wickedness of the world, which provoked God's wrath, and caused the flood; v. 8—Noah findeth grace; v. 14—The order, form, and end of the ark.

Chaper VII., v. 1.—Noah with his family entereth the ark; v. 17—The beginning, increase, and continuance of the flood.

Chapter VIII., v. 1—The waters assuage; v. 15—Noah being commanded; v. 18—Goeth forth of the ark; v. 20—He buildeth an

altar, and offereth sacrifice; v. 21—Which God accepteth, and promiseth to curse the earth no more.

I find here an intimation of the Flood, and directions to build the ark; an account of the Flood; of the preservation of Noah, and all with him in the ark, and other particulars; but I find no duplicate, and I cannot imagine what Professor Smith means by a duplicate containing Jehovistic and Elohist documents. I can find no warrant for holding that two accounts have been merged into one. I find, moreover, the terms Jehovah and Elohim intermixed throughout the narrative without the slightest difference of meaning, as an examination of the passage will shew.

In verse 5th of chapter VI. it is said, "And *Elohim* saw that the wickedness of man was great on the earth;" v. 6, "And it repented *Jehovah* that he had made man;" v. 7, "And *Jehovah* said, I will destroy man whom I have created;" v. 8, "But Noah found grace in the eyes of *Jehovah*;" v. 9, "Noah was a just man and perfect. . . . and Noah walked with *Elohim*;" v. 13, "And *Elohim* said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come before Me;" v. 22, "Thus did Noah, according to all that *Elohim* commanded him, so did he".

Chapter VII. v. 1, "And *Jehovah* said unto Noah, come thou and all thy house into the ark;" v. 5, "And Noah did all that *Jehovah* commanded him;" v. 9, "There went in, two and two, into the ark, the male and the female, as *Elohim* had commanded Noah;" v. 16, "And they went in, male and female, as *Elohim* had commanded, and *Jehovah* shut him in".

Chapter VIII. v. 1, "And *Elohim* remembered Noah. . . . and *Elohim* made a wind to pass over the earth;" v. 15, "And *Elohim* spake unto Noah, Go forth of the ark;" v. 20, "And Noah builded an altar to *Jehovah*, and took of every clean beast," &c.; v. 21, "And *Jehovah* smelled a sweet savour," &c., "and *Jehovah* said in His heart, I will not curse the ground," &c.

So much for the important duplicate of the Flood, on which Professor Smith lays so much stress.



I have stated that the passage from verse 4th of chapter second to the end of chapter third, cannot with any propriety be called a Jehovistic document, inasmuch as throughout the whole of it, Jehovah and Elohim are connected together, in all probability, as I have said, to show that the Being called Jehovah, in chapter second, is the same Being who is described as the Creator of all things in chapter first. And I hold from this and other passages, that in the Book of Genesis there is no difference in the usage of the two names, but that the one may be substituted for the other; and I acknowledge that I cannot observe in it any *priestly* tendencies of the Elohist, as distinguished from the *prophetic* delineation of the Jehovist.

Professor Smith says, that "the *Jehovistic* narrative which also begins with the creation, treats the early history more in the spirit of prophetic theology and idealism, containing for example the narrative of the Fall and the parts of the history of Abraham, which are most important for Old Testament theology. That this narrative is not a mere supplement to the other, but an independent whole, appears most plain in the story of the Flood, where two accounts have certainly been interwoven by a third hand."

Let us now examine this Jehovistic narrative, which, it is said, contains an account of the Fall, and the parts of the history of Abraham, which are most important for Old Testament Theology. The subject of chapter xii., in the heading of the ordinary Bibles, is as follows: v. 1, *Jehovah* calleth Abraham, and blesseth him with a promise of Christ; v. 4, he departeth with Lot from Haran; v. 6, he journeyeth through Canaan, which is promised to him in a vision. This, it is true, is a purely Jehovistic narrative, and exactly corresponds with Professor Smith's test. In chapter xiii., which likewise corresponds with the test, v. 14, seq., *Jehovah* renews his promise to Abraham. Let us turn now to chapter xvii., which is purely *Elohistic*, except in v. 1, where it is said that *Jehovah* appeared to Abraham, and announced himself as the *El Shaddai*, *i.e.*, the

*Almighty Elohim*, saying, "Walk before me, and be thou perfect; and I will make my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly;" v. 5, &c., Abram his name is changed in token of a greater blessing; 10, circumcision is instituted; 15, Sarai her name is changed, and she blessed; 17, Isaac promised; 23, Abraham and Ishmael are circumcised. The foregoing passages also seem to me to contain one of the parts of the history of Abraham, which are most important for Old Testament theology. Chapter xviii. is purely *Jehovistic*. The substance of the chapter is as follows: v. 1, Abraham entertaineth three angels; 9, Sarah is reproved for laughing at the strange promise; 17, the destruction of Sodom is revealed to Abraham; 23, Abraham intercedeth for the men thereof. The foregoing chapter does not seem to be a very strong confirmation of Professor Smith's criterion. Chapter xxii., a purely *Elohistic* document contains the following particulars:—v. 1, Abraham is tempted to offer Isaac; 3, he giveth proof of his faith and obedience; 11, the angel stayeth him; 13, Isaac is exchanged with a ram; 14, the place is called Jehovah Jireh; 15, Abraham is blessed again; 20, the generation of Nahor, from whom came Rebekah. This chapter is purely Elohistic, unless exception be taken to the name, "Jehovah Jireh," to which I shall refer immediately, and is the part of Abraham's history, which is of all others, the most important for Old Testament theology.

A very learned friend of mine maintains, that the expression *Jehovah Jireh* already quoted, is in itself a conclusive argument, that the term Jehovah was known to the patriarch Abraham, and consequently previously to the era of Moses. I acknowledge that I can much more easily form a conjecture how the word Jehovah Jireh may be accounted for, in the passage above referred to, than I can reconcile the existence of the word in Abraham's time, with what God himself is described as saying to Moses in Exodus vi. 2, 3, "I (am) Jehovah and, I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob by (the name of)

God Almighty (El Shaddai), but by my name Jehovah was I not known unto them." Moses may have received the account of the name in words tantamount to Jehovah Jireh, such as "God (Elohim) will provide," instead of "Jehovah (LORD) will provide". Be this as it may, however, it does not affect my argument, that in the book of Genesis, the terms Jehovah and Elohim are used indiscriminately, and I cannot admit that it is the former only that "appears in the parts of the history of Abraham, which are most important for Old Testament Theology". The name "Jehovah Jireh," I presume will not prevent chapter twenty-second from being so, if it was the object of holy men from the earliest period of history to look through the types and shadows of the Jewish law, to "Christ, the end of the law to every one that believeth".

It will appear on examining the following ten chapters, namely from the xxiii. to the xxxii. inclusive, that sometimes the term Jehovah is employed, and sometimes the term Elohim, as it seems to me, without any appreciable difference. In chapter twenty-ninth, neither name is mentioned till verse thirty-first, where the term *Jehovah* only is found, and also in the remaining verses, in reference to Leah's conceptions and the births of her children. In chapter thirtieth, where reference is made to Rachel's barrenness, Elohim only is used from v. 1 to 23, and Jehovah afterwards to the end. Pray where is the difference between the terms here?

The remaining chapters, from the thirty-third to the end of the book, are Elohistie, with the exception of chapter thirty-ninth, which describes the advancement of Joseph in Potiphar's house, which is Jehovistic. This chapter, however, does not seem to have any bearing on Old Testament theology. Jehovah, moreover, appears once in chapter forty-ninth.

The reader can now judge upon what authority Professor Smith calls the subject of the second chapter of Genesis, from verse fourth to the end, a duplicate of the Creation; and the account of the Deluge "an important duplicate". He will see

from the use of Jehovah and Elohim, that the existence of the two terms in that document, is not uncommon throughout the book of Genesis ; that there is no apparent difference of meaning involved in them, which cannot be unravelled without the introduction of three authors, and that in the book of Genesis there is no evidence of the three currents of influence which Professor Smith says run through the Old Testament development, viz., the traditional lore of the priests, the teaching of the prophets, and the religious life of the more enlightened of the people ; or the counterpart of these in the three main sections of early history, viz., the priestly narrative of the Elohist ; the prophetic delineation of the Jehovist ; or the picturesque and popular additions of a third author.

In reference to the disappearance of the Jehovist in the latter portions of Genesis, Professor Smith says—"Great weight is laid on orderly development, and the name of Jehovah is avoided in the history of the Patriarchs to give proper contrast to the Mosaic period." I candidly acknowledge that I cannot comprehend the force of this reason.

It seems that weight has been laid upon the usage of the names Jehovah and Elohim, resting upon their etymology, which is not justified by Scriptural usage, or by analogy. The great ancestor of the heads of the twelve tribes, was known by the names of Jacob and Israel. He was called Jacob in consequence of his attempt to supplant his brother Esau at his birth ; and his brother said to their aged father, that he well merited the name by his craftily depriving him of his blessing. He subsequently received the honourable name of Israel, after he had wrestled with the Lord at Peniel and prevailed. It might have been thought that thereafter the odious name of Jacob would have been discontinued, and the name of Israel substituted in its stead. But this was not the case, for although the honourable name of Israelites was applied to his posterity, the name of Jacob notwithstanding its offensive etymology, was as a general rule applied to the venerable Patriarch,

in the subsequent history both in the Old and New Testament, nay even by the Saviour himself.

It has been said that a great portion of the historical matter found in Genesis is quite unnecessary, and unsuitable to be incorporated with the religious doctrines, laws, and ordinances contained in it. This may appear to be the case to one who takes only a superficial view of the matter; but to an intelligent observer, the case assumes a different aspect.

The first portion of Genesis contains the only authentic record of the creation, and of the early history of the human race, whereas the accounts from profane sources are entirely mythical and unworthy of credit. The precision, distinctness, and occasionally the minuteness of the history during that period—the names and ages of the individuals, their lineage, and incidents in their lives, the countries in which they lived, and other particulars, afford materials for testing the truth of the history, different from what we find in any uninspired writings, which profess to reach the most remote periods of the world's history.

