



LIBRARY
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

No. Case, -----
No. Shelf, -----
No. Book, -----

THE PENTATEUCH AND
ITS ANATOMISTS.



THE PENTATEUCH

AND

ITS ANATOMISTS

OR,

THE UNITY AND AUTHENTICITY OF THE
BOOKS OF MOSES
VINDICATED AND CONFIRMED,
IN REPLY TO MODERN CRITICISMS.

BY THE

REV. T. R. BIRKS,

VICAR OF HOLY TRINITY, CAMBRIDGE,

AUTHOR OF 'CHURCH AND STATE,' 'BIBLE AND MODERN THOUGHT,'
'DIFFICULTIES OF BELIEF,' ETC.

LONDON :

HATCHARDS, 187 PICCADILLY, W

1869.

LONDON:
STRANGWAYS AND WALDEN, Printers, 28 Castle Street,
Leicester Square.

PREFATORY NOTICE.

THE present volume is a small contribution to a controversy of growing importance, and to the defence of those books of Scripture, which form the wellspring and source of all later revelations from the living God to the children of men. The Elohist question, or the objection raised against the unity and genuineness of the Book of Genesis from the use of the two Divine names, is here treated in a form quite intelligible to plain English readers. I think that I have given a full and complete solution of the problem, which has been solved very imperfectly, so far as I am aware, even in the best of those German and English replies to neological critics which have hitherto appeared. In the later portion, also, I believe that there are some parts which may claim to be original contributions to the main object of the work. Owing to a long interval, from various causes, between the writing

of the first and last parts, I fear that there is some little want of completeness in its structure. Such as it is, I commend it to the blessing of God, and also with some confidence to the perusal of those who desire, in these perilous times, to have their faith in the lively oracles of God confirmed by new lines of thought, and rooted more firmly against every storm.

Trinity Parsonage, Cambridge.

Sept. 23, 1869.

CONTENTS.

CHAP.	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
I. STATEMENT OF THE CONTROVERSY	3
II. THE NAME OF GOD REVEALED TO MOSES	23
III. THE ELOHISTIC THEORY	40
IV. THE SACRED NAMES IN GENESIS	58
V. THE CREATION AND THE FALL	88
VI. THE TIMES BEFORE THE FLOOD	97
VII. THE TIMES OF THE FLOOD	106
VIII. THE HISTORY OF ABRAHAM	129
IX. THE HISTORY OF ISAAC AND JACOB	145
X. ON ALLEGED ANACHRONISMS IN GENESIS	160
XI. ALLEGED ANACHRONISMS OF THE LATER BOOKS	191
XII. ALLEGED HISTORICAL CONTRADICTIONS	223
XIII. THE BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY	235
XIV. THE SINAITIC LEGISLATION	277
XV. THE UNITY AND INSPIRATION OF THE BOOK OF GENESIS	295

THE PENTATEUCH

AND ITS ANATOMISTS.

INTRODUCTION.

1. THE Pentateuch, according to the firm belief of the whole Jewish nation for centuries before Christ, is the law of God, given by Moses with Divine authority to the people of Israel. Its truth, authority, and Divine inspiration, are confirmed by our Lord and His Apostles, and form the basis of their teaching, almost in every page of the New Testament. Such has been also the constant faith of the whole Christian Church, built on these sure testimonies, from the days of the Apostles through every later age.

During the last century, however, a series of attacks on the authenticity and truth of the books of Moses have been made by learned writers on the Continent, who have not openly renounced the name of Christians. Various hypotheses have been framed to account for their origin, without admitting any supernatural revelation from God to man. They have thus been assigned to some unknown

weavers of Jewish legends, long after the death of Moses; whose works, at first imperfect, were reduced by some compiler into their present form, and were then offered to the nation as the genuine work of Moses, the legendary lawgiver of the people.

This vital controversy, involving the whole issue between open infidelity and Christian faith, after having lasted in Germany for three or four generations, has now passed over to ourselves. In the recent works of Drs. Davidson and Colenso, the doctrinal arguments of the foreign critics are condensed and simplified, and set before the English public in a popular form. It seems highly desirable, then, to submit the merits of these sceptical theories, so confidently proposed, and so loudly extolled, to a close and exact cross-examination. Their vague, indefinite, and shifting character, has, till of late, been a serious hindrance in the way. The last edition of Dr. Davidson's Introduction, however, has removed this difficulty, by presenting the main hypothesis in a distinct and definite form. In the present work the whole question will be examined with especial reference to these latest developments of the negative theory. The variety of the topics, and the width of the inquiry, will make it desirable to study condensation, so far as it is consistent with a searching and thorough investigation.

CHAPTER I.

STATEMENT OF THE CONTROVERSY.

2. THE theory which resolves the Pentateuch into the work of several later and uninspired authors, and denies, to a great extent, its historical truth, has passed through many varieties of form. Dr. M'Caul's Summary in the 'Aids to Faith,' will supply a just and brief outline of their origin and succession.

i. 'In 1753 Astruc, a French physician, taught that the Book of Genesis is made up of twelve memoirs or documents, of which the two principal are the Elohist and Jehovistic. From these Moses composed the book in twelve columns. Copyists mixed these together, and hence the present form of Genesis.

ii. 'Eichhorn asserted that it is based on two pre-Mosaic documents, distinguished by the names, Elohim and Jehovah; and that the author, in relating any event, selected the document in which the fullest account was contained. Sometimes they are mixed together. Some other documents were consulted.

iii. 'Ilgen supposes seventeen documents, but only three authors, one Jehovist and two Elohists; and is so acute in his scent, as sometimes to divide single verses among the three, and give each his own.

iv. 'De Wette's theory, in his first edition, is that a continuous Elohist document forms the basis of the whole, and extends to Exodus vi. In this the author inserted what he found in one or more Jehovistic documents.

v. ' Von Böhlen believes in the same Elohist basis, but denies the existence of Jehovistic documents. The author of the book in its present form is the Jehovist.

vi. ' Gramberg makes three authors, the Elohist, the Jehovist, and the Compiler, who does not scruple sometimes to substitute one Divine name for another.

vii. ' Ewald begins by holding the unity of Genesis, and proving it against the document and fragment hypotheses. About ten years after, he taught that the basis of Genesis is an ancient writing, of which considerable remains are found in the whole Pentateuch, which is distinguished by peculiarities of language, and especially by the use of Elohim up to Exod. vi. 2. This author incorporated more ancient documents, as Exod. xx., xxi.—xxiii. Subsequently arose another work, which ascribed the name Jehovah to patriarchal times. From this, portions were inserted in the former work by the author of the present book of Genesis, so that at least four writers are concerned. Thirdly, he extended and modified this view, by supposing more than two treatments of the ancient history, forming the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua. He ascribes Genesis in its present form to that writer whom in his first edition he calls the fourth narrator, and in his second, the fifth narrator of the primæval histories, who lived in the time of Joshua. This work had several predecessors, three according to the first edition, six according to the second. Three are Elohistie.

viii. ' Hupfeldt takes, as the basis of our Genesis, three independent historic works, two Elohistie and one Jehovistic, and makes a Compiler in addition.

ix. ' Knobel believes in two documents; first, the Elohistie, forming the basis of the Pentateuch and Joshua; secondly, the Jehovistic, which again has two previous sources. There are, besides, two Jehovistic developments, in which the Compiler followed hints in the documents, sometimes popular tradition, or his own conceptions.

• This enumeration is far from exhausting all the varieties.

Some assert one Elohist document, others two, others three. Some make one Jehovist, others more. Some make him the same with the Compiler, others a different person. Some make two, others three, others four, and Ewald seven documents, by different persons, to be the materials of Genesis. One supposes the documents pre-Mosaic, another that they were in the time of Joshua or the Judges, another in the time of David, another some centuries later.'—*Aids to Faith*, pp. 191–193.

3. Dr. Davidson, a disciple and warm admirer of these German theories, in his earlier introduction (1857) has a chapter on the authorship and date of the Pentateuch, in which their differences cause him no small perplexity and vacillation. His report of them will supplement the previous description.

'What is called the Supplement Hypothesis is now the most approved one in Germany. According to this, an ancient document formed the essential basis of the work, which received considerable insertions and supplements. Critics have attempted to trace this groundwork, and the supplementary matter, distinguishing one from the other. The two chief are usually called the Elohim and Jehovah documents. The former is closely connected in its parts, and forms a whole, while the latter is thought to be supplementary. They were combined by the hands of an editor so skilfully as to make their separation very difficult—indeed almost impossible in some instances.'

This last remark is exactly reversed by Dr. Colenso, (Part II. p. 8), who calls this union so clumsy and imperfect, that it falls to pieces in the reader's hands. The other statement is modified before the end of the chapter by Dr. Davidson himself. The moon enters on a new phase.

'After the ingenious investigation of Hupfeldt, the name,

Supplementary Hypothesis, is seen to be inappropriate, because the Jehovist did something more important than furnish an appendix to the first document. We prefer the name, Documentary Hypothesis, now that justice has been done to the Jehovist. With regard to the hypothesis of Ewald, none seems to have adopted it. Rightly so, for it lacks all verisimilitude and probability. Nothing but an excess of subjectivity could have led that scholar to divide the Pentateuch into four portions of different ages, to which the Deuteronomist, said to be the final author of the Book of Joshua, gave its last form. It is surprising to see how he fixes the respective time of the four parts, supposing that the oldest, the Book of the Covenant, was written in the time of Samson.'

4. Dr. Kurtz gives a somewhat fuller outline of Ewald's theory.

'Ewald's Crystallization Hypothesis, although based on an assumption of critical omniscience and infallibility, and hence exacting implicit reception, has not found any support among the learned. He supposes that seven works were incorporated in the "great book of primeval history." (1) The oldest historical work, of which very few fragments are preserved, was the book of the Wars of Jehovah; then follows (2) a biography of Moses, of which also only a few scanty fragments have been handed down; much more has been preserved of (3) the Book of Covenants, written during the time of Samson; and (4) of the Book of Origins, the author a priest of the time of Solomon; these writers are followed by (5) the third narrator of primeval history, or first prophetic narrator, a citizen of the kingdom of Israel at the time of Elijah and Joel; (6) by the fourth narrator, who flourished and wrote between B.C. 800 and 700; and (7) by the fifth narrator, or third prophetic narrator, not long after Joel, who collated all former authorities. Then commenced the purely artistic application of primeval history, "when its sacred soil merely served as material for prophetic and legislative pur-

poses." This was done, first, by an unknown author in the beginning of the seventh century, and then on a much wider scale by the author of Deuteronomy, the prophet who restored and completed the ancient law, and who lived in the time of Manassch, and wrote in Egypt. . Finally, during the time of Jeremiah, flourished the author of the poem called the Blessing of Moses. A somewhat later historian combined the work of the Deuteronomist, originally an independent composition, the smaller sections by his two colleagues, and the work of the fifth narrator, into one great work—such vicissitudes did it undergo, before attaining its present form. Happily for us, Ewald is able, not only to assign to each of these ten authors his own part in the great work, even to single verses and words, but generally to distinguish and characterise the sources, from which each of them again had drawn his original materials!—KURTZ, *Old Covenant*.

5. Assuming two documents, Dr. Davidson gives a summary of opinions on their respective dates.

‘It is very difficult to ascertain the time when they wrote. Nothing but conjecture has been advanced on the point. Ewald and Von Lengerke place the Elohist under Solomon, the Jehovist under Hezekiah. Stahelin, again, puts them in the time of the Judges and Saul. Tuch thinks the older lived in the time of Saul, the younger in that of Solomon. Killesch places the Elohist in David’s time, De Wette in the time of the Kings, and the Jehovist after Jehoram, and before Ezekiel (?) We are more inclined to the view of Delitzsch, that they lived not far from the time of Moses himself. We cannot think that one merely supplemented the other’s work, or even saw it. Neither was the Pentateuch completed by the Jehovist, or so early as his day. After him it existed in two pieces, separately composed, and some one must afterwards have put them together.’

‘The Deuteronomist may have had peculiar sources, whence

he drew additional materials, as Ewald and Von Lengerke suppose, though we entirely dissent from their ideas. In comparing it with the other books, it has been too generally assumed that it was composed after them. It may be that it was written first of all, there is nothing against it! and it is very probable, as will appear afterward. We cannot believe, with Von Bohlen, Vater, Gesenius, and Hirtmann, that it proceeded from Jeremiah, the evidences of identity being very few and feeble indeed.

6. The view of Dr. Colenso (Part II. pp. 356-359), seems to agree in the main with De Wette and Von Bohlen. Instead of accepting what Dr. Davidson calls the results of Hupfeldt's most profound investigation, he remarks on it as follows:—

‘ Though very unwilling to differ from one of the most original and clear-sighted of modern critics, I think a single glance at the Jehovistic insertions will satisfy the minds of most readers that they could never have been taken out of a complete story, which lay before a later editor.’

His own theory is thus explained:—

‘ Different authors were concerned in the composition of the Book of Genesis, whose accounts, in some respects, contradict each other. One of these is distinguished by abstaining altogether from the name Jehovah in that book, while the other freely uses it from the first. The former composed also Exod. vi. as all critics admit, and internal evidence proves, and designedly forbore the use of the name, till he had announced its revelation to Moses. He had some special reason for thus commending it to the regard and veneration of the people. The most natural is that he was himself introducing it as a new name for the God of Israel. Samuel was probably this Elohist, and the position he held, the circumstances of his time, and the

accounts of his doings, tend to confirm this suspicion. It is made almost certain, because David, in his earliest Psalms, made little or no use of the name Jehovah, and in the later Psalms used it more freely. The Jehovist could not be earlier than the latter part of David's life, nor yet have lived long after Samuel, since he does not introduce freely into the story names compounded with Jehovah, as a later writer would probably have done. All of the four first books, and of Joshua, which is not from the Elohist, was composed by one or more writers in the latter part of David's reign or in the early part of Solomon's, except a few interpolations. These are from the Deuteronomist, who revised the work, and added almost the whole of Deuteronomy. He wrote about the time of Josiah, and may not improbably have been the prophet Jeremiah.'

7. In his Introduction of 1862 Dr. Davidson changes, and partly reverses, the conclusions of his earlier work (1857). He now supposes three writers, and not two only, referring no small portion to a younger Elohist. He brings down the Elohist from the time of Eleazar or Joshua, where he placed him before, to the reign of Saul, and the later writer from the time of the Judges to the reign of Uzziah. Instead of holding with De Wette that Deuteronomy was the first written, and placing it apparently under Joshua, he now makes it the latest of all, in the reign of Manasseh, a change of seven or eight hundred years. He still adheres to that view of the independence of the later document, which Dr. Colenso thinks a single glance at its contents enough to disprove. Strangely enough, however, he calls these new-born opinions, reversing on three main points his own views of five years before, 'settled results,' which only those who dwell in an 'atmosphere of ignorance' can reject and

oppose. In one respect his last work is a real benefit, since it presents us with a definite theory, capable of strict examination. Amidst the chaos of learned guesses and hypotheses in the Germans from whom he borrows, it is usually hard to discover the exact theory they intend to substitute for the old faith of Jews and Christians. Dr. Davidson exhibits his own system, borrowed apparently from Hupfeldt, in a tabular form, so as to supply a definite basis for comparison with the creed of the Church which he casts contemptuously away. The Book of Genesis is broken up into more than three hundred portions, which are then parted among four writers, placed in the reigns of Saul, of Joram, of Uzziah, and Manasseh, though who they were is quite unknown. This distribution professes to rest on internal evidence in the teeth of all external testimony, which has constantly assigned the whole to Moses for two thousand five hundred years. Such an exploit, so long after the last of these supposed authors, would be without parallel in the whole history of literature. Nothing could rival such a piece of learned ingenuity, in dissecting the work into its elements, except the skill of the first Redactor, who wove them together with such curious art as to deceive the whole Jewish nation, and the whole Church of Christ, almost for three thousand years.

8. The attempt to turn one-third of the Old Testament history into fable, and to degrade the prophets of God into authors of a clumsy patchwork of uncertain legends, is so gigantic an undertaking, that most persons would approach it with feelings of diffidence, and almost of dismay, from the greatness of the task, and the mo-

mentous issues it involves. Even Dr. Davidson and Dr. Colenso, with all their confidence in their new-formed opinions, feel that some external authority is required, as a partial counterpoise to the consent of the wisest, holiest, and most learned men, who for more than two thousand years have owned the genuineness and Divine authority of the Book of Moses. This counterpoise they find in the German critics of the last century. The spuriousness of the Pentateuch, they affirm, is almost universally held by the only class whose Hebrew learning qualifies them to pronounce a judgment. Common English Christians have not been able to climb the mount where these critics give their oracular decisions, and thus have remained the contented slaves of an old superstition. These two writers undertake the office of mediators, and descend to the plain with the tables of this new and negative revelation, to communicate to the English laity the oracles they have received from more learned hands. Thus Dr. Colenso writes:—

‘ All the elaborate attempts which have been made to explain away difficulties and reconcile contradictions are but as breath spent in vain, when the composite nature of the Exodus is once distinctly recognised, and the Pentateuch falls to pieces, as it were, in our hands, the different ages of the different authors being established beyond a doubt, and clearly exhibited ! He who is no Hebrew or German scholar is necessarily ignorant, at present, of the real facts of the case, and can scarcely be regarded as a fair and competent judge. In the present Part the main points of the argument are put within the grasp of any one, whether clerk or layman, though unacquainted with Hebrew or German, if only he will give the needful attention, free from prejudice, to the points at issue. . . . The notion of

two distinct writers being concerned in the composition of Genesis is not a mere fancy of critics, but a fact which it becomes us, as true men, and servants of the God of truth, to recognise, whatever the consequences, however it may require us to modify our views of the Mosaic dispensation, or of Christianity itself. On the main point there is almost unanimous agreement among all who have devoted themselves to the close examination of the question. All such critics as are here referred to are of one mind as to the existence of Elohistie and Jehovistic portions in Genesis, and agreed as to most of them. This conclusion, being so unanimously adopted by those competent to judge, should influence the minds of all reasonable persons. . . . The differences of opinion of different critics with respect to details, the ages of the writers, and the extent to which their hands can be traced, do not at all affect the main question, in which all are agreed, that Elohistie and Jehovistic passages certainly exist in the Book of Genesis, and as certainly are due to different authors.'

Two grave questions are thus raised at the outset of the controversy, before entering on the direct question. First, is the truth or falsehood of the Pentateuch, its origin from the God of Israel through His servant Moses, or from unknown Jewish impostors, an esoteric inquiry, on which only a few learned German Hebraists are competent to form a judgment, while plain English Christians, of common sense and fair intelligence, are bound to accept submissively their oracular decisions? And next, are these oracles agreed among themselves, except in trivial details, which do not affect the evidence of their main theory? Or do they, on the contrary, disagree on every point except a false interpretation of one important passage of Scripture, the main foundation of their theory,

and a common rejection of the most weighty and emphatic declarations of the Son of God? A reply to these two questions will prepare us to enter, without prejudice, on the following inquiry.

9. The great question at issue is whether the Pentateuch is the Word of God, the writing of Moses the man of God, and historically true; or whether it is historically false, a clumsy patchwork of impossible fictions, the work of two, three, or four, or perhaps eight or ten, Jewish deceivers. Is advanced Hebrew scholarship the chief requisite for a just decision? The answer is plain, with the least reflection on the nature of the real evidence. This is either external or internal. The former consists in its acceptance as the law of God and the work of Moses by the whole Jewish nation, as far back as any records remain, and in the repeated and strong testimony of our Lord and his Apostles to its worth, genuineness, and Divine authority. To these may be added its acceptance by the most learned Jews and Christians alike, down to the present day, the collateral testimonies of heathen writers, records, and monuments, and the firm adherence to its statutes by the Jews through the long ages of their dispersion. All this evidence is just as accessible to the intelligent English reader, who avails himself of the help his own language supplies, as to the most learned Oriental or Sanscrit scholar. With every disciple of Christ, His words alone are decisive. It is only where faith in Christ has perished, and the disciple thinks himself able to sit in judgment on his Master, and to correct the mistakes of the Lord of glory by his own superior wisdom, that the alleged tokens of spuriousness, from internal evidence, can

be more than dust in the balance against the sayings of Him who is the Truth, the Word, and the Wisdom of God.

But even in dealing with the internal evidence, Hebrew scholarship occupies a very secondary place among the qualifications for passing a sound judgment. The Pentateuch is historical, and extremely simple in its style. The chief gain from a knowledge of Hebrew consists in greater vividness of impression, and the sense of closer contact with the events, but not in the possession of definite materials of reasoning, which a good translation fails to give. There are delicacies of style, like the scent of a flower, which may perish in the best version. But these either do not enter at all, or else must hold a very secondary place, in a serious historical controversy. In the question before us it is hardly one tithe either of the objections or the replies, which need any amount of Hebrew learning, either to discern their force, or to detect their weakness. Thus, in the First Part of 'The Pentateuch Examined,' nineteen reasons are advanced to prove the Book of Exodus incredible. Of these there are only three or four where any reference is made to the Hebrew, and of these there is not one where it is really necessary, either to see the force of the objection, or to understand the reply. Its chief use is to render an argument, complete in itself, more pointed and decisive. Again, out of 134 pages in Dr. Davidson's argument to prove the composite nature of the Pentateuch, only two pages, from first to last, involve the necessity of Hebrew scholarship to decide upon them, and even these are points which the use of a Hebrew concordance might supply. The main requisites in

such an inquiry are a spirit of humility and reverence, which dreads equally to exalt the human into the Divine, or to degrade the Divine to the level of human error;—good common sense, which seizes on the essential points in an historical inquiry, and keeps eye in view the real question at issue; and a judicial habit of mind, which weighs carefully the whole evidence on both sides of a question, before it comes to a final decision. In all these qualities the negative critics of Germany, as a class, are palpably and deplorably wanting. They come to the Bible, as the hospital surgeon to a corpse which he is to dissect in the presence of admiring pupils, not as creatures who may find, and wish to find, a message from their Creator, still less as guilty sinners, who long for tidings of salvation. They constantly lose sight of the real question in a maze of learned speculation; and their habits of solitary study commonly leave them the slaves of their own hypotheses, and strangers to that judicial temper of mind which English thinkers, from the nature of our institutions, usually attain in a far higher measure. Such negative critics, even on intellectual grounds alone, and still more from their want of humility and reverence, are almost the worst authorities on a question of this vital kind, to which an appeal could possibly be made. Even their Hebrew scholarship can, at the most, place them merely on a level with thousands of intelligent Jews, for a thousand years before the fall of the second temple, with whom Hebrew was their native tongue, and its literature their exclusive and familiar study, and amongst whom a suspicion against the Mosaic authorship of the law, so far as evidence remains, never once arose.

10. A second inquiry remains: Are these modern critics, who contradict our blessed Lord and affirm the spuriousness of the books of Moses, unanimous in their main conclusions? Is not their disagreement almost as great as it is possible to be? This is a question of fact, which ought to admit of an easy reply. Their opponents, as Hengstenberg, in the Preface to his work on the Pentateuch, Dr. M'Caul, in the 'Aids to Faith,' and Mr. Rose, in the 'Replies to the Essays,' affirm this variance of the sceptical critics in the strongest terms. Even Dr. Davidson, in his earlier work, admits and apologizes for the perplexing fact. 'In separating,' he says, 'the two (three? four? five?) original documents of the Pentateuch, it is apparent that the subject does not admit of very definite determination. In regard to details we must expect that scarcely two critics agree in all things.' After five years, however, what was once apparent has ceased to be plain, and his later work contains 'a very definite enumeration of the chapters and verses, due to each,' not of two, but four writers. Still, that two documents at least are incorporated in the Pentateuch, and these in many respects different and sometimes contradictory, are in his judgment 'settled results' and 'firmly established on critical grounds,' so that as soon as a little light dawns upon hitherto benighted Christians, the emptiness of their traditional faith appears. In the same spirit Dr. Colenso repels the charge of incurable discord brought against his German teachers. The main conclusions, he says, are established beyond all doubt. As to the details we can only feel our way with caution, with continued labour, and a repeated survey of the ground travelled

over. Critics are agreed as to the existence of Elohistie and Jehovistic portions in Genesis, and in respect to most of them. The differences do not affect at all the main question, and are only proof of their independence of each other, and of the common truth of their judgment when they all agree. The only admission needful is that the conclusions of criticism, in some of the very difficult questions raised by the examination of the Pentateuch, are not so thoroughly worked out as to command universal assent, and take their place among the positive results of science.

Let us examine this plea more closely, and inquire what are the main conclusions in which these negative critics agree, and what those mere details in which they still differ, not quite so certain as the Newtonian theory.

First, it is plain that the word Elohim occurs thirty-five times in unbroken succession in Gen. i.-ii. 4; and again, along with El Shaddai, about twenty-five times in the history of Joseph and its sequel, and ten or twelve times successively in one or two other parts of Genesis. Again, the double title occurs about twenty times in Gen. ii. 5-iv. 24; and the sacred name alone twenty times in Gen. x.-xiii.; seventeen times in ch. xviii. xix.; nineteen times in ch. xxiv.; fourteen times in ch. xxv. 19-xxvii. 27; and ten times, with one deviation, in ch. xxxviii. xxxix. In this sense all readers, orthodox or rationalist, of course agree that there are Elohistie and Jehovistic portions; however strongly pious minds may dislike the degradation of these names of the Holy One, to form the mere counters of critical controversy and learned disquisition.

Next, all these negative critics, who have more faith in their own grammatical skill than in the 'true sayings of God,' agree in denying that 'Moses gave the Law' to the Jews, or that he 'wrote of Christ,' or gave the account of the vision at 'the bush,' or the precept on divorce; and ascribe the Pentateuch to several later authors. Many orthodox German critics, not inferior to their rivals in learning, differ wholly from this view; and believe rather the words of the Faithful and True Witness, with whom Moses himself conversed on the mount of glory. But when we speak of those critics, whom Drs. Davidson and Colenso extol and admire, their agreement on this second point is almost complete.

Thirdly, these critics nearly all expound Exod. vi. in this sense, that the word Jehovah, as a name of God, was wholly unknown till the Exodus; so that, in the view of the writer, its use began with that message to Moses. This is a view, the entire falsehood of which admits of a perfect demonstration from the whole context. It is a mistake, however, into which mere grammarians without theology, who deal more with syllables than with the deep things of God, are very likely to fall. These critics, accordingly, adopt it with great unanimity, and it is one of the very few 'main conclusions' in which they agree.

Fourthly, it results, of course, from this construction of the passage, that he who wrote it, unless asleep or dreaming, could never represent this sacred name as used by the patriarchs and others long before Moses. Those parts of Genesis, then, where this name is put into the lips of others beside the narrator, must, on this hypothesis,

be due to some other hand. This is a fourth and last point on which they agree. Their unanimous consent includes a self-evident fact, which a child may perceive, a common disbelief of the words of Christ, a false exposition of a passage in Exodus, and a necessary and unavoidable consequence of that false interpretation.

11. Let us next inquire what are those mere details, on which they continue to differ.

i. The Number of the Supposed Authors. Some admit two only; a greater number, three; Hupfeldt and others, four; Ewald, seven at least; and others as many as twelve.

ii. The Nature of the Composition. There are three main varieties, or genera, of critical theories; the Fragment, Supplement, and Plural-Document Hypotheses. The first admits many pre-Mosaic or post-Mosaic fragments, pieced together by the last compiler. The second supposes one Elohist document, supplemented by one, two, or three writers, whom it calls Jehovists. The third assumes at least two, or perhaps three, distinct documents or histories, united at last by one compiler.

iii. The Nature of the Contrast in the use of the Sacred Names. Astruc and Eichhorn admit three varieties, parts exclusively Elohist, others where the sacred name alone occurs, and others mixed of both. De Wette and most later critics exclude the second class, or writings where the sacred name alone is used. The change is required by common sense, since Elohim, if the earlier name, certainly never grew obsolete. But it abandons more than half the alleged ground of the whole theory. There are only three passages of any length where there is an

exclusive use of the name, Elohim, and six where there is the like use of the name, Jehovah.

iv. The Number of Elohist. Astruc, Eichhorn, De Wette, Gramberg, Knobel, assume one only, and so Dr. Davidson in his earlier work. Ilgen and Hupfeldt, and the Dr. Davidson of 1862, assert that there were two Elohist; and Ewald, in his latest hypothesis, either three or four.

v. The Number of Jehovists. Eichhorn, Ilgen, Von Bohlen, seem to admit one only, De Wette several, Gramberg and Hupfeldt two, and the latter a Deuteronomist beside; Knobel three or four, Ewald five or six. It is not easy to reduce some of these complex theories to an exact enumeration.

vi. The Age of the first Elohist. Delitzsch, who comes nearest to the orthodox view, places him in the time of Joshua, being perhaps Eleazar himself. Stahelin refers him to the Judges, Dr. Colenso makes him the prophet Samuel. Tuch, and Dr. Davidson in 1862, refer him to Saul, Killisch to David, Ewald and Von Lengerke to Solomon, De Wette to some of the later kings. Others think the whole a fabrication in the days of Josiah; and Sorensen, bolder still, ascribes it to the time of the Maccabees. These conclusions deserve the praise of chronological impartiality, and range pretty evenly over the eight centuries from the death of Joshua to the Captivity.

vii. The Age of the Supplement Writer, assuming one only. Delitzsch places him just after the death of Joshua; Dr. Davidson, in 1857, under the Judges; Stahelin under Saul, Dr. Colenso near the close of the reign of David, Tuch under Solomon, where Ewald places the Elohist,

Dr. Davidson (1862) under Uzziah, Ewald and Von Lengerke under Hezekiah, De Wette somewhere after Jehoram. Many also place the last compiler, whether the same with the Jehovist, or a different person, in the time of Jeremiah.

viii. The Extent of the Elohist Document or Documents. Even in Genesis the diversity is considerable, but in the later books the divergence is complete. Most assign to him the greater part of the laws in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. But a minority, including Dr. Colenso, make his work end abruptly at Exod. vi., except a few fragments, and ascribe nearly all the rest to later hands.

ix. The Place and Date of Deuteronomy. Many, as George and Dr. Davidson (1857), hold it to be the first and earliest of all the books of the Pentateuch; others, as De Wette, Hupfeldt, and Dr. Davidson (1862), make it the latest; some under Manasseh, others under Josiah, and several (Gesenius, Hirtmann) even fancy it to be Jeremiah's own composition.

There are some of those minor 'details,' on which the negative critics continue still to disagree. Except their common denial of the Mosaic authorship, and their common perversion of the text in Exodus, they include every conceivable point of divergence. The number, the ages, the extent of composition, the relative order of the supposed writers, are all diversely explained. Beyond the four points already specified, it seems impossible to discover one foot of firm ground amidst a quagmire of conjectures and contradictions. The variations are precisely of that kind which clear, well-defined contrasts of earlier

and later style, in definite portions of the work, would exclude altogether. Thus Deuteronomy is placed alternately as early as Joshua, or as late as Jeremiah, or even the Maccabees. The age of the Jehovist, in the view of Tuch, is the age of the Elohist in that of Ewald. In the only points where a delicate perception of Hebrew style might prove its existence and value, by consistent and harmonious conclusions, the diversity, and even the contrast, is complete. It is thus tolerably clear, even at the outset, that all these theories grow out of one root, their interpretation of Exod. vi.; that the Book of Genesis is carved, first, into two or three portions, and then, to complete the system, into three hundred, in order to suit this fundamental assumption, and present it in some form not wholly incredible; and that differences of style are then fancied or invented, in critical caprice, to strengthen a decision based on other grounds, where the mere English scholar is nearly as competent as the most learned Hebraist to form a sound judgment. We may add, far more competent, if only trained in habits of judicial and exact reasoning, and taught from childhood to approach the Word of God in humility and reverence, listening to the voice which says to every Scriptural student, 'Put off thy shoes from thy feet, for the place where thou standest is holy ground.'

CHAPTER II.

THE NAME OF GOD REVEALED TO MOSES.

12. THE reasons alleged to disprove the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch may be classed under three heads, —the use of the Sacred Names, alleged Contradictions, and alleged Anachronisms and Contrasts of Style. But the negative theories founded upon them have one common root, from which they all spring. It is inferred, from Exod. vi., that the word Jehovah, as a name of God, was first made known to Moses, and was, at least in the writer's view, wholly unheard of in the times of the patriarchs. Hence it would follow at once, that only those parts of Genesis where this name is absent, or else confined to the narrator, could belong to the writer of Exod. vi., whoever he may be. In the chaos of opinions, if there be any 'main conclusion established' in contrast to the 'details' where the discord is interminable, it consists in this doctrine or exposition alone. An inquiry into its truth is thus the first step towards a clear and just view of the whole sceptical argument. The passage itself reads as follows :—

'Then Jehovah said unto Moses, Now shalt thou see what I will do to Pharaoh; for with a strong hand shall he let them

go, and with a strong hand shall he drive them out of the land.'

'And Elohim spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am Jehovah. And I made myself known to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as El Shaddai, but by my name Jehovah I was not made known to them. And I have also established my covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage, wherein they were strangers. And I have also heard the groaning of the children of Israel, whom the Egyptians keep in bondage, and I have remembered my covenant. Wherefore say unto the children of Israel, I am Jehovah, and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will rid you out of their bondage, and I will redeem you with a stretched out arm, and with great judgments. And I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you for Elohim. And ye shall know that I am Jehovah your Elohim, which bringeth you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians. And I will bring you in unto the land, concerning which I did swear to give it to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, and I will give it to you for an heritage: I am Jehovah. And Moses spake so unto the children of Israel, but they hearkened not unto him, for anguish of spirit, and for cruel bondage.'

13. In the 'Pentateuch Examined,' Pt. II., these verses receive the following comment:—

'The above passage cannot, without a perversion of its obvious meaning, the meaning which would be attached to it by the great body of simple-minded readers, be explained to say anything else than this,—that the name Jehovah was not known at all to the patriarchs, but was now for the first time revealed, as the name by which the God of Israel would henceforward be distinguished from all other gods. So Professor Lee admits in his Hebrew Lexicon, and so Josephus writes,—“Wherefore God declared to him His holy name, which had never been discovered to men before.” But then we come at once on the fact,

that this name is repeatedly used in the earlier parts of the story throughout the whole Book of Genesis, and is put into the mouths of the patriarchs themselves. The recognition of the plain meaning of Exod. vi. 2-8, would be enough to decide at once the question of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. If the name originated in the days of Moses, then Moses himself, in writing the story of the patriarchs, would not have put the name into their mouths."

'The ordinary mode of reconciling these discrepancies is exhibited in Kurtz, ii., p. 100: "It is not expressly said that the name was unknown before Moses, but merely that in the patriarchal age God had not revealed the fulness and depths of His nature, to which that name particularly belonged." But this is an assumption made only to get over a difficulty. If Abraham made use of the name at all, then God was known to him by that name in some measure, in some sense or other, if not so perfectly as by the Israelites in later days. If the patriarchs employed the name at all, it could scarcely have been said "I appeared," &c. Could Abram have believed in Jehovah, and God himself have declared the name to Abram, and yet Abram, after all, be said not to have known God by that name? It appears to be a mere straining of Scripture, in order to escape from an obvious contradiction, to assign such a sense as Kurtz, and Kalisch, and other able commentators do, to the word *know* in this passage of Exodus. The whole is easily explained when we know that different writers were concerned.'—*Pent. Ex.* ii. 232.

13. Now it is quite true that superficial readers and verbal triflers, learned or unlearned, may easily and sincerely persuade themselves that the view in the above extract is the only natural meaning of the text. But it is equally true, that whoever turns from words to things, from grammar to real history and genuine theo-

logy, and studies the words with the reverence due to a message of the living God, will be led certainly and irresistibly to a wholly opposite conclusion. The text, with its context, far from proving that the mere word-name Jehovah was unknown to the patriarchs before Moses, proves the exact reverse; that the name, as a word, was already familiar to Moses and the people of Israel, though its deep significance was now, for the first time, to be clearly revealed. Let us consider the proof at length.

i. And, first, the other view degrades the message into a piece of verbal trifling, wholly unsuited to the actual wants of the people, and to the majesty of the God of Israel. They were fainting under a heavy yoke, and ready to despair of deliverance. The message was to give them new hope in their hour of extreme discouragement. Yet its main drift, in the view here examined, is to tell them that a new sound or set of characters must henceforth be used in speaking of the God of their fathers, instead of names already familiar, and hallowed by long and sacred memories. What comfort could there be in such a change? To see the force of the argument, without irreverence, let us replace the word by the name of God in some modern language, and mark the effect. 'I was known to your fathers as El Shaddai; but by my name Iddio I was not known to them. Wherefore say unto the children of Israel, I am Iddio. Ye shall know that I am Iddio, your God. I will give it to you for a heritage: I am Iddio.' On this 'only natural view' of the text, His people ask for bread, and the God of glory offers them a stone. They need comfort in their distress, and they receive an elaborate piece of verbal trifling.

ii. 'And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am Jehovah.' The writer cannot mean this for the first mention of a new word, because he represents it as used already twelve times before, by Moses, by the elders, by the people, and even by Pharaoh. To start with assuming a plural authorship in these four chapters, Exod. ii.-vi., so closely connected, and tearing away the text from its whole context, in order to found a cavil upon it, would be the mere madness of scepticism, and deserves no answer. The passage, by every rule of honest criticism, must be expounded by its own context. Hence the sense cannot possibly be,—I now take to myself for my title this new word, unknown to you and your fathers. This message rather, at the opening of the Old Covenant, must answer to the message by Malachi at its close,—'I am Jehovah, I change not; therefore ye the sons of Jacob are not consumed.' So here,—'I am Jehovah, I change not; therefore ye shall assuredly be delivered.' I am all that this familiar name really implies, the True, the Faithful, the Unchangeable.

iii. 'And I was revealed to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, as El Shaddai.' The word, *name*, does not appear in this clause. No allusion is made in it to a mere sound, but to the Divine character alone. It is not 'They called me,' or 'I called myself,' El Shaddai, but I was seen or revealed as such; and a word could be no object of sight in an oral message. Other titles might be and were used in God's messages to the patriarchs, but this had its meaning so unfolded, that they saw and felt its force and power. He was shown to be Almighty in the victory over the kings, the destruction of the cities of the plain,

the birth of Isaac, and His other wonderful works in the days of old. It results at once that the other clause has a similar meaning.

iv. 'But by my name Jehovah I was not made known to them.' This clause contains two proofs to fix its own meaning. First, the change of person. It is not said, 'My name Jehovah was not known to them,' but 'by,' or 'as to my name Jehovah, *I* was not known.' The knowledge thus delayed was real, not verbal. What is taught is not that their vocabulary was too scanty, but that their experience of God's perfections was partial and incomplete. Again, the same inference follows from the phrase, '*my* name Jehovah.' If now first introduced, the natural phrase would be, 'by *the* name Jehovah.' But here it is implied that this was already a Divine name, even from the time of the patriarchs, though its full and proper force was now to be learned more fully. The Divine Speaker claims the title to Himself, as already His own.

v. The whole message turns on the contrast between a promise and covenant, simply given, and its fulfilment, in spite of seemingly insurmountable hindrances, after long delay. The sum of the whole is plainly, 'I am the Unchangeable God, whose word is sure and true after many generations.' Now this is clearly one idea prominent in the name Jehovah, though it may not exhaust the fulness of its meaning. 'I am that I am' points to the same truth. He is not only the Self-existent, but the Self-consistent Being, 'the Father of Lights, with whom is no variableness nor shadow of turning.'

15. These reasons, from the passage itself, are confirmed by the whole context.

vi. And, first, what is the meaning of the inquiry ii. 13? 'When I am come to the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you, and they shall say unto me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them?' Did Moses ask for some arbitrary sound, which might distinguish the God of Israel from Ammen, Ptah, or Chem, and the other gods of Egypt? This would be wholly at variance with the wisdom of the Jewish lawgiver. There is a close resemblance to his prayer in a later crisis. 'If I have found grace in thy sight, show me now thy way, that I may know thee, and that I may find grace in thy sight.' What he needed to sustain him in his great commission, and also to encourage the people, was a deeper and more intimate knowledge of the true name and character of the God of their fathers. A new set of sounds or syllables could be of no avail. What they needed was a firm hold on the Divine perfections, and to this the answer corresponds. 'And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM. Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.'

These words ought to decide the whole controversy. Verbally and literally, the name Jehovah is not announced, but two others, which never once reappear in the whole history. What is given is not a word-name to replace those already in use, but a grand idea, a Divine perfection. Again, the name so announced is an exposition of the word-name Jehovah, which is assumed to be already known, and therefore is used in the next verse without further preface. If the object were to announce a fresh word-name, the whole passage is unmeaning; for the

word Jehovah is not announced at all, and the two which are actually mentioned never appear again. But if the object were to bring out in fresh relief the true meaning of a familiar name, which had been worn down by use, till it became like an empty sound, then all is consistent, emphatic, and harmonious. The old name is verified by a double change. The old root יהוה, already almost obsolete, is replaced by יהי, the modern and usual form; and the third person, suitable in the lips of God's servants, is exchanged for the first, since it is God Himself who here announces His own name. The redoubling of the word, also, as both subject and predicate, brings out more clearly its hidden force. The name Jehovah, HE WHICH IS, had been worn down, like 'holy day' in holiday, till its power was lost. But the title, 'I am that I am,' and the message, 'I AM hath sent me unto you,' would waken up the buried truth. The name, He Which Is, Jehovah, would no longer be a mere sound, but a watchword, on which the faith and hope of God's afflicted people might securely repose.

vii. The next words fully confirm this exposition: 'Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, Jehovah, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: this is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations.'

