



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

MOSES, OR THE ZULU?

W. WICKES, M.A. Digitized by Google



600084959%

MOSES, OR THE ZULU?

A DETAILED REPLY

TO THE

OBJECTIONS CONTAINED IN PARTS I. AND II.

OF

BISHOP COLENSO'S WORK.

BY THE

REV. W. WICKES, M.A.,

FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE;
PROFESSOR OF MATHEMATICS IN M'GILL COLLEGE, MONTREAL;
AND RECTOR OF THE HIGH SCHOOL, QUEBEC;

AND NOW ASSOCIATION SECRETARY OF THE COLONIAL AND CONTINENTAL CHURCH SOCIETY.

With a Preface

BY THE REV. J. C. RYLE, B.A.,

VICAR OF STRADBROKE, SUFFOLK.

Γινέσθω ὁ Θεὸς ἀληθής, πᾶς δὲ ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης.—Rom. iii. 4.

LONDON:

WERTHEIM, MACINTOSH, AND HUNT,

24, PATERNOSTER-BOW,

AND 23, HOLLES-STREET, CAVENTISH-SQUARE.

1863.

100. p. 106.





TO THE RIGHT REVEREND
JOSEPH COTTON, LORD BISHOP OF ROCHESTER,
THE FIRST OF OUR BISHOPS WHO PUBLICLY CONDEMNED
BISHOP COLENZO'S WORK,

This Reply

IS, BY PERMISSION OF HIS LORDSHIP,
MOST RESPECTFULLY AND GRATEFULLY INSCRIBED.

P R E F A C E.

THE Author of "Moses, or the Zulu?" has requested me to preface his work by a few recommendatory remarks. I have much pleasure in doing so, though I hardly think his volume requires any "imprimatur" of mine. I do it, of course, with the distinct understanding that I do not profess to be responsible for every critical remark which the work contains.

Bishop Colenso's famous book, in my humble judgment, is so exceedingly weak and open to criticism that I do not expect it will do much harm. The man whose faith is shaken by it must be a very weak and credulous person, or a person who wants an excuse for becoming an unbeliever. Many replies to the book have been already published. Many more, I have no doubt, will yet appear. All of these replies of course cannot be read. But to any one who desires to see a plain, calm examination of many of the Bishop's alleged difficulties in the Pentateuch, I think the present work will supply much useful information.

The Bishop of Natal's book is certainly a most remarkable phenomenon. It proves undoubtedly that there are some "new things under the sun." In plain English, there are some things I never could have believed possible, if I had not seen this book.

(1.) For instance, I never could have believed it possible that a highly-educated Cambridge man, and a Clergyman, could have seen so many difficulties in the Pentateuch where none really exist, and where a closer and more accurate study of the Bible would have shown him that it is he, and not Moses, who has made mistakes.

(2.) Again, I never could have believed it possible that any Protestant Bishop could have exhibited such total ignorance of the fact that many of his alleged difficulties have been known, considered, and answered long ago by commentators and expositors, of whom he seems to know nothing.

(3.) Again, I never could have believed it possible that any reasonable man, writing on controversial topics, could have exhibited such a transparent determination to see nothing except in his own point of view,—assuming utter absurdities to be truths when they are in his favour, and denying probabilities to be possible when they are against him.

(4.) Again, I never could have believed it possible that any one calling himself a Christian would have so coolly ignored God's *miraculous agency* as the plain solution of some of his supposed difficulties. Had the book come from an anonymous author, I should have said, "This

man is an infidel. He evidently regards miracles as a kind of perilous lumber, which must be thrown overboard at any risk.' Yet the author is a professing Christian!

(5.) Again, I never could have believed it possible that any one would publish so elaborate an attack on the authorship of the Pentateuch and the veracity of its historical facts, and yet pass over in silence the enormous mass of direct evidence by which the Pentateuch can be supported. The Bishop of Natal has mustered and paraded his difficulties of belief. Has he ever weighed fairly and reckoned up the difficulties of unbelief?

(6.) Finally, I never could have believed it possible that any Bishop of the Church of England could put forth such a book, and yet retain office a single day as a minister of the Church of England, much less as a Bishop. If the clergy of the diocese of Natal can recognise Bishop Colenso as their spiritual superior after writing such fearful things about our Lord Jesus Christ as he has put forth in the Preface to his First Volume, they are a strange body of men. The eyes of the Church are upon them. Let us hope that they will act in a manner worthy of the emergency.

I have no fear for the cause of Christ's truth from Bishop Colenso's attack. The Word of God has passed through furnaces seven times hotter than that which the Bishop has heated, and come out unscathed, unharmed, and purer than before. The same thing will happen again. Men will examine the evidences of Scripture with renewed diligence, and their faith will be strengthened by the examination. High Churchmen, it is to

be hoped, will find out that men like the Bishop of Natal do not deserve the confidence they were so ready to place in him a few years ago, in spite of the warnings of the "Record" newspaper. Evangelical Churchmen, it is to be hoped, will find out that a few spiritual thoughts and nice doctrinal statements are not sufficient to make an able divine in these latter days. They must really learn to read and think far more than most of them do, and to remember the advice of that "prince in Israel," Richard Cecil, "never to forget the infidels." Both parties in the country, I trust, will get good from the controversy, and will find that, after all, they have much common ground. It is no time for disunion when the sceptic and the unbeliever are undermining our walls.

For the Church of England, as an Establishment, I own that I feel many fears, if the Bishop of Natal is allowed to hold on his way, and to exercise his calling and ministry unchallenged, unrebuked, and undisturbed. Prosecutions for heresy no doubt are hateful things, but circumstances may make them not only necessary, but a positive duty. A more flagrant case than the present one can hardly be imagined. If Bishop Colenso is a sound member of the Church of England, the Archbishops and nearly all the Bishops are not.

If nothing is done by those who ought to move in the matter, and the Bishop of Natal is let alone, we must not be surprised if the enemies of the Church of England draw some such conclusions as the following:—

Either—they will say—the bishops do not consider distinct views of the veracity of Scripture necessary, and

a man may believe anything he pleases about the Bible, and yet be a Churchman :

Or else—they will say—the Bishops consider Dr. Colenso's book unanswerable, and are not able to reply to his arguments, and to prove him wrong :

Or else—they will say—the Bishops have no power to call Dr. Colenso to account, and there is no such thing as discipline for the Episcopal body. Presbyters like Williams, and Wilson, and Heath, may be tried and condemned for heresy, but you may never touch a Bishop :

Or else—they will say—the Bishops are afraid of controversy. They dread the attacks of the Edinburgh Reviewers, of the "Saturday Review," the "Athenæum," and the "Morning Star." They will make any sacrifice for a quiet life. They love peace so much better than truth, that not even Bishop Colenso's book can move them to action.

Any of these conclusions would be humiliating and melancholy. But each and all of them will be drawn, if the Bishops sit still and do nothing. The Church of England will be disgraced in the eyes of Christendom, as a Church whose Bishops went to the stake for the truth in the sixteenth century, but tolerated undisguised infidelity within her pale in 1863.

That God may bless this volume, and every kindred effort to maintain unimpaired the honour of His holy Word, is my heart's desire and prayer.

J. C. RYLE.

STRADBROKE VICARAGE, SUFFOLK,

May 1, 1863.

INTRODUCTION.

MY object, in the following pages, has been to furnish a concise, and (as far as I might be able) a complete reply to Bishop Colenso's various objections.

I have, throughout, sought to compare Scripture with Scripture, and to make *the Word of God explain itself*.

I have not, intentionally, allowed a single difficulty, advanced by the Bishop, to pass unexamined and unanswered.

At the same time, I beg to state that I have derived but very little assistance from the Replies hitherto published. Indeed, my own Reply to Part I. was printed in February last, and *before* the most able of those works (as Dr. M'Caul's, Mr. Birks's, and the "Layman's") had appeared.

I venture to draw attention to the attempt made, in pp. 105—151, to show the *appropriateness* of the use of the two Divine names, JEHOVAH and ELOHIM, as they occur in the Pentateuch,—in opposition to the Document-theory of Germany, adopted by the Bishop;—and to the proofs, advanced in pp. 152—179, that *the*

whole of the Pentateuch, as it has come down to us (excepting the last chapter of Deuteronomy), *is the work of Moses*,—in opposition to the Interpolation-theory of our own divines.

May the Lord graciously accept and bless this humble effort to uphold the honour and integrity of His holy Word!

W. W.

7, PARK PLACE TERRACE, PADDINGTON, .

April 30, 1863.

The profits of this work (if any) will be given to the COLONIAL
AND CONTINENTAL CHURCH SOCIETY.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Preface by the Rev. J. C. Ryle	v
Introduction	xi

PART I.

Chapter		
	The Bishop's Preface	1—2
I.	The Case of the Slave (Ex. xxi. 21) considered	2—7
II. & III.	The Genealogy of Judah	8—12
IV. & V.	The Gathering of all the People together	12—13
VI.	The Extent of the Camp	13—16
VII.	The Numbering of the People	16—20
VIII.	The Israelites dwelling in Tents	20—21
IX.	The Israelites armed	22—23
X.	The Institution of the Passover	24—25
XI.	The March out of Egypt	25—30
XII.	The Sheep and Cattle in the Desert	30—39

Chapter	Page
XIII. The number of Israelites compared with the extent of the Land of Canaan	40—41
XIV. The First-born	42—44
XV. The Sojourning of the Israelites in Egypt	44—45
XVI. The Exodus in the Fourth Generation	45—47
XVII. The Number of Israelites at the time of the Exodus	48—55
XVIII. & XIX. The Danites and Levites at ditto	56—61
XX. The Number of Priests at the Exodus	62—69
XXI. The Celebration of the Second Passover	69—72
XXII. The War on Midian	72—78
XXIII. General	79—88

PART II.

The Bishop's Preface	91—101
I. Signs of Different Authors in the Pentateuch	101—107
II. Elohistie and Jehovistic	107—151
III. & IV. The Title, "Books of Moses"	152—153
V. & VI. Signs of Later Date in the Pentateuch	154—182
VII. Was Samuel the First Author of the Pentateuch?	182—183
VIII.—XI. The Names compounded with Jehovah	184—186
XII.—XVIII. The Davidic Psalms	186—189
Concluding Remarks	189—191

REPLY TO

PART I.

**“THE PENTATEUCH EXAMINED AS AN
“HISTORICAL NARRATIVE.”**

MOSES, OR THE ZULU?

THE BISHOP'S PREFACE.

"If ye believe not his [i.e. Moses'] writings, how shall ye believe MY words?" (John v. 47.)

As I purpose, in my concluding chapter, making some general remarks on the Bishop's Preface and Introduction, I shall here only draw attention to the conclusion the Bishop sets before us, in p. xxxi,—the bare enunciation of which must shock every devout mind,—in reference to the teaching and ministry of our Blessed Lord, whilst here on earth. The Bishop finds no difficulty in considering that our Lord's knowledge was *limited* and *imperfect*,—that He was **LIABLE TO ERR**,—and that, in particular, He knew no more than the most pious and learned adults of His nation, on the subject of the authorship, age, and historical value of the different portions of the Pentateuch. As *they* went wrong on these points, so did *He*!

The Bishop has been driven to this conclusion, in order to escape from our Lord's repeated testimony to "Moses and the Prophets." This testimony—so clear in its recognition of the historical reality of Moses, as a **MAN**, and the authority of Moses, as a **PROPHET**—furnished, in itself, a *fatal* objection to the Bishop's newly-adopted views; and so, (as the alternative of abandoning those views could not be for a moment entertained,) our Lord Himself is put out of court as a witness; and He, who was ²¹*full of grace and truth*,—He, on whom the Spirit rested

without measure,—He, who claimed to be *one with the Father*,—He, who said of Himself, speaking of His own eternal existence (and therefore of *His knowledge of all things from the beginning*), “Before Abraham was, I AM,”—He is made to appear (I almost tremble to write the words) a fallible mortal, like ourselves!

And will it then come to this, that the Lord Jesus Christ, on the Great Judgment Day,—in the presence of His Father and the Holy Angels, and the dead, both small and great, that shall stand before His Throne,—will have to confess that He has misinformed and misled His people?—O no! Perish the thought! He is “THE FAITHFUL AND TRUE WITNESS.” “If we believe not, yet *He* abideth faithful, “HE CANNOT DENY HIMSELF.”

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

In this chapter the Bishop alludes incidentally (p. 9) to what he considers *the defective morality* of the Law of Moses.

St. Paul thought “the commandment holy, and just, and “good.” The Bishop does not hesitate to speak of it in terms the very reverse.

He tells us that he was one day translating the Bible with the help of an intelligent Christian native into the Zulu tongue, when they came to Exodus xxi. 4, and 20, 21:—

“If the master [of a Hebrew^w servant] have given him a wife, and she have borne him sons or daughters; the wife “and her children shall be her master's, and he shall go “out by himself:”—

“The wife and children in such a case” (suggests the Bishop), “being “placed under the protection of such words as these:”—

“ And if a man smite his servant, or his maid, with a rod, and he die under his hand ; he shall be surely punished. Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished : for he is his money.”

“ Never shall I forget,” (says the Bishop), “ the revulsion of feeling, with which this Christian native first heard these words, as words said to be uttered by the same Great and Gracious Being whom I was teaching him to trust in and adore. His whole soul revolted against the notion, that the Great and Blessed God, the Merciful Father of all mankind, would speak of a servant or maid as mere ‘ money,’ and allow a horrible crime to go unpunished, because the victim of the brutal usage had survived a few hours. My own heart and conscience at the time fully sympathized with his. But I then clung to the notion, that the main substance of the narrative was historically true. And I relieved his difficulty and my own, for the present, by telling him, that *I supposed such words as these were written down by Moses, and believed by him to have been divinely given to him, because the thought of them arose in his heart, as he conceived, by the inspiration of God, and that hence to all such laws he prefixed the formula, ‘ Jehovah said unto Moses,’ without it being on that account necessary for us to suppose that they were actually spoken by the Almighty.*”

And so, when this weak brother, lately brought in from heathenism, was sitting at the Bishop’s feet for instruction, and looking up into the Bishop’s face for some solution of a difficulty at which he stumbled in the Word of God, the only reply he received was, ‘ *that Moses was deceiving himself and deceiving others!*’ Might not the Bishop (I ask, in all sorrow) have paused before he gave so off-hand an answer;—an answer so dishonouring to God, and so calculated to shake the faith of an unestablished convert, aye, and to help him make shipwreck of his soul’s salvation? Might he not at least have made the attempt to *harmonize* the law before him with the *general spirit* of those other laws that regulated the treatment of the Jewish slave? Might he not have drawn his disciple’s attention to the many kind and merciful ordinances whereby a God of love sought to *improve* the slave’s condition? Might he not have shown him how, in this very

chapter (ver. 2), no Hebrew was allowed to be kept in servitude for *more than six years* ; how (ver. 3), at the end of that period, if he had brought his wife with him, he was to take her back again ; how (Deut. xv. 13, 14) he was not to be sent away *empty*, but was to be *liberally* furnished out of the flock, and the floor, and the wine-press ; how (Ex. xxi. 26, 27) he, or any other slave, if brutally treated by his master, *e.g.*, so as to lose an eye or a tooth—became instantly free, for his eye or for his tooth's sake ; and have thus led his Zulu friend to see that One, who watched with such tenderness over the poor slave, would surely lay down no law which would expose him to harsh and cruel treatment ?

Thus, with reference to the slave-marriage, spoken of in ver. 4, the man had only to wait, if his wife were a Hebrew, till the six years of *her* bondage had expired, and then he could claim her and his children as his own ; and if she were an alien, he had the option of staying with his master, and continuing to live with his wife and children : *the master had no power to separate husband and wife, when they wished to live together* ; and when the husband preferred liberty to remaining with his wife, *her* condition was simply that of every *free-born* matron in Israel, to whom the husband was allowed to give a bill of divorce and send her away.

With respect to the cases mentioned in ver. 20 and 21, a little preliminary consideration is necessary. The first of these verses in the Hebrew reads, " If a man smite his servant or his maid, with THE ROD, &c.," not with " A ROD," as our translation has it ; and, trifling as the difference may seem, I cannot but think that the whole explanation of the passage turns on this, the more correct, rendering.

THE ROD is constantly used in the Bible as the symbol of *moderate, but necessary correction*. Thus, God Himself puts THE ROD into the hand of the parent, and *bids him use it*. (Prov. xiii. 24, and xxiii. 13, 14.) And THE ROD, in God's

own hand, is not *a sword* wherewith He slays His people ; but “ whom the Lord *loveth* He chasteneth, and scourgeth *every son* whom He receiveth.” (Heb. xii. 6.) “ Hear ye *THE ROD*, and who hath appointed it.” (Micah vi. 9.)

And so, in the passage before us, *THE ROD* was the instrument allowed, both by the law of God and the custom of the age, to the master, for the *moderate correction* of his slave.*

The law recognised the master's right to punish with *THE ROD*, and *protected* him in the exercise of that right ; on the other hand, the law *limited* him to the use of the rod, and allowed no other instrument. *THE ROD* was not in itself a murderous weapon, and, therefore, if the master confined himself to it, the law supposed, even when serious consequences followed, that he could only have intended the *correction*, not the *death* of his slave. The law took the merciful view of the case, and who shall say that it was wrong ? Let the Bishop open any work that tells of the state of slavery in the Southern States of America, and he will see that where a master wilfully and maliciously aims at taking away the life of a slave, he uses other instruments than *a rod* to do it. The fearful lash, tearing flesh away at every blow, the bowie-knife, the revolver, the axe, the halter, the blazing fire, are some of the murderous means that he employs. But had a Hebrew master put his servant to death in any such way, whether the servant died at once, or lingered for a day or two, the master would unquestionably have paid the penalty of his cruelty by *his own death*. (Ex. xxi. 12 ; Lev. xxiv. 17.) The case contemplated is that of *ACCIDENTAL DEATH UNDER MODERATE CORRECTION*,—a case for which legislation has always found it necessary to provide, in coun-

* *THE ROD* was used, as an instrument of punishment, by the ancient Egyptians. (See *Wilkinson*, II. 40.) And so highly do the Moslems of the Nile still appreciate it, as a harmless but effective weapon, that they have a saying :—“ The stick (= rod) came down from heaven, a blessing from God.”

tries where slavery exists. Thus, in the statutes of the State of Georgia:—

“Any person who shall maliciously dismember, or deprive a slave of life, shall suffer such punishment as would be inflicted in case the like offence had been committed on a free white person, and on the like proof, except in case of insurrection by such slave, and unless *death should happen by accident*” is giving such slave moderate correction.” (Cobb’s Dig., 1851, p. 1125.)

Now, is there anything immoral or inhuman in such a provision? The statute just quoted (*O si sic omnia !*) protects master and slave alike. And so did the Jewish law.*

The Bishop must remember that, where slavery exists, the master is not likely to give up the right he has always possessed, of administering castigation, with his own hand, to his slaves.† All, that the law can do, is to step in, and try and cultivate (which the Jewish law did to an extent that no other laws have done, or attempted to do) a humane and kindly spirit on the part of the master to the poor beings who are in his power,—protect *them*, on the one hand, against any *abuse* of that power,—and protect *him*, on the other, against any consequences unintentionally following from *the lawful exercise* of that power. I unhesitatingly assert that the Jewish code, viewed as a whole, was not only

* The question might now be asked, Why should the master have been punished in the one case, more than in the other? Why not, in both cases, have been allowed to go free? Here, if the Bishop pleases, there is a difficulty, but of quite a different kind from that which he has started, and of comparatively little consequence. Hävernicks’s opinion is, that there is a reference to an ancient custom, which the law simply endorsed. Many similar instances might be cited of the law not interfering with what it found already established. That such customs often present *anomalies*, without contravening the great principles of truth and justice, we need not go out of England to prove.

† An attempt was made by our own Home Government, in a circular dated May, 1823, to abolish, in our slave-colonies, the punishment of flogging in the case of females, and the carrying of whips on the field. The burst of indignation in the colonies was violent and unanimous. Jamaica spoke of asserting its independence! So jealous are slave-masters of interference with their rights in this respect.

vastly more favourable to the slave than any other code of ancient or modern times ; but that it *did* hold, with *impartial hand*, (which they have never done,) the balance between the rights of the master and the rights of the slave. And what was the consequence ? Before our Lord appeared, *slavery had died out* among the Jews. Although, of course, I do not mean to say that in this, or in some other respects, THE LAW of Moses came up to the high and perfect standard of THE GOSPEL. Some things were by *it* tolerated, which to *us* are forbidden.

“ So law appears imperfect, and but given
With purpose to resign them, in full time,
Up to a BETTER COVENANT.”

NOTE.—I cannot forbear from quoting a part of Michaelis' remarks on the verses we have been considering :—

“ It is to be observed, that it is the master who is here spoken of as beating *his own* slave, and that the instrument of chastisement is specified, viz., a *stick* ; so that the law does not extend to the case of his punishing him in a manner utterly unusual, such as that, for instance, of running him through the body with a sword, or breaking his skull with an axe. *In every nation where slavery is established, a master must have a right to chastise his slaves.* If they are obstinate, and provoke him into a passion, his blows may prove fatal, contrary to his inclination ; but a predetermination to kill a slave will not be imputed to him.....For, if he has a right to beat, and to beat severely, (and without such a right slavery can hardly subsist, particularly where captives, taken in war, are enslaved,) as there may be slaves who rebel under correction, and by their insolent language provoke him to such a degree that, in the excess of his rage, he may happen to give one of them such a blow with his stick (certainly not in itself a murderous weapon) as to kill him on the spot ; it were very hard indeed, that, for a mere excess in a permitted act, he should be condemned to atone with his life. I therefore suspect that, in such a case, the Israelitish master was subjected only to an arbitrary punishment, [generally considered, a fine,] which, according to the variation of circumstances, was regulated by the pleasure of the judge.”—*Comm. on Laws of Moses, Art. 277.*

Perhaps these remarks may convince the Bishop of the injustice of the charge he has brought against the Word of God.

CHAPTERS II. AND III.

THE GENEALOGY OF JUDAH.

“And the sons of Judah; Er, and Onan, and Shelah, and Pharez, and Zarah: but Er and Onan died in the land of Canaan. And the sons of Pharez were Hezron and Hamul.” (Gen. xlv. 12.)*

THE whole difficulty, started by the Bishop in these chapters, will vanish, if we can prove that ^HHezron and Hamul, Judah's grandchildren, *might have been born*, at the time of Jacob's going down into Egypt. It seems necessary to be able to do this, as, otherwise, the number of seventy souls, mentioned in verse 27, as accompanying Jacob, will not be complete.

In the first place, I cannot allow that the date, which the Bishop has fixed on for Judah's marriage, is the correct one. Because the words “at that time” occur in Gen. xxxviii. 1, the Bishop concludes that the marriage, which is there recorded, took place *immediately after* the events related in the preceding chapter. But surely the Bishop must be aware that the expression “at that time,”† like the corresponding one “in those days” of the New Testament, is used with great latitude of meaning; so that, in all probability, it simply refers in this case to the period spoken of in the first verse of ch. xxxvii., the period that elapsed between

* The Bishop leaves out the word “were,” in quoting this verse, showing that he could not have looked at the Hebrew text, which introduces the substantive verb here, *and nowhere else* in the whole of the genealogy. May not the Sacred Writer have intended to draw attention to the fact, that Hezron and Hamul *were actually born* at this time?

† Let me give one instance, 2 Chron. xxx. 3, referring back to ch. xxix. 3.

the departure from Shechem, and the descent into Egypt. Judah then may have been married several years before, although the chief event narrated in ch. xxxviii. did undoubtedly take place after Joseph had been sold into bondage (as narrated in ch. xxxvii.), and so finds its true historical place in this connexion.

Again, Judah's age may have been *somewhat more* than the Bishop makes it. As Leah's-children followed each other very rapidly (Gen. xxix. 32—35), there was probably an interval of fully three and a-half years between his birth and that of Joseph (Gen. xxx. 25). Then, as Joseph was in his fortieth year, when his father came down to Egypt, and perhaps near the close of it, (for the numbers mentioned in Gen. xli. 46 and xlv. 11, are, of course, only *round* numbers,) Judah may at that time have been in the middle of his forty-fourth year, instead of *forty-two*, as the Bishop supposes.

I must now ask my readers to divest themselves of English notions, and to transport themselves to the East, where customs prevail that are very different from our own.

One of those customs is, *marriage at a very early period of life*,—the human frame developing itself much more rapidly, and attaining to maturity much sooner than with us.

Ten and twelve are mentioned as common ages for the bride and bridegroom in India.*

Among the Arabs, circumcision takes place at thirteen, and marriage soon after, whilst girls are sometimes betrothed at seven, and married at nine. This was the age of Mahomet's favourite wife (Aysha), when he espoused her.†

Dr. Ewald, chaplain to Bishop Gobat, writing to me, says:

"The Jews in the East and in Africa marry very early, males after thirteen years, and females after ten, and even before. I have known *many such* in the

* Capper's "Three Presidencies of India," p. 418.

† Washington Irving's "Life of Mahomet," p. 90.

East and Africa. The Jews do in this respect what all natives do, both Mohammedan and Christian."

But what, perhaps, will most astonish my readers, is that *our own laws* * lay down *fourteen* as the marriageable age for men, and *twelve* for women, and so far *recognise marriage contracted at even an earlier age*, as to count it binding, if both parties, when they arrive at the ages of fourteen and twelve respectively, are willing to live together. Nay, our law even supposes that *children may be born before* those ages, because it declares all such children to be bastards.

These facts being borne in mind, my readers will be prepared to hear that there are well-authenticated instances on record of persons having become parents at a very early period in life.

In the Berkeley MSS., there is an account given of Maurice, third Lord Berkeley, who was married at eight, and was a father before he was fourteen. The writer who records this fact, mentions a dozen similar instances.

Julius Scaliger cites a case well known in his days—known, indeed, to his own father—of a lad of not quite twelve years who had a child by a girl of not quite ten. Bochart, who quotes Scaliger's testimony, also adduces other cases in his *Phaleg*, p. 920 (*Ed.* 1712).

And Fodéré, (*Traité de Médecine Légale*, vol. i., p. 42), mentions the case of a youth of thirteen, who had become a father.

Once more, Beck and Taylor, in their works on Medical Jurisprudence, acknowledge that instances of early puberty are *numerous*, both in male and female. The former (p. 400), furnishes a long list of authorities and examples.

Lawyers also are found giving concurrent testimony. Sir

* Blackstone's Comm., i., 436. We have copied from the old Roman Law (*Just. Inst.* i., tit. 22), under which the *toga virilis* was assumed at fourteen.

Samuel Romilly, in his speech on the celebrated Banbury case, delivered himself as follows (*Guy's Forensic Medicine*, p. 26) :—

“The law of England admits of no age in which a man may not become a father, and many medical authorities may be cited to show that this rule is founded in reason. * * * In short, the liberality of the law on this subject is excessive; for there is no age, from seven upwards, at which a man is denied the privilege of having children.”

IT IS A FACT, *then, that neither medical men nor lawyers have yet ventured to fix the age at which a man may be considered capable of becoming a parent. And if they have not, why should divines, or why should we?*

In short, learned men, who have thoroughly examined the subject, consider that Judah may have been married at thirteen (the very age at which the Jews have always permitted marriage, and at which marriages are still common in the East), have become a father before he was fourteen, and that his children, following his example (as medical men will tell us they were very likely to do), married also, and that one at least (Pharez) had children, at the same early age.

It will now follow, by a very simple calculation, that Hezron and Hamul *might have been born*, and as the Bible says so, we believe that they WERE BORN, at the time Jacob went down into Egypt.

What, if we have no evidence that such early marriages were common in patriarchal times? Granted even that they were *rare* and *exceptional*. Shall that be a sufficient reason for rejecting them? I would earnestly impress upon my readers, now, at the commencement of our examination of the Bishop's work, that we shall never find any clue to conduct us through the details of Jewish history, but shall certainly wander in the mazes of doubt and unbelief, unless we are prepared to accept, *to the full*, the *exceptional* character of the events recorded. From first to last, from the call of Abraham *to the present day*, the whole history of the Jewish

nation is a history of God's WONDERFUL dealings with His people.

It may be, then, that this early maturity and rapid fruitfulness of Judah's house were intended to show the beginning of the realization of the Divine promise regarding a numerous progeny,* and that we have here an earnest of the remarkable way, in which it was God's settled purpose to increase the race, till it became "as the stars of the sky for multitude, "and as the sand which is by the sea-shore innumerable."

CHAPTERS IV. AND V.

THE GATHERING OF ALL THE PEOPLE TOGETHER.

THE Bishop here harps on the words, "*the Congregation*," "*all the Congregation*," "*all Israel*," and insists that they must be taken in their strict and literal meaning in such passages as the following:—"And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, . . . Gather thou *all*† *the Congregation* together unto the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation. And Moses did as the Lord commanded him; and *the Assembly* was gathered together unto the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation." (Lev. viii. 1—4.)

"These be the words which Moses spake unto *all Israel*." (Deut. i. 1.)

Now, I would venture to remind the Bishop that the Bible is a *plain book*, written for *plain people*, and that the words the sacred writers employ are not intended to be used in a

* Baumgarten.

† This expression simply implies that the assembly was not of an *eclectic* or *exclusive* character. *All classes and all ages were invited, and were represented, on these occasions.*

nice and hypercritical sense, but with the meaning attached to them in ordinary intercourse between man and man.

The Bishop has, perhaps, preached before "*the University*." Did he imagine that he had *every member of the University* listening to him?

St. Matthew tells us, speaking of John the Baptist's ministry (chap. iii. 5), "Then went out to him Jerusalem, and *all Judæa*, and *all the region round about Jordan*." But who ever for a moment supposed that St. Matthew meant us to take his words in their *strict and literal* meaning?

Once more, did Cicero imagine that any one of his audience would misunderstand him, when, in his last oration against Catiline, delivered before the Roman Senate, he exclaimed: "Here are ALL PERSONS, of ALL CLASSES, indeed of ALL AGES, present! The forum is full, the temples round the forum are full, all the approaches to this sacred spot, in which we are met, are full!"* But adopt the Bishop's canon of criticism, and we shall make Cicero say that *all the human race* (OMNES HOMINES), *every man, woman, and child,—not only in Rome, not only in Italy, but in the whole world,*—were waiting, at that moment, outside, to hear the decision of the Roman Senate!!

I say no more. The Bishop's own defenders allow that he has here refined over much.

CHAPTER VI.

THE EXTENT OF THE CAMP COMPARED WITH THE PRIEST'S DUTIES AND THE NECESSITIES OF THE PEOPLE.

"*And the skin of the bullock, and all his flesh, with his head, and with his legs, and his inwards and his dung, even the*

* Or. iv. in Cat., sec. 7.

“ *whole bullock shall he (the priest) carry forth without the camp unto a clean place, where the ashes are poured out, and burn him on the wood with fire: where the ashes are poured out shall he be burnt.*” (Lev. iv. 11, 12.)

AFTER some remarks as to the extent of the camp, the Bishop draws this picture:—

“ In fact, we have to imagine the priest having *himself to carry*,* on his back, on foot, from St. Paul's to the outskirts of the metropolis, ‘the skin and flesh and head and legs and inwards and dung, even the whole bullock.’”

Here again the *literal* meaning of a word is *pressed*, contrary to all the principles of sound and fair criticism.

Are not persons often said to *do* things, which are done *under their own direction and superintendence*?—*Qui facit per alium, facit per se.*

The Bishop, when he went out to Natal, probably *built* himself a house. Did he carry the hod on *his own* shoulders? or lay the bricks with *his own* hands?

But had the Bishop examined his Bible a little more carefully, he would have seen that Moses never contemplated laying such menial duties on the priest, and making him so contemptible in the eyes of the people.

We read, for instance, in Lev. xiv. 45, the following directions for the priest, when he has discovered leprosy in a house: “He shall break down the house, *the stones* “of it, and *the timber* thereof, and all the mortar of the “house: and *he shall carry them forth* out of the city into “an unclean place.” It would have been *physically impossible* for the priest to execute this command in his own person. Nor did Moses intend to put any such unreasonable injunctions upon him. The meaning of the law is not left doubtful for a moment, for in ver. 40 we read: “Then the

* The Hebrew word means, “to cause to go forth,” which, of course, a person may do either by himself, or by the agency of another.

“priest shall COMMAND that they take away the stones in which the plague is, and THEY shall cast them into an unclean place without the city.”

But the Bishop has other difficulties in connection with “the extent of the camp.” He does not see how the daily necessities of a population as vast as London could have been met. Whence could wood, for fuel, have come? whence water? and how could the command, contained in Deut. xxiii. 12—14, have been carried out?

I answer his first question by referring him to Kitto's note on Ezek. iv. 15.* “In all cases, where wood is scarce, *animal dung*, and especially cows' dung, is much employed for *fuel*. In some regions of Western Asia it forms the *common fuel*. . . . In winter we have seen it used in some of the best rooms of some of the most respectable houses in towns of Northern Persia.” And above the note is a woodcut[†] shewing *Egyptian* women, preparing the dung-cakes, in a simple manner, for future use. Why might not this then have been the common fuel, to which the Israelites had been accustomed, during their sojourn in Egypt? and as they carried out with them “*very much cattle*” (Exod. xii. 38), there would be no probability of the supply failing them.

But whence came the *water* they required? The Bishop does not condescend to allude to St. Paul's explanation of the difficulty: “They did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink, for *they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them*, and that rock was Christ.” (1 Cor. x. 3, 4.) “How,” says Calvin, “did that rock, which stood fixed in its place, accompany the Israelites? As if it were not perfectly clear that, under the word ‘rock,’ is pointed out the stream of water, flowing from it, *which never deserted the people*.” “He opened

* Pictorial Bible, Vol. III., last edition.

“ the rock, and the waters gushed out: *they ran*, in the “ dry places, *like a river.*” (Ps. cv. 41.)

The Bishop professes not to disbelieve in miracles, as such, (p. 10.) Let him see God’s hand here, and every difficulty disappears.

Lastly, the Bishop alludes to the command contained in Deut. xxiii. 12—14, and is pleased to make himself merry about it. “ Imagine,” says he, “ half a million of men going “ out daily—the 22,000 Levites, for a distance of *six miles*— “ to the suburbs, for the common necessities of nature! “ There were also the aged and infirm, women in childbirth, “ sick persons, and young children, who could not have done “ this.” What shall we say? Will it be believed that the passage referred to *contains no such command?* Ver. 9 shows that this was a sanitary regulation, intended for *warriors in the field*,—for an *army or detachment on active service*. Hence the reference to “ weapons ” in v. 13, and to “ the enemies,” against which the expedition was marching, in vv. 9 and 14.* They needed the Lord’s *special* presence and defence on these occasions, and He promises not to fail them. “ The Lord “ thy God walketh in the midst of thy camp, to deliver thee, “ and to give up *thine enemies before thee.*” (v. 14.)

CHAPTER VII.

THE NUMBERING OF THE PEOPLE.

THE Bishop considers it surprising that the number of adult males should have been *identically the same* (603,550), when

* A correspondent of the “ Morning Post ” states, that this sanitary arrangement is precisely what is adopted, in the present day, in the East, and is declared by the English Commissioner of the Punjab to avoid all inconvenience. The Punjab Sanitary Report for ’62 actually refers to the enactments of the Pentateuch in elucidation of this habit of the East.

the Atonement-money was collected from each individual (see Ex. xxxviii. 26, and xxx. 12—16), and, again, when the general military * enrolment took place *more than six months* afterwards (see Num. i. 46).

In the first place, I see nothing to show that an interval of "*more than six months*" must have elapsed between these two events. A period of *three or four months* will satisfy all the conditions of the case.

In the next place, it is clear that the census was *begun* at the commencement of this period, and formally *concluded* at the close of it,—*begun* by the collection of the silver, *which Moses needed*, for the completion of the Tabernacle, and *concluded* (when all the labour connected with the preparation and erection of the Tabernacle was over) by the formal registering, according to their families, of all who had previously paid the capitation-tax.†

The first number (603,550) gave the ACCURATE TOTAL of the adult male population, and was checked by the amount of silver collected as Atonement-money. This total then was taken as the *basis* for the military enrolment that followed. *Only* those, who had paid the half-shekel, would be allowed to present themselves for enrolment, for had others done so, it would have been a *new census*, and the Atonement-money would have had to be collected again.

But more than this, even those who had deceased, in the three or four months that had elapsed since the com-

* In using the word "military" in this chapter, I do not mean to imply that *all* the Israelites were equipped as "men of war;" but only that the census included all those of *military age* (Num. i. 3), and had reference to their encampment and march, in, so to speak, *military order* (Num. ii.).

† So Michaelis, sect. 172: "Two distinct enumerations are not to be understood, but only that the census, *commenced* in the first year, was *completed* in the second." I am also gratified to find that he agrees with me in considering that *deceased* members of the tribes would still be retained in the census-lists, till the census was completed.—*De Censibus Heb., Comm. Soc. Reg. Goett.* II. § 2.

mencement of the census, would still be *included* in this second return, because it was the *original number* of 603,550 that was, for the sake of detail, being now counted over again,—*that number* (as might have been expected) *covering the whole period between the commencement and the close of the census*. Of course (for in this history we are dealing with miraculous events, and see God protecting and preserving His people in a most wonderful way), there *might have been no death* in this interval,—the men numbered were all in the prime of life, and the interval a short one,—and so they might have been *identically the same individuals*, who presented themselves on the two occasions.* On either supposition, the difficulty, which the Bishop sets before us, is removed.

The Bishop is struck with observing that the returns are all in *round numbers*, as Reuben 46,500, Judah 74,600, and so on. But what, if Moses (acting under Divine direction) has not given us, *with minute accuracy*, these military returns? Do our own historians never use *round numbers*, in speaking of armies or their divisions? or do we accuse them of ignorance or want of truthfulness, when they make such statements? I open Keightley's *Outlines of History*, and at almost every page I find an illustration in point: p. 374, "Mazarin returned, escorted by 3,000 men." p. 433, "An army of 39,000 men, under the Earl of Cathcart, sailed to Walcheren:" and so on. In fact, in a book which attempts to summarize the history of the world, as Moses (if I may use the comparison) does that of the Jews, I find this to be *the invariable rule; no attempt is made at minute precision*. Moses then, when the total amounts were brought to him, would strike off the odd figures from one return, and supple-

* "There lacked not one man of them" on another memorable occasion (Num. xxxi. 49).

ment those of another, so as to represent, in *round numbers*,* the military force under each banner. This was enough, further accuracy was not required; it was enough too to show how marvellously God had increased each branch of His "fruitful vine." These several sums added together made up the total as before (603,550). Of course each tribe *would keep its own returns accurately.*†

In conclusion, the Bishop in this chapter stumbles at the use of the expression, "Shekel of the Sanctuary" (Ex. xxx. 13), placed in the mouth of Jehovah, before there was a Sanctuary in existence.