The early history of our race gives us, moreover, an account of certain phenomena which have a purely religious aspect. The Fall and the sentence pronounced against Adam and Eve prepare us for the promise of a deliverer; and the promise of a deliverer prepares us for the phenomena of sacrifice, which was to typify the mode of deliverance on the principle of substitution. The reference to animals clean and unclean, at the period of the Deluge, evidently points to early instructions in regard to the observances connected with sacrifice; and this subject is farther elucidated, by the division of animals into clean and unclean, prescribed under the Mosaic dispensation. And the reference to clean and unclean animals referred to at the time of the Deluge, may throw light as to the grounds why Cain's sacrifice was rejected, and Abel's accepted; and why Abel's sacrifice was said to be offered in faith. What is said of the corruption of the antediluvians, prepares us for the catas-

trophe that was to follow. The history, subsequent to the Deluge, up to the period of Abraham, and the brief reference to the Canaanitish and other nations in Abraham's time, by which it appears that the earth had become altogether corrupt, furnish us with the grounds and reasons for Abraham and his posterity being selected from the other nations of the earth, as God's peculiar people, to whom special revelations and promises were to be made, and who were to live under a special dispensation, which was to be instrumental to the preservation of God's name and will in the world, and to foster and strengthen the faith of the chosen race, and to prepare them and others for the coming of the Just One. Subsequently, the idolatrous usages of the surrounding nations exhibit the necessity of making the unity of God the great fundamental principle of the Jewish state, and the propriety of placing at the head of the Decalogue the prohibition of having any other gods before Jehovah, or of worshipping him by images. The idolatry and vices of the nations with which the Israelites were surrounded rendered a number of prohibitions as to food and cleanliness necessary, which may be supposed to have an undue prominence in the laws of Moses, but which were designed to place obstacles in the way of a corrupting intercourse between the Israelites and their neighbours—a second fundamental principle in the Jewish economy. The prohibition of private sacrifices in groves and high places, and of the offering of sacrifices excepting by the authorized priests, was issued for the removal of the temptation to idolatrous worship. The idolatry and superstition, the vices, the violence, the discord, and the wars, of which the history is full, from the period of the Fall to the coming of Christ, in nations, communities, families, and individuals, which are so contrary to what might have been expected in men, originally created after the image of God, and endowed with understanding, reason, and inherent perceptions of right and wrong, indicate a radical disorder in the moral constitution of mankind, which is attributed in Scripture to the Fall, and the universal prevalence of which

can only be accounted for by inherent tendencies to sin, with which according to the Word of God all mankind are born. We thus see the bearing of historical facts upon doctrine ; and likewise how they furnish reasons for the enactment of laws which would otherwise prove utterly unintelligible.

### JEHOVAH AND ELOHIM.

I have endeavoured to show in the remarks already made, that there is no sufficient ground for supposing that there is any difference of meaning, or any discrimination in the use of the words Jehovah and Elohim, in the book of Genesis ; or for the important conclusions thence drawn by Professor Smith. These conclusions have an important bearing on the interpretation and general scope of Genesis itself, and on the other books of the Old Testament. According to the view I hold, the word Jehovah seems to have been, as it were, incidentally introduced by the author of Genesis, which cannot be of earlier date, in its present form, than the era of Moses, if we are to believe what is said regarding the term Jehovah, in chapters third and sixth of the book of Exodus.

Elohim, as has been already said, according to the best Hebrew Lexicographers, is founded upon an Arabic word, signifying "fear" or "dread," hence "worship or adoration," and by metonymy, the object of worship and adoration—"Deity". But as the word Elohim was common to the Israelites, as the Being worshipped by them, with the idolatrous nations about them, God revealed himself to his own people, under a distinctive title, by which he was to be known to them in his covenant relation as *their* God. The name of Elohim, however, was not discontinued ; it was to be retained as a term of appropriation. Accordingly in his covenant relation to his people, he is called "Jehovah," their "Elohim," or, as it is rendered in our translation, "The Lord their God". The word Jehovah can admit of

no pronominal or other affix of any kind, such as *my* Jehovah, *your* Jehovah, *his* Jehovah; the affix is added to Elohim. And this accounts, as a general rule, for the existence of Elohim, throughout the whole of the Hebrew Scriptures, where Jehovah alone might have sufficed, but for this peculiarity; and if this is true, much of what is said by Professor Smith, about what he calls the Elohim documents, after the formation of the Sinaitic covenant, falls to the ground. In the cases in which we find *my* Lord, the word *Adonai* is used, and not Jehovah with an affix.

It appears as clear as words can express it, that the name of Jehovah was not known to the Patriarchs, or to Moses himself, till God appeared to him in the Bush; nor to the Israelites till after God's manifestation to Moses, as recorded in the third verse of the sixth chapter of the Book of Exodus. The Israelites called their supreme object of worship Elohim, and the surrounding heathen nations called their supreme objects of worship Elohim; but *they* had distinctive names for their Elohim, such as *Bel*, *Dagon*, *Moloch*, &c. And Moses, when he was directed to go to deliver the Israelites from Egyptian bondage, asked God how he would be called, in order to his obtaining credence as a divine messenger, and the preventing the God of Israel from being confounded with a name applied to a false, as well as to the true God. Accordingly God told Moses in Exodus iii. 13, to say unto them "*I am* hath sent me; and in Exodus vi. 23, "God said unto Moses, I am *Jehovah*; and I appeared unto Abraham by the name of *El Shaddai*, but by my name *Jehovah*, was I not known to them". It hence follows, that the occasion above mentioned was the first in which God made himself known to the Israelites under the name of Jehovah. And it also follows, that the introduction of the name of Jehovah into the book of Genesis, in its present form, indicates that the existence of that book was posterior to the manifestation of God to Moses in the Bush, and afterwards in Egypt already referred to. If Genesis then was written in its



present form previously to these appearances, Moses could not have been the author of it. And if Moses was not the author of it, it must have been written by another, or others subsequently to these appearances. It was ascribed to Moses till the time of Astruc; according to whom there must have been more than one author. Professor Smith holds that three writers are necessary to support his theory—the Elohist; the Jehovist; and a third author, supposed to be a native of the North of Palestine, the representative of the popular element.

After the departure of the Israelites from Egypt, God was about to make a Covenant with them at Sinai, and in anticipation of that Covenant, He manifested Himself to His people in Egypt, and declared that he was henceforth to be known as their Covenant God; and from the time of the manifestation of God to Moses in Egypt, he is all but uniformly designated by the name of Jehovah, with the appropriate name of Elohim as *their* God. Until that period he is not specially called *their* God, and there is no pronominal affix in Genesis marking this appropriation. After God enters into covenant relationship with the Israelites, Jehovah becomes the appropriating name, and Elohim the appropriating title. There is no difference of meaning between the two terms. When Elohim is therefore so frequently seen in the last four books of the Pentateuch, it is, with a few exceptions about to be noticed, only when it is connected with Jehovah. I maintain then that after the manifestations of God to Moses, which have been mentioned, the Supreme Being as a general rule is designated by the name of Jehovah; and that after these manifestations, the names of Jehovah and Elohim are not used to describe different ideas; and I can find no authority for Professor Smith's averment, that Elohim is used when reference is made to *liturgical* matters, and Jehovah in connection with *prophetic* delineation; or that in the three main sections of the early history, the *priestly* narrative of the *Elohist*; the *prophetic* delineation of the *Jehovist*, and the more *picturesque* and *popular* story of the third author, embody three

tendencies, which are not merely personal, but national, which constantly appear in the other parts of Hebrew Literature, and which, up to the book of Joshua, all three run side by side.

The only exception to the use of Jehovah as the leading term which is found in the last four books of the Pentateuch, is in the episode in Numbers, chapters xxii., xxiii., xxiv., where Balak and Balaam are introduced, in which sometimes Jehovah, and sometimes Elohim is used. It is true that some of the Psalms are what might be called Elohistic; some Jehovistic; some have both names; and some have neither, as in Genesis, without any reason, that I can discover. Elohim is always found in Ecclesiastes; Jehovah, on the other hand, is the leading term in Proverbs, with a few exceptions. But, as a general rule, Jehovah is used from the sixth chapter of Exodus as the leading term throughout the Old Testament Scriptures, and Elohim, with pronominal affixes, is the term by which Jehovah is appropriated as the people's God. It may be necessary to mention to those unacquainted with Hebrew, that the term Jehovah in that language is expressed by the word LORD in the English translation. It may also be necessary to mention that Jehovah, or the Lord thy God, is only used during the subsistence of the Sinaitic covenant, when the Israelites were distinguished from the gentile nations as God's peculiar people. When the Sinaitic covenant was superseded by the covenant of grace, in which all the families of the earth had an interest, the general name  $\acute{o} \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$  was substituted in its place as the Covenant God of all the kingdoms of the earth, as appears throughout the New Testament Scriptures.

## THE PASSOVER.

BISHOP COLENSO'S OBJECTIONS TO ITS HISTORICAL AUTHORITY,  
AND PROFESSOR SMITH'S OBJECTIONS TO THE UNITY OF  
THE LEGISLATION OF THE PENTATEUCH, FOUNDED ON THE  
REPETITION OF LAWS CONTAINED IN IT, RESPECTING THE  
PASSOVER.

There is no objection which Bishop Colenso has raised, which he dwells upon with greater confidence, than upon what he conceives the impossibility of the Israelites holding the pass-over, and leaving Egypt in the manner described in the 12th chapter of Exodus; and there are perhaps none of his objections which make a stronger impression upon those who are unable to judge for themselves. The criticism is so minute, and the critic so confident in the strength of his objection, that, to the incautious reader, it might be thought to be fairly established from the words of Holy Writ.

The object of the Bishop's criticism is to show, that the Israelites had not received any notice of the Paschal Feast, till the very day on which it was held. Such being the case, he argues that it was impossible, within so short a period, to circulate the order amongst a body of people, amounting to upwards of two millions, scattered over a large district of country; that it would have been impossible to provide, by the evening of that day, and to kill the requisite number of lambs; and on the following morning, to be ready to set out on their journey from Egypt.

The passage which heads the Bishop's chapter upon the pass-over, is taken from Exodus 12th chapter, 21-28 verses, which commences as follows—"Then Moses called for all the elders of Israel, and said unto them, Draw out, and take you a lamb, according to your families, and kill the passover," &c. And he thus comments upon these words, "That is to say in *one single* day, the whole of the immense population, as large as that of

London, was instructed to keep the passover, and actually did keep it. I have said in *one single day*, for the first notice of any such feast to be kept, is given in this very chapter, where we find it written, verse 12, "I will pass through the land of Egypt *this* night, and will smite all the first-born in the land of Egypt, both man and beast." I have to remark, what is known to every Hebrew Scholar, that the demonstrative pronoun  $\text{זֶה}$  *zeh* in the Hebrew, like *ce* in French, signifies *that* as well as *this*; and the Bishop will find  $\text{זֶה}$  rendered *that* in the authorized version in verse 8, of the 12th, and also in verse 8, of the 13th chapter of the book of Exodus. It cannot but appear to the general reader, that the word *this* could not be read in either of these verses, being inadmissible to denote either past or future time.

In verses 1st and 2nd of the 12th chapter, is described the Lord's meeting with Moses and Aaron. In verses 3 to 13 inclusive, He institutes the passover, and gives Moses and Aaron (who alone were present), instructions as to its *first celebration*. From verse 14 to 20 inclusive, He gives injunctions in regard to its *subsequent celebration*, as a memorial of the Exodus of the Israelites, with special directions applicable to all *future* occasions. And in verses 21 to 28, *Moses* reports to the *people* the Lord's message, contained in verses 3 to 13 inclusive.