The compound title has been used ten or twelve times in the Book of Genesis, which is some presumption that it is not mentioned as wholly new, but as a familiar title, revived with a deeper meaning. But this is plain also from the text itself. The title, 'the God of your fathers,'

was certainly familiar, and needed no explanation. But the name, Jehovah, enters here likewise, without any formal introduction, as one familiar to their ears. If wholly new, the previous verse could not prepare them for its sudden introduction, since the letters and the sound are wholly different. But if the name were familiar, and only its true meaning forgotten, the previous verse would serve to revive it in the most impressive way. The old sound would start into new life, and have all the emphasis of a new revelation. The name I AM would be a pledge that Jehovah had indeed spoken to Moses, and resumed His name into His own lips, that it might bring hope and comfort to His people in their hour of fear and sorrow.

viii. 'Jehovah, the God of the Hebrews, hath met with us: let us go . . . that we may sacrifice to Jehovah our God.'

This use of the name on the first appeal to Pharaoh would be most unnatural, had it been unknown until that hour to the Israelites themselves. The Egyptians must have known them to be worshippers of some God distinct from their own, and have spoken of Him under some name used by the Israelites. If Jehovah was this name, either the most usual or the most distinctive, then the message is natural. But the appeal, on which their deliverance was to depend, would never be weakened by introducing a verbal novelty, a name unheard of before. This would conceal from Pharaoh the real nature of the petition. It would then seem as if these Hebrews were taking up some new worship, which neither they nor their fathers had known, and asked for a three-days' absence, to carry out their capricious innovation. What could be

more likely to defeat the purpose of their appeal to Pharaoh, and to rob it of all moral power?

16. The intervening chapters, Exod. iv. v., point as clearly to the same view.

ix. First, how does Moses describe his own fears from the unbelief of the people? 'But, behold, they will not believe me, nor hearken to my voice; for they will say, Jehovah hath not appeared to thee.'

These words exclude the notion that the historian meant to describe this name as now first revealed. In that case, unbelief of the vision to Moses would clearly involve also a rejection of the name. It would be to the people, what the Pentateuch is now to unbelieving critics, a mere forgery. Their answer might be, 'The God of our fathers,' or else 'El Shaddai, hath not appeared to thee.' But the words prove that, in the view of the writer, this sacred name was in use among the people, even before they were persuaded that the God of their fathers had once more revealed Himself to Moses.

x. The purpose of the signs is next explained. 'That they may know that Jehovah, the God of their fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath appeared to thee.'

There is here no sign of any persuasion to induce them to adopt a new and untried name. On the contrary, the order of the words implies that the name, in both parts alike, was familiar to their ears. The only difficulty was to convince them that Jehovah, their fathers' God, would really deliver them. The words would else have been, 'That they may believe that the God of their fathers hath appeared to thee, and that His name is Jehovah.' To com-

plicate the direct conflict with their unbelieving fears by the attempt, at such an hour, to make a whole people take up a new word for the name of their God, never heard of before, would contradict all common sense. It would be wholly opposed to the wisdom of God, and His tender care for the weakness of His people.

xi. 'And the Lord said unto him, Who hath made man's mouth? or who maketh the dumb, or the deaf, or the seeing, or the blind? have not I Jehovah?'

The nature of the appeal here makes it evident that a familiar name would be used, not one which Moses had heard for the first time a few moments before. Its emphasis rests on the simplicity and self-evidence of the truth, which Moses ought to have known already. A new title of God, now first used, would plainly deaden its force. That One called Jehovah had these high attributes would then have been a fresh revelation, and not, as here described, an old and familiar truth.

xii. 'And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith Jehovah, Israel is my son, my first-born,' &c.

The same remark applies here. A new name for the God of the Hebrews, which Pharaoh heard now for the first time, would only tend to defeat the object of the message. It would lead him to think that his Hebrew slaves were adopting some new god, unknown to their fathers, and using the futile pretext of some religious caprice to procure a respite of their labours.

xiii. 'And Pharaoh said, Who is Jehovah, that I should obey His voice to let Israel go? I know not Jehovah, neither will I let Israel go. And they said, The God of the Hebrews hath met with us; let us go, we

pray thee, three days' journey into the desert, and sacrifice unto Jehovah our God,' &c. 'But he said, Ye are idle, ye are idle; therefore ye say, Let us go, and do sacrifice to Jehovah.'

Here Pharaoh accepts the name Jehovah, without question or surprise, as the usual name of the God of the Hebrews. He merely disclaims all reverence, honour, and obedience, as due from him to this tutelary deity of a foreign and servile race. Jehovah, and God of the Hebrews, are in his eyes equivalent terms. Thus he says to the taskmasters, 'They cry, saying, Let us go and do sacrifice to our God;' but to the officers of the Israelites, 'Ye are idle; therefore ye say, Let us go and do sacrifice to Jehovah.' He thus takes it as a matter of course that Jehovah was the well-known name of the God of the Hebrews, whom he disowned.

xiv. 'Jehovah look upon you, and judge, because ye have made our savour to be abhorred in the eyes of Pharaoh,' &c.

This use of the name by the officers in the forefront of their bitter complaint is quite inexplicable, if they had learned it first from Moses a few days before; and this, too, in connexion with a message which now seemed to them a delusion and a snare. On this hypothesis they could only have said, 'The God of our fathers look upon you, and judge,' but could never have made their complaint in its actual form. If the message were only a delusion, this new name would share in its disgrace.

xv. The whole history of the plagues confirms the same view. Five times the purpose of these judgments is said to be, 'that the Egyptians may know that I am

Jehovah.' (Exod. vii. 5, 17; viii. 22; x. 2; xiv. 4, 18.) Plainly, it was not to convince them that the God of the Hebrews had adopted a new surname, a fresh sound or hieroglyphic, but to convince them that He was the true God, the Self-Existent and Unchangeable, whose covenant could not fail. These words are thus a clear and distinct commentary on the previous message. By these plagues and this deliverance God revealed the unchangeableness of His purpose of love, as it had never been revealed before.

17. These reasons, from the message and its context, are a full and decisive demonstration of the entire falsehood of that exposition on which all the sceptical theories depend. But they are further confirmed by the character of the name itself. It is the future of הוה, an older form of היה, to be, but one almost obsolete when the first books of the Old Testament were written. This is clear from the fact that היה occurs thousands of times from Genesis to Malachi, but הוה only in about six places; and three of these are imperatives, the simplest and most primitive part of the verb, which, therefore, retains more easily an ancient and earlier form. The future, which answers to the sacred name, is never once found in its grammatical sense, 'I will be,' or 'He will be,' and a form akin to it once only; while the root היה is found in that tense alone some thousands of times. Just as the name, Holy Ghost, in our language, must have been given in our language to the Spirit of God, when *ghost* was a familiar term for *spirit*; but is still used as a sacred name, when that word has become confined to the sense of an apparition; so the name Jehovah must have been formed in a stage of the

Hebrew tongue earlier than the earliest writings of the Old Testament; that is, in the pre-Mosaic or Patriarchal times. Its artificial invention at any later period would reverse all the laws of language; and would degrade it, from being the natural utterance of a Divine perfection, retaining its ancient and venerable form as first given, into a piece of verbal trifling, unnatural and almost ridiculous, which could never have been adopted with reverence by a whole people, nor have replaced names consecrated by ages of holy worship.

18. One argument only is offered, in the 'Pentateuch Examined,' to support the interpretation now disproved: 'If Abraham made use of the name Jehovah at all, then God was known to him, in some measure, in some sense or other, by that name, if not so perfectly as by the Israelites.' The answer is plain and easy. It may be quite true that God was known by this name to Abraham, *in some sense or other*; and equally true that He was not known to him by this name, *in that most important sense*, which the whole context proves to be alone intended in these words of Exodus. It would be a strange and novel maxim of criticism that no historical statement is true, unless it be true in every sense of the words, which is grammatically possible. What modern history would not be proved almost a tissue of falsehoods, if once tried by a test so ridiculous and absurd?

19. The reasoning of Dr. Davidson (i. 16-24) on this passage, as often, is tortuous and obscure. In direct opposition to Dr. Colenso, he admits that Exod. vi. refers to the fuller discovery of the meaning of the name, and not to its first invention. 'We do not deny that the

name was sometimes employed in the pre-Mosaic time. Probably it was usual among the maternal forefathers of Jochebed (who were they?) as the composition of her name implies. Nor do we deny that between the ante-Mosaic and Mosaic use of the appellation there must have been a great distinction, because the import of it was not properly understood till the times of Moses.' But he still clings to the sceptical conclusion, after abandoning the main premise on which it rests. 'We cannot believe that the writer of Exod. vi. 3 intended such a contrast. Had he done so, the text would have been different. The word *appeared* would have had associated with it, not El Shaddai, but Jehovah; *i.e.* I appeared to the patriarchs as Jehovah; but the fulness of the meaning implied in the name was imperfectly apprehended by them. Or some other verb would have been used as antithetic, Jehovah still standing in place of El Shaddai; *i.e.* "I was known to the patriarchs as Jehovah, but I was not experimentally known to them in the fulness of the covenant meaning." Their knowledge of my character was only superficial. But it is clear to the unbiassed reader that there was no such marked difference between the apprehension of Jehovah before and after Moses, as one-sided apologists would lead us to suppose.'

Here we learn, as one of the author's 'settled results,' that 'there must have been a great distinction' in the employment of the name before and after Moses, but still no 'marked difference,'—as apologists, in their atmosphere of ignorance, falsely pretend. The question is answered both yes and no in the same page. Next, the sacred writer, had he meant to mark this contrast, would not

have said, 'God was known to them as El Shaddai, but as Jehovah (*i.e.* the Unchangeable) He was not made known,' but have used the briefer and more emphatic antithesis: 'He was known to the patriarchs as Jehovah, but was not experimentally known to them in the fulness of the working power and covenant meaning of the name!' In other words, if the Lord had really spoken to Moses at the bush, instead of the grand and simple message as it stands, He would certainly, in Dr. Davidson's opinion, have made use of his own milk-and-water paraphrase. Had this modern improvement appeared in the text, it would have been a more convincing sign of spuriousness than all the laborious arguments such critics have hitherto been able to devise.

20. It is urged, however, that Abraham believed in Jehovah, Gen. xv. 6, and apprehended rightly the character of God under that name, and realised the promise, though not yet fulfilled, so that the essential character of the knowledge in both cases was the same. This argument contradicts flatly the previous admission of a great distinction, in respect of this knowledge, between the earlier and later time. But it contradicts also the force of the words employed—I was seen—I was not known. Here sight and knowledge are used as equivalent and convertible, while sight is the constant antithesis of faith. And this meaning is confirmed by the whole sequel, where the Egyptians are to 'know Jehovah,' or that God is Jehovah, by the actual experience of the judgments upon the land, and the actual deliverance of Israel. The name, it is admitted, was in existence and use before, and its meaning, so far as a word alone could convey it, must therefore

have been known. But the contrast referred to a deeper and more intimate knowledge, such as could be gained only by the present manifestation of God's unchangeable truth and grace, in the fulfilment of His promise after ages of delay. Such, when compared with the whole context, is the clear and demonstrable meaning of the message. It is grand, simple, majestic, worthy of the living God to reveal, and to place as the very foundation of His written messages of truth and holiness; while the exposition of unbelieving critics is crude, contradictory, and frivolous, worthy of themselves. The whole history, from the third to the fifteenth of Exodus, rises up, with one consenting voice, to prove its utter falsehood.

CHAPTER III.

THE ELOHISTIC THEORY.

21. THE modern criticism, which affects to place among its settled results the spuriousness of the Books of Moses, starts usually from the perversion of Exod. vi., which has now been fully disproved. This datum is then combined with four main arguments, from supposed anachronisms, from the use of the two sacred names in Genesis, alleged contradictions between parts thus assigned to different authors, and supposed contrasts or diversities of style. These are so mixed and involved together as to make it hard to decide on the best order of review. It seems the clearest plan, first to state the sceptical theory in its ripened form, and the direct arguments which prove it inconsistent and incredible; and then to compare the opposite views, in their solution of the successive details of the sacred narrative in historical order, from first to last.

The modern critics assume, then, two writers of the Pentateuch at least, but five in the scheme of Hupfeldt and Davidson, and perhaps of Dr. Colenso—an Elohist, a junior Elohist, a Jehovist, a Deuteronomist, and a Redactor by whom the work was completed into its present form. The Elohist is supposed to be the writer of Exod. vi. 1-8,

and to avoid constantly the use of the name Jehovah in pre-Mosaic times. The Jehovist some hold to have written a second continuous history, others that he only supplemented the earlier work. He is said to use either name, but more commonly Jehovah, even in the times before Moses. The junior Elohist is admitted by some only, as Hupfeldt and Davidson, who make him agree with the Elohist in style, and with the Jehovist in the mixed use of the names, or else conversely. The part assigned to the first Elohist is styled the fundamental document. In Dr. Davidson's scheme it only forms one-sixth of Genesis, another sixth is given to the junior Jehovist, five-ninths, or more than half, to the Jehovist, and one-ninth to the Redactor, who fused the whole into one. The theory splits up Genesis into more than three hundred fragments, great and small, and then assigns each of them, on alleged critical grounds, to its right owner among these four claimants, whose names, ages, and characters, are all unknown. Some place the Elohist as high as Eleazar, others as late as Solomon. The Jehovist has been referred to the times of Phinehas, of Saul, of Solomon, of Uzziah, and of Hezekiah. The Redactor and the Deuteronomist, of course, come later. Many place them under Manasseh or Josiah, and many melt them into one.

The parts assigned by Dr. Davidson to each of his four contributors are these:—

I.—Ch. i. 1 — ii. 3; v. 1-28, 30-32; vi. 9-22; vii. 6-9, 11, 13-16, 21, 24; viii. 1-5, 13-19; ix. 1-17, 28, 29; xi. 10-32; xii. 4, 5; xiii. 6 (11, 12); xv. 1; xvi. 3-15, 16; xvii.; xix. 29; xxi. 2, 4, 5; xxiii.; xxv. 7-11, 17, 20, 26; xxvi. 26-35; xxviii. 1-9; xxxi. 18; v. 9-15,

28, 29; vi. 6-8; xxxvii. 1; xlvi. 6, 7; xlvii. (11, 27), 28; xlviii. 3-7; xlix. 29-33; l. 12, 13.

II.—Ch. xvi. 2, 15; xx. 1-17; xxi. 1-3, 6, 7, 10-17, 18-20, 21-34; xxii. 1-13, 19; xxv. 11*; xxvi. 6, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19-22, 25; xxviii. 10-12, 17-22; xxxi. 2, 4-9, 11, 13-17, 19*, 23*, 20, 24-6, 8, 9, 38-41, 42-6, 7, 51-4; xxxii. 1-3, 23*, 25*, 27-32; xxxv. 6, 7, 22-26; vi. 2-5, 11-14, 19-28; vii. 3-18, 19-22-4-8, 29-31 (32-36); xl.; xli. 1, 5-14, 15-17, 22-24 (25-27, 34, 35, 39, 40, 42), 43, 45-48, 50-52, 54; xlii. (6, 7), 8-10, 12, 21-23; xlv. 2, 3; xlvi. 8-12, 13-27; xlviii. 1, 2, 10, 13, 14, 20; xlix. 33; l. 22.

III.—Ch. ii. 4-9, 10-25; iii. 1-21; iv. 1-26; vi. 4-8; vii. 1-5, 10, 12, 16, 17, 22, 23; viii. (2-4), 6-12, 20-22; ix. 18, 19; x. 1*-32; xii. 1-4, 6-20; xiii. 1-5, 7-11, 12-18; xiv.; xv. 2-f; xvi. 1, 4-14; xviii. 1; xix. 28; xx. 18; xxi. 20; xxii. 14-18, 20-24; xxiv.; xxv. 6, 12-16, 18, 19, 21, 26-28; xxvii. 45; xxix.; xxx. 13, 17-40; xxxi. 1, 3, (17-19), 21-23, 25-30, (31, 50), 53, 54; xxxii. 1, 4-24; xxxiii. 16, 18, 20; xxxiv. 4, 6, 8-18, 20-26, 28, 30; xxxv. 5, 16, 20, 21, 27; xxxvi. 9, 10, 15-19, 31-43; vii. 2, (3, 11, 18, 23), 25, 27, (28, 32-3-5), 34; viii.; ix.; xli. (14, 15, 17, 25), 18-21, 29, 31-*42, 44-6-7-9, 53-57; xlii. 1-5, 7, 9, 11, 13-20, 24*; xliii.; iv. 3-34; v. 1-4, 28; vi. 5, 28; vii. 1-10, 12-27; viii. 8-12, 15-19; ix. 1-28; l. 15-21, 22, 23.

IV.—Ch. ii. 9; iii. 22-24; v. 20*; vi. 1-3, 4; vii. 8; ix. 18, 20-27; x. (5, 8, 20, 25, 31), 21; xi. 1-9; xix. 30*; xxi. 8, 9, 17; xxiv. 67*; xxv. 26, 29-34; xxvi. 1-5, 7-12 (14, 25), 15, 18, 23, 24; xxvii. 46; viii. 13-16; xxx. 14-16, 40; xxxi. 1, 10-12, 18, (25, 41, 48, 50-52);

xxxii. (23-25), 26, 32, 33; *iii. 17-19; iv. (1, 2, 13, 26), 5, 7, 19, 27, 31; v. 1-4 (7, 9, 16, 20, 27); vi. 1, 2, 6, 9, 18, 29, 36; ix. 1, 20; xl. (3, 5, 7, 15); xli. (1, 14, 15, 22, 24-27), 32, 39; ii. 6, 7; iv. 1, 2; vi. 1-5, 12; vii. 29; viii. 1, 5, 12; ix. (28, 29); i. 1-11, 14, 24, 26.

The succession of the two sacred names, using A for the first (Elohim), B for the second, and C for the compound, will be —

$A^{35}, C^{12}, A^3, C^8, B^9, AB, A^5B, AB, AB^4, A^5, B^2, A^2B, A^3B^3, A^6BA, B^2, B^50, B^7, B^6, D^3B, B^7, B^8, BA^{10}, B^{10}, B^7, A^2, AB, A^5B. — B^2, A^{11}B, A^4B, AB^{40}, B^{19}, AB^4, B^7, B^3A, A^3, B^3, A^2BA, 0B^3, A^8, B^3. — BA^7BA, A^2BA^2, A^{+0}, A^{11}0, 0, 0, B^30, B^5AB^3, A0. — A^9, A^2, A^2, A^3, A^4, A^20, A^7, BA, A^4.$

22. This quadripartite theory is so complex in its details, so flatly opposed to all external evidence, and so destitute of internal coherence and probability, as to need no refutation, if it were not laboriously framed, and stoutly and confidently upheld, by writers who almost claim a monopoly of learning and critical discernment. It becomes necessary, on this ground alone, to show the fatal objections to which it is exposed in every part, even irrespective of all the historical and external evidence.

Let us begin with the Elohist, the writer of *Exod.* vi. 2-4, and, therefore, a disguised name of Moses; who, in the common faith of Jews and Christians, and by the direct teaching of our Lord and His Apostles, is the inspired author of the whole Pentateuch. In this new system, however, the Elohist has only one-sixth, and the rest is transferred to other and later hands. But the reasons assigned are futile and worthless.

i. First, Exod. vi. 2-8, is said to prove the belief of the writer, that the word Jehovah was unknown before the Exodus. This has been proved false by a dozen arguments, drawn from the passage itself and its whole context. The name of the mother of Moses, Jochebed (*i.e.* Jehovah hath honoured), in this same chapter, is an additional and decisive evidence of the falseness of the exposition on which the theory is based.

ii. Even if this false exposition were received, the words refer distinctly to God's messages to the three patriarchs, and to these alone. The parts of Genesis affected by it are xv. 7, 8; xvii. 1-22; xviii. 9-19; xxii. 11-18; xxvi. 24, 25; xxviii. 10-22; xxxii. 24-30; xxxv. 9-15, and xlvi. 1-4. These are just one-twentieth of the book. Those which introduce the name Jehovah in a Divine message are only xv. 7, 8; xviii. 9-19; xxii. 11-18; xxviii. 10-22; or just one-fiftieth part of the whole. These are all which even the false construction of Exod. vi. would compel us to assign to a different author; yet this is made the pretext for depriving the Elohist—that is, Moses—of five-sixths of the whole book.

iii. The natural result, if the false exposition were true, would simply be a contrast between the absence of the name Jehovah in the speeches of the patriarchal times, and its presence in the narrative. Since the name had been revealed, and revealed as specially appropriate, when the Elohist wrote, there is every reason why he should use it throughout in the history, and exclude it only in the speeches, where, on this view, it would be a direct anachronism. But no such contrast is found, except in two or three places, chaps. ii., xxxix. ; and these

the theory does not assign to the Elohist, but to the Jehovist!

iv. The pleas for the arbitrary hypothesis, that the Elohist constantly forbore the sacred name in pre-Mosaic times, are contradictory and worthless. According to Dr. Colenso, the Elohist is Samuel the Prophet, who conceived the pious and patriotic design of introducing a new word, of his own invention, for the popular name of the God of Israel; and, in order to give it a due prestige, invented these conversations of God with Moses, and the chief incidents in the narrative of the Exodus. An object worthy of a third-class grammatical pedant, pursued by means worthy of the Arch-Liar himself! Still on this hypothesis, as silly as profane, there is no reason why the writer should abstain from the name Jehovah through a whole book, but quite the reverse, if his object were simply to bring it into vogue. Its absence in the messages of God to the patriarchs, and in their conversations with each other, would be more, not less striking, if the historian himself constantly employed it. To sustain the hypothesis, the holy prophet is degraded into a compound of impious profaneness and more than childish folly; and the only gain is to make the assumption on which it rests doubly incredible.

Dr. Davidson, on the contrary, 'does not deny that the name Jehovah was sometimes employed in pre-Mosaic times.' But, then, 'the earlier a writer was, the more likely would he be to attend to the distinction' of using the name only after Moses, and so 'the careful Elohist excluded the name in the matter of Genesis.' But we look in vain for any reason to justify the assertion. If

the name was actually known before Moses, there can be no reason why an earlier post-Mosaic writer, rather than a later, should reverse the fact which lay nearer to his own time, and treat it as unknown. Still less is any show of reason offered why he should treat it as unknown to himself, as well as to the patriarchs, throughout more than one half of his own narrative. The proper inference, if the interpretation of *Exod. vi.* were correct, would not be that its writer composed only the Elohistie sections, but rather that there were portions he did not write, and introduced, without change, from earlier pre-Mosaic records.

23. The passage in *Exodus*, then, even as explained by these critics, lends no help whatever to their theory, but is a direct stumbling-block in its way. We may, therefore, dismiss it from the inquiry. Let us now examine whether this theory fulfils its claim to satisfy and explain the use of the two names in the *Book of Genesis*.

i. And, first, if the use of the names be a sufficient ground of separation, it points clearly to three authors, and neither two nor four,—an Elohist in *ch. i. 1–ii. 3; xvii. 2–f.; xxxv.; xl.–l.*; a Jehovist in *ch. ii.–iv.; xi.–xvi.; xviii.–xix. 28; xxxviii.; ix.*; and a Neutral, who uses either name, in the rest, or *ch. v.–x.; xix. 29–xxxiv.* But such a division among three writers, which is the result of the proposed test, fairly applied, is wholly preposterous. The Elohist would thus vault from the first Sabbath to the covenant with Abraham when 99 years old, then to the return of Jacob from Padan-aram, with no mention of his birth or that of his sons, and then at once to the dreams of the chief butler and baker, when in prison with Joseph in Egypt. The two other portions also would be such

fragments, as neither inspired prophet nor cunning forger would ever be likely to compose. Besides, the hypothesis of any writer strictly confining himself to the name Jehovah is wholly unreasonable.

ii. The exclusive use of Jehovah, or Jehovah Elohim, in ch. ii.-iv., xi.-xvi., where it occurs 29 and 35 times in succession, needs an explanation just as much as that of Elohim 35 times in ch. i. 1-ii. 3; and again 35 times in ch. xl.-l. Now if the former passages are consistent with an admission that their writer knew, and so might have employed either name, the latter must be consistent with it also. If this use of Elohim requires an Elohist, to whom the sacred name was unfamiliar or unknown, then we ought to admit a Jehovist, who used that name exclusively. But such an assumption is not made by these critics, and is disproved by the currency of both names throughout the Old Testament.

iii. The parts which the test refers to the Elohist, when we assume the latitude of a solitary deviation or interpolation, are ch. i. 1-ii. 3; v.; ix. 1-19; xvii.; xxi. 2-34; xxiii.; xxix. 1-30; xxxiv.-xxxvi.; xl.-l., or 21 chapters. But the theory assigns him only the four first of these, and the sixth (ch. xxiii.) with a few verses in the other seventeen chapters. By way of compensation, it culls out for him parts, amounting to one-half of his portion, from those chapters where the names are mixed, or where the sacred name alone is used. Out of his 262 verses, 132 belong to these five chapters, and 130 to the other fragments. Thus the actual division of these critics, and that resulting from their own test, when fairly applied, wholly disagree, except in a few chapters, chiefly at the opening

of the book. Again, ch. xl.-l. are clearly Elohist in the use of the names, since the other name is found only in one verse out of eleven chapters, or 360 verses. Yet here only $16\frac{1}{2}$ verses, less than one-twentieth part, are assigned to the Elohist; while 228 are ascribed to the Jehovist, and the rest (116) to the junior Elohist and the Redactor, who share the same privilege of using either name.

iv. The theory involves the dissection of the Book of Genesis into verses, and even parts of verses, in order to satisfy its imaginary conditions. But such a process destroys the main pillar on which it pretends to rest. Out of 1534 verses, only about 300, or one-fifth, contain either of the sacred names. When once the dissection into single verses is allowed, the test on which the theory depends ceases to apply to four-fifths of the whole. The further license of assuming interpolations or substitutions of the names themselves, or of a Jehovistic for an Elohist portion, completes the suicide, and makes the test useless in the remaining 300 verses, to which it might otherwise apply.

24. The 'groundwork document,' as elaborated by the theory, from ch. ix. onward, is one quite inconceivable for any historical writer to have composed. After twenty-three verses of genealogy, from Shem to Terah, made to follow close on ix. 1-17, 28, 29, it continues as follows:—

'And Abram was seventy-five years old when he departed out of Haran. And Abram took Sarai his wife, and Lot his brother's son, and all their substance, and the souls they had gotten in Haran, and they went forth to go into the land of Canaan; and into the land of Canaan they came. And the land was not able to bear them that they might dwell together,

for their substance was great, so that they could not dwell together; and they separated one from the other. Abram dwelt in the land of Canaan, and Lot dwelt in the cities of the plain. After these things came the word of Jehovah to Abram in a vision, saying, Fear not, Abram: I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward. And Sarai, Abram's wife, took Hagar her maid, the Egyptian, after Abram had dwelt ten years in the land of Canaan, and gave her to her husband Abram, to be his wife. And Abram called his son's name, which Hagar bare, Ishmael. And Abram was eighty-six years old when Hagar bare Ishmael to Abram.'

Ch. xvii., God's covenant, ending,—

'And all the men of his house, born in the house, or bought with money of the stranger, were circumcised with him.'

Then, without preface,—

'And it came to pass, when God destroyed the cities of the plain, that God remembered Abraham, and sent Lot out of the midst of the overthrow, when he overthrew the cities in which Lot dwelt. And Sarah conceived at the set time of which God had spoken to him. And Abraham circumcised his son Isaac, being eight days old, as God commanded him. And Abraham was a hundred years old when his son Isaac was born unto him. And Sarah was a hundred and seven and twenty years old, the years of the life of Sarah. (ch. xxiii.) . . . And the field and the cave were made sure unto Abraham, for a possession of a burying-place, by the sons of Heth. And these were the days of the years of Abraham's life which he lived, one hundred and seventy-five years. Then Abraham gave up the ghost and died And it came to pass after the death of Abraham, that God blessed his son Isaac. And these are the years of the life of Ishmael, one hundred and thirty-seven years; and he gave up the ghost and died, and was gathered to his people. And Isaac was forty years old when he took to wife Rebekah, the

daughter of Bethuel the Syrian, of Padan-aram, the sister to Laban the Syrian. And Isaac was threescore years old when she bare them. (*i.e.* Esau and Jacob.) And Abimelech went to him (*i.e.* Isaac) from Gerar, and Ahuzzath, one of his friends, and Phichol the chief captain of his army. And Isaac said unto them, Wherefore come ye to me, seeing ye hate me, and have thrust me away from you? &c. &c. 'And he called it Sheba. And Esau was forty years old when he took to wife Judith, daughter of Beeri the Hittite, and Bashemath, daughter of Elon the Hittite; which were a grief of mind unto Isaac and Rebekah. And Isaac called Jacob and blessed him, and charged him . . . the sister of Nebaioth, to be his wife.' (xxviii. 1-9.) 'And he (*i.e.* Jacob) carried away all his cattle and all his goods, the cattle of his getting, which he had gotten in Padan-aram, to go to Isaac his father in the land of Canaan. . . . And God appeared to Jacob when he came out of Padan-aram, and blessed him. (vv. 10-14.) And Jacob called the name of the place where God spake to him, Bethel.'

This disjointed, meagre outline, the mere bones of the sacred history, all misjoined together, may be left to the judgment of any sensible reader. The mere perusal of this 'document,' which the critics have devised with so much labour, is enough to fix its real worth as the original of the sacred history. Yet, in order to produce this limping continuity, fifteen single verses, and nine parts of verses, have to be stolen from paragraphs or chapters, either mixed or Jehovistic in their use of the names; and one verse is included (xv. 1), where the name Jehovah alone appears in the sacred text. The transition from xiii. 12 to xv. 1, and from this to xvi. 3; the mention of the name of Ishmael before his birth had been mentioned; the passage from the circumcision of the servants to the escape of Lot, without a single verse on the judgment from which

he was saved; the mention of the conception of Isaac and his circumcision, but not of his birth or naming, which are left to be supplied by the 'junior Elohist;' and then of the death and burial of Sarah, without a word about Isaac or Ishmael, are curious illustrations of this product of modern criticism, when it undertakes to distribute among four Jewish forgers of fables the earliest message of the living God to sinful men. To crown the absurdity, we are told that this 'ground-work document,' thus composed chiefly of genealogies, geographical notes, and marks of chronology, 'resembles a poem more than a history.'—*DAV. Introd.* p. 25. In truth, it resembles rather a broken skeleton, the remains of a living history, from which a reckless criticism has scraped the flesh entirely away.

25. Let us now turn to the junior Elohist, to whom are assigned 221 verses and 56 parts of a verse, or nearly the same amount as to the earlier writer. The proofs of his existence are thus given:—

'How have traces of a junior Elohist been detected? Certain portions belong to neither of the two documents exclusively, but have peculiarities resembling both. Though Elohim occurs in them, they are not what are termed Elohistic. Their tone and manner more resemble the Jehovist's. Such phenomena appear in the history of Jacob and Joseph. There is no doubt that xxxv. 9-15 belongs to the first document. But by the preceding history of Jacob, ch. xxxii., he received the name Israel from his night-wrestling. Hence different traditions were employed in the two chapters, as is clear from the contents. In conformity with this twofold tradition is the double origin of Bethel. Hence xxviii. 11, &c., and xxxv. 1-7, though marked by the same name, Elohim, are of later origin than xxxv. 9-15. So

ch. xxxi. does not belong to the primitive document, from whose genuine parts it varies, but to a later Elohim document, agreeing more nearly with the Jehovistic parts of the history. The account of the settlement in Egypt belongs, in a great degree, to the junior Elohist. This is shown by the contents, manner, and style. The narrative is too diffuse and minute to harmonise with the summary notices of the primitive Elohist. Great stress, too, is laid on dreams, which is unlike the original document . . . To the same Elohist must be referred Gen. xxii. 1-13, 19. Apart from the use of Elohim, the entire conception and point of view show a higher development of the religious idea than belongs to the primitive Elohist. The sacrifice of an only son is remote from his conception, who studiously kept sacrifices away from the time of the patriarchs! . . . The third chapter of Exodus belongs to the same; for not only does the title Elohim occur in it seven times along with Jehovah, but an explanation of the latter is given, which cannot belong to the Jehovist, because of vi. 13. The old Elohist would not use the name Jehovah as is here done, and therefore it belongs to the junior Elohist. Of the sections referred to one thing must be allowed, that they belong to some other document than the two leading ones. A third source of tradition shines through them. . . . The principal traits in him and the Jehovist resemble each other. He is distinguished from the latter, not only by the use of Elohim, but by the absence of strong expressions of hatred against neighbouring tribes, and a milder apprehension of sin. In many things he has an analogy to the Elohist, in more to the Jehovist.'— *Introduction*, pp. 44-46.

26. This passage is a striking instance of the self-contradiction into which these discoverers continually fall, when they set up a claim to special insight.

i. First, the contrast between the so-called Elohist and Jehovist rests entirely on two things—the use of the Divine names, and the general tone and style. We are

warned (p. 18) that it is great ignorance to think that the conclusion rests on either line of proof, separately and alone. It is affirmed to rest on their concurrence. Yet now a junior Elohist has to be invented, because, in one-sixth of the book, these two kinds of evidence contradict each other. Here parts agree in style and tone which differ in the use of the name; and, on the other hand, those which agree in the use of the names differ in style and tone. Thus, if we rest upon the names only, this junior must be identified with the first Elohist; if we rest on the style, with the Jehovist. Hence, by these concessions, instead of a concurrence of the two arguments, they are seen to be in direct antagonism, and neutralise each other. The need of inventing this junior Elohist is a deadly blow against the original theory, which it crumbles into dust.

ii. The next recourse is to the charge of contradiction. 'There can be no doubt that xxxv. 9-15 belongs to the first document, and it contradicts xxxii. and xxviii. 11-22.' Now, first, since both are called Elohistie, it is surely more natural to reckon the first passages the earlier, if they are to have two sources. To assume, without proof, that the third alone belongs to the first Elohist, is quite in keeping with the superficial presumption of the whole criticism. Next, the alleged contradiction is purely a result of critical blindness. The passage xxxv. 1-8 contains, as is allowed, a direct allusion to the previous history, ch. xxviii. But the passage vv. 9-16 is a simple continuation of the former. The negative critics break up this chapter of simple, continuous narrative, into thirteen parts, in this marvellous order:—

Ch. xxxv. 1-4, Redactor ; v. 5, Jehovist ; vv. 6, 7, Junior Elohist ; v. 8, Redactor ; v. 9, 'And God appeared unto Jacob,' Elohist ; 'again,' Redactor ; 'when he came out of Padan-aram,' &c., v. 10-15, Elohist ; v. 16a, Redactor ; v. 16b-20a, Jehovist ; v. 20b, Redactor ; v. 21, Jehovist ; vv. 22-26, Junior Elohist ; v. 27, Jehovist ; vv. 28, 29, Elohist.

Comment seems superfluous on such a climax of critical folly. The second account of the name Israel is so far from contradicting the first, that it assumes and implies it. There is nothing in xxxv. 10 to explain why this particular name should be given. Exactly the same repetition occurs in the New Testament. Simon is surnamed Peter at the ordination of the Apostles, Mark, iii. 16 ; and again, considerably later, the name is repeated and confirmed, Matt. xvi. 17, 18. The only part assigned also to this junior Elohist, within the first nineteen chapters, or from the Creation to the birth of Isaac, is precisely these two verses : 'And Sarai said unto Abram, Behold, now, the Lord hath restrained me from bearing : I pray thee, go in unto my maid, it may be that I may obtain children by her. And Abram hearkened to the voice of Sarai. And Hagar bare Abram a son.' Some century earlier the Elohist had recorded, 'And Abram called his son's name, which Hagar bare, Ishmael.' Then, after this long delay, the junior Elohist records the birth itself ; and another century later, a Jehovist prefaces with the verse, 'Now Sarai, Abram's wife, bare him no children, and she had a handmaid, an Egyptian, whose name was Hagar.' Perhaps, in like manner, some learned critic on 'Paradise Lost,' in future

days, will discover clear signs that the third paragraph was by Pope, the second by Byron, and the first by Tennyson, except a few words from the Redactor, who soon afterwards fitted them together.

27. The separation of the part of the Jehovist, to whom five-ninths of the whole are assigned, and who has thus in quantity more than three times the Elohist, depends on nothing but arbitrary caprice. The text in Exodus, it has been shown, would leave the Elohist, the first writer, nineteen-twentieths of the whole. But by the arbitrary assumption that he chose to abstain wholly from the name Jehovah, this is reduced to twenty-one chapters, and by the invention of a second Elohist, to bridge over the opposition between the names and the style or contents, only five of these are left to him, and are pieced out with odd verses, chosen here and there, amounting in length to five or six chapters. Thus the Jehovist, the supplementer, comes to be the chief writer, and owns more than half the book. Yet, even with these ample materials, the blanks are distressing and unaccountable. He gives, for instance, the genealogy from Noah to Eber, and the history of Abraham at length; but the genealogy from Eber to Abraham belongs to the Elohist. He is robbed also of the vision, xv. 1, where the sacred name occurs, which is given to the Elohist, to bridge over a chasm. In ch. xx. he has the last verse alone assigned him, which is unmeaning without the history to which it belongs; and in ch. xxi. only the clause about Ishmael, 'And he dwelt in the wilderness and became an archer.' In ch. xxii. we are told of that solemn oath of God, the subject of repeated praise and adoration in the Psalms

and Prophets, and celebrated by Zacharias before the birth of Christ, and by St. Peter when two thousand souls were gathered in by his message (Acts, iii. 25, 26), that 'vv. 14-18 are evidently a Jehovistic appendix loosely added to the preceding.' 'They have not known nor understood, for their eyes are shut that they cannot see, and their hearts that they cannot understand.'

28. If one history, beyond all others, bears simplicity and unity on its face, it is that of Joseph. The following specimen of its treatment, by these modern neologists, will almost supersede, with most persons, the need of more laborious refutation of their scheme. Ch. xxxvii. enters their crucible, and is distilled as follows:—

1. 'And Jacob dwelt in the land wherein his father was a stranger, in the land of Canaan.'—*Elohists*. 2. 'These are the generations of Jacob. Joseph being seventeen years of age . . . their evil report.'—*Jehovist*. 3. 'Now Israel loved Joseph more than all his children, because he was the son of his old age.'—*2nd Elohist*. 4. 'And he made him a coat of many colours.'—*Jehovist*. 5. vv. 4-10, *2nd Elohist*. 6. 'And his brethren envied him.'—*Jehovist*. 7. 'But his father observed the saying.'—*2nd Elohist*. 8. 'And his brethren said to him, Shalt thou indeed reign over us . . . and bring me word again.'—*2nd Elohist*. 9. 'So he sent him out of the vale of Hebron, and he came to Shechem.'—*Redactor*. 10. vv. 15-18a . . . 'And when they saw him afar off,'—*2nd Elohist*. 11. 'before he came near.'—*Redactor*. 12. 'they conspired to slay him.'—*Jehovist*. 13. vv. 19-22a . . . 'And Reuben said to them, Shed no blood, but cast him into this pit that is in the wilderness, and lay no hand upon him.'—*2nd Elohist*. 14. 'that he might rid him out of their hands, to deliver him to his father again.'—*Redactor*. 15. 'And it came to pass, when Joseph was come unto his brethren.'—*2nd Elohist*. 16. 'that they stripped

Joseph out of his coat, his coat of many colours that was on him.'—*Jehovist*. 17. 'And they took him, and cast him into a pit; and the pit was empty, there was no water in it.'—*2nd Elohist*. 18. 'And they sat down to eat bread,' &c. v. 25.—*Jehovist*. 19. 'And Judah said unto his brethren, What profit is it, if we slay our brother, and conceal his blood?'—*Not assigned*. 20. 'Come and let us sell him,' &c. v. 27.—*Jehovist*. 21. 'Then there passed by Midianite merchantmen; and they drew and lifted up Joseph out of the pit.'—*2nd Elohist*. 22. 'And sold Joseph to the Ishmeelites for twenty pieces of silver; and they brought Joseph into Egypt.'—*Jehovist*. 23. 'And Reuben returned . . . and they brought it to their father.'—*2nd Elohist*. 24. 'and said, This have we found: know now whether it be thy son's coat or no. And he knew it.'—*Jehovist*. 25. 'and said, It is my son's coat; an evil beast hath devoured him.'—*2nd Elohist*. 26. 'Joseph is without doubt rent in pieces.'—*Jehovist*. 27. 'And Jacob rent his clothes . . . unto my son mourning.'—*2nd Elohist*. 28. 'Thus his father wept for him.'—*Jehovist*. 29. 'And the Midianites sold him into Egypt.'—*2nd Elohist*. 30. 'Unto Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh's, and captain of the guard.'—*Jehovist*.

The credulity of sceptics is proverbial. But it may be doubted whether a more striking illustration of it can be found than in the publication of this patchwork theory, where this one chapter is broken up into thirty morsels, and assigned to four different writers, as a triumph of critical skill, a 'settled result,' far more credible than the express affirmation of Apostles and of the Lord of Glory!

CHAPTER IV.

THE SACRED NAMES IN GENESIS.

29. THE use of the two names of God, Elohim and Jehovah, in the Book of Genesis, occupies a chief place among modern objections to the Mosaic authorship. The explanation the negative critics propose proves indeed, when examined, a total failure, and some of the details of their composite scheme violate the plainest lessons of common sense. But the proof of their failure cannot alone satisfy the inquiring mind. The interchange of the names cannot be accidental, since each, in turn, occurs ten, twenty, and thirty times in succession. Hence the modern defenders of the genuineness and unity of the book have all recognised a distinction in the use and meaning of these names. But in their efforts to detect an internal reason for the choice their success has not been complete. Some of their explanations are so strained and artificial, as to give occasion to their adversaries to cast discredit on the whole, and to represent it as mere special pleading, to which truth and honesty are sacrificed. Dr. Davidson says, that ‘Hengstenberg and Drechsler failed to show that the name employed is *always* the one which alone suits the connexion. To prove the exclusive suitability of each

where it stands, they have taxed their ingenuity to the utmost without success.' This remark is true. But it has not been shown that this complete insight into the reason of the choice, in every case, is at all required to vindicate the unity of the book. Such a condition is never exacted in the case of any human writer whatever. These learned and able German apologists, by attempting too much, have obscured the real strength of their cause; and have neglected the previous inquiry, within what limits this distinctive use of the names might be expected to prevail. The subject admits of a more cautious and thorough treatment than it has yet received, and will then furnish a powerful evidence of the original unity of the work, and the Divine art and wisdom of the sacred narrative.