But, if "the Sanctuary" was not in existence, the most minute directions (see Ex. xxv.) had been already given for its erection. Let this fact be put in connexion with another, which has evidently escaped the Bishop's notice, and all will be clear. *The Egyptians kept their standard of weights and measures in their temples (or holy places.)*‡ The Israelites, familiar with this custom, would, of course *expect* that there would be deposited, in *their own sanctuary*

* There is only *one* exception to the use of *hundreds*, in the enumeration of the tribes, and that is in the case of *Gad*, whose number is set down at 45,650. No doubt the *real* number *approximated* to this; and *this* number is used in order that the two sums total may agree. I hope no one will misunderstand me when I say: "*in order that they may agree.*" Two courses were open to Moses. Either he might *set down precisely* the numbers of each tribe, and then every one will see (from what I have said above) that the two results *must* have been the same: or he might adopt *general numbers*, and, by a slight change, make *them* harmonize with the *accurate total*. This total having been settled beforehand, and minuteness of detail not being required, it pleased God to direct (or to permit) him to take the latter course.

† The Bishop throughout gives the number of Levites as 22,000, evidently not being aware that it is 22,300, as he would have found, if he had added the several returns together (Num. iii. 20—34). The 300 were no doubt themselves *firstborn*, and therefore not included in the reckoning of vv. 39—51.

‡ Michaelis, sec. 227; and not the Egyptians only, it was a *general custom* among the nations of antiquity, see Horne, *Introd.* III. c. 2. § 2.

(or *holy place*), when erected, a similar standard to which they could refer. Nor would it be necessary to explain to them what "the shekel of the Sanctuary" meant. And so we find that, when the Sanctuary was completed, one part of the duty of the Levites was to attend to these matters of measure, weight, and size (see 1 Chron. xxiii. 29).

I thank the Bishop, however, for this hint. This indirect allusion to an Egyptian custom—well known to the Jews, but buried in the dust of ages, and only brought to light through the researches of learned men,—I enlist, against himself, as a proof of the *truthfulness* of the Divine narrative.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE ISRAELITES DWELLING IN TENTS.

"WHENCE could the Israelites have *procured*, and, if procured, how could they have *carried*, their tents?" Such are the questions the Bishop requires us to answer in this chapter.*

The Bishop himself represents them (pp. 57—59), as a *pastoral*

* The Bishop's knowledge of Hebrew (though he quotes it, and makes critical remarks on the Hebrew text) is evidently very superficial. One rendering of Lev. xxiii. 43 is: "I made the children of Israel *dwell* in Succoth." "Surely," exclaims the Bishop, "they did not *dwell* there." Did Abraham's young men *dwell* at the foot of Mount Moriah? (Gen. xxii. 5, where the same Hebrew word occurs.)

I should not have alluded to this unfortunate slip, but that the Bishop, in this same chapter, undertakes to *correct* the authors of the Books of Samuel and Kings for *their* use of a Hebrew word in an *improper* sense!! *improper*, because it mars the conclusion, at which the Bishop would arrive, as to the signification of the Hebrew word מִדְבָּר , which means, 1, "covering," 2, "booth," and 3, "tent;" whereas the Bishop would confine the use of it to the *second* meaning, and so convict Moses of inconsistency and error!

people, scattered through the land of Goshen. Very well! Then, for at least part of the year, they must have been, as all shepherds in those days, "*dwellers in tents*," and so, to a great extent, already prepared for a sojourn in the wilderness. And those, who were unprepared, had, in the notice given (as I shall show in my remarks on chapter x.), ample time to provide what they might need. Had they been absent for only *three days* (which was the purport of their first request, Ex. v. 3), they would still have required a *covering*, and what answered for three days would have served for longer.

Then, for *transport*, they had camels, asses, oxen (and I beg to inform the Bishop that these animals *are* trained in the East to carry goods on their backs, see Jahn, *Bib. Antiq.* c. iii., § 47), and waggons. Surely these might have sufficed: for if a horde of Bedouin Arabs can carry with them tents and equipage, I see not why the Israelites—with means of transport of the same kind, and additional means, (as the waggons)—might not have carried *theirs*.

But one covering they had, of which the Bishop takes no account. I read in Ps. cv. 39: "*He spread a cloud for a covering*, and fire to give light in the night." So that, with this cloud to cast its refreshing shade between them and the noon-tide heat, and at night the pillar of fire to warm and cheer them, they would not require the same amount of protection as might otherwise have been necessary. Happy people! "The Lord was their keeper; the Lord was their shade upon their right hand, so that the sun did not smite them by day, nor the moon by night." (Ps. cxxi. 5, 6.)

CHAPTER IX.

THE ISRAELITES ARMED.

"THE children of Israel went up *harnessed* out of the land of Egypt." (Ex. xiii. 18.) The Bishop insists that the word "harnessed" here means "armed;" and asks, Whence could 600,000 men have all at once procured their arms? But it is (to say the least) very doubtful, whether the Hebrew word, which we render "harnessed," has, in this passage, the sense which the Bishop attaches to it. It is a word, about the etymology and meaning of which learned men are by no means agreed. Certainly, no cautious critic would hazard, as the Bishop has, a conclusion on so weak a foundation. (Nor will the Bishop's reference to Num. i. 3, help him. "All that are able to go forth to war" are simply "all of military age.")

Many commentators,* ancient and modern, have considered that the original meaning of the word was "equipped;" and that from this meaning branched out two others: 1, "Equipped for battle;" 2, "Equipped for a journey." The Bishop chooses the *former* meaning for this passage; the commentators I have referred to, the *latter*.

Kitto (*Daily Bible Readings—16th week, Tuesday*) even supposes that our translators, in selecting the word "harnessed," *meant* to give the latter meaning:

"It is said, in the authorized version, that the Israelites went up out of Egypt "harnessed," which means, fully equipped for war or for a journey, in which latter sense only it is now used, and is that intended by the translators here."

But, however that be, with the authority we have on our side, we need not hesitate to accept this, as the probably correct, rendering of the passage in question.

* See Rosenmüller *in loco*.

Still, I do not deny that the Israelites were, to some extent, "provided with arms." Indeed, they *must* have been so. Notwithstanding their subjection to the Egyptians, they maintained, at least many of them, their *pastoral* character, and they could not have driven their vast flocks afield, into the pasturage of the wilderness, in and adjoining the land of Goshen, without being prepared to resist the attacks of the nomad tribes, who roamed in these parts. The notions of *meum* and *tuum* prevailing among these "children of the desert" are, and always have been, vague and unsatisfactory in the extreme. The shepherd's life, in consequence, is very different from what it is in our own peaceful land. He is obliged to be always on the alert, provided with arms, and ready to use them if necessary. There is an interesting passage, relating to the history of the Israelites in Egypt, which shows that they *were subject* to these predatory attacks, and must, in consequence, have been prepared to resist them:—"And the sons of Ephraim; Shuthelah, and Bered his son, . . . whom the men of Gath that were born in that land slew, because (or, *when*) *they came down to take away their cattle.*" (1 Chron. vii. 20, 21.)

Thus, there is no doubt that some at least of the Israelites went out "armed," while others would procure arms from the dead bodies of the Egyptians, cast up on the Red Sea shore; and again, when God overthrew before them the Amalekites, the Midianites, the Ammonites, and others, a still further supply of arms (as many, we may be sure, as were needed) was obtained. But after all, let us remember:—"They gat not the land in possession through *their own sword*, "neither was it *their own arm* that helped them, but God's "right hand and His arm, and the light of His countenance, "because He had a favour unto them." (Ps. xliv. 3, 4.)

CHAPTER X.

THE INSTITUTION OF THE PASSOVER.

I DO not wish to appear disrespectful, but I cannot help saying that the criticism, on which this chapter is founded, is almost *beneath notice*.

Because Moses speaks of "*this* night," (Ex. xii. 12,) the Bishop concludes that the departure of the Israelites must (according to the story) have taken place in the course of the night then close at hand. But had the Bishop opened his Hebrew lexicon, or even read through, in the Hebrew, the chapter on which he is commenting, he would have seen (as in verses 17, 41, 42) that the pronoun זֶה , "this," has no such strict and precise meaning as he seeks to attach to it. (In English we often render it by "the same," as Gen. vii. 11; Ex. xix. 1.)

And yet this is the *only* ground* to which he trusts for a long attack, continued through *seven pages*, on the consistency and truthfulness of the sacred narrative. But the premiss being false, of course the conclusion falls to the ground. *Ex nihilo nihil fit*.

Let me, however, give my readers a specimen of the strange assertions on which the Bishop ventures: he says, that "the Israelites, *suddenly* summoned to depart, hastened, at a *moment's notice*, to "borrow" in all directions from the "Egyptians:" "that the warning came *suddenly, at midnight*, and they started *at once, in hurried flight*, for the "wilderness." Why, the account distinctly states (Ex. xii. 3) that they had warning *several days beforehand*, and

* He does indeed allude to the expression "about midnight" in chapter xi. 4. But this expression fixes the *hour*, not the *day*.

that they were told that God would bring them out from Egypt on the very day (Ex. xii. 17) following that upon which they kept the Passover. Therefore they ate it, (Ex. xii. 11), with loins girded, shoes on their feet, staff in their hand, and in haste, as travellers who might at any moment be summoned to start on their journey. Where was then the "hurried flight"? There had been ample notice given: ample time for every preparation: and ample opportunity "to borrow" (or rather "to ask") such things as they needed from their Egyptian neighbours. When, at last, the long-expected intelligence came that Jehovah had triumphed and Israel was free, it found the people ready and waiting to depart. It is difficult to conceive how the Bishop could have closed his eyes to the whole tenour, and the plain and repeated statements, of the narrative. Must we apply to him the old proverb: "None so blind, as those who *will not see*"?

CHAPTER XI.

THE MARCH OUT OF EGYPT.

BEFORE proceeding to consider the difficulties, which the Bishop has brought before us in this chapter, it will be necessary to settle two points:—

I. The situation of Rameses, the city from which the Israelites started (Ex. xii. 37); and

II. The number of days it took them to march from Rameses to the Red Sea.

In reference to the first point, it will be sufficient for our purpose to observe that, since the time of the French expedition, and the researches of the *savans* who accompanied it,

the almost universal opinion of scholars has been that *Rameses was situated in the heart of the land of Goshen*, and on the banks of the great canal, which, in ancient times, connected the Nile with the Red Sea.

As regards the number of days, which the march from Rameses to the Red Sea occupied, I suppose most readers of the sacred narrative would at once say that it was *three*; viz., one day from Rameses to Succoth (Ex. xii. 37); another from Succoth to Etham (xiii. 20); and the third from Etham to Pi-hahiroth (xiv. 2.) But a little consideration will, I think, lead us to extend this time.

Ex. xvi. 1* will show that the Israelites were *a whole month* in journeying from Rameses to the Wilderness of Sin; whilst, in Num. xxxiii. 5—12, the several stations, or stopping-places on the march, are named. These are *seven*, independently of the two nights spent in the wilderness of Etham (verse 8), where, however, it is not said that they "pitched" or "encamped." Probably they simply rested for the night, and then moved on,—the difference of expression in the other cases seeming of itself to show a longer stay at those places. Deducting, then, the nine days of journeying from the thirty days of the month, we get twenty-one days as *days of rest at the seven stations*. It now, then, seems probable that the Israelites *stayed for some days* at each of their three halting-places on the march to the Red Sea. With reference to the last of these places, this probability may be made to appear *a certainty*. For the intelligence that the Israelites had altered their course ("turned backward," as the Hebrew is) towards Pi-hahiroth, and "that

* "And they took their journey from Elim, and all the congregation of the children of Israel came unto the wilderness of Sin, which is between Elim and Sinai, on the *fifteenth day of the second month* after their departing out of the land of Egypt." They left on the *fifteenth day of the first month*. (Num. xxxiii. 8.)

“ they were [consequently] entangled in the land, and the wilderness had shut them in,” could not have been forwarded to Pharaoh till the afternoon or evening of that day’s march. Considering the distance, we may fairly calculate that another day would elapse, before the intelligence could reach him. Then he had to summon a council of war, and to issue his orders for “ his chosen chariots, his horsemen, and his army,” to start in immediate pursuit of the fugitives. Could all have been prepared, and a march of forty miles been taken, in less than *two days*? If not, then the Israelites must have been encamped for *at least three days* at the station of Pi-hahiroth. And if *there* three days, why not three days (more or less) at Succoth, and three days (more or less) at Etham?

We shall now find the difficulties of the march much diminished. The *main body* would start from Rameses, hurried out of the city by the urgency of the Egyptians, and would direct their steps to the first camping-ground at Succoth. There they would probably wait,—having, perhaps, made themselves “booths” (סוכות, see Lev. xxiii. 43)—till those who lived in the western part of Goshen had joined them. Then they would move on; and, after another day’s march,—picking up, as they came along, numbers who would meet them on the road,—they would reach Etham. Now, let us observe that their march these two days has not been, as the Bishop asserts, through *the desert*, for it was *only* when they reached Etham that they came “to the edge of the wilderness” (Ex. xiii. 20.) In short, thus far, they have been journeying through their own land, “the best” in Egypt, which would afford abundant supplies to their cattle as they moved along. From Etham they turned backwards, (does not this imply, into their own fertile land once more?) and then struck southwards towards the Red Sea. Even this day’s march, I hope the next chapter will show, was not through a *desert land*; the very name of the station, Pi-hahiroth, meaning “a

place where grass or sedge grows," (*Ges. Lex.*), or,—as Stanley (p. 37) considers the word may be rendered,—“GRASSY PLACES!”*

I would ask, Is there anything unreasonable in the above suppositions? Rather, do not Scripture and reason go hand in hand together? We have supposed, on Scriptural authority, some days' delay at the several stations. Time would thus be given for those, who lived scattered in distant and different parts of the land of Goshen, to join the main body, either on the line of march, or at the stations of Succoth, Etham, or Pi-hahiroth. In this way we avoid the difficulty of the hurried *rendezvous* at Rameses, and the great column of men, women, and children, I know not how broad, but twenty-two miles in length, which the inexorable arithmetic of the Bishop sets before us. And we see, instead, the procession gradually swelling as it comes along, and only attaining its full dimensions, when it is stopped by the waters of the Red Sea. Meanwhile, the cattle would not all have followed in the *same* track, but would have come in from different parts of the land; and, when the line of march was decided on, would have been sent to find their way slowly onwards, by routes more or less circuitous, as their numbers, and the state of the pasture might require. The Israelites simply did what, under similar circumstances, and on a smaller scale, would be done in the present day.

But do I, in making these suggestions, mean to imply that God's hand was not most strikingly manifest, in bringing his people out of Egypt? God forbid! These suggestions only *reduce*, but do not *remove*, the difficulties of the march.†

* In the "Dictionary of the Bible" Art. Exodus, I find: "The cultivable land now extends very nearly to the Western side of the ancient head of the Gulf. At a period when the Eastern part of Lower Egypt was largely inhabited by Asiatic settlers, there can be no doubt that this tract was under cultivation."

† "Such an emigration as this," says Mr. Smith (in his "Sacred Annals"

There are many difficulties, to which the Bishop has not even alluded; but, were they tenfold greater than any he has started, we have one simple and sufficient answer: "Is anything too hard for the Lord?" The Lord claims, and I am sure my readers will join me in willingly giving Him **ALL THE GLORY**. "I am the Lord thy God, that brought thee out from the "land of Egypt." We allow that, if the Lord had not brought his people forth, "with a mighty hand and a "stretched out arm," *they never could have come out*. All was marvellous and miraculous. Sick and infirm (to impede their march) there were none: "There was not one feeble person "among their tribes." (Ps. cv. 37.) The very clothes they wore, the shoes they carried on their feet, were not, as we know, to wax old for forty years! (Deut. viii. 4; xxix. 5.) And soon the Lord Himself was seen among them, going before them, by the day time in a pillar of a cloud, and in a pillar of fire by night. Then came the crowning deliverance, when the sea fled and parted at the presence of the God of Jacob,—opening "a way for the ransomed to pass over,"—

ii. 47), "the world never saw. On the lowest computation, the entire multitude must have been above two millions, and in all probability the number exceeded three millions. Is the magnitude of this movement usually apprehended? Do we think of the emigration of the Israelites from Egypt as of the emigration of a number of families twice as numerous as the population of the principality of Wales, or considerably more than the whole population of the British metropolis (in 1841) with all their goods, utensils, property, and cattle? The collecting together of so immense a multitude,—the arranging of the order of their march,—the provision of their requisite food for even a few days, must, under the circumstances, have been utterly impossible, unless **A VERY SPECIAL AND OVERRULING PROVIDENCE HAD GRACIOUSLY INTERFERED TO OBIVATE THE DIFFICULTIES OF THE CASE**. To the most superficial observer it must be evident that no man, or number of men, having nothing but human resources, could have ventured to undertake this journey. Scarcely any wonder, wrought by Divine Power in Egypt, appears greater than the emigration of a nation when fairly and fully considered."

and the Lord, "as a man of war," "triumphed gloriously" over Pharaoh and his host.

Are we to attempt some poor explanation of all this? Nay! We stand by and wonder! We stand by and adore! The old saints (see the constant allusions by Psalmists and Prophets to these mercies in Egypt and the wilderness) *lived*, so to speak, on this wonderful and glorious history. And so would *we*,—tracing, as they were not able, the love; and power, and presence of CHRIST HIMSELF, in the midst of His people. (1 Cor. x. 4, 9.) *

"O GOD, we have heard with our ears, and our fathers have declared unto us THE NOBLE WORKS that thou didst in their days, and IN THE OLD TIME before them!"

"O Lord, arise, help us, and deliver us for thine honour."

CHAPTER XII.

THE SHEEP AND CATTLE OF THE ISRAELITES DURING THE FORTY YEARS' SOJOURN IN THE DESERT.†

There are many reasons for supposing that the journey of the Israelites to Mount Sinai was not through such a dreary and inhospitable region as the Bishop would have us believe,

* Vitrings, *De Deserto*, l. v., c. 16, s. 4. "Si quid forte mirandum et notabile occurrit in Verbo Dei, ad Christum, tanquam ad centrum Divinæ Sapientiæ, confugiendum.....de Christo cogitandum est, qui Christum amat." Alas! the only reference the Bishop makes to Christ in his volume (p. xxxi.), is to cast *discredit and dishonour* upon Him.

† As the words "wilderness," and "desert," will frequently occur, it may be as well to mention that the Hebrew expression, generally used, does not necessarily mean "a waste or desolate region;" indeed, properly it means, "a pasture-ground for cattle:" hence, "the pastures of the wilderness." (Ps. lxx. 12.) There was only one *real* desert in the neighbourhood of Judæa, that in which the Israelites wandered for nearly forty years. It is important to remember this.

consisting of nothing hardly but rocks and stones and drifting sand. *On the other side of Sinai* the case was different ; then, indeed, soon began that *real* desert, of which the Bible gives us such an awful description. But, on the Egyptian side, the oases, the wells, the groves, the pastures, were doubtless far more numerous and abundant then, than in the present day. Moses and the shepherds of Midian fed their flocks in this region. (Ex. iii. 1 ; ii. 17.) The Amalekites *dwelt* in these parts. (Ex. xvii. 8.) Abraham, who was "rich in cattle," passed, with them, to and fro, through the northern part of this wilderness (Gen. xii. 10 ; xiii. 1, 2), and subsequently *came to reside in it*, between Kadesh and Shur. (Gen. xx. 1.) And the Israelites requested permission of Pharaoh to go, for three days' journey, with their flocks and herds, into the same wilderness,—a request which implied either great faith in God's power to work miracles for their preservation, or (which is far more likely) the knowledge that they would find there the pasture they needed. Indeed, had the country been of the character the Bishop represents it to have been, Pharaoh, who wished to humble and reduce the Israelites, would have acted a most impolitic part in refusing to let them go ; for he must have known that they would soon be driven back again, with diminished numbers, and cattle perhaps altogether destroyed, out of the desert region into which they had madly plunged. His long resistance to their departure, his determination, if possible, to keep the flocks and herds, as a pledge for their return, shows that he at least (*and, surely, he must have known*) did not conceive it impossible that this vast multitude should be able to maintain themselves and their flocks in the wilderness.

In these accounts, we see an *evident consistency!* All together point to the certainty of animal life being sustained in these parts, in a way in which it *would* not, or rather

could not, be sustained in the present day. It is the Bishop, and those who think with him, who are *inconsistent*, in allowing that great changes *have* taken place in Egypt and in Palestine, but in refusing to believe that the regions adjoining those countries have undergone any change at all! And yet the change,—although in an opposite direction,—is going on under our eyes! I turn to the “Times” of December 30th, and in a letter from Alexandria I read:—

“The maritime canal from Sues to Port Said was to have formed the frontiers between Egypt, and Turkey properly so called.....The company was thus confined *within the limits of the desert*, and OF THE PRODUCTIVE LAND WHICH IT WOULD HAVE CREATED.”

Should, then, M. de Lesseps succeed in completing his canal, he will restore that part of the country to the state in which it was thousands of years ago. Indeed, all that is required to clothe the desert anew in verdure and beauty is WATER; and where that is either artificially introduced, or carefully preserved, vegetation invariably resumes its sway. Cities existed, (but certainly not without water), as Strabo tells us,* on the edge of this desert, on sites where human life is not tolerable now; flourishing towns and villages, the remains of which are still to be seen, were planted in the vallies, or on the borders of the Sinaitic range; † mining operations were carried on to a great extent in the same mountains; ‡ and temples and tombs, covered with hieroglyphics, some of them of more ancient date than the time of Moses, § bear record to the importance which the Egyptians, from the earliest times, attached to their intercourse with this region.

* xvii. 1, 25, 26.

† Burckhardt, “Travels in Syria,” p. 617; Kitto, “Pictorial Bible,” Notes on Ex. ii. 15, and xvii. 1; Benjamin of Tudela, in “Early Travels in Palestine” (Bohn,) p. 123.

‡ Humboldt’s “Cosmos,” ii., 124.

§ Ritter, “Ev. Kal.,” III. p. 45 (quoted by Kurtz, III. p. 63.)

Have I now said enough to show my readers that the state of this part of Arabia was very different in those days from what it is in our own ; and that, in consequence, the picture the Bishop has drawn for us must be pronounced "*not historically true !*" Even as a representation of the *present state* of the country through which the Israelites travelled, it is not to be depended on. Thus, referring to the arrival of the host at the shores of the Red Sea, and desiring to show how impossible it was for the cattle to have found pasture, as they came along, the Bishop says, (quoting at second hand) :—

"The journey to this point had been for *the most part over a desert, the surface of which is composed of hard gravel, often strewed with pebbles.*"

Now, who will not be surprised to find that the passage, from which the above description is taken, given fairly, goes to prove that, even in the present day, this part of the desert is *not altogether unsuited for pastoral purposes ?*

"The desert, which we were now crossing, is not sandy, but *its surface, for the most part, is a hard gravel, often strewed with pebbles.* Numerous wadys, or shallow watercourses, intersect its surface. In all these wadys there are usually to be found scattered tufts of herbs or shrubs, on which the camels browse as they pass along, and which serve likewise as their pasturage, when turned loose, at night. During the rainy season and afterwards, the inhabitants of Belbeis and the Shurkiyeh, [the ancient Goshen,] as *probably did the Israelites of old, still drive their mingled flocks of sheep and goats for pasturage to this quarter of the desert.*"—Robinson's *Biblical Researches*, vol. i., p. 41.

Let us next hear what other travellers say about certain parts of that desert beside the Red Sea, through which the Israelites journeyed on their way to Sinai.

Tischendorf (i. 172), speaking of Ayun Musa, which is probably near the spot where they emerged from the Sea, exclaims :—

"*This lovely and fertile oasis of the desert !*"

D

And Seetzen (*Monatl. Corresp.*, xvii. 72), adds :—

"I counted twenty-five young palm-trees here, 100,000 *might be grown with care.*"*

Tischendorf, again, describing ELIM, says (i. 189) :—

"This is a glorious oasis ; at the place where we rested, it lies inclosed, like a jewel, between the chalky cliffs. We reposed for a long time in *the grass, which was as tall as ourselves.* Tamarisks and dwarf palms stretched like a garland from east to west."

Graul also speaks of this wady (ii. 254) as "a combination of *fertility and loveliness.*"

Of another wady, in which the Israelites probably rested, "by the Red Sea," (Num. xxxiii. 10,) Strauss (p. 142) writes :—

"We reached the broad and beautiful valley of TAYIBEH, which is covered with *tamarisks and fresh herbage,* and where we found the rain of the previous autumn still remaining in many a deep pool.

"The sandy plain, on which *there is a great quantity of vegetation,* runs along by the sea-shore for three or four miles, and is about three-quarters of a mile in breadth."

Again : the WADY FEIRAN is described by Kurtz (p. 62) as

"An oasis, *beautifully studded with palm-groves, fruit-gardens, and corn-fields,* in which stand the ruins of the ancient Pharan (subsequently a Christian city, the centre of a flourishing episcopal see), bearing testimony to an age, which understood, far better than the present degenerate age, how to turn its fertility to account."

Lepsius, who visited it a few years ago, praises, in his *Briefe* (p. 332),

"Its *luxuriant forests of palms and tarfah, and the lovely banks of the brook, winding [for several miles] along amidst bushes and flowers.* We had to keep

* For the quotations in this page, I am indebted to Kurtz, iii. 1—102.

off the overhanging branches with our arms as we walked along and heard birds singing among the thick foliage of the trees."

Lastly, not only was the plain of ER RABAH, in Monconys' time, a vast green plain, *une grande champagne verte* (Stanley, p. 26); but the adjoining plain of SEBA'ÏYEH, where probably the Israelites encamped before Sinai, is described by Kellog (see Kitto, D.B.R., *Sinai difficulties*) as

"Level and broad, bounded by mountains, having long sloping bases, and covered with wild thyme and other herbs."

What a different idea do these descriptions give from that which the Bishop's selections convey! I do not, indeed, deny the *general* correctness of what the Bishop has advanced: but, in all fairness, he should have set before us *both sides* of the picture, that, knowing such fair scenes to be possible, we might at least have been allowed to suppose that they might have been more numerous and more widely spread in remote times. Thus, in the extract last given, we have the very pasture we require for the sheep and cattle of the Israelites. We have only to suppose this pasture to have covered a greater extent of country, and to have occupied many a wady and hill-side that is now barren, and it becomes more than possible that the flocks and herds of the Israelites may have found all the support that they needed. As I have shown, the Bible intimates that such was really the case; and these intimations are confirmed by the circumstance that the Israelites travelled *very leisurely* from Egypt to Sinai. They took nearly *seven weeks* (comp. Exod. xii. 17 with xix. 1) in journeying a distance which, even encumbered as they were, they could certainly have accomplished in twelve or thirteen days. It is clear, therefore (as shown in the last chapter), that they stayed several days at many of the stations, and that they were not obliged to hurry on, *from lack of pasture*.

Perhaps we may form some slight idea of the way in which the cattle were pastured at this time, from the following description by Burckhardt (*Notes on the Bedouins*, p. 129):—

“On the Arabian plains the Bedouins encamp in summer (when rain cannot be found in pools) near wells, where they often remain a whole month, while their flocks and herds pasture all around, at the distance of several hours, under the guard of slaves or shepherds, who bring them every second or third day to the well for water.”

No doubt these detached parties took care to keep within sight of the pillar of the cloud and of fire, which certainly shone for a great distance.

May I throw out another hint? Canon Stanley (quoted by the Bishop, p. 69) says:—

“There is nearly everywhere a thin, it might be said a transparent, coating of vegetation.”

Now, would not a heavy rain, occurring at intervals, bring out and develop this vegetation? The Israelites went out at the season, when “the latter rain” of Scripture had not yet ceased.

Robinson (i, p. 41) informs us—

“Rains usually fall here in December and January, and extend sometimes into March and April. In the middle of April, 1831, heavy rain fell for two days in and around Suez. (Ruppell's *Reise in Abyss.* i. p. 104.)”

This was just the time at which the Israelites started. I remind my readers once more of the universal testimony of competent authorities, that water only is needed to make most parts of the desert fertile.* What, if God, in this

* Burckhardt, quoted by the Bishop, p. 81:—“Wherever water passes in these districts, vegetation invariably accompanies it.” Robinson (i. 36, 54): “Wherever water is, there is fertility; the desert is turned into a fruitful field.” Kitto (*Cyclopædia*, art. “Goshen”): “Nothing is needed but water to make the desert fertile.” Ditto (*Bible History of Holy Land*, p. 26): “The desert of Syria, in the summer, is a parched region, destitute of herbage and of water, but after the winter and vernal rains it becomes a rich prairie, covered with fragrant and nutritive herbage.”

natural way, was pleased to send the needful supply ? and by this "gracious rain" provided for the wants of these vast flocks and herds ?

It may, indeed, be objected that the people *were in want of water*, and more than once murmured against Moses because it failed them. But, in the first place, the heavy rains might then have ceased, and showers be only falling in sufficient quantities to revive the herbage, without supplying the wants of so vast a host ; and again, long after the spring rains are over, the herbage maintains its juicy and nutritive qualities: Let me refer, by way of illustration, to Burckhardt's *Notes on the Bédouins*; p. 130 :—

"There are tribes which encamp in spring time, far from any streams or wells, on fertile plains, where they remain for several weeks *without tasting water*, living wholly upon milk ; and their cattle can dispense with water as long as green and juicy herbage affords them nourishment."

When the Israelites reached Sinai, and during their long encampment at its foot, the water from the rock close by supplied them and their flocks, and that abundantly. "He clave the rocks in the wilderness, and gave them drink as out of *the great depths*. He brought streams also out of the rock, and caused waters to run down *like rivers*." "The waters *gushed out*, and the streams *overflowed*." (Ps. lxxviii. 15, 16, 20.) It is interesting to find in the Pentateuch itself more than one incidental allusion to this abundant supply. The Israelites were directed to wash their clothes, and did wash them (Exod. xix. 10, 14) ; but so vast a multitude could not have done this, unless water, in great quantity, had been provided for them. Again: Moses is said, after he had been forty days on the mount, and when the month of August was now close at hand,—a time at which, even in Palestine, the brooks are all dried up,—to have "ground the calf to powder, and to have strawed it *on the water*, and made the children of Israel drink of it," (Exod. xxxii. 20),—the water (Deut. ix. 21) being that which

"*descended out of the mount.*" Need I say, that the *water* being thus abundant, the *pasture* would be (or, by irrigation, could be easily made) equally abundant?

Lastly, we come to the period when they had left Sinai, and were wandering, for so long a season, in "that great and terrible wilderness, wherein were fiery serpents, and scorpions, and drought, where there was no water:" (Deut. viii. 15:) "a land of deserts and of pits, a land of drought and of the *shadow of death*, and a land that no man passed through, and where no man dwelt." (Jer. ii. 6.)

Truly, if God had not been with His people, sheep and cattle must have perished in this "waste, howling," desolate, and dreadful region.

What means did God provide for their support? His Word tells us.

The water from the rock still "followed" them,* (1 Cor. x. 4,) and *with the water, vegetation sprang up on every side!* "The wilderness and solitary place were glad, and the desert rejoiced and blossomed as the rose."

The experience of the Israelites was, then, *literally*, what has since been *spiritually* the experience of God's people.

"Though in a bare and rugged way,
Through devious, lonely wilds, I stray;
Thy bounty shall my pains beguile:
The barren wilderness shall smile
With sudden greens and herbage crowned,
And streams shall murmur all around."

* Of course, the word "followed" indicates that *every difficulty that was in the way of its following* them, was removed or overcome by the mighty hand of God. Or we may, perhaps, adopt Abarbenel's explanation, who, whilst allowing that a miraculous supply of water *did* follow them, thus explains himself: "The true meaning is this, that the waters which issued from the rock in Horeb were a gift of God, bestowed upon the Israelites, and continued throughout the desert, like the manna. For wherever they went, sources of living water were opened to them, according to their need."

But the Bishop tries to prove that the miraculous supply of water did *not* permanently continue. He misquotes one passage, which, if it had been quoted fairly, would have told, not *for*, but *against* him:—

“Who led thee through that great and terrible wilderness, wherein were fiery serpents, and scorpions, and drought; where there was no water.” [Here the Bishop stops, leaving us to conclude that no water was supplied to the Israelites in their necessity: but let us read on:] “WHO BROUGHT THEE FORTH WATER OUT OF THE ROCK OF FLINT; who fed thee in the wilderness with manna, which thy fathers knew not.” (Deut. viii. 15, 16.)

Observe, that manna and water are here mentioned as *both* equally necessary, and as *both* equally supplied, not at some one particular station, but ALL THE TIME they were dwelling in, and being led through, that great and terrible wilderness. There was drought everywhere, and “no water.” How, then, could they have lived, if “the water out of the rock of flint” had not been with them? “He turned the wilderness into a standing water, and dry ground into water-springs.” (Ps. cvii. 35.)

The Bishop also refers to Numbers xx., where we have an account of that smiting of the rock, which cost Moses and Aaron their inheritance in the land of promise. But the Israelites were now on the borders of Edom, in an inhabited land (ver. 16); and it is nowhere said that the stream from the rock followed them out of that great and terrible wilderness. This was not a land where there was “no water;” but after they had stayed there some time (ver. 1), the *natural supply* (as we may suppose) *failed them*. Hence their murmuring, and the miracle that followed.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE NUMBER OF THE ISRAELITES COMPARED WITH THE
EXTENT OF THE LAND OF CANAAN.

GOD had said, speaking of the Canaanites:—"I will not drive them out from before thee in one year, lest the land become desolate, and the beast of the field multiply against thee." (Exod. xxiii. 29.)

The Bishop ridicules the idea of a population of 2,000,000 not being able to maintain their ground against the beasts of the field, in a country of such limited dimensions as the Holy Land.* "In Natal," says he, "with a population not one-twentieth that of the Jewish people, we have long since got rid of the lions, elephants, rhinoceroses, and hippopotami, which once abounded."

Here (as in many other parts of the Bishop's book) I am reminded of Jahn's expression (*Heb. Com.* c. i. § 3):—"When will men cease to measure the old world by the standard of the new, and to believe that everything in ancient times must have been just as it is now?"

Is it fair to compare the wholesale havoc which the deadly weapons of modern times enable the settlers and hunters of our day to make among the wild beasts of the field, with the results which the spears and bows and arrows of the ancients were able to accomplish? When a Cumming and a Jules

* I believe the Bishop is incorrect in the dimensions he has assigned to the Holy Land. Certainly, as promised (and that in the very chapter from which he quotes, ver. 31) to the Israelites, its extent was far greater. "I will set thy bounds from the Red sea even unto the sea of the Philistines, and from the desert unto the river" [Euphrates]. That it did not come into their possession, as promised, before David and Solomon's time (1 Kings iv. 21), was their own fault. But even taking the size of the Holy Land, as it is generally calculated, I find Smith (*Dictionary of the Bible*, art. "Israel") making it 13,620 square miles, whereas the Bishop only allows 11,000.

Gérard can boast of slaying their thousands and tens of thousands, no wonder the animals rapidly disappear! It is *fire-arms alone* which have given us our great advantage.

But as the Bishop is so fond of *modern* illustrations, let me direct his attention to a country of our own day, civilized from the earliest times, and thickly inhabited—what shall I say?—containing one-sixth of the population of the globe; within limits much smaller than such a proportion would imply? and yet a modern writer, who knows the country, writing from his own experience, says:—

“In few countries are WILD ANIMALS met with in GREATER ABUNDANCE, or of more varied types, than in British India.

“The ELEPHANT has, from the earliest period, been highly esteemed for his great utility to man, when caught and broken into harness, or to carry loads upon his back. These animals exist WILD, IN GREAT NUMBERS, in MANY parts of India, and whilst in that state commit great injury to crops on the ground.

“In the forests are to be found RHINOCEROSSES, BUFFALOES, BEARS, LIONS, WOLVES, FOXES, antelopes, deer, wild boars, &c. The smaller jungles and low underwood are the haunts of TIGERS, PANTHERS, LEOPARDS, AND JACKALS; whilst monkeys and apes abound on every side.”—*Copper's Three Presidencies of India*, p. 29.

Again: Kitto, in his *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, art. “Lion,” writes:—

“If LIONS, in primitive times, were as numerous in Western Asia (including, of course, *Palæstine*), as TIGERS still are in *some parts of India*, they must have been a serious impediment to the extension of the human race; for Colonel Sykes relates that, in less than five years, in the Deccan alone, during his residence there, *above 1,000 of the latter were shot!*”

Here are FACTS, which show that wild animals *may*, and *do*, hold their own against their enemy, man, even in a populous and cultivated country.

It was no *imaginary* danger, then, that is alluded to, in the verse the Bishop has quoted. And if the danger was *real*, what becomes of his objection?

CHAPTER XIV.

THE FIRST-BORN.

TAKING 22,273 (Num. iii. 43) as the number of the first-born, the Bishop calculates that each mother must have had at least forty-two children !

But we are reduced to no such dilemma. If there *is* a difficulty, a simple explanation has been long since found,*—an explanation so lucidly expressed by Scott, that I give his words (as quoted by the Bishop):—

“The first-born in any company amount to at least one in eight or ten; whereas the number here mentioned was scarcely one in fifty of all the males, young and old; for there were above 600,000 adults, and perhaps almost as many under age. It is therefore evident that none were numbered, but those who had been born after the destruction of the first-born in Egypt. This, indeed, seems to be the meaning of the law, which referred to the *future*, and not to the *past* (Ex. xiii. 2); and it is evident that the firstlings of the cattle were thus reckoned. Indeed, 45,000 of both sexes, which is rather more than double the first-born males, seems a vast number of first-born children, within the space of one year. But, upon reflection, we shall find it to be by no means improbable that among 1,200,000 persons of both sexes, who were above twenty years of age (and many might marry much younger than that age), there should be within that time 50,000 marriages,—that is, about the twelfth part of the company of marriageable persons of each sex. Especially, if we consider that multitudes might be inclined to marry, when they found that they were about to enjoy liberty.”

The law was simply NOT RETROSPECTIVE. “Whatsoever “openeth the womb (*i. e.* hereafter) shall be mine.”

Scott’s suggestion that, just before the Exodus, there would have been many more marriages than usual, seems a very probable one. For some weeks before they were

* See Poli Synopsis, Patrick, M. Henry, and other Commentators.

allowed to leave, their cruel bondage had no doubt ceased; the pressure, that had bowed them down to the dust, had been removed; and a season of rest and joy had succeeded. We can easily imagine the state of their feelings, as they watched one mighty miracle after another performed for their deliverance! Why might they not come together, to exchange happy congratulations, and to talk over their bright prospects, in the land flowing with milk and honey,—the glory of all lands,—to which their God was leading them? What more likely than that, at this season of excitement and joy, an unusually large number of marriages should have taken place?*

Scott names 50,000.—Even this number may be accounted for. Our own returns (see the Registrar-General's various Reports) show one marriage annually for every 120 persons of our population. Suppose, then, the Israelites to have numbered 2,400,000, and marriages among them to have been no more frequent than with us, there would have been 20,000 in the year preceding the Exodus. But it turns out that *we* are not a marrying people. Mr. Malthus has long since proclaimed it to the world (see his *Summary View of the Principles of Population*, p. 24), that

“there are the best reasons for believing that, in no other country of the same extent, is there to be found so great a proportion of late marriages, or so great a proportion of persons remaining unmarried as in Great Britain.