The 12th chapter thus commences—"And the Lord spake to Moses and Aaron, in the land of Egypt, saying, this (the present) month, shall be unto you the beginning of months, it shall be the first month in the year to you". From the way in which this announcement is made, it is as probable that it was made on the first day of the month, as on any other day previously to the 10th. Verse 3, "Speak ye unto all the congregation of Israel, saying, "In the *tenth* day of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb," &c.; verse 6th, "Ye shall keep it up until the 14th day of the same month, and the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it in the evening; v. 8, and they shall eat the flesh in *that* night" (so is

the word necessarily translated in the authorised version), that is, in the night of the 14th. As the Lord was still speaking to Moses and Aaron, it is evident that the rendering of  $\text{לָיְלָה}$  by *this* is inadmissible, since the interview took place before the 10th of the month. V. 11, "And thus shall ye eat it (the Lord is still speaking to Moses and Aaron), with your loins girded, &c. ; v. 12, for I will pass through the land of Egypt *that* night" ( $\text{לָיְלָה}$  as before, but now inconsistently rendered in the authorised version by "*this*," which is as inapplicable as it would have been in v. 8th). It is manifest that what is contained in verses 14 to 20 inclusive, does not refer to the institution of the first passover, but to the passover as a commemorative ordinance, as it was to be celebrated in after times V. 14 (God is still speaking to Moses and Aaron) "And *that* day shall be to you for a memorial, and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord, throughout your generations, &c. ; v. 15, seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread, &c. ; v. 16, and in the first day there shall be a holy convocation, &c." It is obvious that these directions cannot refer to the first passover. V. 17, "And ye shall observe the feast of unleavened bread, for in *that* self same day, I brought your armies out of the land of Egypt, therefore shall ye observe *that* day in your generations by an ordinance for ever."

We now come to the passage in verses 21-28, upon which Bishop Colenso rests the strength of his case. Moses was ordered to communicate to the Israelites, what is contained in verses 3-13 ; and he does so, through the Elders of Israel. V. 21, "*Then* Moses called for all the Elders of Israel, and said unto them, Draw out and take you a lamb according to your families, and kill the passover." What time it may be asked, does the word "*then*," indicate. Is it not the most rational and most probable inference, that it was as soon as possible, after Moses and Aaron were commanded to deliver the Lord's communication to the Israelites. It is evident that the Israelites could not have obeyed the injunctions given, if the meeting of the Elders of Israel had not taken

place previously to the 10th of the month Abib, for had not that been the case, they could not have kept up the lambs four days. There is no ground from which any other inference than this can be deduced. There is no authority whatever for the Bishop's averment, that the first intimation was made to the Israelites on the 14th. There is no reference to time at all, between verses 21st and 28th, but in the word *then* at the commencement of v. 21. Moses told them "to draw out and take a lamb and kill the passover," but he does not say *when*. He does not tell them to kill it on the day in which he communicated the Lord's message to them. We are only authorised to infer that he told the people, what God had ordered him to tell them, viz., to draw out and take the lamb on the 10th, and to kill it on the 14th. V. 28, "And the children of Israel went away, and did as the Lord commanded Moses and Aaron, so did they." V. 29, "And it came to pass, that at midnight the Lord smote all the first-born in the land of Egypt". Not, be it observed, at the midnight succeeding the day in which Moses had spoken to the Elders of Israel, but the midnight that followed the killing of the lamb, viz., of the 14th. The Bishop having recourse to verse 12, to get himself out of his difficulty, shows the distress under which he laboured, in endeavouring to subvert the historical authority of this most instructive and interesting portion of the divine word. On the supposition that the communication was made to the Israelites on the 14th of the month, he declares it to be impossible for the whole of the people to be apprized of it on that day.

Professor Smith lays particular stress upon the repetitions of laws relating to the passover, six in number, as indications of different authorship in the Pentateuch. The first he mentions is that of the original institution, which contains also directions about its future celebration, to which special attention has been fully directed.

The next legislative act, according to Professor Smith, indicating different authorship, is contained in Exodus xiii. 3-7,

which I shall quote at length. What is there contained is all that is said upon the subject of the Passover, from the time of its institution in Exodus xii. till the children of Israel reached Mount Sinai. "Remember that day in which ye came out from Egypt, out of the house of bondage, for by strength of hand the Lord brought you out from that place; there shall no leavened bread be eaten; that day came ye out in the month Abib. And it shall be when the Lord shall bring thee into the land of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, which He sware unto thy fathers to give thee, a land flowing with milk and honey, that thou shalt keep this service in that month. Seven days thou shalt eat unleavened bread, and in the seventh day shall be a feast to the Lord. Unleavened bread shall be eaten seven days, and there shall no leavened bread be seen with thee, neither shall there be leaven seen with thee in all thy quarters." This, indeed, might be called legislation, if a lawgiver calling upon his subjects to remember to continue to keep the laws enacted by him, can be called legislation.

The next legislative act, according to Professor Smith, will be found in Exodus xxiii. 14, 15 :—"Three times thou shalt keep a feast unto me in the year. Thou shalt eat unleavened bread seven days, *as I commanded thee*, in the time appointed of the month Abib, for in it thou camest out from Egypt, and none shall appear before me empty." This is a mere reference to a law formerly passed, and an intimation that it was still to be observed, and it cannot be fairly adduced as evidence of the fragmentary character of the legislation of the Pentateuch.

The next case adduced by Professor Smith is found in Leviticus xxiii. 4, &c., where there is a recapitulation of the Jewish festivals. It is as follows:—"These are the feasts of the Lord, even holy convocations, which ye shall proclaim in their seasons. In the fourteenth day of the first month, at even, is the Lord's passover. And on the fifteenth day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread unto the Lord; seven

days ye must eat unleavened bread. In the first day ye shall have a holy convocation ; ye shall do no servile work therein ; but ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord seven days ; in the seventh day is an holy convocation, ye shall do no servile work therein." The object of this chapter is to remind the people of the feasts of the Lord. There is no legislation here ; an admonition only is given to keep the passover and the other feasts. The 23rd chapter of Leviticus thus commences :— " And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak ye unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, *Concerning* the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall *proclaim to be holy convocations*, even these are my feasts. Six days shall work be done, but the seventh is the Sabbath of rest," &c. Might not this also be adduced as an instance of fragmentary legislation in the Pentateuch ? These feasts were all previously established, and none of them here referred to can, with any reason, be adduced as instances of fragmentary legislation.

There is still more legislation, according to Professor Smith, respecting the passover in Deuteronomy xvi. 1-8. One of the generally acknowledged objects of the Book of Deuteronomy is to recapitulate the laws in the three preceding books, and to urge obedience to them, not to re-enact them. Any one who reads the passage quoted, may see this to be the case. What is there said was quite sufficient to remind the Israelites of the institution of the passover, and to urge them to keep it in its season ; but it would have been quite insufficient of itself to enable them to observe all the requirements contained in its original institution, without which its celebration would have been vitiated ; and the same may be said of all the other passages quoted by Professor Smith.

Professor Smith mentions, in evidence of his averment that different laws were given in the Pentateuch on the same subject, the order to erect other altars than that erected in the central sanctuary. In proof of this he quotes Exodus xx. 24, as contrasted with Exodus xxvii. 1. As this is a point on which



Professor Smith lays great stress, it is necessary, with a view to its settlement, to ascertain what is said in the Pentateuch on the subject of altars, and what was the usage in after times upon this important subject, and its bearing upon the future character and destinies of the people. In Exodus xx. 24, the following command is given by the Lord to Moses:—"An altar of earth thou shalt make unto me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings, and thy peace offerings, thy sheep and thine oxen; in all places where I record my name, I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee. And if thou wilt make me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone, for if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it." In Exodus, chapter xxvii., another order is given, which is as follows:—"Thou shalt make an altar of shittim wood, five cubits long, and five cubits broad; the altar shall be four square, and the height thereof shall be three cubits," &c. See also Exodus xxxviii. 1, &c. This altar was to be placed at the door of the tabernacle, and it is said that "what man soever of the House of Israel that killeth an ox, or lamb, or goat *in the camp*, or that killeth it *out of the camp*, and bringeth it not into the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, to offer an offering unto the Lord before the tabernacle of the Lord, blood shall be imputed unto that man; he hath shed blood, and that man shall be cut off from among his people, to the end that the children of Israel may bring their sacrifices, which they offer in the open field, unto the Lord, and they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto devils, after whom they have gone a-whoring. This shall be a statute for ever unto them throughout their generations." Lev. xvii. 3-7.

The prohibition of offering sacrifices except at the public altar situated at the door of the tabernacle, under pain of death, it would seem relates only to private sacrifices, which had led in times past, and which would, in time to come, lead to idolatrous practices, with their abominations, but not to public sacrifices offered by divine authority on special occasions, when they could not be offered at the door of the tabernacle, as happened

in the case of Joshua and Samuel, and the Prophet Elijah at Carmel. On such occasions the altars were doubtless to be of earth or of unhewn stone. The question is asked why two apparently so contradictory statutes have been given upon this subject? It is quite plain that it was the second statute which the Israelites were bound to keep throughout their generations, and which they did, with certain exceptions, observe till the division of the kingdom by the revolt of the ten tribes under Jeroboam, who were prohibited from worshipping at the temple, and from offering sacrifices at the public altar at Jerusalem. That revolt, and the sacrificing on private altars, soon led to idolatry, with its attendant abominations, among the ten tribes, which the subjects of the Kingdom of Judah were not slow in imitating, when they were restrained neither by the authority, nor influenced by the example, of powerful and pious kings.

What then, it is asked, was the object of the preceding law in Exodus xx. 24, respecting the erection of temporary altars of the materials and construction there mentioned? In the first place, some time must have elapsed between the enacting of the law in Exodus xx. 24, and the erection of the tabernacle, ark of the covenant, and stationary altar in Exodus xxxv. 4, seq. It is evident, therefore, that whatever sacrifices were offered in the interval, must have been offered upon an altar constructed as described in Exodus xx. 24, of earth or unhewn stones. It may be that they might be easily thrown down, and not left to be used by heathens in the desert; or they may have been thus constructed as a contrast with what heathens used, and that the Israelites and heathens might not worship upon the same altars. These are but conjectures. There seems to be no doubt, however, that at the sacrifices offered by Elijah and Baal's priests, neither used the altars used by the others.

One reason, however, why the altars of earth and stone were erected, was because sacrifices had to be offered in the interval between the order on the subject of altars given in Exodus xx. 24, and the order for the erection of the stationary altar, con-

tained in Exodus xxxv. 4, seq. The former order was given immediately after the Israelites' arrival at Mount Sinai. The stationary altar was not erected till the first month of the second year, Exodus xl. 17. Mention is made of only one public sacrifice on the stationary altar; how many more there were cannot be ascertained, but it is certain that the order to sacrifice only at the central altar, was disobeyed to a great extent during the residence of the Israelites in the wilderness, who probably sacrificed upon the altars of earth or unhewn stone referred to in Exodus xx. 24. At all events, Moses must have observed this order in the sacrifice offered by him referred to in Exodus xxiv. 4, where it is said that "Moses wrote all the words of the Lord, and rose up early in the morning, and builded an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars according to the twelve tribes of Israel. And he sent young men of the Children of Israel, which offered burnt offerings, and sacrificed peace offerings of oxen unto the Lord". This, of course, took place between the order in Exodus xx. 24, and the order given to offer sacrifices only at the stationary altar. After the latter order was given, we hear nothing of any penalties being exacted for not sacrificing on the stationary altar, although the people were in the continual practice of offering sacrifices elsewhere. This is evident from what Moses says, nearly forty years after the order was given for the erection of the stationary altar; and a little before his death, in giving them his parting advice, he tells them in Deut. xii. 3-14, that they were not to do in time to come, everything which they were in the practise of doing in the desert, every one at his pleasure, not being come to their first habitation; and commands them to offer nowhere but at the place which the Lord should choose as the seat of His worship. Wherever the tabernacle or ark was, there they might, and should present their offerings, because that was the place chosen by the Lord for the time. Nevertheless, the statute did not prohibit offerings to be made at a place remote from the tabernacle, if the Lord or a prophet so ordered, as in the case of

Moses' special command to Joshua, Deut. xxvii. 4, 5, 7; of the Lord's special command to Samuel to offer a sacrifice at Bethlehem, which was at a distance from the temple; and in the case of Elijah at Carmel. All, therefore, that could be meant by the statute, Exodus xx. 24, in reference to altars of earth and stone, was that where sacrifices were offered, anywhere but at the door of the tabernacle, they must be of the kind prescribed in the foregoing statute.