30. Let us assume, then, that Moses was the writer, and actually received those Divine messages in the third and sixth of Exodus, and inquire what conclusions will follow with regard to the use of these sacred names.

And, first, it results from Exod. iii., that the name Jehovah, worn down by use till its origin and force were almost forgotten, was revived by the lips of God himself in His first message to Moses. 'He which is continually,' the meaning of the name, became, when God himself was the Speaker, the solemn utterance, 'I Am that I Am,' a God unchangeable in moral excellence, and in the truth of His counsels. Thus the name, to Moses, would be no mere sound, but have a full and deep significance, announcing the unchangeableness and perfection of God.

Next, it results equally from Exod. vi., that Moses was taught to recognise a contrast between the name El Shad-

dai and Jehovah. In the first character God had revealed Himself to the patriarchs, and in the second He would now reveal Himself by fulfilling His earlier promises. The statement refers plainly to comparative, not absolute knowledge, and to revelation, not in words but in acts, such as the works of power about to be displayed. The Lord had revealed His mighty power to the patriarchs within the narrow limits of their own lifetime. The practical disclosure of His unchangeableness needed a wider range of time, an interval of delay and seeming oblivion, and the fulfilment of His promise to the fourth generation. A similar contrast must obtain between Elohim and Jehovah. The former may differ from El Shaddai by an implication of Divine fulness of being, from its plural form, but the main idea seems clearly the same. Each refers to the power of God, for which He is the just object of religious reverence. And hence Moses, to whom those two messages were given, would be likely, above any other writer, to use these names with a vivid perception of the secret contrast in their power.

This contrast is viewed by Hengstenberg as follows:—

‘Elohim is the Great Unknown which infuses fear. Of His interior nature nothing is expressed. The name is merely relative, and, as such, superficial; for the deepest relations of God to men, such as holiness and love, are not included in the name. The plural ending leads also to such a vague character. It is the more general, and Jehovah the more deep and discriminating name of God. Hence we must expect that these names, before the complete establishment of the theocracy, would alternate differently from a later period. The religious condition of this period appears allied to that of the later heathen world, yet had the same elements which were combined in the theocracy. The

mixed character must have certainly occasioned a mingled use of the names. As the relation to the earlier or later period prevailed, the analogy to the heathen world or the theocracy, must the name Elohim or Jehovah have been brought into use The name Jehovah relates to the complete unfolding of the Divine nature. In Elohim and El Shaddai the Godhead is contemplated only in its most outward relation, and the religious stage corresponding, the mere sense of dependence, is the lowest of all. In Jehovah, the superior nature assumes a determinate form. It is the only name of God which describes Him according to His innermost nature, the only one which can be considered as a proper name Elohim became Jehovah by a historical process. That Elohim became Jehovah is the object of the whole sacred history; to show how He became so is the main principle of its representations.'

The main idea in these extracts is true, though not the whole truth; but the expressions at the close are misleading and inexact. The name, Jehovah, is expounded by the lips of God Himself—I AM THAT I AM—the Self-consistent and Unchangeably Perfect Being. That Elohim should 'become Jehovah' directly contradicts the meaning of the name. He is, and must be, the same from everlasting. But a dimmer apprehension or knowledge, on the part of His worshippers, may be raised, by revelation, into one which is fuller and more intimate. This, doubtless, is what the able writer intends; but in subjects of this kind inexact phrases react upon the mind, and produce confusion of thought.

A more serious defect in this view is the representation of Elohim as, in all respects, an inferior name, suited only to a superficial stage of religious feeling. If this were so, its frequent use in the Old Testament, from first to last,

would be unaccountable. But a comparison with the New Testament furnishes a complete disproof. The names which answer to these in the Greek version, it is well known, are Θεός and Κύριος. But in the New Testament Θεός is reserved, almost invariably, for the title of God the Father ; the name Κύριος, Lord, is applied almost as constantly to our blessed Saviour, the Incarnate Son of God, the Mediator of the new covenant. Here it is plain that Θεός occupies the highest, and Κύριος the second place. So 1 Cor. xiii. 4-6, and in hundreds of passages. The view offered above, if accepted as the whole truth, plainly contradicts this great fact, the main result of the comparison of the sacred names in the Old and New Testaments.

31. The truth is, that each name, in turn, may be viewed as higher than the other, according to the special aspect in which we regard it. Elohim represents God as the Mighty, the rich in power, the Unsearchable, the Unknown ; Jehovah, as the Unchangeable, the harmonious and self-complete, the holy and perfect, the Self-revealed, who is capable of being definitely known. Thus the passage from ignorance to knowledge, from dimmer to clearer apprehension, is the transition from the knowledge of Elohim to the higher apprehension of Jehovah. But, again, all creature knowledge is limited by faculties which are finite, and cannot exhaust the nature of the Divine Being. One who could be comprehended and fully known by the creature could not be the true and infinite God. Hence the stage of thought, where advanced but still imperfect knowledge loses itself in a higher mystery, in the feeling how much still remains unknown, is the passage from a knowledge of Jehovah to the worship of Jehovah

as Elohim. And this reconciles the opposite facts of the Old and New Testaments. In the Mosaic revelation, the vague, dim knowledge of God, in earlier times, became enriched, enlarged, and made definite, by a series of direct revelations. The worship of God as Elohim was ripened into the knowledge of the great I AM, the unchangeable, covenant-keeping Jehovah of the Exodus. In the Gospel this work of self-revelation reached its height, when 'the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us;' and the incommunicable name, Jehovah, passing first into the *Κύριος* of the Greek version, coalesced with the frequent title of honour between men and men, in that wondrous name, the Lord Jesus. It now becomes the sign of completed revelation, the Godhead manifested in our Lord's humanity; and Jesus, the Son of Man, is crowned with the name of the Most Holy,—'that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord (*i.e.* Jehovah), to the glory of God the Father.' But now the unsearchableness of the Divine nature is exhibited by the name *Θεός*, *i.e.* Elohim, applied to the Father, whom the Son reveals, but who remains for ever inaccessibly glorious. 'No man hath seen God at any time; the Only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath revealed Him.' Thus the soul is led upward by successive stages, from Elohim to Jehovah, and from Jehovah to Elohim; from dim religious reverence, to see, to look upon, and to handle the Word of Life, and know Him that is from the beginning; and, from this higher knowledge, to the voice of Apostolic adoration,—'O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out!'

We have thus obtained a partial key to the probable use of these names by Moses in his inspired history of the patriarchal times. The more general name, Elohim, forms the starting-point and ground-work of the whole. When a definite, historical, and moral revelation is made to men, the name Jehovah will form its natural embodiment and expression. When past revelations lose themselves in the course of general providence, and in the sense of a mystery, to be solved only by new and higher revelations, the name Elohim, the title of God as the mysterious and infinite, may be expected to reappear.

32. A second truth, however, remains to be weighed, and its consequences traced, before we can expect to solve the problem before us. Both of these names are names of one and the same God; Elohim is Jehovah, and Jehovah is Elohim. The distinction and contrast of the names needs to be so wisely tempered as never to create the false impression of two Deities, whose attributes are independent and incompatible. They are to be used, so to speak, as stereoscopic photographs, for the object of both is the same glorious Being; and the mental eye must learn to combine these contrasted aspects in one wondrous vision, an unknown God, who can and must be known; a revealed God, who is and must remain unsearchable. There must be many passages, in a sacred history where the main object of thought is the Divine Being, which have no special reference either to the dimness or clearness of human knowledge, to the presence or absence of a peculiar mystery. To fulfil this object, both names have naturally to be employed; not in strict alternation, which would give an artificial air to the language, but rather with such

an occasional change, that in the same historical section one name predominates, but the other is once or twice introduced; or so that successive sections are placed in relief, or slight contrast, by the insensible transition from one to the other name. Such a character we may expect to prevail in those passages which have a connective or transitional character, which relate neither to the crisis of a new, moral, or historical revelation, nor to that time of growing mystery, which forms the preparation for a revelation still to come.

The book of Genesis, for the purpose of this inquiry, may be distinguished into ten portions of unequal length; or chh. i.-iv., v.-x., xi.-xviii. 28; xviii. 29-xxiii., xxiv. xxv. xxvi. xxvii.-xxxii. xxxviii. and xxxix., and ch. xxxiii.-L. (except the last). Five of these, containing thirty-three chapters, illustrate the first principle, or the more discriminating use of the sacred names; and the rest, containing seventeen chapters, the mixed, or more alternate and miscellaneous usage.

33. THE CREATION. Chap. i. 1-ii. 3.—Here the name, Elohim, alone occurs thirty-five times. The section reveals the sequence and order of the natural creation, and prepares the way for the record of the Fall. It displays the power of the Almighty; but it is in the government of men and angels that His moral perfections are displayed. Hence the name expressive of Divine power, in contrast to Jehovah, expressive of truth and holiness, is alone employed.

PARADISE AND THE FALL. Chap. ii. 4-iii. 24.—Here, twenty times in succession, we meet with the compound title, the Lord God, Jehovah Elohim. Only in the words

of the Serpent and of Eve we find simply Elohim. That name of dimmer knowledge and vague reverence alone suits the lips of the deceiver, and the woman's expiring faith. The use of the compound in the narrative is constant and unvaried:—

‘Jehovah, the Self-revealer, and Elohim, the Almighty Creator, are one. Had Moses suddenly used Jehovah alone, there might have been a doubt whether Jehovah was not different from Elohim. The union proves their identity; and, this being proved, Moses drops the union, and employs sometimes one, sometimes another, as occasion and propriety may require.’—*McCAUL, Aids to Faith*, p. 196.

This use of the compound here alone, and so often, is a distinct proof of the unity of the work. No hypothesis of two, three, or four independent authors can explain it. This primitive revelation of God to man, the basis of the moral government of our world, evidently requires the higher name, Jehovah. But since only Elohim has been used before, its addition is needful here, and here only, to establish the truth Israel confessed in the days of Elijah,—‘Jehovah, He is Elohim; Jehovah, He is Elohim.’ This union, expressed here so early, is then implied throughout. It keeps Jehovah from being degraded into a mere local and national God of the Jews; and Elohim from passing into a dim worship of the powers of nature—the Elohim, the gods many, and lords many, of the heathen world.

CAIN AND ABEL. Ch. iv.—In this third section the compound title ceases. Nine times Jehovah appears alone. Once only, in the words of Eve, we read, v. 25, ‘Elohim hath appointed me another seed, instead of Abel, whom Cain slew.’ The narrative is a first example of

God's moral government of our fallen world. Hence the name Jehovah is clearly appropriate. And now the addition of Elohim is superfluous. It has been amply shown, by the previous section, that Jehovah is also Elohim; that He who accepted Abel, and pronounced the sentence on Cain, is the Almighty Creator of heaven and earth.

The name Elohim, v. 25, has been explained to denote (Hengst.) that the faith of Eve had become less lively than at the birth of Cain, and now amounted only to a recognition of a general Providence, and that this is confirmed by the case of Leah, xxix. 35; xxx. 18. But this is far from a certain, scarcely even a probable, inference. The reason is, rather, that the first birth directly brought to mind the promise and sentence of Jehovah, iii. 15, 16. This birth of Seth, 130 years later, when hundreds had intervened, had no such peculiar reference. Its special feature was to be a work of God's power, counteracting the ravages of sin and death. Hence Elohim is the more appropriate name.

In these three sections the names occur sixty-seven times, in a way clearly expressive of choice and design. And this design implies as clearly a single writer. A plural authorship might explain the use of Elohim in ch. i. 1—ii. 3, and of Jehovah in the rest; but not the twenty-fold repetition of the compound name.

34. THE CALL AND VISIONS OF ABRAHAM. Ch. xi.—xviii. 28.—This portion of the book extends to the visit of the angels and the overthrow of Sodom. The promise culminates, before the performance in the birth of Isaac. The sequence is B⁵⁰, B⁷, B⁶D³B, B⁷, B⁸, BA¹⁰, B¹⁰, B⁷.

In eight chapters Jehovah occurs more than fifty times, and Elohim (or El Shaddai) ten times in one chapter alone.

This era was one of repeated messages to the Father of the faithful, the ground of all the later revelations of the Law and the Gospel. The constant use of the name Jehovah is thus in full harmony with the facts revealed. The one exception makes the reason of the choice still plainer. Ch. xvii. is a record of the covenant of circumcision, when the land of Canaan and the birth of Isaac were both promised. In v. 1 the name Jehovah links it with the whole context; but the message itself begins, 'I am El Shaddai, the Almighty God.' Now this is the name placed in direct contrast to Jehovah, Exod. vi. 2-4. The kindred name, Elohim, appears twice as a term of relation, and seven times as a narrative title. Thus an Elohist message is firmly imbedded in a context, where the name Jehovah alone is used more than fifty times. The revealed fact corresponds. In the midst of a season of special revelation there was given the pledge of a higher revelation still to come. The birth of Isaac, and the overthrow of the cities of the plain, works of Divine power, in which God appeared as El Shaddai, were close at hand. In the Exodus, and the inheritance of Canaan, after generations of delay and seeming oblivion, He would reveal Himself as Jehovah, the Unchangeable. The constant use of Jehovah in the whole narrative marks the period as one of signal revelation. The use of El Shaddai and Elohim in this one chapter marks its contrast with the later message, when the promise would be fulfilled after long delay.

35. THE MARRIAGE OF ISAAC. Ch. xxiv.—This chapter is the crown and close of Abraham's history, the calm sunset of his life of faith. The covenant is seen passing over, in its fulness, to Isaac, the heir of the promise. The name Jehovah occurs, then, nineteen times, and Elohim never once alone. But the sacred name is enriched and varied in the lips of Abraham and of his servant,—‘Jehovah, the God of my master Abraham;’ ‘Jehovah, the God of heaven and the God of the earth;’ and ‘Jehovah, the God of heaven, which took me from my father's house,’ &c. The constant use of the name answers to the nature of the history, as crowning the mercies of God to His servant and friend, the climax of the first stage of the Abrahamic revelation.

THE LIFE OF ISAAC. Ch. xxvi.—This chapter is the sole account of Isaac, except the record of his weakness and infirmity in the blessing being overruled by the hand of God. It contains a series of tokens of Divine favour, and of special mercies bestowed on him as the heir of the promise. A reference to the covenant with Abraham is expressed or implied from first to last. Seven times, then, Jehovah is used, never Elohim.

36. Ch. xxxiii.—L. (except chh. xxxviii. xxxix).—In these sixteen chapters, or 519 verses, being more than one-third of the book, Elohim is found fifty times, and Jehovah once only, in the ejaculation of the dying patriarch, ‘I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord!’ Such a usage, through so large a part of the narrative, needs explanation, even more than the repetition, thirty-five times, in the first chapter of creation.

The schemes of Hupfeldt and Davidson, and others of

the same kind, here fail miserably. They break down the history of Joseph, that pattern of simplicity and historical truth, into a multitude of petty fragments—thirty in one chapter alone—and parcel it out among four writers, who lived centuries apart from each other. And next, in this most Elohist portion, these anatomists assign only seventeen verses to their Elohist, out of 360, and no less than 228 to their Jehovist, whose characteristic is either the use of Jehovah alone, or the mixture of both names. It is hard to conceive how a critical suicide could be more complete. If two-thirds of the most Elohist portion may, after all, belong to the Jehovist, what a mere pretence it must be to justify this theory of manifold authorship by an appeal to the supposed contrast in the use of the sacred names!

The principle already laid down supplies a direct key to this striking feature of the history. We find that Elohim alone occurs also nine times in Exod. i. ii., before the vision at the bush, when the name I AM was solemnly revealed to Moses. Thus the name is used sixty times, in almost unbroken sequence, before the dawning light of that glorious vision. Then there is a marked and sudden change, and Jehovah, almost exclusively, occurs 160 times in the ten chapters that follow Exod. iii. 14—xiii. 16.

After the return of Jacob from the East, and the renewal of the covenant at Bethel, the season of special revelation to the three patriarchs reached its close. A season of delay and mystery set in, marked by the crimes of the patriarchs; the sale of Joseph into Egypt; the hopeless grief of Jacob, through the unrepented sin of his children; and the descent of the chosen seed into the house of bondage. That early revelation, which had

begun with the call of Abraham, was losing itself in a deeper mystery, in which the God of Providence was watching secretly and silently over the destinies of the chosen race, until the appointed time of the promise should come. Thus the constant use of Elohim has its ground in the whole tenor of the history. Special uses may be explained by special reasons, as in xl. 8; xli. 16, &c.; but the great fact itself, now mentioned, can alone account for a usage so constant, and maintained throughout twenty chapters, except two only, and one of these an historical episode.

The principle, then, of the revealed contrast of the names in the message to Moses, and of his authorship of the work, expounds all the cases, from first to last, of the decisive predominance, or the exclusive use, of either name. It explains also their constant combination in the second section of the history, which occurs there alone. Out of six or seven distinct phenomena, the sceptical theory can account for one or two at most, and fails completely in all the rest.

37. Let us now turn to the case of a mixed or composite use of the names. This occurs in ch. v.-x., the transition from the Adamic revelation of Paradise to the covenant with Abraham; in ch. xvii. 29—xxiii., the transition from the fulness of the promise to Abraham to his ripe old age; in ch. xxv., the passage from Abraham to Isaac; and in ch. xxviii.—xxxii., the chequered history and conflicts of Jacob, before the covenant fades into mystery once more. Here the second principle (no. 31) will supply a sufficient key, without recourse to strained and conjectural solutions, by which some able German

writers have obscured and weakened the force of their own argument.

The six chapters, v.-x., lead us from the dying out of the days of Paradise to the dawn of the Abrahamic covenant. The covenant with Noah, though a type of better things to come, abides chiefly within the range of outward blessings, or the restoration of the orderly course of Providence, which had been disturbed and arrested by the overflowings of evil. Hence both names of God, the general and the special, suit equally with the events, and may be expected to appear in the history. In character it was special—a time of solemn judgment, never to return; but in extent general, affecting the whole race. Hence secondary reasons may well enter here into the choice and alternation of the two sacred names.

THE GENEALOGY. Chap. v.—Here we find the name Elohim at the beginning and in the middle, but Jehovah at the close. In v. 1 Elohim appears twice, and for a double reason. There is a direct allusion to ch. i. 27, from which the account is resumed; and also the contrast with the name Jehovah in the previous verse marks the beginning of a new section. This bridge also, between the first and last days of the old world, is a time of mystery, not of revelation. All these reasons conspire to explain the use of Elohim.

Again, in v. 22, 24, we read that ‘Enoch walked with God; and he was not, for God took him.’ In the former phrase, Elohim is required from the nature of the thought, the reaching upward of the soul after Divine communion, and to walk with the Lord is a phrase never used. By attraction the same name is used in the sequel,—God

took him; and it is in harmony with this time of mystery and long-suffering.

The name Jehovah reappears in the words of Lamech at the birth of Noah. There is here a direct allusion to the sentence of the Lord, ch. ii. 17, 18. The chapter, linked with the first section of the history at its opening, is linked equally with the second at its close. Here, too, we have the dawn of a new revelation in the days of Noah; while this mention of Jehovah restores the balance between the two aspects of the Divine character, equally revealed in this portion of the history.

38. THE WORLD BEFORE THE FLOOD. Ch. vi.—The order of the names here is A B, A B⁴, A⁵. But in the title, sons of God, the name Elohim is essential, and son of Jehovah never occurs. Hence the chapter resolves into two parts; eight verses where Jehovah, and fourteen others where Elohim, occurs five times in succession. The first of these sections is a message of moral truth, the verdict of the Most High on the state of a guilty world. In vv. 6, 8, it mingles grace with the tones of judgment, and anticipates the tears of the Lord Jesus over guilty Jerusalem. Hence Jehovah, the name of moral revelation, is fully appropriate. But since the message is world-wide, affecting the whole of mankind, and all God's lower works, Elohim is appropriate also. It is used, therefore, in the immediate sequel and continuation. The change is made simply through the phrase, 'Noah walked with God,' where Elohim alone is suitable. This name, once introduced, is continued to the close, both to mark a distinct paragraph of the history, and to maintain the balance between the natural and moral features of the event, at

once a special judgment on abounding moral evil, and a marked era of God's universal providence towards mankind.

39. THE FLOOD. Ch. vii. viii.—The order of the names here is B², A²B, A³, B³. Thus Elohim occurs five, Jehovah six times, and still with four alternations. Hence, by the rule of the sceptical theorists, the whole should be referred to the Jehovist, to whom they assign less than half, or 22 out of 46 verses. To account on their theory for the four changes of the name, they have introduced no less than sixteen alternations of two writers. A truly wonderful piece of critical patchwork, illustrating the large credulity of unbelief! Let us see whether we cannot find a simpler key.

The account is composed of seven sections—vii. 1–10 (B²A); vv. 11–16 (BA); vv. 17–24 (0); viii. 1–5 (A²); v. 6–12 (0); vv. 13–19 (A); and vv. 20–22 (B³). Of these two are mixed, in two both names are absent, two have Elohim only, and the last only Jehovah.

In the previous section, vi. 9–22, which is Elohistie, we have the times of long-suffering and mysterious patience while the ark was preparing. But now, in vii. 1–10, we have the announcement of present judgment, the seven days immediately before the flood. The mystery unfolds, and the judgment begins. Hence the name Jehovah once more, vv. 1, 5, and also to mark the opening of a new historical section. But this section continues to the 10th verse, for v. 8 answers plainly to vv. 2, 3, and v. 10 to v. 14, as its fulfilment, and v. 11 marks plainly a historical commencement. Why, then, does Elohim appear v. 9? Partly to link the passage with the earlier directions vi. 22, and partly for the general reason, to maintain the balance of opposite

features in the whole history of the solemn judgment. The whole narrative is too intensely moral to be fully expressed by the name Elohim alone; and yet its contrast with the Abrahamic covenant, in which God was more specially revealed, and its universal aspect, forbid equally the use of Jehovah alone.

In the next section the two names occur only just at the close . . . 'they went in, male and female, of all flesh, as God had commanded him, and the Lord shut him in,' v. 16. Here the antithesis is more striking, because one name follows close upon the other. One clause links the passage with the original directions, vi. 9-22, and the other with the detailed instructions, vii. 1-5. The Lord not only informed him of the exact day when the flood should begin, but crowned his care and watchful love by securing the ark when he had entered. The works of general providence and special grace are kept equally prominent, and neither is suffered to obscure the other. In the next section, vii. 17-24, the names are absent. Nevertheless, the critics break it up into four fragments, and assign two to each writer.

In ch. viii. the features of ch. vi. are reversed. In vv. 1-19, Elohim occurs thrice, twice in the first, and once in the third section. Then, in the closing account of Noah's sacrifice, Jehovah is used once more, three times. The name agrees with the nature of the event, the sacrifice of faith accepted, and a covenant of grace renewed and confirmed once more. The use of Elohim, in all the first part, maintains the view of this great event as a signal work of Divine power—a great era of the history of the world and of mankind. The parts of the four

chapters correspond, by a kind of inverse parallel, vi. 5-8 (B^4) with viii. 20-22 (B^3). Noah finds grace once more. The earth shall not be cursed, though the imagination of man's heart be evil continually, vi. 9-22 ($A^4 + A$), with viii. 1-19 ($A^2 + A$), and vii. 1-10 (B^2A), with vii. 11-24 (AB), the direct warning, with its immediate execution. The higher aspect is conspicuous at the commencement, vi. 5-8; and again at the close, vii. 20-22.

40. THE SEQUEL OF THE FLOOD. Chh. ix. x.—The order of the names is A^6BA , B^2 . Thus, in the Noetic covenant, ch. ix., Elohim is used throughout, except in the blessing upon Shem, v. 26. In v. 6 alone it is required by the nature of the phrase. But in vv. 1, 8, 12, 16, 17, two or three reasons concur for its use. By contrast with viii. 20-22, it marks a new and complete section, and it answers to the unusual character of the promise, which includes not mankind alone, but the lower creatures. Still further, the special season of judgment and mercy is passing away, and melts into the twilight of God's mysterious providence, till the call of Abraham. But the sacred name is joined fitly with the promise to Shem, 'the father of all the children of Eber,' through whom the special covenant of grace was to be handed down to Abraham and his seed in later days. The force of the name is more conspicuous by the contrast that follows,—'Elohim shall enlarge Japheth.' In one case the reference is to the covenant of Jehovah; in the other to God's universal providence, who is God not of the Jew only, but also of the Gentiles.

The use of Jehovah twice in x. 9, standing alone in a genealogy, and the mention of a proverbial title of

Nimrod, hardly needs an explanation. It implies merely that this was the more familiar name of God with the writer, or else commonly used by those who spoke of Nimrod under this expressive description.

41. THE BIRTH AND SACRIFICE OF ISAAC. Ch. xix. 29—xxiii.—The order of the names in these three chapters, and the close of a fourth, is A²; AD, A⁵B; B², A¹¹B; A⁴B, AB⁺; 0. Thus Elohim occurs 24, and Jehovah only 10 times, and there are nine alternations. The scheme of Hupfeldt and Davidson breaks it up into twenty-one divisions, of which twelve are in ch. xxi. only. But, assuming the unity of the narrative, the changes admit of an easy and simple explanation.

The first occurrence of Elohim is xix. 29. 'And it came to pass, when God destroyed the cities of the plain,' &c. The verse is plainly a summing up of the previous narrative, to form an introduction to the sequel of Lot's history. In ch. xviii. xix., Jehovah alone has been used 17 times, in connexion with the signal honour given to the faith of Abraham, and as signal an execution of Divine judgment upon sin. Here we have the transition to two portions, in which the sin of Lot and the weakness of Abraham's faith are revealed. This opening of a new section of the history is indicated by the transition to Elohim, after the constant use of Jehovah through sixty preceding verses. The same use is continued through the next chapter, the sojourn of Abraham in Gerar. It was an interval of delay before the actual birth of Isaac, and was marked by Abraham's prevarication and weakness of faith. Yet here also a balance is maintained. First, Abimelech makes an appeal: 'Adonai, wilt

thou also slay a righteous nation?' using a name intermediate in its character. And next, at the close, the statement that God healed Abimelech and his wife is followed by the explanation, that Jehovah had inflicted on them temporary barrenness. The immediate transition seems here to disprove any radical contrast, and still more any union of two documents. The names are combined, to link the chapter with the general series of special mercies to Abraham; and still to mark its nature, as part of the wide scheme of God's universal providence. Looking at these two verses alone, the names might have been reversed with equal propriety, but the link of connexion with the Abrahamic revelation comes in more pointedly at the very close.

Again, in chap. xxi., the birth of Isaac, Elohim is used eleven times throughout its course, but Jehovah twice at its opening and once at its close. Yet these verses are inseparable parts of the narrative, which ought thus, by the theory, to be referred to the Jehovist, and not to the Elohist. In the scheme of Dr. Davidson it is assigned mainly to a junior Elohist, but six verses, in fragments, to the Elohist, the Redactor, and the Jehovist. In vv. 1-20 we have a climax of capricious complication. But the unity, in vv. 2-32, appears alike from the simplicity of the record, and the constant use of Elohim. Its opening and its close alone link it with God's promise and Abraham's faith, by the name Jehovah. 'And the Lord visited Sarah, as he had said; and the Lord did unto Sarah as he had spoken. . . . And Abraham planted a grove in Beersheba, and called on the name of Jehovah, the everlasting God.' The use of Elohim in the rest of the

chapter answers to a time of transition from the crowning revelation of God in promise, ch. xviii., xix., to the perfecting of Abraham's faith, when he offered Isaac on the altar, and received the final promise, confirmed by the oath of God.

In chap. xxii. we pass from this time of transition to the crowning point of Abraham's life-long discipline, and the full victory of his faith. In its first stage Elohim only is used four times, and in the second, Jehovah five times, in the same exclusive way. It is when Abraham has lifted up the knife to slay his son, in the moment of triumphant faith, that the name Jehovah reappears, and is repeated to the close. It is the angel of Jehovah who speaks from heaven. Abraham calls the place Jehovah-Jireh. The proverb is, 'In the mount Jehovah will be seen.' The angel of Jehovah calls to him a second time, and the oath runs, 'By myself have I sworn, saith Jehovah.' Here, then, we have not a mixed and balanced use of the names, but a plain transition from mystery to new and fuller revelation, and therefore from the name of dimmer knowledge, Elohim, to the higher and covenant name. Only in v. 12 the angel says, 'Now I know that thou fearest Elohim.' The command had been received from God, as a God of mystery, whose path is in the deep waters; and the prompt obedience of Abraham had been a practical acknowledgment that, even as Elohim, the Inscrutable and Unsearchable, He is to be implicitly trusted and obeyed. New mysteries of Providence, when solved, are transfigured into the causes and materials of clearer vision, and of a more ripe and perfect faith and love.

THE DEATH OF ABRAHAM AND BIRTH OF JACOB. Chap.

xxv.—After the crowning feature of Abraham's faith, in chap. xxiv., and the transfer of the covenant to Isaac, the child of promise, we have here a new historical transition. Here Elohim is found once, v. 11, and Jehovah four times, in vv. 20–23. The whole is plainly continuous, and from one hand. It contains in order, (1) the sons of Abraham by Keturah, and their portions, 1–6; (2) the age and death of Abraham, and his burial by both his sons, 7–10; (3) the blessing and house of Isaac, v. 11; (4) the genealogy of Ishmael, vv. 12–18; (5) the fuller genealogy of Isaac, vv. 19–26, and (6) Esau's sale of his birthright, vv. 27–34. The quadripartite hypothesis, however, splits it into eleven fragments, from four different writers, the Jehovist, the Elohist, the junior Elohist, the Jehovist, the Elohist, the Jehovist, the Elohist, the Jehovist, and the Elohist again, and the Redactor in the last six verses! But the names alternate after an interval of ten verses, because neither character predominates. The covenant unfolds itself silently, by God's blessing, yet it is not a time of special revelation, but rather of general providence. Abraham dies and is buried. His sons, both alike, have children born. Only in v. 23 the answer of God is a new prophetic revelation, and there Jehovah is used with its full significance.

42. THE LIFE OF JACOB. Chap. xxvii.—xxxii.—The order of the names, in these six chapters, is B³A, A³B³A²BA, 0B³, A²B³, BA⁷BA, A²BA², so that Elohim is found 27, and Jehovah 16 times. In the first triplet the occurrences are 7 and 10, and in the second 20 and 6 times. Thus they are mixed throughout, but Jehovah predominates slightly at first, and Elohim more decisively in

the later portion, which is followed by sixteen chapters, where the more sacred name is never found. There is here the clear sign of a general purpose. As the covenant with Abraham loses itself more and more in the general mystery of God's all-wise providence, through the chequered life of the third patriarch, the name Jehovah is withdrawn, and Elohim appears in its stead. Beyond this main law of usage we have repeated marks of a simple alternation. Thus, in xxvii. 27, 28, it seems more ingenious than true to say that Isaac, by using the sacred name in the former verse, meant 'a field like that of Paradise, resplendent with traces of the Deity, a kind of enchanted garden.' (Hengst.) Isaac's faith was not so bright in this hour of dim-sightedness of body and spirit, as that we should assign to his words such a recondite meaning. On the contrary, the names seem to alternate here, because both were in frequent use, and the blessing required and implied no allusion to the contrast between them. The sense and drift is the same as if in each instance Jehovah Elohim were employed. In xxviii. 13, Jehovah appears twice in God's own message. But in the answer of Jacob, vv. 16, 17, the words alternate once more, and so also in vv. 20, 21. If we omit 'the house of God,' the proper name of Bethel, the order will be AB²B AB, and the names alternate simply, both in the narrative, vv. 12, 13, and in the exclamation and vow of Jacob, vv. 16, 17, and vv. 20-22. So, also, Jehovah is used in connexion with the birth of the four eldest sons, Elohim in that of the rest; and the hopes of Rachel, after Joseph's birth, introduce the sacred name once more—'The Lord shall add to me another son.' A section, where Jehovah is used once both by Jacob and

Laban, and once by the historian, xxx. 25—xxx. 3, is followed by Jacob's flight, where Elohim is used seven times, by Jacob, by Rachel and Leah, and by the historian; and the names alternate once more in the closing words of Laban, vv. 49, 50.

In chap. xxxii. this mixed, alternate use, comes to an end. In the prayer of Jacob in his distress, v. 9, he uses the title, 'O God of my father Abraham, and God of my father Isaac, Jehovah, which saidst unto me, Return to thy country and thy kindred, and I will deal well with thee,' &c. After this voice of earnest prayer in the hour of danger, El Shaddai and Elohim recur forty times, in the lips of the patriarchs and messages of God; but Jehovah never more, till that death-bed utterance, 'I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord!' These are like two mountain-tops of faith and hope in the patriarch's history, but there lay between them a dark valley of fear, mystery, and sorrow.

43. JUDAH AND JOSEPH. Ch. xxxviii., xxxix. — These two chapters, B³⁰, B⁵AB³, directly reverse the usage in all the close of Genesis beside. Except in v. 9, where Elohim alone is suitable in addressing a mere heathen, Jehovah is used in them eleven times in succession. In the former chapter this might seem the more surprising, since it records the sin of Judah and of his two eldest sons. But a key is found in the later history. Judah was the ancestor, and Joseph a conspicuous type, of Messiah. Chap. xxxviii. ends with the birth of Pharez, from whose stock David and the kings of Judah, and our Lord himself, were to spring. The chapter appears in the opening genealogy of the Gospel, only in a condensed

form; and Tamar, Ruth, and Bathsheba, alone are named among the female ancestors of Messiah. The history serves, then, to mark how, even amidst the sins of the patriarchs, and in spite of them, the covenant of Jehovah with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, moved on steadily towards its final consummation in the birth and advent of the Messiah of God.

The use of the name in chap. xxxix. has a kindred purpose. For this stands at the head of Joseph's history in Egypt, of which it forms an inseparable part. Hence, the constant presence of the name in this one chapter serves to link the whole narrative firmly with the Abrahamic revelation, chap. xii.—xxiv., as a continuation of the same covenant of grace; while the avoidance of it as constantly, in all the sequel of the history, through thirteen whole chapters, serves to bring out into strong relief the fuller and higher revelation to Moses, wherein the power and emphasis of the name, Jehovah, was signally displayed. Again, the solitary occurrence of the name, in the dying utterance of Jacob, is like a bright star of faith and hope in the midst of a time of mystery and of darkness.

44. Let us now review briefly the conclusions to which we have been led. The main facts, in order, are these:—(1) An exclusive use of Elohim, i. 1—ii. 3; (2) an exclusive use of Jehovah Elohim, ii. 4—iii.; (3) and of Jehovah alone, chap. iv.; (4) a mixed use of the names, chh. v.—ix.; (5) a sole use of Jehovah, x.—xix. 28, except (6) a sole use of El Shaddai and Elohim in chap. xvii., after the first verse; (7) a mixed use, xix. 29—xxiii.; (8) a sole use of Jehovah, xxiv. and xxvi.; (9) a mixed use, in chap.

xxv., and in xxvi.—xxx. i.; and (10) a sole use of Elohim, xxxii.—l., in nineteen chapters, except (11) a sole use of Jehovah, in chap. xxxviii., xxxix., and twice beside, in the prayer of Jacob and in his dying confession.

The use of Elohim alone, in the record of Creation, is at once explained by the nature of the message. It records the work of Divine Power, before God's moral government of man begins to be displayed. The use, as constantly, of Jehovah Elohim, in the record of Paradise and the Fall, and there only, is the result of two causes; first, that the sacred name is natural and appropriate, in laying the firm basis of God's moral government, and of all the later promises; and next, that the sameness of Jehovah and Elohim needed to be shown, once for all, at the opening of the work. The sole exception, in the words of Eve and the serpent, makes the proof of design clearer still. The sole use of Jehovah, in chap. iv., results from the fact, that it contains the one specimen of God's moral government in the old world, and that the further addition of Elohim is now superfluous. The occurrence of Elohim and Jehovah at the close may imply that the birth of Seth was viewed rather as a new work of Divine power, while that of Cain had been the first fulfilment of Jehovah's promise; or, as a simple alternation, preparing for the alternate use in the chapters that follow. The mixture of the names, chaps. v.—ix., where Elohim occurs twenty-four and Jehovah thirteen times, and there are thirteen alternations, answers to the nature of the history, as a transition from the Adamic to the Abrahamic era of revelation; and to the twofold character of the Flood, as a season when God was revealed alike as the

Moral Governor and the Universal Creator and Preserver of mankind, and of all the lower works of His hand. The details are explicable by a double purpose, to give distinctness to the successive sections of the narrative, and to give a balanced exhibition of the special and general aspect of this great work of God. The constant use of Jehovah, in ch. x.–xix. 28, xxiv., xxvi., results at once from the dignity and importance of the Call and Covenant of Abraham, and its continuation in Isaac, the heir of promise. The mixed use, in xix. 29–xxii. and xxv., results from the transitional character in each case; first, from the completion of the covenant and mercy to Abraham to the consummation of his faith; and then, from his calm and peaceful old age, to Isaac's inheritance of blessing. Here the name, Elohim, prevails, as in a time of preparation for higher light and fuller mercy; but there is a constant mixture, and links to combine it with the main era of promise just before. In chap. xxii. the transition comes to light once more. Elohim is used during the trial of Abraham's faith; Jehovah alone, when faith prevails, and the blessing is given. In the history of Jacob, chap. xxvii.–xxxvii., its chequered character of sin and conflict, as well as faith, prayer, and blessing, is reflected by the mixed use of the names; where first Jehovah is more frequent, and Elohim towards the close, when the covenant begins to shroud itself in a season of conflict, sorrow, mystery, and long delay. In the last nineteen chapters, from the vision of the angel and the meeting with Esau to the close, this character wholly prevails; and Elohim is used to the exclusion of the more sacred covenant name, to prepare, by contrast, for the dawn of fuller and clearer

light in the Mosaic revelation. The two exceptions illustrate and confirm the general law. The episode concerning Judah and Pharez, and the first chapter of Joseph's Egyptian history, by their sole use of the name Jehovah, maintain the union with the earlier days of the covenant, with which the whole narrative of Joseph is thus combined by a portion inseparable from the rest ; while the use of the sacred name, once in Jacob's prayer, xxxii. 9, and again in his dying ejaculation, xlix. 18, are like two mountain-tops of faith and hope at the beginning and close of this long period of mystery and sorrow, and of patient waiting for a promise, only to be fulfilled after generations of delay.

Thus, on the assumption of the unity of Genesis, and of its Mosaic authorship, the explanation of the use of the two sacred names, which is so striking and peculiar, is consistent, harmonious, and complete. On the other hand, the sceptical hypothesis, amidst its high pretensions, fails to satisfy every main condition of the problem it affects to solve. It cannot account at all for the special use of the compound name in the second, and only in the second, section of the narrative. It cannot account for the alleged dislike of the supposed Elohist to the use of the sacred name in his own narrative, as well as in the speeches of the patriarchs. Its alleged indications of diverse authorship, from the names and the style, confessedly contradict each other in at least one-sixth of the book, and the theory has thus to be patched by the invention of a third writer. But the rent is only made worse, since the junior Elohist has then to be distinguished from the Jehovist by his use of the names alone, in spite of re-

semblance of style; though it is made a charge of gross ignorance, in defenders of the authenticity, to conceive that any distinction is made to rest on such a different use of the names alone. It cannot explain, in the least, the Elohist character of the last nineteen chapters, the most striking feature of the whole; and actually assigns to the Elohist only one-twentieth part, and to the Jehovist two-thirds, of this largest Elohist portion. To crown the whole, that history of Joseph which is marked by internal unity almost beyond any history ancient or modern, is split up into some eighty or ninety portions—a tessellated mosaic of paragraphs, verses, and half verses, supplied by four different writers, the earliest supposed to live in the days of Samuel or Saul, and the latest in the time of Uzziah or Manasseh. A more prodigious violation of all critical common sense is hardly possible to conceive. Even in the points, then, where the sceptical theory boasts most loudly of settled results, of critical facts and deductions, it proves, when once closely tested, to be a miserable failure. Its complicated vortices, which split up the Book of Genesis into more than three hundred fragments, cannot explain, after all, the most striking phenomena they have been rashly invented to solve, in the teeth of all Christian faith and all historical evidence.

CHAPTER V.

THE CREATION AND THE FALL.

45. THE first of those internal arguments, which have been lately adduced to prove the spuriousness and plural authorship of the Book of Genesis, is drawn from alleged contradictions between the first and the second chapters, in the account of creation. No single person, we are modestly assured, could be guilty of so many absurdities. But an acquaintance with these critics will show that it is hard to assign a limit to the absurdities of which even a single writer may be guilty, when once they cast off all deep reverence for the oracles of the Living God. Our Lord, when risen from the grave, opened the understandings of His disciples, to reveal to them the certainty, truth, and wisdom, of 'all things written in the Law of Moses' concerning the Saviour of mankind. Our modern critics promise their readers an illumination of an opposite nature, by which they will see that Law to be full of impossibilities and contradictions so gross and flagrant, that the blundering or deceit of several writers, all combined, is needful to explain them. How much wiser and more discerning they must be than the Son of God! Let us examine these alleged contradictions.

46. Six notable points of difference, it is said, exist between the two cosmogonies. But, as Dr. M'Caul has well observed, and a reference to the text will show, it is wholly false that there are two cosmogonies. In chap. ii. there is no mention of the creation of light, of the firmament, of the sun, moon, and stars, of the sea and the dry land, the main elements of a real 'cosmogony.' Three events only are named, in close connexion with man's creation; the formation of plants, since he was placed in Paradise; of the animals, since they were brought to him to receive names; and of the woman, who was to supply the want of loving and intelligent companions. Nothing, then, can well be plainer than the truth of Dr. M'Caul's statement, which a glance at the text, by some strange blindness, is said to disprove. There is no second account of Creation; but a needful expansion of that part, the most important, which relates to the creation of man, and his first estate in Paradise before the Fall.

i. 'In the first chapter the earth emerges from the waters, and is, therefore, saturated with moisture; in the second, the whole face of the ground required to be moistened.'