In an *ordinary* year, therefore, we may be quite sure that the Israelites would have *much exceeded* the 20,000 marriages, which *our* statistics would assign to them. Nor is it unreasonable to suppose that at least *double* that number took

* Moreover, “The Lord gave the people favour in the sight of the Egyptians” (Ex. xi. 3), and this may have led to an increase of intermarriages with *them*. Many Egyptian women may have been convinced, like Rahab, that the God of Israel was the true God, and have been glad to cast in their lot with His people.

place in the *exceptional* year we are considering. Moreover, the Jews were a people who practised polygamy; we may, therefore, in addition to the 40,000, who were now, for the first time, united in the bands of matrimony, distribute another 10,000 brides, as second or third wives, through the population at large; and thus we reach the 50,000 marriages we required. I venture now to hope that my readers will feel that another of the Bishop's insuperable difficulties has been surmounted.

The above explanation may be confirmed by a comparison between Num. iii. 46, 47, and Lev. xxvii. 6.

In the first of these passages we read that the 273 firstborn, who were over and above the number of the Levites, were redeemed by the payment of *five shekels a-head*: and in the second, that, when a person was consecrated by a vow to the Lord, "the estimation of the male, *from a month old even unto five years old*," was to be "*five shekels of silver*." Here, then, is a remarkable coincidence, tending to show that the firstborn, on this occasion, were all *children between five years of age and one month*. This condition our hypothesis satisfies, but the Bishop's does not.

CHAPTER XV.

THE SOJOURNING OF THE ISRAELITES IN EGYPT.

THIS chapter calls for no remark. The Bishop's calculations are, for once, in a right direction; and the result he arrives at is one which orthodox commentators have long since adopted, viz., that the period of the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt was 210 or 215 years.

But I warn my readers that, in making this concession, the Bishop is only preparing the way for another attack, which follows in chapters xvii.—xix.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE EXODUS IN THE FOURTH GENERATION.

"In the fourth generation they shall come hither again."

GEN. xv. 16.

THE Bishop allows that what God had *promised*, in these words,—He also *performed*. Here, of course, I agree with him. The sons of Moses and Aaron, who entered into Canaan, were, through their grandfather Amram (Ex. vi. 16—20), of the *fourth generation from Levi*; and, through their grandmother Jochebed (Num. xxvi. 59), of the *fourth generation from Jacob*. The Divine prediction, therefore, was literally fulfilled.

But when the Bishop insists that *four, and only four*, generations intervened between the descent into Egypt and the return to the land of Canaan, I once more part company with him. The Sacred Narrative having *proved itself true*, he has no right to require anything more, or so to "wrest" its statements, as to make it contradict and falsify itself.

In fact, there is nothing to prevent our supposing *any possible* number of generations in this period. Nor shall we find it difficult to discover several instances of a more rapid succession of families than Moses' and Aaron's pedigree exhibits. Thus, (i), take the case of Jacob himself. When he went down into Egypt, he had been married only forty-seven years, and yet he took with him, in the line of Judah,

his descendants (Hezron and Hamul) of the *fourth* generation. In other words, there were three complete generations in forty-seven years,—a rate of increase which would give nearly *fourteen* generations, instead of *four*, in 215 years. But dropping the exceptional case of Hezron and Hamul, there were certainly *two* complete generations, in the forty-seven years, which would be equivalent to about *nine-and-a-half* generations, instead of *four*, in the 215 years. (ii) Joseph, who was married at 30 and died at 110, saw Ephraim's children (*plural*) of the *third*, or his own, of the *fourth* generation; *i. e.* in less than eighty, say seventy-five years, *three* generations were completed, and in 215 years there would be *eight-and-a-half* generations, instead of the Bishop's *four*. (iii) Aaron married Elisheba, the sister of Naashon (Ex. vi. 23), and yet the Bishop's own list (p. 97) shows that Aaron was in the *fourth*, and his wife in the *seventh*, generation from Jacob. (iv) The same list, drawn up by the Bishop for a very different purpose, still proves (limited as it is) that the cotemporaries of Moses were some of them in the *sixth*, others in the *seventh*, and others again in the *eighth*, generation from Jacob.

These instances are surely enough to prove that we may introduce many more than *four* generations in the space of the 215 years before us.

I have not alluded to Joshua's genealogy (1 Chron. vii. 20—27), which the Bishop treats at great length, as it goes sorely against him. He is unwilling to allow the authority of the Books of Chronicles, and so I have proved my case out of the *Pentateuch*. But I would venture to suggest that the verses the Bishop has quoted be read as follows:—

“And the sons of Ephraim; Shuthelah, (and Bered his son, and Tahath his son, and Eladah his son, and Tahath his son, and Zabad his son, and Shuthelah his son) and Ezer, and Elead, whom the men of Gath, that were born in that land slew, because, (or when) they came down to take away their cattle. And Ephraim their father mourned many days, and his brethren came to comfort him. And when he went in to his wife, she conceived, and bare a son, and he called his name Beriah, because it went evil with his house. And Rephah was

his son, (also Resheph, and Telah his son, and Tahan his son,) Leadan his son, Ammihud his son, Elishama his son, Non his son, Jehoshuah his son.”

The two parentheses, which I have introduced, and which seem pointed out by the difference of construction, appear to make that plain which is otherwise somewhat confused. The first parenthesis may be considered as giving the line of Shuthelah's family, and the second that of Resheph, down to Joshua's time.

If, then, the Bishop will receive it, Joshua, according to this account, was in the *ninth* generation from Jacob, or, we may really say, in the *tenth*; for an *intermediate* generation had been almost destroyed by the men of Gath.

The difficulty felt by the Bishop regarding the absence of Beriah's name from the list in Num. xxvi. 35, is explained by Smith (*Dictionary of the Bible*, arts. “Becher” and “Beriah.”)

The list in pp. 96 and 97 is certainly remarkable : remarkable in the way of proving at *how late an age* the Israelites continued to have children. Kohath must have been from seventy to eighty when Amram was born to him, and Amram of the same age when Moses and Aaron were born.* And it will be at once seen that a similar supposition must be made for *all* the cases (eight in number) cited by the Bishop from the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua. But if (as the Bishop supposes) no children were *previously* born, these cases are clearly *exceptional*, brought about and recorded, in order to show that “He is faithful, that promised.” The Bishop, however, does not hesitate to take them (p. 103) as *fair representative* cases of what took place in the nation *at large*. In other words, *the Israelites generally did not become fathers till they were seventy or eighty years of age*. Great arithmetician as the Bishop is, the absurdity of adopting such a basis for his calculations seems never to have struck him. I beg my readers to notice (and this is only one instance among many) the utter recklessness with which these calculations are advanced, and the awful presumption of attacking the Word of God on such shallow, ill-considered grounds.

* The Bishop himself (p. 93) allows Jochebed to have been seventy-eight years old when she became the mother of Moses.

CHAPTERS XVII. AND XIX.

THE NUMBER OF ISRAELITES AT THE TIME OF THE EXODUS.

THE laws, which regulate the increase of population, have been so thoroughly investigated, and are now, to so great an extent, understood, that I am surprised at the Bishop's making no reference to them in his calculations.

He prefers, instead, to take a few isolated cases, out of the millions of Israel, and to gather, from the number of children which these cases exhibit, what must have been the rate of increase among the Israelites *generally*.

For instance, he directs us to Ex. vi. 14—25, and finding there thirteen heads of houses, and only thirty-nine sons named, he concludes that he may safely reckon *three* as the average number of sons which the families of the Israelites contained. In this way, and by greatly extending the length of each generation, he reduces the number of 603,550 adult males, who left Egypt with Moses, to 4,923!

If the Registrar-General has read Bishop Colenso's book, I think he must have held up his hands, in blank amazement, at the rashness of such a calculation!

Nothing but returns, on a large and comprehensive scale, can justify us in drawing any conclusion, as to the average number of children per family, in a given population. Such *data* as the Bishop has adopted can hardly fail to lead us altogether astray.

Thus, the tribe of Levi was *by far the smallest* of all the tribes, and therefore affords no fair criterion of the rate of increase in the other tribes. It numbered only 22,300 males (Num. iii. 21—34), whereas, the total of the males of Manasseh, the *least numerous* of the other tribes, may be calculated at 64,000 (Num. i. 35), and of Judah, the *most*

numerous, 148,000 (Num. i. 27.) Yet this is the tribe that furnishes *ten* out of the thirteen examples, which serve as the basis of the Bishop's calculations. As to the three remaining examples, it will be observed that they relate to the increase, *before* the descent into Egypt, and therefore have no place in such calculations as the Bishop is making, (they are simply *nihil ad rem*), because it was *not till* they came down into Egypt that the wonderful increase promised was to commence. (Gen. xlvi. 3; Deut. xxvi. 5.)

What, then, are such calculations worth? Do not *data* and results collapse together? I therefore decline following the Bishop any further: and prefer setting before my readers some carefully compiled modern statistics, which will show that the marvellous increase, that took place during the sojourn in Egypt, was still quite within the bounds of possibility. I do not mean to say that we shall meet with an *exact parallel* to it. *That* we could not expect. But we shall find an *approximation*, and more we do not require,—if only we remember that the Divine power was specially put forth, in this case, to accomplish what the Divine word had promised.

I suppose our two highest authorities, on questions of this kind, are Malthus and Macculloch. The former says (*Essay on Principles of Population*, vol. i. pp. 515—17):—

“It is calculated that the Israelites, though they increased very slowly, while they were wandering in the land of Canaan, on settling in a fertile district in Egypt, DOUBLED THEIR NUMBERS EVERY FIFTEEN YEARS, during the whole period of their stay.”

He then gives his reasons for believing that such a rate of increase *has actually taken place*, even in modern times:—

“The European settlements in America exhibit a rapidity of increase, almost without parallel in history. Throughout all the Northern provinces, the population [after making every allowance for emigration] was found to double itself in twenty-five years. In the back settlements, where the inhabitants applied themselves solely to agriculture, and luxury was not known, they were supposed

to double their number in fifteen years. Even this extraordinary rate of increase is probably short of the utmost power of population. According to a table of Euler, calculated on a mortality of 1 in 36, if births be to deaths in the proportion of 3 to 1, the period of doubling will be only 12½ years: and this proportion is not only a possible supposition, but has actually occurred for short periods, in more countries than one.*

Macculloch (in his edition of Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, p. 454), treating on the same subject, writes:—

“It has been proved that the population of some of the States of North America has (after making the most ample deduction on account of immigrants) continued to double for a century, in so short a period as twenty, or at most twenty-five years:—and there seems little reason to doubt, had supplies of food and other articles necessary for the accommodation of man been increased in a more rapid proportion, that the population would have kept pace with their progress;” [in other words, that it would have doubled itself in a less period than twenty-five or even twenty years.]

We shall not then be going, according to the sober statements of philosophic writers, beyond the limits of possibility, in supposing that *the population of the Israelites did actually double itself in less than twenty, or, as Mr. Malthus has stated, in fifteen years.* That such an increase took place at all, was (I allow) very remarkable: but that it should have continued for 200 years and upwards was wonderful indeed! Still, if

* Dr. Franklin, tells us (*Miscellanies*, p. 9) of the thoughts that passed through his mind, as he watched the astonishing increase going on amongst his countrymen in the last century. “There is no bound to the prolific nature of plants and animals, but what is made by their crowding and interfering with each other's means of subsistence. Were the face of the earth vacant of other plants, it might be gradually sown and overspread with one kind only, as for instance with fennel; and were it empty of other inhabitants, it might in a few ages be replenished from one nation only, as for instance with Englishmen.” And Malthus (vol. ii. p. 267) confirms this opinion. “We appear to have, in the fecundity of the human race, a great power, capable of peopling a desert region in a small number of years.” Once more then, the deductions of science and observation appear in complete accordance with the statements of Scripture.

God undertakes to do a thing, is it wonderful (alas ! that I should have to ask a Christian Bishop such a question) that He brings it to pass ? “Hath He said, and shall He not do “it ? or hath He spoken and shall He not make it good ?” What are wonders and difficulties to us, are not so to HIM ; unless the Bishop would limit the power, or seek to stay the hand, of the ALMIGHTY. God claims everywhere, in the Bible, the power to increase or diminish the offspring of man, as He pleases. “Children, and the fruit of the womb, are an heritage and gift, that cometh of the Lord.” He had bidden Jacob go down into Egypt, promising there to make of him A GREAT NATION. (Gen. xlv. 3.) And in the book of Exodus the fulfilment of this promise stands duly recorded in those remarkable words (i. 7) : “And the children “of Israel WERE FRUITFUL AND INCREASED ABUNDANTLY,* “AND MULTIPLIED, AND WAXED EXCEEDING MIGHTY ; “AND THE LAND WAS FILLED WITH THEM.” Could any words have been found to express more strongly the marvellous and unprecedented increase, which, through God’s special blessing, then took place ? †

We now recur to the hypothesis above stated, and ask, To what results will it lead us ?

* This is a very emphatic expression in the Heb. “teemed” or “swarmed,” the word applied in Gen. i. 20 to the increase of *fishes*, the greatest natural increase with which we are acquainted. Writers on natural history tell us that a large cod yields something like four millions of young ; and that if the produce of a single pair of herrings had but fair play, and no enemies, in a few years it would make up a mass of animated matter almost beyond calculation.

† I may mention, in passing, that the period, in which a nation doubles its numbers, is subject to the greatest variations. In England this period has varied from 48 years in the present century, to 129 in the early part of the last. And in other countries of Europe, whilst Hungary has doubled in 20·2 years, Lombardy has required 152·8 years. (See Quetelet *sur l’homme*, vol. i. p. 292.) Such variations may well make us hesitate before we undertake to dogmatize on this question, and to pronounce (as the Bishop has) that increase impossible, which God declares to have taken place.

To the sixty-eight males of Jacob's family, may be assigned, on a moderate computation, fifty-five females, besides his daughter (Dinah) and granddaughter (Serah.)

The family of Jacob may be considered then, on the descent into Egypt, as numbering 125 souls. Doubling itself in fifteen years, it would be, at the end of that time, 250, and still increasing at the same rate, it would become

In 30	years	500	In 135	years	64,000
" 45	"	1,000	" 150	"	128,000
" 60	"	2,000	" 165	"	256,000
" 75	"	4,000	" 180	"	512,000
" 90	"	8,000	" 195	"	1,024,000
" 105	"	16,000	" 210	"	2,048,000
" 120	"	32,000	" 215	"	about 2,560,000

which is a larger number than we require.

In connexion with, and explanation of, the above striking result, I submit the following considerations:—

1. The Israelites *married early*. And it is generally acknowledged that early marriages, for more reasons than one, greatly accelerate the increase of a population. (Michaelis, sec. 87 and 90, has some curious and original remarks on this subject.)

2. *Few comparatively remained unmarried*. Malthus (*Summary View, &c.*, p. 66) says: "If, in any country, all were to marry at twenty or twenty-one, the proportion of births would probably be more than 1 to 19 (at present, in England, it is only 1 to 80), and the effect would be to occasion a *most rapid increase of population*." The Census Report for 1851, vol. ii. P. 1., p. lxx., goes even beyond this calculation, and maintains that the births would be more than doubled, or would be more than 1 to 15 of the population, if all of adult age were married.

3. God blessed those who did marry with offspring. The promises made in Deut. vii. 13, 14, and xxviii. 11, we may well suppose, had been fulfilled in Egypt: "He will love thee, and bless thee, and multiply thee: He will also bless the fruit of thy womb; . . . *there shall not be male or female barren among you, or your cattle.*" "And the Lord shall make thee *plenteous* in goods, *in the fruit of thy body*, and in the fruit of thy cattle, and in the fruit of thy ground."

4. They lived to a great age,* and continued, at an advanced period of life (see last chap.), to have children.

5. They practised polygamy. This the Bishop denies or questions. It is quite enough to refer to Ex. xxi. 10, and Deut. xxi. 15; and to quote the instances of Manasseh and Caleb, 1 Chron. vii. 14, and ii. 18, 46, 48.

To show the possible results of polygamy, Rawlinson (*Aids to Faith*, p. 281) cites the case of a recent Shah of Persia, who is supposed to have left 3,000 descendants behind him! and who certainly had a son, whom sixty grown-up men called father.

6. Life seems to have been remarkably preserved,—*e.g.*, no death appears to have taken place, except from sin (Gen. xxxviii. 7—10), among Jacob's descendants, for 47 years!

If it were to please God to stop the mortality among *infants* only in the present day, a great element of increase would be added to our population. In London, in 1859, out of 62,000 deaths, 26,000 and upwards were those of *children under five years*! "They buried not," says Dr. Short, "their 33, 46, or 57 per cent. *impuberes*, as we do, no not one."

We may also suppose them delivered, by the goodness of God, from "those terrible correctives of the redundance of mankind," famines, plagues, pestilences, wars, crowded houses, insufficient or unwholesome food, &c. Perhaps also they were spared ordinary diseases: "*The Lord will take away from thee all sickness*, and will put none of the evil diseases of Egypt, which thou knowest, upon thee." (Deut. vii. 15.)

Lastly. Aristotle, Pliny, and other ancient writers (see Rosenmüller on Ex. xii. 37) testify, that Egypt was a country, *where both men and animals were*

* One of the objections brought forward by the late Baron Bunsen to the historical reality of the Pentateuch was founded on this very longevity of the Patriarchs; and he consequently proposed to reduce the age of Joseph from 110 to seventy-eight (!) But again, *God's Word proves itself true*. An Egyptian hieratic papyrus has been discovered in the Bibliothèque at Paris, bearing a moral discourse by one Ptah-hotp, apparently eldest son of Assa (cir. 1910—1860), in which he speaks, of himself: "I have become an elder on the earth: I *have traversed 110 years of life*, by the gift of the King, and the approval of the elders; fulfilling my duty towards the King in the place of favour." The natural inference from the above is that Ptah-hotp wrote in the full possession of his mental faculties. And if, as seems probable, his father Assa was still on the throne of Egypt, *he* must have been 130 years old or more. (See Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, art. "Chronology.")

remarkably prolific,—and where, therefore (Rawlinson, p. 280), “the natural law would have tended in the same direction, as the special action of Divine Providence at this time.”

Acting by these and similar means, God was pleased to increase His people, till, from a few, they soon became, in His hands, A NATION, GREAT, MIGHTY, AND POPULOUS. (Deut. xxvi. 5.)

I cannot conclude this chapter without drawing attention to the interesting fact, which modern statistics seem to have established, that, even *in the present day*, the rate of increase among the Jews is *more rapid* than that of the nations among whom they dwell.

Dr. Boudin, in a work published in Paris, in 1859 (*Traité de Géographie et de Statistique Médicale*, vol. ii. pp. 131—137), has shown that the statistics of the Jewish race, with regard to births, diseases, and deaths, are *entirely different* from those of the people among whom they live. He says, p. 137, (that there may be no mistake, I will give his words in the original):—

“ Dans tous les pays, dont nous avons pu nous procurer des recensemens rétrospectifs de la population Juive, nous constatons une accroissement d’une rapidité insolite.”

He then goes on to state that the following has been the annual rate of increase on 100 Jewish inhabitants:—

“1·4 in Holland.
1·8 in Prussia.
2·1 in Rhenish Bavaria.
3·1 in Switzerland.
4·1 in Belgium.
5·8 in Algeria.

“An increase of such rapidity as is not seen in any people of Europe.”

N.B.—The annual increase of the population in England and Wales is about 1·2 per cent.

I select one other example, from observations made in

Prussia during the nineteen years, 1822—1840; and I beg my readers to notice this very remarkable comparison:—

Among 100,000 of the Prussian and 100,000 of the Jewish population, the deaths were as follows:—

	Christians.	Jews.
Born dead.....	143	89
First year.....	697	459
1—5	477	386
5—14	202	151
14—25	155	123
25—45	334	231
45—70	614	392
70 and above ...	339	330
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	2,961	2,161

If, even now, the increase of the race is so observable, what is it likely to have been, when the Lord was watching over them for good, and fulfilling towards them the promises He had made to their fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob?

Lastly, it is very deserving of notice that it is the Jew, and the Jew only, of all nations, who has the power of acclimatizing himself in *all parts of the world*.

“One race alone has as yet been found able to prove to mankind its power of ubiquity. One race alone is in reality cosmopolitan. This is the Jewish race. ‘Without visible faculties for longevity,’ says Laménais, ‘*the Jew lives everywhere, nothing can exterminate him.*’ The Jew is to be found in all parts of the globe. He is found in Europe, from Gibraltar to Norway; in Africa, from Algiers to the Cape of Good Hope; in Asia, from Cochin China to the Caucasus, and from Jaffa to Peking; in America, from Monte-Video to Quebec. During the last fifty years he has travelled to Australia.”

The present condition of the Jews, then—“scattered among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other” (Deut. xxviii. 64), “a proverb and a bye-word among the nations” (ver. 37)—

“is in itself a PERMANENT ATTESTATION TO THE DIVINE MISSION OF MOSES. A *standing miracle* is thus exhibited to the world, in the fulfilment, at this very time, of prophecies delivered more than 3,000 years ago!” (Horne, *Int.* i. 284.)

CHAPTERS XVIII AND XIX.

THE DANITES AND LEVITES AT THE TIME OF THE
EXODUS.

THE calculations of the last chapter will help us to remove the difficulties of the present.

The 62,700 adult males of the tribe of Dan (Num. ii. 26) are reduced by the Bishop to 27!

If, indeed, Dan had only *one* son, Hushim (Gen. xli. 23), and had none others born to him in the land of Egypt, such an increase in 215 years was most extraordinary, and yet not impossible or incredible.

For let us suppose that Hushim's family multiplied in 50 years as rapidly as Jacob's did (a rate of increase which the Bishop does not seem to consider as in any way remarkable), then we should have, at the end of that period, a total of 68 males, and perhaps (as I have said before) 57 females, *i.e.* 125 altogether. But, as we do not need so large a number, we will say 105 instead. Then, doubling this number every 15 years, we get for

65 years	210	140 years	6,720
80 "	420	155 "	13,440
95 "	840	170 "	26,880
110 "	1,680	185 "	53,760
125 "	3,360	200 "	107,520
and for 215 years, 215,040.			

A half of which number is *more* than the 104,500 which the Bishop (p. 111) sets down as the total of the Danite males.

This total will be still more easily reached, if (as I suppose further on) Dan had *other* children, after he came into Egypt.*

The case of the Levites (pp. 107—111) requires a little more investigation.

We are at once confronted by the question, Have we in the genealogical list of Ex. vi., on which the Bishop rests so much,—on which, indeed, he may be said to build almost all his calculations,—*the whole of the descendants of Levi set down?* I do not hesitate to answer this question in the negative; and for the simple reason that no children are here assigned to Moses or to Hebron, although we know that Moses had sons, and *the family of the Hebronites* is spoken of again and again in the book of Numbers, and is also recorded as a numerous and important family in 1 Chron. xxvi. 30—32.

Indeed, nothing is more common than the omission of names in the Jewish genealogies; the object of these genealogies evidently not being to furnish (except in such cases as Gen. xlvi. 7—27) a full and complete list of the members of the families to which they refer. Sometimes the *fathers'* names are dropped, sometimes the *sons'*. Instances of the former kind occur in Ezra vii. 1—5, compared with 1 Chron. vi. 3—15, and in our Lord's own genealogy (Matt. i. 8),

* But most easily of all, should we be able to account for this increase and the general increase of the last chapter, if we might assume, as many have done, that the descendants of Jacob's retainers and servants were included in the tribal returns. But the plain statements of Scripture appear to me quite opposed to such a supposition. "Thy fathers went down into Egypt, with threescore and ten persons," [I dare not say that this ought to be read, "with five hundred persons,"] "and now the Lord thy God hath made thee as the stars of heaven for multitude." (Deut. x. 22.) No! God claims for himself the glory of having raised from this *little seed* so stately a tree! Comp. Deut. xxvi. 5.

where at least three names, which are found in Old Testament records, have disappeared. For the latter class of omissions see 1 Chron. ii—viii., where, in the list of the tribes, no mention at all is made of the descendants of Zebulun and Dan; 1 Chron. vii. 6, in which no less than seven of Benjamin's sons named in Gen. xli. 21, are dropped; and Gen. xlviii. 6, where *other children* of Joseph are spoken of, though they are nowhere mentioned by name. In the last case, it must be remembered that Jacob was speaking under the influence of the Holy Spirit, and therefore referred to children whom God was really about to give him. Or, if we translate literally, and (as seems) more correctly, "the issue, whom thou hast begotten," Jacob spoke of children *already* born.

We are thus led more and more to doubt whether we have a complete list of the family of Levi before us.* If omissions, beyond question, *have* taken place, in other genealogies, why not here? Nay, more, if Hebron, and Moses himself, had sons not named, nor even alluded to, in this genealogy, why might not other members of the family have had sons not named, as well? Why might not Amram, for instance, have been the father of a family, before he married Jochebed late in life, and begat Moses and Aaron? At that time he must have been nearly, if not fully, eighty years of age. Supposing him to have had a previous family, when twenty, thirty, or forty years old, there would have been 120, 130,

* The simple object of the inspired penman seems to have been to give the pedigree of Moses and Aaron, (see vv. 26, 27: "These are **THAT** Moses and Aaron.") *Incidentally* (as in vv. 21, 22, 24), he names some members of the tribe of Levi who became celebrated in the subsequent history. The frequent occurrence of such terms as "heads of fathers' houses" and "families," seems to me to show that we have here only a *skeleton register*, according to the "families," in which the names of those who were not advanced to the same honourable post of "heads of ancestral houses," as their brothers, are dropped.

or 140 years, in which those children could have increased, before the Exodus took place. Hence the Amramites (and therefore, also, the Izharites and others) might by that time have included a considerable number.

If it be asked on what principle some names are omitted and others retained in the Jewish genealogies, I believe no satisfactory answer can be given. Sometimes it would seem that only names of a cotemporary or historic interest are introduced. Thus, in the case of Amram, his famous sons Moses and Aaron may have been named, and the others, as not on any account notable, have been dropped, although Moses seems tacitly to assume the existence of these sons, by speaking afterwards of the family of the Amramites, and assigning to them the same privileges and duties as to the Izharites, Hebronites, and Uzzielites. (Num. iii. 27.) The Rabbinical writers, who did not fail to notice the prominence assigned to certain illustrious names, and the silence observed as to others, liken the Sacred Writer to a man searching for pearls, who tosses aside the sand and pebbles as of no value, and when he has *found* a pearl, holds it up as the object for admiration. (Surenhusius, *Βιβλος καταλλαγης*, p. 126.)

Sometimes, again, one family is absorbed by another, and so becomes lost. Jacob gave orders that Joseph's *other children* (Gen. xlviii. 6), should "be called after the name of *their brethren*, in their inheritance;" and an instance of this absorption occurs in 1 Chron. xxiii. 11:—"Jeush and "Beriah had not many sons; therefore *they were in one reckoning*, according to their father's house."

But, though we cannot always account for the selection of some, and the rejection of other names, the *fact remains*; and we can never allow the Bishop to take an *abbreviated and confessedly imperfect* (see remarks, p. 57) genealogy, and to maintain that it furnishes him with the *whole* of the family.

These remarks will apply (I may note in passing) to the families of the patriarchs, who came down into Egypt. The oldest of Jacob's sons was forty-seven, and the youngest perhaps twenty-five. Now, is it likely that these men, all in the prime of life, and coming into that land where God had promised greatly to increase and multiply them, would have had (as the Bishop supposes) no addition to any of their families? Is it not far more probable that children born to them after the historic period of their descent into Egypt, were called, like Joseph's, after the names of their brethren,—who, next to the twelve sons of Jacob, were looked up to as the heads and chiefs of the race? At all events, considering the great uncertainty that attaches to our interpretations of the Jewish genealogical tables, it becomes us to be very cautious in any arithmetical conclusions we may draw from them. This uncertainty, were there no other reasons, would quite nullify the Bishop's calculations.

Returning, now, to the case of the family of Levi, and supposing Gershon to have married soon after the descent into Egypt, we shall have, for the successive periods of fifteen years, the following numbers, representing the increase in his descendants:—

4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256, 512, 1,024, 2,048, 4,096, 8,192, 16,384, 32,768; which is at least twice as large a number as we require, the total of the males among the Gershonites being only 7,500.

Of course, a similar calculation will show that the Kohathites and Merarites might have increased to a number far greater than the census states (6,200, and 8,600).

I have already observed that the tribe of Levi was *the smallest* of all the tribes; in other words, it had not increased so rapidly, nor been so prolific as the others. Hence, we are not surprised to find, as in the cases of Moses and Aaron, *a small number* of children in some of the households. Indeed,

this discovery, of which the Bishop makes so much, only shows the harmony and truthfulness of the Sacred Narrative. The *total* being smaller, of course the *families*, which go to make it up, would be, many of them, smaller. The great increase in the tribe of Levi seems to have taken place *after* they came into the land of Canaan. Then, for example, Rehabiah, Moses' grandson, is said to have had *very many* sons (1 Chron. xxiii. 17); and in David's time, the number of the priests and Levites (particularly of the former) was very considerable. (1 Chron. xxiii. 3, and xxiv.)*

Before I pass on, I must, however, draw attention to the great carelessness with which the important calculations of this chapter have been made. First, Hebron and his family are entirely left out! Secondly, the numbers of the three Levitical families are set down as 2,750, 2,630, and 3,200, whereas they really are 6,200, 7,500, and 8,600! And, thirdly, the decennial rate of increase of the population of England and Wales is calculated at 23 per cent., whereas it is only 12, or, making allowance for emigration, about 15 per cent., the Bishop's mistake having arisen, as any one will see by looking at the census-lists, from his including *foreign* and *Irish* emigrants in the population of England and Wales!

Such are specimens of "Colenso's arithmetic." It seems to me something quite solemn to see the power, on which he prides himself, thus failing in his hands. For we know One who has said, "I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and " will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent."

* Nothing will please the Bishop! Sometimes the Levites increase *too rapidly*; sometimes *not rapidly enough*. Does it not seem presumption to say (p. 110),—"They *should* have increased by more than 26,000 in the wilderness," when we know so little of their condition there? Has the Bishop noted that there was already one Levite (from thirty years of age to fifty) for about every 250 of the population. Here was provision enough for the religious wants and instruction of the people. Perhaps, for this reason, God was not pleased to accelerate the increase of this tribe.

CHAPTER XX.

THE NUMBER OF PRIESTS AT THE EXODUS, COMPARED
WITH THEIR DUTIES.

THE Bishop sets before us, in minute detail, the multifarious duties devolving on the priests, and asks : How could Aaron and his two sons have possibly fulfilled them all ?

But here, as on other occasions already pointed out, the Bishop has confined himself to a very one-sided view of the case.

He has altogether left out of sight two important passages, which all authorities, whom I have been able to consult, consider to warrant a conclusion entirely different from that which he has adopted.

It would really seem as if the Bishop had not even read through the books, which he is criticising and condemning, or these passages would surely have attracted his notice.

One of them, which I give at length, is as follows, Deut. xii. 8—12 :

"8 Ye shall not do after all the things that we do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes. 9 For ye are not as yet come to the rest and to the inheritance, which the Lord your God giveth you. 10 But when ye go over Jordan, and dwell in the land which the Lord your God giveth you to inherit, and when he giveth you rest from all your enemies round about, so that ye dwell in safety ; 11 Then there shall be a place which the Lord your God shall choose to cause his name to dwell there ; thither shall ye bring all that I command you ; your burnt offerings, and your sacrifices, your tithes, and the heave offering of your hand, and all your choice vows which ye vow unto the Lord : 12 And ye shall rejoice before the Lord your God, ye, and your sons, and your daughters, and your menservants, and your maidservants, and the Levite that is within your gates ; forasmuch as he hath no part nor inheritance with you."

Now, to what does verse 8 refer ? Moses, of course, does

not mean that the camp was in a *lawless* state, each man doing what was right in his own eyes, without regard to the peace, and order, and wellbeing of the community. For, observe! Moses numbers *himself* with the people: "Ye shall not do after all the things that WE* do here this day." If, then, we discard this view, we can only suppose that Moses alludes (and to this the context leads us) to the laxity that had been allowed to prevail, in reference to *religious duties and observances*. In the wilderness, the people were in a *transition* state, so abnormally circumstanced that it was *impossible* for them to fulfil many of the ceremonial requirements. God, therefore, (who is no hard and exacting Master, reaping where He has not sown, and gathering where He has not strawed,) was pleased to dispense with many of those rites and ceremonies, of which, under more favourable circumstances, He would surely have claimed the observance at their hands. Having eased their necks from *one* yoke, He did not wish to lay upon them *another*, which they would not have been able to bear. So He left them—(*Moses*, be it remembered, as well as the people,—the *law-giver*, equally with those to whom the law was given,—one and all, without exception),—He left them to do what was right in their own eyes, as regarded their burnt-offerings, and their sacrifices, their tithes, and heave-offerings of their hand, and their vows, and their freewill-offerings, and the firstlings of their herds and of their flocks.

Whilst, with marked and solemn emphasis, (twice repeated, vv. 6 and 11), it is declared that these commands would be fully binding on them, when they came to the rest and the inheritance which the Lord was about to give them,—it is as plainly intimated that He had seen fit to suspend the operation of them, in part at least, for the present. I say

* How touching is the change of pronouns here! It is the language of truth itself! "You are to go over! I to remain and die here!"

“in part,” for we are not to suppose that *all* sacrifices and burnt-offerings ceased, during the sojourn in the wilderness; but that it was left to each individual to decide for himself what he might be able, and what he might wish, to offer to the Lord.*

The second passage, to which I would refer, gives an unexpected meaning to Moses' words. So far had the people been left to do what was right in their own eyes, that they had neglected to perform the *primary*, and, as we should have supposed, the *essential* and *vital* rite of CIRCUMCISION. For we learn from Joshua v. 5, that “all the people that were born in the wilderness by the way as they came forth out of Egypt, *them they had not circumcised.*”

It is clear that, if the fulfilment of this great and weighty matter of the Law, on which everything else depended, was left optional, every other ceremonial obligation must have been in abeyance as well.

I trust my readers will now feel that there is much more to be said for this view of the case, than for that which the Bishop advocates; and that, with diminished duties, the priests might have been quite able to attend to all that was laid upon them.

But I go further. This very relaxation of the strict requirements of the Law, in the wilderness, revealed a *principle*, which was henceforth to be looked for, in the dealings of the Lord with His people. The Lord taught them, thus early, that He claimed at all times the right (when it should seem good to Him to exercise it) of relaxing, modifying, or repealing the laws which He had given them. This was a

* The 90,000 pigeons now disappear! Some of these birds, indeed,—so numerous (as travellers tell us) in Egypt,—would, no doubt, follow the great host of the Israelites, living upon what they might pick up, in and about the camp. Then, again, they were also found in the wilderness, (Kurtz, ii., 126.) So that there would be a sufficient supply for the few offerings that were made.

gracious intimation on the part of the Divine Legislator. Nor was the principle liable to abuse,—for no change could be made, except under the direction of His sovereign will. A people, whose circumstances were to undergo such variations, who were to-day wanderers in the desert,—to-morrow settlers in a hostile land, with hostile tribes about them,—and afterwards united under a kingly head, with a splendid temple and ceremonial provided for them,—could hardly have carried out one strict and uniform mode of worship. It would be needful, with varying circumstances, to vary the ordinances that were laid upon them.

Hence we explain the modifications that were introduced into the Mosaic ritual, on the completion of the Temple by Solomon. “The Lord had made David understand all, in writing, by His hand upon him.” “He had the pattern of all, by the Spirit.” (1 Chron. xxviii. 19 & 12.) Hence, also, we account for the not unfrequent departure from the strict command laid down in the book of Deuteronomy (xii. 13, 14):—“Take heed to thyself that thou offer not thy burnt-offerings in every place that thou seest: but in the place which the Lord thy God shall choose, there shalt thou offer thy burnt-offerings, and there thou shalt do all that I commanded thee;”—as when Gideon sacrificed at Ophrah (Judges vi. 24); Manoah, in the country of Dan (xiii. 16—20); Samuel at Mizpeh (1 Sam. vii. 10), and at Bethlehem (xvi. 5); David in the threshing-floor of Ornan (1 Chron. xxi. 22); and Elijah on Mount Carmel (1 Kings xviii. 30, *et seq.*). For it is expressly asserted in David's case, that “*the angel of the Lord commanded* Gad to say to David, that David should go up, and set up an altar to the Lord, in the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite,” (1 Chron. xxi. 18): and we conclude that, in the other cases, the sacrifices were offered, by *special direction and command*, God exercising the right, which he undoubtedly possesses, of

superseding his own positive laws, when and in what manner He pleases.*

Now, seeing that Samuel, who was only an ordinary Levite,—and that kings, and prophets, and judges, who were not Levites at all,—were yet permitted (on certain exceptional occasions) to officiate as priests, sacrificing, and blessing the people,—may we not be sure that the priests, if at any time their duties pressed too heavily upon them, would receive special permission to call in the assistance of the Levites, whom the Lord had “wholly given unto them, out of the “children of Israel”? (Num. iii. 9). In this way the services of the Sanctuary would be conducted without difficulty, “decently and in order.” An instance of the call, thus made upon the Levites, to assist their brethren on an emergency, actually occurs in 2 Chron. xxix. 34: “*But the priests were too few . . . wherefore their brethren, the Levites, did help them, till the work was ended, and until the other priests had sanctified themselves.*”

This important principle must never be lost sight of. It is intimately connected with the mode of government, which God established for His covenant people. He Himself was their King, sitting enthroned between the cherubim,—there, on His mercy-seat, waiting to receive their homage, and ever ready to guide, counsel, and bless them in return. Moses and Aaron first, then the high priest and the prophets, were the medium of communication with Him, and the official interpreters of His will. If a difficulty arose as to the interpretation of a law, as to the way in which it was to be carried out, or as to any other matter that concerned the interests of religion or the welfare of the people, they had but to inquire of the Lord, and He answered and directed them.†

* Jennings's “*Jewish Antiquities*,” b. ii. ch. 4.

† Instances occur in Num. vii. 89; ix. 8; xxvii. 5, 21; Judges xx. 18, 28; and elsewhere.

Supposing, as above, the number of priests not equal to the duties laid upon them, Moses would bring their case before the Lord, and the Lord would appoint the assistants, that should be provided for them. Supposing the Court of the Tabernacle not large enough for some great feast or sacrifice, the High Priest, by Urim and Thummim, would ask of the Lord, and a gracious intimation of the Divine Will (making the necessary provisional arrangement) would be vouchsafed to him. I do not, indeed, mean to say that the cases just suggested ever actually occurred, but, if they did, here was the remedy.