This last case is brought forward by Professor Smith to shew that sacrifices on altars different from that which stood at the door of the tabernacle or temple were fully approved of by Elijah. It is first to be observed that Elijah was a prophet of Israel, not Judah; that there was no authorised altar in Israel; and that the subjects of the Kings of Israel were interdicted from offering sacrifice at the public altar in Jerusalem. It hence would seem, that if the godly people in the kingdom of Israel sacrificed at all, they must have offered their sacrifice on the occasional altars referred to in Exodus xx. 24. In the next place, the sacrifice was offered on a memorable occasion, and for an important object. It was a contest between a prophet of God, and the whole of the prophets of Baal, to demonstrate, in a public and unmistakeable manner whether Jehovah or Baal was the true God. The result of the trial might have convinced the whole of the Kingdom of Israel, if it was possible to convince idolaters, that "Jehovah he is God". Can the fact then of the erection of an altar by Elijah, in the peculiar circumstances in which he was placed, of itself warrant the inference, that the altars in question, were fully approved of by him. No one could have known better than Elijah, what had been the consequences of the prohibition by the Kings of Israel of the people resorting to the temple, for the offering of private, and joining in the public sacrifices at Jerusalem.

It does not appear that any public sacrifice was offered by Joshua till after the capture of the city of Ai; which was upon an altar such as is described in Exodus xx. 24, and by the order

of Moses. So that it hence seems that in special circumstances by command of God, or an inspired servant of God, sacrifices might be offered elsewhere than upon the public altar, upon an altar made of earth or unhewn stones. The tabernacle was not erected in Canaan till they were in Shiloh, and until after the tribes had received their inheritance, "and till the land was subdued before them," Joshua xviii.

## DEUTERONOMY.

### THE AGE IN WHICH IT WAS WRITTEN.

Professor Smith, says:—"It is difficult to suppose that the legislative part of Deuteronomy is as old as Moses. If the law of the kingdom in Deuteronomy xvii., was known in the time of the Judges, it is impossible to comprehend Judges viii. 23, and above all, 1 Samuel viii. 7, and following verses." It appears to me on the contrary that the legislative part of Deuteronomy, so far from furnishing an irresistible argument against the early age of Deuteronomic legislation, furnishes one of the strongest arguments in favour of its antiquity.

Moses supposes, what any man of ordinary forecast of mind, and without inspiration might foresee, that the Israelites, who were to be under a constitution, different from that of any of the surrounding nations, especially in such a period as that of the Judges, and above all, after the experience of their troubles and discomfitures, in the degrading position they were in through the misconduct of Eli's sons might desire a king like other nations. The following are Moses' words contained in Deut. xvii. 14, seq. :—"When thou art come unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and shalt possess it and dwell therein, and say, I will set a King over me, like as all the nations that are about me; thou shalt in any wise set him King over thee whom the Lord thy God shall choose, one from among thy brethren

shalt thou set King over thee ; thou mayest not set a stranger over thee which is not thy brother." What is said about the election of a King in Judges viii. 23, which refers to Gideon's refusal to be appointed King of Israel, and what is said upon the subject of the election of a King in 1 Samuel viii. 7—does not seem to have led greater critics than Professor Smith, and those of his school, to the inference that the legislative part of Deuteronomy is not so old as Moses ; and that if the law of the Kingdom in Deut. xvii. was known in the time of the Judges, it is impossible to comprehend Judges viii. 23, and above all, 1 Sam. viii. 7. The following are the observations of Sir John David Michaelis, one of the ablest commentators on the laws of Moses, upon Deut. xvii. 14-20—"Moses seems to have been very desirous that the nation of Israel should always preserve the constitution of a free republic. But still by a particular law, Deut. xvii. 14-20—he gave them permission to choose a King, when once they should find the monarchical government more suited to their circumstances. In this, his judicious conduct merits commendation : since he thus avoided the error into which other legislators, both ancient and modern, have fallen, in wishing to prescribe for their nation a form of government never to be changed. For even the very best constitution of a state may become, in a manner, antiquated and enfeebled by abuses that are too strong for the laws ; in which case it is expedient to alter it, and to convert, for instance, into a monarchy, a free republic, where the people have become lawless, or certain citizens too powerful and ambitious. History confirms this observation ; and the government, which has in itself no inherent power of changing its form, as where it is high treason to think even of the establishment of a King, will, sooner or later, experience a revolution notwithstanding ; with this difference only, that it will be effected not peacefully, but by force. The above-mentioned passage in Deut. xvii. 14-20, which allows the Israelites the choice of a King, and specifies the limitations of his power,

deserves our attention as a fundamental law of their government.”\*

Rosenmüller, in his commentary on the passage in question, says—“The regal power is not approved of, but a precaution is taken, lest that which could not be prevented might prove prejudicial. And whom did it better become to give the Israelites this wholesome warning than Moses, who, in all that he commanded them, had given them able specimens of his remarkable wisdom and foresight, and who having been himself brought up in a King’s palace, had become acquainted with the effects of despotism, and the evils thence arising to his subjects, &c.” Neither of these two great critics had imagined that the existence of the passage in the 17th chapter of Genesis, just quoted, furnished evidence that the legislative part of Deuteronomy is not as old as Moses; or that if the law of the kingdom in Deut. xvii., was known in the time of the Judges, it is impossible to comprehend Judges viii. 23, and above all, 1 Sam. viii. 7. It is said in Deut. xvii., “If thou wilt set a King over thee, thou shalt in any wise, set *him* over thee whom the Lord shall choose.” Moses here gives instructions in regard to a supposed case that might emerge, in regard to the constitution of the Jewish state. The passage in Judges in viii. 23 is as follows:—“Then the men of Israel said unto Gideon, Rule thou over us, both thou and thy son, and thy son’s son also, for thou hast delivered us from the hand of Midian. And Gideon said unto them, I will not rule over you, neither shall my son rule over you: the Lord shall rule over you.” We shall be the better able to judge of this case after adverting to that in 1 Sam. viii. 7. It appears from the foregoing verses of the chapter taken in connection with the preceding history, that the Israelites had been defeated in various battles, and greatly humbled by the Philistines; that, as is said in the beginning of chapter viii., they attributed their misfortunes to the mismanagement and misconduct of

\* *Commentaries on the Laws of Moses*, Vol. I., Chap. VII., Art. 54.—Smith’s Translation.

Samuel's sons, and that the ark had been taken, and was in the possession of the Philistines. It was in this painful and humiliating condition that the elders of Israel, probably taking advantage of what Moses had said upon the subject, applied to Samuel to make a King to them like other nations. Samuel would not venture to do so on his own authority, but as no King could be appointed, but such a one as the Lord their God should choose for them, Samuel prayed to the Lord for direction, and the Lord permitted him to hearken to their advice, after a reflection upon their conduct in that they had not rejected Samuel, but had rejected himself. Here we have all the necessary requisites,—the choice of the people through their rulers, the approbation of the head of the state, and the consent of the Lord. In the case of Gideon, it was the men of Israel by whom he was selected. We do not know who they were ; whether the soldiery after the victory, or the whole of the people. There is nothing said of the approbation of the elders of Israel, or of their consulting the Lord, or of their obtaining His approbation. It may have been owing to the want of these formalities that Gideon refused to reign over the people, or to other obstacles of which the history makes no mention. Gideon may have known that the want of these formalities would render the throne an insecure possession. Be this as it may, we are quite unable to see how the two cases specified warrant the conclusion that the Book of Deuteronomy was posterior to both these events.

#### AUTHORSHIP OF DEUTERONOMY.

Professor Smith says that it is most probable that the writer of Deuteronomy was the editor of the whole history from Genesis to Kings. The style, he says, is certainly peculiar, and occurs in various passages all through these books ; still it is a style which might be easily imitated, and it may have been so by later writers. In any case it cannot possibly be as old as



Moses. Some episodes in the subsequent history are unintelligible, on the supposition that Deuteronomy was known to the actors. (Compare, e.g., Deut. xvii. with Judges viii. 23, and especially with 1 Sam. viii. 7. Compare also the laws about high places.) Deuteronomy is known to Jeremiah, but to no earlier prophet; and the whole theological standpoint of it is in accordance with that period. It gives the most spiritual view of the law, and if it be placed at the beginning of the theocratic development, the whole subsequent history is rendered intelligible. The author puts his work into the mouth of Moses, because he is not giving a new law, but expounding and developing Mosaic principles. This involves nothing like pious fraud; it is quite natural that he should adopt such a course. (Encyc. Brit. Art. "Bible," pp. 637, 638.)

It is most probable, nay, as certain as any historical event can be, that the writer of Deuteronomy is the writer of the whole history from Genesis to Joshua. I have stated the grounds of this fact in regard to the Mosaic authorship of Genesis; and it is more strongly attested still in regard to the other books of the Pentateuch. The books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers are ascribed to Moses in the books themselves, and by the all but unanimous voice of the Jewish and Christian churches, up to the rise, in comparatively recent times, of the higher criticism. All the evidence, external and internal, which seems possible to be obtained, is found in these books. What is said of the nature and attributes of God, of the holiness and purity of the laws given by Him, of the worship to be paid to Him, of the service to be rendered to Him, of the rites and ceremonies to be observed in His service, is accountable only on the grounds stated in the books themselves, viz., Divine revelation. The constitution of the Israelitish state, moreover, is so unlike to that of any other nation that ever existed, and their relations to other nations in the new circumstances in which they were afterwards placed so peculiar, as to render them quite unique and exceptional in the history of our race.

Moses, it is stated, was selected by God to deliver the Israelites out of the thralldom of Egyptian bondage ; to be their guide till they reached Mount Sinai ; to meet with God as their Mediator ; to receive the communications of His will which are found in the books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, and which are there said to have been written by him, at God's command. Moses claims to be the author of these books, and there are no reasonable grounds to question his claim ; and scarcely any one, until recent times, ever did question it. From the nature of the books themselves, and from the minuteness, the number, and the peculiarity of the laws contained in them, it does not seem possible that they could have been transmitted by tradition. In the whole circumstances, it need excite no surprise that the Mosaic authorship of these three books has been universally acknowledged, with a few exceptions, in recent times ; and, considering the period at which they were written, and the nature of their contents, it is difficult to imagine what better authority for the Mosaic authorship could have been desired or required.

After a residence of forty years in the wilderness, Moses claims to have written the book of Deuteronomy, which contains, partly, accounts of the journeyings and residence in the wilderness ; partly a recapitulation, partly a summary, of the laws given in the previous three books ; and partly the enactment of the laws, constitutions, and ordinances which were to be observed by the Israelites on their settlement in the inheritance promised to them. They received instructions in regard to their occupation of the land of Canaan ; to its division among the tribes, and the duties required of them ; to the extermination of the Canaanitish nations which they conquered, and to the footing on which they were to stand with neighbouring nations whom they were not ordered to exterminate ; to the civil and criminal laws by which they were to be governed ; and to what might be regarded as frivolous laws and ordinances, which, however, served the important purposes of preventing

religious and social intercourse with heathens, lest they should be corrupted by their idolatries and other abominations.