The so-called contradiction is an agreement. If a mist went up from the earth, then the earth from which it went up was not dry, but 'saturated with moisture.' Such was the state of the earth in general. The 'whole face of the ground' which the mist watered must be distinct. It will mean, naturally, those high and open tracts, which would be the first to be dried by the heat of the sun. In the absence of rain, copious dews would be required for the full growth of vegetation.

ii. 'In the first, birds and beasts are created before man; in the second, man is created before the birds and beasts.'

The text says nothing of the kind. We might as well make it assert that the four rivers of Paradise were created after Adam, before the birds and beasts; or make St. Luke affirm that John did not baptize our Lord till after Herod had put him in prison.

iii. 'In the first, all the fowls that fly are made out of the waters; in the second, out of the ground.'

This is the only plausible objection to the consistency of the narrative. It admits of a double answer. The words admit plainly the marginal version,—'And let fowl fly above the earth,' &c. The contrast, then, disappears at once. Or if we retain the Septuagint version and our own, the waters here may answer to the 'place of the seas' in v. 9, in contrast to the dry land or continent, and include the islands. But the order of the words, in i. 21, where the fowls are not included in the description, 'which the waters brought forth abundantly after their kind,' seems to confirm the marginal version. The birds will thus hold a middle place, as created on the fifth day, like the fishes and creeping things; but from the ground, like the beasts of the sixth day.

iv. 'In the first, man is created in the image of God; in the second, he is made of the dust of the ground, and merely animated with the breath of life. It is only after eating the forbidden tree, that "The Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil."''

Man, according to this objection, had not the image of

God while sinless, and only gained it when he became the bondslave of sin and death. The aim of God's command was to hinder him from attaining it; and that of the tempter, to secure to him God's image, in spite of God's own prohibition! Such an objection needs no reply. It is simply a large contribution to a Satanic theology.

v. 'In the first, man is made the lord of the whole earth; in the second, he is merely placed in the garden of Eden, to dress it and to keep it.' Another proof of contradiction almost as strange. Our Queen has gardens and a royal residence at Windsor; therefore, plainly, she cannot be Queen of England.

vi. 'In the first, man and woman are created together, as the closing work of the whole creation; created also, as is evidently implied, in the same way, and blessed together. In the second, the beasts and the birds are created *between* them. First, man is made of the dust, and placed by himself in the garden; then the beasts and birds are brought to him; and lastly, after all this, the woman is made, but only as an helpmate for the man.' This objection is mainly a repetition of the second. But, further, it asserts that the creation of Adam and Eve, in ch. i. is simultaneous, and in ch. ii. successive. In reality, there is an exact agreement. For ch. i. notes briefly two steps in man's creation, without explaining them, and the distinction of sex first appears in the second. 'In the image of God made he him, male and female created he them.' The next chapter simply expands this notice, and explains the transition from the first to the second stage. Woman was first created, virtually, *in* man, and then was formed from him. So, in vv. 1, 2, which

the sceptics assign to the Elohist, or writer of the first chapter,—‘In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God created he him; male and female created he them, and blessed them, and called their name Adam in the day they were created.’ Here are three stages, the creation of Adam, under which name the two sexes are included; the separation of the woman, who still shares the common name; and, lastly, the blessing pronounced upon both.

Such are the alleged contradictions, which are to prove the presence of two authors and an ignorant compiler. All, with one exception, are frivolous and absurd; and that one seeming divergence depends on a very doubtful rendering, and, even with our version, may be very easily explained. Let us now examine the internal proofs of unity in the whole narrative.

47. And first, the opening words of the second section, ii. 4, link the two parts indissolubly into one. ‘These are the generations of the heavens and the earth, in the day that the Lord God created the earth and the heavens.’ Dr. Davidson, indeed, affirms that ‘there is little doubt it is a proper title to the account immediately following.’ ‘In all other instances it is a title. As used elsewhere, the words show that they stand at the head of a leading historical section, where a new epoch, a new genealogy, or the account of a new patriarch, commences. Hence, they must point to a new and independent statement.’ That is, because, in ten or eleven cases, the generations plainly follow the words in question, we must expound ‘these’ to mean ‘the following,’ in a passage where they plainly and expressly come before, and as plainly do not follow. And

it must be observed, further, that, in the other cases of human genealogies, there is usually a formula of recapitulation at the close, varied slightly from the opening. So, Gen. x. 20, 'These are the sons of Ham, after their families, after their tongues, in their countries, in their nations.' Also, x. 30, 31, 'These are the sons of Shem,' &c. 'These are the families of the sons of Noah, after their generations,' &c. 'All these are the children of Keturah,' xxv. 4. 'These are the sons of Ishmael, and all these are their names,' xxv. 16. 'These are the sons of Esau, who is Edom, and these are their dukes,' xxxvi. 19. 'These are the dukes of the Horites, among their dukes in the land of Seir,' v. 30. 'These are the dukes of Edom, according to their habitations in the land of their possession,' v. 43. Again, in Exod. vi., the word 'these,' in connexion with genealogies, refers twice to what follows, and eight times to what has gone before. The attempt, then, to expound it 'the following' in this place, where the generations evidently have come before, and as evidently do not follow, is a piece of critical lunacy hardly to be surpassed. The verbal allusion is clear and plain. 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth,' i. 1. 'Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them,' ii. 1. 'These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created,' v. 4. On the other hand, there is plainly not one word of the creation of the heavens and the earth in the chapter that follows. There is also a clear reason why the title or summary, in this case, should follow and not precede; and one which does not apply to later human genealogies, as every reader of taste and feeling will at once perceive. The sublime

message, 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth,' forms the natural opening of all Divine revelation; and its power and simple grandeur would be weakened if a formal title were made to come before. In fact, the whole structure of ii. 4, 5, is so plainly dependent, and so wholly unlike the heading of the genealogies of Adam, Noah, Ishmael, &c., as to make the attempt to turn it into a separate cosmogony an astonishing instance of critical blindness.

48. The next verse is obscure in the English translation, which follows the Septuagint. But when its true sense is perceived, it doubles the force of the previous argument. The word *טרו* should be rendered, as often elsewhere, 'not yet,' and the verses will read as follows,— 'These are the generations of the heavens and the earth, when they were created, in the day the Lord God made the earth and the heavens; and when no plant of the field was yet in the earth, and no herb of the field was yet grown: for the Lord God had not caused it to rain on the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground. And there went up,' &c. We have thus a condensed description of the previous cosmogony. The first clause refers to the first and second, and the dawn of the third day. In that first stage 'no plant was yet in the earth.' In the next, or the third, fourth, and fifth days, no herb was yet grown, and there was no rain, and no human culture, for man was not yet created. But from the earth, still saturated with moisture on the greater part of its surface, a mist went up, and watered the face of the ground in Paradise, and man was formed and placed in the garden, to dress it and to keep it. Thus the three main stages of the six

days' creation are briefly repeated; before the plants were made on the third day; after the plants were in the ground, before man's creation; and, lastly, the creation of man himself. Thus the retrospective character of the whole statement is plain, and proves that both parts proceed continuously from one and the same author. Four successive stages correspond, (1) when they were created, ii. 4; i. 1, 2; (2) no plant as yet in the earth, v. 5; ii. 2-10; (3) no herb as yet grown, v. 5; ii. 11-25; (4) man created to till the ground, to dress and keep the garden, v. 7; i. 26-30.

49. 'And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground.' So, on the sixth day, the creative fiat ran before,—'Let the earth bring forth the living creature after its kind.' The exact manner of man's formation is not there specified; but the words here are in harmony with the general statement, that the living things of the sixth day were brought forth by the earth.

'And man became a living soul.' This scripture is quoted by St. Paul to confirm, by resemblance and contrast, the higher truth that 'the last Adam was made a quickening spirit.' In the heart of an inspired revelation of the resurrection, and of mysteries of God's will connected with the rapture of the saints, he puts on this earliest message the seal of an equal authority. It is thus a message of God—a foundation able to bear the weight of that glorious superstructure, the doctrine of our Lord's new-creating power in the resurrection of all His people.

50. The rest of the chapter falls into three sections,—(1) Man's relation to the vegetable world, to Paradise, and the tree of knowledge and the tree of life, vv. 8-17; (2)

his relation to the animal world, giving names to all, but finding among them no companion, vv. 18-20; (3) his relation to the woman, formed out of his side, to be a help meet for him, vv. 21-25. This also repeats the order of the first chapter. Man receives dominion, first, over the plants and trees, but with one test of his obedience assigned; then over all the animals, to whom he gives names, in token of his higher intelligence and royal dominion. Lastly, woman is given for his companion, and a common blessing pronounced upon them. The Divine authority of vv. 23, 24, is directly affirmed in our Lord's answer to the Pharisees, Matt. xix. 3-6; Mark, x. 2-9. Those who venture to ascribe this chapter to an unknown legend-monger, in the days of Solomon and Uzziah, cannot avoid the guilt of claiming to be wiser than the Lord of glory, and pouring open contempt on the most solemn declarations of the Son of God.

CHAPTER VI.

THE TIMES BEFORE THE FLOOD.

51. THE fifth and sixth chapters of Genesis contain a genealogy from Adam to Noah, and a description of the sin of the old world, with the command to Noah to build the Ark, reaching thus to the eve of the flood. On the Elohist theory ch. v. is assigned to the Elohist, except v. 29 which is torn away from the rest and given to another writer, and also ch. vi. 9-22; while ch. vi. 1-8 is either ascribed wholly to the Jehovist (Colenso), or partly to the Redactor, and partly to the Jehovist, in four fragments (Davidson). On either view, ch. v. must have joined at first to ch. ii. 3, and again ch. vi. 9-22 to the close of ch. v. But the internal reasons against this mutilation and distortion of the narrative are clear and decisive.

i. First, the almost verbal repetition of i. 27, 28, in ch. v. 1, 2, is natural and impressive, when three chapters full of various interest, the record of Paradise and the Fall, and the birth and history of Cain and Abel, have come between. But if only six verses were interposed, as in the Elohist theory, this repetition of four clauses, with scarcely a change, becomes only a dull tautology.

ii. 'The book of the generations of Adam,' implies

naturally that some account of Adam himself has gone before, just as the genealogy of the sons of Noah follows the full record of their preservation from the flood. As a direct sequel of the mention of the Sabbath, to pass on so rapidly through near two thousand years of the history of mankind without a word of comment, whether we view the writing as inspired scripture, as legend, or as forgery, is unnatural in the extreme.

iii. The phrases, ch. v. 1, 2, 'in the day that God created men' and 'in the day they were created,' copy the form of ch. ii. 4, 'in the day they were created.' While the substance of these verses links them with i. 27, 28, at the close of the Elohist section, their form links them as plainly with the opening of the section assigned to the Jehovist. This directly contradicts the hypothesis which assigns them to two different authors.

iv. The clause, 'he called their name Adam,' alludes to the previous mention of the naming of Eve, Cain, Abel, and Seth, ii. 23, iii. 20, iv. 1, 2, 25. The naming of Adam was implied, but only implied, in i. 27. But after the record that Eve received a double name from her husband, and Cain, Abel, and Seth, their names from Eve, it becomes natural to observe expressly that Adam received his name directly from God.

v. The mention of Seth refers back plainly to iv. 25, 26, where the reason of his name is given, which also implies the previous history of Cain and Abel. This alone explains the long delay of his birth for a hundred and thirty years; since Adam was in manly prime when first created, and the promise had been given at once, 'Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth.'

vi. The words, 'he died,' repeated seven times in the genealogy, refer back to the previous record, ii. 17, iii. 3, 19, of the entrance of sin and death. They do not recur after the flood, which implies that they are repeated here, and that seven times, with a special purpose. They form plainly a series of Divine corollaries on the truth and reality of the previous threatening and sentence of God.

vii. Lastly, the rapid transition, in so brief an outline of descent, from Adam to Noah is most unnatural, unless some account of the first days of mankind has gone before. The record is no mere pedigree, given for its own sake, as an antiquarian curiosity. It must grow out of a sacred history, a section of Divine revelation, at its opening, just as it issues and expands into another at its close.

52. In the birth of Noah and the words of Lamech at the close of this chapter, the sacred name is found once more, with a direct reference to the curse of Jehovah, ch. iii. 17. The Elohist theory, then, has to tear away this verse from the context, as due to later interpolation. The separation is made in this curious way. 'And Lamech lived 182 years, and begat,' (Elohist) 'a son, and he called his name' (Jehovist) 'Noah' (Elohist), 'saying, This same shall comfort us . . . because of the ground the Lord hath cursed,' (Jehovist). And Lamech lived, after he begat Noah,' etc., etc. Elohist.

The sacred text, however, protests loudly against this violent separation, for many reasons.

i. The words, vv. 28, 29, are the parallel and counterparts of vv. 1-3 at the opening of the chapter. The name Adam, received from God, marks the opening of the genealogy, and the name Noah, received by prophecy from

Lamech, marks its close. Creation and the hope of redemption thus correspond to each other.

ii. The years of Lamech, by the rule of the theorists, must be from the Jehovist, since the number 777 has plainly the sevenfold or mystical character in the highest degree. Hence, if any part is ascribed on this ground to a different source, the four verses 28–31 must go together. But the entire omission of Lamech in this connected genealogy is plainly impossible. As Enoch is the seventh, so is Noah always in Scripture or in tradition the tenth from Adam.

iii. The use of the sacred name, by Moses, in recording the prophecy of Lamech, connected with God's signal work of moral government as the righteous Judge, is natural and appropriate. But the interpolation of two fragments before and after the name Noah, by a second writer, coming a century or more after the first, is an hypothesis wholly violent and incredible. On this view, the original sentence, the present verse, and the words of viii. 21, must be three inventions, devised to dovetail neatly into each other. Yet we are told that the Jehovist did not unite the documents in any way whatever. That was the *Redactor's* work, who forming them into a connected text, 'was not solicitous of exact agreement, nor could have introduced it everywhere without materially altering the nature of the documents. It shows ignorance of the subject to talk of the supplementer or editor intending to harmonise the parts, and taking pains to fit them with great nicety.' According, then, to the view of this critic, the Redactor was so indifferent to truth and consistency that he left a flat contradiction at the interval of six verses, vii. 3, 8, 9. It

was by mere accident that he interpolated here two half verses from some later documents, so that no common eye can detect the junction; and so as to refer back to the threatening in iii. 17, and forward to the promise viii. 21, with a punctual and exact correspondence. In the view of Dr. Davidson, it is ignorance and absurdity to see anything here but a fortuitous concourse of atoms and fragments of verses!

iv. But the Jehovist, it is said, is 'a diligent seeker of etymologies,' and so this fragment of a Jehovistic verse is inserted by the Redactor in an Elohist chapter, and is also incorrect. Thus one contradiction is piled on another. For if the Redactor culls out an etymology from a long document to interpolate it here, the charge of a taste for etymologizing must belong to him far more than to the author of this unknown, invisible document. The accusation against Moses, that a false derivation is given, is only a new instance of reckless and profane criticism. The text does not affirm that *rest* and *comfort* are the same root or verb, but only that, when Lamech called his son, Noah, 'a resting-place,' he added the explanation, that his son would be a comfort to himself and others, under the toil which the curse of God had imposed. The proper etymology is implied and assumed afterwards, in viii. 4,— 'And the ark *rested* . . . on the mountains of Ararat;' words which the scheme refers also to the Jehovist, and not the Elohist.—*Introd.* p. 59.

53. The next chapter is divided by the theory, either into two (Colenso) or five fragments (Davidson). In the latter, which claims to be the ripest scheme, we have 1-3 the Redactor, 4a the Jehovist, 4b the Redactor, 5-8 the

Jehovist, and 9-22 the Elohist. But again the text protests loudly against this separation, and offers many proofs of its own unity. The guilt of the world is first described, then God's favour to Noah. His genealogy and character are briefly resumed, and then is recorded the Divine command to prepare an ark for the saving of his house. We have thus a natural sequel of the previous genealogy, an unbroken and harmonious narrative. Let us now consider the results of the Elohist theory.

i. First, on this view, vi. 9, 10, is the direct sequel of ch. v. 32. The document would run thus,—‘And Noah was five hundred years old, and Noah begat Shem, Ham, and Japheth. These are the generations of Noah; Noah was just and perfect in his generation; Noah walked with God. And Noah begat three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth.’ Who does not feel how unnatural and incredible is this mere tautology? After a description of the world's wickedness has been interposed, it is quite suitable that the same link, which formed the close of the first genealogy, should become the heading of the new history. But when this important paragraph has been wrenched away, and assigned to another, the repetition becomes a useless folly.

ii. The solemn warning, that God would destroy all flesh, is wholly based on the previous record of man's fall, and consequent expulsion from Paradise, of the murder by Cain, and the fuller and riper wickedness of ch. vi., 1-8. When these are torn away, and given to another, it loses all moral congruity, and seems more like a work of sudden and capricious displeasure than a righteous judgment on abounding sin. The two verses, vi. 11, 12, are

not enough to explain it; but rather stand themselves in need of some fuller illustration, such as the paragraph before them clearly supplies.

iii. The part, vv. 9-22, is referred by the theory to the Elohist, the first writer; vv. 5-8, to the Jehovist; and vv. 1-3 to the Redactor, the latest of the three. Yet the three form one plainly connected, continuous history. This is much the same as if some ingenious critic should give the first paragraph of 'Paradise Lost' to Pope, the second to Byron, the third to Tennyson.

iv. According to Dr. Davidson, 'much injury has been done to the hypothesis by terming the Jehovist a *reviser* or interpolator of the Elohim document. He wrote independently, and has his own peculiarities. The facts of the case necessitate a hypothesis, which assumes the employment of two or more documents by a final editor. The larger the induction, the more manifest does the need of this become.' According to Dr. Colenso, a single glance at the facts is enough to prove this variety of the hypothesis untenable. But let us give the first example of this wide induction, or the sequence here of this 'independent document.' It will run thus,—'And to Seth, to him also there was born a son, and he called his name Enos; then began men to call upon the name of the Lord. And Lamech lived 182 years, and begat a son, and called his name Noah, saying, This same shall comfort us, concerning our work and toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed. There were giants in the earth in those days. And the Lord saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was

only evil continually.' Is not this a wonderfully connected, and harmonious 'independent document?' Certainly it has 'peculiarities,' which distinguish it from any real document the world has ever witnessed, sacred or profane.

v. The Elohist is said to be marked by regular gradation and exactness in the notation of times (pp. 40-1). In vi. 3, we have an important notation of this kind. But the theory transfers this to the Redactor, directly in the teeth of this alleged contrast.

vi. The sequence of the parts which the theory strives to separate is plain. The multiplying of men upon the earth is the natural completion of the previous genealogy. The birth of daughters answers to the repeated phrase before, 'and begat sons and daughters.' 'They took them wives,' answers to the statement respecting Lamech before, 'And Lamech took unto him two wives.' The words, 'he also is flesh,' prepare the way for the double statement, vv. 12, 13,—'All flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth.' 'The end of all flesh is come before me.' 'His days shall be 120 years,' links itself with v. 32 before, and vii. 6, following, both referred to the Elohist. It shows that this voice, or message of God, was just twenty years before the birth of Shem or Japheth. It was the requiem of the old world, shortly before the birth of the parents of the new world to follow. 'Those days' refers back to the words just before, and not to the birth of Noah, as the theory requires, or even the birth of Enos. 'That he had made man upon earth,' is like a summary of i. 2,—'Let us make man in our own image . . . upon the earth,' an Elohistie section. 'I

will destroy man whom I have created,' answers to the next verse,—'So God *created* man in his own image,' &c. The sequence of the two words, in the same order, is like a direct reference. Again, v. 8, the close of the so-called Jehovistic portion is plainly the text of the whole section that follows. Because the holy patriarch 'found grace in the eyes of the Lord' he received a Divine message, instructing him how 'to prepare an ark for the saving of his house.' The unity of the narrative, thus far, is manifestly unbroken and complete. Every attempt to tear up the sacred text, and resolve it into a series of interlacing fragments by the different writers, the more closely it is examined, reveals more clearly its contradiction to all internal evidence.

CHAPTER VII.

THE TIMES OF THE FLOOD.

54. THIS part of the sacred text has been strangely tortured, to suit the Elohistie theory. It is parted, chh. vii.-ix., by Drs. Davidson and Colenso, into nearly thirty fragments, as follows:—

‘Davidson, *Introd.*’ p. 60. Ch. vii. 1-5, Jehovist; 6, 7, Elohist; 8a, Redactor; 8b, 9 El.; 10, Jeh.; 11, El.; 12, Jeh.; 13-16a, El.; 16b, 17, Jeh.; 18-21, El.; 22, 23, Jeh.; 24, El.; viii. 1, 2a, El.; 2b, 3a, Jeh.; 3b, El.; 4a, Jeh.; 4b, El.; 4c, Jeh.; 5, El.; 6-12, Jeh.; 13-19, El.; 20-22, Jeh.; ix. 1-17, El.; 18a, Jeh.; 18b, Redac.; 19, Jeh.; 20-27, Redac.; 28, 29, Elohist; twenty-eight portions.

‘*Penta. Exam.*’ Part IV. Ch. vii. 1-5, Jeh.; 6-9, El.; 10, Jeh.; 11 El.; 12, Jeh.; 13-16a, El.; 16b, 17, Jeh.; 18a, El.; 18b-20a, Jeh.; 20b, 21, El.; 22, 23a, Jeh.; 23b, 24, El.; viii. 1, 2a, El.; 2b, Jeh.; 3, 4a, El.; 4b Jeh.; 5, El.; 6-12, Jeh.; 13a, El.; 13b, Jeh.; 14-19, El.; 20-22, Jeh.; ix. 1-17, El.; 18-27, Jeh.; 28, 29, El.; twenty-five portions.

In these seventy-five verses there are only six where the name Jehovah occurs, and ten others with Elohim. When the license of separating verses and parts of verses

is assumed, there are thus fifty-nine, or four-fifths, to which the test of the names does not apply. These are parted by Dr. Davidson, Elohist 31 v. 4 fr., 12 portions; Jehovist, 16 v. 4 fr., ten portions; Redactor, 6 v. 2 fr., three portions. Or supposing the test to apply to the four unbroken paragraphs, vii. 1-5, viii. 15-19, 20-22, ix. 1-17; or thirty verses, there remain forty-five, which these critics have to apportion by other tests. And here they agree in twenty-eight, and vary in seventeen verses, which may claim, perhaps, to be a fair amount of success.

55. The six first chapters are assigned by the theory, alternately, to the Elohist and Jehovist, thus,—chh. i., ii. 3, El.; ii. 4-iv. Jeh.; ch. v. (except 29) Elo.; vi. 1-8, Jeh. (or Redac.); v. 9-22, Elohist. But its unity throughout has been shown by following reasons. The words of ii. 4, 'These are the generations,' &c., are a distinct verbal reference to the previous chapter, linking the two parts expressly into one. Next, ii. 5, is a further summary and retrospect of the previous narrative, in its three stages, before the plants were formed, after they were formed, before man's creation; and lastly, that creation, given now in fuller detail. Thirdly, the compound name, Jehovah Elohim, is used in this section alone. This is explained at once with one sole author, who would prove silently, at the outset, the common reference of both names, when he is about to use them alternately in the rest of the work. On the opposite theory, no plausible explanation of this main feature can be given. Lastly, the transition from the first Sabbath, by a bare genealogy, to the birth of Shem, Ham, and Japheth, and the wickedness before the flood, is unnatural

and incredible, even in a mere inventor of legends, and far more in the outset and basis of a series of Divine revelations.

Again, ch. v. is linked with the first section, it is true, by its opening verses. But it has also many links with those which follow. The form of the phrases, 'in the day that God created man,' 'in the day they were created,' is repeated from ii. 4. The naming of Adam refers to the previous naming of Eve, Cain, Abel, and Seth; the words, seven times repeated, 'he died' to the threatening and sentence, ii. 17—iii. 19; the mention of Enoch and Lamech has a resemblance and allusion to the genealogy of Cain; Enoch's walking with God is an allusive contrast to Adam and Eve's guilty flight and concealment; and the birth of Noah, 28—31, an inseparable part of the genealogy, refers most plainly to the record of the curse, iii. 17. Also the passages, 1—3, and 28—32, at the beginning and close, answer to each other, as linking the brief genealogy with the previous account of Creation and the Fall, and the latter of the Flood; and the presence in them of both names (Elo. 2, Jeh. 1) deprives the whole of its alleged Elohist character, the only plea for its separation from the actual context.

Again, ch. vi. 1—8, is fixed in its place by various internal signs. The multiplying of men, the birth of daughters, sum up the two main results of the genealogy. The period of 120 years is linked with the twenty-eight numbered periods before it, and is almost exactly the average of their nine generations ($117\frac{1}{3}$.) The description of the world's wickedness is essential to account for the flood, and v. 8 to explain why Noah was alone preserved.

Only the presence of this section hinders v. 32 and vi. 10, from becoming a needless tautology, instead of a natural and emphatic resumption. Lastly, in vi. 9–22, the phrase, ‘Noah begat *three* sons,’ refers to ch. v. 28, in contrast to v. 3, where son is omitted; ‘the end of all flesh,’ to vi. 3; ‘he also is flesh,’ ‘wherein is the breath of life,’ to ii. 7; and the ‘fowls, cattle, and creeping things,’ to v. 7, just before, all in the so-called Jehovistic portions. By these various links and fastenings the whole six chapters are firmly bound together.

56. In the account of the flood, chh. vii.–ix., three charges of internal contradiction are brought to disprove their unity and Mosaic authorship. The first and chief is found in vi. 19, 20, and vii. 2, 3. According to Drs. Colenso, Davidson, and Kalisch, this is a contradiction ‘impossible to reconcile, especially in the case of the fowls;’ and ‘all attempts at arguing away the discrepancy have been utterly unsuccessful, though the most desperate efforts have been made,’ sophistry used, and common sense defied. Dr. Davidson adds further, that ‘the plain statement cannot be evaded by the arbitrary assumption of two commands given to Noah at different times; the first when he was ordered to build the ark, and the other when it was finished. The narrative contradicts this, because the word *of* is found in vii. 8, and this forbids the construction that they went in by pairs, whatever their numbers. ‘The language is explained by vi. 19, 20, where the number of the pairs is confessedly given.’

The emptiness of this charge against the narrative may be easily proved.

i. First, it is self-evident that the text represents two

messages as given to Noah; one before the ark was begun, the other after it was finished. This is neither evasion nor assumption, but plain on the face of the text. Whoever denies it, as Dr. Davidson has done, must be either blind or dishonest. In vi. 14-21, Noah receives instructions how to build the ark, and why, or for what end. In vii. 1-5, he is told what he must actually do, when he has now completed it, seven days before the flood began. The interval might be longer, but could scarcely be less than from ten to twenty years.

ii. The words of vi. 18-20, are a promise even more than a command, and predict how, and with what attendance, Noah and his family shall be preserved. They form part of God's covenant, v. 18; and the only two direct imperatives are in vv. 14, 20, and refer to the building of the ark itself, and the collection of food. But vii. 1-4 opens with a direct command, and a limit of time is named for its performance. There is thus no mere repetition, as asserted, but a distinct advance. To encourage him in building the ark, Noah has been told from the first that he and his household, and all the species of living things, shall be saved in it, by God's covenant; and now he is told to enter it within seven days that the promise and covenant may be fulfilled. The words, 'Come thou, and all thy house into *the Ark*,' are a contrast to those before, and imply that it was now built and ready for use.

iii. The first direction is that two of every sort, male and female, must enter the ark, to keep seed alive. It is not said, 'two only,' or 'two and no more.' The purpose required two at least, and what was essential, to show the

purpose of the ark, and be an explanation of its size, was revealed at once. To suppose that this general instruction, years before, forbade the preservation of more pairs than one, in any case, is ridiculous and absurd. The contradiction has no source but an utter confusion of thought in the objectors themselves. 'Two of every kind, to keep seed alive' can never be expounded 'Two, and no more of any single kind.' The second instruction, some years later, really confirms and repeats the first, and only adds a further direction, to take six additional pairs of the clean beasts and birds alone.

iv. The ellipsis in vii. 3, explains itself at once by the parallelism. The LXX., perhaps for the sake of careless readers, have given it in a brief and easy paraphrase. 'Also of clean fowls of the heaven by sevens, and of all fowls that are not clean by two, the male and female, to keep seed alive upon the earth.' The same contrast between the number of the clean and unclean preserved is to apply to the beasts and the fowls.

v. The word 'of' in vii. 8, implies that there was a selection in each case, and 'two, two,' that those selected entered by pairs, a male and a female. It is used equally in v. 2, 3, to which it plainly refers, where the number of seven pairs and single pairs is prescribed. To infer from it, with Dr. Davidson, in the face of the plain words of the text, that vi. 13-21 and vii. 1-5 must be parallel, not successive, is lunacy, and not criticism.

vi. If the contradiction were as plain and certain as it is plainly groundless, it is not true that 'the matter explains itself easily by the hypothesis of two authors.' It is scarcely less incredible that this Redactor or Jehovist,

who joined the parts elsewhere so skilfully that the world, for three thousand years, has never detected the patch-work, should leave a flat contradiction within six verses, than that Moses himself should do it. A few grains of modesty would teach these negative critics how far easier and more natural is the third alternative, that they have fallen into a blunder themselves, while trampling under foot those words of Christ,—‘It is easier for heaven and earth to pass than for one tittle of the law to fail.’

57. The next contradiction alleged relates to the continuance of the flood, of which Dr. Davidson writes as follows:—

‘In the prior narrative 150 days are represented as the time of the flood’s rising before it began to abate. The word *prevailed*, v. 24, cannot consist with the hypothesis, that, while the rain lasted forty days, the water still prevailed during 110 after the cessation of the rain, so that there was no *perceptible* subsidence to Noah. No such *imperceptible* subsidence is ever alluded to. All that *is* stated is in viii. 3, the abatement of the waters at the end of the 150 days. The verb, in vii. 24, is explained by its like use in vii. 18, where *were increased* is joined with it, as if to show that it is inconsistent with the subsidence of the waters. It is incorrect to say, that a different term, *וירבו*, is used to express the rise or increase of the waters; because the latter is appended to the former in v. 18, which is Elohistic. The use of both in this verse determines the sense of the one in v. 24, and, therefore, precludes the idea of imperceptible subsidence. Besides, it is utterly impossible that so many as 110 days’ subsidence followed forty days’ rain. The proportion is unnatural.’

Here the alleged contradiction is that v. 17, from the Jehovist, makes the waters rise only forty days; while v. 24, of the Elohist, makes the rise last 150 days. Now,

first, this contradicts flatly the explanation the text itself supplies. For the 150 days reach from 'the second month and the seventeenth day,' vii. 11, to 'the seventh month and the same day,' viii. 4. Then the text marks the end of these days by a definite fact, the resting of the ark on one of the mountains. But since the waters had prevailed 'fifteen cubits and upward,' a subsidence of fifteen cubits, and probably of much more, since the ark was not likely to rest on the very highest point, must have gone before. Next, the nature of the case excludes any other view. The resting of the ark would be a definite event, and a natural measure of time; but the moment of greatest height would be invisible and imperceptible, and need a miraculous revelation to decide. Again, vv. 17, 18 are so far from limiting the rise to forty days, that they express plainly just the reverse. Three stages of later increase are described at once in three successive verses. Till contradiction has been proved from the text as it stands, there can be no pretence for splitting it up, as these critics do, into ten fragments, of which one half, it is alleged, contradict the other.

It is argued, next, that *prevailed*, v. 24, means *rose* or *increased*, because it is joined with the word *increased* in v. 18, 'to show that it is inconsistent with a subsidence of the waters.' An astonishing inference! Thus if we are told, first, that a person stood up and spoke; next, that he stood up; and thirdly, that he stood up and was silent, the first will prove that *to stand up* means *to speak* in the other two cases, and that the third statement is an 'irreconcilable contradiction.' The true conclusion from v. 18 is clearly just the reverse, that the waters might prevail, and not increase. One word refers to their actual

height, as surmounting the eminences; the other to their progress to a height still greater. If they prevailed, and then increased further, they must have still prevailed when they had decreased only to that former level. Here the resting of the ark is the limit expressly named.

A further discovery remains, that v. 18 'precludes the idea of an imperceptible subsidence.' That is, because the waters prevailed so as to cover the hills, and increased further, they could not decline from fifteen to fourteen cubits above the mountain-tops without the change being perceived clearly by those within the ark. Also, 'the proportion is unnatural, of 110 days' subsidence after forty days' rain.' Another strange piece of confusion! For the text makes the rise terminate *after* the forty days, though before the 150. It specifies three steps of increase after the first period, and makes one of these only to have been reversed, when the 150 days were complete. Besides this perversion of the text, the attempt to fix the times, in such a case, by rules of arithmetic, is an acme of critical folly. The event, if true, lay so far beyond the common course of nature, that an attempt to improve the intervals by abstract reasoning is little short of a claim to be wiser than God.

58. The text has been further charged with contradiction, 'as the story now stands,' from the interval between viii. 5 and 13 being too long to be filled up by the specified interval, three months or 96 days by $40 + 21$ days. This difficulty, at first sight, has some ground, though the Elohist theory does not in the least explain or remove it. But a closer search provides a solution which turns it into mark of consistency and truth.

Let us only assume, in v. 8, that an interval has to be supplied from v. 6, since the account of the sending of the raven is finished before the dove is named. Why should Noah make a double experiment the same day? The mission of the raven, forty days after the first of the tenth month, would be 11.11, and the first mission of the dove, if at the same interval, would be 12.21. The second would be 12.28, and the third 12.35. Now this would be the last day of a true solar or Egyptian year, with five epagomenæ, or added days, after the close of twelve equal months of thirty days. The next day after that on which the dove failed to return, would thus be 'the first day of the first month.' Surely this exact coincidence is a strong sign that the above is the true construction, that the simplest and very ancient Egyptian form of year was then in use, and that the records present a genuine history.

Let us now inquire whether the narrative contains internal signs of its own unity. For this end, this chapter may be divided into ten sections and paragraphs.

59 Ch. vii. 1-5.

These verses are ascribed by the theory to the Jehovist, and thus made the immediate sequel of vi. 4-8; but they continue in reality the Elohist narrative, vi. 9-22.

i. First, the previous command to build the ark implies and requires further directions when it was built, and some notice of the exact time when the judgment would come. This is exactly what is here supplied. The change of the sacred name is natural, partly as the sign of a new paragraph, and partly to mark the fulfilment of the covenant made some years earlier.

ii. The previous message began, 'Make thee an ark, &c.

The opening words here, 'Come thou and all thy house, into the ark,' refer back to this command, and imply that the work was now complete.

iii. 'For thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation.' There is here a plain reference to the words, 'Noah was righteous, and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God,' and a contrast to those which follow,—'God looked on the earth, and behold, it was corrupt, vi. 10, 12.

iv. The instructions, v. 2, 3, refer to those in vi. 19, 20, which they do not contradict, but simply complete. The first and general instruction is renewed and confirmed, but Noah is taught to take six additional pairs of the clean animals alone.

v. A mark of time, like vii. 4, on the eve of the flood, is plainly required by the nature of the event. When this paragraph is cut out, there is a most unnatural leap from the charge to make the ark, some years before, to the sudden influx of the judgment without warning.

vi. The last verse, vii. 5, agrees with vi. 32, with a verbal difference. The repeated clause, 'so did he,' marks the close of the long delay during the ark's preparation. It is a full stop at the close of a distinct era of time. But the shorter form, vii. 5, links this paragraph more closely with that which follows, in which Noah's obedience to the new charge is at once described. The making of the ark, the command to enter, and its prompt execution, are the subject of those successive paragraphs, and none of them can be left out without producing a mutilated narrative.

60. Ch. vii. 6-10.

i. The date, v. 6, refers back plainly to ch. v. 32, which

gives the generation of Noah, and to ch. v. 27, which makes Methuselah die in the year of the flood. But it also refers to vi. 3, since it marks the close of those 120 years of patience, and its month-date, to the week's interval just before.

ii. The form of v. 7 answers to the previous command, vv. 2, 3. Hence the negative critics are perplexed and disagree. Some make these clauses a mere interpolation of the Redactor, while another refers them to the Elohist, as merely implying a complete obedience to vi. 19, 20.

iii. The four verses, 7-10, answer to 1-4, each to each. vv. 1, 7, 'Come thou, and all thy house, into the ark.' 'And Noah went in unto the ark.' Vv. 2, 8. 'Of every clean beast, and of beasts not clean. Vv. 3, 9. 'The male and the female, to keep seed alive.' 'The male and the female, as God commanded.' Vv. 4, 10. 'For yet seven days, &c. . . . And after seven days the waters of the flood were upon the earth.' Thus we have, first, the command and the promise; and then, the fulfilment of God's commands by Noah, of the promise by God himself. The second passage clearly implies the first, and depends upon it; and v. 10 belongs strictly to the three before. Its separation by the Elohist theory dislocates and disturbs the whole passage. Its connexion is further shown by the recurrent mention of the 'waters of the flood,' vv. 7, 10.

61. Ch. vii. 11-16.

The Elohist theory breaks this section into four parts, by separating v. 12 and the last clause of v. 16 from the rest, and assigning them to later interpolation. The piecemeal division it requires, so that vv. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, are

successively referred to different authors, is alone its full condemnation. But other direct reasons prove its falsehood.

i. The date, v. 12, is separated by the theory from the one before and after. Yet it has the plainest connexion with both. This first day of the flood here specified, the 17th of the 2nd month, was the last of the seven days, and the first of the forty, and stands here in its true place just between them.

ii. The words of v. 12 clearly refer to the warning v. 4, and announce its fulfilment, beginning on the day named in the previous verse. The theorist then tears it from the context, and ascribes it to the Jehovist. It is said to be 'inserted awkwardly, out of its proper place in the story, and to interrupt the continuity.' On the contrary, the close of the seven days, v. 10, the date of the flood, v. 11, and the forty days of rain which at once began, stand plainly in the most natural order possible. The forty days are named again, it is true, v. 17; but equally in order, since v. 12 refers to their commencement from the day just named, while v. 17 represents the whole period as the first stage of the flood, succeeded by others.

iii. The statements of 7-10 and 13-16 have been said to contradict each other as to the day when Noah entered the ark. More stress would have been laid on this by the objectors, only that both alike are called Elohistie, and contradiction here would be only a stumbling-block to their own theory. But the simple explanation is, that the whole week would be required for these final arrangements. The task began as soon as the command was

given, or seven days before the flood, and it was completed 'the self-same day' when the flood began.

iv. The four verses, 13-16, correspond alike with the two quartets, 1-4 and 7-10. The first, in each case, refers to the entrance of Noah and his house 'into the ark,' now finished. The second, to the beasts and cattle, in vv. 8, 14, including also the fowls. The third specifies 'male and female;' 'two and two, the male and female,' and 'two and two of all flesh.' The fourth predicts the time of the flood, and notes that time as fulfilled, and the closing act of preparation on the seventh and last day, 'The Lord shut him in.' This exact correspondence proves the unity of the whole.

v. The union of the names, v. 16, is no sign of a double origin, but the reverse. A Redactor, using both names, would be most unlikely to vary the name used just before in so brief an addition. The words, also, are so far from having the marks of a later supplement, that they form rather the natural and necessary conclusion of the whole account of the preparation. They sum up together the two previous sections of the Divine commands before and after the ark was built, vi. 9-22, vii. 1-5, and mark their common fulfilment by the double sacred name. The union is so close as to be plainly intentional. In a single author it is full of emphasis at this point, where the promise to Noah culminates, and the judgment on the world begins.

62. Ch. vii. 17-24.

Four of these verses describe the rise of the flood, and the other four its effects and time of continuance. The parts are thus equal and similar, three verses of climax in

each case, with a following pause. The attempt, in one scheme, to sever vv. 17, 22, 23, and refer them to the Jehovist, and in the other ('Pentateuch Examined,' Part IV.) to part them into six alternate morsels of a verse and half a-piece, ascribed to the two imaginary writers, is really preposterous. Let us examine the details.

i. In vv. 17-19 three stages are plainly marked. In the first the ark, during the forty days, began to float, and was lifted above the earth. The water had covered deeply the lowlands where it was built. In the next, the waters were so risen that the lower eminences were covered, and the ark moved with freedom 'upon the face of the waters.' In the third, 'all the high hills were covered.' The fourth verse adds, then, a definition of their highest elevation, fifteen cubits above the highest mountains, so that there was no point left where the ark could not float without obstruction. Yet the scheme of Dr. Davidson transfers to another writer the first verse, on which the rest depend, simply because the forty days refer plainly to v. 4 in a Jehovistic portion. Dr. Colenso goes further, and assigns all four verses to the Jehovist, except the two clauses,—'And the waters prevailed, and were increased greatly upon the earth,' v. 18; 'and the mountains were covered,' v. 20. Dr. Davidson leaves all to the Elohist, except v. 17; which the forty days compel him to assign to his Jehovist, since they refer to v. 4. Dr. Colenso leaves all to the Jehovist, except two clauses, required to give some show of continuity to the Elohist's 'ground-work document.' It is quite plain that both views are equally false, and that the three statements are a regular climax from one and the same hand. 'And the

waters increased, and bare up the ark,' v. 17; 'And the waters prevailed, and increased greatly upon the earth,' v. 18; 'And the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth.' Like the first, second, and third stories of the ark itself, the three statements are built compactly together, and wholly exclude the idea of mere patchwork and accidental union.

ii. The four verses are thus plainly a connected whole. But the first verse, in the mention of the forty days, links them firmly with the Jehovistic section, vii. 1-5. And the last, in the mention of the fifteen cubits, just half the depth of the ark, and probably that of its draught, or immersed portion, links them as plainly with vi. 15, 16, or the dimensions of the ark, in the Elohist section.

iii. The three verses, 21-23, in describing the results of the flood, refer equally to Elohist and other portions:—

'And all flesh died,' vii. 13. 'The end of all flesh is come before me.'—*Elohist*.