How easily then (when we allow the Word of God to speak for itself, and to give us its own meaning) do we see our way, once more, out of the difficulties in which the Bishop seeks to entangle us.

One word as to the *number* of the priests. Unquestionably, when Aaron was consecrated (Ex. xxviii. 1), there were only four of his family of an age to be consecrated with him, two of whom died soon after, childless. (Num. iii. 4.) But, at this time, Aaron was eighty-four years of age, and therefore both Eleazar and Ithamar might have had sons of nearly adult age, who, soon after, might have been received into the ranks of the priesthood. If they had each a family of ten or twelve sons, there might have been *every year* an accession to the number of the priests; and if those sons, as they grew up, had, (say) on an average, six sons apiece, there might have been 140 or 150 priests, most of them in the prime of life, on their entrance into the land of Canaan.—Outram (*De Sacrificiis*, d. i. c. 7, s. 3) shows that the priests might enter on their duties at a *much earlier age* than the Levites.—Thus, if there was any difficulty, in consequence of the small number of priests, *at first*,—that difficulty would have been only temporary, and would have soon passed away.

The Bishop, indeed, will not allow that Eleazar had more than *one* son. It is enough to answer that the passage (Ex. vi. 25) on which he relies, speaks of Phinehas not as the *only*, but as the *oldest* son, and on that account one of "the heads" of the fathers of the Levites."

In conclusion, the Bishop (*entirely ignoring the foreknowledge of God*) asks, How came *thirteen* cities, with their suburbs (Josh. xxi. 19), to be set apart for the *small* number of persons of which Aaron's family must have consisted at that time? And how came all these cities to be in the *immediate neighbourhood of Jerusalem*?

A reverent spirit would here have seen cause to admire the Divine wisdom and goodness, in making arrangement beforehand for that enlargement of Aaron's family, which had been already ordained in the Divine counsels, and in placing all their cities within a convenient distance of the temple, where their presence would be so frequently required. "This did not happen," says Calvin, "by chance; but, according to His own admirable design, God placed them in the situation, which He had determined to select as the site of His temple." They could not, of course, have *occupied* these cities at the time referred to; indeed, some of them were still in the hands of the Canaanites. But is it not possible that the present arrangement determined the *right* of the priests to the cities in question, whenever their increased numbers should render the whole of them necessary; and that till then such of them, as were not immediately wanted, remained in the hands of the tribe in whose domain they were situated? * The priests might be regarded as the lords of the manor, and receive certain dues from

* Kitto, "Pictorial Bible," whose notes on this chapter (Josh. xxi.) are well worth consulting.

the occupants of their property. We read, however, that the time *did* arrive when the priests needed the cities thus set apart for them. In David's reign, they had so increased in numbers that, notwithstanding the onerous duties of their service, which required a large number in attendance at one and the same time, it was found necessary to divide them into *twenty-four* courses, who ministered by turn, week about, before the Lord.

CHAPTER XXI.

THE CELEBRATION OF THE SECOND PASSOVER.

HAVING contemptuously *rejected* the testimony of the Books of Chronicles in p. 134 and elsewhere, the Bishop quietly *adopts* it in p. 135, because, in the latter case, it enables him to point an argument against the truthfulness and consistency of the sacred narrative.

This strange want of consistency appears again and again in the Bishop's book. Statements are counted true or false, according as it suits his purpose to have them so.

The chapter before us takes a particular instance of the difficulties started in the preceding one. The question is, ^{*} How, on the occasion of the celebration of the Passover, related in Num. ix. 1—5, the large number of victims required could have been slain, and the blood sprinkled, in so small a space (as that of the court of the tabernacle),—in so short a time (as the period "between the two evenings"),—and by so small a number of sacrificing priests (as Aaron and his two sons)?

The simple answer is, that there is nothing to prove that any change was made in the mode of celebrating the Passover, as it had been observed on the night of the people's departure from Egypt.

Let it be remembered that the precise directions about the Passover (contained in Ex. xii.) were *written subsequently* to the first celebration; and yet (according to the Bishop's theory) *after having been written, they were never carried into practice.* The *argumentum a silentio* may well be applied here. That commands so minutely given, so solemnly enforced, and made binding on all future generations, should have been silently abrogated in the course of the first twelve months after their enactment, appears to me in the highest degree improbable. Nay, the very words, in which this second observance is enjoined, show that no change was to take place. "According to all the rites of it, and according to all the ceremonies thereof, shall ye keep it;" (v. 3) and (v. 12): "according to all the ordinances of the Passover they shall keep it." But what rites, what ceremonies, what ordinances had been appointed, except those contained in Ex. xii.? I have no doubt therefore that Kurtz is right in supposing that, till the temple was built (when, as we are all aware, various changes were made in the Levitical ordinances), each master of a household slew his own lamb, and himself sprinkled its blood, as his forefathers had done in the land of Egypt. The Jews have always considered that the head of the household occupied a *priestly* position, at the celebration of the Passover. Philo's words are very remarkable:—

"(*De Vita Mosis*, p. 686. *Francf.*) In offering up the Paschal lamb the office of the laymen is by no means simply to bring the sacrificial animals to the altar, that they may be slain and offered up by the priests: but, according to the regulations of the law, *the whole people exercise priestly functions, inasmuch as every one on his own behalf offers up the prescribed sacrifice.*"

But (says the Bishop) read Leviticus xvii. 2—6, and it will

be seen that *every sacrifice* had to be brought to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and that there *the priest had to sprinkle the blood on the altar*, and to burn the fat for a sweet savour unto the Lord.

Allowing this, I would ask, May not a *general command* be here laid down, subject, however, to a particular and well-known *exception*? The *exception* (in the case of the Passover) had preceded the *command*, and was well understood by all the people.* Nor is this the *only* instance of the kind in the Law of Moses. Does not the Bishop remember the *command* (Lev. xx. 21) against taking a brother's wife, admitting, however, of the *exception* detailed in Deut. xxv. 5—10?

But the Bishop has another objection: he finds it stated in 2 Chron. xxx. 5, that the congregation kept the Passover "*in such sort as it was written*," and also (v. 16) that the blood of the Paschal lambs was on this occasion sprinkled by *the priests*. And he puts these two statements together and concludes that it was clearly understood, in Hezekiah's time, that the law of Moses *enjoined* this sprinkling of the blood by priestly hands, in respect of *the Passover*, as well as in respect of every other sacrifice.

It is extraordinary that the Bishop has not noticed that this Passover was NOT kept "in such sort as it was written." Perhaps no Passover was ever celebrated with *greater irregularity*. The *time* of celebration was one month LATER than it ought to have been (v. 2): the Levites undertook duties, which did not properly belong to them (v. 17), and the sacred historian distinctly states that "a multitude

* Still, it must not be forgotten, that the Passover could only be offered (Deut. xvi. 5, 6), "at the place, which the Lord should choose, to place his name in," and had to be accompanied (Num. xxviii. 16—25) by sacrifices of a public character, presented in the usual way, at the door of the tabernacle, and whose blood was *sprinkled*, like that of all other victims, at the foot of the altar.

“ of the people did eat the Passover OTHERWISE THAN IT WAS “ WRITTEN ” (v. 18). In short, the Bishop has been misled by a false translation, for v. 5 would be more correctly rendered (see Bertheau’s Commentary *in loco*): “ They had not kept it, IN A BODY, as it is written : ” they had not kept it *en masse*, *in the assembly of the whole people*, as the law required.

A few pious individuals had done so, but the bulk of the nation had utterly neglected this sacred ordinance. So Hezekiah (vv. 6—13) sent his posts in all directions, to try and stir up the people to a sense of their religious duty, and unite them once more in the bond of a solemn covenant with the Lord : and, notwithstanding all the irregularities which distinguished this Passover, the Lord graciously accepted the service of His people (v. 20), and such a season of holy joy was witnessed, as had not been known since the days of Solomon. Truly “ His thoughts are not as our thoughts.” The Bishop will listen to no deviation from the strict letter of the Law. The Lord mercifully pardoned such deviations, when they proceeded from pious motives, and were necessitated by peculiar circumstances. The Law was made for man, and not man for the Law. The Bishop has yet to learn what that meaneth : “ I will have MERCY, and not SACRIFICE.”

CHAPTER XXII.

THE WAR ON MIDIAN.

ONE would have been thankful to see that the Bishop had confined himself to an *arithmetical* view of the chapter in Numbers that records the terrible judgment inflicted on the Midianites,—and had not joined Voltaire and other infidels

in an attack on the *morality* of this portion of God's Word. The Bishop only just stops short of the awful language of Paine, who denounces Moses as "a detestable villain," for ordering this massacre and "butchery."

First, however, he stumbles at the vast amount of prey captured, and would have us believe that Moses represents each man as carrying off eight captives, and driving before him sixty-seven head of cattle! But (to say nothing of camp-followers, who would have assisted the warriors) was not the host of Israel encamped *close* to the scene of their army's exploits? When therefore their success was announced, what could have been easier, and what was more likely than that Moses should send a further detachment, to help them bring home the immense (and probably the unexpected) booty they had obtained?

The Bishop calculates that out of a population of 148,000, 32,000 only were spared. The males were all slain, and only the female children left alive. I see nothing incredible (for that is the only question at present) in these numbers. God had severely punished his own people, by slaying *twenty-four thousand* of them (Num. xxv.), for taking part in the impure and idolatrous rites, to which the Midianites had invited them; and now His wrath falls on those who had been the prime movers in this attempt to seduce them from their allegiance to Him. We must remember that *the women* had been the special instruments of temptation, and therefore not even *they* (contrary to the general law in such a case, see Deut. xx. 14) are to be spared. When the cup of a nation's iniquity is full, then comes "the besom of destruction" (Isa. xiv. 23), to sweep it off from the face of the earth. "They that plow iniquity, and sow wickedness, reap the same. By the blast of God they perish, and by the "breath of his nostrils are they consumed." (Job iv. 8, 9.) And, as the Moral Governor of the universe, He not only *punishes* the wicked, but *selects what instrument He pleases*

to execute His just and righteous sentences. Of His "four
 "sore judgments,—the sword, and the famine, and the
 "noisome beast, and the pestilence" (Ezek. xiv. 21), we see
 Him, on the present occasion, employing the first,—and we
 hear Him saying: "Sword, go through the land, so as to cut
 "off man and beast from it." "Shall not the judge of all
 "the earth do right?" or "Shall mortal man be more
 "just than God? shall a man be more pure than his
 "maker?"*

But the whole of the events of this great victory offend
 the Bishop. He weighs them in a balance, not "of the
 sanctuary," and pronounces them extravagant and incredible.
 He will not believe that God could keep His servants,—the
 appointed ministers of His justice,—in the hollow of His
 hand, so that not one of them was slain or missing (v. 49.)
 He will not believe that God could fulfil His own true and
 faithful promises: "Five of you shall chase an hundred, and
 "an hundred of you shall put ten thousand to flight; and
 "your enemies shall fall before you by the sword,"
 (Lev. xxvi. 8); and "there shall not a man be able to stand
 "before you; for the Lord your God shall lay the fear of
 "you and the dread of you upon all the land." (Deut. xi. 25.)

The Bishop talks of "Jehovah's tribute of *slaves*,"
 thirty-two persons. What! were the children who were

* Those who wish to pursue this solemn subject further may consult Hengstenberg's admirable remarks, II. 387—417, Fairbairn's "Typology of Scripture," II. 428, and Bishop Butler's "Analogy," Part II. end of chap. 3. Bishop Watson, in his "Apology," speaking of the Canaanites says:—"Now it will be impossible to prove that it was contrary to God's moral justice to exterminate so wicked a people. He made the Israelites the executors of His vengeance; and in doing this, He gave such evident and terrible proof of His abomination of vice, as could not fail to strike the surrounding nations with astonishment and terror, and to *impress upon the minds of the Israelites, what they were to expect*, if they followed the example of the nations, whom He commanded them to cut off." (See Lev. xviii. 28.)

spared, to be cared for by no one? Jehovah sets the example of taking this number of them, under *His own* protection.

I am sure I need not follow the Bishop, in his attempt to assign the *weeks* and *months* necessary for the events recorded in the latter part of the Book of Numbers. No one will find any difficulty in calculating that, with the vast host under Moses' command, and the various detachments he might have sent out simultaneously in different directions, these events might have succeeded one another far more rapidly than the Bishop imagines.*

The Bishop in pp. 141—2, incidentally alludes to the "extravagant statements of Hebrew writers," in reference to the vast armies said to have been called into the field on various occasions, and the numbers put down as slain after various battles. Now, whilst it may well be doubted whether, in *all* cases, the correct numbers have come down to us (for in nothing were copyists, like compositors in our own day, so liable to err, as in *names* and *numbers*,) still it is by no means necessary to suppose a *wholesale* series of mistakes on the part of transcribers.

I think my readers will peruse, with satisfaction, the following remarks of Dr. Kitto, on some of the cases cited by the Bishop. They will shew how little truth there is in the Bishop's statement, that these matters have not been *practically* considered heretofore.

1. That of Amaziah, 2 Chron. xxv. 5, 6, who marched against the Edomites with 300,000 men, and hired 100,000 more out of Israel.

* Whilst preparing these last pages for the press, I have glanced at Dr. M'Caul's "Examination of Bishop Colenso's Difficulties," and find him clearly showing how this master of arithmetic fails in his calculations here, as elsewhere.

“ Under a young king of warlike tastes, the kingdom was soon astir with military movements and preparations. Amasiah was anxious to ascertain the military resources at his command; and caused a general muster to be taken of all the males fit to bear arms, from twenty years and upwards; and the number was found to be three hundred thousand. Some have thought this number incredible. But why so? It is expressly said to be the number of all fit to carry arms—that is, all the adult male population from twenty to sixty—such as it was usual in ancient warfare to call out on great occasions, all Orientals being more or less familiar with the use of arms. The numbers given in Scripture are only high in reference to modern European circumstances, in which warfare is a distinct profession, which can never as such be followed by such large proportions of the population. Having this in view, and recollecting that the present is expressly stated to be the number of those qualified to bear arms, IT SEEMS TO US SMALL RATHER THAN LARGE; for as the number of such is generally about one-fourth of the population, it would make the entire population of the kingdom of Judah only one million two hundred thousand, which we take to be much too little. Josephus, who copies these numbers, was aware of this inference from the number stated, and little suspected that it would ever be doubted from its largeness, and he therefore states that three hundred thousand was only a selection from the whole number fit to bear arms! ” *

2. That of Asa, 2 Chron. xiv. 8, 9, who had an “ army ” of 580,000, and was attacked by Zerah, the Ethiopian, with “ an host of a thousand thousand and three hundred chariots.”

“ It is always important to remember that the modern European sense of the word “ army,” as applied to a body of men *exclusively* devoted to the military profession, is unknown in the history of this period (except among the Egyptians); and in the statement before us we see no more than that the men thus numbered were provided with weapons, or that the king (Asa) had weapons, to arm them, and were, the whole or any part of them, bound to obey any call from the king into actual service.

“ ‘ *An host of a thousand thousand and three hundred chariots.* ’ Josephus gives 900,000 infantry and 100,000 cavalry, which some would reduce by striking off a cipher from each number. A merely conjectural emendation is, however, so difficult and hazardous, that it is better to retain the original numbers, even when doubtful. In the present instance we may refer to what has just been said, as to the distinction between the armies of those times and

* Kitto’s “ Daily Bible Illustrations,” vol. iii., 50th week.

our own. And if Asa, in his contracted territory, was able to call out above 500,000 men, there is no solid reason why it should be impossible to the Cushite nomades, among whom every man was able to use arms, to bring double that number together. There must always be a vast difference in numbers between the army that must be kept and paid permanently, and that which may be raised by a general call upon the adult male population to a warlike enterprise, and only for the time of that enterprise. The army of Tamerlane (as we call him) is said to have amounted to 1,600,000, and that of his antagonist Bajazet to 1,400,000. Bruce, respecting this host of Zerah's, says, 'Twenty camels, employed to carry couriers upon them, might have procured the number of men to meet in a short space of time; and, as Zerah was the aggressor, he had time to choose when he should attack his enemy: every one of these shepherds, carrying with them their provision of flour and water, as is their invariable custom, might have fought with Asa in Gerar, without eating a loaf of Zerah's bread, or drinking a pint of his water.' *

One rejoices to find experienced Oriental travellers, like Bruce and Kitto, thus upholding the plain statements of the Word of God. The Bishop cannot expect us to take *his* opinion in preference to *their's*.

In alluding to the terrific slaughter recorded in 2 Chron. xiii. 17, and xxviii. 6, 8, the Bishop refuses to recognise the hand of God put forth in awful judgment, "because the people "had forsaken Jehovah the God of their fathers." "God "SMOTE Jeroboam and all Israel before Abijah and Judah." (v. 15.) "THE LORD BROUGHT JUDAH LOW, because of "Ahaz, king of Israel; for HE MADE JUDAH NAKED." (v. 19) These appalling events do indeed show us what "a fearful "thing it is to fall into the hands of the living God." Though He is "the Lord, the Lord God, merciful and "gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, "keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin;" yet "HE WILL BY NO MEANS CLEAR THE "GUILTY:" to all such as refuse to turn from the evil of their doings, "OUR God is a CONSUMING FIRE."

* Kitto's "Pictorial Bible," notes on 2 Chron. xiv. 8, 9.

I close this chapter with another instance of the Bishop's arithmetic:—

"The kingdom of Judah contained about 2,500 square miles, that is, in extent it was about half as large as the counties of Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex together: but, in Jehoshaphat's time, it contained, according to 2 Chron. xvii. 14—19, 1,160,000 warriors, that is, about 4,000,000 of inhabitants; in other words, it was about *eight* times as thickly peopled as the three eastern counties in the present day; and yet a great part of Judah was very unfruitful."

I correct the 2,500 square miles, and make it 3,435 (Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, art. "Israel"), and then I read the last sentence as follows:—

* * * "In other words, it was *not so thickly* peopled as our own county of Lancashire in the present day, as the Census Returns clearly prove. And if parts of Judah were unfruitful, parts of Lancashire are the same."

I am well aware of the *special circumstances*, which account for the great population that Lancashire (equal in size to about half Judæa) contains; but there were also *special circumstances*, which all who have examined the subject are acquainted with, that account for the great populations of Palestine and Egypt in ancient days. Josephus speaks (*De Bello Jud.* b. iii. c. 3) of Judæa and Samaria as "TEEMING WITH MEN" in his day; and Egypt, even now, when the population is almost at the lowest point reached in history, when villages have replaced towns, and hamlets villages, is still calculated to be more densely inhabited than our own rich and thickly populated Yorkshire.

Away, then, with such false calculations! "Who is this "that darkeneth counsel by words WITHOUT KNOWLEDGE?"

CHAPTER XXIII.

GENERAL.

I HAVE thus far sought to furnish a *specific* answer to the Bishop's various objections;—(with what success I must leave my readers to decide; if with any, to God be all the glory!)—I would now conclude with a few *general* remarks.

And, first, I would draw attention to the *foregone conclusion*, which animates this book. Notwithstanding the expressions (repeated, I must say, *usque ad nauseam*) of his love for the truth, his desire to know the truth, his determination to buy the truth at any cost,—I altogether fail to discover that sober and impartial exercise of judgment, that calm and comprehensive survey of all the bearings of a question, that cautious and patient spirit of investigation, which mark all honest and thorough searchers after truth. On the contrary, I see that the Bishop has quite made up his mind beforehand to certain views, which he designates "THE TRUTH,"—and that all other considerations are made to give way to the maintenance of those views. Whilst searching in every direction for inconsistencies and discrepancies in the Word of God, he never once thinks of looking for any internal evidence of *consistency and truthfulness*, never once regards those "undesigned coincidences," which form so striking a proof of the reality of the Scripture story, and of the honesty of its writers. The *external evidences* of the genuineness and authenticity of the sacred narrative are also quietly passed over, and we are led to conclude that nothing more is necessary, in order to form an opinion on the momentous subjects

brought before us, than the *ex parte* statement furnished by the Bishop.

I think this *animus* exhibits itself in no part of his work so painfully, as in his answers to the objection raised on the ground of the repeated and emphatic testimony which our Lord Himself bore to the Divine mission of Moses. He talks petulantly of such an objection, that it is like "bringing the sacred ark "itself into the battle-field;"—as though we were not called upon to "contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered to the saints,"—and this were not a time for us to cry, with Moses (Num. x. 35), "Rise up, Lord, and let thine enemies be scattered!" And then he goes on to say, with an assurance, which none but a special pleader could assume (p. xxx):—

"There is, however, NO FORCE (!) in this particular objection, as will appear from the following considerations:—

"(1.) Such words as the above, if understood in their most literal sense, can only be supposed at all events to apply to *certain parts* of the Pentateuch, since most devout Christians will admit that the last chapter of Deuteronomy, which records the death of Moses, could not have been written by his hand, and the most orthodox commentators are obliged also to concede the probability of *some* other interpolations having been made in the original story. It would become, therefore, even thus a question, for a reverent criticism to determine, what passages gave signs of *not* having been written by Moses."

As if the question could be for a moment entertained, what in our Lord's days was meant, and what our Lord Himself meant, by "the writings of Moses." It was certainly not the Pentateuch, as edited by Bishop Colenso, or as pared down by German criticism, but the Pentateuch, *then read and revered by the Jews, and now possessed by us*, that our Lord endorsed. What honest man would deny this? or maintain that, because a few verses in the Pentateuch were not written by Moses, our Lord's testimony to Moses' authorship of the same is in any respect invalidated? The Bishop must acknowledge that *the Jewish Church has always*

considered all those passages to which he objects in his volume, as constituting a part of the Books of Moses, and that our Lord's testimony cannot but refer to them. What have we here, then, but a specious and sophistical answer to a fair and well-founded objection? Is it not the *answer* that contains "no force," whilst the *objection* remains untouched?

"But, secondly (the Bishop proceeds), and more generally, it may be said that, in making use of such expressions, our Lord did but accommodate His words to the current popular language of the day, as when he speaks of 'God making His sun to rise,' or of 'stars falling from heaven,' &c., &c.

Again, I maintain that this is a *superficial* explanation, and one that will not bear a moment's investigation.

When our Lord used popular expressions, *no one could be mistaken as to His meaning*. Whereas, if He said that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, with the full knowledge that he *did not*, our Lord clearly *misinformed and misled* his hearers. What an important distinction is this! But more, far more, remains behind. Our Lord not only testified to the existence of Moses as a man, and to the reality of his authorship of the Pentateuch, but he called attention to Moses' words as *deserving of all credit*, as being indeed *the words of God Himself*. "THEY HAVE MOSES and the prophets, let them HEAR THEM." "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for HE WROTE OF ME;" (but if God had not taught Moses, how could he have written of Christ?) Nay, He placed the truthfulness of Moses on a footing with His own unerring truthfulness: "If ye believe not HIS writings, how shall ye believe MY words?"

Instead of fairly weighing the importance of such a testimony as this, the Bishop boldly says: "It was no testimony at all,—a mere accommodation to popular ignorance and prejudice." What is this, but to accuse our Lord of *conscious deception*? to represent Him as having a less regard for the Truth than the Bishop himself has (for it must

have been as needful *then* as *now* to proclaim the Truth), and to make that Blessed One less scrupulous and conscientious than the Bishop showed himself, when his heart suggested to him (on the occasion mentioned in p. vii): "Shall a man " *speak lies* in the name of the Lord?" *

II. I cannot but draw attention to the Bishop's *confessed incompetence* for the task he has undertaken.

It must be remembered that his objections, so far as they are really worth notice, have been long familiar to all careful students of the Word of God. Not only Christian, but Jewish commentators, have, again and again, considered and refuted them. Could we then have conceived it possible (if we had not witnessed the phenomenon) that any man,—and least of all, a Christian Bishop,—should, in the present day, have revived and republished these objections, without a fair, candid, and thorough examination of all that had been written in answer to them? The Bishop's *naïve* confession tells us that he has not even made the attempt to do this. A few modern German authors, with Josephus and Scott's Commentary, seem to have constituted the whole of his Theological Library, at least as far as the preparation of the present Part was concerned. We never hear of the opinions of Chrysostom or Calvin, Abarbinel or Kimchi, Michaelis or Rosenmüller, Vitringa or Outram, Lightfoot or Lardner. The Bishop might, if he had pleased, have continued in *ignorance*; but if he undertook to enlighten the Christian

* Having already alluded to the Bishop's remaining suggestion, that our Lord's knowledge as man, was limited and imperfect, I would here only say that I readily accept the plain and obvious meaning of the words: "Jesus increased in wisdom." But I am sure I shall carry my readers with me, when I add, that as child, as youth, as man, Jesus was undoubtedly preserved—by the Holy Spirit resting upon Him beyond measure, and by His own Divine nature, one with the human—from ALL ERROR in thought, in WORD, and in deed.

public, we had a right to expect that he should *qualify himself* for such a task. The consequence is that crude statements, false criticisms, and rash calculations abound in this extraordinary book. There is hardly a chapter, in which some error, more or less glaring, does not occur. Hebrew expressions mistranslated,—Hebrew idioms misunderstood,—Oriental customs ignored or misrepresented,—careless quotations,—false or partial statements,—feeble verbal quibbles,—palpable contradictions,—meet one at every turn. The charges of inconsistency, absurdity, and error, that he has brought against the Word of God, thus recoil, with tenfold force, upon himself.

This judgment may appear sweeping and severe; but, in such a case as the present, one is obliged to be plain-spoken; and I think, after the minute examination to which I have subjected the Bishop's book, I am quite justified in using even such strong terms of condemnation. I have no wish to indulge in personalities, but it becomes necessary to warn those, who may be misled by the tone of confident assurance which the Bishop adopts, and the "great swelling words" that he uses, that there is, after all, nothing alarming or damaging in his book, and that though he assumes almost to be a teacher sent from God, he betrays the shallow acquirements of one, who "speaks evil of the things that he understands not," and who has not yet advanced beyond that "little knowledge," which, in Biblical criticism especially, is "a dangerous thing."

III. I notice the *issue involved*.

We all feel that the question the Bishop has started, "Is the Pentateuch true?" involves much more; and really means, Is the Bible true? is the Christian religion true? Indeed, the Bishop has not been able to avoid the necessary consequences of his speculations, for in pp. xxx and xxxi

we have found him discussing the proposition, Whether **THE TESTIMONY OF THE SON OF GOD IS TRUE** or not?

These are the *real* questions of the Bishop's book, beside which the arithmetical and other questions sink into nothing. It is impossible (as the Bishop would have us) to stop half-way. Moses and Christ must stand or fall together. We cannot reject the Pentateuch and retain the Gospel. The story of the Pentateuch is not simply a preface, which could be cancelled, without affecting the truthfulness of the great Scripture narrative, but it is a component and essential part of God's Book. It runs like an interwoven thread through all that follows, and you cannot tear it away, without destroying the fabric to which it belongs. It is the very basis, on which history and doctrine and practice are built, all through the Bible,—till the top-stone is placed to the sacred canon, and the building stands complete. You might remove a solitary stone, and the stability of the edifice would not be affected; but you cannot undermine and destroy the foundation, without bringing the superstructure down in ruins too.

It may be all very well for the Bishop to tell us that, although the Bible is not true, it *contains the truth*. But who is to eliminate for us the pure gold from the alloy with which it is mixed? Who shall say what part comes direct from God, and what springs from the passions, infirmities, and errors of fallen men? The Bishop does not undertake to do this for us, but bids us (p. 152) trust to Reason and Conscience, and rest satisfied that whatever in the Bible answers to the witness from within, which God has given us, must be **TRUTH**.

But Reason and Conscience are not *infallible*. We require no more than the Bishop's own example, to prove to us how Reason may be imposed on by the weakest of arguments, and how easily Conscience will abdicate her functions when self-interest puts in its claims.

Reason and Conscience, therefore, are no safe and sure guides to the truth: and if there be no other way of arriving at the knowledge of the truth, most certainly mankind will never attain to that knowledge. But, in reality, the question is not, Are Reason and Conscience *competent* to decide in the present case, but, Would they *undertake* the task the Bishop has assigned to them? Is it possible to believe that men's reasons and consciences would long continue to venerate a book, which they knew to be full of error, and to accept the teaching of a book, the moral precepts and principles of which are (according to the Bishop's showing, pp. 9 and 144), many of them, shocking and revolting! If, as is the case, men have turned infidels, because they could not harmonize one or two scientific discoveries with the statements of the Bible, what would surely be the result if that book should be shown to abound in mistakes, historical, scientific, and moral (and the Bishop would prove to us all this), from beginning to end. It would at once be cast aside as undeserving of the notice of honest, truth-loving, conscientious men. Its influence over men's minds, consciences, and conduct would be gone for ever! The Bishop himself (notwithstanding the advice he has given us above) is quite prepared for such a result:—

“It is (he says, p. 12) perhaps God's will that we should be taught in this our day, among other precious (!) lessons, *not to build our faith upon a book*, though it be the Bible itself, but to realize more truly the blessedness of knowing that He himself, the Living God, our Father and Friend, is nearer and closer to us than any book can be,—that His voice within the heart may be heard continually by the obedient child that listens for it, and *that shall be our teacher and guide in the path of duty, which is the path of life, when all other helpers,—even the words of the best of books,—may fail us.*”

There is, indeed, no alternative. The Bible must be accepted as infallible! or rejected, (for the Bishop's followers would soon learn to adopt a different language about it, from

that which he at present employs)—rejected, I say, as an impudent fraud! Mr. Cook is quite right when he says (*Aids to Faith*, pp. 145—6; he is speaking of the characteristics of *Englishmen*, but surely we may make the remark general):—

“Once assured that [Rationalism] simply means denial of the veracity of the writers who bear witness to miraculous facts,—of the truth of the whole, or of any considerable portion of the book, in which it nevertheless recognises utterances of a Divine Spirit,—they will turn aside in contempt from what must seem to them a suicidal inconsistency. . . . Once convinced of the *untruthfulness* of a writer, no ingenuity of reasoning, no fascination of style, no adaptation of his statements to their feelings or prejudices, *will induce them to listen to his words*. They may be slow to discern the symptoms of untruthfulness, may be deceived and misled, but they will have but *one short sword* to designate what they are once convinced has no foundation in fact. The very last position they will admit as possible, or tolerate as defensible, is, that truths of infinite import should have been transmitted from the Divine to the human intelligence by unvaracious witnesses, or through the medium of events distorted by enthusiasts.....One thing with them is fixed and certain. Whatever else may be doubtful, this at least is sure,—a narrative purporting to be one of positive facts, which is wholly, or in any essential or considerable portion untrue, *can have no connection with the Divine, and cannot have any beneficial influence upon mankind*. The doctrines which are based upon it, or inseparably bound up with it, must have their origin in another region than that of Light.”

Indeed, on the TRUTHFULNESS of God's Word all depends, The Divine promises of life and salvation, through Christ Jesus our Lord, derive hence all their value. It is the “YEA” and “AMEN” of those promises that gives them their preciousness, and makes them “more to be desired than gold, yea, than much fine gold.” And how many of those blessed promises were spoken by the lips of Christ Himself! But if His testimony breaks down in one point, what confidence can we have that it is true in other points? How can we implicitly believe the message which He delivered to us Himself, or that which He sent His apostles to deliver? And if He fails us as the PROPHET, can we trust Him as the PRIEST?

can we trust Him as the KING ? No ! To be our Saviour, He must be a PERFECT Saviour,—and THAT He is not ! What follows ? “ Our faith is vain : we are yet in our sins ; ” and the great scheme of human redemption has been worked out to no purpose !

Most firmly do I believe that the Bishop is prepared to help us thus make shipwreck of our hopes and of our salvation. His theological views (as propounded in this work) are those of pure DEISM, in which Christ's atonement, Christ's mediation, Christ's abiding presence with His Church, have no part. The great truth (p. ix), which has brought solace to his trembling soul, has not been one like this, that “ Christ Jesus “ came into the world to save sinners,” but one common (as he himself maintains) to ALL RELIGIONS,—that there is a “ faithful Creator,” “ an almighty and most merciful Father, “ in whom we live, and move, and have our being.” (See also pp. 12 and 148.) And hence he winds up his book with commending to us the voice of the Great Spirit, as He spoke to the North American savage, to the refined heathen of Greece and Rome, and to the Sikh Gooroos of comparatively modern days ! *

* I at first wondered why the teaching of these Gooroos should have been specially selected for our edification ; but, on the principle *noscitur a sociis*, I believe all is explained. There is a wonderful harmony between the teaching of Nânuk, the great Gooroo, and that of our Bishop. Nânuk tried to find something Divine in all the forms and creeds with which he was acquainted. He spoke of Mahomet and the Hindoo incarnations, not as impostors and diffusers of evil, but as *having been truly sent by God to instruct mankind*. He tolerated the veneration shown to the cow, and the abhorrence felt for the hog. But his belief in *the Books*, that professed to contain the message of God to men, was, like the Bishop's, very weak. There is a verse ascribed to him, which may be thus translated, and might almost be adopted as an Episcopal motto :

Several Scriptures and books had he read,

Several Korans and Poorans had he read,

But faith he could not put in any.

(Cunningham's *History of the Sikhs*, pp. 42, 46.)

That some few rays of Divine truth have penetrated the “ gross darkness ”

Blessed Jesus! We prefer to listen to THY loving voice! To whom else *should* we go? Thou, and Thou only, hast the words of eternal life! We would learn of THEE! Oh give us Thy Holy Spirit! Make us humble and child-like! Bow down our proud reason, enlighten our darkened conscience! Convince us of sin, and lead us evermore to rejoice in Thy salvation! Show Thou to him, whose work we have been considering, how far he has wandered from Thy Truth! Open his eyes, that he may discern the wondrous things of Thy Law, and the sweet and unspeakably precious comforts of Thy Gospel! Be Thou to him and to us Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification, and complete Redemption! Thou that sittest at the right hand of God the Father, have mercy upon us! For Thou only art holy; Thou only art the Lord; Thou only, O Christ, with the Holy Ghost, art most high in the glory of God the Father. Amen.

of heathenism few will deny. (See Acts xiv. 17; xvii. 27, 28; Rom. i. 20, 21.) But they have only made the darkness the more terribly visible. It is not till the Sun of Righteousness rises on a people, "with healing in His wings," bringing "light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death," that their feet *can* be guided into the way of peace.

Against the quotation the Bishop has given from Lactantius, expressing his admiration of some fine and noble thoughts that Cicero had uttered, let me set another from the same author, showing how utterly powerless such teaching was in arresting the attention of the multitude, or in reforming the awful depravity of the age. A revelation felt and acknowledged to be DIVINE, and accompanied by Divine power, could alone do this.

"Quid ergo? nihil ne illi [philosophi] simile præcipiunt? Imo permulta et ad verum frequenter accedunt. Sed nihil ponderis habent illa præcepta; quia sunt humana, et auctoritate majore, id est, divinâ illâ carent. Nemo igitur credit; quia tam se hominem putat esse qui audit, quam est ille qui præcipit."
—*Div. Inst.*, iii., 27.

R E P L Y T O

PART II.

**“THE AGE AND AUTHORSHIP OF THE
“PENTATEUCH CONSIDERED.”**

THE BISHOP'S PREFACE.

AFTER reiterating the views advanced in Part I.,—not one of which he will either retract or even modify,—the Bishop takes a bold step in advance, and maintains that *every* reasonable man, in the present day, who has given any “thought” to the subject, *must* have arrived at a similar conclusion to his own, and *must* have made up his mind that the greater part of the early Scripture narrative is “not historically true.” “For instance, do even the Bishops and Doctors of our Church,” he asks, “believe the Scripture account of the Deluge?” “I assert,” he continues, “without fear of contradiction (!), that there are multitudes now of the more intelligent Clergy, who do *not* believe in the reality of the Noachian Deluge, as described in the Book of Genesis:” although they would gladly do so, if they could, since they are called upon “habitually to use that solemn form of address to Almighty God in the Baptismal Service, which expressly assumes the reality and historical truthfulness of the story: ‘Almighty and Everlasting God, ‘who of Thy great mercy *didst save Noah and his family ‘in the ark from perishing by water,’ &c.*”

Such reckless assertions may surprise many, but will deceive no one. They are quite in character with the other rash and random statements found in so many parts of this book.

The Bishops have answered the insinuation thrown out against *them*, in words of their own, which plainly imply that *they* still continue to believe the Church's doctrine in regard to the historical veracity of the Deluge.

And, in the name of my brethren, the inferior clergy, I should, if it were necessary, and if my humble voice might be lifted up in their defence, indignantly repudiate the charge of duplicity brought against us. But I am quite sure that no one suspects us of being the accomplished hypocrites the Bishop represents us to be. No one supposes that, Sunday after Sunday, we stand up, "in the holy presence "of God, and in the face of a Christian congregation," and make solemn statements in His name, which we do not believe, in our hearts, to be true.

Of course, with the Bishop's views, we are not astonished at finding him insist on the utter unfitness of the formulæ we are obliged to use,—of the doctrines we are compelled to teach,—to the growing intelligence of the age; and on the need there is for great and sweeping changes in our system, to accommodate it to the discoveries of modern science, and to the large and liberal spirit of inquiry which is abroad in the present day. But we protest against this attempt to drag us, the Bishops and a great body of the Clergy, into the same false position as he occupies himself. Does he thus seek to divert from himself a portion of that righteous indignation, which all Christian people feel at the immoral course he is pursuing, and which finds its expression in the solemn words of old (so solemn from all the associations bound up with them): "His bishopric "let another take" (Acts i. 17, 20)? or has he trumped up this false and groundless accusation, in order to give weight to the complaints and remonstrances that follow, and are founded on it? For if the Clergy (as a body) *do* believe the plain statements in reference to the Deluge,

the Exodus, and the other great historical events recorded in early Scripture, then is there no necessity for "relieving "their consciences of a yoke that now presses heavily on "them," or of "setting them free from the antiquated "and effete traditions, with which they are now fettered;" unless indeed the whole of our Church system is to be revolutionized, in order to enable the Bishop, and the few who think with him, still to maintain their position and their livings, and to shock the sound sense and Christian feeling of the Laity (to say nothing of the Clergy) by their crude and unscriptural speculations. From any such change the Good Lord deliver us!

But let us follow the Bishop a little further. As the condition of accepting orders in the Communion of our Church, we professed "unfeignedly to believe all the "Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament," we gave in our "assent and consent to all things written "in the Book of Common Prayer," and we bound ourselves, by a solemn obligation, "to use the form in the said book "prescribed, in public prayer and administration of the "sacraments, and NONE OTHER." The question then arises: if a Clergyman has been led to disbelieve any part of the Canonical Scriptures,—if he can no longer assent to all things contained in the Book of Common Prayer,—if he cannot, with a clear conscience, use the Church's formularies, what is he to do? I say, "The question arises," because the Bishop has started it. But surely, to an honest mind, *there can be no question at all.* The Bishop of London, in his recent Charge, laid down what every right-minded man must feel is the only course open to such a clergyman:—

"If inquiry leads to doubt,—and if the doubt ends in disbelief of the Church's doctrine,—OF COURSE he will resign his office as one of the Church's authorized teachers."