As matters of fact, we find laws relating to all these subjects in the book of Deuteronomy, and that these are the laws adopted by Joshua, and that they are the laws and constitutions of the Jewish state, which were regarded as unalterable, and which never were altered in any way during the subsistence of the Jewish Republic. What, then, was their origin? Upon what authority did they rest? Joshua disclaims all connection with their enactment.

There are no enactments of laws in the book of Joshua. The laws and constitutions there referred to upon which he acted, and by which the Israelites were governed in Canaan, rest their authority upon the book of Deuteronomy. The violation of these laws involved capital punishments, and other consequences, which never would have been submitted to but on the highest legal authority.

Joshua, surely, who administered the law, could best tell from what quarter he received it, and was capable of judging of the competence of the authority upon which it rested. The following is the account given by him in the first chapter of the book that bears his name:—

“Now after the death of Moses, the servant of the Lord, it came to pass that the Lord spake unto Joshua, the son of Nun, Moses’s minister, saying, Moses my servant is dead, now therefore arise, go over this Jordan, thou, and all this people, unto the land which I do give to them, even to the children of Israel.” (Josh. i. 2.) “As I was with Moses, so I will be with thee.” (Josh. i. 5.) “Only be thou strong and very courageous, that thou mayest observe to do according to all the law which my servant Moses commanded thee.” (Josh. i. 7.) “This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth; but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein: for then thou shalt make thy way prosperous, and thou shalt have good success.” (Josh. i. 8.)

There is no ambiguity here. Joshua rests the law which he administered after the Israelites left Egypt, and during their abode in the wilderness, upon the authority of God, and this is the law contained in the book of Deuteronomy. There were no laws given in any of the previous books of the Pentateuch which would have so guided the people as to supersede the necessity of the book of Deuteronomy. Whether, therefore, it be an attack on Canaan, or the extermination of its inhabitants (Josh. xi. 12, 15, 20; Deut. vii. 2, 24), or the appointment of the cities of refuge (Josh. xxi. 2, and Deut. xix. 2-9), or the general division of the land (Josh. xiii. 8, xiv. 2-5, and Deut. iii. 12, 13), or its allocation to particular tribes or individuals, such as the Transjordanic tribes (Josh. i. 13, 15, 17; Deut. xiii. 23), or in reference to the tribe of Levi (Josh. xiii. 23; Deut. xviii. 1-2, 7-8),—all rest upon the authority of Moses. Indeed, Jehovah himself orders Joshua to obey all the laws for his direction by Moses, in the following words, after Moses's death:—"Be thou strong and very courageous, that thou mayest observe to do according to all the law which Moses, my servant, commanded thee. Turn not from it, to the right hand or to the left, that thou mayest prosper whithersoever thou goest. This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein, for then thou shalt make thy way prosperous, and then thou shalt have good success." (Josh. i. 7, 8.) The duty pointed out to him, at the beginning of his career, Joshua at its close pressed upon all Israel in the same way: "Take diligent heed," said he, "to do the commandment and the law which Moses the servant of the Lord charged you; to love the Lord your God, and to walk in all his ways, and to keep his commandments, and to cleave unto him, and to serve him with all your heart, and with all your soul." (Josh. xxii. 5; Deut. vi. 17, 18, 19; xi. 22; x. 12.) The commandments given to Joshua, in regard to his conduct after the occupation, are so complete, that all change was forbidden, either by addition,

alteration, or repeal: "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it; that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you." (Deut. iv. 2.) As a matter of fact, no change was made in the laws given in Deuteronomy, and adopted by Joshua, during the subsistence of the Israelitish Commonwealth.

It appears, as has been already said, that Joshua did not enact the laws upon which the Israelitish constitution was established in Canaan, but that the whole of that constitution was framed upon laws given by Moses in Deuteronomy; and the constitution of the State, and the laws and institutions by which it was established and governed, are in such complete conformity with what is found in Deuteronomy, that it seems impossible to account for the fact upon any other principle than that of cause and effect. The laws of Moses must have been written at the period immediately preceding the occupation in Canaan, since from their minuteness, numbers, and importance, it is difficult to see how the Israelites could have been settled, guided, and governed in Canaan, but upon the authority stated by Joshua himself. As Joshua was Moses's minister, he must have known the authority and the grounds upon which the Israelites were settled and governed in Canaan.

On examining the references to the Book of Deuteronomy in the authorized Bibles, there will be found in Joshua, sixty-six; in Judges, seventeen; in I. Samuel, seven; in II. Samuel, under David's reign, ten; in I. Kings, under Solomon's reign, eighteen; in II. Kings, under Solomon's reign, two; in II. Kings, during the reigns of Jehoshaphat, Ahab, and Ahaziah, three, in Amaziah's, nine; in I. Chronicles, during David's reign, four, in Solomon's, fourteen, in Jehosaphat's, ten, in Manasseh's, five.

All the above references are made, as I have said, to the book of Deuteronomy in the historical books of the Old Testament previously to the era of Jeremiah; and the references in Jeremiah are similar to those in the other books. I find in

Jeremiah that there are about sixty references to the book of Deuteronomy. I find likewise that in the same prophet there are thirty-two references to Exodus, thirty-one to Leviticus, and thirty-one to Numbers. What conclusion does Professor Smith draw from these facts? He might have nearly as strongly argued on the same principles as he has done in regard to the book of Deuteronomy, that these other books too were written in the times of Jeremiah.

It may be expected, however, that I should do more than merely refer to the marginal references, and leave readers the trouble of examining and comparing them for themselves. In doing so, I shall endeavour to show that the references in the Scriptures antecedently to the era of Jeremiah are stronger in evidence of the existence of Deuteronomy in the era of Moses than the references in Jeremiah are to its existence in the period in which that prophet lived. They are indeed more convincing and satisfactory, because they commence from the period of the establishment of the Israelitish Republic, and are to be looked upon in the connection of law and obedience or disobedience thereof, of prediction and fulfilment, of prohibition and observance or infraction. In Deuteronomy we have the law, and in the subsequent books evidence of its observance. This is especially the case before any alteration was made in the republican forms of the Jewish constitution on the establishment of the subsequent kingly government.

I shall make no farther reference to Joshua; what follows marks the parallels between Deuteronomy and Judges, &c.

## PARALLELISMS

## BETWEEN DEUTERONOMY AND THE BOOK OF JUDGES.

Deut. vii. 2. And when the Lord thy God shall deliver them before thee, thou shalt smite them and utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with nor show mercy unto them.

Deut. xii. 3. Ye shall overthrow their altars.

Deut. vii. 16. Neither shalt thou serve their gods, for that will be a snare unto thee.

Deut. xxxi. 16. This people will rise up and go a-whoring after the Gods of the strangers of the land, whither they go to be among them, and will forsake me, and break my covenant which I have made with them.

Deut. xxxii. 36. For the Lord shall judge his people, and repent himself for his servants, when he seeth that their power is gone, and there is none shut up and left.

Deut. vii. 3. Neither shalt thou make marriages with them, thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son.

Deut. xvi. 21. Thou shalt not plant thee a grove of any trees near unto the altar of the Lord thy God, which thou shalt make thee.

Deut. ii. 9. "And the Lord said unto me, Distress not the Moabites, neither contend with

Judges ii. 2. And ye shall make no league with the inhabitants of this land.

Judges ii. 2. And ye shall throw down their altars.

Judges ii. 3. Their gods shall be a snare unto thee.

Judges ii. 12. And they forsook the Lord God of their fathers, which brought them out of the land of Egypt, and followed other gods, of the gods of the people that were round about them.

Judges ii. 18. And the Lord raised them up . . . . Judges, for it repented the Lord because of their groanings, by reason of them that oppressed them and vexed them

Judges iii. 6. And they took their daughters to be their wives, and gave their daughters to their sons, and served their gods.

Judges iii. 7. And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord . . . . and served Baalam and the groves.

them in battle: for I will not give of their land for a possession," &c.

Deut. ii. 19. "And when thou comest nigh over against the children of Ammon, distress them not, nor meddle with them: for I will not give thee of the land of the children of Ammon," &c.

Deut. vii. 3. "Neither shalt thou make marriages with them. Thy daughter shalt thou not give unto his son; nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son."

Deut. xii. 8. "Ye shall not do after all the things that we do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes".

#### DEUTERONOMY AND RUTH.

Deut. xxv. 5, 6. If brethren dwell together, and one of them die, and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger: her husband's brother shall go in unto her, and take her to him to wife, and perform the duty of a husband's brother unto her; and it shall be, that the first-born which she beareth shall succeed in the name of his brother which is dead, that his name be not put out of Israel.

#### DEUTERONOMY AND 1 SAMUEL.

Deut. xvi. 19. Thou shalt not wrest judgment, thou shalt not respect persons, neither

Judges xi. 15. Thus saith Jephthah, Israel took not away the land of Moab, nor the land of the children of Ammon.

Judges xiv. 3. "Then Samson's father and mother said unto him, 'Is there never a woman, among the daughters of thy brethren or among all my people, that thou goest to take a wife of the uncircumcised Philistines?'"

Judges xvii. 6. In those days there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes.

Ruth iv. 5. Then said Boaz, What day thou buyest the field of the hand of Naomi, thou must buy it also of Ruth the Moabitess, the wife of the dead, to raise up the name of the dead upon his inheritance.

1 Sam. viii. 3. And his (Samuel's) sons walked not in his ways, but turned aside after



take a gift, for a gift doth blind the eyes of the wise and pervert the words of the righteous.

Deut. xvii. 14-17. And when thou shalt say I will set a king over me, like as all the nations that are about me : thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee whom the Lord thy God shall choose, &c., &c., but he shall not multiply horses to himself, nor cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he should multiply horses; neither shall he multiply wives to himself, that his heart turn not away.

Deut. xxii. 8. When thou buildest a new house, then thou shalt make a battlement for thy roof, that thou bring not blood upon thine house, if any man fall from thence.

Deut. xvi. 19. Thou shalt not wrest judgment, thou shalt not respect persons, neither take a gift, for a gift doth blind the eyes of the wise, and pervert the words of the righteous.

Deut. xii. 16. "Only ye shall not eat the blood."

luere, and took bribes, and perverted judgment.

1 Sam. viii. 11. And he said, This will be the manner of the king that shall reign over you; he will take your sons, and appoint them for himself, for his chariots, and to be his horsemen, and some shall run before his chariots.

2 Sam. xi. 2. And it came to pass in an evening tide, that David arose from off his bed, and walked upon the roof of the king's house.

1 Sam. xii. 3. "Whose ox have I taken? or whose ass have I taken? or whom have I defrauded? Whom have I oppressed? or of whose hand have I received any bribe to blind mine eyes therewith? and I will restore it to you."

1 Sam. xiv. 32. And the people did eat them with the blood.

#### DEUTERONOMY AND KINGS AND CHRONICLES.

Deut. xxix. 9. Keep therefore the words of this covenant, and do them, that ye may prosper in all that ye do.