'Both of fowl, and cattle, and beast, and every creeping thing,' 'and every man,' vi. 7. 'Man and beast, and creeping thing and fowls.'—*Jehovistic*.

'In whose nostrils is the breath of life,' vi. 17. 'All flesh, wherein is the breath of life.'—*Elo.* ii. 7. 'And breathed into his nostrils the breath of life.'—*Jehovistic*.

'Every living substance;' compare vii. 4, its only other occurrence.—*Jehovistic*.

'Upon the face of the ground.' So ii. 6, iv. 14, vi. 1, 7, vii. 4, *Jehovistic*; but viii. 13, *Elohist*.

'Men and cattle, and creeping things, and fowl of the heaven.' So vi. 7, *Jehovistic*.

iv. V. 24 answers to v. 20. Each follows three verses, which describe the *progress* and the *effects* of the flood. One assigns its limit in height, the other in time. The 150 days refer directly to v. 11, 'The second month, the seventeenth day;' but also indirectly to the seven days before, and directly the forty days that followed, being a third historical datum of the same kind. These two last periods mark the beginning and the close of the present section, the brief record of the flood itself, in contrast to the preparation and the abatement. No verse can be severed without sensibly impairing the symmetry of the whole.

63. Ch. viii. 1-5.

These five verses are parted by Dr. Davidson into seven portions, and by Dr. Colenso into five, to suit the Elohist theory. The parts they respectively assign to the Jehovist are 2b, 3a, 4ac, or 2b, 4c alone. But it is plain that the three clauses in v. 2 answer exactly to vii. 11, 12, in the same order, the fountains of the deep, the windows of heaven and the rain. 'The waters returned from off the earth continually,' is a direct contrast to vii. 17-19, before, and the 150 days, v. 3, refer also to vii. 24. 'The ark rested,' is an allusion to the name of Noah, 'rest,' in ch. v. 29; and the date to the previous date, in vii. 11. 'The mountains of Ararat' correspond with the geographical notices of the rivers of Paradise. The continual decrease, 'till the tops of the mountains were seen,' reverses the previous description, vii. 19, that all the high hills were covered. There is really not the least pretence for breaking up this simple passage into five or six fragments, and assigning them alternately

to two different unknown authors, in open defiance to all common sense, no less than in foul disparagement of the words of God.

Four reasons are assigned why 'on the mountains of Ararat' should be referred to a second writer, as a later addition. (1.) If it had formed part of the original verse, the Hebrew idiom would require that it should follow immediately after "the ark rested," and not come at the end of the verse. *Ans.* There is no such Hebrew idiom, different from our own. In both languages, the note of time usually comes either first or last, as being a simple accessory to the main thought. But here we have an exception, for a reason in the nature of the case, and not dependent on the language. The time is here an intimate part of the statement, from the double reference to the date of the flood, vii. 11, and the period of 150 days. But the place is here purely additional, since no indication of it has come before. Hence, either in English or Hebrew, the actual order is the most suitable. (2.) 'The Jehovist shows special acquaintance with the geography of the East.' This is no argument, but a double assumption, that the whole is a pure fiction, and that the prophet Samuel, the Elohist of the writer, was too ignorant to name Ararat, even in a pure invention. (3.) 'The Jehovist fixes the residence of men after the flood in the neighbourhood of Armenia.' This is merely, in other words, that the history in viii. 4. and ch. xi. is consistent. (4.) 'Both writers refer to mountains, but the particularity of detail agrees more with the style of the Jehovist.' Yet most of the details of time, the years of the patriarchs, the date of the flood and its duration, and the dimensions of the ark, belong to the

Elohistic. When such loose allegations are allowed to outweigh all direct, historical evidence, there is no limit to the absurd hypotheses which may be formed, like soap-bubbles, to glitter for a moment and disappear for ever.

64. Ch. viii. 6-12.

In this paragraph neither name of God appears. The critics assign it to their Jehovist, because the two intervals of seven and forty days resemble those in vii. 4, where the name Jehovah precedes and follows. But here they are met with a great difficulty; at least those, like Hupfeldt and Davidson, who view the second as an independent author. For when v. 5. is transferred to another document, there is nothing to which this new period can be properly referred. 'At the end of forty days' refers to the date in viii. 5, Elohist. He 'opened the window of the ark which he had made' refers equally to vi. 14, 16, Elohist. 'The raven went forth, in going forth and returning,' a phrase like viii. 3, 5, Elohist. On the other hand, 'the face of the ground,' occurs chiefly in places called Jehovistic, but presently, in v. 13, Elohist. The paragraph, since it contains direct allusions alike to Elohist and other sections, is a fresh proof of the unity of the whole. But this is still plainer from the sequence of the whole narrative, and also from the correspondence of the successive intervals, when once it is understood that in v. 8 an interval of forty days is implied, as one is expressed two verses before.

65. Ch. viii. 13-22.

The three last verses are here assigned to the Jehovist, the others usually to the Elohist. And yet the date in v. 13 is linked with that in v. 5 by the intervening intervals

$10.1 + 40 + 40 + 7 + 7 = 12.35$, or the last day of the six hundredth, followed by the first of the next year. Also vv. 13, 14, refer to v. 7 in their mention of the drying of the earth (Jeh.), but vv. 15, 16, to vi. 18, 19, and also to i. 22, 28.

The three verses 20–22 refer directly to vii. 2, 3, iii. 17, 18, v. 29, vi. 5, vii. 28, i. 5. The last of these, where day and night are first named, is Elohistie, and v. 29 is an inseparable part of what is called an Elohistie section. But while the cross references are thus enough, even here, to disprove the dual theory, the unity of the whole narrative is more plainly marked another way. For the mention of day and night refers to the first chapter of the Creation, that of the curse on the ground to ch. iii. on the Fall, the sacrifice of Noah to ch. iv., and the sacrifice of Abel, to which the Lord had respect, the arrest of the curse through Noah to ch. v. and the prophecy of Lamech; the description of man's heart to ch. vi. 5, which brings on the judgment; the mention of clean beasts and fowls to ch. viii. 2, 8, where seven pairs of these are preserved, while the whole passage is the direct and natural sequel of the chapter where it occurs. This sacrifice prepares the way for the covenant and blessing that follows.

66. Ch. ix. 1-17.

Here Elohim recurs six times, and also there are various allusions to ch. i. 1 — ii. 3, and what are called Elohistie passages. Thus ix. 1 refers to i. 22, 28, viii. 17, and again ix. 3. to i. 29, ix. 66 alike to i. 26, 27, and v. 1, v. 9, to vi. 18, and v. 10 to viii. 17, and perhaps v. 11, to vi. 13 and 7 and 17. At the same time, one main enactment, vv. 5, 6, refers not less plainly to the previous ac-

count of the murder of Abel, iv. 1-15, and of the violence with which the earth had been filled, vi. 5, 11, 12. The narrative of the Fall is the necessary link of transition between the record of Creation and of the Flood, and this covenant with Nch is the first stage in a great economy of redemption. The sacredness of blood, here enjoined, is an early preparation for the great mystery of the New Covenant.

67. Ch. ix. 18-29.

This passage, except the two last verses, is referred to the Jehovist in the simpler form of the modern theory; but Dr. Davidson and Hupfeldt, for some esoteric reasons, make it over to a third party, the Redactor, except 18a, 19, which they are content to leave to the Jehovist. It is self-evident, in opposition to this wonderful piece of anatomy, that vv. 18-27 form one connected history. No verse or clause can be severed from it without violence. The sacred name occurs only once, in the blessing of Shem, where it is full of emphasis. By the narrator himself neither name is here used. The only reason why it should be thought that the writer of ix. 1-17, who there uses Elohim four times, and the writer of Exod. vi. 1-8, could not also have written this passage, is the false construction of the text in Exodus, as if Jehovah were a name or word wholly unknown before Moses. Once restore the true sense, and it becomes quite natural that Moses, while he uses Elohim in the world-wide covenant with Noah, and in the blessing of Japheth, in the blessing of Shem should represent the patriarch as employing the higher and more sacred name, 'Jehovah, the God of Shem,' as a preparation for the title 'Jehovah, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob.'

68. The sequel of the Flood, chh. x. xi., consists of two genealogies, separated from each other by the history of the Confusion of Tongues. This last is purely Jehovistic, the sacred name occurring in it five times; but the two genealogies, except in one parenthetical verse, x. 9, exhibit neither name. The critics have thus a free range, to assign them as they please. Yet as the first, ch. ix., is the direct sequel and expansion of the Elohistical covenant with Noah, in which his sons are commanded, 'Be fruitful and multiply;' while the latter is the genealogy of Shem only, ix. 26, of whom Jehovah was to be the God, and is a direct preparation for the purely Jehovistic narrative of Abraham, chh. xii.—xvi.; we might have expected that the former would be given to the Elohist, and the latter to the Jehovist. Strange to say, their decision is just the reverse. The general, diffusive genealogy, including Ham and Japheth, is assigned to the later Jehovist; and the limited, special pedigree of the sons of Shem and forefathers of Abraham, is ascribed to the Elohist. But the reason soon becomes plain. This 'ground-work document' could not leap over ten generations. Hence, the transition from Shem to Abraham must be given to it, in order to avoid a total breach of continuity. But when we have reached so far, through ten descents, plainly designed to prepare for the life of Abraham, the problem grows intractable, for that life is Jehovistic from first to last; and the only resource is to cull out a verse and a half from ch. xii., one and two halves from ch. xiii., one where the sacred name occurs from ch. xiv., and two others from ch. xvi., to bridge over the passage to the Elohistical chapter of the covenant, ch. xvii. The overthrow of Sodom is then

slurred over in a single verse, and two verses more are given for the birth of Isaac, while the Elohist is permitted to retain a whole chapter of the burial of Sarah. The genealogy then, in ch. xi., becomes like a long avenue which leads to nothing; instead of being, as the text itself shows it to be, the brief transition to a new era of fuller and higher revelation. So strange and violent are the shifts to which those critics are obliged to have recourse, who burn incense to their own critical dissecting-knife, and thus blind themselves to the unity and divine harmony of these 'true sayings of God.'

CHAPTER VIII.

THE HISTORY OF ABRAHAM.

69. THE life of Abraham, chh. xii.—xxiv., is the central portion of the Book of Genesis, the basis of every later message of God. The covenant it reveals is for ‘a thousand generations.’ The New Testament, from its first sentence onward, claims to be simply the expansion and fulfilment of the oath and promise of God here made known to mankind. Any theory which would resolve it into the union of three or four vague and contradictory traditions, or successful forgeries, strikes plainly at the foundations of the Christian faith. When it comes before us with loud boasts of superior wisdom and insight, our duty is to deal with it as it professes to deal with the word of God, and to submit its claims to a close and searching examination.

The sceptical theory assigns these thirteen chapters, except one paragraph, to three writers, ascribed to the times of Saul, Jehoshaphat, and Uzziah, in more than forty fragments of very unequal length. The Elohist has chh. xvii., xxiii., and a few verses from six others; the Junior Elohist, chh. xx.—xxii. 13, except five or six verses;

and the Jehovist, chh. xii.–xvi. ; xviii. 1–28 ; xxii. 14–24 ; xxiv., or nearly all the rest. The Redactor has only the nine last verses of ch. xix., and two or three other verses, or parts of verses.

70. The direct marks of unity in the whole narrative are clear and plain. The stem from which the whole proceeds is the brief genealogy of Terah, xi. 27–32. Nearly all the names in that family record recur in the course of the history, Abraham, Lot, Nahor, Sarah, Milcah. The journey of ch. xi. 31, 32, is continued and completed in xii. 4–6. The age of Abraham, xii. 4, refers to the double notice of xi. 26, 32 ; and the mention of Haran to xi. 28, 31, 32 ; and that of the Canaanite to the earlier catalogue, x. 15–19. After the descent into Egypt, xii. 10–20, we have the return, xiii. 1 ; the consequent increase in the pastoral wealth of both patriarchs, xiii. 2–5 ; and the need for separation, v. 6, which refers back to the record of their joint migration. Then the record follows, alternately, of mercy and blessing to the stronger, and of chastisement to the weaker faith. Thus xiii. 14–18, repeats and expands the earlier promise, xii. 2, 7 ; and ch. xiv. recounts the calamity in which Lot was involved by his choice of Sodom for a home. The promise, xv. 1, refers directly to the oath of Abraham just before, and is a kind of Divine compensation. The seventh verse refers back to xi. 28, in the genealogy, and the rest of the chapter unfolds and confirms the two earlier promises, chh. xii. 1–3, xiii. 14–18. The history of Hagar, also, is linked, in vv. 3, 16, with the previous notice of the age of Abraham, xii. 4, and stands midway in time between the call and the birth of Isaac, which soon follows.

Again, ch. xvii., which the theory assigns to a distinct author, is linked most closely with what precedes and follows. For the names Abram and Sarai, after occurring uniformly seventy times, in xi. 26–xvii. 5, are now changed to Abraham and Sarah, which occur uniformly, about 140 times, in all the sequel of the history. Abraham's age, v. 17, refers to xii. 4, and xvi. 3, 16; and his prayer for Ishmael to the narrative xvi. 11–15; and the promise of Isaac is the groundwork of the three or four next chapters. In ch. xviii. the names Abraham and Sarah refer to xvii. 5, 15; their age to xvii. 17; the laughter of Sarah, v. 12–15, to that of Abraham, xvii. 17; the promise, v. 14, to xvii. 21; and the cry of Sodom to the earlier statement, xiii. 12, 13. In ch. xix. the mention of Zoar refers back to three earlier passages, xiii. 10, xiv. 2, 8. The twentieth chapter is linked with xii. 10–20, or the descent into Egypt, both by resemblance and contrast, as might be traced in various details. But ch. xxi. is full of these references to the previous history. Thus v. 1 refers to xvii. 19, 21, and xviii. 9–15, v. 2 to xvii. 21, v. 3 to xvii. 19, the name of Isaac assigned before his birth; v. 4 to xvii. 12, for the time of circumcision; v. 5 to xii. 4, xvi. 3, 16, xvii. 1, 24, 25, for the age of Abraham; v. 6 to xviii. 12, 15, v. 10 to xvi. 1, 6, xvii. 21, v. 11 to xvii. 18, and vv. 12, 13, to xvii. 19–21, and vv. 14–20 to the account, xvi. 7–14, of Hagar's first peril in the wilderness. The act of Isaac's sacrifice, besides other allusions, stands nearly midway in time between ch. xxi. and ch. xxiii.; and the latter, with its account of Sarah's death and burial, comes just three years before Isaac's marriage; of which the record is linked with it by the closing

words,—‘And Isaac was comforted after his mother’s death.’

71. The Elohist has only xii. 4b, 5, xiii. 6, 11b, 12a, xv. 1, xvi. 3, 15b, 16, xvii., xix. 29, xxi. 4, 5, and xxiii., assigned to his share in the quadripartite scheme. Three disjointed fragments, on the sceptical theory, were the first written account of Abraham among the Israelites, composed about the time of Saul, or eight hundred years after the events, and four hundred after the Exodus. Besides a few verses of chronology, &c., culled out from chh. xii.–xvi., they contain no incident of the patriarch’s life; but only a Divine vision, a fiction in the view of these theorists, in which circumcision was enjoined, and an account of the purchase of Machpelah for a burial-place. A glance at the contents of this ‘Elohim document’ might satisfy any reasonable mind that it is a strange chimera of some modern theorists. Neither inspired prophet, nor honest historian, nor reckless forger, could ever have devised so crude a narrative of the time-honoured patriarch, and have published it to the world.

Next, how does it satisfy the main test, on which the whole theory professedly depends? The Pentateuch, we have been told, by its use of the sacred names, ‘drops to pieces of itself in our hands.’ It is a ‘very interesting and easy study’ for common readers, by this simple means, to convince themselves of the falsehood of the old doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, and the superior truth of the modern or composite theory. How does the test apply here? The passage, xvii. 3–22, which is the record of God’s message, and not a simple narrative, may be set aside as equally explicable on either view. We have then forty-

nine verses within the limits, xi. 27-xxv. 10, assigned to the Elohist. Only three of these have the name Elohim, xvii. 23, xix. 29, xxi. 4. Two have actually the name Jehovah, xv. 1, xvii. 1; the entire absence of which, by the theory, is the chief mark of this Elohist. The other forty-four verses have neither sacred name. The test, then, cannot be used at all, except in five verses out of forty-nine, and is flatly contradicted in two verses out of the five. In so wonderful a way, by the help of the new theory, does this part of the Pentateuch drop to pieces of itself in our hands!

72. There are, however, some other more general tests, or contrasted features, which are said to mark this 'Elohim document,' and which Dr. Davidson states as follows (p. 25):—

i. 'In the Elohim document there is no mention of sacrifices and altars, because these were Mosaic forms of religious intercourse between God and man.' There are twelve places in Genesis where there is mention of sacrifice or altar, from ch. xii. to the close. Of these, seven, that is a majority, are Elohistie, by the test of the names: Gen. xxii. 1-8; xxxi. 54; xxxiii. 18-20; xxxv. 1-3, 6-8, 13-15; xlvi. 1-4.

ii. 'God speaks with His servants without the peculiar forms of communion afterwards employed, such as angels, dreams, visions, &c., &c.' This is almost a direct reversal of the fact, since there are no less than fourteen such cases recorded in Elohistie passages: Gen. xx. 3; xx. 6; xxi. 17, 18; xxi. 23; xxxi. 11; xxxi. 24; xxxii. 1; xxxii. 24-28; xxxv. 9; xxxvii. 5, 9; xl. 5; xli. 1-7; xlvi. 2.

iii. 'The patriarchs move about freely.' We might

infer that the Jehovist invented by these critics is so ill informed as to confine the patriarchs to a single spot. But of Abraham's movements from place to place three only are in Elohistie passages, and eight in the Jehovistic. 'Their wealth consists of herds and servants.' Another proof of the accuracy of these learned theorists. In the lives of Abraham and Isaac, flocks and herds are named seven times in Jehovistic, only twice in Elohistie passages. 'The tent is the dwelling-place.' Another strange test by which to distinguish two patriarchal historians. It is even more unfortunate than the last. In Abraham's history tents are named seven times, and *always* in Jehovistic passages, never once in the Elohistie: xii. 8; xiii. 5, 12, 18; xviii. 1, 9, 10; xxiv. 67.

iv. 'The whole history is disposed in epochs, so that it has an epic form and character, with evenness of proportions and equability of manner.' A simple reference to No. 23 will illustrate the hardihood of this assertion. Anything less epic in style, or more uneven, like a series of sudden historical jerks, it is impossible to conceive. The Word of God, however mangled, can hardly be robbed of its divine simplicity; but if the purpose were to make it ridiculous by critical mutilation, the success could hardly be more complete than in the 'Elohim document.'

v. 'It resembles a poem more than a history, since only the more important points are touched on successively. The descriptions of the Elohist are regular, orderly, clear, simple, in artificial calm, free from the rhetorical and poetical.'

This critical invention, the Elohim document, is certainly not like a history, and as certainly 'free from the

poetical element.' But its resemblance to a poem no common eye can discover. It is rather like an index of contents to some work of history, in which clauses have been omitted. Its orderly nature consists in a series of sudden vaults, from Abraham's vision to Sarah's gift of Hagar to her husband, before Hagar has been once named; from the circumcision of Ishmael and Abraham's household to the rescue of Lot from Sodom, without one word to explain the judgment; and from the birth of Isaac to the burial of Sarah, and from this to Abraham's death, without mention of Isaac's marriage. It is, in fact, a capricious selection, which contradicts the test on which it professes to depend, and after all, can scarcely claim the most imperfect degree of historical continuity.

73. This portion of the Elohim document, besides the two whole chapters, xvii., xxiii., contains nine small fragments. Let us see by what right, or on what grounds, these can be parted from the context to which they belong.

i. The first is ch. xii. 5. It stands between the Jehovistic verses, 4, 7, 8. It is a direct sequel of the previous verse, which names the age of Abraham when the migration occurred; and introduces the next verse, the land being named in both, fully in the first, briefly in the second. The course of the narrative requires its presence. Abram must have reached the land, before passing through it. The separation of this one verse, and its transfer to a writer three centuries before the composition of the rest, is a paradox without a grain of evidence, even on the grounds of these neologists themselves, and bids defiance to every law and rule of sober criticism.

ii. The second passage is xiii. 6. The verse coheres most intimately with its context on either side. When appended to xii. 5, where the scheme places it, the sequence is most unnatural. If Abraham and Lot could travel together from Haran with their flocks, why need they part as soon as they enter the land? But the verse explains itself in its true context. By the gifts of Pharaoh, and natural increase, the wealth of Abraham was enlarged on his return from Egypt, and that of Lot also. On their return northward this new difficulty might well arise. The sixth is the necessary transition from the fifth to the seventh verse, and stands now in its own natural place. The internal evidence is just as decisive as the external against its forced separation and transfer to a wholly distinct author, who is said to have lived some three hundred years before the rest was composed.

iii. The third passage is xv. 1. Its transfer to the Elohist is a still more marvellous work of the 'higher criticism,' since it not only requires its actual context, but contains that sacred name, Jehovah, the presence of which is made elsewhere the sure proof that another hand, distinct from our Elohist, has been at work. Still further, the verse records a vision, and from visions, we have just been told, the Elohist is free! How, then, can we explain this contradiction, not merely of the common laws of evidence, which they set aside continually, but of the empirical rules of the theorists themselves? Simply, by the desperate effort to bridge over a chasm to which the theory leads, and by which the Elohist would pass at once from the genealogy of Terah to the covenant of circumcision. For decency's sake a few stepping-stones had to be supplied;

and for this end even the double test of the sacred names, and of visions, is cast to the winds. The Elohist must here have one verse given him, at whatever sacrifice of consistency or common sense.

iv. A fourth passage is xvi. 3, to which may be added 15b, 16. This short chapter is broken by the scheme into six portions, assigned to three writers. The earliest contributes two verses and a half; the second, two centuries later, a verse and half; and the third, a century still later, the other twelve verses. Stranger still, the third supplies v. 1, the second v. 2, and the first v. 3. A hypothesis more ridiculous in the eyes of sober criticism could hardly be devised. Thus, immediately after the words to Abraham, 'I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward,' without any previous mention of Hagar, or of Abraham's complaint, xv. 2, 3, on which it depends, we should have the abrupt sequel,—'And Sarai, Abram's wife, took Hagar her maid, the Egyptian, &c.' This evidently implies the previous mention of Hagar, v. 1, and of Sarai's hope, v. 2, to become a mother by proxy. Again, the second clause of v. 15 is parted from the first, which is given to the junior Elohist, two centuries later; and this is parted from vv. 4–14, by which alone it is explained, and which are made a century later still. The result is to bring xii. 4, xvi. 3, 16, within seven verses, and thus to turn the last into a mere tautology.

v. In ch. xix. only v. 29 is given to the Elohist. Yet this is plainly the summary of the whole preceding history. When used to replace it, the verse becomes abrupt and unnatural. In the scheme it follows close after the wholly different statement of xvii. 27,—'And all the men of his

house, born in his house, or bought with money of the stranger, were circumcised with him.'

vi. The division of ch. xxi. 1-20, is like an extreme of critical caprice and folly. It runs thus:—

v. 1. *Junior Elohist.*

v. 2. 'For Sarah conceived,' *Elohist*, 'and bare Abraham a son in his old age,' *Junior Elohist*; 'at the time of which God had spoken to him,' *Elohist*.

v. 3. 'And Abraham . . . Isaac,' *Junior Elohist*. vv. 4, 5, *Elohist*. vv. 6, 7, *Junior Elohist*.

vv. 8, 9, *Redactor*. vv. 10-17a, *Junior Elohist*.

'And the angel of God called to Hagar out of heaven,' *Redactor*, 'and said unto her . . . And God was with the lad, and he grew,' *Junior Elohist*.

'And he dwelt in the wilderness, and became an archer,' *Jehovist*.

74. Two chapters in this part of the history are assigned to the Elohist. The first is ch. xvii., where the name Elohim is used throughout the message. But in v. 1 the whole is linked with the previous context by the use of the sacred name,—'The Lord (Jehovah) appeared to Abram.' Since the character of the Jehovist is to make use of either name, but of the Elohist to use Elohim only, and this verse is inseparable from the rest, the whole chapter, by the rigid application of the test, should be referred to the third writer, and not to the first. The theory fails wholly to account for this solitary occurrence of the sacred name at the outset of an Elohist message.

Again, ch. xxiii., though neither Divine name is found in it, is referred to the Elohist, and thereby separated

from nearly the whole preceding and following history. But its links of connexion are many with previous parts, not Elohistie. The last previous verse of the Elohim document would be, 'And Abraham was a hundred years old when his son Isaac was born unto him.' Then, without one word of Sarah's joy, or Isaac's weaning, childhood or manhood, the sequel would come, leaping over thirty-seven years at a bound, 'And Sarah was 127 years old, the years of the life of Sarah. And Sarah died in Kirjath-arba.'

Again, the mention of Hebron refers to xiii. 18, xiv. 13, xviii. 1, where Abraham's sojourn there is named. The words, 'I am a stranger and sojourner,' refer to the first promise, xii. 7, xiii. 14-17. The words, 'Thou art a mighty prince among us,' refer to the victory, xiv. 16-24; and the friendly intercourse with the sons of Heth to the earlier statement, xiv. 13. The whole account is firmly fixed by the chronology to its actual place, later than the sacrifice of Isaac, and before his marriage. Among the adjoining chapters this, more than any other, might be viewed possibly as a later supplement, rather than a main part of the fundamental document.

75. The parts assigned to the Junior Elohist are eh. xx., xxi. 1, 2b, 3, 6, 7, 10-17a, 17c, 20a, 21-34, xxii. 1-13, 19. And here the hypothesis is a combination of paradoxes, hard to refute from their total want of even the least show of evidence. First, the existence of this writer depends on an admission fatal to the whole theory. For the distinctness of the Elohist and Jehovist is alleged to depend on the concurrence of two separate tests, the use of the Divine names, and certain supposed contrasts in

the nature of the contents. But because some parts agree with the Elohist in the use of the Divine name, and with the Jehovist in other features, a third writer is invented to whom these may be referred. The portion of the book assigned him is one-sixth, just equal to that assigned to the Elohist. Thus it is really admitted, that the alleged tests of diverse authorship contradict each other, just as often as they seem to agree. And since only about one-half of what is assigned to the Elohist is properly Elohistie, and the rest consists of verses wrenched out of their context in Jehovistic sections, the true result is that Elohistie parts agree twice as often in character with the Jehovistic as they differ, and the theory is disproved and condemned by the data of its own authors.

Next, the document of this Junior Elohist is made to commence with Abraham's sojourn in Gerar, and the episode with Abimelech. But such a commencement of a separate work or document is wholly incredible. It is here doubly so, because this history is a sequel of xii. 10-20, of the same general character, only modified by the difference in the character of Abimelech—a history where there is more of grace and less of righteousness. But the theory reverses and destroys this delicate relation between two real events in one continuous history. The event, ch. xx., is made to be first recorded, the opening of a separate composition; and then, a century later, the other account of the descent into Egypt proceeds from a wholly different hand.

Again, the last verse of this chapter, because of the Divine name, is severed from the rest, and assigned to the Jehovist. But its inseparable connexion with the verse

before it is perfectly clear. Without this key, the other verse would be an unsolved enigma, instead of forming the climax to the moral of the whole narrative. No writer, not drunk with the spirit of hypothesis, would dream of giving them to two writers a century apart from each other. The confused patchwork into which ch. xxi. is resolved by the theory has been already shown. But indeed, amidst its extreme simplicity, the narrative here baffles all the attempts of the most subtle anatomists to tear the parts asunder. Thus xxi. 1-3, referred to the Junior Elohist, alludes plainly to xvii. 19, 21, referred to the Elohist; and as plainly to xviii. 14, referred to the Jehovist. Again, vv. 6, 7, referred to the second writer, refer directly to xviii. 13, 15, ascribed to the third, a hundred years later. Also v. 10, still referred to the Junior Elohist, is the direct continuation of vv. 8, 9, referred to a fourth writer, some centuries later, and becomes unmeaning when separated from them; while v. 17, referred piecemeal to the second and fourth writers conjointly, is the echo and varied repetition of xvi. 7, 8, 13, referred to the third writer, the Jehovist, distinct from both. Again, v. 21, still referred to the Junior Elohist, links itself with xvi. 1, of the Jehovist, which mentions the country of Hagar. The words, also, of xxi. 33, 34, by the principles of the theory, assign themselves to the Jehovist; and they are so linked with the rest of the chapter, as its consummation, as wholly to destroy the argument for diversity of authors from the various use of the Divine names.

Again, in ch. xxii., vv. 1-13 are ascribed to the second writer vv. 14-18 to the third, v. 19 to the second, and vv. 20-24 to the third once more: the next chapter being

given to the Elohist, or first writer. A separation more forced and unnatural could hardly be devised. It is self-evident that vv. 14-18 are the direct sequel of the previous account of the sacrifice, on which its moral significance entirely depends. To call them 'evidently a Jehovistic appendage, loosely added to the preceding account,' proves the blindness and critical fatuity which may accompany claims to superior wisdom and learning.

76. To the Redactor are ascribed two passages, xix. 30-38, xxi. 8, 9, one clause in xxi. 17, and the last words of xxiv. 67. What the pretences may be for this whimsical selection it is hard to divine. There is no use of either sacred name in the first passage; and its simply genealogical character would seem to fix it at once to the same writer with the other genealogies, most of which are referred to the Elohist. This passage, also, links itself by a plain moral unity with the rest of the chapter, of which it forms the close, and with the earlier mention of Lot, chh. xi. xii. xiv.; who now disappears from the history, after his relation to the Moabites and Ammonites has been shown, just as Ishmael disappears after the mention of his twelve sons, xxv. 13-18; and Esau, after the genealogy of the Edomites, ch. xxxvi. The perfect unity of plan in these three cases is alone fatal to the sceptical theory, which parts these closing passages among four different authors.

The ascription of xxi. 8, 9, to the Redactor is still more strange. For v. 9 is plainly the beginning of a new paragraph, and the key to the ten verses that follow. Nothing can be clearer than that these verses are an integral part of the narrative in which they stand. In like

manner, one clause of xxiv. 67 is ascribed to him, plainly to destroy the mark of unity thus supplied between the two successive chapters, xxiii. and xxiv., and for no other conceivable reason whatever.

77. In reviewing this portion of the history, it is plain that the sceptical theory divides a connected and continuous narrative into forty portions, ascribed to four writers, who range from the time of Saul to that of Manasseh, in equal contempt of all external and of all internal evidence. Thus, in this fundamental portion of the history, the Elohist has only fifty-seven verses ascribed to him out of 360, or less than a sixth of the whole. Seven of these are picked out of chh. xii.–xvi., a portion clearly Jehovistic, where the sacred name occurs thirty times in succession, and Elohim not once. Ch. xvii. is ascribed to him, because Elohim occurs in it seven times, though the sacred name appears in its first verse; and this, by the test, would assign it to the Jehovist, like those which precede and follow. Ch. xx., which exactly resembles ch. xvii., since Elohim occurs six times, but Jehovah once at the close, is not referred to the Elohist, but to another wholly different writer. So also ch. xxi., which is wholly Elohistic, except in the first and two last verses, is transferred almost entirely to this third source, with the exception of two verses of chronological detail. Last of all, a chapter which supplies no test from the presence of either name is ascribed to the Elohist; though it is preceded and followed by Jehovistic passages, with which it has the closest connexion, both in point of time and in moral unity. The sacred narrative is rent into tatters, into verses, and fractions of a verse; but

every attempt to give the recomposed documents some air of completeness only involves the scheme in deeper and more hopeless contradictions. The more thoroughly the hypothesis is examined by the ordinary rules of evidence, the more difficult will it be to explain how it could ever have arisen ; unless from a judicial visitation, which turns wise men backward, and makes their knowledge foolish, when they dare, with unholy hands, to tear in pieces and mangle the oracles of the living God.

CHAPTER IX.

THE HISTORY OF ISAAC AND JACOB.

78. THE twelve chapters, Gen. xxv.-xxxvi., including the genealogy of Esau, form plainly a continuous and connected history, reaching from the marriage of Isaac to his death, an interval of 140 years. Nine chapters are occupied with the life of Jacob, from the time when he obtained the blessing by subtilty until his return to Isaac at Hebron. It includes, in regular order, his flight from Esau, and journey to Haran, the vision and promise he received at Bethel, his stay with Laban, and the birth of his eleven sons, his six years of longer service, his abrupt return, his encounter with Esau and their reconciliation, the sin of Dinah and destruction of the Shechemites, the return to Bethel, the birth of Benjamin, the return to Isaac at Hebron, and his death. The history is strictly continuous, and does not seem to contain one single departure from the true order of time.

This portion of the narrative, by the sceptical theory, is split up into 120 fragments, which are then assigned to the four different authors whom it professes to have discovered. Let us examine this wonderful mosaic, reviewing each chapter in succession.

79. Ch. xxv.

Here Elohim occurs once only, v. 11, and Jehovah four times, vv. 21-23. Hence, if the whole is viewed as closely united, it must be referred to the Jehovist; but if separated, vv. 1-18 may be supposed to belong to the Elohist; and all the rest, which is plainly one history, to the Jehovist. The scheme, however, breaks it up into eleven fragments, of which four are given to the Elohist, five to the Jehovist, six verses to the Redactor, and one clause to the Junior Elohist!

i. First, vv. 1-6 are given to the Jehovist. This is so far natural, that it assigns them to the same author with the last chapter. The passage is plainly a direct sequel of the previous history. In v. 5 there is a distinct allusion to xxiv. 36. The genealogy of these sons of Abraham by Keturah resembles those in x. 21-31, xix. 37, 38, and xxii. 20-24, all collateral lines to the sacred family, through Shem and Eber, Terah and Abraham, so as to imply strongly one common author.

ii. Vv. 7-11a. These verses are ascribed to the Elohist, but the last clause of v. 11 to the Junior Elohist. This supposed interpolation of a solitary clause from a distinct author is doubly unnatural in those who repel a similar solution, almost with contempt, when used to set aside a few supposed anachronisms. In this case we read the decision,—‘No interpolation hypothesis can be regarded otherwise than as a tacit admission of the insuperable difficulty that exists in the assumption of Mosaic authorship, and therefore we reject all such expedients.’ But though four interpolations in the whole book are held intolerable, when used to remove an argument against the

genuineness of the Pentateuch, four in one chapter alone are here adopted, without scruple, as a normal and usual feature of the composite theory. (11b, 17, 20, 26b.)

The transfer of these verses to a different author from those before them can have no ground in the sacred names. For no such name occurs in vv. 1-6, and Elohim once only in v. 11. Hence all might be assigned to the Elohist, or to the Jehovist, without any violence to the main theory. But these verses are plainly the continuation of those before. It is ridiculous to suppose that any writer would pass from the last acts of Abraham to the genealogy of Ishmael, and the genealogy and history of Isaac, without any allusion to the patriarch's death. Still further, the words, 'while he yet lived,' in v. 6, are plainly the direct preparation for the two verses that follow, with their brief account of Abraham's death. Again, the mention of his age, 175 years, continues the series of notices xii. 4, xvi. 3, 16, xvii. 1, 17, 24, xxi. 5, xxiii. 1, of which the four first are Jehovistic, the three next Elohist, and the last neutral, so far as the names are a test, but which form together one clear sign of the common authorship of all the chapters where they occur. The mention of Isaac and Ishmael refers to ch. xvi. 11, 15, xvii. 18, 19, xxi. 3, and that of the cave of Machpelah to ch. xxiii., while the mention of Beer-lahai-roi, v. 11, refers plainly to xvi. 7-14, a Jehovistic passage. On this ground, no doubt, the extraordinary expedient is used of making this one clause an interpolation of the Junior Elohist. But the pains are wasted, since this junior, like the senior, could not refer to the words of the Jehovist, who is placed a century later than himself. It is plain that vv. 1-11 must be from one

and the same author, and the same who wrote the previous chapter. Thus the whole is reclaimed to the Jehovist, that is, to Moses, as far as v. 16.

iii. V. 17 is given to the Elohist, while those before and after are assigned to the Jehovist; and again v. 20 in the same arbitrary way. But the context forbids the separation in either case. Thus, in xi. 27-31, we have the genealogy of the sons of Terah, followed, v. 32, by Terah's age and death. In xxv. 1-6, we have the sons of Abraham by Keturah, followed, vv. 7, 8, by his age and death. In xxv. 12-16 the genealogy of the sons of Ishmael, followed, v. 17, by Ishmael's age and death. In xxxv. 22-27 the genealogy of the grandsons of Isaac, followed, vv. 28, 29, by Isaac's age and death. In l. 22, 23, we have Joseph's children, followed, v. 26, by Joseph's age and death. This uniform plan, in five cases, proves the unity of each passage, and also indicates the plan of one common author. None of these passages has any test of its origin in the use of the sacred names. Yet the scheme refers the first to the Elohist, the second and third to the Jehovist, the fourth to the Junior Elohist, the last to the Redactor and Jehovist in partnership together, in utter defiance of reason and common sense. Here it is self-evident that v. 17 is the direct sequel of the verses before it, and that v. 18 is the geographical topstone of the whole passage.

iv. Vv. 20 and 26b are taken from their context, and assigned to the Elohist. The theory is driven to this desperate expedient, in order to have some link of connexion between the genealogy of ch. xi. and the life of Jacob, since in this interval hardly an Elohist passage is to be found. But the separation in each case is plainly absurd.

The text would then read, ' And these are the generations of Isaac, Abraham's son : Abraham begat Isaac, and Isaac intreated the Lord for his wife, because she was barren.' The omission of the marriage and age at marriage in the intermediate verse makes the simple narrative, so clear and complete as it stands, almost ridiculous. Again, the fragments reserved for the Elohist have even a stranger appearance. ' And these are the years of the life of Ishmael, 137 years ; and he gave up the ghost, and died, and was gathered unto his people. And Isaac was forty years old when he took Rebekah to wife, the daughter of Bethuel the Syrian, of Padan-aram, the sister to Laban the Syrian. And Isaac was threescore years old when she bare them !' By this triumph of modern criticism, the father and brother of Rebekah are identified with her twin children, whose names are not given. On the other hand, the clause 26b is essential to the paragraph before it, since it shows that there had been twenty years of delay and barrenness between Isaac's marriage and the birth of his sons.

v. Vv. 29-34 are assigned to the Redactor, on what pretext it is hard to say. In xxvii. 36, which the scheme itself refers to the Jehovist, there is a direct allusion to this whole paragraph. It could not, then, have been from a later, though it might be from an earlier writer, if there were really more than one. But since the whole chapter before it has now been shown to have one and the same source, links itself by its opening with the Jehovistic chapter that precedes, and here, at the close, with ch. xxvii., admitted to be also Jehovistic, the unity of all the three chapters is directly proved by internal evidence.

81. Ch. xxvi.

This chapter is a brief record of Isaac's peaceful life. Tried by the test of the names, it is Jehovistic from first to last. The sacred name is found in it seven times, from v. 2 to v. 29; and Elohim, as a simple name, never. The scheme of Davidson and Hupfeldt, however, as if Chaos sat umpire, does not here allow the Jehovist a single verse, but shares all among the Elohist, Junior Elohist, and Redactor. To the Redactor, as coming latest, is assigned, of course, the earliest and most fundamental portion, or vv. 1-5, 7-12, with 18, 19, 23, 24. To the Junior Elohist are given nine verses in the middle, but in five morsels, vv. 6, 13, 14a, 16, 17, 19-22, 25a. To the Elohist, as first in time, is allotted the conclusion and sequel, vv. 26-33a, where the sacred name appears twice, and Elohim never. If the aim of these critics had been to show how many inconsistencies could be heaped up in one hypothesis, their success could hardly have been more complete.

i. The first paragraph, vv. 1-5, is ascribed to the Redactor. Yet it is plainly the basis on which the whole sequel depends. It contains the sacred name, Jehovah, and records a vision; and, by the maxims of the theorists themselves, should be referred to the Jehovist, and thus continue the previous narrative from the same hand. It also refers directly to xii. 10, a Jehovistic passage; and, again, to xx. 1, 2. In vv. 3, 4, it refers once more to the oath, xxii. 15-18, also a Jehovistic passage; and in v. 5 to xviii. 18, 19, another of the same kind.

ii. In vv. 6-16 we have one connected paragraph of Isaac's abode in Gerar. The scheme refers vv. 6, 13, 14a,

16, to the Junior Elohist, and the rest to the Redactor, breaking the whole into five portions. But the division is senseless and absurd. For v. 7, 'the men of the place,' refers directly to the verse before it, 'And Isaac dwelt in Gerar;' and again, v. 13, 'the man waxed great,' refers equally to the words, 'He received a hundred-fold, and the Lord blessed him.' In like manner the words, 'the Philistines envied him,' assigned to the Redactor, refer to the statement, 'For he had possession of flocks, and possession of herds, and great store of servants;' which some author, according to the scheme, wrote in the days of Elisha, while the envy of the Philistines was added by another in the time of Manasseh. The whole passage is plainly from the same author as vv. 1-5, of which it is the direct consequence. Isaac obeyed the instruction; and, instead of copying Abraham's example in the first famine, remained in Gerar. It is from the same author as xii. 10-20, to which it alludes. Isaac fell under the same temptation as his father had done. It has the same author, again, as xiii. 2, 6, to which it has a close resemblance.

iii. Vv. 17-25. These nine verses, again, have been parted into six fragments, alternately ascribed to the Redactor and Junior Elohist. By the test they plainly belong to the Jehovist, since the sacred name is found in them three times, and no other. Their unity is plain. Twice Isaac digs a well, and abandons it because the herdmen of Gerar strive for it. A third time he digs a well, and they cease to strive, and his patience and meekness are rewarded by a vision and a blessing. But while the narrative is one whole, and Jehovistic, it refers plainly to xxi. 25, an Elohist context; and in

vv. 23, 24, to xxi. 33, 34, the close of the same chapter where Abraham calls on the name of Jehovah, the everlasting God.

iv. Vv. 26-35. These verses, except one clause, the scheme paradoxically ascribes to the Elohist, though the sacred name occurs twice, and Elohim not at all. Its unity with the previous context is fixed by vv. 25, 32, 33, while the allusion to the previous league of Abraham, almost a century earlier, xxi. 22-34, is equally plain. The mercies to the father were, in substance, repeated to the son. But, beside the long interval, the contrasts are as striking as the general resemblance. Isaac had been thrust away in envy; but in Abraham's case, Abimelech's plea for favour was the kindness he had shown, and the fault of his servants is remedied as soon as known. This whole chapter, then, belongs to the same writer as chh. xxiv., xxvii., and also xxv., or to the writer of all the main portion of Abraham's and Isaac's history.