The Bishop of Natal, however, has come to a very different conclusion. This lover of the truth, who "bids us buy the truth at *any* cost," (saving, of course, the resignation of Bishopric or Living,) does not scruple to recommend a course of downright dishonesty and falsehood. He bids such a clergyman retain his position and his preferment,—by every means in his power disseminate his newly-acquired views,—and *drop*, in the Church's services, this part or that (*e. g.*, *all allusion to the Deluge and the Exodus in the Baptismal Service*), when it has ceased to commend itself to his enlightened judgment; to do all this, and to take the consequences! But, every one asks, is it acting the part of a "true" man to *promise* one thing and to *do* another? to undertake the duties of an office, which has certain indispensable conditions attached to it, and to retain that office, when he is no longer willing to fulfil those conditions? In business matters such conduct would be counted simple chicanery. Nor will all the Bishop's special pleading convince any of the enlightened laity, whose good opinion and support he seems so anxious to secure, that the course he recommends is not an outrage on all right moral and religious principle.

I must be allowed to add that the Bishop has quite mistaken the character of his own position, and that of the clergy generally. We do not occupy an *independent* position. Nor (however much we may be allowed liberty of *thought* and liberty of *conscience*) is *liberty of action* one of our privileges. The laity, whose servants we are, justly look upon us as the ministers of a National Church, from whom they have a right to claim the fulfilment of certain duties, *according to a certain appointed method and order*; any deviation from that order (without their consent first sought and obtained through the Parliament which represents them) on the part of the Church or any of her ministers, is a

direct breach of faith with them, which they are entitled to resent and resist by every means in their power. By preference, they have attached themselves to her services and formularies; but the moment those services and formularies are tampered with, the Church ceases to be what she professed to be, and (unless the law steps in to protect them, and to put an end to such irregularities) it becomes a proper subject for consideration with them whether they shall continue in communion with a Church that permits changes of which they may distinctly disapprove, and at all events admits an element of uncertainty in her authorized teaching, which may lead, in their opinion, to results of a most disastrous character. I therefore repeat it, that we, the Bishops and Clergy, are *not* free agents: but one thing we are bound to be, before God and man, and that is, *honest men*. We have no right to make certain promises in the face of the Church, and for the benefit of the Church at large, and then to break them as we please. Has it never struck the Bishop that, independently of the moral phase of the question, discord and anarchy would be thus at once introduced into our system? The liberty the Bishop claims for himself, in certain matters, he must be prepared to concede to others, in other matters; and thus, instead of all things being done according to the Apostolic rule, "decently and in order," every man would be doing that which was right in his own eyes. A Church, thus divided against itself, could certainly never stand. A Church, that distinctly recognised such violations of truth and uprightness, could never have God's blessing resting on it!

The Bishop dwells at such length on the difficulties, or, as he asserts, the impossibilities, of the Scripture account of the Deluge, that it may be well to inquire what is the real value of his objections.

He does not *insist* on the results of geological and physical science, as forbidding the possibility of such an event, but puts his case in the following popular form (p. xix):—

“Without any appeal to science at all, if only [a person] allows himself to ‘think’ upon the subject, and to realize to his own mind the necessary conditions of the supposed event, he will need only a common practical judgment to convince him that the story told in the book of Genesis is utterly incredible, which involves the necessity of Noah taking in a supply of animals, or of animal food, for the special use of the carnivorous beasts and birds, and of Noah and his family taking round two or three times a day food and water to such a multitude of animals, supplying them daily with fresh litter (how stored and kept?) and removing the old, with other considerations of the same kind, as, *e. g.*, that the supply of *light* and *air* for the whole community in the ‘lower, second, and third stories’ (Gen. vi. 16), was to be furnished by *one* very small window,—‘and a window shalt thou make to the ark, in a cubit shalt thou finish it above,’—which window, however, seems never to have been opened till the end of the deluge (Gen. viii. 6), (if, indeed, it *could* have been opened during the fall of rain,) in which case as they had no glass in those days, the inmates of the ark could have had neither light nor air.”

I desire, as briefly as possible, to show that we may both “think” and *believe*,—that the Word of God does not require an *unreasoning* assent on our part,—and that, whilst *superficial* “thinking” (as is often the case) suggests insurmountable difficulties, a deeper and more thorough examination removes those difficulties, and harmonizes the statements of Scripture with the conclusions of common sense and the deductions of sound reason.

First, let me answer the *practical* objection, made on the ground of neither light nor air being furnished to the inmates of the ark. “They had but *one* very small window, “and that seems not to have been opened till the end of the “Deluge.”

What, if it is the Bishop’s mind that needs light to be let into it, and not Noah’s ark that was left in darkness! Not having consulted his Hebrew Lexicon, he has not discovered that the word which we render “window” has a

more *general* meaning, and here may be taken to signify “a series of windows,”—the very means needed for introducing light into the several stories.

Gesenius thus explains the Hebrew word:—

“Properly, *light, a light*; used collectively in Gen. vi. 16, *light shalt thou make for the ark, i.e., WINDOWS: and of a cubit long shalt thou make THEM, the windows.*”

So Kalisch, in his recent Commentary, renders the words—

“*LIGHT shalt thou provide for the ark.*”

The inmates, therefore, were not left in *darkness*.

Again, the Hebrew word in Gen. viii. 6, “Noah opened the *window* (צַוּרֹת) of the ark,” is quite different from that in Gen. vi. 16 (צַוּרֹת). The Bishop evidently supposes it to be *the same*! Nor does the expression, “the window,” imply that there was *only* one window to the ark, any more than when we talk of opening *the* door, or opening *the* window, we mean to state that there is only one door or one window in the house or room in which we may happen to be.

Even more trivial are the other objections started! It would have been enough to supply *FOOD* *once* a-day to most of the animals. *RAIN-WATER* might have been brought by the simplest contrivance from the outside into reservoirs, whence the animals might have drunk,—and *LITTER* they did not need!

But, perhaps, the Bishop may answer that these are only *a few* of the objections, which must suggest themselves to any sensible and reflecting mind. It may, then, be satisfactory if I cite two or three authorities, which will show that men of high intellect and deep research *have* inquired, and “thought,” and calculated, and experimented, and, after all, come to conclusions *in favour* of the entire credibility of the Scripture narrative.

Bishop Stillingfleet, in his *Origines Sacræ* (pp. 336—346, ed. 1709), examines, with great minuteness and far greater

learning than our Bishop exhibits, the Mosaic record of the Deluge, and considers that its truthfulness is beyond dispute. He was the first to suggest the theory of a *partial* deluge—(*universal*, indeed, as regarded man, but *partial* in reference to the extent of the earth's surface that it covered)—a theory which, as is well known, has met with much acceptance in our own day.*

Hugh Miller, in his *Testimony of the Rocks* (pp. 322—324), has some remarks which show that even *arithmetical*, among other high authorities, are arrayed against the Bishop :—

“Measures so definite as those given by Moses were effectual in setting the arithmeticians to work in all ages of the Church, in order to determine whether all the animals in the world, by sevens and by pairs, with food sufficient to

* This theory has been considered by competent judges to remove all the geological and other difficulties which the Bishop has briefly alluded to in Part I., p. vii.

It is important to observe that it was brought forward long before Geology had made its wonderful discoveries, and is therefore not an hypothesis, which the advocates of the truth have been *driven* to adopt, in order to escape from the consequences of those discoveries. The following popular works may be consulted by those who wish for information on the subject :—Dr. Pye Smith's *Scripture and Geology*, pp. 72—119; Hugh Miller's *Testimony of the Rocks*, pp. 267—350; Archdeacon Pratt's *Scripture and Science not at Variance*, pp. 52—56; Professor Hitchcock's *Religion of Geology*, pp. 103—129; Mr. Hamilton's work (who was President of the Geological Society in 1855) *Researches in Asia Minor, &c.*, vol. i., p. 203, and ii., p. 386; and Kitto (*Cycl. of Bib. Lit.*, new ed., art. “Deluge”).

The Bishop ought to know (if he has read Hugh Miller's book) that the theory of a *partial* Deluge does *not* involve (as he asserts it does) a *universal* Deluge.

As usual, the Bishop takes no account of *external evidence*. If there were no Deluge, how will he account for the all but *universal tradition* of that event,—a tradition found by Humboldt among the wild Indians in the heart of the South American Continent, and by our own missionaries in the South Sea Islands?

serve them for a twelvemonth, could have been accommodated in the given space. It was a sort of stock problem, that required, it was thought, no very high attainments to solve. Let us take the question as we find it presented (drawn, however, from a much older source) in Sir Walter Raleigh's magnificent *History of the World*. 'If in a ship of such greatness,' says this distinguished man, 'we seek room for eighty-nine distinct species of beasts, or, lest any should be omitted, for a hundred several kinds, we shall easily find place both for them and for the birds, which in bigness are no way answerable to them, and for meat to sustain them all. For there were three sorts of beasts, whose bodies are of a quantity well known; the beef, the sheep, and the wolf; to which the rest may be reduced by saying, according to Aristotle, that one elephant is equal to four beeves, one lion to two wolves, and so of the rest. Of beasts, some feed on vegetables, some on flesh. There are one-and-thirty kinds of the greater sort feeding on vegetables, of which number only three are clean according to the law of Moses, whereof seven of a kind entered into the ark, namely, three couples for breed, and one odd one for sacrifice; the other eight-and-twenty kinds were taken by two of each kind; so that in all there were in the ark one-and-twenty great beasts clean, and six-and-fifty unclean; estimable for largeness as ninety-one beeves; yet, for a supplement (lest perhaps any species be omitted), let them be valued as an hundred-and-twenty beeves. Of the lesser sort feeding on vegetables were in the ark six-and-twenty kinds, estimable, with good allowance for supply, as fourscore sheep. Of those which devour flesh were two-and-thirty kinds, answerable to threescore-and-four wolves. All these two hundred and eighty beasts might be kept in one story, or room of the ark, in their several cabins; their meat in a second; the birds and their provision in a third, with space to spare for Noah and his family, and all their necessaries.' Such was the calculation of the great voyager Raleigh,—a man who had a more practical acquaintance with *stowage* than perhaps any of the other writers who have speculated on the capabilities of the ark; and HIS ESTIMATE SEEMS SOBER AND JUDICIOUS."

The latter (be it observed) is the observation of the hard-headed Scotch "thinker," who, of course, considers Sir Walter's estimate to tell on the side of a *partial* deluge.

Once more, Kurtz (vol. i., p. 101) shows how admirably fitted the ark was, for the purpose for which it was constructed:

"It was neither intended nor suited for *nautical* purposes. It was not meant for *navigation*, but for carrying freight, for which it was much more suited than if it had been constructed according to the principles of shipbuilding. The

vessel, after the model of the ark, which P. Jansen built at Hoorn, in the year 1608, was capable of carrying one-third more freight than ordinary vessels of the same tonnage, but was unfit for navigation. N. Tiele shows in his commentary, that the ark was sufficiently large to receive all those animals which were to be preserved. Of the 3,600,000 cubic feet, which it contained, he reserves nine-tenths for the victualling department, and assigns a space of 54 cubic feet to every species of animals, and accordingly finds that there was room for nearly 7,000 different species. Fishes, worms, and insects were, of course, not received into the ark."

These references are enough to prove that men of acute and profound intellect, men of great and varied learning, men of a practical turn of mind, having examined the Scripture narrative of the Deluge, have combined to testify that, independently of the Divine sanction, it commends itself to their judgment as a *credible and truthful account*.

We are thankful for this result. But there is One, whose testimony far eclipses that of all his creatures. We read in Matt. xxiv. 37—39 :

*"As the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. For as in the days that were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be."**

Now, the Bishop asserts, again and again, that we have only to exercise our reasoning faculties, and the impossible character of the story of the Deluge becomes at once manifest. He even sneers at those who never gave themselves an

* Let my readers notice the distinction drawn in Luke xvii. 26, 28, between the Antediluvians, who were eating, drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, and the men of Sodom, who also ate and drank, but besides *bought, sold, planted, builded*. This is a distinction which Moses does not draw, but is due to that full and minute knowledge of the facts which our Lord possessed. The former seems to have been a *rude* age, given up to coarse animal indulgences, the latter combined with sensuality, a *refined* state of civilization.

hour's hard "thinking" in their lives. Our Lord must share this sneer. *That* transcendent intellect, beside which all other human intellect is dwarfed into insignificance, must be counted deficient in common sense and intelligence. And *That* Glorious Being, who in the beginning made the worlds, and has since "upheld all things by the Word of His power," could have known nothing of the events that had taken place in his dominion during the previous ages ! But to us, who have not so learned Christ, the few words, above quoted, are *decisive*. Indeed we observe that the deluge of Noah, and the second coming of the Son of man are mentioned as events *equally true and equally certain*. So that if the latter event *will* surely take place, the former as surely *has* taken place. On the other hand, if the one can be proved to be false, then the hopes held out of the other are false too. Is the Bishop prepared for this conclusion ?

CHAPTER I.

SIGNS OF DIFFERENT AUTHORS IN THE PENTATEUCH.

THE second Part of this book,—whilst reiterating the conclusions of the first,—is of quite a different character. The first part was arithmetical and practical ; the second is philological and speculative. The Bishop has deserted the numerical grounds, on which he felt himself (we have seen how falsely) so secure ; and has taken up a position, as a scholar and a critic, for which, according to his own confession, he is altogether unqualified. From such an attack the Word of God has even less to fear than from the former.

The points the Bishop will aim at establishing in this Part are the following :—

- I. That more than one author was engaged in the composition of the Pentateuch, chs. i. and ii.
- II. That there are signs in the Pentateuch itself of its having been written at a much *later* date than the age of Moses, chs. v. and vi.
- III. That the real authors of the first four books were Samuel, and perhaps Gad, or Nathan, ch. vii. to end.

In the commencement of the work, objections that have been met and overcome a hundred times,—from Porphyry's and Jerome's day downwards,—are once more furbished up, and made to do battle against the truth. Orthodox commentators do not *conceal* these difficulties. They frankly state them, and have been generally supposed to have suggested a sufficient and satisfactory explanation of them. The Bishop (pp. 170—174) barely alludes to the possibility of any such reconciliation, but states his case with a boldness of assertion that would mislead any one not acquainted with the learning and labour that have been devoted to the elucidation of these questions. The blunders, into which he falls, in his haste to multiply the errors of the sacred historian, would be amusing, if the subject were not one of such solemn moment.

The Bishop's FIRST PROPOSITION is, that the Pentateuch gives evident signs of more than *one* writer having been engaged in its composition.

We have only to take the first few chapters of Genesis, and examine them carefully, and we shall at once discover (says the Bishop) these signs of different authorship.

1st, The *second* chapter is entirely at variance with the *first*.

This we deny, but let us hear what the Bishop has to say. What are the particulars in which the accounts differ ?

(i.) "According to ch. i. 9, 10, the earth emerges from the waters, and is, therefore, *saturated with moisture*; whilst, according to ch. ii. 6, the 'whole face of the ground' *requires to be moistened*."

But what is the contradiction here? Neither the Bishop, nor any one else, can say what was the effect of such a sudden and wonderful outburst of vegetation, as is recorded in chapter i. 11, 12. The garb of verdure, that now clothed the universal face of nature,—

"The herbs of every leaf, that sudden flower'd,"

the stately trees, that crowned the fields, the valleys, and the fountain side,—may have served, like a vast sponge, to absorb at once the surface-supply of moisture, and thus rain or vapour may have been *really required* by the thirsty ground, and Milton's words, describing what took place on the very evening of the day in which earth's vegetation sprang into being, *may have* been literally true (*Paradise Lost*, vii. 331—337):—

"God had yet not rain'd
Upon the earth, and man to till the ground
None was; but from the earth a dewy mist
Went up, and water'd all the ground, and each
Plant of the field; which, ere it was in the earth,
God made, and every herb, before it grew
On the green stem."

Of course, if (as many geologists suppose) the *days* of creation were periods of vast but indefinite duration, a very small part of the third day would have passed away before it became necessary that some moisture should be provided "to water the face of the whole ground." The Bishop professes to have some knowledge of geology. Might he not,

for once, have allowed his science to testify to the truth of God's Word ?

(ii.) and (vi.). "In the first narrative, the birds and beasts are created *before man and woman*, ch. i. 20, 24, 26."

"In the second, *man* is created *before the birds and beasts*, ch. ii. 7, 19; and *woman* after both, 22."

We reply, that the *strict chronological order* had been given in ch. i.; and that the sacred writer was not directed to keep to that order in ch. ii. Historians do not always follow the rigid sequence of events, but group them together, so as to set them more vividly before us. This is what Moses does all through ch. ii.

Or we may render the commencement of verse 19 thus: "And out of the ground the Lord God HAD formed every "beast of the field," as the preterite tense is rendered in ver. 3 and 5. (See *Ges. Heb. Gr.*, sec. 124, 2.)

My readers will not fail to notice before what *simple* explanations these great difficulties melt away.

(iii.) "In the first narrative, 'all fowls that fly' are made out of *the waters*, ch. i. 20."

"In the second, 'the fowls of the air' are made out of *the ground*, ch. ii. 19."

This, like the other two difficulties, is one of the Bishop's own creating, and does not exist in the sacred text.

Had the Bishop consulted his Hebrew Bible, he would have seen, as Milton did, that the true meaning of ch. i. 20 is :—

"And God said, Let the waters generate
Reptile with spawn abundant, living soul:
And *let fowl fly above the earth*, with wings
Display'd on the open firmament of heaven."

Nothing is said of their origin. Ch. ii. 19 supplies this particular.

(iv.) "In the first narrative, man is created in the image of God." (i. 27).

"In the second, man is made of the dust of the ground, and merely animated with the breath of life." (ii. 7.) And

(v.) "In the first, man is made the lord of the whole earth." (i. 28.)

"In the second, he is merely placed in the garden of Eden, 'to dress it, and to keep it.'" (ii. 8, 15.)

I unhesitatingly assert that none but a prejudiced mind would discover signs of contradiction in these passages. *Additional* particulars are furnished in ch. ii.* But *addition* is not *contradiction*. In short, if only we remember what the object of ch. ii. is, we shall cease to wonder at the differences (not discrepancies) which we cannot fail to observe in the two narratives. Chapter ii. furnishes the connecting link between the history of the Creation, and the history of the Fall. It is supplementary to the one, and introductory to the other. The author does not undertake to go over again the ground which he had traversed in ch. i.; he selects, under Divine guidance, such facts (generally *new*), and adopts such an order of narration, as shall best prepare our minds for the account he is about to give us

"Of man's first disobedience, and the fruit
Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
Brought death into the world, and all our woe."

But, 2dly, the account of the *Deluge* furnishes (according to the Bishop) another series of contradictions.

Thus in Gen. vi. 19, 20, we read as follows:—

"And of every living thing of all flesh, *two of every sort* shalt thou bring into the ark, to keep them alive with thee; they shall be male and female. Of fowls after their kind, and of cattle after their kind, of every creeping thing of the earth after his kind, *two of every sort* shall come unto thee, to keep them alive."

* See Hävernicks, *Introd. to Pent.*, 66, 67, and Rosenmüller on ch. ii. 4, "Enarratio in unicum mundi ortu, nunc transit auctor ad singula."

But in Gen. vii. 2, 3, the command is given thus :

“Of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee *by sevens*, the male and his female: and of beasts that are not clean by two, the male and his female. Of fowls also of the air *by sevens*, the male and the female; to keep seed alive upon the face of all the earth.”

The case is similar to the one we have been considering. A *general* command is given in the first passage, a *supplementary* one in the second.* The second command did not in any way interfere with, and could not therefore contradict, the first. Two animals of every sort were to “*come*” to Noah, and he was to conduct them into the ark. And, in addition to these, he was to “*take*” seven pairs of clean beasts and of clean birds. The *reason* is given afterwards.

“Compare,” says Hengstenberg, very pertinently, “*var. 2, ‘Of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee by sevens,’ &c., with ch. viii. 20, ‘And Noah builded an altar to Jehovah, and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar.’ It was proper that He, to whom the offerings were to be presented, should provide for their being presented.*”

I confess, indeed, that there is an apparent want of distinctness in the command, “Of fowls of the air also by “sevens, the male and the female.” But this verse is intimately connected with the preceding one. The *principle* of selection had been explained there, and is not repeated here.† The Samaritan Pentateuch reads: “Of the fowls of the air “that are *clean*, seven pairs, the male and the female; and “of fowls that are *not clean*, two pairs, the male and the “female.” And this is obviously the *meaning* of the Hebrew text.

But, besides these contradictions, there is (urges the

* Rosenmüller on Gen. vii. 2, “Addit Jova novum præceptum de animalibus mundis, quæ hominibus majori sunt usui, præter bina illa (vi. 19) sumendis.”

† So Poole, *in loco*, “Nulla ne hęc mundorum et immundorum distinctio? ...Moses compendio usus est, et ex præcedenti versu id cognoscendum reliquit.”

Bishop) a diversity of *expression*, which proves a diversity of *authorship*. The word "GOD" is used in ch. i., whereas "LORD GOD" occurs in chs. ii. and iii.; and, subsequently, "LORD" in some sections, and "GOD" in others. I admit the fact, and a striking one it is,—observed long since by Tertullian, Chrysostom, and Augustine; but I deny the conclusion, for reasons that will be given at length in the next chapter.

CHAPTER II.

ELOHISTIC AND JEHOVISTIC.

THE two names of the Deity, that most frequently occur in the Hebrew Scriptures, are אֱלֹהִים, ELOHIM, God, and יְהוָה, JEHOVAH.*

With the proper *signification* of these names we are not at present concerned. It is the peculiarity attending their *use* in the Pentateuch, and more particularly in the Book of Genesis, to which the Bishop calls our attention.

For instance, he bids us observe that in the first chapter of Genesis, and to the end of ch. ii. 3, the name ELOHIM (God) *alone* occurs: whilst, from that verse onwards to the end of ch. iii., a new title JEHOVAH ELOHIM (LORD God) is (with the exception of iii. 1, 3, 5) employed; and that in the account of the Deluge part of the

* The authorized version prints the word "Lord," when it stands for "Jehovah," thus: LORD; but when it stands for אֲדֹנָי (Adonai), thus: Lord. When the two words come together יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים (Lord Jehovah) we translate and print: Lord GOD; but when "Jehovah Elohim" occurs: LORD God.

narrative refers to ELOHIM (Gen. vi. 9—22), and part to JEHOVAH (vii. 1—5). He then recommends us to examine the Book of Genesis for ourselves; and, without going into detail (which he promises to do in Part III.), he broadly states that we shall find one class of passages exhibiting a constant preference for the name ELOHIM, and another a preference hardly less decided for the name JEHOVAH.

His conclusion is, that *two distinct authors* must have been engaged in the composition of Genesis, one of whom preferred *one* Divine name and the other *the other*. This conclusion he maintains is confirmed by the circumstance, that *other* differences of style and expression are found to mark the sections wherein JEHOVAH and ELOHIM respectively occur. More or less these characteristics distinguish the other books. It follows that the notion of the whole "Pentateuch having been written by Moses, and as such coming "to us in every part with the sanction arising from his "Divine mission," must be abandoned.

Such is the Bishop's statement of his own case. A little less of *assertion*, and more of *proof*, would have been acceptable.

We are thus at once introduced to the famous "Elohistic "and Jehovistic controversy," which has shaken Germany to its very centre,—has given rise to a literature *per se*,—and has led to the most daring speculations as to the origin and authority of a great part of the Word of God.

A brief sketch of the history and results of this controversy will (I hope) not be out of place here, as helping us to form a right decision on the questions raised by the Bishop.*

* I have gathered the particulars that follow from various sources, Hengstenberg, Hävernick, Nicolas (*Etudes critiques sur la Bible*), Farrar's *Bampton Lectures*, &c.

A French physician, M. Astruc, was the first to propound (in his work, *Conjectures sur les Mémoires originaux du Livre de la Genèse*, published in 1753) the theory that the peculiar use of the Divine names in the Book of Genesis characterizes *two distinct writers*, one of whom employs ELOHIM, and never JEHOVAH,—and the other JEHOVAH *chiefly*, though not to the exclusion of ELOHIM. But besides these two writers, he thought he could trace ten different memoirs, which Moses made use of, in the compilation of Genesis. He considered the book to be disfigured by useless repetitions, disorder, perplexity, and contradictions. Of course he denied its Divine authority, though he acknowledged the Mosaic origin.

When first published, this work produced no sensation. The views in Germany then, on the subject of the inspiration of Scripture, were those which still (thank God) prevail among ourselves. But years passed by, and when the theory was revived and embellished by Eichhorn, towards the end of the last century, “it met with general acceptance, and “spread with amazing rapidity, so that only a few eminent “scholars remained, who refused to it homage.” (Hengstenberg, i., 221.)

Eichhorn, however, pruned the theory of its excrescences, and confined himself to the assumption of *two* different documents, respectively characterized by the use of the names JEHOVAH and ELOHIM. He undertook to show that each of these documents has its own peculiar phraseology and circle of ideas. Like Astruc, he altogether denied the *Inspiration* of Moses; but allowed his *authorship* of the Books that go by his name. His theory became known as the *Document-theory*, and the writers of the two documents were termed the Jehovist and Elohist respectively.

It is unnecessary to trouble my readers with the various modifications and extensions of this theory, which have

sprung up, from time to time, in Germany. I shall confine myself to giving very briefly the opinions of two or three of the leading writers. With reference to the others it may suffice to say: *Quot homines, tot sententiæ.*

De Wette assigned a *fragmentary origin* to the Pentateuch, which he regarded as a religious epic, composed at different times by different authors, just as the Homeric epic by the rhapsodes. An Elohist and a Jehovistic writer collected these various fragments, and were followed by another compiler, who brought together the Elohist and Jehovistic productions, drew up the Book of Deuteronomy, and completed the Pentateuch in its present form,—perhaps about 750 B.C. By this theory not only the Divine origin, but the Mosaic authorship, of the work is rejected *in toto.*

Ewald has a most extraordinary opinion about the documents that supplied the early Hebrew writers with materials. He would have us believe that, beside the Book of Jasher (Jos. x. 13), and the Book of the Wars of the Lord (Num. xxi. 14), there was a Book of the Victory over the Amalekites (Ex. xvii. 14), a Book of Covenants, and a Life of Moses, which together constituted the source from which a *Book of Origins* (the Elohim document) was composed; that, subsequently, a history of early Hebrew times was drawn up by a Jehovistic writer for the Ten Tribes, and another by a second Jehovist for the Kingdom of Judah; and that these three books were, after a time, fused into one by a pious Hebrew who lived in Uzziah's or Jotham's reign. Such was the origin of the first four Books of Moses, and the Book of Joshua!! Deuteronomy was written a hundred years later by an Israelite refugee in Egypt!!! Well has this theory been called by one who is himself a Rationalist, a "tissue of arbitrary fictions."

Dr. Davidson, who seems to have copied from Professor Hupfeld, of Halle, sets before us (in his *Introduction to the*

Old Testament, vol. i., ch. i., secs. 4—9) another set of German views, according to which the Pentateuch was composed in the following way:—

1st came the ELOHIST, in Saul's days, who formed the groundwork of the narrative from older documents and traditions:

2dly, a JUNIOR ELOHIST, who from similar sources produced a similar work, in the time of Elisha (about 880 B.C.):

3dly, the JEHOVIST, who found still some important documents not touched, and some traditions not exhausted. He also composed an independent document (about 780 B.C.):

4thly, the REDACTOR (Editor), (? 700 B.C.), who brought together the writings of his predecessors, added contributions of his own, and put the first four Books into their present form:

And 5thly, in the reign of Manasseh (B.C. 650) the DEUTERONOMIST, who wrote the Book of Deuteronomy and completed the Pentateuch.

Of course, having gone so far, German scholars are not likely to be deterred by any scruple or any difficulty from proceeding still farther. They claim, indeed, a complete acquaintance with all the details of the composition of the Pentateuch, and, with an audacity of criticism unparalleled in the history of letters, will analyze for us every chapter, and give the very verses and *parts of verses* that are to be assigned to each of the writers,—whom they have conjured into being. Does any one wish to see to what lengths this process has been carried, let him turn to pp. 58 and 59 of Vol. I. of Dr. Davidson's work, and take one chapter of Genesis, we will say the 31st. He will find this chapter cut up and distributed as follows:—

To the Elohist *one verse* is traced, v. 18.

To the Junior Elohist are due vv. 2, 4—9; 13—16; 20,

24, 26, 28, 29; 38—40, 42, 46, 47, 51 and 52; and parts of 11, 17, 19, 23, 31, 41, 53, and 54.

To the Jehovist belong vv. 1, 3, 21, 22, 25, 27, and 30; and parts of 17, 19, 23, 26, 31, 50, and 53, with the *two last words* of 54.

To the Redactor are assigned vv. 10, 12, 18, and 49, and parts of 11, 23, 41, 48, 50, and 51, with *four words* of 52. *He has also made several minor omissions* in putting the finishing touch to the work.

Such are specimens of the wild and fanciful views, which modern criticism submits for our adoption, instead of the simple truth taught us by Prophets and Apostles, endorsed by the Great Master Himself, and accepted and handed down by the Church, as an heirloom of inestimable value, for thousands of years.

We are willing, indeed, to concede that if learned men, who have thoroughly examined the subject, were *agreed in any one view*, we should be ready at least to give them a respectful hearing, however extravagant, improbable, and even impossible their opinions might seem to us. But what is the real state of the case? We find the *utmost uncertainty* prevailing among these German scholars;—the views in favour one day, are rejected the next;—and those views, which meet with acceptance among *them*, are discarded as impossible by rationalistic writers in *other* countries.

The instances, which I have quoted, are illustrative of the great divergence, and the endless variety of opinion, that prevail in the modern German school. Mr. Rawlinson (*Bampton Lectures*, p. 47), writing on this subject, says:—

“Having to assign a time for the introduction of the forged volume [the Pentateuch], they have varied as to the date, which they suggest, by above a thousand years (!), while they differ also from one another in every detail (!), with which they venture to clothe the transaction.”

Yet, as Professor Stuart (*Critical History and Defence of the Old Testament Canon*, sect. 3, p. 44) remarks:—

“Each of these writers is *confident* in his critical power of discrimination. . . . Each is *sure* that he can appreciate all the niceties and slight diversities of style and diction, and therefore *cannot be mistaken*. Each knows, in his own view, *with certainty*, how many authors of the Pentateuch there are,” &c.

But not only do these learned doctors disagree among themselves, and to such an extent as to make their conclusions altogether valueless, but their *confrères* in other countries, as England and France, are altogether at variance with *them*; and, be it observed, not in some unimportant *details*, but in regard to the *general principles* of their criticism, and some of the most important results at which they have arrived.

M. Nicolas, for instance, an able and learned writer of the Rationalistic school in France, (*Études Critiques sur la Bible*, p. 27) writes:—

“This confusion regarding the composition of the Pentateuch, a confusion which is the consequence of an erroneous view of the state and movement of religious ideas in Israel, from Moses' time to the last period of the monarchy, affects with fatal error (*frappe d'un vice radicale*) the greater part of the critical researches of modern German science on the origin and formation of the Pentateuch. The fundamental error of this confusion will appear in all its force in the course of my remarks.”

When he says “the greater part,” he means to except (p. 25) the *early* German critics, but his condemnation applies to De Wette and all who have written since his time; in reality, to *all* whose opinions obtain prevalence, *in the present day*, in Germany: “all the critics” (as he himself says, p. 25) “on the other side of the Rhine.” According to this French writer, himself an unbeliever in the inspiration of the Word of God, *they are all radically wrong in their opinions on the origin and formation of the Pentateuch!*

Again: Dr. Donaldson (*Christian Orthodoxy*, p. 233)

maintains, in opposition to the Germans, that the Jehovist writer is *more ancient* than the Elohist, a view which strikes at the very root of most of their conclusions.

Let us see also how Dr. Donaldson and M. Nicolas agree one with the other. "The book of Leviticus," says the former (p. 232), "is exclusively ELOHISTIC." "La Lévitique," asserts the latter (p. 50), "est entièrement JEHOVISTE !"

Once more, the German critics (and our Bishop follows them) maintain that the Jehovist and Elohist are distinguished quite as much by *other peculiar phraseology* as by their use of the Divine names. But what says M. Nicolas (p. 64):—

"Can we feel any confidence in arguments drawn from *forms of language*, when we see one and the same word set down by Hebraists as an *archaism* (an *ancient form*), and by others, equally competent, as a *Chaldaism* (*modern form*)?"

Let us take an example of the diversity of opinions on *this head*.

The Bishop, following one class of German writers, gives us (p. 176) three instances (which are specially selected, and meant of course to be *very striking* proofs) of the differences in style and language which are found to distinguish the two writers.

Thus (i.) "the Elohist uses the expression, אֱלֹהִים, El Shaddai, ALMIGHTY GOD, Gen. xvii. 1 ; xxviii. 3 ; xxxv. 11 ; xliii. 14 ; xlviii. 3 ; and xlix. 25 (?), which the Jehovist *never* employs."

We notice the tone of confidence with which this assertion is made. We next turn to Dr. Davidson's work, vol. i., p. 59, where we have another set of German views, and we find two of *these very* passages assigned to the Jehovist !

"Again (ii.), the Elohist uses *Israel* as a *personal* name "for Jacob, xxxv. 21, 22 ; xxxvii. 3, 13 ; xliii. 6, 8, 11 ;

“ xlv. 28 ; xlv. 1, 2, 29, 30 ; xlvii. 29, 31 ; xlviii. 2, 8, 10, “ 11, 13, 14, 21 ; xlix. 2 ; l. 2,—the Jehovist *never*.”

Once more, we consult the Bishop's ally, and out of the twenty-three instances here cited, we discover *only seven* assigned to the Elohist; the other sixteen belong to the Jehovist and the Redactor!

“ Also (iii.), the Elohist always designates Mesopotamia “ as *Padan*, or *Padan-Aram*, and the Jehovist as *Aram-Naharaim*.”

We consult Rosenmüller on Gen. xxv. 20, and we find him maintaining that these were properly the names of *different* districts in the same region, the first the name of the *plain* country, the second that of the *highlands* adjoining.*

Once more, then, we see utter uncertainty and confusion in the ranks of our adversaries: they cannot even agree as to the *data* on which to build their hypotheses. Indeed, each man's hand may be said to be against his fellow; and we may leave them to overthrow and destroy one another's theories. As we have said, when they can *unite* in presenting us with certain ascertained truths, we shall be ready to listen to them. Meanwhile we shall maintain that Moses, with other holy men of God, spake and wrote as he was moved by the Holy Ghost, and that the history, the types, the prophecies of the Pentateuch are truth itself, and all full of precious and blessed instruction to those to whom God has given “ the hearing ear, and the understanding heart.”

I have gone, at greater length than I had intended, into an exposition of the discrepant opinions advanced by the Rationalistic teachers of the present day. I have, however, thought it right to state plainly the astounding

* Kitto (*Cycl. of Bib. Lit.*, art. “Aram”) agrees. Rawlinson (*Herod.*, i., 463), trusting to an Assyrian inscription recently discovered, even places Padan-Aram on the *opposite* side of the Euphrates to Aram-Naharaim.

character of the results to which their rash speculations lead, and to utter a word of warning as to the dangers we court, the sea of uncertainty on which we launch, if once we let go our hold on the sure anchor of God's faithful Word.

I proceed to meet the Bishop on *his own* ground.

In this chapter (as far as his arguments go) he confines himself to insisting that, from the peculiar way in which the two Divine names occur in the Book of *Genesis*, we have the productions of *two* different authors before us.

It is satisfactory to be able to state that we may even allow this,—and yet maintain the genuineness and authenticity of the Book.

It is *possible* that Moses may have availed himself, to some extent, of older documents, existing at the time he composed the Pentateuch.

Long before the Jehovah-Elohim controversy arose, Vitringa, than whom no man could have had a greater reverence for the Inspired Word, proposed, with much diffidence and modesty, the opinion that “Moses collected, arranged, embellished, and (where necessary) completed ancient memoirs and records, preserved among the Israelites.”*

To this general supposition of originals, belonging to the ante-Mosaic period, which the author of *Genesis* had before him, other writers, as Calmet † and Bishop Gleig (in his

* Vitringa urges that the patriarchs had doubtless committed to writing the chief facts of the early history of the world, especially those of the Creation, the Fall, and the promise of redemption, together with the various revelations which they had received from God, and then adds—“Has vero schedas et scrinia Patrum, apud Israelitas conservata, Mosen opinamur collegisse, digessisse, ornasse, et, ubi deficiebant, complèsse, atque ex iis primum librorum suorum confecisse.” (*Obs. Sac.* i., c. 4, p. 36.)

† Calmet thus explains himself:—“Quoiqu'à prendre les choses dans la rigueur, il ne soit pas impossible que Moïse n'ait pu apprendre par la tradition

edition of Stackhouse's *History of the Bible*), gave in their adhesion. On this subject Horne (*Introd.* i., p. 52) has the following remarks:—

“Should the reader be disposed to adopt the hypothesis of Vitringa or Calmet without the refinements of Eichhorn and his followers, this will not in the slightest degree detract from the genuineness of the Book of Genesis. It was undoubtedly composed by Moses, and it has been received as his by his countrymen in all ages. But it is not necessary to suppose that he received by inspiration an account of facts, which he might easily have obtained by natural means. All that is necessary to believe is, that the Spirit of God directed him in the choice of the facts recorded in his work, enabled him to represent them without partiality, and preserved him from being led into mistakes by any inaccuracy that might have found its way into the annals which he consulted. ‘If this be admitted, it is of no consequence whether Moses compiled the Book of Genesis from annals preserved in the family of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, or wrote the whole of it by immediate inspiration; for, on either supposition, it is a narrative of Divine authority, and contains an authentic account of facts, which constitute the foundation of the Jewish and Christian religion; or, to use more accurate language, the one great but progressive scheme of revealed religion.’*”

The Rev. J. Ayre, in his recent edition of the second volume of Horne's *Introd.*, pp. 587, 588, supports this view. He examines, with much care, the different theories that bear on the explanation of the peculiarity we are considering, and thus concludes:—

“It is very possible that a student, after diligent research, may be persuaded that he sees traces of more than one hand in the Pentateuch. The question is confessedly intricate. And if the varied use of the Divine name, and any per-

orale tout ce qu'il nous dit de la création du monde, du déluge, et de l'âge des patriarches.....il est pourtant assez croyable que ce Législateur avoit des mémoires et des recueils qui se conservoient dans les familles des Juifs. Le détail des généalogies, les dates des faits, les circonstances des événements, le nombre des années de la vie des patriarches, tout cela ne peut guère s'apprendre d'une manière si précise et si exacte, que par des écrits et des mémoires.” (*Comm. Lit.*, tom. i., p. xiii.)