1 Kings ii. 3. And keep the charge of the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, to keep his statutes, and his commandments, and his judgments, and his testimonies, as it is written in the law of Moses, that thou mayest prosper in all that thou doest, and whithersoever thou turnest thyself.

Deut. xxxi. 9. And Moses wrote this law and delivered it unto the priests, the sons of Levi, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and to all the elders of Israel.

Deut. x. 5. And I turned myself and came down from the Mount, and put the tables in the ark, and there they be as the Lord commanded me.

Deut. iv. 20. But the Lord hath taken you out of the iron furnace, even out of Egypt, to be unto him a people of inheritance, as ye are this day.

Deut. ix. 26. I prayed therefore unto the Lord, and said, O Lord God, destroy not thy people, and thine inheritance which thou hast redeemed through thy greatness, which thou hast brought forth out of Egypt with a mighty hand.

Deut. xxviii. 37. And thou shalt become an astonishment, a proverb, and a by-word, among all nations whither the Lord shall lead thee.

Deut. xxiv. 16. The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers; every man shall be put to death for his own sin.

Deut. x. 8. At that time the Lord separated the tribe of

1 Kings viii. 3, 4. And all the Elders of Israel came, and the priests took up the ark and they brought up the ark of the Lord, and the tabernacle of the congregation, and all the holy vessels that were in the tabernacle, even those did the priests and Levites bring up.

1 Kings viii. 9. And there was nothing in the ark but the two tables of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb.

1 Kings viii. 51. "For they be thy people and thine inheritance, which thou broughtest out of Egypt from the midst of the furnace of iron."

1 Kings viii. 53. For thou didst separate them from among all the people of the earth to be thine inheritance, as thou spakest by the hand of Moses thy servant, when thou broughtest our Fathers out of Egypt, O Lord God.

1 Kings ix. 7. And Israel shall be a proverb and a by-word among all people.

2 Kings xiv. 6. But the children of the murderers he slew not, according unto that which is written in the Book of the law of Moses, wherein the Lord commanded, saying, The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, nor the children be put to death for the fathers, but every man shall be put to death for his own sin.

1 Chron. xv. 2. Then David said, none ought to carry the

Levi to bear the ark of the covenant of the Lord, to stand before the Lord, to minister unto him, and to bless in his name; unto this day.

Deut. xii. 5. But unto the place which the Lord your God shall choose, out of all your tribes, to put his name there, even unto his habitation shall ye seek, and thither thou shalt come.

Deut. ii. 4-19. And command thou the people, saying, Ye are to pass through the coast of your brethren the children of Esau, which dwell in Seir; and they shall be afraid of you; take ye good heed unto yourselves therefore, &c.; and the Lord said unto me, Distress not the Moabites, &c. (and children of Ammon).

ark of God, but the Levites, for them hath the Lord chosen to carry the ark of God, and to minister to him for ever.

2 Chron. vii. 12. And the Lord appeared to Solomon by night, and said unto him, I have heard thy prayer, and have chosen this place to myself for an house of sacrifice.

2 Chron. xx. 10. And now behold the children of Ammon, and Moab, and Mount Seir, whom *thou wouldst not let* Israel invade, when they came out of the land of Egypt, but they turned from them and destroyed them not; behold, I say, how they reward us, to come to cast us out of thy possession, which thou hast given us to inherit.

I trust that the preceding references to the Book of Deuteronomy, from Joshua to Chronicles, furnish evidence of the authorship and date of Deuteronomy, which is incontrovertible. After the arguments and facts adduced, I cannot think that those who have been brought up in the belief—and grown old in the belief that Moses was the author of the Book of Deuteronomy, will be startled out of it by Professor Smith's statement, that it is *most probable* that the writer of Deuteronomy was the editor of the whole history from Genesis to Kings; that *the style is certainly peculiar*, and might be easily imitated, and that it may have been so by a later writer. In any case, that it cannot possibly be as old as Moses. . . . Deuteronomy (it is said) was known to Jeremiah, but to no earlier prophet, and the whole theological stand-point is in accordance with that period. It gives the most spiritual view of the law, and if it be placed at the beginning of the theocratic

development, the whole of the subsequent history is unintelligible.

It is not likely that believers in Moses' authorship of Deuteronomy, will have their faith shaken merely by Professor Smith's averment that it is *most probable* that he was not so; or that they will be persuaded by the additional averment, that the style is so peculiar that it might be easily imitated, and that it may have been so by a later writer, and that in any case it cannot possibly be so old as that of Moses. These are very important averments, and such as seem to be unwarrantable, especially when unaccompanied by any kind of proof. It does not seem that the nature and intention of the article "Bible," was such as to warrant Professor Smith to make averments of such unsettling and dangerous tendency, which might tell a sad tale in subverting the faith of the unlearned and unstable, who might never see the reasons assigned by him for his opinions.

There is a great similarity between the style of Moses and Joshua, which is not surprising if it be remembered that Joshua was his minister, that a great part of the book which goes under his name is made up of quotations from Deuteronomy, and of references to it, and that one of the great purposes of the Book of Deuteronomy was to direct Joshua as to the occupation of Canaan, and to lay down the laws and constitutions by which the Israelites were to be governed and guided, and by which they *were* governed and guided; and also to direct them as to the treatment of the nations conquered by them. And looking at the marginal references in the Book of Joshua, it will be found that upwards of sixty of them are taken from Deuteronomy, and that as far as these references are concerned, there seems to be no difference between the one author and the other. There are laws, commands, prohibitions in Deuteronomy which are recognised, adopted, and carried out in the latter, as has been already shewn. There are also references and parallel passages which shew a connection between Deuteronomy and Judges, proving that the laws and ordinances in the former were obligatory upon

the Israelites while under the government of the latter. They shew a connection between commands in the former and obedience in the latter—prediction and fulfilment, prohibitions and their infraction, and the like, manifestly proving in the case of Judges, as well as Joshua, that the laws and constitutions in Deuteronomy were the laws and constitutions of the Jewish republic, and were not altered in any particular till the establishment of the regal government.

In Deuteronomy we find predictions of the effects of the intercourse of the Israelites with their idolatrous neighbours. It was predicted that in consequence they would be corrupted, conquered, and enslaved by them. We see the fulfilment of these predictions in the book of Judges, which but for divine interference would have defeated God's purposes towards His people. The book of Judges gives a melancholy example of the corruptions of the people and of the predicted consequences, of the slavery of the people to their conquerors, and of their tendencies to amalgamation with them. We see this in the style of the language even in the commonest words, and also in the introduction of new words and forms, resulting from the manners, customs, and usages of those among whom they lived. Of these I shall give instances in a separate article. It may be, however, remarked here generally that the style of Judges is very different from that of the previous books, which is an attestation of a different era, of forbidden intercourse with a foreign race more civilized than themselves as regards habits, usages, and luxuries, and highly distinguished for their idolatry and its abominations.

The Israelites seem to have been on a different footing with their heathen neighbours in the time of the Judges from what they were in the time of Joshua and his immediate successor. They were then frequently living as a conquered people, and were on the footing of a conquered people, which affected their language as well as their character, and hence the difference of style of the book of Judges from that of the Pentateuch and

Joshua. But of this I shall give examples, both from Judges and Samuel—a period during which the style underwent considerable changes, marking a different type from the era of the Pentateuch.

The Book of Deuteronomy is the portion of the Pentateuch against which the higher criticism directs its shaft with the greatest vigour and pertinacity. One would have thought that the drawing up a summary of the law previously given, was a most necessary proceeding. In the form in which it is found in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, it was not suitable for being read to the assembled multitudes of the Israelites, at the periods subsequently prescribed. There were instructions given at great length, and with great minuteness, for the erection of the tabernacle and all its furniture, and for the altar and all its vessels; and there are long and minute accounts of the execution of the whole of the work. There are, moreover, many laws which were only applicable to the Israelites in the wilderness, which it would have been unnecessary to read publicly after the occupation in Canaan, and the rehearsal of the whole would in itself have been a weariness of the flesh. What, then, could have been a more likely or reasonable proceeding than to summarise the contents of the three preceding books for the edification of the people in new circumstances, by such a work as the Book of Deuteronomy?

It was indispensably necessary for the Israelites to know the law upon which life and death were suspended, and to have it in such a form that without great inconvenience it might be publicly read to the people, that none might pretend ignorance of their duty, and that it should be strongly impressed upon them, with the consequences of obedience or disobedience. The law thus summarised in Deuteronomy, and enforced with all the consequences of obedience and disobedience, was indispensably necessary for the peoples' guidance, and its absence would have been a stronger and more rational argument against the wisdom

of the Lawgiver, than any that have been yet advanced in the works of the higher critics.

It is said that the style of Deuteronomy is very different from what is found in the three previous books. No wonder, as it was composed under different circumstances. It may be readily imagined that the style employed in the making of a law, would be different from that employed in its enforcement. And were not that the case, the style of an author might be different after an interval of forty years. The style of the same person in the present day is different in youth from manhood, and in manhood from old age. And it may be readily supposed that the state of Moses' feelings, in taking leave of the people who were connected with him by so many ties, would naturally affect the style in which he addressed them. After the interval too of forty years some changes might have taken place in the language, in the new circumstances and relations in which the people were placed in the wilderness, and in occasional intercourse with their neighbours; and in the enforcement of the law, and in the circumstances of leave-taking, new words and forms might naturally have been introduced, sufficient to raise the arguments which the higher criticism has suggested, to deny the claims of Moses to the authorship of the work. We are quite willing to admit all this, but we deny emphatically, till we have satisfactory evidence to the contrary, that there are forms and idioms, and even words, which can in any fairness tie down the style of Deuteronomy to the era of Jeremiah.

These are fair *à priori* arguments in favour of Moses' claim to the authorship of Deuteronomy. And it is not a weak argument in favour of his being its author that it was not, I may almost say ever, disputed by Jews or Christians till the era of the higher criticism. We might therefore in the circumstances fairly expect very strong reasons for setting aside Moses' long established claims.

Before adducing the reasons given by Professor Smith and

others, I might state some further reasons against the late authorship.

1. If the book of Deuteronomy had been necessary it would have been written at the time and under the circumstances in which it was written, and not at a period so close to the period of the Captivity and the termination of the Jewish State, when the King of Babylon and his armies were almost at the gates of Jerusalem, and the contemporary prophets had predicted the capture of the city and the exile and dispersion of its inhabitants.

2. If such a work was necessary for the correction of the national sins of the people, was there any previous period of their history in which such a work was not necessary? Moreover, if it was made public at the era of Jeremiah, where is there any record of its publication? where is there any intimation of its having been read in public? And if the people of Judah were not moved by Jeremiah's descriptions of their sins, and by his denunciations of the terrors of the Lord against them, is it likely that God would inspire a prophet to write such a book as Deuteronomy to reclaim them? If this was done it utterly failed. Is it likely, moreover, that this Deuteronomist, as he is called, would have been inspired in a way that no other prophet was inspired? The prophets were inspired with the knowledge of truths beyond the reach of the human faculties to predict or to discover. But the writing of the book of Deuteronomy in the days of Jeremiah required an amount of suggestive information upon common subjects different from anything that was ever known or heard of before or after Jeremiah's times. The iniquity of the people of Judah, exhibited in excesses in idolatry and vices of all kinds and shades of enormity, was never before equalled and never afterwards surpassed. No language could depict in stronger terms the enormity of the sins of the people of Judah in those times, nor the weight of the threatened denunciations fulminated against them, than what is found in the pages of Jeremiah. If these failed, is it likely that such



sinner would be moved by being told of the marches and countermarches of the Israelites through the wilderness to the promised land? All the minute legislation found in the Pentateuch was admirably calculated to guide and direct the people in the time of Joshua, but unlikely to suit the times of Jeremiah. The Lord swore to the Israelites, who had not the courage, in consequence of the report of the faint-hearted spies, to obey his orders to quit themselves like men, and face their enemies, gigantic in stature and dwelling in fenced cities with walls reaching up to heaven, that they should not enter into the promised rest. But such a threat was not likely to deter the sinners described by Jeremiah from *their* sins. The children of Israel in the wilderness were a stiff-necked, perverse, and rebellious generation, but what were they when compared with those in Jeremiah's times?