80. Ch. xxviii.

The previous chapter is assigned to the Jehovist in the scheme itself, an admission of their unity with the previous narrative, excepting the last verse, which is supposed to be from the Redactor. But here vv. 1-9 are given to the Elohist, 10-12 to the Junior Elohist, 13-16 to the Redactor, and 17-22 to the Junior Elohist again. This fourfold division is less complicated and unnatural than the utter dissolution in chh. xxi., xxv., and xxvi., but is still groundless and untenable.

And first, v. 46 is plainly the link of connexion between the fears of Rebekah, with her advice to Jacob, vv. 42-45, and Isaac's charge, which follows on her com-

plaint, xxviii. 1. The union is so close as to show that all have the same author. But the scheme assigns the first to the Jehovist, the second to the Redactor, and the third to the Elohist, writers five centuries apart from each other.

Next, the charge of Isaac refers plainly to the mission of Abraham's servant, in answer to which Rebekah came from Padan-aram to Palestine. There alone we have the previous mention of Laban. The blessing, v. 3, also refers more immediately to the oath, xxii. 15-18; and a whole series of Jehovistic promises, chh. xii.-xviii. Again, the statement concerning Esau, vv. 6-9, refers plainly to xxvi. 34, 35, and also to xxv. 13; the latter Jehovistic in the scheme, and the other proved by its connexion to belong to xxvi. 26-33, a Jehovistic section. Hence the whole passage, xxviii. 1-9, is falsely ascribed to a different author from the four previous chapters.

In xxviii. 10-22 we have a connected account of Jacob's journey, of his vision at Bethel, and the vow that followed. The scheme refers the greater part to the Junior Elohist; but vv. 13-16 to the Redactor, two centuries later. It is wearisome to deal with these violent dislocations and manglings of plain history. Here v. 13 is the natural sequel of v. 12, and depends directly upon it. Again, vv. 16, 17, are closely connected, so that the second implies the first. The mention of the waking is the natural sequel of the dream, v. 12; and the fear was his waking meditation, when the dream and vision were gone by. The whole passage is plainly one consistent narrative; and Jehovistic, since the sacred name occurs four times in these thirteen verses, and Elohim, as a simple name, once only. The promise also, v. 14, is a repetition of

that to Abraham, xiii. 14-16; and again, xxii. 18, both Jehovistic sections. The mention of Haran links itself with xii. 4, 5, where it is last mentioned; while the naming of Bethel prepares the way for a whole chapter (xxxv.), Elohist throughout, of the later history. It thus appears that the Elohist and Jehovist are the same person, the Elohist referring to Jehovistic sections which have gone before.

82. Chh. xxix. xxx.

No sacred name occurs in vv. 1-30 of the next chapter, but the name Jehovah four times in the five last verses. The theory ascribes the whole to the Jehovist. On its own hypothesis this decision is capricious, but is so far correct, that the writer is taken to be the same as in chh. xxiv., xxv. 19-28, xxvii.; and who has been shown, by internal evidence, to be also the writer of chh. xxv. 29-34, xxvi., and xxviii. But the history is a direct continuation of xxviii. 16-22, and not of xxvii. 41-45, the last Jehovistic section in the scheme; and the whole narrative, with its vivid and minute delineation, is absurdly ascribed to an author in the time of Uzziah, eight or nine hundred years after the interview occurred.

Again, ch. xxx. is ascribed to the Jehovist, except vv. 14-16 and 40b, which are separated from the rest, and given to the Redactor. But those verses are necessary to explain the transition from v. 13 to v. 17, since they show that Leah still felt herself comparatively slighted and forsaken. The whole chapter, then, is justly ascribed to the same author with the last. But the theory, in making this admission, destroys the principle on which it

affects to rest. For in xxx. 1-23, Elohim occurs eight times, and Jehovah not once; so that by the rule it should be referred to the Elohist, not the Jehovist. Yet it is plainly unnatural to ascribe the record of the birth of four older patriarchs to one writer, and that of seven younger ones to another, who lived three centuries earlier.

83. Ch. xxxi.

In this chapter the sacred name occurs twice, near the beginning and the close; but Elohim seven times as a simple name, and eight times in a compound title. On the sceptical hypothesis, the whole has thus a strong claim to be given to the Elohist. Its treatment, however, is a marvel of critical sagacity. It is divided into somewhere about thirty-six portions, eleven verses, out of fifty-five, being shared between two writers. The Elohist, who might seem to claim the whole except two verses, has only v. 18; the Junior Elohist, vv. 2, 4-9, 11a, 13-17a, 19a, 20, 23b, 24, 26, 28, 29, 31a, 38-41ac, 42, 46, 47, 51, 52, 53b, 54a, or fifteen fragments; the Jehovist, v. 1, 3, 17b, 19b, 21-23a, 25, 26a, 27, 30, 31a, 50b, 53a, 54c, or eleven fragments; and the Redactor, vv. 10, 11b, 12, 18, 23c, 41b, 48b-50a, 51b, 52b, or nine fragments. In the analysis of this chapter, learned pedantry has certainly achieved a signal triumph over common sense, as well as religious reverence for the word of God. Any hypothesis which parts this simple, clear, and connected narrative, so true to life in every particular, into forty morsels, by three different authors three centuries apart, curiously inwrought together like a tessellated pavement, may be left to sink under the weight of its own folly.

If, however, the sceptical theorists fall back on the simpler view, that this chapter, except vv. 3, 49, is from the Elohist, the name Jehovah being there a later interpolation, reasons start up on every side to refute the hypothesis of separation, even in this less monstrous form. For the whole depends plainly on the previous narrative of Jacob's twenty years with Laban, and cannot be understood without it. But this narrative, both by the use of the names and the confession of the theorists, is Jehovistic. Thus v. 5 refers to xxx. 27; v. 7 to v. 33; v. 13 to xxviii. 16-20; 13b to xxviii. 15; v. 14 to xxix. 25-30; v. 15 to xxix. 27; v. 18 to xxviii. 2, 5; v. 20 to xxv. 20; v. 24 to xx. 3; v. 38 to xxix. 20, 27, and xxxi. 7; and v. 53 to xi. 29; xxii. 20, 21; xxiv. 10; xxix. 5. The narrative is not only connected throughout, but linked with the whole course of the previous history.

84. Ch. xxxii.

The narrative, from v. 9 of this chapter, becomes purely Elohist to the end of the book, except in chh. xxxviii. and xxxix., and the ejaculation of Jacob, xlix. 18. This prayer in his distress, and that death-bed confession, are like two mountain-tops of faith and hope, with a long valley of mystery and sorrow between them. Here, however, where we should expect nearly the whole to be assigned to the Elohist, he almost disappears from the scheme. Out of more than 600 verses only thirty are ascribed to him, or less than one-twentieth of the whole. In this chapter, especially, he is not allowed to own a single verse. The Junior Elohist has vv. 1, 2, 22c, 24b-31a; the Jehovist, vv. 3-21, 22b, 23b; and the Redactor, 22a, 23a, and 31a, 32. The two first

verses, strangely severed from their context, are proved by the geography to be an integral part of the narrative, for Mahanaim lies between Mizpeh and Penuel. The separation, again, of vv. 22–24 into seven fragments is plainly absurd. Here the higher criticism surpasses itself, and gives this result. ‘And he rose up that night,’ *age of Saul*, ‘and took his two wives, and his two women-servants, and his eleven sons,’ *age of Uzziah*, ‘and passed over the ford Jabbok,’ *age of Elisha*. ‘And he took them,’ *age of Manasseh*, ‘and sent them over the brook; and sent over that he had,’ *age of Uzziah*. ‘And Jacob was left alone,’ *age of Manasseh*; ‘and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day,’ *age of Elisha*. Further comment is needless on such a scheme. The whole chapter, except in v. 9, is Elohist, like the sequel, but plainly belongs to and continues the previous Jehovistic narrative, thus establishing the unity of the whole history of the three patriarchs.

85. Chh. xxxiii., xxxiv.

The first of these chapters is Elohist in the names, and in the second neither name appears. The scheme, however, constant in its inconstancy, gives xxxiii. 1–16 to the Jehovist, and also the main part of ch. xxxiv. But xxxiii. 17, 18b, 19, xxxiv. 2b, 5, 7, 13b, 19, 26, 27, 31, are assigned to the Redactor, and no part to either Elohist, though here the purely Elohist division of Genesis begins. It is quite true that the writer here, as elsewhere, is the Jehovist; that is, one who freely uses the sacred name wherever occasion requires. But it is no less true that the separation of the verses thus ascribed to the Redactor is without a shadow of internal ground.

And first, v. 17 is a direct sequel of xxxi. 47, 49, xxxii. 2, 30, 31, the previous stations of Jacob at Mizpah, Mahanaim, and Penuel. These are ascribed, in the scheme, to the Junior Elohist, to whom, in consistency, this v. 17 should also be given, and not to a fourth and much later writer. But the existence of this Junior Elohist has been already disproved. The passage xxxi. 47-49 is Jehovistic on the face of it. The mention of Mahanaim, also, and Penuel, is linked inseparably with Jacob's earnest prayer to Jehovah, who had ordained his journey, xxxii. 9, on which the emphasis of the later vision depends. The excision of v. 19, and of the previous words, 'which is in the land of Canaan,' is equally gratuitous; while the last verse, with its motto, 'God the Elohim of Israel,' is strangely left to the Jehovist undisturbed. The next chapter is divided into sixteen fragments, between the Jehovist and the Redactor, in the same capricious way. As a climax in this process of critical dissection, the complaint of Jacob, v. 30, is put into the lips of one writer, and the reply of his sons, v. 31, is given to another, a century or two centuries later in time, and more than a thousand years after the occurrence!

86. Chh. xxxv.-L.

In ch. xxxv. only the name Elohim occurs, and in ch. xxxvi. both are absent. In ch. xxxix. the sacred name occurs seven times. The other thirteen are the main Elohistie portion of the book, since the name Elohim occurs in them forty times, and the sacred name twice only. The higher criticism perseveres in its learned toil. It parts ch. xxxv. into fourteen, and ch. xxxvi. into twelve or thirteen portions, and ch. xxxvii., the first

of Joseph's history, alone into thirty fragments, and those which follow into twenty or thirty more. Also one-sixth is given to the Elohist, and two-thirds to the Jehovist, in this the most Elohist portion of the whole book.

When the hypothesis fails so miserably in dealing with the most important features of the problem it pretends to solve, it seems lost labour to disprove, in detail, the seventy or eighty changes of writers which it introduces in these sixteen remaining chapters. The mere statement, already given, of the manner in which it is attempted to dissect ch. xxxvii. into thirty different fragments, is alone, to simple minds, a full refutation of the whole theory. It seems more natural to pass on at once to the positive objections to a Mosaic origin, which these chapters and the other books of the Pentateuch are alleged to supply. These consist of anachronisms, which would prove the author to be later than Moses; contradictions or duplicate histories, which would infer the union of two imperfect and inconsistent accounts; and diversities or contrasts of style. Of the first class, from twenty to thirty have been advanced in recent works, and examined in the replies of Hengstenberg, Keil, Kurtz, and Havernich; but they deserve and will repay a fresh examination.

CHAPTER X.

ON ALLEGED ANACHRONISMS IN GENESIS.

87. THE CANAANITES.

Gen. xii. 6. 'And the Canaanite was then in the land.'
 xiii. 7. 'And the Canaanite and the Perizzite dwelled then in the land.'

From these words it has been argued that the writer must have lived after the expulsion of the Canaanites by Joshua; the sense being, that they were still in the land, and not yet expelled. Dr. Davidson remarks:—

'An ordinary reader must feel that they are a superfluous addition, if not later than Moses. The writer means the particular tribe or race of the Canaanites. This is given as a reason for Abraham's finding them in the locality where he first settled, a part remote from the sea. In Moses' time the tribe in question dwelt near the sea, and at the Jordan, away from Abraham's first place of residence. The remark, then, could have had no propriety if it came from Moses.'

The objection rests on the view, that there is an implied contrast with the occupation of the land by Israel in the time of the writer. But this notion is plainly untrue, and even absurd. What Jewish writer, under David or Solomon, could think it needful to remind his readers

that Abraham was earlier than Joshua, and that the Canaanites had not been extirpated in his days. The idea of guarding against such a mistake is preposterous. Neither the previous narrative, nor current tradition, could leave room for a suspicion that Joshua had driven them out before Abraham entered the land.

The true sense is plain from the context. In ch. x. we have been told that in the days of Peleg 'the earth was divided.' In ch. xi. only fourteen verses separate the mention of Peleg from the call of Abram; and in these no allusion is made to the migration of the sons of Canaan, or their occupation of Palestine. Hence, looking to the previous record alone, in its rapid transition from the days of Noah to those of Abraham, it might well seem open to doubt whether the Canaanites were already there when Abram arrived. The main purpose is clearly, as Hengstenberg has said, to record the fact that 'Abraham, the bearer of so great a promise, came as a stranger and a pilgrim, and had not a foot of land he could call his own.' But still some contrast with a possible misconception must as plainly be here intended. And that misconception, as evidently, is not the preposterous idea that the Israelites had expelled the Canaanites at the time of the Call, a century before Israel was born; but the conjecture that this Call, named only a few verses after the confusion of tongues, might have been even earlier than the Canaanitish occupation of the land. The word *then* is the only proper translation of the Hebrew word; but *then, even already*, is not less clearly the implied meaning, or correct paraphrase.

Dr. Davidson, however, in the above extract, supposes

a contrast with the later position of the Canaanites near the sea-coast. This proves, he says, that the remark could not be from Moses,—a strange instance of confusion of thought. For the effect of this construction would evidently be just the reverse, to destroy the whole objection, and to prove that the words might be those of Moses himself; since the Canaanites were by the sea-coast in his days, at the mission of the spies in the second year of the Exodus, Num. xiii. 29. If the words referred, then, to their removal from Sichem, in the centre, to the sea, no one could be so likely as Moses to have noticed the change. In his zeal to confirm the objection, the writer destroys it. But there is no reason to think, that ‘in the land’ means only ‘in the central part of it,’ or that ‘the Canaanites’ is here a specific, and not rather a generic term. The repetition, in xiii. 7, has a double purpose. It gives more emphasis to the contrast between Abram’s pilgrim state, though rich, and an actual inheritance; and the mention of the Perizzites, the more pastoral inhabitants of the un-walled villages, Ezek. xxxviii. 11, explains how it came to pass that the flocks of the two patriarchs were straitened through want of sufficient pasture.

88. HEBRON, or KIRJATH-ARBA.

Gen. xiii. 18. ‘In the plains of Mamre, which are in Hebron.’ xxiii. 2. ‘And Sarah died in Kirjath-arba: the same is Hebron in the land of Canaan.’ xxv. 11. ‘In the field of Ephron the Hittite, which is before Mamre.’

xxxv. 27. ‘Unto Mamre, unto the city of Arba, which is Hebron.’ xlix. 30, L. 13. ‘Before Mamre in the land of Canaan.’

Num. xiii. 22. ‘And they came unto Hebron . . . Now Hebron was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt.’

Josh. xiv. 15. 'And the name of Hebron before was Kirjath-arba; a great man among the Anakims.'

Here it is argued from the text in Joshua, that Hebron first received that name in the time of Joshua and Caleb, and indeed from Caleb's son; so that the name could not appear in a genuine work of Moses. The reply of Hengstenberg is that Hebron was the earlier name; that Kirjath-arba was of later origin, from one of the Anakims, between the death of Abraham and the time of Joshua; and that the earlier name was then revived and retained. To this it is retorted that the words in Joshua are absolute, and do not naturally admit of this meaning.

Now the first inquiry must be,—Does the text in Joshua mean that Kirjath-arba was the only name by which the city had been known before the Conquest? This is certainly not its sense, for two weighty reasons. First, besides Hebron, the city is twice called Mamre in the Book of Genesis. And this name is plainly derived from the Hittite, who, with his brothers Aner and Eshcol, was in league with Abraham, and took part in the victory over the four kings. Again, Arba was a chief man among the Anakims, and we have no hint of the presence of these Anakims in the days of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Hence the words in Joshua must plainly mean that Kirjath-arba was the name current among the Canaanites, when Caleb wrested the city from them. Thus Mamre and Kirjath-arba will be two successive names, derived from two chief inhabitants; the earlier, Mamre the Hittite, brother of Aner and Eshcol; and the

later, Arba, possibly the king of Hebron, who is mentioned in the list of those dispossessed and overthrown.

But besides these two names, Mamre and Kirjath-arba, or city of Arba, derived from the Canaanite possessors, have we no sign or proof that the name Hebron was in use before the days of Moses? This may be deduced, first of all, from the meaning of the name, *society*, or *association*. This might have been given by the first Canaanite settlers, but it is more probable that the sacred history itself supplies the key. We read in Gen. xiv. 3. of the five kings, that they were 'joined together (הברו) in the vale of Siddim, which is the salt sea.' They were routed and slain, and their people made captive by the four kings. Next we are told that Abram dwelt in the plain of Mamre the Amorite, brother of Eshcol and brother of Aner, and *these were confederate with Abram*. In common, they pursue the kings, rout them completely, and rescue the captives. It is the sole instance of confederacy or association with the Amorites or Canaanites in the Book of Genesis, and is connected with the most signal and conspicuous political event in the history of Abraham. What could be more natural than that the city or town where Mamre dwelt, and where the compact (ברית, v. 13) was made, should be named by Abraham, and perhaps by his companions, הברון, *association*? The word is rendered *coupling together*, Exod. xxvi. 3, 6, 9; xxxvi. 10, 13, 16; *league*, Dan. xi. 23; *compact*, Ps. cxxii. 3; and *fellowship*, Ps. xciv. 20. The name, if it arose from this league of Abraham with the three Amorites, would remain in use in Abraham's family, and be the sacred and abiding name; while they might adopt along with it the successive

titles given by the Canaanites, when they 'called the lands after their own names.' (Ps. xlix. 11.) This key will explain all the variations in the text.

89. The first mention of the city is in Gen. xiii. 18, 'Abram dwelt in the plains of Mamre, which are in Hebron.' The plains are mentioned by their native title at the time, since Mamre was then alive. But since that title had passed away, it is explained by the permanent name of the city, which had continued unchanged from Abraham to Moses among the Hebrews, while Mamre had been replaced by Kirjath-arba among the Canaanites. And besides, 'the plains of Mamre which are in Mamre,' would have been a tautology. The early but transient name has its meaning fixed by the other, which was more sacred, and also more lasting.

ii. 'And Sarah died at Kirjath-arba, the same is Hebron, in the land of Canaan.' These words are a direct sign of the Mosaic authorship. A later writer in the age of David or Solomon might have named the place, either simply by its actual name Hebron, or by its name at the time of Sarah's death among the Amorites, that is Mamre. But there seems no reason why he should introduce a name, certainly not in use when Sarah died, and as certainly obsolete in his own age. On the other hand, Kirjath-arba was the actual name of the city among the Canaanites before the death of Moses; and its introduction, in his case, is quite natural, though in a fictitious Elohists or Jehovists it would be wholly out of place.

The words, 'in the land of Canaan' ought clearly to be separated by a slight pause. They are not meant to distinguish Hebron from some other city of that name,

not in Canaan, for no mention of such occurs in the Bible, but to point out that Sarah died and was buried in the land of pilgrimage and promised inheritance. It is thus a weighty and natural addition, answering to xxxvii. 1 — ‘And Jacob dwelt in the land wherein his father was a stranger, in the land of Canaan.’

iii. ‘Before Mamre, the same is Hebron, in the land of Canaan.’ As the former verse identifies Kirjath-arba, the actual Canaanite name when Moses wrote, so this identifies Mamre, the earlier Canaanite name, with Hebron, the sacred Abrahamic name from first to last. The Masoretic pause, neglected by our translators, is here plainly after Hebron, not after Mamre, and thus confirms the previous remark. In the land of Canaan Sarah died, and in the land of Canaan she was buried. The place is fixed by its earlier and later Amorite name, and by its constant name in the family of Abraham.

iv. ‘And Jacob came unto Isaac his father, unto Mamre, the city of Arba, which is Hebron, where Abraham and Isaac sojourned.’ Here we have, in natural order, the native name at the time of the event, the native name when Moses wrote, and the sacred name, permanent in the sacred family, ever since that *הברית*, or *league* of unity between Abraham and Mamre, Aner, and Eshcol, which was crowned by their victory over the confederate kings.

v. ‘So he sent him out of the vale of Hebron.’ This narrative relates entirely to the internal history of Jacob’s own family, and hence the Canaanitish name is not introduced, but the more sacred title alone.

vi. xlix. 30, ‘Which is before Mamre, in the land of Canaan.’ l. 13, ‘Before Mamre.’

In the former passage, where Jacob speaks, Kirjath-arba, a later name, could not be used, and does not appear. He employs naturally the native name, Mamre, then in use at the time. The historian retains it, therefore, when he relates how the sons of Jacob fulfilled his dying charge.

vii. Num. xiii. 22. ‘And they ascended by the south, and came unto Hebron, where were Ahiman, Sheshai, and Talmai, the children of Anak. And Hebron was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt.’ The name Mamre was now obsolete, and the old name, Hebron, was alone appropriate, since the mention of the sons of Anak involved a virtual allusion to its other name, the city of Arba. The added clause implies the writer’s intimate knowledge of its whole history, even from its foundation before the time of Abraham.

viii. Josh. xiv. 13, 15. Here the sacred name is still used, as most familiar to the Israelites. It is mentioned as the habitual name, and not at all as now first imposed, for there was nothing in Caleb’s conquest to give rise to such a name. It is only noted, in passing, how the later Canaanite name had arisen. ‘He was the great man among the Anakims’—their most noted leader, probably only one or two generations at most before the time of the conquest.

ix. The only counter argument, that Caleb ‘called it after one of his sons,’ (Dav. ‘Int.’ p. 2.), seems to be nothing else than a critical blunder, founded on 1 Chron. ii. 42. The Caleb there named is the brother of Jerahmeel, or Chelubai, v. 9, the son of Hezron and great-grandson of Judah. The sons of Caleb the son of Je-

phunneh are named much later, iv. 15, Iru, Elah, and Naam, but not Hebron. The passage ii. 42 is obscure, but seems to imply that Hebron was grandson to the earlier Caleb, which would place him in the sixth generation from Judah. But there is also a still earlier Hebron, the grandson of Levi and uncle of Moses, Exod. vi. 18, from whom a family were named in the wilderness, Num. iii. 27. There is thus no ground whatever for the assertion that Caleb the son of Jephunneh had a son, called Hebron, from whom the city derived its name.

90. DAN.

The most plausible charge of anachronism is founded on Gen. xiv. 14, when compared with the history of the Danites, and their occupation of Laish or Leshem in Josh. xix. and Judg. xviii. How could the place be called Dan by Moses, if the name were first given to it long after his death? Hence Prideaux, Reland, Witsius, the older defenders of the authenticity of Genesis, have supposed that Laish might have been changed to Dan at some later period. On the other hand, Havernick, Kurtz, and Hengstenberg, rather maintain that there was a second Dan in the same neighbourhood, distinct from Dan-Laish. On this hypothesis Dr. Davidson remarks:—

‘It would be difficult to convince an impartial reader that any other than the well-known city is intended in the Pentateuch, or that the hypothesis of two places identical in name, and not far distant, is other than arbitrary. That the name, Dan, stands by prolepsis, or prophetic anticipation, is quite improbable. Nor is it more likely that Laish originally stood here, and was altered for the new name by a later writer.’

This objection, unlike most of the others, has some

strong apparent force. Unless clearer reasons can be offered than those of Jahn or Hengstenberg for the existence of two Dans near together, one older than Moses, the difficulty will remain, and will be some presumption, however slight, in favour of an origin of the book during the time of the Judges or the Kings. But the following remarks will give, I think, a full solution of the difficulty, and turn it into a new proof of the unity and consistency of the sacred narrative.

i. The name Dan, in the later books, is constantly associated either with Beersheba or Bethel; in the former case, as a northern limit of the land; and in the latter, as the place selected for the site of one of the golden calves. Both of these names are derived from signal events in the lives of the first patriarchs. This is some presumption that Dan had received its name in a similar way. In the phrase, 'from Dan to Beersheba,' one name alludes to the solemn oath and promise of God to Abraham. It seems unlikely that the other should allude only to the marauding expedition and idolatry of the Danite emigrants.

ii. The most striking event in the whole life of Abraham, viewed from without, was his victory over the kings, when he routed them at Dan, and chased them on the way to Damascus. Beerlahai-roi, Zoar, Beersheba, Moriah, Galeed, Bethel, Peniel, Succoth, Mahanaim, Abel Mizraim, all received lasting names from some event in the lives of the three patriarchs. It seems hardly possible that this notable victory of Abraham should leave behind it no trace of a similar kind.

iii. The name Dan, *judging* or *judgment*, if applied by

Abraham himself to the scene of his first encounter with the kings, is plainly most suitable and expressive. The word occurs in this very reference in the next chapter, where the plagues of Egypt are foretold. 'And also that nation whom they shall serve *will I judge*—DAN *anoki*.' That victory of Abraham was the pledge and earnest of every later deliverance. The Almighty was seen, almost visibly, executing judgment on behalf of His servant.

iv. The scene of the victory would be some night encampment of the kings. And this would not be likely to be within or under the walls of a Canaanite or Sidonian city, but might very naturally be around the springs or fountain of a river. Josephus says, that he pursued them unto Dan, 'for so the other source of the Jordan is styled.' The name, if it were given by Abraham to the place of the encounter, would thus belong naturally to a plot or encampment near the fountain, and not to any Canaanite city, though one might be near to the place. A name, also, given to the spot from an event so public and conspicuous, would be likely to be widely current, and might well be associated with Beersheba, as the popular Hebrew name for the northern limit of the land of promise. Both alike would thus be memorials of the most signal mercies of God to their forefather Abraham.

v. This view is confirmed by its analogy with the case of Bethel. The spot where Jacob received his vision first took this name, which was current side by side with that of Luz, the city. But after the conquest Luz itself was named Bethel, from the sacred spot of the vision, to which it was near.

vi. The words of Judg. xviii. 29, when weighed care-

fully, rather confirm this view than oppose it. 'They built a city, and dwelt therein. And they called the name of the city Dan, after the name of Dan their father, which was born to Israel; however, Laish was the name of the city at the first.' The threefold repetition of the word *city*, in these few lines, seems almost superfluous. But if this name attached before, not to the city itself, but to a river, fountain, or camping-ground in its immediate neighbourhood, and for quite a different reason, then the mention of the city has its full emphasis, and also the explanation of the reason of its name.

91. vii. The compound title, Dan-jaan, in 2 Sam. xxiv. 6, is a strong and hitherto unnoticed confirmation of this view. It means, 'Judging he answered *or* answereth.' Comp. Gen. xviii. 27, xxiii. 14. What words could be more expressive of the Patriarch's feelings of gratitude after his marvellous success? This fuller name must have been preserved by tradition, though the shorter was usually employed, and seems to fix its own origin to the time of Abraham. The name of the city had no such reference, but was an echo, in the lips of apostatizing Danites, of Rachel's name for Bilhah's firstborn, when she 'judged before the time,' and applied to the birth of Dan the truth really fulfilled afterwards in the birth of Joseph.

viii. It will complete the proof, and remove the last trace of the objection, if it can be made probable that the writer of Genesis himself has recognised the existence of Laish. That city is called Leshem (לֶשֶׁם) in Judges, two radicals being the same, but the third different.

Let us now turn to Gen. x. 19, and we read as fol-

lows,—‘ And the border of the Canaanites was from Sidon, as thou comest to Gerar, unto Gaza ; as thou goest, unto Sodom, and Gomorrah, and Admah, and Zeboim, even unto Lasha (לָשָׁא).’

It is natural to conclude that we have here a brief outline of the whole circuit of the land. We have plainly, in the first clause, the whole length of the sea-coast line, from Sidon, in the extreme north, to Gaza near Gerar in the furthest south. The second clause, then, should give the eastern side. It begins with the cities of the plain, at the south-eastern limit, or the southern end of the Dead Sea, and to complete the circuit, must end in the north-east. This is precisely the place of Laish, or Leshem, and here we find it said, ‘ even unto Lasha ’ (לָשָׁא). Two radicals are the same in each of the three forms,—Lasha, Leshem, and Laish, and the third only is different. Lasha does not differ more from Laish than this from Leshem. Nothing more than an uncertain guess is offered by Jerome and others, who regard this Lasha as the south-eastern limit ; and no allusion to a town or place of that name, near to Sodom, occurs in any other passage ; while Sidon, Gaza, Sodom, and Laish, would mark out the four cardinal limits of the land of promise. Thus, on the whole, it seems to result, from a comparison of the passage, that the scene of the encampment of the kings, and of Abraham’s victory, received the name Dan-jaan, ‘ judging he hath answered,’ or Dan simply, long before Laish changed its name through the Danite settlement ; and it is also probable that Laish is named even in Genesis, but under a varied and earlier form, as the north-eastern boundary of the Canaanite possessions.

It may be added, that the choice of this spot by the Danites for the mission of their spies first, and then for their military expedition, implies that they had some special reason for regarding it as a part of their inheritance. We have no sign in the history that it was formally allotted to them by Joshua, but the reverse. But if the source of the Jordan, near which the city lay, had borne the name Dan, the name of their tribe, ever since Abraham's victory, they might easily take this as a warrant to seize upon it as part of their destined inheritance.

92. AMALEK.

'In Gen. xxxvi. 12, 16, Amalek appears as a grandson of Esau and chief of an Arabian tribe, and according to all probability must be regarded, from the design of the genealogies, as the father of the Amalekites. But this contradicts the account in Gen. xiv. 7, according to which the Amalekites, at the time of the expedition of the kings from Asia, appeared on the field of history, and suffered a defeat from them.'—GESEN.

This difficulty, as Hengstenberg remarks, Le Clerc, Michaelis, and others have attempted to remove by assuming that Amalek, the son of Esau, had nothing to do with the Amalekites. But this expedient is wholly unnatural, and opposed to the clear purpose of the genealogy. The solution of Hengstenberg himself, after Mark and others, is simple and complete. The text in Gen. xiv. speaks only of the 'country of the Amalekites,' and not of the Amalekites themselves. This peculiar form of expression is used in this one case alone, and plainly points to a difference of meaning. The land which Amalek afterwards occupied was already peopled, either by the Horites,

named just before, or by the Amorites, who complete the list of the conquests. 'The closer examination of the context, in which not a word is placed unadvisedly, gives a death blow to the assumed contradiction.' (Hengst.)

93. MORIAH.

According to Vater, Von Böhlen, and other German critics, the author of Gen. xxii. derived the name Moriah from an event in Abraham's life, 'because Solomon built his temple on a mountain of that name.' Others, again, deny the identity of the two places, and transfer, with the Samaritans, the Moriah of Genesis to Mount Gerizim. The strong argument which the whole passage supplies for the early knowledge of the sacred name, Jehovah, has been also set aside in the '*Pentateuch Examined*,' on the ground of the entire uncertainty of the real meaning and derivation.

The view of Hengstenberg is, that the name denotes 'the shown of Jehovah,' or 'the appearance of Jehovah,' from the Hophal participle of the verb *ראה*, *to see*; and that Jehovah-Jireh is simply an explanatory paraphrase; so that the name Moriah is used by prolepsis in v. 2, and was really given in consequence of this remarkable vision and message at the time of Isaac's sacrifice. The recurrence of the name, at the time when the temple was built, is no proof at all of a later origin than Moses, unless we wholly deny the fact of a Divine Providence, and set aside both typical and actual prophecy. On the contrary, the three events,—Isaac's sacrifice, the building of Solomon's temple, and the fulfilment of the Saviour's words, 'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will build it again,'—have a most intimate connexion with

each other, and might well be associated with the name, 'the vision, appearance, or revelation,' of the Lord.

The whole subject, when further examined, instead of constituting an objection, becomes a direct evidence of the truth and authenticity of the Book of Genesis.

i. The view of Hengstenberg, that the name is used by prolepsis in v. 2, is needless and rather strained. But it is wholly different from the absurdity which Dr. Colenso charges upon him, that 'the Divine Being used the name proleptically, and commanded Moses to go to a place, which was not yet called by the name by which he called it.' The criticism implies either ignorance or entire forgetfulness of what prolepsis means. The view of Hengstenberg is not that the Lord Himself used the name before it was given, but that Moses used it in describing a place, to which the Lord had summoned Abraham by some earlier name.

ii. The derivation Hengstenberg, with others, has proposed, from *מִרְאָה*, the Hophal participle of *רָאָה*, *to see*, and the name Jehovah, seems highly probable, for several reasons, if it be not rather from the verbal noun *מִרְאָה*, by a similar contraction in composition, change of vowels, and the omission of a feeble radical. Aquila renders it 'the conspicuous land,' and Symmachus 'the land of vision;' while the Samaritan text, *מוראה*, retains the radical, the omission of which has been urged as an argument against the derivation.

But a stronger reason may be drawn from the passage 2 Chron. iii. 1, where Moriah is also named. Solomon began to build 'on Mount Moriah, where the Lord appeared to David his father.' So our version, supplying

the name of God, and rendering the relative by the adverb *where*. But this would properly require the addition of םִשֶׁׁ. The literal rendering is, 'who was seen by,' or 'who appeared to,' David his father. The construction at first sight is obscure. But it becomes plain, when once we resolve the name into its components, 'on the mount of the vision of Jehovah, who appeared to David his father.' The relative refers to Jah, that is Jehovah, which ends the name, and the verb נִרְאָה to the participle or verbal noun, with which the name begins. The passage, then, seems to fix, beyond reasonable doubt, the true derivation and meaning of the name Moriah.

The question will now arise whether it is a proper name. Except in these two texts it never appears, and it is a descriptive title in the LXX., Symmachus, Aquila, and the Vulgate. The land is mentioned in one place, the mountain in the other. It seems, then, to have been a proper name only in an imperfect sense, like the Land of Promise for Palestine, the Holy City for Jerusalem, and the City of Peace for Bagdad, where the force of the title is never lost. Thus the Mount Moriah in Chronicles will be simply 'the Mount of the vision of the Lord, who appeared to David, and to whom he builded an altar in the threshing floor of Araunah the Jebusite.'

94. On this view the words in Genesis will mean 'the land of the vision of Jehovah,' nearly as in Symmachus, εἰς τὴν γῆν τῆς ὀπτασίας. To what vision, then, would this refer? When Abraham returned from the slaughter of the kings, he met Melchizedec 'in the valley of Shaveh, which is the king's dale,' near to Salem. After renouncing the spoil of Sodom in fidelity to God, the mes-

sage follows,—‘After these things came the word of the Lord to Abram in a vision, saying, Fear not, I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward.’ The close connexion in thought with the previous verses, which describe the Patriarch’s sacrifice, makes it most likely that the promise was given as a direct sequel to this interview, before the return to Hebron. Then followed that striking vision of the burning lamp and fiery furnace, and a more detailed promise of the land of Canaan. The district where this revelation occurred might well be named from it, ‘the land of the vision of the Lord.’ The addition, ‘on one of the mountains that I will tell thee of,’ shows that this land included several hills or eminences. If the meeting with Melchizedek, and the vision, ch. xv., were near Jerusalem, then this feature is explained. The mount of the sacrifice, the temple mount, and Calvary, would all belong to this ‘land of Moriah,’ and still might all be distinct from each other, as the two last are clearly not the same. The event included a type, not only of the Crucifixion, but also of the Ascension, since the beloved son was restored to his father after a figurative resurrection; and may have taken place, like the Ascension, in private, even though Salem was already a city, and possibly at the same place, on some retired spot of the Mount of Olives.

The chapter, thus explained, becomes a direct proof that Moses was the writer of Genesis. For it is plainly a whole, not a patchwork of fragments, and yet we meet with Elohim only at the beginning, and Jehovah only at the close, while the change of names answers to the turning-point of the history. This is a clear sign that

the like transition, elsewhere, is from the intelligent choice of one and the same author, and not from the piecing of independent documents. Again, a proverb based on the event was current at the date of the writing—‘In the Mount Jehovah will be seen’—a clear proof, besides the names Moriah and Jehovah-Jireh, that the sacred name had been in use even from the days of Abraham. The Elohist and the Jehovist, therefore, are not two persons, but one and the same, in whose days the tradition of the sacrifice was still fresh, and the proverb had not faded away by the lapse of many generations.

95. BETHEL.

This name has been said to prove a later date than the time of Moses, because of the passage in Judg. i. 22, 26. But the answer of Hengstenberg is here complete.

‘The apparent anachronism vanishes on close examination. Jacob called, not the city, but the place in its vicinity, where he saw the vision, Bethel. They are distinguished from each other in Josh. xvi. 1, 2, “And the lot of the children of Joseph goeth out from Bethel to Luz.” The name was transferred by his descendants to the town. Comp. xxxv. 6: “So Jacob came to Luz, which is in the land of Canaan, that is, Bethel.” That the Canaanites still persisted in calling it Luz as before, and that the name Bethel had only a prophetic importance, was perfectly natural, and needed not to be expressly noticed. Not till the Israelite conquest would the name Luz be superseded by the name Bethel. That this existed already appears from its being given to Luz as soon as taken. It stands in no relation to any event of that time, and points only to the fact recorded in Genesis How powerfully the minds of the Israelites had been impressed thereby we learn from the circumstance that,

during the war against the Benjamites, the ark of the covenant was in Bethel; and there also, after the war was over, the gathering of the people was held. Jeroboam trusted so much to the ancient sanctity of the place, that he considered it suited, in preference to all others, to be the rival of Jerusalem.'

The words of xxxv. 6 seem indeed a direct sign of the Mosaic authorship. 'And Jacob came to Luz, which is in the land of Canaan, that is, Bethel.' If the name Luz were still in use, and the writer were not in the land of Canaan, while Bethel was already in use among the Israelites, to express the place where their forefather received the vision, then the expression is natural and appropriate. But it is less natural if the name Luz had long been obsolete, and the book were written within the borders of the land.

96. THE KINGS OF EDMOM.

Gen. xxxvi. 31. 'And these are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the sons of Israel.'

The objection from these words has been stated as follows:—

'The last clause could hardly have been written till after there had been a king in Israel. Hengstenberg replies, that it contains a reference to the preceding promises to the patriarchs of a kingdom among their posterity, especially to ch. xxxv. 11. "Not yet," says the historian, "had this promise been fulfilled to Jacob, for no kings had appeared in his line." He quotes with approbation J. H. Michaelis and Calvin. He might also have alluded to the laboured attempt of C. B. Michaelis, containing a similar explanation. All such endeavours are opposed to the plain meaning of the clause, which refuses to play the part

forced upon it. The Edomite list contains eight kings, and may perhaps reach up to the time of Moses. It is impossible, however, to show that it reached *to* his time. Granting that it did, what a trifling remark would it be for Moses to say, when he was giving a list of the kings before his own time, "There was no king then in Jacob's line: this was before Israel had a king." Truly this would have been what Locke calls "a trifling proposition," since they all knew that kings in Israel had not then appeared.'