* Bishop Gleig's edition of Stackhouse, vol. i., p. xxi.

ceptible difference of diction incline the mind to the conclusion that the most reasonable mode of accounting for the phenomena is to believe that previous documents were worked up into the composition as we have it, the present writer is far from censuring such a conclusion. This is nothing but what we have a thousand examples of. Luke had made himself acquainted with the works of those who before him undertook to describe our Saviour's life and actions, (i. 1.) Secular writers, too, have largely availed themselves of the labours of those who preceded them, and historians especially have often literally transcribed into their narrative events related by older annalists. It is no charge against the author of the Pentateuch to suppose that he has done the same. It does not interfere with the belief in his inspiration; for inspired writers were to employ all diligence in acquiring information. The Divine superintendence guided their faculties, but did not supersede the exercise of them. It preserved them from erroneously using the knowledge they anyhow acquired, so that what they have left on record is the very Word of God.

"To the belief, then, in the existence of the so-called Elohim and Jehovah documents there is no theological objection. *This* question is not of vital interest. But it becomes of vital importance when men not only distinguish, but *set one against the other*,—when they imagine contradictions, and argue that each author respectively described events, not as they occurred, but *according to his own fancy*, and the prevalent opinions of his times, and thus degrade the sacred book.

"It is here, then, that a stand must be made. The documents used—if separate documents there were—in the composition of the Pentateuch (and it is in Genesis chiefly that they would be used) were in *perfect harmony*. If information was found only in *one*, it was not denied, though not recorded, by the *other*. And the facts obtained from both were disposed with unerring faithfulness in the fittest place to make a **TEXT-BOOK OF HOLY TRUTH FOR GOD'S CHURCH FOR EVER.**"*

This opinion, without in the least detracting from the full and complete inspiration of the sacred records, or from the character of Moses as a prophet sent of God, and moved by the Holy Ghost to take in hand the great work of recording the history of God's plans of love and mercy to our fallen race,—removes (as it appears to some) difficulties in

* The above opinion seems adopted by Professor Rawlinson (*Bampton Lectures*, p. 51, and *Aids to Faith*, p. 251); and is upheld by the Rev. J. J. S. Perowne, in the art. "Genesis," in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*.

connexion with the *form* in which it pleased God that this revelation should be made, and seems to give to the *human* element of Genesis a great increase of interest. The antiquity of writing, both in Egypt and Babylonia, has now been clearly proved, and it is "not improbable that the art" was known and practised soon after the Flood, if it was not "even (as some have supposed) a legacy from the antedeluvian world."* The Book of Genesis may, then, be based on documents *cotemporary*, or nearly *cotemporary*, with many of the events narrated. Documents from the hand of Abraham, from the hand of Noah, from the hand of even some "man of God" who lived before the Flood, may have lain before Moses, and been embodied by him in the volume he wrote for the use of the Church of God in all coming ages. No one would venture to dogmatize on such a subject; but, at least, there appears no serious objection to this limited and qualified application of the "document-hypothesis." To my own mind, indeed, it seems to encounter far greater difficulties than it avoids; but every one must judge for himself on this point.

There is, however, another, and far more satisfactory opinion. The view that, till modern days, has been held by the Church, viz., that Moses was divinely taught the contents of Genesis, or so worked up the facts, which by tradition had come down to him, that the result is a consistent and uniform exposition of Divine truth,—written by him as God's "secretary," under God's direction,—with *one* aim and object, and in *one* simple and connected style,—this is the view, I cannot but think, that will approve itself to the Christian feelings and sober judgment of the majority of my readers, and this is the view which I shall endeavour, in the next chapter, to set before them.

* See Rawlinson's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 52, with the authorities referred to in the Notes.

The great importance of the subject must serve as my justification in going somewhat into detail. In no other way can it be brought clearly before us. And we shall not, I think, grudge a careful and minute investigation, when we remember that, if only we can succeed in establishing the *unity* of the Mosaic narrative, we destroy the foundation on which the Bishop's theory rests, we cut away the ground from under his feet, and we leave little besides, in the present Part of his work, which will require our serious notice.

May God's Holy Spirit guide us into all Truth!

CHAPTER II.

(CONTINUED.)

IT will be necessary, first of all, to ascertain the precise meaning of the two Divine names.

ELOHIM, according to some authorities (*e. g.*, Gesenius), is derived from the verb **הָאָן**, "to be powerful,"—according to others (as Hengstenberg), from an obsolete root, only found in the Arabic, "to be astonished, seized with fear, &c." It signifies, then, either "the Mighty Being," or "the Being whom men regard with reverential awe and fear." The two meanings evidently flow into one another. The plural form is what grammarians term the *pluralis majestaticus* or *excellentie*, pointing to "the infinite riches and the inexhaustible fulness contained in the One Divine Being."* By itself the plural does not indicate (as some have supposed) the mystery of the Trinity, because, like our word God,

* Hengstenberg, i., p. 273.

ELOHIM is used in reference to a *false* (e.g., 1 Sam. v. 7), as well as to the *true* God.

On the other hand, JEHOVAH is undoubtedly derived from the verb הָיָה (ancient form of הָיָה) "to be." See Ex. iii. 14: "I AM THAT I AM." The name represents the self-existent God, independent and unchangeable (Mal. iii. 6; James i. 17), "which is, and which was, and which is to come." (Rev. i. 4.) As might be expected, this is the *proper name* of the Deity, as is proved by its having no plural and no construct state. We meet constantly with the expressions, 'my ELOHIM,' 'our ELOHIM,' 'the ELOHIM of Israel,' &c. But such constructions never occur with JEHOVAH. Nor can we, when computing the number of times that ELOHIM and JEHOVAH occur in a given passage, take such instances (as the Bishop, by a most extraordinary mistake, does) into account. With suffixes or the genitive, no other word but ELOHIM *can* be used.

As contrasted one with the other—

ELOHIM is the wider and more general name; sometimes only the *superior natura quam Divinam vocant* of Cicero, or τὸ Θεῖον of the Greeks; but, in its higher signification, the Divine Majesty; GOD, in the fulness of His power, glory, and dignity; Creator, Preserver, and Governor of all things. Of God's *interior* nature and moral qualities, however, this name expresses but little. The *deeper* relations of God to man, those which proceed from His holiness and love, are hardly included in it. Speaking generally, it may be said to represent "the Deity," "the Supreme," "the Almighty Being," as opposed to feeble man and to all that is earthly. Hence, the very heathen are found recognising ELOHIM, just as the infidel, in our own day, does not deny the existence of GOD.

JEHOVAH, on the contrary, is the more definite and profound name,—the most exalted of all the Divine names,—

THE NAME, *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, (Lev. xxiv. 11, 16); the only name which describes the innermost being and nature of God, presents His *moral* attributes, and exhibits Him in His relations of love and justice to our race. We may learn something of ELOHIM from nature and the light of reason (Rom. i. 20), but JEHOVAH must come forth from His hiding-place, and testify of *Himself*, or we shall never know Him. Hence He is the God of *revelation*, who manifests Himself by His Word and by His acts, and who, in the sacred narrative, identifies Himself with the history and welfare of a chosen people. The progressive revelations, whereby JEHOVAH made Himself known to Abraham and his descendants, are the great subject of the Pentateuchal history.

But He is more than the God of *revelation*. As "*The Being*," He is the ground and root of *all* being. And when once, through revelation, He is known as JEHOVAH, He is recognised as operating in the facts of nature, and through the world at large. The religious principle, when it has attained to distinctness and life, beholds everywhere the living, personal God. (Ps. cxxxv. 6, 7.)* Thus he is also the God of the *heathen*, though He had only *manifested Himself* to Israel. The name JEHOVAH, therefore, in its full signification, embraces every idea which attaches to ELOHIM.

Those moral attributes, which specially centre in JEHOVAH, are represented in Exod. xxxiv. 6, 7, by Himself:—

"JEHOVAH, JEHOVAH GOD, *merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, but that will by no means clear the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and to the fourth generation.*"

With reference to the last expression, we observe that,

* Hengstenberg, i., pp. 287, 301.

though full of grace and full of mercy, JEHOVAH is yet infinitely *holy*, and will often appear as *the judge* and the punisher of *sin*. "JEHOVAH is known by the *judgment* which he "executeth." (Ps. ix. 16.)

There is, however (as it seems), *one* exceptional usage of the title ELOHIM in the Book of Genesis, to which I shall have occasion (*e.g.*, in the remarks on ch. xvii.) to draw attention. We must be careful to remember (for the remark, though obvious, is not perhaps unnecessary) that JEHOVAH and ELOHIM are not *different Persons*, but the same Great and Glorious Being, considered from different points of view. Nor does it seem unbecoming to regard ELOHIM as sometimes set before us,—not in the *absolute* sense just explained, but in the *modified* sense of *the undeveloped*, or *partially revealed* JEHOVAH. This idea, borne in mind, will (I think) help us over future difficulties.

Now, with the above significations of the Divine names before us, it will be my aim to prove,* in opposition to the document-hypothesis, that there is *a peculiar ap-*

* Of course I am largely indebted, in the remarks that follow, to Hengstenberg's chapter (vol. i., pp. 308—398) on *the Divine names in the Pentateuch*, and I cannot but think that the Church of God is under great obligations to this learned, able, and orthodox divine, for the great services he has rendered in the defence of the Truth against the daring assaults of rationalistic writers. Still I am free to concede to the Bishop that he shows, here and there, a tendency to that over-refinement, which seems a characteristic of the German mind. But I think that every unprejudiced reader will allow that his explanations are, in the *great majority of cases*, eminently satisfactory, and often very striking. In many instances I have ventured to differ from him, and, in others, much to simplify the explanations he has given.

I have also consulted Hävernicks' *Introduction to the Pentateuch*, Horne's *Introduction* (vol. ii., edited by Rev. J. Ayre, pp. 540—607), Professor Turner's *Companion to Genesis* (pp. 17—67), Maodonald's *Introduction to the Pentateuch* (vol. i. 124—188), and the article "Genesis," in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, by Rev. J. J. S. Perowne. But I have not found one English writer who goes *thoroughly* into the question before us!

propriateness in the use of the two names as they occur in the Book of Genesis,—in other words, that Moses was directed, in each case, to select the one name as *better suited* than the other to the connexion in which it stands. Such a view, revealing a beautiful harmony and depth of meaning in the Word of God, must certainly (if only it can be established on sufficient grounds) commend itself for our adoption. It has been upheld with much learning by Ranke, Drechsler, Hengstenberg, Hävernick, and other orthodox German divines, and endorsed by our own eminent Hebrew scholar, Dr. M'Caul (*Aids to Faith*, p. 196).

In GEN. i. ELOHIM alone appears. The creation, organization, and perfection of every thing are referred to the *fiat* of the ALMIGHTY BEING, who speaks the word and it is done, who commands and it stands fast. Thus, we learn that the world was not eternal nor independent,—that “the things which are seen were not made of things which “do appear.” (Heb. xi. 3.)

It is to be observed that man and woman were made in the likeness of ELOHIM. They might and did faintly shadow forth, in their primeval state of holiness and purity, some of the perfections of the Divine nature; but they could not have been made in the likeness of JEHOVAH, the eternal, self-existent, unchangeable God. Only one Being,—JEHOVAH'S SON,—is the bearer of JEHOVAH'S image.

GEN. ii. and iii. introduce us to JEHOVAH, the kind and gracious Being, who watches, with a tender and a personal care, over the creatures whom He has formed in the Divine likeness. As He is to be named so often in the subsequent narrative, it is needful, from the first, to guard against any possible misapprehension. Had Moses in this chapter used

JEHOVAH *alone*, there might have been a doubt as to whether JEHOVAH was not different from ELOHIM. The two names are therefore brought together, JEHOVAH ELOHIM (*i.e.*, JEHOVAH, who is also ELOHIM). Identity is thus established; and this point proved, Moses drops, after the present narrative, the composite name, and uses JEHOVAH *by itself*.

“ In chapter iii., however, (the narrative of the Temptation) it is observable, that the Tempter employs not this significant name, but only that of ELOHIM: ‘ Yea, ‘ hath ELOHIM said,’ &c., and thrice he confines himself to this more distant indication of the Author of their being. Eve, also, in her answer, corrects not the Tempter, by referring to the nearer relation in which God stood to her and Adam. Herein, doubtless, had been her victory in the conflict. The name of JEHOVAH would have proved a strong tower into which she had run and been safe. (Prov. xviii. 10.) [She should have employed it as an impenetrable shield, to repel the fiery dart of the Wicked One.*] But, alas! she takes up the Tempter’s word, and merely replies, ‘ ELOHIM hath said,’ (verse 3). The transition, however, to the name JEHOVAH ELOHIM is immediate, when the Spirit describes the scene which follows, the vain hiding of Adam and his wife from their offended Creator. ‘ They heard the voice of JEHOVAH ‘ ELOHIM walking in the garden, and they hid themselves ‘ from the presence of JEHOVAH ELOHIM.’ And for the remainder of the chapter, which recounts the disclosures of Redeeming love, with its assurance of mercy rejoicing over judgment, the use of this Covenant name is carefully retained.” †

In CHAPTER iv. ELOHIM occurs only once. When the

* Hengstenberg.

† *Inspiration, a Dialogue*, by Rev. James Kelly, p. 49.

“mother of all living” gave birth to her first-born child, her feelings of joy and exultation could only find their proper expression in referring the gift to JEHOVAH. “I have gotten a man from JEHOVAH” (ver. 1). But, after her grievous disappointment, when Abel was dead,—and Cain an exile, with the curse of Jehovah resting on him,—her sentiments on the birth of Seth (ver. 25) could not rise to the same joyful height. She contented herself with recognising God's *general providence*. The event was one in the ordinary course of nature. She could see ELOHIM's hand, but no further.

A *similar* explanation will apply to the use of the two names by Leah on the birth of *her* children (ch. xxix. 32—35, and xxx. 18—20.)

To JEHOVAH,—the personal and revealed God, the God of mercy, promise, and grace,—sacrifices (ver. 4), and public prayer (ver. 26) are offered. JEHOVAH, as the *Judge*, sentences and punishes Cain (ver. 9—15).

CHAPTER v. contains both ELOHIM and JEHOVAH.

In ver. 1 we have simply a reference to ch. i. 27, “In the day that ELOHIM created man, in the likeness of ELOHIM made He him;” and in ver. 29 to ch. iii. 17.

In ver. 24, “Enoch walked with ELOHIM; and he was not, for ELOHIM took him,” the contrast is tacitly drawn between one who walked with GOD and those who walked in the ways of a *corrupt world*. Where GOD and *man* are opposed, ELOHIM is the term commonly employed. So in ch. vi. 9, we shall find: “Noah walked with ELOHIM.”

CHAPTERS vi.—ix. furnish an interesting subject for enquiry. For the reason just given, the sons of ELOHIM are opposed to the daughters of MEN in ver. 2. Then the personal and holy God, the Judge of all the earth,—JEHOVAH,—is introduced, passing sentence on a depraved

and utterly corrupt generation* (vi. 3—8). But from verse 11 onwards, ELOHIM appears. "The earth was corrupt before ELOHIM;" "ELOHIM looked upon the earth;" "ELOHIM said unto Noah;" "According to all that ELOHIM commanded Noah, so did he." It would seem as though, after Moses had been directed to write the words, "And JEHOVAH said: I will destroy man, whom I HAVE CREATED, from the face of the earth; both man and beast," &c., it was brought to his mind that ELOHIM had been represented as THE CREATOR, at the commencement of the sacred narrative. Therefore, as the ELOHIM of ch. i. had merged into JEHOVAH in ch. ii., so now, contrariwise, JEHOVAH withdraws into the back-ground, and ELOHIM again comes prominently before us.† He, who "had seen every thing that He had made, and, behold, it was *very good*" (i. 31), now "looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was *corrupt*" (vi. 12);—He, who had gathered the waters together into one place, and made the dry land appear (i. 9), now broke up the fountains of the great deep, and opened the windows of heaven, so that once more the waters prevailed upon the face of the whole earth (vii. 11, 19);—He, the Creator, is represented as cancelling His own work, the work of Creation;—and then, when the awful judgment had passed, in the very words of ch. i. ELOHIM re-issued his blessing, and said to Noah and his sons: "Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth."‡ Hävernicks on these last words, observes (p. 71):—

"Here begins a *new creation*, as it were; and as the earth, coming forth

* Why our translation renders הָאָרֶץ , in verse 5, by GOD, and why Kalisch follows this rendering, I confess I do not understand.

† The transition is marked by the use of HA-ELOHIM in verses 9 and 11, THE (true) GOD, virtually JEHOVAH.

‡ Hengstenberg's explanation is very different, and (I must allow) appears far-fetched. He considers that Moses had an eye to the history of Abraham,

from the waters, has renewed its youth, no other blessing, but that which is appropriate to *creation*, can here be repeated."

I have already explained how the use of ELOHIM in the expression, "Noah walked with ELOHIM" (vi. 9), is justified. The contrast is implied with those who walked after the ways of an ungodly world. *Therefore* (as in ch. v. 24) ELOHIM "established His covenant" with Noah (vi. 18). Although, indeed, there is another reason for the occurrence of ELOHIM in this last connexion; the covenant had relation to *others* besides Noah,—even to the *whole creation*, of which man is the acknowledged head (verses 19—21),—and was thus of a *general* character. *The Creator* shows His care for the *preservation* of the creatures of His hand. ELOHIM is thus, on every account, the title to be employed.

A hundred and twenty years after, the Divine Being appears again to Noah (vii. 1—5), but on this occasion as JEHOVAH, for now He makes provision for the *sacrifices*, which can only be offered to HIM, and which we find so offered in ch. viii. 20, 21. Hengstenberg's remark (i., p. 329) I have partly quoted before:—

"It was proper that He, to whom the offerings were presented, should *provide* for their being presented. This command, in reference to the beasts [and fowls], goes beyond the *general* care of the Creator for their preservation; this *special* supplementary direction belongs to a *personal, revealed* God," [One who grants His people *communion with Himself* through His appointed ordinances].

Then follows chap. vii. 16: "And they that went in, went in male and female of all flesh, as ELOHIM had commanded, and JEHOVAH shut him in."

"The respective agencies of ELOHIM and JEHOVAH are here intentionally

in which a further and remarkable revelation of JEHOVAH's character takes place, and that, *compared with this glorious development of God*, JEHOVAH is only as ELOHIM,—which title is therefore introduced in the passage before us!

contrasted. ELOHIM cares for the whole creation.....JEHOVAH, the righteous, the merciful, cares for him, whom He had seen righteous in that generation, and who had found grace in His eyes. When JEHOVAH closed the door upon him, it was certain that not all the waters of heaven and earth" [nor all the violence of the wicked, seeking a refuge for themselves] "could force it open." (*Hengst.*, i., p. 330.)

Again: the covenant in ch. ix. 9—17 was not special and individual,—a covenant of *grace* and spiritual blessings between JEHOVAH and His faithful servant, Noah,—but of a general, outward, and formal character. ELOHIM and "*every living creature of all flesh*" (ver. 16) were the parties concerned.

Lastly: we observe the interchange of JEHOVAH and ELOHIM in ch. ix. 26, 27: "Blessed be JEHOVAH, God of "Shem . . . ELOHIM shall enlarge Japheth." It was in the family of Shem that the knowledge and worship of JEHOVAH were to be preserved and perpetuated. A *general* Divine blessing was to descend upon Japheth. God would visit Japheth with worldly prosperity, but reserve His spiritual blessings for the favoured people, amongst whom He was to dwell. (So even ancient translators understood the passage. See Kalisch, *in loco*.)

Let us now pause for a moment, and ask whether, though appearances were much against us, and strongly in favour of the advocates of the document-hypothesis, it has not clearly appeared that there has, thus far, been a beautiful appropriateness in the alternation of the Divine names. But how has it fared with *them*? Whilst the advantage seemed so much on their side, they have been driven to their wits' end, to carry out their theory. Even supposing them safely over the difficulty of the occurrence of ELOHIM in ch. iii. 1—5, how can they account for its appearance in the Jehovistic document (iv. 25)? How came JEHOVAH into the Elohist portion (v. 29)? into vii. 16? into ix. 26? There is no help for it but to cry out, in the face of all manu-

scripts and ancient versions, "Interpolation! interpolation! interpolation!" What surer sign could we have of a weak and untenable position? *

CHAPTER X. Here we have only the expression (ver. 9), "Nimrod, a mighty hunter before JEHOVAH." We may suppose that the chase was his *school for war*: † and that, as Peter, from a fisher, became "a fisher of men," so, though in a very different sense, Nimrod, from a hunter, became "a hunter of men." (Compare Jer. xvi. 16: "Behold, I will send for many fishers, saith JEHOVAH, and they shall fish them: and after will I send for many hunters, and they shall hunt them from every mountain, and from every hill, and out of the holes of the rocks.") The intermediate position of ver. 9: *he was "a mighty hunter,"* between ver. 8: "*he began to be a mighty one in the earth,*" and ver. 10: "*The beginning of his kingdom was Babel, &c.,*" shows plainly that, like them, its main reference is to his warlike and ambitious character. But the sacred historian leads us to infer that, though he prepared and carried on his schemes with amazing energy and success, and "with an apparent exemption from control, and independence, all his misdeeds were still perpetrated *under the eye of the living, avenging, and punishing JEHOVAH.*" (Hengstenberg, i., p. 331.) So "the men of Sodom" (xiii. 13) "were wicked, and sinners before JEHOVAH exceedingly."

CHAPTER XI. JEHOVAH, the Judge, whose eyes "are in every place, beholding the evil and the good" (Prov. xv. 3), rebukes the pride of those who would build at Babel a tower that should reach to heaven. JEHOVAH had not yet confined Himself, in His manifestations, to a single chosen race. In fact, at this time, all the world was *one*.

* See Dr. M'Cauley, in *Aids to Faith*, p. 194. † So Bochart and others.

ABRAHAM'S HISTORY. CHAPTERS XII.—XXV.

We now enter on the first great manifestation of JEHOVAH, as the Covenant-God of a chosen people. Abraham receives from Him a call (xii. 1), which he obeys in faith.

JEHOVAH then appears, through the greater part of the narrative, directing, protecting, and blessing the Father of the Faithful,—holding converse with him, as friend with friend,—and bestowing on him a glorious inheritance of true and faithful promises, which were to be fulfilled to him and his posterity.

ELOHIM does indeed occur. But there is only one instance (ch. xvii.) in which we cannot readily account for its appearance.

The *heathen* Abimelech, for instance (ch. xx.), knows no other name for the Deity. And Abraham also, in his intercourse with him, and when praying with him and for him (ver. 17), employs it,—for the name JEHOVAH would have been unintelligible to him. But we can hardly fail to observe how beautifully JEHOVAH comes in at the close (ver. 18), shedding its brighter radiance (as it were) on all that goes before. He, who to Abimelech was ELOHIM, had graciously watched, with covenant-faithfulness and love, over His servant, and even in the hour of his weakness and want of faith, “suffered no man to do him wrong, yea, “reproved kings for his sake.” (Ps. cv. 14.)

Let us next compare the narrative relating to Hagar and Ishmael, in ch. xvi., with the almost parallel account, xxi. 12—19. A striking difference is observable. All through the former narrative we meet with JEHOVAH, and all through the latter with ELOHIM. What can be the reason of this variation? Once more, a remarkable propriety reveals itself. Up to the time of Isaac's birth, as Ishmael's circumcision proves, he and his mother had remained a part of the chosen

family, and therefore shared in the relation to JEHOVAH. But, after Ishmael's scandalous conduct (ver. 9, compare Gal. iv. 29), and the Divine declaration, in consequence : "Cast out the bondwoman and her son : for in "Isaac shall thy seed be called,"* their position was altogether different. They became "strangers and foreigners," cut off from the privileges of "the household of God," and with no more share in JEHOVAH than Cain, when he was driven from the presence of the LORD into the land of Nod (*i. e.*, the land of *exile*). Henceforth they were only under the jurisdiction of ELOHIM.†

Melchizedek also, though a true believer, seems not to have known the Divine Being by His name JEHOVAH. He is called "the priest of" EL ELYON, אֱלֹהֵי עֵלְיוֹן, "THE MOST HIGH GOD." (xiv. 18.) And when he blessed Abram, he said, "Blessed be Abram of EL ELYON, possessor of heaven "and earth ; and blessed be EL ELYON, which hath delivered "thine enemies into thine hand." Abraham's reply is observable. He purposely employed the designation of God, which Melchizedek had used just before, that he might thus acknowledge, in the sight of idolaters, the fellowship of faith which subsisted between them, but he no less intentionally added the name by which the Divine Being had been pleased specially to reveal Himself to *him*. "I have lift up mine hand "unto JEHOVAH, EL ELYON (the most high God), the possessor of heaven and earth."

Hengstenberg here acutely observes (*i.*, p. 338) :—

"This passage is so far worthy of notice, as it shows with what care the author preserved the peculiar forms of the manifestation of religion. He repeats the words with such exactness by which Melchizedek (whose religious

* This command properly came from ELOHIM, because as *man*, as the father of the family, Abraham had no right to cast out his concubine and her child. Nothing but a *Divine* command could justify such an act.

† Hengstenberg, *i.*, p. 346.

position is so singular and characteristic) designated his God, that we cannot imagine"—[as some even good men, like Professor Lee, have done, thereby putting a weapon into the hands of our adversaries, of which they have not been slow (see the Bishop's book, p. 230) to avail themselves]—"we cannot imagine a prolepsis in the use of יְהוָה, JEHOVAH, in Genesis."

In chapter xix. 29: "And it came to pass, when ELOHIM destroyed the cities of the plain, that ELOHIM remembered Abraham, and sent Lot out of the midst of the overthrow, when he overthrew the cities in the which Lot dwelt." Moses designs to impress upon us (by repeating under a different form, the statement previously made in ver. 24) that it was through a *special Divine* interposition that this awful calamity took place. It was contrary to the *natural course* of things, to *human* or *earthly* causes. But when such a contrast is drawn between heaven and earth, God and man, ELOHIM is the term properly employed. It is remarkable that the Prophet Isaiah, in the same way (who employs the name JEHOVAH, in common with the other prophets, far more frequently than ELOHIM; indeed, who only introduces the latter title *seven times* in the whole of his writings, and then generally in connexions which *require* its use, yet, in reference to this Divine visitation) says (xiii. 19):—

"And Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency, shall be as when ELOHIM overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah."

So, also, Amos (*who nowhere else employs ELOHIM*) writes (iv. 11):—

"I have overthrown some of you, as ELOHIM overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah."

There is therefore a *special* signification attaching to the name here. The above seems the true explanation. As the calamity came from *heaven*,—direct from *God's* hand,—there could be no chance of escape, no hope of restoration!

But little now remains to be noticed save the use of ELOHIM in ch. xxii. 1—10: "And it came to pass, after

“ these things, that ELOHIM did tempt Abraham, &c.” I do not, however, see any difficulty here. Abraham had been living for many years among the wicked inhabitants of the land. His righteous soul must have been vexed by what he saw round about him. At the same time he breathed an atmosphere of *temptation*. Let holy men say, who have lived in heathen lands, whether they do not feel the depressing and ensnaring influence of the iniquity that abounds around them. Nay, in his own household he had had his trials and temptations (chs. xiii., xvi., xxi.). But at length comes the crowning test of his faith: “ It came to pass “ that GOD did tempt Abraham.” What is *Divine* once more opposed to what was *earthly*. All other temptations—from without, from within the family circle, from his own deceitful heart—were *as nothing to this!* His faith, however, triumphed; and, just at the turning-point of the transaction (ver. 11), ELOHIM reveals himself as the patriarch’s own loving JEHOVAH, rich in covenant mercies, “ abundant in goodness and truth.”* (ver. 12—17.)

One passage still remains to be considered, the only one, indeed, which seems to break in upon the unity of the narrative.

In chapter xvii. the covenant is confirmed by the institution of *circumcision*; new names are, by Divine warrant, assigned to Abram and Sarai; Isaac is promised, and Ishmael blessed. Now, it must be frankly confessed that here, if anywhere, we should have expected to meet with JEHOVAH,

* It has been asked: Would not ELOHIM have been more appropriate in the mouth of Lehan than JEHOVAH (xxiv. 31, 50)? I think not. He simply takes up the name as Eleazar had used it. Nor are we to suppose him previously ignorant of it. Would not Abraham, before he left the land of his nativity, have taught Nahor and his family *the name* (if nothing more) of the Divine Being who appeared to him and summoned him to leave them? An event which caused the complete break-up of the family (xi. 31) would have been preserved, with all its details, among them.

—the God of revelation,—who by outward signs (the symbols of inward grace) gathers out and sets apart a people peculiar to Himself. The solemnity of the occasion cannot be denied. What reason, then, can be given for the prominence assigned to ELOHIM, instead of the covenant-making, covenant-keeping JEHOVAH?

JEHOVAH, indeed, is not altogether absent. The chapter opens with “And JEHOVAH appeared unto Abram” And we may feel with Hengstenberg that

“this JEHOVAH, by being placed at the beginning, of which all that follows may be considered as a continuation, is the *invisible companion* of ELOHIM through the whole chapter.”

Still, the continued exclusion of the title afterwards cannot but strike us.

We observe, however, a new and solemn name introduced for the first time on this occasion. “I am EL SHADDAI (the Almighty God).” Here, I think, we have the key to unlock the difficulty. We are at once reminded of what is said in Ex. vi. 3:—

“*I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as EL SHADDAI, but by my name JEHOVAH was I not known to them.*”

The Bishop has made so much of this passage (having devoted a whole chapter—chapter viii.—to it), that it becomes necessary, independently of the light which it throws on the question before us, to submit it to a careful examination.

We learn, then, first of all, that it was part of the purposes of God to make a *gradual* revelation of Himself,—to develop His glorious character more and more, by *successive* manifestations of His power, faithfulness, mercy, and love. His people in Egypt were to know Him, as JEHOVAH, in a way in which even Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob *had not known*

Him ; just as *we know Him*,—now that the last and complete revelation of Himself, in the person of His Son Jesus (JEHOVAH-Saviour), has been made,—in a manner far surpassing that which was granted to prophet or king under the Mosaic dispensation. (See Luke x. 23, 24 ; 1 Pet. i. 10—12 ; Heb. xi. 40.)

Next, we notice that *the name* JEHOVAH, which was certainly known to the patriarchs,—for Abraham (xiv. 22), Isaac (xxvi. 22), and Jacob (xxviii. 16) all made use of it,—could not have had to them the *full and deep* signification which attached to it after the revelations granted to Moses, and the wonders wrought on behalf of the chosen people in Egypt, at Sinai, and all through their wilderness wanderings, till they reached their promised inheritance in the land of Canaan.

Such is the simple meaning of the words (which have given the Bishop so much trouble, and have led him to such a false and outrageous theory): “By my name JEHOVAH “was I not known to them,” *i. e.*, *comparatively not known* to them ;—in all the richness and fulness and depth of my character, as embodied in, and represented by, my name JEHOVAH, was I not known to them.*

Let us illustrate this *comparative* language by references to other portions of Scripture.

St. Paul, contrasting the *Legal* with the *Gospel* dispensa-

* Calvin and Hengstenberg put the same idea in *other* words : “Neque,” says the former, “tamen Deus hoc loco per *nomen* syllabas vel litteras inteligit, sed gloriæ et majestatis suæ notitiam, quæ *major et amplior* resplendit in ecclesiæ redemptione, quam in ipso fœderis exordio.” And the latter, i., p. 294 :—“The clause ‘by my *name* JEHOVAH,’ is equivalent to ‘in my *character* as JEHOVAH.’ The *name* of God here, as everywhere else, is that portion of the Divine nature which is actually exhibited.” (See, *e.g.*, Ps. cxxxviii. 2 ; Isa. xxx. 27.) That the “knowing by name” is a *pregnant* expression is proved by Ex. xxxiii. 12, 17. Compare also our Lord’s expression (John xvii. 26) : “I have declared (*ἔγνώρισα*) unto them *Thy name*, and will declare it.”

tion (as the above passage does the *Patriarchal* with the *Legal*) says (2 Cor. iii. 10):—"Even that which was made "glorious, had NO glory in this respect, by reason of the "glory that excelleth." Let the expression be noted: "NO glory!" It exactly answers to the words, "By my name "JEHOVAH was I NOT known to them." Glory there was, and knowledge there was, but the revelation that was made to the patriarchs had NO glory, NO knowledge *in this respect*, by reason of the far brighter glory and more perfect knowledge that was to follow.

Witness, again, the *comparative* language of Luke xiv. 26:—"If any man come to me, and HATE not his father, "and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and "sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple:" certainly not "hate" literally: the word only expresses the inferior position which father, mother, and even wife and children must have in the disciple's affections, *compared with* that which his Lord is to occupy. The same sentiment is expressed in Matt. x. 37: "He that *loveth* "father or mother *more* than me, is not worthy of me."

Compare also John xiii. 34: "A NEW commandment I "give unto you, That ye love one another;"—NEW, however, only by reason of the new motives, new obligations, and new example, which enforced it:—"as I have loved you, that ye "also love one another." But from another point of view it was *not* a new commandment: see our Lord's own epitome of the Law (Mark xii. 31): "*Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.*"*

But a still more striking parallel is found in the words of John the Baptist (John i. 33, 34):—

"I KNEW HIM NOT," *i.e.*, Jesus: "but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and

* Comp. Kurtz's excellent remarks, ii., p. 216.

remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God."

Yet how is such a statement reconcilable with the *long personal acquaintance* which John *must* have had with Jesus, from his youth upwards, and which showed itself, *before* this revelation, by his exclamation, on Jesus' coming to him for baptism (Matt. iii. 14), "*I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?*"

Dean Alford, in his note on this passage of Matthew, writes:—

"There is only an *apparent* inconsistency between the speech of John in this sense, and the assertion made by him in John i. 33, 'I knew him not.' Let us regard the matter in this light. John begins his ministry by a commission from God, who also admonishes him that He, whose forerunner he was, would be in time revealed to him by a special sign. Jesus comes to be baptized by him. From the nature of his relationship to our Lord, he could not but know those events which had accompanied His birth, and His subsequent life of holy and unblamable purity and sanctity. My impression, from the words of this verse, certainly is, that he *regarded Him as the Messiah*. Still, his belief wanted that full and entire assurance which the occurrence of the predicted sign gave him, which the word *ἤδεν* implies, and which would justify him in announcing Him to his disciples as the Lamb of God."

Neander, in his *Life of Christ*, § 42 (8), in the same way, finds no difficulty in harmonizing the two statements:—

"John means to say, with emphasis (in John i. 33), that his conviction of Christ's Messiahship is not of human, but Divine origin. His previous expectations, founded upon his knowledge of the circumstances of Christ's birth, were *held as nothing, in comparison* with the Divine testimony immediately vouchsafed to him."

Therefore, in the opinion of these learned men, the "I KNEW HIM NOT" of St. John is quite consonant with a considerable, though *imperfect*, knowledge of Him before. We ask no more. Had Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob lived till Moses' days, they might have said, comparing their present with their past knowledge of JEHOVAH, "WE KNEW HIM

NOT." And the Holy Spirit, writing of this their *imperfect* knowledge, most truly recorded, "By my name JEHOVAH was I NOT KNOWN to them."*

We are then quite justified in concluding that the language of Ex. vi. 3 is *comparative*, and that a *partial* revelation of JEHOVAH and His attributes *was* made to the Patriarchs.

But if, as was certainly the case, this revelation was *only* partial, so that, even when we meet with the name JEHOVAH, *as used by them*, it is to be taken to represent *less* than it did afterwards, when the theocracy was fully and finally established,—are we to be surprised that other titles, *inferior* (if I may with reverence use the expression), *inferior* in the richness and fulness of their glorious signification, should, during this period, be employed as equivalent in meaning to the ONE NAME, whereby, afterwards, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob was to be specially distinguished? Thus, in the chapter before us, we read, in ver. 1:—"JEHOVAH appeared "to Abram, and said unto him, I am EL SHADDAI."

Abraham would thus know the Supreme Being under two titles—JEHOVAH and EL SHADDAI—which *to him* would be identical in meaning, although in reality the difference in meaning was great,—as great as afterwards it became between JEHOVAH and ELOHIM. And then, to impress upon *our* minds the difference, so fully stated in the subsequent revelation to Moses, the sacred historian is directed to drop the title JEHOVAH after ver. 1, and to employ, through the remainder of the chapter, that of ELOHIM, which thus becomes *most significant*, implying, as it does, that JEHOVAH,

* Might not John also have said, "By *His name* JESUS I knew Him not," I knew Him not, by all which that name implies,—I knew Him not as JEHOVAH-SAVIOUR (for that is the meaning of the word "Jesus"), as JEHOVAH, the Son of God (ver. 34), as the SAVIOUR, "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." (v. 29.)?

who revealed Himself to Abram on this occasion, was only as ELOHIM, *compared with* the more glorious manifestation of Himself which was to follow.*

The chapter is thus written, *from Abraham's point of view*, in order that we may see the full force and meaning of the Lord's words to Moses: "By my name JEHOVAH was I *not known* to them." And ELOHIM all through represents the *undeveloped* JEHOVAH. JEHOVAH, *as known to Abraham*, was only yet as EL SHADDAI and ELOHIM.

We are then prepared to find, as in ch. xxi., where reference is made to the covenant and promise of ch. xvii., the names JEHOVAH and ELOHIM used interchangeably: "And JEHOVAH visited Sarah as He had said, and JEHOVAH did unto Sarah as He had spoken. For Sarah conceived, and bare Abraham a son, in his old age, at the set time of which ELOHIM had spoken to him."

Still to Abraham there would be this distinction. ELOHIM was *more general*, as implying the Deity, whose almighty power and providence were acknowledged by the heathen themselves. JEHOVAH was the *special* name by which ELOHIM had been pleased to reveal Himself to *him*. Hence JEHOVAH is unquestionably the *more precious* title in Abraham's eyes.

I may just mention, in passing, that, in the portion we have just gone through, the supporters of the document-theory find themselves, again and again, sadly at fault. The

* Again I refer to Hengstenberg (i., p. 295): "When it is said (Ex. vi. 3) that JEHOVAH had *not* made Himself known to their fathers, but was now first about to reveal Himself, who can understand it in any other sense than that He would now show Himself to be JEHOVAH in all His glory, in the full manifestation of His nature, so that His earlier manifestation could no more be thought of, and the earlier JEHOVAH again be merged in the generality of ELOHIM?"

occurrence of ELOHIM in xix. 29, and of JEHOVAH in xvii. 1, xx. 18, and xxii. 11, perplexes them beyond measure.

ISAAC'S HISTORY. CHAPTERS XXV.—XXVIII.

The separate history of this patriarch commences with the words (xxv. 11):—

“And it came to pass after the death of Abraham, that ELOHIM blessed his son Isaac.”

This is equivalent to saying that *the Divine blessing* passed over to his son Isaac. It is a *general* expression, the particular force of which is proved by the details that follow, (xxvi. 12, 13, 28).