It was not the want of motives by which sinners could be impressed "to repent, and be converted that their sins might be blotted out," that such a means of converting them was required as the Book of Deuteronomy. The importance, necessity, and propriety of such a book as Deuteronomy for the purpose, which it bears on the face of it, it was intended to serve, is very manifest. And if such a teacher and sin-reprover, and denouncer of Divine judgment as Jeremiah was necessary in his times, one would almost think that the higher critics were sporting with the credulity and common sense of believers in God's Word, to propose, as an article of faith, a belief in the Book of Deuteronomy, first heard of in Jeremiah's times, written by almost plenary inspiration, in order to their conversion from sins of the deepest and most horrible dye. The raising Moses up as it were, from the dead, would imply that there was no prophet in the period to proclaim and denounce their guilt. Turn to the nineteenth chapter of Jeremiah, and see how that prophet deals with the sinners in his times; and if such dealing had no effect, is it probable that they would be corrected by the public reading of the book of Deuteronomy. "Go forth," said

the Lord to that prophet, “unto the valley of the son of Hinnom, and proclaim there the words that I shall tell thee : and say, Hear ye the word of the Lord, O kings of Judah, and inhabitants of Jerusalem ; thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, Behold, I will bring evil upon this place, the which whosoever heareth, his ears shall tingle. Because they have forsaken me, and have estranged this place, and have burned incense in it unto other gods, whom neither they nor their fathers have known, nor the kings of Judah, and have filled this place with the blood of innocents ; they have built also the high places of Baal, to burn their sons with fire for burnt-offerings unto Baal, which I commanded not, nor spake it, neither came it into my mind : therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that this place shall no more be called Tophet, nor The valley of the son of Hinnom, but The valley of slaughter. And I will make void the counsel of Judah and Jerusalem in this place ; and I will cause them to fall by the sword before their enemies, and by the hands of them that seek their lives ; and their carcases will I give to be meat for the fowls of the heaven, and for the beasts of the earth. And I will make this city desolate, and an hissing ; every one that passeth thereby shall be astonished and hiss, because of all the plagues thereof. And I will cause them to eat the flesh of their sons, and the flesh of their daughters, and they shall eat every one the flesh of his friend, in the siege and straitness wherewith their enemies, and they that seek their lives, shall straiten them. Then shalt thou break the bottle in the sight of the men that go with thee, and shalt say unto them, Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, Even so will I break this people, and this city, as one breaketh a potter’s vessel, that cannot be made whole again : and they shall bury them in Tophet, till there be no place to bury. Thus will I do unto this place, saith the Lord, and to the inhabitants thereof and even make this city as Tophet ; and the houses of Jerusalem, and the houses of the kings of Judah, shall be defiled as the place of Tophet, because of all the houses upon whose roofs they

have burnt incense unto all the host of heaven, and have poured out drink-offerings unto other gods.”

Having such a prophet as Jeremiah among them, the people could have had no need of such an extraordinary and unheard of means of reproof and correction of the national sins as the inspiration of a prophet to write the book of Deuteronomy. There are other arguments worthy of consideration against such a theory.

In the *first* place, it is dissimilar to any previous proceeding for the instruction of the people. In the *second* place, there appears to be no necessity for such a course, as there were sufficient, more direct, and more effectual means of doing so already existing. In the *third* place, there is no direct testimony, in any contemporary author, that it was written for the purpose alleged. In the *fourth* place, because it seems to be a very indirect and ineffectual means of answering the intended object. In the *fifth* place, because in the distracted condition of the country at the time, it seems difficult to imagine how such a document could have been communicated to the people; and if so, that listeners would have been obtained to hear so much that had no direct bearing upon their own circumstances. In the *next* place, it seemed very unlikely to answer the desired purpose, in consequence of its not directly pointing at the sinners whom it was to reclaim; and whom, if it was read, it utterly failed in reclaiming. Josiah's command and example on the reading of the Book of the Law had a temporary effect in resisting the torrent of iniquity. How long Josiah's influence continued we cannot tell, but that it was of short duration appears from the book of Jeremiah, who did not long survive Josiah. We have heard what Jeremiah says of them. Where is the evidence that the Deuteronomist of his times reclaimed sinners?

If it is asked what the evidence is of its being written at the time, and for the object alleged by the higher critics, the answer must be that there is no such evidence. It is maintained that

the allegation is without any foundation, and that the whole of the evidence is on the other side.

#### FINDING OF THE BOOK OF THE LAW BY HILKIAH.

The Book of the Law was found in the temple by Hilkiah, the high priest, in the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign over Judah, and in the twenty-first year of his age. He died at the age of thirty-nine. Jeremiah began to prophecy in the thirteenth year of Josiah's reign, and in the twenty-first year of his age.

The Book of the Law was read in the house of the Lord, in the presence of the king and the men of Judah, and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem with him, and their priests, and the prophets, and all the people, both small and great; in their ears were read all the words of the Book of the Covenant which was found in the house of the Lord. Was this, it may be asked, the whole of the Book of the Law, comprising Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, or Deuteronomy alone? It must, one might imagine, have been something that the hearers had known and heard of before, and had been taught to reverence, although it had disappeared for a time. If not, whence the dread that it inspired? If not, was it a book written at the time, professing to be a book that was lost, and which was foisted upon the people by a pious fraud? Had this been a fraud, the high priest and the other officers of the temple must have been accessories to it. King Josiah, one would think, when he saw the book would know whether it had the appearance of a book which had lain long in the temple, or whether it seemed to be a new one. They must, one would think, have held it to be the Book of the Law, which they must have all heard of, and which had been acknowledged to have been written by Moses, and publicly read to their fathers throughout their generations. The expression, *Book of the Law*, occurs only in Deut. xxviii. 61; xxix. 21; xxx. 10; xxxi. 26; and (with reference to Deut.) in Joshua i. 8; viii. 31-34; but nowhere else except in 2

Kings xxii. 8; and in 2 Chron. xxxiv. 15. It does not appear to have been used except as indicating Deuteronomy. This seems in itself a fair argument that that book alone was the *Book of the Law* found by Hilkiah. If this had been a Deuteronomy of their own times, the high priest and others must have been privy to the fraud; and it is extraordinary, if it was a fraud, that it was never detected, that not a suspicion of it oozed out till, comparatively speaking, a few years ago. One would think the people must have been well aware that it was an ancient, authoritative document before so many of them humbled themselves, confessed their sins, professed repentance, turned to the Lord, and made the sacrifices which the law required of them. They were bound by it to abandon their idolatries, and the abominations connected with them, which are so graphically described and denounced by the prophet Jeremiah.

There are certainly strong denunciations of idolatry in Deuteronomy, but they are all directed to the Israelites in Moses' times; and there are also curses denounced against them. And if they were to have a direct bearing upon sinners in Jeremiah's times, they would have been denounced with a more definite bearing upon the existing sins and sinners of the time, and not be almost smothered up amidst a variety of matters, of high interest indeed to the people when about to enter the promised land, but which had little or no bearing upon the circumstances and condition of the people in the time of Jeremiah. And if it was only written to terrify and reform the people, the denunciations in Leviticus, from which those in Deuteronomy are quoted, might have had equal effect, and would have saved the necessity of the novel and previously unheard of proceeding of writing the Book of Deuteronomy to terrify and reform them.

Such a revelation as that given to the pseudo-Moses is contrary to the analogy of any revelation previously given under the Old or New Testament dispensation.

Farther, it has been said that the people fell into the condition described by Jeremiah because the Law had been lost for a

time, and that they had no warnings of the consequences. I find that there were seven of the prophets who flourished earlier than Jeremiah, and who have left records of their prophecies, and denunciations against sin, previously to the era of that prophet, viz., B.C. 629. Of these the earliest, Isaiah, flourished 977 B.C.; Hosea, 785; Joel, 800; Amos, 787; Jonah, 862; Nahum, 750; Zephaniah, 630. All these, who threatened fearful denunciations against Judah and Israel for their idolatry and other sins, might have been naturally supposed to supersede the necessity of the pseudo-Deuteronomist. The sinners in Jeremiah's times might have listened to the Deuteronomist till their patience was exhausted before anything was said peculiarly applicable to their own case. They might have heard Deuteronomy read up to the twenty-eighth chapter before reference was made to the sins of their own times, and the denunciations proclaimed against them. And if it was the denunciations only which were to be read, the rest of the book was unnecessary. If they were great sinners in Isaiah's time, Isaiah, the earliest, rebukes them in such a manner as leaves no room for misunderstanding his intention and meaning. I shall merely quote the heading of a few of the chapters, leaving the reader to peruse them for his own satisfaction. Chap. i., v. 2, Isaiah's complaint of Judah; 10, he upbraideth their service; 16, he exhorteth to repentance, with promises and threatenings; 21, the prophet bewalleth their wickedness. Chap. ii., v. 1, Isaiah prophesieth Christ's kingdom; 6, wickedness is the cause of God forsaking his people; 10, the prophet forewarneth them of the terrible day of the Lord, and the powerful effects of God's majesty. Chap. iii., v. 1, the calamities coming upon Judah through sin; 10, different states of the righteous and the wicked; 12, the oppression and covetousness of the rulers; 16, the punishment of the women for their pride. Chap. iv., in the extremity of evil Christ's kingdom shall be a sanctuary. Chap. v., v. 1, under the parable of a vineyard, God excuseth his severe judgments; 8, his judgments upon covetousness; 11, upon

lasciviousness; 18, upon impiety; 20, upon injustice; 26, the executioners of God's justice.

Joel (800 B.C.), chap. i., declaring sundry judgments of God, exhorteth to observe them; 8, and to mourn; 14, he prescribeth solemn fasting and prayer, &c. Chap. ii., the terribleness of God's judgments; 12, he exhorteth to repentance; 15, prescribeth a fast and humiliation; 18, and pronounceth a blessing thereon.

Amos (B.C. 787), chap. iii., v. 1, The necessity of God's judgment against Israel; 9, the publication of it, with the causes thereof. Chap. iv., v. 1, God reproveth Israel for oppression; 4, for idolatry; 6, and for their incorrigibleness. Chap. v., v. 1, A lamentation for Israel; 4, an exhortation to repentance; 21, God refuseth their hypocritical service.

Hosea (B.C. 785), chap. ii., v. 1, The idolatry of the people; 6, God's judgments against them; 14, his promises of reconciliation with them. Chap. iv., v. 1, God's judgments against the sins of the people; 6, and of the priests; 12, against their idolatry; 15, Judah is exhorted to take warning by Israel's calamity, &c.