Now this passage, when taken with its own context, is really a powerful argument for the Mosaic authorship, as the following remarks will prove:—

i. First, the original does not, as our version seems to do, prejudge the question, whether the list were limited by the first king in Israel, or by the time of the writer? It may be rendered, with equal exactness in the first clause, and greater in the second: 'And these are the kings which have reigned in the land of Edom, before the reigning of a king over the sons of Israel.' It is the context alone which can decide whether the perfect or the simple past gives more exactly the true meaning.

ii. If we retain the other version, it is implied that the limit of the list is the beginning of the reign of Saul, the first king of Israel. It is plain also, from Num. xx. 14–20, that Edom had a king in the fortieth year of the Exodus, and from the whole passage, that they were elective, not hereditary. For such reigns twenty years is a high average, and seven reigns and a half, for the last was current, will be 150 years. But the interval from the Conquest to Saul's accession, according to 1 Kings, iv. 1, would be at least 356 years, still longer by the

chronology which sums up the periods of the judges; and even with the contracted and impossible chronology of Bunsen and Lord A. Hervey, more than 200 years. Hence on no reasonable hypothesis can the period of these kings be made to reach so far as from the Conquest to Saul. And besides, the mention of the King of Edom in Numbers has not at all the appearance of being the first commencement of kingly rule. The list, therefore, disagrees altogether with the later limit, and cannot be made, without extreme violence, to close with the reign of the first Israelite king.

iii. Let us now try the other hypothesis, that Moses is the author, and Hadar the king of Edom mentioned in the Book of Numbers. Taking eighteen years for the average in an elective monarchy, seven reigns and a half will be 135 years. Reckoned back from the Conquest, these bring us to 120 years after the descent, or 210 years after the marriage of Esau, for the accession of the first Edomite king. The date will be 145 years, or four descents, after the time when he was already a powerful chieftain, leading an armed band of four hundred men. It is quite natural, then, to suppose that by that time the Edomite tribes might have so far multiplied, and have had such accessions from the Horites, as to set up an elective monarchy, and thus bind together the tribes that would else have been weakened by separation. The number of kings, therefore, agrees perfectly with this hypothesis, and confirms its truth.

iv. The words 'before the reigning of a king over the sons of Israel,' if Moses were the writer, are by no means a trifling proposition. The two facts, when put side by

side, conveyed a deep moral lesson of the rapid progress of the power which was doomed to decay, and of the slower growth of that which rested on the sure promise of God. The contrast might have been overlooked, unless the well-known fact, that no king had yet appeared in Israel, were stated in the same breath with the brief record of these Edomite kings. And this view of the purpose is directly confirmed by the position of the whole Edomite genealogy. It follows close upon the promise to Jacob, 'A nation and a company of nations shall be of thee, and kings shall come out of thy loins;' and is followed at once by the expressive contrast: 'And Jacob dwelt in the land wherein his father was a stranger, in the land of Canaan.' The force of these words is increased by their antithesis with the last verse of the genealogy: 'These are the dukes of Edom, according to their habitations in the land of their possession: this is Esau, the father of the Edomites.' The antithesis in v. 31 is plainly just of the same kind. So many kings have ruled in Edom, and there is yet no king in Israel. So many dukes of Edom in a land of possession, while Jacob dwelt with his sons in a strange land, first in Canaan, and then in Egypt, the house of bondage.

v. But the Mosaic date of the list is proved further by two internal signs. The fourth king is thus described: 'Hadad, the son of Bedad, who smote Midian in the field of Moab: and the name of his city was Avith.' Now if these eight reigns extended from Moses to Saul, their average length must be forty-five years, an amount wholly unreasonable, and this reign would fall at the close of Ehud's rest, or one generation before the time of

the greatest prosperity and strength of Midian. There would thus be no harmony, but direct opposition to the probable deduction from other evidence. But if the series ends with the king named in Numbers, or at the time of the Conquest, then, at the probable rate of eighteen years for each elective reign, the middle of the fourth reign would be about seventy-two years before the Conquest; that is, it would answer to the first ten years of the sojourn of Moses himself in Midian. What could be more natural than that he should place on record an Edomite victory, which took place while he was a sojourner in Midian, and was gained over the main body of the tribe among one branch of whom he was compelled to sojourn?

Again, the last king is named with fuller particulars than the rest. 'And Hadar reigned in his stead: and the name of his city was Pau; and his wife's name Mehetabel, the daughter of Matred, the daughter of Mezahab.' This minuteness of detail agrees perfectly with the view that this was the king who refused Israel a passage through his land, and was still alive when the record was penned, so as to be a double reason why fuller particulars respecting him should be given.

Thus the objection drawn from these words is so far from having any weight, that it turns, when closely examined, into a powerful evidence and clear sign that the record was of the age and in the time of Moses. On this view alone the requirements of chronology are satisfied, and the internal marks in the notices of the fourth and eighth kings are fully explained.

97. THE LAND OF THE HEBREWS.

Gen. xl. 15. 'For indeed I was stolen away out of the land of the Hebrews.' Comp. xxxix. 14, 17; xli. 12.

Another objection has been raised from these passages.

'The word *Hebrew* is used in a familiar way, as if it were a well-known appellation of a whole people, well known even in Egypt; nay, as if the land of Canaan could already be spoken of by Joseph as the land of Hebrews, so as to be readily understood by the Egyptians. It seems plain that expressions, current in a later age, have been allowed inadvertently to slip into the narrative.'

The reply to this objection is clear and simple.

i. First, the narrative is throughout consistent. The name, Hebrew, is applied to Joseph, alike by his master's wife, and by the chief butler before Pharaoh, as well as by Joseph himself. It appears again in the account of the feast. 'The Egyptians might not eat bread with the Hebrews, for that is an abomination to the Egyptians.' It occurs in Exodus, in Pharaoh's instructions to the midwives, and their excuse, i. 18, 19, in the words of Pharaoh's daughter, 'This is one of the Hebrews' children,' and in the request of Moses' sister in reply. It enters into the first message which Moses was to address to Pharaoh, 'The Lord God of the Hebrews hath met with us.' It is thus represented throughout as the standing name and title by which the family of Jacob were known, from the first, in Egypt. It seems even to have been detected among the hieroglyphics as their actual name.

ii. The use of the phrase, 'the land of the Hebrews,' is perfectly natural and appropriate. It occurs once only, when Joseph speaks of his own sale by his brethren. In

all other cases 'the land of Canaan' is used, ch. xlii. 5, 7, 13, 29, 32; xlv. 17, 25; xlvi. 6, 12, 31; xlvii. 1, 4, 13, 14, 15; xlviii. 3, 7; xlix. 30; L. 5, 13; or twenty times in the history of Joseph. Hence the use of the other name in one case only, where the question is of the sale of a Hebrew captive by other Hebrews, is an internal sign of historical truthfulness, and not of accidental error. It means clearly, 'the land in which it is well known that the Hebrews sojourn.'

iii. But the use of the name Hebrew itself is here charged with anachronism, as if the Abrahamic family were too few or too obscure to have a distinct name, known in Egypt. This, however, is to contradict the most prominent facts in the history. Abraham himself had sojourned in Egypt, and his removal, according to the narrative, had been with signal marks of God's power, that were likely to make a deep impression on Pharaoh and his servants. Soon after followed the victory over the kings, the most signal political event of that period. When Abraham asks for a burial-place for Sarah, the Hittites answer him, 'Hear us, my Lord, thou art a mighty prince among us, in the choice of our sepulchres bury thy dead,' xxiii. 6. When Isaac leaves Gerar, the Philistines envy him for his large possessions of flocks, herds, and servants. 'And Abimelech said unto Isaac, Go from us; for thou art much mightier than we.' When Jacob goes to Bethel, 'the terror of God was upon the cities round about.' And presently it is said of the two brothers, 'Their riches were more than that they might dwell together; and the land wherein they were strangers could not bear them, because of their cattle, xxxvi. 7. The name, Hebrew, given

already to Abraham before his victory, xiv. 13, would become still more conspicuous after that event, and attach to the family in every stage of their later growth into a powerful nation. And hence the use of the word by Potiphar's wife, by Joseph to the chief butler, and by the chief butler to Pharaoh, is one plain internal sign of the truth and reality of the whole narrative. In the speech of Joseph, 'For indeed I was stolen away out of the land of the Hebrews,' it is self-evident that the usual phrase, 'the land of Canaan,' would be far less appropriate and expressive.

98. ABEL MIZRAIM.

A double objection has been drawn from this part of the narrative. First, that the route described is unnatural and incredible. And next, that the words 'beyond Jordan' could not be used by Moses, but imply a writer who lived in the land of Canaan.

i. It seems, no doubt, a strange and unlikely route for a funeral procession from Egypt to Hebron, to journey to the east bank of the Jordan, and then to cross over, and pass southward to its destination. But this is rather a presumption for its truth, since it is not a route which could easily suggest itself to a mere inventor of legends in some later age. On the other hand, there are several things to explain why this circuit might be preferred. The burial was attended by 'chariots and horsemen, a very great company.' It would thus have the air, to the Canaanites, of a military expedition, and, if it came direct against their southern frontier, might provoke immediate hostility. Again, in funeral processions the object is to do public honour to the deceased, and, instead

of the least expensive and the shortest course, the more costly and the more public may often be preferred on that ground alone. Next, the solemn mourning of seven days required a cultured land and not a desert, and yet the Canaanites were not likely to permit a military encampment on their own territory. Besides, the districts on the east of the Dead Sea were not improbably in some partial dependence on Egypt, and the Midianite traffickers, to whom Joseph was sold, seem to have passed that way. Lastly, the arrangements would of course be made by Joseph, and it might be one purpose he had in view, by choosing the route for this powerful cavalcade by which he had been led away as a lonely captive into Egypt, to impress more deeply on his own family, and on the Egyptians themselves, the overruling hand of God, and His constant care for the chosen people.

ii. The description, 'beyond Jordan,' is fixed by the whole context to mean here the eastern side. Is this any objection to the view that Moses is the writer? None whatever. The phrase must be used, either with reference to general geography and the stand-point of the history itself, or else with reference to the actual position of the writer, where he happened to be when the words were penned. But the later use can only be allowable when that position has been previously named or is evidently implied. To adopt it, in other cases, would create hopeless ambiguity, and defeat the very object of the definition. This use is quite natural, Deut. iii. 20, 25, iv. 21, and in similar passages, but here it would be wholly out of place. Canaan is the centre of the whole history, ch. xii.-1, and the phrase 'beyond Jordan' must refer to that alone;

since the writer has given us, thus far, no sign of the place where his narrative was composed or published. Still further, if Moses wrote the law near the end of his life, and on the eve of the Conquest, it must have been with the express design that it should first be read publicly, when the people had actually crossed the Jordan, and begun to possess the land. On the other hand, the very name, Abel Mizraim, in so strange a locality, would be a lasting pledge for the truth of the whole narrative — a seal of the whole book of Genesis to the Israelites of later days.

99. THE KING'S DALE. Gen. xiv. 17.

'The king referred to *may* have been Melchizedek, or some other of the kings of Canaan. But it seems more probable that the expression points to King David, who was the first to make Jerusalem the seat of government for the children of Israel. And so we read, 2 Sam. xviii. 18, "Absalom in his lifetime had taken and reared up for himself a pillar, which is in the king's dale." He would be most likely to have done this near the royal city, as Josephus writes, 'Ant.' vii. 10, 3. This would accord with the statement that Melchizedek, king of Salem, came out to the valley of Shaveh. The use of Salem, also, in the substance of the main story, would indicate a writer living in later times, since the Canaanite name was Jebus; and there can be little doubt that the name Jerusalem, possession of peace, was first given to it by David.'

The assumption that 'the valley of the king' was so named from King David has no ground whatever on which to rest. There is no recorded event in David's life which would explain it. If it were named from him, as Zion was called 'the city of David,' the probable name would have been 'the valley of David.' On the

other hand, the history suggests spontaneously an adequate reason for the title in this interview with Melchizedek. The valley of Shaveh is plainly the older and Canaanitish name, and 'the valley of the king' is one which replaced it among the Hebrews. But 'Melchizedek, king of Salem,' is here declared to have met Abraham and blessed him in this very place. The words run, 'in the valley of Shaveh, the valley of the Melech. And Melchi-zedek, Melech Salem, met Abraham,' &c. Among the chosen family it received and retained, no doubt, this new name of Emeg Melech, 'valley of the king,' because here the King of righteousness, the King of Salem, or peace, bestowed his blessing on the father of the faithful, and Abraham's victory was crowned there by the fullest approval of heaven. There is as little ground for the view that the name Jerusalem was first invented in the time of David. For the name Jebus applied properly to the stronghold of Mount Zion, while Salem appears to have been an early name of the lower city. In like manner, from Josh. x. 1, 3, 5, 23, xii. 10, Jerusalem seems to have been an early and familiar name. It was simply the extension of the name to include Jebus, the upper city, which appears to have been the work of a later age.

The other geographical objections in the 'Pentateuch Examined,' Part II., deserve only a passing notice :

Gen. xiii. 10. "Like the land of Egypt, as thou comest to Zoar." What could the Hebrews in the wilderness have known of the nature of the country in the land of Canaan, as thou comest unto Zoar, Gen xv. 22? Or what could Moses himself have known of it?

That is, what could Moses, or the Hebrews before the Conquest, have known of the route by which they had just passed only a few months before, skirting it at a distance of about twenty miles, and which lay about thirty miles south from their actual and prolonged encampment on the plains of Moab? Surely a more surprising inquiry was never made.

Gen. xxxv. 19. 'Ephrath, which is Bethlehem.' xiv. 2, 'Bela, which is Zoar;' v. 3, 'The vale of Siddim, which is the Salt Sea; v. 7, 'Enmishpat, which is Kadesh.' These double names are thought, in some unexplained way, to be signs of a later date. But the natural inference is just the reverse. If the name Zoar was used ever since the time of Lot in his family, and among the Hebrews, then the use of the earlier name, xiv. 2, bespeaks a writer of patriarchal times, or at least one very intimately acquainted with them. So also the mention of the vale of Siddim, which is the Salt Sea, is a direct consequence of the antiquity of the campaign described, and forms a presumptive sign that the narrative dates from a remote and very early age.

CHAPTER XI.

ALLEGED ANACHRONISMS OF THE LATER BOOKS.

100. THE GENEALOGY OF MOSES AND AARON.

Exod. vi. 26. 'These are that Aaron and Moses to whom the Lord 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.'

THESE words have been thought unsuitable for Moses himself to write, and to imply the lapse of a considerable time, when his name had become celebrated. 'Even if it meant "this is the genealogy of Moses and Aaron," this does not remove the idea of a later author. Why should Moses himself have mentioned that he and his brother were the persons to whom the Lord said, "Bring out," &c.? Surely this was a superfluous addition to the register as given by himself. The two were not unknown to the reader, but already prominent in the history. Why, then, give their genealogy just at this place? One can only explain it by supposing that different documents were used, from one of which the genealogy was taken and inserted without

much regard to naturalness of position. It is evidently part of an older and longer genealogy, and not composed on this occasion.' (Davids. 'Intr.' pp. 7, 92.) All these statements, on inquiry, will be found exactly to reverse the real truth.

i. First, the genealogy is in its most natural place. It follows the completed mission of Moses and Aaron, and precedes the miracles and judgments by which that mission was fulfilled. Their previous message had been tentative alone, and was followed by heavier burdens on the people. So also, in the New Testament, our Lord's genealogy in St. Luke follows close on His baptism, and introduces His public and miraculous ministry.

ii. Next, the suitableness and propriety does not depend on the person of the writer, but flows directly from the facts themselves. A new era of Divine revelation was here to be opened, and needed to rest on a firm historical pedestal. These great facts were no legends, and by no legendary persons was the message given. The wonders of the Exodus are here linked with thirty names of known persons, one half of whom enter into the later history. Thus the passage, charged with being out of place, or superfluous, is really an impregnable bulwark against those various devices of scepticism, which labour to dissolve and melt away the solemn facts of Providence into a series of untruthful and worthless legends.

iii. The theory of several documents cannot explain a single feature of the text, but contradicts them all. Misplacement, if real, would be as hard to explain in the case of a compiler as of an original historian, since the chief task of such a compiler must be to arrange his materials.

The arresting of the genealogy with the third tribe, that of Levi, and the expansion of that part alone, so as to include the descent of fourteen persons, all named in the later narrative, agrees with the supposition that it was written expressly for its actual place, but with no other theory. In fact, Exod. vi. 14, 15, is a repetition of Gen. xlv. 8-10; while xlv. 11, is expanded into ten verses, reaching to the birth of Phinehas, which must have been about the time of the Exodus. This points at once to the composition of the list by Moses, or one of his contemporaries:

iv. The notion that Moses and Aaron were less celebrated and conspicuous at the date of the Conquest than in later ages is plainly absurd. At the date of the composition of the Pentateuch, if genuine, the vivid sense among the people of the greatness of Moses would be at its height. Here Moses and Aaron are defined by their great work which they had fulfilled, and the object of the passage is to fix their relation, by genealogy, to the rest of the people. The features alleged to prove a later origin are precisely those which prove the reverse. A mere historian of some later age would be likely to define the leaders by their parentage, fully and at length, before the history began, and then to record their actions. But here they are defined by the work itself, as being public and notorious; and their families and descent are given, not at the very outset, but before the record of their mighty works, to impress a deeper tone of historical reality on the wonderful narrative:—

‘The words are repeated at the end of v. 27, to mark precisely the resumption of the history. At the beginning the

genealogical reference predominates, and Aaron stands as the elder. At the end the historical view is taken, and Moses is named first, as the more important.'—HENGST. i. p. 108, c. v.

101. THE WESTERN SEA.

In Gen. xii. 8, xiii. 14, xxviii. 14; Ex. x. 19, xxvi. 22, 27; Num. ii. 18, iii. 2, 3, xxxiv. 6, xxxv. 5, the word *yam*, the sea, is used to denote the west, or western side. The expression, it is said, 'obviously could not have been familiarly used in this way till some time after the people were settled in the land of Canaan. It is evident that neither Moses nor any one of his age could have invented this form of expression while wandering in the wilderness. Still less could he have used the phrase "wind of the sea" to express a westerly wind, with reference to an event in the land of Egypt, where the Mediterranean lay to the north and the Red Sea to the east.' It is said further, that in Gen. xli. 6, 'the east wind is spoken of as a parching wind, which it is in Palestine, not in Egypt, whence the LXX. in that place write νότος south-west, and not εὔφορος, east wind.'—*P. E.* ii. p. 200.

Ans. i. The Hebrew language was not formed in Egypt, but imported and retained. Joseph 'spake to his brethren by an interpreter.' The names and the whole course of the history imply that the sojourners in Goshen remained distinct in language, as in religion, from the Egyptians. The language thus retained was confessedly that of Canaan, where their fathers had sojourned more than two hundred years, and to which they looked forward as their destined inheritance. The familiar term, in Canaan, for a westward direction would thus be naturally retained, even in Egypt.

ii. Brief words, in constant use for familiar ideas or objects, are those which most rapidly drop their original, and retain their secondary meaning. Who, now, ever thinks of wood in connexion with a candlestick? But the customary name for one of the cardinal points is a case to which this principle must apply in its greatest force.

iii. The early knowledge of western geography was too dim to form any temptation to the Israelites in Egypt for departing from the language of their fathers in this one point. They knew, probably, nothing at all of the breadth of Africa to the west. As Europe was to them 'the isles of the sea,' so their main association with the western regions would still be that of a great maritime district, just as before.

iv. In Exod x. 19, on which the objection is made chiefly to rest, it is doubly worthless. For a north-west wind, which would be strictly 'the wind of the sea,' would exactly fulfil the object of carrying the locusts from Egypt into the Red Sea. The direction from Alexandria to Suez, and Thebes to Berenice, is exactly that which passes over the largest portion of the Mediterranean.

v. The LXX. do not translate קריב by νότος in Gen. xli. 19, &c., but use the compound ανεμοφθόρος. In most instances of the later use of *qadim* for the name of a wind, the reference is to its pinching character rather than to its direction. Hence it must naturally have acquired very early a secondary sense. The wind which brought the locusts may have been from the south, or south-east, and that which removed them, from the north-west-by-west, and in each case the name used will be

the most appropriate among the few Hebrew names of winds.

102. THE CELEBRITY OF MOSES.

Exod. xi. 3. 'And the Lord gave the people favour in the sight of the Egyptians. 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.'

Individuals, it is said, are only spoken of thus after a considerable lapse of time. From Moses himself the words are not appropriate, and every attempt to show them suitable to their present place is abortive. So far from his greatness being an additional reason for the Egyptians' parting with their jewels, it detracts from and irreverently spoils the one just given. (Davids. 'Intr.' p. 8.)

'Hengstenberg observes, that the above laudations of Moses are in keeping with the context. This may be quite true, without its being true that they were written by Moses: it would only tend to show that the context also was of a later age.'—*Pent. Exam.* ii. p. 222.

The main stress of this objection depends, as often, on a very superficial view of the text. The greatness of Moses is not named as a reason why the Egyptians gave so freely to Israel. On the contrary, this favour shown to the people at large, and this deep reverence for Moses among the Egyptians, are noted as conjoint effects on the previous judgments. The reproach which had rested on Israel from their long bondage was mightily removed. They had favour in the sight of the Egyptians, and gifts from their hands; and their leader, from being looked on as an outcast and despised as a fanatic, had come to be

regarded with deep honour and reverence, as the messenger of a Power now proved to be Divine. The mention of this second result, as well as the former, is essential to the moral completeness of the narrative. It is a strange mistake to suppose that they contain a 'laudation of Moses.' So far as praise is implied, it is in the previous choice of him as God's messenger, and the mighty works he was sent to perform. The change was not that he was grown more worthy, but that the Egyptians were less blind than before, and compelled at length to see and own, through those works, the mighty hand of the God of Israel. Some allusion to this great change of feeling on their part is needful to throw light on the closing events of the Exodus.

The phrase, 'the man Moses,' is purposely used to remind us whence this greatness before the people and Egyptians arose. It had its source in the fact that he was the 'man of God,' or the Lord's own commissioned messenger, to do these great works before Pharaoh and his servants.

103. THE MANNA AND THE TESTIMONY.

Exod. xvi. 34, 35. 'As the Lord commanded Moses, so Aaron laid it up before the Testimony, to be kept. And the children of Israel did eat manna forty years, until they came to a land inhabited: they did eat manna until they came to the borders of the land of Canaan.'

'This verse,' it is said, 'could not have been written till after they had ceased eating manna. Nor could it have been written until the Israelites were within the Canaanite border, since the word here used never means *extra terminum* but always *intra terminum*.'—*P. E.* p. 212. 'Moses was dead before the manna ceased, and therefore it is natural to infer that he did not write

these words. Hengstenberg argues that the author means only to state the time when it still continued, not to determine when it ceased : but this explanation is unnatural.'—DAV. p. 4.

These words, from Le Clere onward, have been often alleged, either as a later interpolation, or a strong presumption against the genuineness. But they form, in reality, a powerful argument on the other side, to confirm the Mosaic authorship.

If the passage had been written after the Conquest, in the old age of Joshua, or still later, the natural statement would be, 'And the children of Israel did eat manna forty years, till they crossed the Jordan, and began to take possession of the land.' Such was the actual period when the manna ceased, after the passover near Jericho. But the language here is different, and is suited to Moses alone. The period here assigned is, 'till they came to a land inhabited ; till they came to the borders of the land of Canaan.' This is a limit earlier, but very slightly earlier, than the actual cessation. It answers plainly to the last days of Moses, or any time after crossing the brook Zered till his death. The fortieth year was then more than half expired, the people had reached an inhabited land, were close to the banks of Jordan, and the manna continued still to fall. The positive statement is exact. It is also implied that the cessation was near at hand, but no word indicates that the manna had ceased already. That was reserved for the first days after the death of Moses, when they entered Canaan itself, and did not merely occupy the inhabited land east of Jordan, that lay close on its borders. The form of the phrase is thus a direct sign that the account was written very shortly before the death of Moses.

It is alleged, however, that they could not be said to have come to 'the border of Canaan' till the Jordan was crossed. The statement is wholly groundless, and equally opposed to reason and usage. As the term properly denotes the edge or limit, it may be used, with equal latitude, of a place either just without or just within. Thus Kadesh, Num. xx. 11, was in 'the utmost border' of Edom, but not within, else the leave to enter would have been taken before it was asked for, and the whole context implies that they did not then overstep the boundary. So Hor was 'on the edge of the land of Edom.' So, in Judg. vii. 11, 17, 19, Gideon clearly did not enter the camp, but remained on its outside. No position could answer more exactly to the description, 'till they came to the border of Canaan,' than the encampment where Moses gave the people his parting message.

The mention of the Testimony, as well as of the forty years, excludes the idea that the Pentateuch in its present form was written successively as the events occurred. Separate messages or laws would most probably be committed to writing as they were given; but the whole work, as it now stands, was the parting legacy of the great Lawgiver to the people. The verses before us, from the peculiar phrase employed, confirm this view in the most indirect, but simple way. Moses affirms what was now history, that the manna had lasted forty years till they had left the wilderness, and reached the inhabited land on the east of Jordan, close to the river, on the very edge of Canaan. He only implies, what was still future, that upon their crossing the Jordan, and beginning to occupy Canaan, it would entirely cease.

104. THE OMER.

Exod. xvi. 33. 'And Moses said unto Aaron, Take a pot, and put an omer full of manna therein, and lay it up before the Lord, to be kept for your generations.' V. 36. 'Now an omer is the tenth of an ephah.'

The explanation in v. 36. is ascribed to the interval of time, in which this measure had gone out of use. Hengstenberg, after J. D. Michaelis and Kanne, would remove the difficulty by affirming the omer to be a common earthen vessel in use among the Israelites, and not a measure. He argues that this very measure is constantly expressed by עֲשָׂרִית, a tenth, and also, that every Israelitish family would be likely to possess a vessel, but not a measure. But this view seems plainly disproved by the words of v. 18, 'And when they did mete it with an omer, he that gathered much had nothing over,' &c. Some vessel must surely have been used in gathering it. The measurement was later, and a distinct process. It is implied that a measure was accessible to every family, but not that each had one of its own. The moral of this history and the force of the definition are both lost, if *omer* was only the name for small earthen vessels of uncertain size. How, then, rejecting the view of Michaelis, Kanne, and Hengstenberg, is the passage to be explained?

The force of the objection lies in the remark that the words are 'totally out of place, because the writer is simply making an historical statement, not enunciating a law.' (Dav. 2.) Now this overlooks the fact that the whole Pentateuch is the Law of God by His servant Moses, and that its histories all subserve a legal purpose. The present

chapter is the first in the Law, where any mention of a measure occurs. It is here linked with a signal miracle of Divine love, completed by a second miracle of Divine equity. The measure would receive a kind of consecration from the miracle, and what could be more natural, in a code of laws, than to mark briefly its relation to the fundamental measure? For the *ephah* is named almost forty times in Scripture, the *homer* (הֹמֶר) of ten ephahs, ten times, but the *omer*, in the sense of a measure, in this chapter alone. Another name, the *tenth*, is preferred in every other instance. This brief definition, then, of a measure named here only, serves to connect the whole system of Jewish measures with the long series of wonders of Divine mercy throughout the forty years of sojourn in the wilderness; and the omer of manna, laid up in the most holy place, would complete the lesson, and make it still more deeply impressive. The words are thus far more suitable from the inspired lawgiver himself, than when viewed as the casual addition of some later age.

105. THE WRITING AGAINST AMALEK.

Exod. xvii. 14. 'And the Lord said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial in the book, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua, for I will utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven.'

Such particulars, it is said, relating to Moses *as a writer*, agree only with a later person who used documents. On the supposition that he wrote the whole, they are incongruous.

This passage is important, since it contains the earliest direct reference to the written composition of any part of the work. Its true force seems plainly to be just the

opposite of what the objection affirms. The phrase, 'the book,' must refer to some work which Moses had either begun to write, or else was expected and intrusted to write before the close of his commission. What Moses is here told to write seems to be, not the account of the conflict, but simply the Divine purpose,—'that I will utterly put out the name of Amalek from under heaven.' This notice plainly could not stand alone, but must be in connexion with a narrative of the event. This narrative is assumed, and is the subject of no command. The message refers wholly to a supplement which Moses could have no warrant to append, except by a distinct revelation from God. Hence the words are a direct evidence that a narrative of the Exodus, by Moses himself, was either actually begun, or at least was well known to form one part of his duty as the apostle and messenger of God. It is further observable that, besides fulfilling the command here, in the regular course of the history, he fulfils it once more in the well-known passage at the very close of the book of the law, where there is a verbal allusion to the *memorial* to be placed on record,—'*Remember* what Amalek did to thee by the way,' &c. (Deut. xxv. 17-19.) It would be the simplest inference of reason, from the facts themselves, that they were not to pass into oblivion through the want of a record. But as soon as the ten commandments, first orally delivered, had been written on the two tables of stone by the finger of God, the principle of a written record of all the other Divine messages, and of the history out of which they arose, would have received a solemn sanction, and must have been seen and felt by all to be one main work entrusted to the Lawgiver of Israel.

106. THE DESCRIPTION OF JOSHUA.

Exod. xxiv. 13. 'And Moses rose up, and his minister Joshua.'

xxxiii. 11. 'And he turned again into the camp : but his servant Joshua, the son of Nun, a young man, departed not out of the tabernacle.'

The words here, it is said, are not such as would be written by Moses, but by a much later person ; and the language in the second place is not the most appropriate, but would agree better with a first mention of Joshua. As coming from Moses, it is an unsuitable description of his own servant, but a later author would insert it. Both places, it is said, belong to the Jehovist.

The objection from the first passage is so unmeaning, that it is hard to understand how it could have arisen, or wherein the incongruity is fancied to consist. This simple mention that Joshua now accompanied Moses is one of those slight touches which mark the truth of the whole narrative, and also its Divine unity. Unless recorded by Moses himself, no tradition was likely to hand it down to later times ; while it stands here, in a single word, as a virtual prophecy of Joshua's later eminence and honour.

The other passage has also an unmistakable character of minute, historical truth. Yet the motive for its insertion, and for the short description of Joshua 'as a young man,' is not so plain. If, however, the fact were to be mentioned at all, there is nothing to make it less natural from Moses than from any later writer. Nay, there is an especial propriety that, in the same verse which records his own signal honour in its first clause, the second should mention a signal and distinguishing

honour of Joshua, his destined successor. Such an association with Moses, in the case of Aaron and Hur, or any of the elders, would have been less significant. But that Joshua, a young man, should be present near to Moses when this revelation was given, and abide still in the tabernacle when Moses left it to bear God's message to the people, was a significant prophecy of the high office in store for him in later years. Such minute touches, so full of meaning, are quite natural in the inspired Law-giver, but wholly inexplicable on the infidel view.

107. ANTICIPATIONS OF THE CONQUEST.

Lev. xviii. 28 'That the land spue not you out also, when ye defile it, as it spued out the nations which were before you.'

Num. xv. 32. 'And while the children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man that gathered sticks upon the sabbath-day.'

Num. xv. 22, 23. 'And if ye have erred and not observed all these commandments, which the Lord hath spoken unto Moses, even all that the Lord hath commanded you by the hand of Moses, from the day that the Lord commanded Moses, and henceforward among your generations,' &c.

Deut. ii. 12. 'As Israel did unto the land of his possession, which the Lord gave unto them.'

These four texts have one common character, and have been alleged in proof of the post-Mosaic origin of the whole. But the objection is strangely superficial.

i. The words in Leviticus come at the close of a chapter, which prohibits to the Israelites incestuous marriages and practices, common among the nations they were about to expel. It opens with a definition of its object. 'After the doings of the land of Egypt wherein

ye dwelt, shall ye not do; and after the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring you, shall ye not do; neither shall ye walk in their ordinances.' The point of time is thus clearly fixed in the chapter itself, *after* the Exodus, and *before* the Conquest. Then, at the close, the warning voice is repeated still more solemnly, 'Defile not yourselves in any of these things; for in all these the nations are defiled which I am casting out before you: And the land is defiled; and I have visited the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself hath vomited out her inhabitants.' The Hebrew tense is the future, with *Vau* conversive, equivalent to the past, and the judgment is thus prophetically exhibited as if already come. Then follows the natural sequel,—'Ye shall therefore keep my statutes,' &c., 'that the land spue not you out also, when ye defile it, as it hath spued out the nations that were before you.'

Thus in v. 3 the ejection is distinctly represented as still future, in v. 24 as if already in progress, 'am casting out,' and in v. 25 as if fulfilled. But since the judgment is prophetically described as already come, so too, by natural consequence, is the moral danger to the Israelites, lest by like sins they should bring on themselves a like visitation. It is a surprising obtuseness, if not conscious dishonesty, which can alone see any proof of a later authorship in this vivid and expressive style of God's most solemn warning. The Hebrew knows nothing of our compound tenses, *shall have*, or *will have*. The choice lay between a perfect and an imperfect. And since the judgment on the Canaanites must first have been executed before the warning lesson could apply, it is plain that the

tense used is by far the most natural and expressive. The language of the chapter, from first to last, suits perfectly the time in the wilderness, and no other period.

ii. The words of Num. xv. 32, 'while the children of Israel were in the wilderness,' &c., have been thought to imply a date after the death of Moses. On what pretence it is hard to say. They had ceased to be in the wilderness at least four months before his death; during which, assuming the genuineness of the Pentateuch, most probably the whole, and certainly this later portion, was written. The precepts, ch. xv. 1-31, must, apparently, have been given early in their sojourn, perhaps in the second or third year, not long after the solemn oath recorded just before. This incident is plainly added to illustrate the previous command, the warning against presumptuous sins. There is no proof that it occurred early, or even before Korah's rebellion. Its connexion with the verse before it is moral, not chronological. Hence the most general notice of the time was enough, that it happened while they were still in the wilderness, before the conquest over Sihon. This later sentence, being revealed and executed while they were still on their journey, confirmed and ratified the code of laws first given, of which the wilderness was the scene, in contrast to the legislation in the plains of Moab.

iii. The passage, Num. xv. 22, 23, is still more strangely made an objection to the genuineness than the text in Leviticus just examined. It is impossible to devise words more appropriate, at the very time of the Mosaic legislation, for conveying instructions to the people how their sins of ignorance, committed in all time to

come, might be forgiven through a fitting sacrifice. Every word is suitable and emphatic, as a true message from the God of Israel to His people in the days of Moses—a stamp divinely affixed to the whole legal economy. The only alternative, and one which the objection must imply, is that the whole account is a pure invention and imposture of the grossest and most hateful kind. Such a calumny against the word of God is too much like one of those presumptuous sins which are here excluded from the hope of pardon.

108. On Deut. ii. 12, Bleek observes,—

‘This plainly sets forth a time when the Israelites were already in possession of the land, and had driven out the former inhabitants; a time, therefore, later than Moses. The supposition of Rosenmüller and others is very forced and unnatural, that the reference is to what had even at that moment happened, “as Israel is now doing to the land of their possession,” and then to think of the tract on the other side Jordan.’

So Dr. Colenso:—

‘Plainly the country of Sihon and Og is not meant by the expression “the land of his possession which the Lord gave unto him,” for this is indicated distinctly as the land of Canaan in Deut. iv. 1.’

This last remark shows extreme carelessness, to say no more. For in Deut. iv. 1 the tense is different ‘which the Lord God of your fathers is giving you.’ But in Deut. iii. 18 we have the very phrase and tense of ii. 12 directly applied to the Transjordanic region: ‘And I commanded you at that time, saying, The Lord your God hath given you (יָרַדְתָּ) this land to possess it.’ This actual

possession, also, is contrasted with one still future: 'Until they also possess the land which the Lord your God hath given them beyond Jordan.' It is a curious proof that the eastern land cannot be meant where the language is of a past possession, because the western is meant where the text speaks of possession still future; and this, when the two texts are parted by a third, which places this past and this future possession in direct contrast to each other!

The text ii. 12 has really no difficulty, when the Hebrew is rendered, as it should be, by the English perfect: 'As Israel hath done to the land of his possession, which the Lord hath given him.' The context fixes the reference to the part of the inheritance already conquered. Even the most careless forger could never speak of the whole land as already possessed, in a chapter the whole drift of which is to encourage Israel in their task of taking possession. On the other hand, the words are most impressive and appropriate on the lips of Moses. They place the past success of the Israelites on the basis of a Divine gift, which brought with it the assurance that equal success would attend them, after his own decease, on the west of Jordan. Edom, Moab, Ammon, and their own first victories and conquests, are all turned into motives of full confidence that Canaan should soon become their possession, according to the covenant of God.

109. THE COMMENDATION OF MOSES.

Num. xii. 3. 'Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth.'

This high praise of Moses has seemed to many to be

inconsistent with the view that he was the writer of the whole Pentateuch. Dr. Davidson remarks on it as follows :—

‘ These words are inappropriate, if proceeding from Moses himself. The attempt of Hengstenberg to explain them is a curious phenomenon of exposition. After giving four reasons to show that they are to guard against a misconception of the words “ the Lord heard,” he still feels that they have something of a strange air. But this vanishes in his view, if we measure Moses by his own standard, not by ours. Whoever can report his own offences and defects, as Moses has done, can speak of what the Lord has wrought in him with an openness entirely different from what we can use. And besides, Christ said, referring to the present passage, “ I am meek and lowly in heart.” If this be not special pleading we know not where to find it. The language is extravagant commendation. A modest and meek man, whatever be his faults, will never employ such self-commendation, exalting his own person above all others in the world The words and their context disown the determination of apologists to shut their eyes to all evidence contrary to their own prepossessions.’—*Introd.* pp. 8, 9.

The difficulty here has plainly its source in the secret assumption that an inspired work is wholly like common history, and depends purely on ‘ the will of man,’ and not on the overruling power and influence of the Holy Spirit. The view of Hengstenberg, who speaks of the noble objectivity of the character of Moses, and quotes from Calmet, ‘ As he here praises himself without pride, he blames himself elsewhere with humility,’ is insufficient on this very ground. If this chapter were nothing more than uninspired narrative, written by Moses, the words of this verse would certainly be unnatural.

The praise here given, if true, could be known to be true by the Searcher of hearts alone. Who but God Himself can weigh in an even balance the characters of all mankind, and decide who is pre-eminent in any one grace or virtue?

When the question is viewed in this light, it assumes a new aspect. Is the Spirit of God to be debarred from the mention of a fact, essential to the clear apprehension of the whole event, and its true moral, because the same statement, had it originated with Moses, would have seemed like what St. Paul deprecates, the foolishness of boasting? Yet since the Spirit is the Spirit of order and decorum, no less than of wisdom and holiness, there is some presumption here, from the nature of the whole monograph, that another prophet, and not Moses, might be chosen at first to place it on record. We know, from ch. xi., just before, that the spirit of prophecy rested on seventy elders at least. Aaron, Eleazar, Phinehas, Joshua, might be used in recording some of the messages given in the wilderness, while these were all finally incorporated by Moses, under Divine guidance, in the Torah committed to the Levites before his death. The short chapter before us is a distinct message, clearly parted off from those which precede and follow. It contains a signal interference of God to maintain the honour of His servant Moses, when his own brother and sister, through jealousy, had cast reproach upon him. The lesson is enforced in a much later command—Deut. xxiv. 9, ‘Remember what the Lord thy God did unto Miriam by the way,’ &c. The record, including God’s own attestation to the character of Moses, and the large trust he had received, would come

with more apparent weight, if some other, such as Eleazar or Joshua, were chosen to be the historian. The office of Moses at a later date, when the Pentateuch was composed, would then be purely ministerial, to insert the message already revealed in its own place, and to accept with gratitude this testimony of God to his meekness and fidelity; when he was called upon elsewhere not to shrink from recording his own sinful impatience, by which he was excluded from the land of promise.

When we look closely at the whole chapter, it has plainly the air of a contemporary narrative. It is dramatic and pictorial in the highest degree. It forms the basis of a later precept near the close of the Law, and of an Apostolic argument on the pre-eminence of Christ over Moses. Heb. iii. 1-6. Its opening words, while they allude to Exod. ii. 15, 22, are suited to a brief and separate narrative. The statements of vv. 2, 9 imply a direct revelation to the writer of the mind of God. Even the words in question could be justified, whether in Moses or another, only on the ground of a distinct Divine revelation. They form the moral keynote of the whole passage. And since the plain drift of the whole was to establish the leadership of Moses on the ground of God's appointment, when even Aaron and Miriam had assailed him, there is a reason here, which applies to no other chapter, for the selection of some third party, whether Eleazar, Joshua, or one of the seventy elders that prophesied, to be the inspired penman of this brief section of the history. On this view the whole difficulty and strangeness disappears. There could then be no risk, even with the most perverse, of ascribing the words to the foolish self-praise of Moses,

instead of hearing in them God's own witness to the grace bestowed on His chosen servant.

110. HORMAH.

Num. xxi. 3. 'And he called the name of the place Hormah.'
xiv. 45. 'And discomfited them unto Hormah.'

Judg. i. 17. 'And Judah went with Simeon his brother, and they slew the Canaanites that inhabited Zephath, and utterly destroyed it. And the name of the city was called Hormah.'

The objection from these verses is stated by Dr. Davidson as follows:—

'The notion of a prolepsis in Num. xiv. 45 is untenable. It appears to a plain reader that Num. xxi. 1-3 was not written till after the time referred to in Judg. i. 17, since the execution of the curse is there related. In other words, Numbers was written after the tribes had received their portions in the land. It is obvious, too, that Judg. i. 17 could not have proceeded from the same author as Num. xxi., because they disagree about the time when the place was called Hormah. It is unlikely that the name was given twice to one place. Hengstenberg thinks that when it was put under the curse by the Israelites, the power of the Canaanites remained unbroken, and therefore it soon became Zephath again. This is contrary to Num. xxi. 3, "And they utterly destroyed them and their cities." In Judg. i. 17 the words infer that Hormah was a new name, not an old one reintroduced.'

Here a little careful attention will remove the whole difficulty, and disclose the real harmony of all the successive statements.

i. The mention of Hormah, Num. xiv. 45, is a prolepsis in this sense alone, that the name had not been given to the place when the mission of the spies occurred,

or in the second year of the Exodus. But the name had been freshly given a few months before the Book of Numbers was written; and there is a peculiar force in this mention of it, to mark the contrast between the vain attempt of the people to take possession without the help of God, and the first earnest of success when that help had been solemnly implored.

ii. The conquest, Num. xxi. 1-3, is no prolepsis, but an account of the first conflict of Israel with the Canaanites, about six months before crossing Jordan, and their complete success. Hormah lay to the south of that mountain boundary, which was a natural defence of Canaan on its southern side. Hence this partial success did not open their way northward; and, after destroying these outlying towns beyond the proper limit of Canaan, they turned back, to compass the land of Edom, and entered Canaan on its eastern side.

iii. The name, Hormah, 'utter destruction,' from the nature of the case, could be current only among the Israelites, and not among the Canaanites themselves. But since they left the neighbourhood immediately, and did not approach it again till the Jordan was crossed, and the conquest had made considerable progress, its use could only be very rare and occasional, historical rather than actual, a memorial of the event, not the title of a place where they dwelt, or with which they had any direct communication. It would be a memory of the past and a prophecy of the future, rather than a name in present, actual use.

iv. The king of Hormah, Josh. xii. 14, and the king of Arad are named among those overcome by Joshua.

When Canaan was so thickly peopled, the chasm made by the utter destruction in Numbers would be soon filled up by the overflow from the populous tribes in the south of Canaan. In the campaign against Sodom, a similar fact appears, Gen. xiv. 10, 11, 17. The victory of Joshua was over these kings, not necessarily over their cities also. They were overthrown, probably, in some conflict where they were confederate with the other southern kings.

v. The event in Judges was 'after the death of Joshua,' i. 1, when the league of Simeon and Judah occurred. It was thus thirty or forty years, a whole generation, after the event in Numbers. Since Zephath lay south of the southern boundary, it would be earliest reached when the Israelites came 'by the way of the spies,' but latest in their actual conquest of Canaan, when they came to it from the north. The Canaanites, of course, would not use the name Hormah—a memorial of past, and a prophecy of future calamity. To them, as soon as re-occupied, it would be Zephath. But the words in Judges refer plainly to the geographical name, or that which was given to the place by its own inhabitants. This now first ceased to be Zephath, and began to be Hormah. In Num. xxi. the Israelites had not taken possession, but retired southward as soon as their vow was fulfilled.