In the subsequent narrative, we find, as in Abraham's history, “JEHOVAH, the God of Abraham” (xxvi. 24), watching over, guiding, and prospering His servant. So striking was the blessing poured down upon him, that even Abimelech could not rest satisfied, without ascertaining the source from which it came, and, then, could not but acknowledge that JEHOVAH *was* a God able to bless those who placed themselves under His care: “Thou art now the blessed of JEHOVAH” (xxvi. 29).

In fact, ELOHIM nowhere occurs* till we come to the last words reported by Moses as uttered by Isaac, when he was sending Jacob to Padan-aram (xxviii. 3, 4):

“And EL SHADDAI bless thee, and make thee fruitful, and multiply thee, that thou mayest be a multitude of people; and give thee the blessing of Abraham, to thee, and to thy seed with thee; that thou mayest inherit the land wherein thou art a stranger, which ELOHIM gave unto Abraham.”

* We have indeed (xxvii. 28), “Therefore HA-ELOHIM give thee of the dew of heaven,” &c.; where, however, from the article, and the close connexion with ver. 27 (“See, the smell of my son is as the smell of a field, which JEHOVAH hath blessed”), JEHOVAH is undoubtedly to be understood, and the simple HA-ELOHIM is = JEHOVAH HA-ELOHIM.

We observe, with much interest, the occurrence of EL SHADDAI in Isaac's experience, as well as in that of his father. The blessing, which Isaac was taught by the Spirit of God to deliver on this occasion, is a conveyance to Jacob in distinct terms of the blessing which JEHOVAH had promised (xii., xiii., xv., xxii.), again and again, to Abraham. We see then once more the identity of the EL SHADDAI of the Patriarchs with JEHOVAH *as known to them*: and we are once more helped to the true meaning of these words as they occur in Ex. vi. 3.

EL SHADDAI and ELOHIM came together in ch. xvii., and in the same way, and with the same meaning, do they come together here.

JACOB'S HISTORY. CHAPTERS XXVIII.—XXXVIII.

In the vision at Bethel, JEHOVAH appears in his true character, as the *covenant-God*, sealing to Jacob the promises made to Abraham and Isaac. ELOHIM indeed occurs, but on grounds easily intelligible: 1st, "the angels (or messengers) of ELOHIM," ver. 12, is an idiomatic expression, *e.g.*, it is found (in the sing.) in Ex. xiv. 19, in which chapter (in no less than seventeen instances) the Deity is invariably called JEHOVAH:—these *heavenly* messengers are probably contrasted with the messengers of *earthly* kings and lords:—2ndly, "the house of ELOHIM" (ver. 17) is opposed to all *earthly* houses and palaces, and refers also to the name Beth-EL, given to the spot where JEHOVAH revealed Himself (Beth-JEHOVAH would, from grammatical grounds, have been inadmissible*):—3rdly, "if ELOHIM will be with me" (ver. 20), is the *general* expression, followed (in ver. 21) by the *particular* one, "if JEHOVAH will be MY God." (Comp. xxv. 11.)

* Hengstenberg, i., p. 357.

The narrative of the birth of Jacob's children (xxix. 31—xxx. 24) exhibits the Divine names in a way that claims attention. "Children and the fruit of the womb are an heritage and gift that cometh from JEHOVAH." (Ps. cxlvii. 3.) Hence we read, ver. 31, "When JEHOVAH saw that Leah was hated, he opened her womb." And both Leah and Rachel (xxix. 32, 33, 35; and xxx. 24) acknowledge JEHOVAH's good hand upon them, in connexion with the birth of their children. But then they also, on other occasions, recognise simply the *general* providence of ELOHIM: "ELOHIM hath judged me" (xxx. 6); "ELOHIM hath given me my hire" (ver. 18); "ELOHIM hath taken away my reproach" (ver. 23). And the Divine Being (ELOHIM) whose blessing they had sought, is represented as "hearkening to them, remembering them," &c. But is there anything remarkable here? If the Patriarchs themselves did not rightly apprehend the real difference between ELOHIM and JEHOVAH, what could be expected from women, who had been brought up in a semi-heathenish school, and who were still exposed to the same evil influences? Occasionally, under their husband's leading, their devotional feelings might reach a greater height: but the *general tone* of their religious sentiment would not rise above the fear of ELOHIM. Thus, in the succeeding chapter (ver. 16), we find them answering Jacob: "All the riches, which ELOHIM hath taken from our father, that is ours, and our children's: now then, whatsoever ELOHIM hath said unto thee, do."

Observe also, whilst ELOHIM appears to Laban (xxxii. 24), who did not belong to the chosen race (comp. xx. 3), JEHOVAH in the same chapter (ver. 3) reveals himself to Jacob, the heir of the promises. And so Jacob, when remonstrating with Laban (ver. 42) appeals only to ELOHIM, but Laban, when anxious to bind Jacob, employs that name, which, as he well knew, was great and awful in Jacob's

esteem (ver. 49), "JEHOVAH watch between me and thee, "when we are absent one from another."

The advocates of the document-hypothesis must tear these chapters all to pieces, to carry out their favourite theory. To *us* all is simple, natural, and strikingly expressive.

The contrast between *God* and *man*, requiring the presence of ELOHIM, is again observable in xxx. 2; and xxxi. 7, 9, 50; as subsequently in xxxii. 28, 30.

Chapters xxxii. and xxxiii. relate to the interview with Esau.

"And Jacob went on his way, and the angels (messengers) of ELOHIM met him. And when Jacob saw them, he said: "This is God's host; and he called the name of that place "Mahanaim (or *two camps*), and Jacob sent messengers before him to Esau his brother."

Hengstenberg (i., p. 364) beautifully draws out the hidden reference:—

"The appearance of *God's* messengers gave Jacob confidence to send *his* messengers under their invisible guidance: the double encampment of *God* stands in encouraging parallelism to *his own* double encampment" (ver. 7)."

Jacob, in his hour of sore distress, finds all his comfort and all his hope in pleading with JEHOVAH (ver. 9), "the "God of his father Abraham, and God of his father Isaac," whose loving-kindness and truthfulness he had himself already richly experienced. But he cannot meet Esau on the common ground of an interest in the same everlasting covenant. Hence, in his conference with him, he speaks only of ELOHIM. "JEHOVAH was exalted above the level of his "brother's superficial religion."

We now come to a chapter (xxxv.) which must not be hastily passed over.

EL SHADDAI appears in the history of Jacob, as He had before done in the histories of Abraham (xvii. 1) and Isaac

(xxviii. 3). When we bear Ex. vi. 3 in mind, this is just what we should have expected.

ELOHIM is, however, the leading title in this chapter.

There is a threefold reason for the frequent occurrence of this name: 1st, the appearance of EL SHADDAI (ver. 11); 2nd, the confirmation of the name Israel, "prince of ELOHIM" (ver. 10); and 3rd, the solemn imposition of the name Bethel, "house of ELOHIM" (ver. 15). The first of these is the *chief* reason. On the previous occasions, when EL SHADDAI appeared, it was accompanied by ELOHIM. So is it now.

It is very observable that these passages, where EL SHADDAI occurs, are the *only* ones which seem to militate against our theory. But it must be noted that the *same* explanation (already given at length in our remarks on ch. xvii.) applies to them all. We have, therefore, but little doubt that the explanation is the true one.

JOSEPH'S HISTORY. CHAPTERS XXXIX.—L.

Here JEHOVAH occurs only nine times, and eight of these are in ch. xxxix.: the remaining one is in the middle of ch. xlix.: "I have waited for thy salvation, O JEHOVAH."

No doubt the ascendancy of ELOHIM in this section is, at first sight, very striking. But an examination of the several chapters will (I trust) show that there were *reasons* for its selection. Certainly, the Divine Spirit might have cast the narrative in such a mould, as to introduce the hallowed name of JEHOVAH much more frequently than we find it; but, in the very *absence* of that name I think we may discern a proof of that *unity of design and authorship*, which we are seeking to establish. The greater part of the history of these chapters refers to the residence, first, of Joseph, and then of his father and brethren in *the land of Egypt*. But what had been said of the troubles that awaited

them, during a sojourn, like this, away from the promised land? "Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger "in a land that is not their's, and shall serve them, and they "shall afflict them four hundred years." (xv. 13.) No wonder, then, that Jacob feared (xlvi. 3) to go down into Egypt, and sought Divine guidance, ere he planted himself and his family in a land, where it seemed likely that so much of sorrow and oppression was in store for them. Even in the presence of royalty, the old man's heart was heavy within him. He thought of past troubles, and looked forward to others, that were approaching. "Few and evil have the days "of the years of my life been." The smiles of the king's favour, resting upon him, and in a special manner on his beloved Joseph, could kindle no bright hope in his bosom. Egypt was not *his home*. His thoughts were still turned to the land of promise; and almost his last words were (xlvi. 21), "Behold, I die, but ELOHIM shall be with you, and bring you again unto the land of your fathers." To him then, and to his pious descendants, the sojourn in Egypt was doubtless—notwithstanding all the temporal prosperity that for a time accompanied it—a season of exile and banishment, of spiritual darkness and gloom. "JEHOVAH, "the great spiritual sun, was at that time concealed behind "a cloud from the chosen race. They knew that its clear "effulgence would once more beam forth. But the entrance "into Egypt necessarily deferred their expectations to a "future period."*

The glory of JEHOVAH's name does not then light up this portion of their history. Wait till the promised deliverance comes, and then it shall burst forth with renewed and unexampled splendour! †

* Hengstenberg, i, p. 374.

† It is observable that in the same way, during the *Babylonish* exile, the name of JEHOVAH seems to undergo a partial eclipse. See Dr. Donaldson's *Christian Orthodoxy*, p. 236, and the Bishop's own admission, p. 317.

Moreover, it is certain that, during the residence in Egypt, a great *spiritual declension* took place. It would seem (from Ex. iii. 15) that the very name JEHOVAH had need to be revived among the people at large. Now we know that the Books of Moses abound in *type and symbol*. May it not then have pleased God to set before us—in the comparative absence of the name from the whole of the narrative embraced between Gen. xxxix. and Ex. iii.—this sad result and feature of their Egyptian experience? As coming events cast their shadow before, so does this great spiritual gloom fall even on that *early* part of the story, with which, perhaps, it was in reality not so closely connected. The exclusion of the name from *so many* chapters was more likely to arrest the attention, and point to the solemn truth meant to be conveyed.

Can the advocates of the document-theory help us to a better explanation? Nay! we find them thrown into the greatest perplexity. ELOHIM occurs (xxxix. 9) in the midst of an unquestionably Jehovistic document, and JEHOVAH (xlix. 18) surrounded by a context undoubtedly Elohistical! Moreover, just those peculiarities appear (as they themselves allow) in the long Elohistical narrative (xl.—l.) which are found elsewhere to characterize Jehovistic documents. The evident *unity* of the narrative, too, is such as to make the supposition of a piecemeal composition from two or three documents very difficult.

In proceeding to give, in further detail, our own view of the case, we notice, first, “the industrious and almost pleonastic repetition of JEHOVAH in the introductory ch. xxxix.” Our thoughts are thus led to “the Being who superintends the “whole train of events that follows,” whose *special* providence watches over the chosen race, and who had sent Joseph into Egypt to prepare the way for the fulfilment of His purposes towards His people in that land. The con-

nexion of JEHOVAH with the ELOHIM of the subsequent chapters seems thus designedly impressed upon us. Though He was pleased to hide Himself for a time from them, He did not forget them, but was silently and secretly, in His own mysterious way, accomplishing the covenant-engagements made with their fathers.

Secondly, it is quite easy to account for the use of ELOHIM in ch. xxxix. 9, xl., and xli. Joseph, in his conversation with a *heathen* woman, ("Shall I do this great wickedness, "and sin against ELOHIM?") and then with the butler and baker of Pharaoh, and finally with Pharaoh himself, would use the *general* name of the Deity. "JEHOVAH, both in name "and reality, was entirely beyond their horizon."

Living, too, among the heathen, and having to assign a reason for the names he had given to his sons, Manasseh, "forgetting," and Ephraim, "fruitful," he would say, as in ver. 51 and 52, "ELOHIM hath made me *forget* all my toil." "ELOHIM hath caused me to be *fruitful*."

A similar reason applies to his use of ELOHIM in his interview with his brethren, ch. xlii.—xliv. "The use of JEHOVAH would have betrayed him." Their own *general* recognition of the Divine Providence finds its expression in such words as, "What is this that ELOHIM hath done unto us?" (xlii. 28.) *It was no common accident* that had befallen them.

We next notice that Jacob, in sending his sons away (xliii. 14), prays for them: "EL SHADDAI" (God Almighty), and not JEHOVAH, "give you mercy before the man." But we remember that *this* was the title under which the Divine Being had *last* revealed Himself to Jacob, at a season of great family trial and affliction not dissimilar to the present. (xxxv. 11.) It was as much as to say, 'May He, whose ALMIGHTY arm was stretched around us to defend us on that eventful occasion, when we were in imminent peril from the cities

round about Shechem (xxxv. 5), protect you now that you are about to incur such danger in the land of Egypt.' At all events, Jacob was not *limited* in his choice of the Divine names. He may have felt, on the present occasion, special comfort in dwelling on the OMNIPOTENCE of his Covenant-God, and in placing himself and those he loved under "the shadow of the ALMIGHTY." (Ps. xci. 1.) Moreover, we may have here another indication that *to the Patriarchs* EL SHADDAI and JEHOVAH were synonymous terms.

The reason for Joseph's employment of ELOHIM, when he made himself known to his brethren (xlv. 5—9), is made quite clear by the contrast *implied* all through, but *distinctly expressed* in verse 8: "So now, it was not YOU that sent me "hither but HA-ELOHIM." When *God* is opposed to *man*, we have observed that ELOHIM is the term usually employed. The same contrast is observable in ch. xlviii. 11: "Israel "said unto Joseph, I had not thought to see thy face; and, "lo, ELOHIM hath shewed me also thy seed:" (God's thoughts are not as OUR thoughts:)—and again in l. 19: "And Joseph said unto them, Fear not; for am I in the "place of ELOHIM?"

Ch. xlvi. 1—3. Here we read that "Israel offered sacrifices "unto *the God of his father Isaac.*" That Jacob counted this expression as synonymous with JEHOVAH may be seen from comparing ch. xxxi. 5 with 3. But we notice that it has a peculiar force and beauty in its present connexion. Isaac had himself meditated, under similar circumstances,—when a *famine* had befallen the land of Canaan (ch. xxvi. 1),—a visit to Egypt, the land of plenty; but had been expressly forbidden to undertake it (ver. 2): "Jehovah appeared "unto him, and said, *Go not down into Egypt; dwell in the "land which I shall tell thee of. Sojourn in this land, and "I will be with thee, and will bless thee; for unto thee, and "to thy seed, I will give all these countries; and I will per- "form the oath which I swear unto Abraham thy father."*

Jacob, therefore, *feared* (xlvi. 3) lest perchance he might be mistaken in his interpretation of the leadings of Divine Providence. Joseph, indeed, had been wonderfully placed in a position to supply all his wants; Pharaoh had also sent a gracious message, with waggons to bring them down. Here was the call from MAN, but did ELOHIM (ver. 2) approve of this call? He appeals then to Him, who had mercifully directed his father Isaac under circumstances so similar, and the Divine answer was given in the visions of the night: "I am HA-EL (the ELOHIM whose guidance thou hast sought) *the God of thy father*: fear not to go down into "Egypt."

Once more, the use of EL SHADDAI is accounted for in xlviii. 3, by the undoubted reference to xxxv. 11, 12; and the blessing of EL SHADDAI being thus uppermost in Jacob's mind, it was natural that he should use this or the corresponding title, ELOHIM, *which we have invariably found to accompany EL SHADDAI*, in the blessing which he himself founds on this earlier one, and which he proceeds to deliver in ver. 15 and 20.

Lastly, we observe ELOHIM in the expressions: "Behold, I die: but ELOHIM shall be with you, and bring you again unto the land of your fathers" (xlviii. 21): and, "I die; and ELOHIM will surely visit you, and bring you out of this land, unto the land which He sware to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob" (l. 24). Once again the contrast is between feeble MAN and Almighty GOD. Dr. Gill, without any reference to the subject we are discussing, comments on the first passage: "He signifies that HE was departing from them, but GOD would not depart from them, WHOSE presence would be infinitely more to them than HIS." And Bush (*Notes on Genesis*) writes on the latter passage: "Joseph did what he could to console the hearts of his brethren, whom his death was depriving of their best *earthly friend*. He let them know that they had a *better*

“*friend in heaven*, who could not die, and who would surely “visit them, and bring them again out of Egypt.”

I have now completed my task. The unity of Genesis established, that of the other Books of the Pentateuch follows, without any difficulty. Indeed, from Ex. iii. onwards, JEHOVAH becomes the prevailing name, and we have only to account for the *occasional* introduction of ELOHIM. This we can easily do, on the principles already laid down.*

Of course, exception may be taken to more or less of what I have ventured to advance. Still I trust it will be felt that there is *so much of truth* in the general principles laid down, and that those principles apply, in so striking a manner, to the elucidation of *many, if not of most*, of the passages considered, that there can be no doubt that the explanation is based on a right foundation, and needs only further development in order to clear away the objections and difficulties that may be considered still to attach to it. And it must be confessed that a thorough examination of this important subject has yet to be made. The question is one quite of modern date; nor has the mind of the Church *generally* been turned to it. Henceforth it will doubtless claim more attention at the hands of our leading divines, and the result (we may confidently anticipate) will be to bring fresh honour to the Word of our God, and to evolve fresh beauties and fresh profit from that storehouse of grace and truth; so that many a devout student, engaged in this labour of love, will be fain to exclaim, “I rejoice at Thy Word, as one that findeth GREAT SPOIL.”

* There are many difficult and delicate questions connected with the use of the two Divine names in other parts of the Old Testament, *e.g.*, in the Psalms, the Book of Job, and the later historical books. But I humbly think that the explanation of these difficulties rests on a different footing from that which applies to the Pentateuch, and therefore I have not felt myself called upon to examine them.

CHAPTERS III. AND IV.

WHAT is the object of the introduction of these chapters? They seem strangely out of place here, and may certainly be passed over without any detriment to the argument in which we are engaged.

There is only one statement in them which deserves any notice, and that is the following (p. 186):—

“Here, first, it should be noticed that the Books of the Pentateuch are never ascribed to Moses in the inscriptions of Hebrew manuscripts, or in printed copies of the Hebrew Bible. Nor are they styled the ‘Books of Moses’ in the Septuagint or Vulgate, but only in our modern translations, after the example of many eminent Fathers of the Church, who, with the exception of Jerome, and, perhaps, Origen, were, one and all of them, very little acquainted with the Hebrew language, and still less with its criticism.”

This is again one of those unfair, one-sided, and captious statements which we have already found in so many parts of this book. Its object apparently is to insinuate that the use of the name “Books of Moses,” now common among ourselves, sprang up in an *uncritical age*, and when the most eminent divines were men very little acquainted with the Hebrew language!

But what are the facts of the case? Even those who oppose the Mosaic authorship (as De Wette himself) cannot deny that the ANCIENT, POSITIVE, AND UNIFORM TRADITION of the Jews assigned the authorship of the Pentateuch (with the exception of the last chapter) to Moses.* The absence of his name from the early manuscripts becomes thus a strong

* For the long *catena* of evidence, beginning with Moses' own claim to have written the Books which go by his name, and thence from Joshua's time downwards to our own day, see Horne's *Introd.*, i., 38—56, and Rawlinson's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 39—47.

argument *in favour of the Mosaic authorship*. It was *unnecessary* to prefix the name, because no one doubted whose work it was. "THE LAW" was accepted by every one as "THE LAW OF MOSES," just as in later times ἡ γραφή and αἱ γραφαί, "the Writings," or, "the Scriptures,"—τὰ βιβλία (*Latin, Biblia, -æ*), "the Books," or "the Bible,"—needed no addition to tell men what writings, or what books were intended.

We find no fault with the Septuagint and Vulgate for copying from the ancient Hebrew manuscripts; nor are modern translators to blame who call these Books by the name of Moses, because they have a far higher authority than "eminent Fathers of the Church," even our Blessed Lord Himself on their side, who says (Mark xii. 26):—

"*Have ye not read in THE BOOK OF MOSES,* how in the bush God spake unto him, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?*"

Let us now pause a moment, and inquire *what progress* we have thus far made.

In opposition to the Bishop's

FIRST PROPOSITION, *That the Pentateuch gives evident signs—by self-contradictions and a peculiar phraseology—of more than one writer having been engaged in its composition,*

I have maintained

(1) In pp. 102—106, that the *contradictions* cited admit of ready reconciliation; and

(2) In pp. 107—151, that the *peculiar phraseology* employed does not in any way disprove the Mosaic authorship; but, on the contrary, gives a force and beauty to the narrative, of which any other hypothesis deprives it.

* *The Pentateuch is still preserved as ONE BOOK, or roll, in the Jewish synagogues: but, long before our Lord's time, the division into five subordinate books had taken place, and accordingly we find this division recognised both by Philo and Josephus. See Horne, i., 41.*

CHAPTER V.

THE Bishop's SECOND PROPOSITION is, *That there are signs in the Pentateuch itself of its having been written at a much later date than the age of Moses.*

From an early period, the opponents of the genuineness of the Pentateuch have made the most of certain *apparent* anachronisms and discrepancies, which they have cited as proof that it must have been composed in a much later age than that of Moses and the Exodus. The Bishop and his German friends simply revive objections that were started at various periods, from the twelfth to the seventeenth century. Modern criticism has made no important addition to their number; nor does it require much skill or discernment to detect these seeming imperfections. They are flaws that lie upon the surface, and almost seem to invite investigation.

The defenders of the Pentateuch have maintained that, as no writer of antiquity has entirely escaped interpolations, it was to be expected that some such alterations of the original text would have taken place in the course of many centuries. We must be careful, however, not to *concede too much* on this point. Certain it is, that many *supposed* interpolations are no interpolations at all, and that many *apparent* discrepancies admit of easy reconciliation. The number of passages, *if there are any*, which *really* show traces of a later hand is *very small*. Jahn supposes twelve such passages, Witsius four, and Hengstenberg *one, at the most!*

I proceed now to consider, as briefly as possible, the long list cited by the Bishop, and hope to show that *there is not one of the passages objected to, which may not have come from the hand of Moses.*

No. 1 contains objections already brought forward, in reference to the "shekel of the Sanctuary," and the command "to sacrifice young pigeons,"—and already answered by me in pp. 19 and 64. I note, however, that Dr. Davidson (i. 111) adduces *the very chapter* in Leviticus which contains the injunction relative to the young pigeons and turtle-doves, as one that has the *genuine Mosaic stamp!* *

2. "*And Jehovah turned a mighty strong west wind, which took away the locusts, and cast them into the Red Sea.*" (Ex. x. 19.)

For *west wind* the original Hebrew of the passage has *wind of the sea*, an expression appropriate enough (it is said) to inhabitants of the land of Canaan, who had the Mediterranean Sea on their *western* coasts, but which could never have been used by Moses, who had been brought up in the land of Egypt, and to whom *a wind from the Mediterranean* must have been a *north* and not a *west* wind.

But the Bishop himself says that it may be admitted that "the Hebrews retained their own language, and their old forms of expression, *after they went down to Egypt*, and "so used, mechanically, as it were, the word 'sea' for 'west,' "though inappropriate." Then why raise the objection? The word in question was embalmed in one of God's precious promises to Jacob (Gen. xxviii. 14), well known to the pious Hebrews from the time it was delivered till Moses' days: and was, therefore, never likely to have changed its meaning.

This, I cannot but think, is the *true* explanation. Another however, is at hand. A *north-west wind* (let any one look at the map of Egypt) would set in *from the Mediterranean*, and carry the locusts in the direction of the Red Sea. Let

the Bishop mark the following words of Volney (*Voyage en Syrie et en Egypte*, t. i., p. 54)*:—

“The north and WEST WINDS bring the evaporation of the Mediterranean to Egypt.”

And if the WEST WINDS, *à fortiori* the NORTH-WEST !

“But,” continues the Bishop, “this is only one of many
* “like phenomena! In Gen. xli. 6, the *east* wind is spoken
“of as a *parching* wind, which, as Gesenius observes—

“it certainly is in *Palestine*, but not in Egypt, whence the LXX, in that place, write νόρος ‘*south-west* wind,’ instead of εὔρος, *east* wind.”

Now, it so happens, that Gesenius says nothing of the kind; in fact, as a truly learned man, he could not have made such a careless blunder.† It is enough to make one tremble, to notice the recklessness with which these charges are brought forward against the Word of God. *Nóros* does not occur at all in Gen. xli. 6! The expression used by the LXX is ἀνεμόφθοροι, ‘*blasted by the wind!*’

And that *that* wind might have been an *east* wind, I shall prove by a quotation from Kalisch *in loco*:—

“☉ is simply the *east wind*, which signification is here perfectly appropriate. The burning east wind, likely to parch the corn in the neighbourhood of Heliopolis, blows from the Desert of Shur and the Desert of Paran; it is far from refreshing; it permits no dew, *withers the vegetation, and completely destroys the labour and the hopes of the husbandman*. Its introduction here implies, therefore, neither geographical ignorance nor carelessness (*Bohlen*). . . . Direct east winds may be rare in Egypt; but dearth and famine, such as described in our narrative, are there at least equally exceptional.”

It is a remarkable corroboration of the above description that the Arabs of the Peninsula, to the present day, seem to call *any parching* wind an *east wind*. The word Shurkiyeh

* Quoted by Hengstenberg, in his *Egypt and the Books of Moses*, p. 10.

† Will it be believed that Gesenius inclines far more to *our* view of the case? See his *Thesaurus*, ☉.

properly signifies "east wind," but Dr. Robinson (*Biblical Res.*, i., p. 305) found them applying it to the scorching *south wind* of the desert.

3. We next come to a notable discovery of *the Bishop's own!* He finds a Gilgal mentioned in Deut. xi. 30, and asks: How could *Moses* speak of the place by this name, when the name was not given till Joshua's days (see Josh. v. 9) ?

The simple answer is, there were *two* Gilgals, both mentioned in Scripture.* And had the Bishop read the passage he quotes, with ordinary care, he would have seen that the Gilgal Moses names was in quite a *different situation* from that referred to in Joshua. The latter place was close to Jordan, and to the EAST of the land of Canaan, whereas the other Gilgal is distinctly placed by Moses in the champaign country of the WEST, "*by the way where the sun goeth down, beside the plains of Moreh.*" Now Jerome and Eusebius mention a GALGULA in the *Western Plain*, near Antipatris, and Dr. Robinson (iii. 47) found, in the same neighbourhood, a village JILJULEH, still preserving the ancient name.

The Bishop's blunder actually places (as any one will see by referring to Deut. xi. 30) Mount Ebal and Mount Gerizim on the banks of the Jordan!

4. "*And pursued them unto Dan.*" Gen. xiv. 14.

This objection is a similar one to the last. The name Dan was not given (says the Bishop) till long after. (Josh. xix. 47.)

* For the other Gilgal, besides the present passage, see Josh. xii. 23.

We have, however, just seen there were two Gilgals, we know there were two Bethlehems, and several Ramahs, Mizpahs, and so on. Why may there not have been *two* Dans? A second Dan (Dan-Jaan) seems to be referred to in 2 Sam. xxiv. 6, and to be there distinguished from the Dan mentioned in ver. 2 and 15. (Such is the opinion of Jahn, Hävernicks, Hengstenberg, and others.)

But, even if we were to allow that the original name, as written down by Moses (*Laish* or *Leshem*), was changed by a later transcriber to *Dan*, we could afford to make this concession, and should not fear that the genuineness of the Pentateuch would be affected thereby. As Hengstenberg says: "It would be absurd to imagine that a breach could be made in a well-built fortress by a single musket-shot."

5. " *And these are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel.*" (Gen. xxxvi. 31.)

The last clause of this verse could not have been written (the Bishop urges) *before* there had been a king in Israel.

And why not? Moses had, in the *preceding* chapter, recorded the promise made to Jacob (ver. 11), that "kings should come out of his loins:" and he here draws attention to the circumstance that, *before* this promise was fulfilled to Jacob's descendants, the children of Esau (to whom no such promise had been made) had *many* kings. Unbelief may murmur and wax impatient; but faith learns to wait *God's* time, which is always the best. (Ps. xxxvii. 34—36.)

6. " *Beforetime in Israel, when a man went to enquire of God, thus he spake, Come, and let us go to the Seer: for he*

“ that is now called a **PROPHET**, נְבִיא, was beforetime called “ a **SEER**,” רֹאֵה (1 Sam. ix. 9).

But, as the word “ Seer ” does not occur in the Pentateuch, whilst “ Prophet ” does, the Bishop concludes that no part of the Pentateuch could have been written before the days of Samuel!

Older objectors, however, have not attached much weight to this difficulty. Le Clerc says (quoted by Hengstenberg) briefly and well: *Temporibus Mosis usitata erat; judicium tempore desiit; inde iterum renata est.* (In the times of Moses it was in common use; in the time of the Judges it fell into disuse; afterwards it was again revived.)

We read in 1 Sam. iii. 1: “ The word of the **LORD** was “ precious (*i. e.* scarce) in those days. No prophecy was “ spread abroad (E. T. there was no open vision).” The *official order* of prophets—the נְבִיאִים—had disappeared. Here and there, the prophetic gift manifested itself, but without its proper connexion with the theocratic system. One so inspired, though truly a prophet, was not counted a נְבִיא, but received a new title, רֹאֵה, “ Seer.” Thus the old name died out. But, with the establishment of “ the School of Prophets ” by Samuel, and the revival of the *Prophetic order*, the word would unquestionably be reintroduced, and, after a time, come once more into daily use.

The temporary extinction and subsequent resuscitation of words or names is by no means uncommon. The name “ Hebrew ” is a case in point. First changed into “ Israel-ite,” and then into “ Jew,” it disappeared for many centuries, and only came into use again shortly before the Christian era.*

7. “ *Is not this written in the book of Jasher ?* ” (Josh. x. 13.)

“ *Behold, it is written in the book of Jasher.* ” (2 Sam. i. 18.)

* See Kitto's *Cycl. of Bib. Lit.*, art. “ Hebrew Language.”

The passage from Samuel refers to a fact in the life of *David*. The book of *Jasher*, therefore (argues the Bishop), must have been as recent as *David's* time. Consequently the Book of *Joshua*, which alludes to it, must have been *later still*.

But what *was* this Book of *Jasher*? Keil (*Comm. on Joshua*, p. 260), Gesenius (*Lex.*), and other authorities, consider that it was a collection of sacred odes in honour of theocratic heroes,—to which (as we may suppose) contributions were made, at various periods, from the time of *Joshua* downwards. This simple hypothesis explains all. Nor is it a matter of surprise (as the Bishop supposes) that the compiler of the Book of *Joshua*, even if he were *Joshua* himself, should have quoted some lines commemorative of the great event of the sun standing still, from the Sacred Anthology of the nation.

8. "*For Arnon is the border of Moab, between Moab and the Amorites; wherefore it is said in the book of the wars of J. hovah,*" &c. (Num. xxi. 13—15.)

In his objection to this passage,—on the ground of the unnecessarily minute description of a country, through which the Israelites had lately marched, and with which they must have been familiar,—the Bishop forgets that soldiers will march through and conquer a country, and yet have but very little idea of its geographical features, and then that *Moses* was writing for ALL ages, and not simply for those among whom he lived.

"But the events alluded to happened," says the Bishop, "as I have shown, § 173, only *a week or so before*, therefore "a quotation from a poem about them was quite impossible." Let my readers turn to the Bishop's reference, and they will be amazed to see that he himself allows they happened

months previously,—for Og's overthrow (ver. 33—35) preceded the narrative given in Num. xxi.

seed I was stolen away out of the land of the .." (Gen. xl. 15.)

As we are called upon to believe that "an expression, which was current in a later age, has been allowed inadvertently to slip into the narrative. It could not be called "the land of the Hebrews,' until they had invaded and "taken possession of it."

I beg to copy Dean Graves's answer to this objection (*Lectures on the Pentateuch, Appendix, p. 446*):—

"Joseph might well call that particular part of the land of Canaan, where Isaac and Jacob had resided for so many years, the land of the Hebrews. They, it is true, were not originally natives of the country, but they possessed such wealth, such numerous families, herds, and flocks, that they were looked up to as mighty princes." (*Vide* the language of the children of Heth to Abraham, Gen. xxiii. 6.) We find them joining the neighbouring kings in making war (*vide* Gen. xiv.), making compacts and leagues even with kings (*vide* Gen. xxi. 23, and xxvi. 14), and even conquering entire cities (Gen. xxxiv.), living according to their own customs, and exercising their own religion. It is therefore perfectly credible, that the place of their residence may have been termed 'the land of the Hebrews,' as they had been there for such a length of time, independent and in alliance with the natives. (*Vide* Gen. xiv. 13.)"

10. The Bishop quotes Deut. iii. 4—11, and reminds us that he has *proved* (?), § 173, that the events here recorded—the destruction of Og, and the capture of his country—had taken place *only a few days* before Moses' address, and when the people could hardly yet have breathed from the conflict in which they had been engaged. "It is absolutely impossible that Moses should have detailed, at such full length, transactions, all the circumstances of which must have been quite

“ fresh in the memory of those to whom he is supposed to be speaking.”

But we have repudiated the Bishop's proof, and therefore see no force in his objection. The events had happened some sixteen weeks before ; and Moses, taught by the Holy Spirit, was certainly a better judge than the Bishop, as to whether he should remind the people, with minute particularity, in his last parting address, of God's wonderful dealings with them, during the past few months !

Again, I say that Moses spoke and wrote, not only for his own people, but for their descendants, and for *us*, who are willing “ to hear his words.” If a heathen historian could speak of his writings as a *κρῆμα ἐς αἰεὶ*, much more may we claim the lofty title for those records of eternal truth, of the details and *minutiæ* of which our Great Master had so high an opinion, that He authoritatively declared :

“ *Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.*” (Matt. v. 18.)

CHAPTER VI.

ADDITIONAL SIGNS OF LATER DATE IN THE PENTATEUCH.

WE are informed that this chapter will contain what the Bishop is pleased to call “ minor indications ” of a later date. But if the main difficulties have been disposed of, the subordinate ones will not detain us long.

11. We are, first of all, told to notice the frequent occurrence of the expression “ unto this day,” in places where it

could have had no meaning, unless the "day" referred to was considerably later than the time of Moses or Joshua.

For example:—

"*Jair, the son of Manasseh, took all the country of Argob, unto the coasts of Geshuri and Maachathi, and called them after his own name, Bashan-Havoth-Jair, unto this day.*" (Deut. iii. 14.)

Now, undoubtedly, it has been usually considered that we have here the hand of an interpolator, either introducing the whole verse, or at least the last three words, "unto this day."

Hengstenberg, however, stands up for the integrity of the text here as elsewhere. We have only to suppose—which certainly is the most natural supposition—that Jair's conquest of the cities of Bashan was *synchronous* with that of the *general* conquest of the land by the Israelites (Num. xxi. 35); and we secure an interval of at least *several months* between that event and the time at which Moses spoke. Hengstenberg, therefore, thus proceeds (ii., 268):—

"Nothing is more common than names, which do not remain fixed to their respective objects. Num. xxxii. 38 furnishes an example. Here we are told that the Israelites gave another name to the city of Nebo. But it could not maintain its hold. Even in the times of the kings, the city bore its ancient name. But *all depends on a name finding its way into general use.* When this happens, it is generally sure of the future. It was therefore worth while, in reference to the name Havoth-Jair, to remark, some months after it was first applied, that it was still in use; for, this being the case, it had passed the crisis of its fate."

The other passages cited by the Bishop will present no difficulty to an unprejudiced and candid student. Every one allows that Moses did not write Deut. xxxiv. 6:—"No man knoweth of his (Moses') sepulchre unto this day."

Considering the close connexion between Josh. i. 1, and the end of Deuteronomy, it seems most probable that the

author of the Book of Joshua (perhaps Joshua himself, towards the close of his life) added this last chapter (Deut. xxxiv.) before he commenced his own work.

What the Bishop can mean by his citation of the passages from Joshua, in which the expression "unto this day" occurs, I am at a loss to understand.* Any one will see that they might all have been written by Joshua in his later days, *many years* after the date of the occurrences to which they allude. Indeed some of them, *e. g.*, the references to the "heaps of stones," would be much more appropriate, as written thirty or thirty-five years, than as written *several centuries*, subsequently to the events recorded, for such transitory memorials would, in all probability, have perished in that long interval of time. We therefore claim such passages as proofs that the author of the Book of Joshua (or at least of these portions of it) was not far removed from the times whose history he narrates.

The Bishop professes to be a sincere searcher after the

* The following are the passages quoted :—

"And Joshua set up twelve stones in the midst of Jordan, in the place where the feet of the Priests, which bare the Ark of the Covenant, stood; and *they are there unto this day.*" (Josh. iv. 9.)

"Wherefore the name of the place is called Gilgal *unto this day.*" (Josh. v. 9.)

"And they raised over him a great heap of stones *unto this day.* . . Wherefore the name of that place was called, The valley of Achor, *unto this day.*" (Josh. vii. 26.)

"And Joshua burnt Ai, and made it a heap for ever, even a desolation *unto this day.*" (Josh. viii. 28. So viii. 29, x. 27.)

"And Joshua made them that day hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Congregation, and for the Altar of Jehovah, *even unto this day, in the place which He should choose.*" (Josh. ix. 27.)

"Nevertheless, the children of Israel expelled not the Geshurites nor the Maachathites; but the Geshurites and the Maachathites dwell among the Israelites *unto this day.*" (Josh. xiii. 13. So xv. 63, xvi. 10.)

"Hebron, therefore, became the inheritance of Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, the Kenezite, *unto this day.*" (Josh. xiv. 14.)

Truth. It seems, then, hard to accuse him of a *suppressio veri*, and yet I am obliged to do so. How could he venture to pass over the passage (Josh. vi. 25), in which Rahab is mentioned as living "UNTO THIS DAY"? The reason (it would seem) is only too obvious. This passage would have told *against* his hypothesis of the *late* composition of the Book. It is perfectly clear that no one living in or after Samuel's day, and composing this book for the first time, would have made such an egregious mistake. Coming from Joshua's pen, the expression is appropriate enough. Thus, both the Bishop's *omissions*, as well as his *quotations*, tell against his theory.*

12. "*And the Canaanite was then in the land.*" (Gen. xii. 6.)

"*And the Canaanite and the Perizzite dwelled then in the land.*" (Gen. xiii. 7.)