Zephaniah (B.C. 630), chap. i., v. 1, When he prophesied; 2, God's severe judgment against Judah for divers sins. Chap. ii., v. 1, An exhortation to repentance. Chap. iii., A sharp reproof of Jerusalem for divers sins; 8, an exhortation to wait for the restoration of Israel. Jeremiah flourished B.C. 629.

Such is the course used by the prophets, before and in Jeremiah's time, in dealing with sinners, viz., proclamation of sins, promises of pardon on amendment, and denunciations of Divine judgments upon the impenitent and incorrigible. This is a more natural, a more usual, and a more probable means of their conversion than by putting into their hands the Book of Deuteronomy. I have already given some grounds of the improbability of such a proceeding, and of the unlikelihood of its success had it been adopted.

## DIFFERENCE OF STYLE.

The argument from difference of style would seem to resolve itself into three lines:—

I.—The presence in Deuteronomy of *Archaic* words, and forms of inflexion, declension, &c., which are not found at all, or which can be shown to be gradually disappearing in the later books.

II.—The presence in the *later* books of words expressive of ideas, which in Deuteronomy are expressed by other and apparently older words, such as also occur in the first four books of Moses.

III.—Gradual introduction into the later books of new words which do not appear in Deuteronomy: partly derived from intercourse with foreigners, and partly expressive of new ideas arising out of a developed civilisation, or out of the altered fortunes or historical position of the kingdom, but all indicative of later date.

I.—Of the Archaic forms are הַיְהִיָּה for הִיָּה *be thou*; יָלַד for יָלְדָה *child*; תִּנְשָׁן for תִּנְשָׁה fem., *they drew near*; תִּהְיוּ for תִּהְיוּנָה fem., *they are*. הוּא for הִיא *she*, which occurs in the Pentateuch in all 195 times; and which is found 36 times in Deuteronomy. Nowhere is הִיא met with in the latter, though in the rest of the Pentateuch it occurs 11 times. In like manner, בַּעַר, *maiden*, a masculine instead of the feminine form בַּעֲרָה, which only occurs once. The demonstrative הַאֵל for הַאֵלָה, which according to Ewald is characteristic of the Pentateuch, occurs in Deut. iv. 42; vii. 22; xix. 11; and nowhere else but in 1 Chron. xx. 8.

The Archaic forms above quoted, found in Deuteronomy and nowhere else but in the books preceding it, are, indeed, few in number but so peculiar, that without farther evidence of the



antiquity of the Pentateuch drawn from other sources, they tie down its place in the Sacred Canon to that which it professes to hold.

See more examples of Archaisms in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, Art. "Pentateuch," pp. 782-3; and especially in the admirable and thoroughly exhaustive work on the *Books of Moses, or, The Pentateuch, &c.*, by the Rev. W. Smith, Ph. D., formerly one of the Professors at Blair's Catholic College.

II.—Another peculiarity, exhibiting difference between the earlier and later style, is the frequency, in the former, of the affix called ה *locale*, with the meaning of *ward, towards, to*, and sometimes *into* of place, *e.g.*, דִּתְיָנָה, *to Dothan*; מִצְרַיִמָּה, *towards, to, Egypt*; אֶרֶץ, *to, into, towards, the land*. This affix is undoubtedly a characteristic of the style of the Pentateuch. It is used 130 times in Genesis, and 30 times in Deuteronomy. It occurs much seldomer in Judges, Samuel, and the later writers, who frequently employ no prefix at all; and sometimes אֶל, *and latterly לְ*, which last, I believe, is never used in the Pentateuch.

In most cases there is no prefix or affix in the later books indicating direction towards, *e.g.*, גַּת יֹסֵב, *let it be carried round to Gath*; עֶקְרוֹן, *to Ekron*, twice, 1 Sam. vi. 16, and v. 10; הַשָּׁמַיִם, *to the heavens*, 1 Sam. v. 12—for הַשָּׁמַיִמָּה in Pentateuch, Deut. iv. 19, xxx. 12; בֵּית שֵׁמֶשׁ, *to Beth-Shemish*, 1 Sam. vi. 9; הַגִּלְגָּל, *to Gilgal*, 1 Sam. x. 8; הַמִּצְרַיִם, *to, towards Egypt*, 1 Sam. xii. 8—in Pentateuch מִצְרַיִמָּה.

III.—Examples of the gradual introduction into the *later* books of new words which do not appear in Deuteronomy, partly derived from intercourse with foreigners, and partly expressive of new ideas, arising out of a developed civilisation, or out of the altered fortunes or historical position of the kingdom, but all indicative of later date.

זָרַע אֲנָשִׁים, *seed of men, male seed, males*, 1 Sam. i. 11. Moses used the word נָקָר, *a male*.—אֵל רֹאשׁוֹ וּמִזְרָה לֹא יֵעָלֶה, 1 Sam. i. 11, *and there shall no razor come upon his head*. Earlier form תַּעַר לֹא יַעֲבֹר עַל רֹאשׁוֹ, Num. vi. 5. מִזְרָה is likewise used for a razor in Judges, but no where else.

קָשָׁה, *was heavy as the hand of God*, 1 Sam. v. 7—*was too high, too difficult*, Deut. i. 17.

The following are words expressive of common objects found in the book of 1 Samuel, or expressed differently there:—

מִנְחָה אַחַת אַפָּיִם, *one portion of two faces, a double portion*, 1 Sam. i. 5. Not used in the Pentateuch.—מְיֵדִי עֲלֵתָהּ, *when she went up*, an idiomatic expression, i. 7.—רָמָה קִרְנֵי, *hath exalted my horn*, ii. 1.—רָחַב פִּי, *my mouth hath been enlarged*, ii. 1.—נִתְּבְנוּ, *are weighed*, ii. 3.—מִצּוֹק, *pillar*, ii. 8.—תְּבַל, *the world, terarum orbis*; never used before—often afterwards, ii. 8.—דוּד, *a pot*, ii. 14.—אֶת־פְּנֵי יְהוָה, *before the Lord*, ii. 17, 18.—לִפְנֵי יְהוָה, *id.*, Gen. x. 9, and xviii. 22.—שׁוֹעָה, *ery*, imploring aid, 1 Sam. v. 12. צִעָקָה in Pentateuch, Gen. xviii. 20.—רָאָה, *feared*, 1 Sam. ix. 5; earlier word, יָרָא, *feared*, Deut. i. 29.—תְּשׁוּבָה, *gift, oblation*, 1 Sam. ix. 7.—מִתְּנָה, *gift*, Gen. xxv. 6.—נִטָּשׁ, *left off*, 1 Sam. x. 2.

Such examples might be multiplied. The following are examples of the numeral אֶחָד, *one*, used as the definite article, which is never so used in the Pentateuch, *e.g.*, יוֹם אֶחָד, *on a day*, on a certain day, 1 Sam. ix. 15. גִּד אֶחָד, *a heap*, Josh. iii. 13. לֶפֶד אֶחָד, *a torch*, Judges xv. 4. פְּרַעַשׁ אֶחָד, *a flea*, 1 Sam. xxiv. 14. This idiom never appears in the Pentateuch, but does so in the New Testament, *e.g.*, *συκῆν μίαν*, *a fig tree*, Matt. xxi. 19; *μία χήρα*, *a widow*, a certain widow, Mark xii. 42.

The footing upon which the Israelites were with the Canaanitish nations in the time of the Judges seems to have had considerable influence upon the Israelites. Never were they

before in a more degraded state, in regard to their religious and moral condition, than they were during that period. Their amalgamation with their wicked and idolatrous neighbours, who were highly advanced in civilisation considering the period in which they lived, notwithstanding their being sunk in idolatry and moral degradation, had a marked influence upon their language as well as character. These changes are very striking in the book of Judges; and the increased copiousness of the language, and the introduction of new words at periods descriptive of alterations manners and customs, are of themselves evidences of the truth of the facts recorded in the history.

The following are illustrations of what has been said of the advancement at that time both of the arts and luxuries of life. They relate, first, to the ornaments; *e.g.*, אֲדָרֶת שֶׁנָּעַר, Judges viii. 26. The former word, signifying *pullium* or *cloak*, appears for the first time—according to Gesenius it is so called from its size—a *spacious Babylonian robe embroidered with forms of birds and beasts*. בְּגָדֵי הָאֲרָגָמָן, *the purple garments worn by the kings of Midian*, Judges viii. 21. עֵבֶעַ, *a dyed garment*, cognate טִבֵּעַ, *dippel*, Judges v. 30. הַשְּׂמִיכָה, *the coverlet which Jael spread over Sisera*, Judges iv. 18. This word is no where else found; it is probably the same kind of garment as that expressed in the Pentateuch by הַשְּׂמָלָה, *the hyke or plaid*, the loose outer garment also used to sleep in. שְׂהַרְגִּים, *crescent shaped ornaments, small moons*, Judges viii, 21. נְטִיפֹת, *ear-drops*, Judges viii. 26—from נָטַף, *dropped*, which is not found in the Pentateuch. עֵזְקוֹת, some sort of *chains* fastened about camel's necks, Judges viii. 26.

The following are architectural allusions:—

עֲלִית הַמְּקָרָה, *chamber of cooling, or refreshing a summer parlour*, Judges iii. 20, 24. הַמְּסָרוֹן, *the porch of the palace of Eglon, king of Moab*, Judges iii. 23, so called from the rows of pillars supporting it. See סְדָרִים, in Lex. אֲשָׁב, *latticed*

*window*, Judges v. 28. The words used in Genesis for the admission of light are זָהָר and הִלּוֹן, Gen. vi. 16, and viii. 6.

The following are words expressive of articles of food and household furniture not used by Moses:—

מָרָק, *broth*, Judges vi. 19, and only there. נַלְוִל and נַלְוִלָּה, some kind of *cake*, Judges vii. 13. סִפְלָה, some kind of *bowl* or *dish*, Judges v. 25, vi. 38.

The following are common ideas expressed in the books written between the eras of David and Moses, not found in the Pentateuch:—

שָׁסִים, *spoilers*, verb שָׁסַם, *spoiled*, Judges ii. 14. In Pentateuch גָּזַל, *spoiled*, Deut. xxviii. 29; and בָּזַז, Deut. iii. 7. נֶאֱדָר, *a skin of wine, milk, &c.*, Judges iv. 19; and חֶמֶת, the same, Gen. xxi. 15, 19. שִׁבְרַת, *breaking of a dream*, an interpretation, Judges vii. 15. פְּפֻרֹן, *interpretation*; and פָּתַר, only in Gen. xl. 5, 8, 12, 18; and xli. 11.

What I have said is but a sample of the evidence of *style* and of difference of *era*. The object and dimensions of this pamphlet prevent me from doing justice to the subject, which would require more time than I have been able to devote to it; and I have probably written more than most of my readers will read. I may, however, have some credit for my diligence in having traced out most of the examples which I have furnished. It is with regret that I differ so widely from the distinguished and accomplished Professor Smith; and it is only a sense of duty, which has enabled me to overcome my reluctance to combat opinions expressed by him, which appear to me to be erroneous.





**Gaylord Bros.**  
**Makers**  
**Syracuse, N. Y.**  
PAT. JAN. 21, 1908

BS1225.4 .P32  
The authorship and date of the books of

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00040 9120