This has been a *locus suspectus* from Aben Ezra's time (12th century) downwards. "These words," says the Bishop, "obviously imply that, at the time when they were written, the Canaanite was not dwelling in the land as its owner and 'lord.'" But I venture to think that they imply the very opposite. It is inconceivable that a writer of later time (as Samuel) should have introduced, in such close connexion, at the interval of only a few lines, the *two* remarks just quoted. Supposing him to have given the information *once*, he would never have dreamt of repeating it immediately afterwards. He must have felt that such a repetition would appear to his readers jejune and unmeaning in the extreme. Whatever difficulty, then, there may be in supposing Moses to have written the words, the difficulty of attributing them to a later author is *greater still!*

* I am well aware of the difficulties connected with the authorship of the Book of Joshua. I only mean that the question is not to be settled by such a lame and unfair statement of the case as the Bishop gives.

But need we find any difficulty here?

Moses, writing *simply as an historian*, and for those who had no personal acquaintance with the land of Canaan and its inhabitants, *might* very properly have introduced these particulars. Any information connected with the land, which they were soon to inherit, would be full of interest to them. He had, however, (taught by the Spirit), a much higher reason for such remarks. In the first passage, it is the *contrast* between ver. 6 and ver. 7 that is to be noted. Wherever Abram went, he found the Canaanite in the land. He did not come to an *unoccupied* territory. His faith was thus put on trial. Could he dispossess so numerous and powerful a race? Then JEHOVAH graciously appeared to him (ver. 7), to encourage and strengthen him, saying: "*Unto thy seed will I give this land.*" This was enough. In humble gratitude, and full assurance of faith, "there builded he an altar unto JEHOVAH, who appeared unto him."

The second passage exhibits also its meaning, when we observe the connexion: "And the land was not able to bear them [Abram and Lot], that they might dwell together: for their substance was great, so that they could not dwell together. And there was a strife between the herdsmen of Abram's cattle, and the herdsmen of Lot's cattle. And the Canaanite and the Perizzite dwelled then in the land."

What have we here but the minute information of one who was familiar with all the circumstances of the history he relates? *The Canaanite* had been named before. But Abram and Lot now found themselves in a *different* part of the country, where the territories of *the Canaanite and Perizzite* adjoined. A reason is thus given for the lack of pasture. The land was too narrow for them, with their vast flocks; and why? because they were hemmed in, on all sides, by the Canaanite and Perizzite. Had they been ALONE, there would have been room enough for them.

But we have also a reason assigned for Abram's earnest determination that the strife should, at any sacrifice, cease. It was neither safe nor becoming for them, brethren as they were, to fall out, whilst the enemies of their faith were at hand, to take advantage of their quarrel, and to cast ridicule on their religion !

Is there not, then, a beautiful force and meaning in these verses, which *proves* them to have come from Moses' hand ?

13. "*These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel on the other side Jordan, in the wilderness.*" Deut. i. 1.

"*On the other side Jordan, in the land of Moab, began Moses to declare this law.*" (Deut. i. 5.)

It is objected that these words could only have been written by one, who found himself on the *west* side of Jordan, and, therefore, after the death of Moses and the occupation of the land of Canaan.

I think that a little more consideration would have made the Bishop hesitate, before advancing this objection. The Hebrew expression *בְּעֵבֶר*, "on the other side," unquestionably has a double meaning, and refers indifferently to the country on the east, or the country on the west of the Jordan,—to the country on the east, or the country on the west of the Euphrates.* So that if some passages go to prove that the writer must have lived in the land of Canaan, and therefore could not have been Moses, an equal number might be cited to show that he must have lived on the *eastern* side of the Jordan, and consequently *could not have been Samuel, or any of his school of prophets !*

In short, the usage of this word proves nothing one way or the other. The Bishop would be sadly puzzled to ex-

* See any Hebrew Lexicon : or compare, *e.g.*, in the Hebrew, Deut. iii. 8. with ver. 20, and 1 Kings iv. 24 with 1 Chron. xix. 16.

plain, from his point of view, Num. xxxii. 19 (the Reubenites and Gadites are speaking): "We will not inherit "with them [our brethren] *on the other side* Jordan, or "forward; because our inheritance is fallen to us, *on the "other side* Jordan, eastward."

In the one case they speak *subjectively*, with reference to *themselves*; in the other case, *objectively*, with reference to *the land of Canaan*, the inheritance of their brethren. Moses, whose mind and whose heart were ever turning to that favoured land, would write in the same way, sometimes identifying himself *with his people*, who he knew were to be planted there, and sometimes, of course, having regard only to *his own* position. The context shows in which sense the expression is to be taken.

14. "And the children of Israel did eat manna 40 years, "until they came to a land inhabited; they did eat manna, "until they came unto the borders of the land of Canaan." (Ex. xvi. 35.)

What the difficulty is here, I confess I find it impossible to discover. This may be taken as one of the passages which Moses added to his original MS., shortly before his death. "Until they came to a land inhabited," is equivalent to "during their wilderness life," and is more fully explained by the last clause of the verse. Moses had brought the people to the borders of the land of Canaan; the 40 years were nearly completed; and still the manna was falling. This is all Moses says. Josh. v. 12 takes up the statement here made, and tells us precisely *when* the manna *did* cease.

The Bishop tries indeed to manufacture a difficulty by telling us that מִגְדָּל, "border," never means *extra terminum*, but always *intra terminum*. This is another of the Bishop's notable critical discoveries! How he will reconcile it with

he following passage in Ex. xix. 12, I must leave him determine: "Take heed to yourselves that ye go not up into the mount, or touch the *border* (רָצֵף) of it: whosoever toucheth the mount shall be surely put to death." Were the Israelites *intra terminum* here?

15. "That the land spue not you out also, when ye defile it, as it spued out the nations, which were before you." (Lev. xviii. 28.)

"This implies that the Canaanites were already exterminated when these words were written."

I defy any one to read the chapter through, and to come to this conclusion.

If the perfect tense is used here, it is simply because the first "spueing out" must have been *perfected*, before the second could take place. I commend to the Bishop his Hebrew Grammar (Ges., § 124, 5, c.), where he will find examples of the perfect tense used for the *future perfect*.

16. "And, while the children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man that gathered sticks on the Sabbath-day." (Num. xv. 32.)

"This, according to its natural interpretation, would seem to have been written, when the people were no longer in the wilderness, that is, it could not have been written by Moses!"

But what an inconsistency does the Bishop thus introduce into the narrative! Before and after (see ver. 19 and ch. xvi.) the writer identifies himself with the people, in their wilderness-life: but all at once he severs himself from them, and remembers that he is writing from the land of Canaan!

Let us rather observe a peculiar propriety in this ex-

pression, "in the wilderness." I have endeavoured to prove (pp. 63, 64), that the observances of the law almost ceased during the sojourn of the Israelites in the wilderness. But to show how, even *there*, the Law of the Sabbath was observed, the case here mentioned is cited. What an idea is thus given of the sanctity of the Lord's Day! The *other* precepts might be in abeyance, but *this*, with the Commandments of the Moral Law, never!

17. "*The Horims also dwelt in Seir before time; but the children of Esau succeeded them . . . and dwelt in their stead; as Israel did unto the land of his possession, which Jehovah gave unto them.*" (Deut. ii. 12.)

The last clause is again said to indicate a time when the Israelites were in possession of the land of Canaan, having dispossessed the older inhabitants. But translate it, "As Israel has done [or, is now doing] unto [that part of] the land of his possession, which Jehovah has given unto them," and all is clear. The country to the *east* of Jordan was included in the original grant of the land, which was to reach to the Euphrates on the one side, and the river of Egypt on the other; and when it had been conquered, it was spoken of as "the land of their possession." "The Lord your God hath given you *this land to possess it.*" (Deut. iii. 18.) And they are bidden to regard it as an *earnest* of that further inheritance which the Lord was about to give them on the other side Jordan. (ver. 21, and xxxi. 4.)

The above passage, with its context, containing historical references to the gigantic inhabitants of Edom, Moab, and Ammon, "*whom Jehovah had destroyed from before*" those who then occupied their territories, is also considered to savour of archæological nicety, and to point to a much later date than the time of Moses.

The Bishop cannot see that the object of such a reference would be twofold: 1st, to give the Israelites a more exalted idea of that Great and Glorious Being with whom they had to do; to let them see that JEHOVAH was not their *national* God alone, but the God of the whole earth, who “determined “the bounds of the habitation” of the children of men; and 2dly, to convince the people that what He had once done, He could do again: “If He destroyed these gigantic people “before the posterity of Lot and Esau, what cause had the “posterity of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, His chosen servants and friends, to fear the Anakim and Canaanites?” (Scott.) *Faith* would apprehend the comfort and encouragement which these facts afforded, and would rejoice (whatever the Bishop may say or feel to the contrary) in finding itself under the protection of an ALMIGHTY GOD, who could do whatsoever He pleased in heaven and earth.

18. Some *geographical* objections follow. “What could “Moses have known,” the Bishop contemptuously asks, “of “the land of Canaan?”

And so the Bishop’s ignorance is to furnish the measure to Moses’ knowledge! One would have thought that a man “learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians” would have known something of the countries adjoining Egypt, the merchantmen of which brought down the produce of those lands to the great *emporium* of Egypt! One would have thought that Amram, who was for more than thirty years a cotemporary of Levi, would have heard from his grandfather many particulars of that “land of promise,” which he might have communicated to his son! One would have thought that there might have been some family records, in which many of the names, &c., would be preserved! One would have thought that the spies, who went through the length and

breadth of the land, would have gathered a multitude of fresh particulars, which would have made Moses' knowledge more complete. All this, and much more that might be added, is but *natural*, yet the Bishop will not hear of it.

"And then one of these names, Hebron, is a *modern* name, which, according to the story itself, did not even exist in the time of Moses." See Josh. xiv. 15, "*And the name of Hebron before was Kirjath-arba.*"

But, stay! Hebron is a name that often occurs in the *history of Abraham, e.g.*, "Then Abram removed his tent, and came and dwelt in the plain of Mamre, which is in Hebron." (Gen. xiii. 18.)

And there is little doubt that this was the *ancient* name, changed into Kirjath-arba (or "city of Arba") when the Anakim, under a prince of that name, conquered it. From Josh. xv. 13, 14, it would appear that this Arba had lived only three generations before the invasion of Canaan, and therefore subsequently to Abraham's time. When, then, the Israelites conquered the land, they restored to the town the name dear to them from its early associations.* Ancient names are often thus revived. I have alluded to the word "Hebrew" in p. 159, and perhaps some old Cambridge men may remember when Corpus Christi College was known as Bene't. The present is simply the revival of the old name.

As the Bishop has drawn our attention to Hebron, let me quote an interesting remark of Hävernicks (p. 146):—

"The uncommonly precise statement in Num. xiii. 22, 'Now Hebron was built seven years before Zoan [*i.e.*, Tanis] in Egypt,' suffices to show how exact was the knowledge that the author of these records had of Egypt as well as of Palestine, and such a notice can be looked for only from Moses."

But the Bishop objects to another geographical reference :

* Hävernicks, p. 146; Hengstenberg, ii., 152; Jahn, and Rosenmüller are all of this opinion.

“ *Which Hermon the Sidonians call Sirion, and the Amorites call it Shenir.*” (Deut. iii. 9.)

“ In David’s time and afterwards ” (he says) “ the Sidonians were well known to the people of Israel. *But what could they have known of them in the days of Moses, that such a note as this should have been inserted in the middle of a speech of the great lawgiver ?* ”

They knew them, because they had carried their victorious arms to the very borders of the Sidonian territory !

Let us observe here another remarkable testimony to the *truthfulness* of the Scripture narrative. Sidon is named, but not Tyre, in the Pentateuch ! Now ancient history tells us that Sidon was the *more ancient* city. Tyre rose *afterwards*, and eclipsed it.

If, indeed, the geographical and historical particulars introduced, like the one we have been just considering, into Moses’ speeches, should seem hardly appropriate to the character of a public address, we may adopt Hengstenberg’s explanation (ii., p. 199):—

“ It must, indeed, be admitted that remarks like this might have been added afterwards by Moses, when committing his discourses to writing. On which account they may properly be enclosed (as by some) in brackets. *But then all doubt [as to their genuineness] vanishes.*”

19. “ *Only Og, King of Bashan, remained of the remnant of the giants; behold, his bedstead was a bedstead of iron; is it not in Rabbath of the children of Ammon? nine cubits was the length thereof, and four cubits the breadth of it, after the cubit of a man.*” (Deut. iii. 11.)

The Bishop wishes to know how it could have reached Rabbath ? I answer him in Hengstenberg’s words (ii., 200):—

“ Objections such as these, that we cannot make out how the bed reached Rabbath Ammon, or how Moses should know that it was there, are really *downright absurdities*. Had Moses, instead of a history of God’s people, been

writing a history of Og's iron bedsteads, a precise answer to such questions might have been expected from him. But it is doing these cavils too much honour to enter on an enumeration of the various possible ways by which the bedstead might get thither, and the account of it to Moses. Whoever wishes for it may consult Le Clerc, Varenius in Carpzov, p. 188, Michaelis, and others."

With reference to the size of the bedstead, Le Clerc's conjecture is no doubt the correct one, that "Og designedly " had it made larger than was necessary, in order that posterity might form a more magnificent idea of the stature " of the man, from the size of the bed in which he was " accustomed to sleep." He quotes Diodorus Siculus (xvii. 95), who tells us that Alexander the Great, when returning from India, left colossal works behind him, "representing a camp of heroes, and furnishing the inhabitants with striking proofs of the gigantic stature of the " invaders and their supernatural strength," (*βουλόμενος τοῖς ἐγγχωρίοις ἀπολιπεῖν σημεῖα μεγάλων ἀνδρῶν, ἀποφάινοντα ῥώμην σωμάτων ὑπερφυῆ*). Thus, among other things, he ordered BEDS, OF A LARGE SIZE, TO BE MADE, and stalls for cavalry soldiers, TWICE AS LARGE as those ordinarily constructed! If such a man as Alexander could condescend to these childish acts, Og's folly ceases to be surprising!

But, surely, the bedstead is huge enough, without the exaggeration of which the Bishop is guilty, in making the Hebrew cubit $1\frac{3}{4}$, instead of $1\frac{1}{2}$ feet!

20. "Now an omer is the tenth part of an ephah." (Exod. xvi. 36.)

"These words plainly imply," says the Bishop, "that at " the time, when they were written, the 'omer' had gone out " of use, and was not likely to be known to the ordinary " reader."

Be it so! Now let us take another case :

“The shekel is twenty gerahs.” (Num. iii. 47.)

According to the Bishop’s principle, the shekel must, at this time, have gone out of use, and was not likely to have been known to the ordinary reader! But let any one open a Concordance, and he will see that “the shekel” was in use from the *earliest* to the *latest* times. What, then, is such criticism worth?

That the names of certain weights and measures rarely occur, is no proof that they were no longer in ordinary use. The “gerah” of the Pentateuch occurs only once in the Bible again, viz., in Ez. xlv. 12; but that is enough to prove that it was still current.

Supposing Ez. xlv. 12 had not been written, the Bishop would have complacently concluded that the “gerah” was an ancient weight, that soon fell out of general use. We thank God that this verse was written, to act as a warning against such rash conclusions.

The Rev. J. Ayre has well observed, in Vol. II. of *Horne’s Introduction*, p. 593:—

“With respect to Exod. xvi. 36, it is said, that if the omer had not gone out of use when Exodus was written, there would have been no occasion to define its capacity. But this is a baseless argument. Modern laws, it is presumed, may be found, stating the proportion which one measure bears to another, without its being implied from this that the proportion has gone out of knowledge. At all events, among ancient regulations a notable example of the kind may be produced. In Ezek. xlv. 10—12, *various measures are defined, measures which had been long in use, which were then in use, and which continued to be in use.*”

21. “Such passages as the following could hardly have been written by Moses himself”:—

(1) “Moreover, the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt, in the sight of Pharaoh’s servants, and in the sight of the people.” (Exod. xi. 3.)

(2) "Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth." (Num. xii. 3.)

(3) "These are that Aaron and Moses, to whom Jehovah said, Bring out the children of Israel from the land of Egypt, according to their armies. These are they which spake to Pharaoh, king of Egypt, to bring out the children of Israel from Egypt: these are that Moses and Aaron." (Ex. vi. 26, 27.)

(4) "And if ye have erred, and not observed all these commandments, which Jehovah hath spoken unto Moses, even all that Jehovah hath commanded you by the hand of Moses, from the day that Jehovah commanded Moses, and henceforward among your generations," &c. (Num. xv. 22, 23.)

Now we readily allow that "the man Moses" was not likely, *proprio motu*, to have made use of some of the above expressions, as (1) and (2). But let us acknowledge that the Holy Spirit directed him to do violence to self, and to use this language for the glory of God, and the benefit of others, and all difficulty vanishes.

(1.) If "the man Moses was great in the land of Egypt," he gives all the glory to God. The Bishop suppresses the context: "THE LORD gave the people" [and therefore Moses] "favour in the sight of the Egyptians." It is the spirit of a St. Paul: "By the grace of God, I am what I am."

(2.) The Lord directs His servant to use these words, that he may stand acquitted by the verdict of posterity. They relate to the rebellion of Aaron and Miriam,—a rebellion, we are taught, utterly unjustifiable; for Moses had ever wielded his authority with the utmost mildness, and was the last man to have provoked such conduct by any exhibition of haughtiness or pride. There had been nothing in the *man* Moses' behaviour to lead to such a display on the part of Aaron and Miriam; it arose from a proud unwillingness to submit to the ordinance of *God*. And so at once we are told, "Jehovah heard it."

(3.) These words have not at all the emphatic form in the

Hebrew which they have in our translation. It is a pity our translators did not put the "that" in *italics*, or drop it altogether, as they have done in the following cases where the same Hebrew idiom occurs:—

"This *was that* Anah that found the mules in the wilderness." (Gen. xxxvi. 24.)

"This *is that* Dathan and Abiram." (Num. xxvi. 9.)

"He is Esau, the father of the Edomites." (Gen. xxxvi. 43.)

"It is a sin-offering for the congregation." (Lev. iv. 21.)

In fact, all the sacred writer means to say, in the passage before us, is:—

"This is the genealogy of Moses and Aaron, to whom "Jehovah said," &c.;

the last words giving the *reason* for their genealogy having been inserted. They were the accredited messengers of God, who were now entering on public life, and about to perform an important part in the Divine dealings with Israel. Herein lay their dignity, not in anything they had in *themselves*.*

(4.) The Bishop seems to object to the use of the *third* person by Moses. *We* find no difficulty, when we remember that Xenophon, Cæsar, Frederick the Great, and others have done the same.

* The words (says Hengstenberg, ii., 168) are repeated at the end of ver. 27, in order to mark precisely the close of the genealogy and the resumption of the history. They here perform the same service as the *phrases of transition* in the more connected historical writings. At the beginning, the *genealogical* reference predominates, and Aaron stands as the elder; at the end, the *historical* point of view is taken, and Moses is named first as the most important personage, just as in ver. 13, Moses is first, where the author passes from history to genealogy.

22. It is asked, Could Moses have written the last two chapters of the books that go by his name?

Unquestionably he did not write Deut. xxxiv., giving an account of his death, and the esteem in which he was held by the generations that succeeded him: and he *may have* left the copy of his last speech (ch. xxxiii.) to be inserted in its proper place; and Joshua, or whoever else had it committed to him, may have introduced it by the words (ver. 1): "This is the blessing, wherewith Moses the man of God blessed the children of Israel before his death."

We thus account for the occurrence of the expressions "man of God," and "before his death," which it seems to the Bishop could never have come from the pen of Moses himself. But it is not *necessary* to make this concession. If the rod of Moses is called (Ex. iv. 20; xvii. 9) "the rod of God," to distinguish it from a common rod, why may not Moses have been directed to call himself here "a man of God," *i. e.*, not a common man, but one taught by the Spirit of God? "a fact here deserving of peculiar notice, *because without it, the blessing would have been of no importance.*"

The Bishop has no reason for objecting to the other expression, "*before his death,*" for at the close of the previous chapter God had expressly announced to him his approaching decease (ver. 49): "Get thee up into this mountain Abarim . . . and DIE in the mount."

23. I find it *asserted* in the last chapter of this Part, p. 359, that the Book of Deuteronomy is of a date, *later* even than that of the other four Books,—"*having been written about the time of Josiah, and, as some suppose, by the hand of the prophet Jeremiah.*" *Proof* is to be forth-

coming in Part III. ! Meanwhile, we are bidden observe the two following indications :—

(1.) “In the first four Books the Priests are *invariably* “ called ‘ the sons of Aaron,’ but in Deuteronomy, ‘ sons of “ ‘ Levi,’ or ‘ Levites.’ ”

“It is obvious, of course,” reasons the Bishop, “that the *same* writer, whether Moses or any one else, cannot be supposed to have changed so completely in one moment (!) as it were,—that is, in the time intervening between the last act recorded in the Book of Numbers, and that in the first chapter of Deuteronomy, which we have shown to be an *inappreciable interval*,—not only his tone and style, but his very phraseology, so as up to this point of time to have called the Priests invariably by one particular denomination, and then suddenly (!) to drop it, and call them ever afterwards by another. This single fact seems sufficient to decide the question whether the whole Pentateuch was written by Moses.”

Here we have another gross and unpardonable misrepresentation of the truth ! The expression “ sons of Aaron,” *does not once occur in the last chapters of Numbers* (xx.—xxxvi.), *i. e.*, in that part of the history immediately connected with Deuteronomy. It had been used with reference to a period long (perhaps 38 years) before, but is altogether absent from the more recent narrative !

The fact of the change of name we do not, of course, deny. *When* it took place, or *why*, we can only conjecture. Of this, however, we may be sure, that God had his own wise reasons for appointing it.

If I might presume to suggest what those reasons may have been, I would venture on the following hints :—

At first, the Priests were a mere *family*, literally the *sons* of Aaron (Lev. xiii. 2), but as they increased in numbers (and I have supposed in p. 64 that they *might* have amounted in the last year of Moses’ life to 140 or 150), they would rise to an *order*, and THEN their title may have been changed.

Or, now that the Israelites were coming in contact with the *priests of false religions* (which had not been the case

in the wilderness), a new and distinctive name may have been appointed. The term "the Levite Priests," would be more *comprehensive* than that of "sons of Aaron." It would have its *strict* signification, but might also, in a *general* sense, include the inferior order, the Levites, "who had been given "to the Priests," and would thus be opposed to the *false priesthoods, with their various gradations.*

(2.) "The Decalogue, as given in Deut. v., differs in some "respects from Ex. xx. 1—17."

To us it would be enough to remember that the Evangelists, in reporting *our Lord's discourses*, exhibit a *similar freedom of expression*; but the Bishop would doubtless urge that this is not a parallel case. Let me then direct his attention to the several accounts which St. Paul himself gives of the Heavenly Vision that appeared to him on the way to Damascus,—and which to him must have been as solemn and awful as the scene on Mount Sinai to the Israelites. The words, ix. 5: "It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks," are *omitted* in xxii. 8, and placed in a different position in xxvi. 14, whilst neither of the two first accounts contains the interesting verses, xxvi. 16—18: "Rise, stand upon thy feet," &c. Yet, I presume, the Bishop himself will not contend that these various narratives were written by *three different* persons. Neither will we allow him to maintain that the trifling variation (not at all interfering with the substantial agreement) of the two versions of the Decalogue is any proof that they could not have been written by the same person (Moses).*

* I cannot but notice here the unfairness of the insinuations dropped here and there (as in pp. 360, 375), that Aaron is only named *once* in certain Books, Moses *twice*, and so on, the object evidently being to mislead the minds of the unwary into the belief that there is little trace of Moses and his legislation in other parts of the Old Testament Scriptures. The Bishop seems to think that, by hinting a doubt here and hesitating a suspicion there, his work is more than

We have now happily completed our examination of the Bishop's SECOND PROPOSITION ; and we ask, with confidence, *What do these signs of a later date in the Pentateuch amount to ?* The Bishop has, no doubt, fortified his case by every possible argument. With all the zeal of a new pervert,—forgetful, alas ! that he is “treading on holy ground,”—he has rushed forward to the assault with every weapon on which he could lay his hand ; and has once more summoned, as his allies, the learned phalanx of German sceptics,—whose name is Legion,—and who have long been striving, with mis-directed labour and ingenuity, to undermine the supreme authority of God's Holy Word. And what has been the result ? I trust my readers have felt that the attack made has, in every instance, signally failed. I myself have been astonished at finding how easily the objections brought forward could be repelled. *Not one single passage* have we been obliged to resign as an *interpolation*. To Hengstenberg are we chiefly indebted for furnishing us with the means of defence,—for developing the hints thrown out by others, and for proving that we are no longer compelled to meet our adversaries halfway, or to subscribe to such terms of compromise as even Professor Rawlinson (following, I am well aware, Dean Prideaux and others) has proposed (*Aids to Faith*, p. 251) :—

“It is not intended to deny that the Pentateuch may have undergone an authoritative (?) revision by Esra, when the language may have been to some extent modernized, and a certain number of parenthetic insertions may have been made in the text [introducing, be it observed, contradictions and ana-

half done. Yet he tells us (p. 380), “Whatever is done, it is not I, but the TRUTH itself, which does it !”

Both Dr. M'Caul and Mr. Birks, in their Replies, have shown the various and abundant testimony which Prophets and Psalmists and sacred Historians furnish to the genuineness of the Pentateuch. Of course other writers give us the same valuable information : as Hengstenberg (i. 106—212) and Hävernick (367—431). See also the authorities referred to by Horne (i. 50).

chronisms of a most serious character!] and this authoritative revision would account at once for the language not being more archaic than it is, and for the occasional insertion of parentheses of the nature of a comment."

Thus this controversy has answered the grand purpose of removing doubts and difficulties, which hung over certain portions of the early Scripture, and setting it before us in its purity and integrity, as it came forth from the hand of God.

"*The words of the Lord are pure words: even as the silver, which from the earth is tried, and purified seven times in the fire.*" (Ps. xii. 7, Pr. Book version.)

CHAPTER VII.

WAS SAMUEL THE ELOHISTIC WRITER OF THE PENTATEUCH?

ANYTHING more helplessly feeble than the reasoning of this chapter cannot be imagined. We expect at least some *plausible* answer to the question proposed. But the proof adduced amounts to this, that the Chronicler—NO AUTHORITY AT ALL, as the Bishop has assured us again and again—records in 1 Chron. xxix. 29:—

"Now the acts of David the King, first and last, behold, they are written in *the Book of Samuel the Seer*, and in the *Book of Nathan the Prophet*, and in the *Book of Gad the Seer.*"

From this passage the Bishop concludes that Samuel *did* occupy himself with historical labours. Again, no one else is *named* in the whole history before the time of Samuel—(observe! all at once the history, which, up to this time, has been utterly unreliable, acquires a sudden value for its un-

erring truthfulness, in the Bishop's eyes!)—who could be supposed to have written any part of the Pentateuch; *ergo*, we may suppose that Samuel was the author of at least an important portion of it!! (Thus this mathematical Bishop proves to us that two *negatives* make a *positive*!!) And, Samuel having commenced the work, the prophets Gad and Nathan, and other priests and prophets, may reasonably be considered to have added to and completed it!!!

But here I stop! The Bishop has left the fair ground of *argument*, and wandered off into the boundless field of *conjecture*. I therefore decline following him.

In short, it would be deserting the battle-ground of the faith, and descending from the high position on which we still feel ourselves secure, if we condescended to notice these “vagaries of an unquiet and unsettled brain.”

To us they are simply shocking! The holy Samuel is represented as a shameless forger of sacred annals! and not only so, but as the fabricator of the ever-adorable name of JEHOVAH, which he invented as a rallying-cry for the nation, when united under the sceptre of Saul! But we remember that, in the early part of the book (see p. 81 of the present Reply), our Lord Himself was set down as “a deceiver and untrue,” and we cease to wonder. “The disciple “is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord. It “is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the “servant as his lord. If they have called the master of the “house Beelzebub, *how much more shall they call them of his “household?*” (Matt. x. 24, 25.)

CHAPTER VIII.—XI. AND XIX.

MORIAH, &c.

THE few remarks I make on this portion of the Bishop's book (in addition to those already made in pp. 120—123, and 135—139) are the following:—

In order to prove the introduction of the name JEHOVAH in Samuel's time, he is compelled to remove all trace of it from the earlier portions of the Old Testament Scriptures.

MORIAH, therefore, (Gen. xxii. 2) cannot possibly be compounded of JEHOVAH—cannot be derived from יָרָא , “to see,” or “choose,” and $\text{יְהוָה} = \text{יְהוֹוָה}$. The Bishop does not hesitate to correct so distinguished a Hebrew scholar as Gesenius, who says of this derivation, “*Neque linguæ rationibus contrarium est hoc etymon*” (*Theol.*), and to pronounce it “*inadmissible!*” “*the characteristic radical א could not have been omitted!*”

What then does the Bishop make of

מִרְאֵשׁוֹ , Josh. xv. 44, contr. מִרְשָׁו , 1 Chron. iv. 21;

שָׂמַר , Lam. iii. 47, contr. שָׂר , Numb. xxiv. 17;

לְהַשְׂאוֹר , Is. xxxvii. 26, contr. לְהַשׂוֹר , 2 Kings xix. 25;

in all of which the radical א is dropped?

Another objection to the ordinarily received derivation is that the name would then have been used *proleptically*. But who is it that speaks? GOD HIMSELF. And *does He not know the end from the beginning?*

The Bishop has, however, yet a further reason for not agreeing with us. Canon Stanley tells him that Mount Moriah, the Hill of the Temple (2 Chron. iii. 1), is *not visible, till the traveller is close upon it*, whereas it is said of Abraham, “He lifted up his eyes, and saw *the place from afar*.”

But how does Kalisch answer both Canon and Bishop?

“Though the traveller, coming from Beersheba, may not see *Mount Moriah* ‘from afar,’ he certainly can see ‘*the place*,’ or region, at some distance, especially if he is acquainted with the locality.”

There are, however, other names compounded with JEHOVAH.

JOCHEBED, the name of Moses’ mother (Ex. vi. 20) means “whose glory is JEHOVAH.”

JOSHUA (Num. xiii. 16) means “JEHOVAH is the Saviour.”

JONATHAN (Judges xviii. 30) means “JEHOVAH gives.”

But these names interfere with the Bishop’s theory, *therefore* they are pronounced fictitious,—the interpolations of a later age! and such a woman as Jochebed, such a hero as Joshua, never existed!

In the same manner, there are many names in the First Book of Chronicles, occurring in genealogical lists of an early date, all proving (as Azariah, ii. 8; Zephaniah, vi. 36) the use of JEHOVAH before Samuel’s days. What is to be done? The same convenient hypothesis is at hand. “It is scarcely possible to doubt that the Chronicler has *simply* “*invented* these names”!

The Song of DEBORAH (Judges v.) exhibits a frequent employment of JEHOVAH. It is consequently pronounced a “Lay of Ancient Israel,” *composed two or three centuries after Deborah’s time*, in imitation of Psalm lxviii.!

And the Bishop really believes that we are going to accept such criticism!

Were he a Bentley or a Porson, risen to throw fresh light on these venerable and sacred records, we should demur to his decision. But he who thus pretends, *ex cathedra*, to teach us the niceties of Hebrew philology is one who has not himself mastered its rudiments! In one of these very chapters, he seriously informs us that Eli (אֵלִי), 1 Sam. iii. 1, is a compound of אֱלֹהִים (God)!

Need I add that he stands alone in these rash and feeble attempts at mutilating the Word of God? Even German scholars (for they are really learned men, and well acquainted with the principles of critical investigation) show more sobriety of judgment; and Canon Stanley, in a too-favourable review of the present Part (which appeared in the "Reader" of February 14), readily allows:—

"The second position, with regard to the late introduction of the name of Jehovah, seems to us improbable in the highest degree. The Bishop proves, indeed, by an elaborate analysis of the proper names, that the name was very rare before the time of Samuel

"But (putting aside all general considerations which would make us reluctant to adopt so sweeping a change in the history of the Exodus as this hypothesis would involve) there are some early instances of the use in composition of the name of Jehovah, which, though few, are decisive in favour of its ante-Davidic existence. We fully grant Bishop Colenso's argument against *Moriah* in Gen. xxii. 2. Something may be said against the early date of the eighteen Jehovistic names in the First Book of Chronicles, and of Jochebed in Exod. vi. 20; although this last (with Ewald's ingenious and almost pathetic argument founded upon it) is far more difficult of removal. But *Joshua*, *Jonathan*, the son of Gershom (Judges xviii. 30), and the use of the name in the song of Deborah, appear to us conclusive. We can really attach no weight to the arguments used against the early date and historical character of this unquestionably genuine song, or of those inimitably primitive chapters at the close of the Book of Judges."

CHAPTERS XII.—XVIII.

THE PSALMS.

THE Davidic Psalms are examined, and an attempt is made to prove that those in which ELOHIM occurs must be assigned to an *early* period in David's life, before Samuel had gained much acceptance for the newly-coined name of JEHOVAH,—

and those in which JEHOVAH predominates must have been composed at a *later* period, when the name was coming into more general use.

Such fanciful attempts have been made in Germany, and have been felt, even *there*, to be failures. Our Bishop, therefore, is not likely to meet with better success.

Nay! it becomes evident, at once, that his conclusions must be utterly untrustworthy. For it can be shown that *the numbers*, on which they depend, have been *falsely calculated!*

The case may be thus illustrated. Take the 84th Psalm. According to the Bishop, ELOHIM occurs eight times and JEHOVAH seven. It is therefore set down as an "Elohistic Psalm" (p. 324). But, of the eight times calculated, three are instances of ELOHIM *in regimen*, e.g., "my Elohim" (ver. 3), "Elohim of Jacob" (ver. 8), and "my Elohim" (ver. 10), in which cases JEHOVAH *could not possibly have stood* (for, as JEHOVAH is a *proper name*, we never meet with the expressions "my JEHOVAH," "JEHOVAH of Jacob," &c.). No true Hebrew scholar would, therefore, have thought of numbering these with the instances in which ELOHIM stands absolutely. ELOHIM consequently does not occur more than five times. But even of these five, one is not ELOHIM at all, but EL (ver. 2), and two others are JEHOVAH ELOHIM (ver. 8 and 11), where JEHOVAH is unquestionably the predominant word; leaving, therefore, but *two instances* in which ELOHIM stands independently, against the *seven* appearances of JEHOVAH. Yet this, according to the Bishop, is an Elohistic Psalm!

The above fatal principle of miscalculation runs through all the numbers quoted by the Bishop in these chapters, on which he prides himself as a notable contribution (indeed as *the* contribution of his book) towards the critical study of the Old Testament Scriptures.

Delitzsch, in his admirable little treatise, *Symbolæ ad Psalmos illustrandos isagogicæ*, gives (p. 4) the following as the number of times in which ELOHIM occurs in the five books of the Psalms:—

Book I. (Ps. i—xli.)	Book II. (xlii.—lxxii.)	Book III. (lxxiii.—lxxxix.)	Book IV. (xc.—cvi.)	Book V. (cvii.—cl.)
15	164	43	0	7
The Bishop's numbers, on the contrary, are (p. 311, 12):—				
65	214	79	27	40

Let these numbers be carefully compared. My readers will not doubt who is likely to be more correct—the learned German or the arithmetical Bishop.

But, as the Bishop's conclusions depend entirely on the correctness of his figures,—the figures being wrong, his results are false, and he has wasted both time and effort, *operose NIHIL agendo*.

Thus, the further he proceeds, the deeper does he seem to sink in the mire; and the more hopeless appear his endeavours to conviet the Word of God of inconsistency or error. So it must always be. No weapon that is formed against *it* shall prosper.

I must, however, just give one instance (and I am sure that it will suffice, and that my readers will ask for no more) of the style of comment adopted in this portion of the Bishop's book.

The glorious Messianic Psalm, xlv., does not refer to Christ at all, but throughout celebrates the praises of King David—having been written (not by himself) in his old age, on the occasion of Solomon's marriage with Naamah, the Ammonitess. "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and "ever," are words addressed to David, as the representative of God! (The quotation in Heb. i. 8, 9 is not even alluded

to). "Thou art fairer than the children of men" is supposed to be a courtly allusion to David, who was once "of a beautiful countenance, and goodly to look to" (1 Sam. xvi. 12), and who may have retained, even in old age, the traces of this his youthful beauty. We are told that we may find a parallel instance of such language in some lines addressed to Queen Elizabeth, when nearly seventy years of age:—

"Fair soul, since to the *fairest body* joined,
 You give such lively life, such quickening power,
 And influence of such celestial kind,
 As keeps it still in *youth's immortal flower*," &c.

It may well be asked, whether anything could be more offensive,—anything more degrading to the majesty of Scripture, to the teaching of the Spirit, and to the person of our Blessed Lord Himself, than such a reference, and such a comparison, as this? Alas! that this should be the teaching of a Bishop of the Evangelical Church of England!

CHAPTERS XX.—XXII.

CONCLUSION.

DECLINING to follow the Bishop any further through the labyrinth of vain and unprofitable, if not profane and perilous, speculations, in which he would seek to entangle us,—I conclude this Reply with an expression of devout thankfulness to Almighty God, that He has made it so clear to my own mind, as I have gone along, that there is not a tittle

of weight or force in the objections, arithmetical or philological, that have been advanced. I was myself hardly prepared for so triumphant a result. I had fully expected that there might be difficulties, for the removal of which we might have had *to wait* for further light. But such difficulties are not to be found among those brought forward by the Bishop. One after another, these "oppositions of science," that appeared in such formidable array, have melted away, like so many castles in the air, before a little patient and careful investigation. And I feel satisfied that all who approach the subject, in a calm and teachable spirit, will be led to see that "we have not followed CUNNINGLY DEvised "FABLES," but that "the Word which is able to save our "souls" is a Word of TRUTH, a Word "THAT ENDURETH "FOR EVER."

Amid all such doubts and speculations,—in whatever form, or with whatever authority, they may come to us,—let us hold fast to the testimony of Christ our Divine Master, let us remember that here is our great advantage, of which our adversaries can never rob us. "THE LORD IS ON OUR "SIDE." Greater is He that is with us than he that is with THEM. The Lord Jesus knew more than all the learned men of the world joined together; and He has set His seal, again and again, to the authorship and Divine contents of the Pentateuch. "If we receive the witness of men, the "witness of God is greater."

But yet we want something more. My readers, may you and I be taught of the Holy Ghost, and "grow in the "grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus "Christ"! Then indeed shall we be safe. This *experimental* acquaintance with "the Truth as it is in Jesus," will be our sure defence against the errors of the day. The difficulties, at which others stumble, will be to us as dust in the balance, when weighed against the witness from

within, which the Spirit will have given us. And we shall hold on our way, rejoicing,—looking, not at the motes in the sun-beam, but at the full flood of light and love, which pours forth from our Glorious Sun of Righteousness, and is reflected in His Word,—to brighten our path, and gladden our hearts, as we journey onward to our Heavenly Home.

Now unto Him THAT IS ABLE TO KEEP US FROM FALLING, and to present us faultless before the presence of His glory, with exceeding joy, to the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. AMEN.