The various statements, it is now plain, agree perfectly with each other. The historical name, in Numbers, first became the actual geographical name when the district was permanently occupied, after the death of Joshua, by the children of Simeon and Judah.

111. THE BOOK OF THE WARS OF THE LORD.

Num. xxi. 13-15. 'For Arnon is the border of Moab, between Moab and the Amorites. Wherefore it is said in the Book of the Wars of the Lord, What He did in the Red Sea, and in the brooks of Arnon, and at the stream of the brooks that goeth down to the dwelling of Ar, and lieth upon the border of Moab.'

'It is improbable,' it is said, 'that Moses should quote the Book of the Wars of the Lord, that is, his own work. The fact of such quotation shows a time of learning, and a person posterior to Moses. This is confirmed by the particle *then*, commencing v. 17, which points both here and Gen. xii. 6, xiii. 7, to a subsequent author.'

The word *then*, in Gen. xii. xiii., no doubt points to an author subsequent to Abraham, and here to one who wrote after the encampment at Beer. But this does not seem to be a formidable objection, in either case, to the Mosaic authorship, since Moses certainly survived the encampment, and lived after Abraham and not before him.

i. Three quotations are given successively in this chapter. The first is from 'the Book of the Wars of the Lord,' and the last is plainly a triumphant war-song. Hence they all probably belonged to the same book. Why are these quotations made? Hengstenberg has said, with truth, that it was certainly not for the mere purpose of confirming the geographical notices. It is rather to relieve the seeming dryness of the details in these journeys; and to show how melodies of song and praise, which had been silent in the wilderness, awoke once more, as soon as they began to enter upon the land of promise.

The Book in question, then, was probably a collection of Israelitish songs of praise, founded on the wonderful works of the Exodus, and later deliverances of the chosen people. Its writers will be called, v. 27, ‘they that speak in proverbs’ that is, not in the simple historical style, but with poetical figures. (Ps. lxxviii. 2.)

ii. The first quotation is abrupt, and plainly incomplete. It might probably have formed part of the opening words of a lyrical song nearly as follows,—‘I will sing the works of the Lord, the mighty acts of the God of Israel. What He did for us at the Red Sea,’ &c. &c. The word *Suphah* seems here to be geographical, referring to the earlier deliverance at the Red Sea, and not to be ‘a storm,’ as Hengstenberg interprets, with *vaheb* for a proper name. ‘*Vaheb* He took in a storm.’ The point of the quotation will turn on the union of the last act of the Exodus, and the first of the Entrance, in the heading of the song. The crossing of the Arnon would thus be marked, in a simple but impressive way, as the close of their wilderness sojourn.

iii. The second quotation is still shorter. It is a contrast to the miraculous smiting of the rock in the wilderness, and marks their first entrance on ‘a land inhabited,’ with ‘fountains and depths that spring out of valleys and hills.’ The rock had been smitten amidst the murmurs of the people, but the well of the nobles is digged amidst their songs of hope and joy.

iv. The third quotation is clearly an Israelite song of victory upon the conquest of Sihon. His former exploits against Moab are named, to make the victory of Israel more impressive. There is an abrupt and lyrical change from the triumphs of Sihon to his sudden overthrow.

There is nothing, then, in these references, when their true purpose is seen, in the least degree inconsistent with the Mosaic composition of the history. This 'Book of the Wars of the Lord' was probably a small collection of national chants or songs of praise, which grew up during their years of sojourn, after the marvels of the Exodus had wakened up the faithful to a new sense of the power and mercy of the God of Israel. Its chief subjects would be the Exodus and the Entrance; and each chant or song being composed successively as the occasion arose, these brief allusions or quotations serve to light up the details of the march with a dramatic vividness, scarcely attainable in any other way. In fact, the words of v. 27 seem to imply that this last triumphal song was still current in the lips of the Israelite bards, and had scarcely been enrolled in the book to which it naturally belonged in a written form.

112. HAVOTH JAIR. (Deut. ii. 14.)

Two objections have been founded on this verse. First, that the phrase 'unto this day' is inconsistent with the shortness of the interval between the conquest of Bashan and the death of Moses. And next, that Judges, x. 3-5, proves that the name Havoth Jair had its origin much later, shortly before the time of Jephthah.

The phrase, 'unto this day,' occurs often in the Pentateuch, Gen. xix. 37, 38, xxii. 14, xxvi. 33, xxxii. 33, xxxv. 20, xlvii. 26, Deut. ii. 22, iii. 14, x. 8. All of these have sometimes been adduced, without distinction, as proofs of a date later than Moses. It is self-evident, however, and owned by the more recent critics of the negative school, that no objection can be drawn from any of them, except

Deut. iii. 14 alone. But this event, it is said, 'belongs to the time named,' before the death of Moses, and could not have been so spoken of in his farewell discourse, the interval being very short. 'Here Hengstenberg,' Dr. Davidson says, 'tries to show that all which occurred from Num. xxii. to the end, intervened, so that the fact was not so near the present time of the writer. But in this the critic fails, and is therefore obliged to have recourse to the fluctuating character of the phrase, and the common occurrence of new names not remaining fixed to their objects soon after their introduction. To say that the phrase was nearly equivalent to our English word, *stilt*, is simply absurd.'

These remarks are equally superficial and supercilious.

i. First, it is almost self-evident that the events of Num. xxii. and onward intervened between the occupation of the land of Bashan and the parting address of Moses. There seems no reason at all why several months should be suffered to elapse, after the victories of Israel, before the occupation of the vanquished territory; while the convenience of the narrative makes it natural that all the facts respecting the possession of the eastern tribes should be recorded together, just before the instructions as to the boundaries of the promised land. The request of the Reubenites and Gadites, from the nature of the case, must have followed closely on the double conquest, and Jair's occupation of Bashan was the direct sequel of the conflict in which Og was overthrown.

ii. The phrase, 'unto this day,' cannot in itself define any long interval or period of time. As Hengstenberg remarks, the duration implied is not absolute, but relative.

It depends entirely on the objects of the discourse, whether they are subject to alteration in a longer or shorter time. Cases of its use for an interval of a few years only are comparatively frequent. The words, '*still*,' 'until now,' and 'until this day,' clearly differ in this alone, that the last implies a distinct interval of several days at least. Thus the words, 'he has never paid me to this day,' might refer to an interval of a few weeks or of several years, according as the debt was contracted on condition of prompt payment, or under a usage of considerable delay.

iii. The strangeness of Deut. iii. 14, is mainly due to the translation. The Hebrew has no distinction between the simple past or aorist, and the perfect, but in this case the latter is the proper English expression of the thought, since its force is to denote an act which continues its effects to the present time. It will then read thus, 'Jair, the son of Manasseh, hath taken all the country of Argob, and hath called them Bashan-Havoth-Jair, unto this day. And I gave Gilead to Machir.'

The whole of Deut. i.-iii. is a review of God's past dealings with Israel, placing them in sharp and strong contrast with that future which was close at hand, the coming years of conquest and ages of possession. This past reaches from the Exodus and Sinai to the latest encampment in Bethpeor. This third chapter relates wholly to events which had occurred within the second half of the fortieth year. Hence it is natural and suitable that its purely historical or retrospective tone should be tempered by one clause or verse, linking it closely with the present, and thus making the past a more direct pledge of future conquest. Og was the more dreaded of the two

powers they had overcome. Yet Israel had taken possession of his land, and held it still. The words 'unto this day' are not restricted to the name, which was merely a sign of the fact, but include the fact itself. Jair has occupied the land of Og, as the present name of these Havoth shows, and possesses it to this day. This 'accomplished fact,' in the present occupation of a kingdom deemed so mighty less than a year ago, is a pledge of similar conquests soon to be achieved. Thus the words in question are far more suitable and expressive in the lips of Moses, than they can possibly be if transferred to an unknown writer of some later age.

The objection from the passage in Judges is plainly worthless. The interval of time between the two events is rather less than three hundred years. The recurrence of the name, Jair, like that of Gilead in the father of Jephthah, is perfectly usual and natural. If this were a proof of identity, it would also identify Jairus in the Gospel with the son of Segub, or with the successor of Tola. One inference would scarcely be more absurd than the other. Again, the revival of the name Havoth Jair, after falling into disuse, when a new Jair rose to eminence in the same district, can occasion no surprise to any thoughtful mind. The towns, so named from the judge, do not seem to have been wholly the same as those to which the name had been given before. They were thirty in number, while twenty-three and sixty are the only numbers given in the first conquest; the former, apparently, for the Bashan Havoth Jair, and the latter including those towns of Kenath, which took the name of Nobah. The passage, 1 Chron. ii. 22, 23, is rendered by Hengsten-

berg,—‘And Segub begat Jair, who had twenty-three cities in the land of Gilead. And Geshur and Aram took Havoth Jair from them (Jair’s descendants) with Kenath and her daughters, threescore cities in all;’ and he adds strangely, that the passage has this meaning or none. It seems plain, however, that it does not speak of a reconquest, which would be quite out of place, but of the first conquest, and should be rendered,—‘And he took Geshur and Aram, even Havoth Jair from them (the Geshurites, &c.), with Kenath and her daughters, threescore cities; all these belonged to the sons of Machir the father of Gilead.’ The words of Joshua, xiii. 13, only prove that the expulsion of the Geshurites was not complete.

The remark of Steuder, that Jair, according to Chronicles, was ‘certainly not contemporary with Moses, but his age falls not long after Joshua,’ is nearly as absurd as the construction Vater has placed on Deut. iii. 15, that Machir in person survived till the conquest. But even Hengstenberg’s own view, that Jair, ‘a valiant warrior, held what he had gained with his sword and bow,’ involves the same error, though in a less flagrant form. For it is plain from Chronicles that Jair, like Machir, denotes the family, and not the person, its historical head. Hezron, the first-born of Pharez, could not have been born much more than twenty years after the descent, and Segub was born to him at sixty years of age. Hence Jair, the son of Segub, must have been born about 110 years after the descent, or 105 before the Exodus, and would have been 145 had he survived till the Conquest. But all who were above forty at the Exodus, except the Levites, had died

before the second numbering. It is plain that Jair was dead even before the Exodus, probably while Moses was in Midian; and his family, who took possession, had multiplied through four descents at the time of the Conquest. It seems to have resulted from the honourable position of Joseph, and of Manasseh as his firstborn, that in this family alone the *maternal* prevailed usually over the *paternal* genealogy. Hence, including sons and daughters, four descents might raise the number to ten thousand, while the half tribe amounted only to twenty-six thousand. Jair took Argob in the same sense as Machir took Gilead, that is, the family who bore his name.

Other anachronisms have been alleged (Davids. p. 13) in Deut. xix. 14; Exod. xxii. 29; Lev. xxvi. 34, 35, 43; but the charge is so manifestly and purely absurd as to deserve no answer. Moses, forsooth, could not have given a law to the Israelites not to remove old landmarks or not to delay the offering of their first-fruits, because they had not then entered the land. He could not warn them of future exile as the sure effect of national sin, and of their neglect of God's sabbaths, because that would imply a foresight of events still remote. There seems really no limit to the childish folly into which men may be permitted to fall, when they rely on their own fancied learning to cast foul reproach on the words of the living God.

CHAPTER XII.

ALLEGED HISTORICAL CONTRADICTIONS.

113. THE charges of internal contradiction brought against the Pentateuch by modern critics are very numerous. Most of them, however, are so palpably groundless, as to make it an irksome and almost superfluous task to offer a formal refutation. Six or seven of the chief shall be examined in order, as presented by Dr. Davidson in his last work, that it may be seen what kind of arguments have been relied upon to uproot and overturn the old foundations of the faith of the Church of Christ.

ISSACHAR, ZEBULUN, AND JOSEPH.

‘There are double etymologies of the names Issachar and Zebulun, Gen. xxx. 14–20. In v. 16 the name Issachar is explained by the circumstance that Leah had hired Jacob with her son’s mandrakes, while in v. 18 she calls him Issachar because God had given her a hire or reward for lending her maid to her husband. In like manner she called her sixth son Zebulun — dweller, saying, “Now will my husband dwell with me:” but her words, “God hath endued me with a good dowry,” intimate *dowry* as the meaning of the name, from *zabad*, *daleth* and *lamed* being interchangeable letters. The Hebrew writers, having no perception of scientific etymology, undertook to explain old

names by the language as spoken in their day. Each would naturally give his own derivation of the same word. Different etymologies of Joseph are given. "And she conceived and bare a son, and said, God hath taken away my reproach. And she called his name Joseph, and said, The Lord shall *add* to me another son." In the former case it is equivalent to $\eta\delta\delta\iota$, from $\eta\delta\delta$; in the latter the Jehovist deduces it from $\eta\delta\delta\tau$, to add. Kiel replies, that the former gives no etymology, but only makes a slight allusion—a most remarkable statement.—*Introd.* p. 62.

Ans. i. This objection flatly contradicts the theory it is brought to confirm. For in the scheme of the writer, xxx. 17–40 is referred wholly to one and the same writer, the Jehovist. Now this contains the alleged double etymology of Zebulun and Joseph, and the sole etymology of Issachar. A strange beginning of the sceptical argument! 'And Balak said unto Balaam, What hast thou done? I took thee to curse, and behold, thou hast blessed altogether!'

ii. The double etymology of Issachar, by the statement of the objector, is one and the same. The meaning, *hire*, is the etymology. If Leah gave it for a double reason, there is in this no shadow of inconsistency or contradiction. The theory makes vv. 14–16 a later addition from the Redactor. But a more unnatural separation cannot be conceived. Leah's grateful acknowledgment, v. 18, is like a direct echo of her own previous words, v. 16; while the intermediate passage, with its minute touches of domestic history, is most absurdly assigned to the last of four fictitious authors, in the reign of Manasseh.

iii. The statement respecting Zebulun involves three flagrant contradictions. The objection assigns vv. 19, 20 to two authors, the scheme to one only. The name Elohim alone is used vv. 17–23, and yet the scheme refers all to the Jehovist, and the objection, part to the Jehovist, and part to the Redactor or Elohist. Again, the double allusion in the name, which the scheme ascribes to the invention of the Jehovist, is held to be impossible in Leah herself, in whom alone it is perfectly natural and consistent.

iv. In the third case the remark of Keil is plainly true, and the dogmatic contradiction plainly false. This is proved by the contrast of tense in the two verbs. The words of Rachel were not ‘God will take away,’ which would be needful to create a second etymology, but ‘God hath taken away (קָטַף) my reproach; while Joseph, קָטַף, a future tense, strictly answers to the saying, ‘God will add to me another son.’ Asaph and Joseph are two proper names, both prominent in Scripture, and quite distinct from each other.

114. ABRAHAM IN EGYPT AND GERAR. Gen. xii. xx.

‘Sarah is taken by Abimelech at Gerar, as she had been taken in Egypt by the king of the country, with the intention of making her a wife. It is remarkable that two events, so strikingly alike, should have occurred in Abraham’s life. And when Sarah’s beauty is that from which danger is apprehended, there is a difficulty in xvii. 17, xviii. 11, 12. She must have preserved her charms to a late period of life. Still, there is some room for doubting the original identity of the facts, on account of the dissimilarities.’

Ans. The two events agree only in two points,—the

desire of a heathen king to marry Sarah, and God's interference for her protection. They differ in all the rest. In time, they are twenty-four years asunder. In place, one is in Egypt and the other in Gerar. In person, one is Abimelech, the other Pharaoh. In the character of the person, one is implied to be a despot, restrained by a strong hand alone, the other a man of uprightness and religious fear. In the means employed, great plagues in one case, and in the other a dream of the night, and a brief restraint on the usual fertility. The tone of the rebuke to Abraham is harsh and irritated on the part of Pharaoh, gentle, modest, and truthful on the part of Abimelech. The view, which would confound together two events so wholly distinct, on the ground of a single resemblance, is an extreme instance of critical blindness. One occurrence, instead of being any presumption against the truth of the other, serves only to make it more probable. The objection from the age of Sarah is clearly worthless; since the basis of the whole narrative, on which its moral depends, is a special exercise of Divine power in the case of Abraham and Sarah, so as to fulfil God's promise in direct opposition to the customary laws of human life.

115. ABRAHAM AND ISAAC IN GERAR.

'The same thing also happens to Rebecca at Gerar. It is remarkable that Gerar, the theatre of action, and Abimelech, the party concerned, are the same in both cases. It is mere assumption to say that it was the common name of Gerar's kings.'

Ans. i. The interval of time between the sojourn of Abraham and Sarah, and that of Isaac and Rebecca, is

about eighty years. The view that 'Abimelech, the party concerned, is the same in both cases,' may pair off, in point of truth and good sense, with an assertion that Festus and Agrippa agreed to send Paul to Augustus Cæsar, and not to Nero, for trial,—Acts, xxv. 25; xxvi. 32; Luke, ii. 1,—and that 'it is a mere assumption to think that' Augustus and Cæsar 'were common names' of the Roman Emperors. Abimelech is still the name of Achish, king of the Philistines, in the time of David.

ii. All the other circumstances are here distinct. Rebecca is not taken at all from her husband; the king merely reproves him for the danger to which he had exposed her from some of his people, and the guilt which might thus have been brought on the land. The criticism, which would confound in one two occurrences so wholly distinct in time, persons, and essential features, is astonishingly absurd.

iii. The sceptical hypothesis divides the history in Gen. xxvi. in the following way, vv. 1-5, Redactor; v. 6, Junior Elohist; vv. 7-12, Redactor; 13, 14a, Junior Elohist; 14b, 15, Redactor; 16, 17, Junior Elohist; v. 18, Redactor; vv. 19-22, Junior Elohist; vv. 23, 24, Redactor; 25a, Junior Elohist; 25b, Redactor; 26-33, Elohist; 33b, Redactor; 34, 35, Elohist. Thus we are required to believe that an unknown author, in the days of Elisha, recovered from tradition, or invented, nine verses, giving an account of Isaac's stay in Gerar; and that another, in the days of Manassch, prefixed five verses, with a pretended account of a Divine vision and message, and interpolated eleven others, in four different fragments; and this compound was then prefixed to ten other

verses, dating from the time of Saul, so as to form one triple narrative, where common eyes can see only a plain, unadorned, consecutive statement of Isaac's personal history. And these follies dare to call themselves advanced Biblical criticism.

iv. The three histories, with all their distinctness, have plainly a moral unity, to which there is allusion in Ps. cv. 13-15. Each falls naturally into its own place, while they all reveal the weakness of faith in the two patriarchs, and the gracious care of God, by which they were preserved from the effects of their own timorousness. But the scheme explains their presence in the same book by a kind of fortuitous concurrence of atoms. The middle one was first composed by the Junior Elohist in the times of Elisha; then the first, or the account of Abraham in Egypt, by a writer in the days of Uzziah; and the third, with its sequel, partly by one in the days of Saul, partly by another in the time of Elisha, and chiefly by a fourth in the time of Manasseh, eleven centuries after the events he professes to record. This confusion, worse confounded, is what we are invited to believe as far worthier of confidence than the true sayings of the Son of God.

116. HAGAR AND ISHMAEL.

‘The narratives in Gen. xvi. and xxi. appear to be varieties of one and the same event, because the principal circumstances are identical. Both have the same result, obviously the aim intended, the separation of the Arab descendants of Abraham from his theocratic posterity. The motive is the same, Sarah's jealousy and envy. The greatness and power of the people are noted in both. In both an angel makes the announcement, with the same etymology of the name Ishmael, at a fountain in the wilderness. Thus the essentials of both are the same; the re-

maining circumstances are of secondary moment, and do not hang well together. The view which refers them to the same event, taking different forms by transmission through independent channels, is confirmed by the fact that one is Junior Elohistie, the other Jehovistic.'—*Introd.* p. 63.

Ans. The trivial differences are these. The two events are just sixteen years apart. In one, Ishmael is unborn; in the other, fifteen or sixteen years old. In one, Hagar is expelled for despising the barrenness of Sarah; in the other, Ishmael for mocking at Sarah's child, when his weaning-feast was held. In one, Hagar flies of her own accord from Sarah; in the other, she and Ishmael are formally dismissed by Abraham, after a Divine revelation. In one case, she is charged to return and submit herself to Sarah; in the other, she never returns at all. In one case, the name Ishmael is given to the unborn child; in the other, the name is assumed to be already known, and is the subject only of an indirect allusion. In one, the result is the birth of Ishmael in the house of Abraham; in the other, his stay in the wilderness, and his marriage. There is a moral resemblance in the two events, but nearly all their historical features are in marked contrast with each other. The effort to identify them, or view them as the same event distorted by two historians, is conspicuously absurd.

117. MERIBAH AND KADESH.

'Another duplicate account is in Exod. xvii. 1, Num. xx. 1-13, of the water brought out of the rock, and the origin of the name Meribah. As the same name could not have been given twice, both must have grown out of one. Exod. xvii. 2-7 is Jehovistic, while Num. xx. 1-13 contains portions of different documents.'

Here, also, the contrasts are so plain, as to make it wonderful how they could ever be supposed to be varied reports of the same event. They differ widely in time, since there was an interval of just thirty-nine years. They differ as widely in place, since the first was at Rephidim, and the latter at Kadesh, in the southern limit of Canaan, a distance of nearly 180 miles in a direct line. In the name given to the place—to the first, Massah and Meribah, and to the second, Kadesh and En Mishpat, the place where God was sanctified, and the fountain of judgment. In the complaint uttered, which implies in the second case the wasting of that whole generation,—‘Would God that we had died when our brethren died before the Lord.’ In the instruction to Moses, to smite the rock in the first case, to speak to it in the other. In the impatience of Moses, the second time only, which was the immediate ground of his exclusion from entering the land. Each is referred to distinctly in the chapters that follow,—‘Ye rebelled against my commandment in the desert of Zin, in the strife of the congregation, to sanctify me at the water before their eyes: that is the water of strife in Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin,’ Num. xxvii. 14. ‘Ye shall not tempt the Lord your God as ye tempted Him in Massah.’ Deut. vi. 16.

118. THE APPOINTMENT OF JUDGES. Exod. xviii.; Deut. i. 6-18.

The latter account, it is here objected, contradicts the earlier, and both are inconsistent with Num. xi. 14-17, where Moses still complains of bearing the burden alone.

Now it is plain, from the account in Exodus, that this appointment of judges was by Jethro’s advice, that it took

place before his return, and formed the first main step in the Sinaitic legislation. An executive was first appointed, and then a code of laws was publicly given. But the order in Deuteronomy is really the same. The objection overlooks v. 18, which follows the mention of this appointment, and includes the whole series of legislation that followed. 'And I commanded you at that time all the things which ye should do.' Moses, in this brief review of the past, first recounts the charge to go up and possess the land, which closed the stay at Horeb; and then notices the double fact, the appointment of judges and the promulgation of laws, which had prepared the way for this march to the Land of Promise.

Again, the selection of the seventy elders, and the gift of prophecy bestowed on them, is plainly distinct in character from the selection of judges, as well as later in time. In the former history, the prophetic character, or the reference of causes directly to God, was expressly reserved to Moses alone. But the prophetic gift, in the later selection, raised its possessors nearly to the level of Moses, and made their utterances final and decisive, like his own. Hence, his words to Joshua,—'Enviest thou for my sake? Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put His Spirit upon them!' There is thus no contradiction between the two statements, but a perfect harmony. Not merely the exclusive judgeship, but the sole possession of the prophetic office, was too heavy a burden, and needed to be shared with others.

119. THE MISSION OF THE SPIES.

Here three contradictions are alleged. First, that in

Numbers it is ascribed to the express command of God, but in Deuteronomy to the wish of the people. But the two things perfectly agree. If Moses consulted God upon the request of the people, the answer he received would be a Divine command. Secondly, that the parties were not the same. 'The writer seems to have forgotten that these things took place, according to the story, forty years before.' On the contrary, his recollection of the interval is conspicuous throughout these opening chapters, and is expressly stated, ii. 7, 14; i. 46. The statement is astonishing for its audacity. Nearly one-half of those numbered the second time would be already alive, and one-third of them old enough to remember, at the earlier date. Thirdly, Moses in Numbers is said to exhort the people to go up, only after the return of the spies, while in Deuteronomy it is before. But there is nothing in Numbers to exclude the earlier exhortation, and it is implied by the whole course of the previous history.

120. THE EDMITES. Deut. ii. 29.

A contradiction is alleged between the statement, Deut. ii., and those of Num. xx. and Deut. xxiii. In one place the Edomites and Moabites sell bread and water to Israel; and in the other are blamed, and an adverse law is enacted, because they refused to do it.

The answer of Leake, Kurtz, and Hengstenberg, is plain and easy, that the two statements refer to different times. The Edomites refused to give Israel a passage across their mountain border; but when these dreaded rivals had reached the eastern side, which is less defensible, they made a virtue of necessity, and were then eager to avoid new occasion of offence.

But it is still urged that the Book of Numbers gives no sign that Balak and his people, either for love or money, supplied the Israelites with bread and water, as the later passage affirms. This disclosure, however, of new historical details, agreeing with the earlier narrative, but not contained in it, is one of the most natural signs of a genuine record. Fear leads naturally to acts of outward submission and courtesy, even where the spirit is secretly hostile, and we are told that 'Moab was sore afraid of the people because they were many.' This passing mention of an outward submission, not mentioned before, and the later condemnation of their hostile spirit when they hired Balaam to curse the people, is so far from being a difficulty, that it is a strong indication of historical truth.

121. THE PLACE OF SACRIFICE.

The limitation of sacrifices, in Deuteronomy, to one appointed place, is thought to contradict the earlier promise in Exod. xx. 24. Also the mention of present licence, Deut. xii. 8, is held inconsistent with the actual condition of the people under the eye of Moses encamped on the plains of Moab.

The appointment, however, of a central place for national worship, where all the sacrifices were usually to be offered, is one main feature of the history, from the pitching of the tabernacle at Shiloh down to the burning of the first temple; and onward, after the Captivity, to the times of the New Testament. The more indefinite promise, in Exod. xx., was not only given before the sanctuary and its altar was built, and the precept, in Lev. xvii. 1-7, but in later times applied to the special and

extradordinary sacrifices, such as that of Samuel at Ebenezer, or Gideon at Ophrah, which were warranted by peculiar circumstances, or by a direct command of God. When God recorded His name in any place, there sacrifice might be offered, while one central place alone for such sacrifices was the general rule. Again, the words, xii. 8, refer to the state of Israel in the wilderness, in which other passages show clearly that great religious laxity had prevailed.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY.

122. THE Elohist theory, which distributes the Pentateuch among four or five authors later than Moses, and remote in time from each other, draws its chief arguments from the use of the sacred names in Genesis, and from supposed anachronisms or contradictions. Its main pillars have now been tested and found worthless. Some of the texts appeared to directly confirm the Mosaic origin of the work. Instead of gleaning objections that remain, it is wiser now to consider the direct evidence from the Law itself, which ratifies the ancient faith of the Church and the Synagogue, that Moses was truly and indeed the writer of the books which bear his name. And here the natural order is to begin with Deuteronomy, which contains various testimonies to its own authorship. Is this book an imposture and forgery of Jeremiah, or some unknown deceiver in Jeremiah's age, or the genuine writing of 'Moses, the man of God?'

No middle ground is possible in this inquiry. If the discourses and parting words of Moses were real events, it seems certain that they would be recorded at once, and the Book of Deuteronomy, received by the Jews as a

Divine message for at least twenty-three centuries, must be that record. If those discourses were not real, but invented long after, and ascribed to Moses, and to God Himself, eight centuries after Moses' death, then the whole book is a successful forgery, by which the Church and the world have been long deceived. It is a fraud, with almost every conceivable aggravation of its impiety and profaneness.

123. First, assuming the events and discourses to be real, what light does the book throw on its own composition?

When Moses gave the addresses, of which chh. xxvii. xxviii. are the record, it is implied that the previous chapters were already written. For the direction is there given, 'And thou shalt set thee up great stones, and plaster them with plaster; and thou shalt write upon the stones all the words of the law very plainly.' This implies that he had the law, to which he refers, in his hand, or by his side, in a written form. And v. 26 implies further its actual existence as a writing. Again, in ch. xxviii. 58, we have mention of 'all the words of this law that are written in this book,' and in v. 61, of 'every sickness, and every plague, which is not written in this book of the law.' It may be doubted whether this book were confined to these last addresses, or contained all the earlier legislation. But it seems clear that the commands so lately delivered were contained and written in a book when these warnings and instructions were given.

Next, it seems also plain that chh. xxvii., xxviii. were also written, when the address in chh. xxix., xxx. was uttered. For ch. xxix. 1 marks a completion of the

repeated law, Deut. i.-xxviii: 'These are the words of the covenant which the Lord commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel in the land of Moab, beside the covenant which he made with them in Horeb.'

The later code, now complete, is here contrasted with the earlier Sinaitic legislation, Exod. xix. ; Lev. xxvii. But here, in v. 21, mention is made of 'all the curses of the covenant that are written in this book of the law ;' and again, v. 27, of 'all the curses that are written in this book.' There is here a double allusion to xxvii. 14-26 and xxviii. 15-68. It seems to follow that these threatenings and curses had been already written in the book of the law, at the time when the further address in chh. xxix., xxx. was given, closing with the solemn alternative of life and death.

124. In chh. xxix.-xxxiv. there is more room for a difference of judgment, how far the words imply their composition by Moses himself, or point to their addition by Joshua or Eleazar after his death. Assuming the general truth of the record, it must seem highly probable that chh. xxix., xxx. would be written by Moses himself after their oral delivery, just as the two previous chapters had plainly been. Again, the account of the death of Moses, ch. xxxiv., must clearly have been added after his decease. Ch. xxxiii. begins with the words, 'This is the blessing wherewith Moses, the man of God, blessed the children of Israel before his death.' This naturally implies that the blessing orally delivered by Moses was recorded after his death by some other person, since this title of honour is added to the name of Moses for the first time.

The question with regard to chh. xxxi., xxxii., or the Song of Moses, with its introduction and sequel, is more obscure and doubtful. Unless Moses recorded the completion of the writing by anticipation before it had strictly occurred, some part, if not the whole, of these chapters, as they now form part of the book, must have been from a contemporary, but later hand.

Hengstenberg thinks that the delivery to the priests and elders, xxxi. 9, was an official act, which had a symbolical character. After this Moses resumed the book, and wrote as far as v. 23, where his own autograph ceased. It was then continued, probably by Joshua, after Moses had written the song separately, and taught it to the people, perhaps also after his death. On this view, v. 9 gives the testimony of Moses himself, and v. 24 that of a Continuator, to the Mosaic composition of the rest of the work.

This view is open to some difficulty from the language of vv. 19, 22. For in this case the Song would be wholly wanting in the part written by Moses, and still a reference be twice made to it, as if written by him. It seems that all from v. 14 must be referred to the same person, whether Moses or Joshua, by whom the Song was appended to the rest of the law. And if this was a Continuator, and not Moses, it is more natural to ascribe to him the thirteen previous verses. For these two chapters, like the two pairs of chapters before them, form one closely connected historical portion of the book.

On examination, however, the difficulty in referring these chapters to Moses himself will be found to disappear. The Song was written the same day that the message was

given, and was publicly brought to the children of Israel, v. 22. This might easily be on the same, or at latest on the following day. But when this was done, Moses the same day received the command to go up to Mount Nebo. He knew, then, that this was the last of the Divine messages he was appointed to deliver and record. The Song, from its very nature, was to be part of the Book of the Law, its fitting and solemn close. The writing of the Song was also to precede its oral publication, and the purpose of its being written required a statement of the circumstances under which it was revealed. One or two hours would suffice to write it down, with the seven verses that precede and the nine that follow. There seems, then, no difficulty in supposing that Moses might write, two hours beforehand, his charge to the Levites, their summons of the people, and the oral publication of the Song, just as he would have written them at the close of the day, or on the day following, had the record been to follow and not precede this oral publication. An anticipation of this limited kind is frequent, and almost necessary, in legal documents. On this view the words in v. 9 refer to the writing as far as ch. xxx, but the fuller phrase in v. 24 to the completion as far as the close of ch. xxxii, where the autograph of Moses will end. As soon as the Law was thus complete, a double charge was given to the Levites, to keep it in their custody, by placing it at the side of the ark, and to gather the assembly for the oral delivery of the Song. These two chapters would be actually written in the course of the day when the threefold message was given, xxxi. 14-16, xxxi. 2, 3, xxxii. 48-52. But officially, by the final delivery of the book to the

Levites, to be placed at the side of the ark, this record of the last day of the lawgiving was ratified at its close, after the Song had been orally published, and the parting exhortation addressed to the assembled people. The Blessing might be pronounced the next day, before Moses went up to the Mount, and be recorded by Joshua or Eleazar after his death.

125. The order of events will result as follows from the internal evidence. The publication of Deuteronomy began on the first day of the eleventh month. Nearly on the last day of that month, Moses gave the charge to the people, xxxi. 2-6, to Joshua, vv. 7, 8, and also to the Priests and Levites for the public reading of the Law every seven years, vv. 9-14. This would be in the morning of the day. Then Moses and Joshua received the joint charge to present themselves before God. Moses was told to write and publish the Song which God was about to reveal, and Joshua to be strong, and of good courage, because he was now appointed the successor of Moses and future captain of the people. Moses receives the further charge to go up, probably the next day, to Mount Nebo. He writes at once these two chapters, the message of his last day of office, the close and seal of the Law. He directs the Levites where to place the Book of the Law, now complete, at the close of the day, but first to gather the people to hear the Song which God has revealed. The Song, already written, is read in their ears according to the record. Moses then adds those few words of affectionate admonition, as already recorded, while he hands over the book to the Levites at the close of the day. The next morning the people are summoned early to hear their

great lawgiver's last words of blessing. He then obeys the command, and goes up to the Mount. The thirty days of mourning begin, and last till the close of the fortieth year.

The conclusion from this analysis is plain. Either Deuteronomy, as far as ch. xxx., and probably as far as ch. xxxii., is the writing of Moses himself, or it must be a most complex and skilful forgery, in which Divine messages are invented, and the holy name of God is taken in vain a hundred times, to give currency to utter falsehoods. The writer, if not Moses, must have been a man of seared conscience and obdurate heart. He must have been able to pen that solemn passage—'If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law, that are written in this book, to fear this glorious and fearful name, the Lord thy God, then the Lord will make thy plagues wonderful, great plagues, and of long continuance,'—while conscious all the time that he was speaking deliberate lies in the name of the Lord. Let any one read the passage, ch. xxix. 18–28, striving to join with it the theory of these critics, that the whole is a mere invention; and his conclusion must surely be that a more hideous and hardened liar than their so-called Deuteronomist could never have darkened and polluted the face of our sinful world.

Let us now turn to the opening of the book, and we shall find a series of indirect proofs of its Mosaic authorship, hardly less decisive and, in some respects, even more striking, than the direct evidence at the close.

126. Ch. i. 2, 3.

'There are eleven days' journey from Horeb, by the way of Mount Seir, unto Kadesh-barnea. And it came to pass in the

fortieth year, in the eleventh month, on the first day of the month, Moses spake unto the children of Israel,' &c. &c.

How is the presence of this second verse to be explained? The answer is simple and clear, if Moses were the writer. The first chapters are a humbling review of the sins of the people. Now the very date of the message contained, to thoughtful minds, a very deep lesson. The distance from Horeb, where the law was given, to the southern border of Canaan, was only a journey of eleven days. And now, at the end of forty years of wandering and punishment, they have not yet entered the land of promise. Thus their perverseness and rebellion had lengthened a journey of a few days into a weary wandering of almost forty years. The insertion, then, is most natural and significant in Moses himself, their aged Lawgiver, while in any later historian it would be an improbable addition.

Strangely enough, in the 'Pentateuch Examined,' ii. 219, this verse has been boldly claimed as an objection to the Mosaic authorship. After quoting the simple and sensible remark of Scott, that 'it seems to have been introduced to remind the Israelites that their own misconduct alone had occasioned their tedious wanderings,' the comment follows: 'One glance, however, at the connexion will show that the verse cannot have been inserted for the reason assigned by Scott, but is simply a note of distance, which interrupts awkwardly the course of the narrative, and never certainly could have been introduced by Moses himself into the story.'

This glance must be very like a later glance at Num. iii. 18, in p. 335, where the text is made to speak of

Gershom, the son of Moses, instead of Gershon, the son of Levi, great uncle of Moses, and a process of reasoning is founded on this flagrant error. Some assertions are so monstrous, that they almost put an end to argument. The truth of Scott's remark, so boldly denied, is almost self-evident, but we will strive to make it still plainer.

The verse in question, then, if it were merely a geographical remark, would be what the objector styles it, an awkward interruption. It would be wholly out of place, because they were now in the plains of Moab, far away from Kadesh-barnea. But if its purpose is to contrast the actual with the ideal route, then it stands exactly where that contrast is rendered the most impressive. Their natural route, had they been faithful and courageous, would have been from Horeb to Kadesh-barnea, close to Hormah, and not far from Beersheba. Their actual place was far different in the plains of Moab east of Jordan. The natural interval would have been only a little more than eleven days, a fortnight or three weeks, from Horeb to that southern border, where they would have begun at once their career of conquest. The interval of time actually spent had been nearly thirty-nine years. How could Moses introduce this later repetition of the Law more impressively, then by reminding them at the outset, even in the formal mention of the date, that their former rebellion against that Law had caused them nearly forty years of fruitless toil and bitter sorrow? Viewed in this light, it is no unmeaning and awkward interruption, but a fit prelude to the cautions, warnings, and exhortations which are soon to follow.

This review has several features, which prove it to be the record of a real address by Moses himself to the people. How abruptly that prayer is interposed, in the account of the appointment of the judges, who were to relieve him from a burden too heavy to be borne! 'The Lord God of your fathers make you a thousand times so many as ye are, and bless you, as He hath promised you.' How true is this to nature, if a real utterance of the dying Lawgiver! The appointment in Ex. xviii. is given with new details, while all the laws in Exodus and Leviticus are summed up in one short sentence: 'And I commanded you at that time all the things that ye should do.'

Again, v. 19 refers back to v. 2, and their journey from Horeb to Kadesh-barnea. Here they had received the command to go up at once, and possess the land. Their request for spies to be sent, which might have been an act of simple prudence, was a first sign of their unbelief. It was shown, by the effect of their message, to be a cloak for their cowardice and perverseness. And thus the contrast in v. 2 unfolds itself more clearly. It was their own sin which had lengthened out this eleven days' journey into a tedious sojourn in the wilderness for forty years.

The order of vv. 37, 38 is natural in Moses and in no other. Caleb and Joshua alone had been excepted from the sentence in Num. xiv. The promise to Caleb, and to the little ones, stands here in the same order as in the earlier history. But Joshua, who then shared the promise to Caleb, received afterwards the higher promise of conducting Israel into the land. Moses himself was

excluded much later, as the people had been before, and through their sin. Thus the rapid transition is natural in Moses, and in him alone, from the second year to the fortieth, and back to the second again, because the first promise to Joshua, and the second, the sin of the people, and his own sin through the people, were closely linked in the thoughts of Moses, when he reviews at their close the long course of those forty years.

The sequel repeats the account in Numbers with one significant addition: 'And ye returned and wept before the Lord; but the Lord would not hearken to your voice, nor give ear unto you.' Their tears were like those of Esau, on the borders of whose lands they were encamped, and could not reverse the settled judgment of God. They, too, like him, had despised their birthright, and 'thought scorn of that pleasant land.'

128. Ch. ii. 9-13.

'And the Lord said unto me, Distress not the Moabites, neither contend with them in battle: for I will not give you of their land for a possession, because I have given Ar unto the children of Lot for a possession. The Emims dwelt therein in times past, a people great, many, and tall, as the Anakims; which also were accounted giants, as the Anakims; but the Moabites call them Emims. The Horims also dwelt in Seir beforetime; but the children of Esau succeeded them, when they had destroyed them, and dwelt in their stead; as Israel hath done to the land of their possession, which the Lord hath given them. Now rise up, and get you over the brook Zered, and we went over the brook Zered.'

These recollections of earlier history, as Scott, Hengstenberg and many others have shown, 'were introduced

to encourage the Israelites.' But this Drs. Davidson and Colenso deny.

'The explanation is ingenious, but improbable, because it does not apply to *some* of the notices. A careful examination of Deut. ii. 10-13, 20-23; iii. 9-11, shows that they refer to events long past, and interrupt the connexion of the discourse. They are parentheses which break the continuity of the composition.' (Davids. 'Introd.' pp. 10, 11). 'It will be plain to an unprejudiced reader that this is not the special reason for which these notices are introduced. They occur only as pieces of interesting information on the points in question, without a word to intimate that they are expressly meant for the encouragement of the people.'—*Pent. Ex.* ii. 220.

The reason, then, which makes it plain that these are not the words of Moses, is that they are awkward parentheses, when referred to any mere historian of later times, while in his lips they would be a powerful encouragement to the people, on the eve of their conflict with seven nations mightier than themselves. And again, they cannot have been meant to encourage the people, however suited for that purpose, because Moses does not state his design in so many words, 'I am telling you of these earlier events on purpose to encourage you!' Such criticisms outrage every principle of common sense.

The view of Keil, that Moses added the words when he wrote down his own discourse, seems also to be groundless. They would be far more suitable in his oral address than if only added in the written copy, given to the custody of the priests for later generations. On the other hand, every clause points silently to the great end for which these statements are made. Why were the Israelites not to

distress Moab? Because God himself had given Moab their possession. The Emims, indeed, whom they had dispossessed, were ‘great, many, and tall, as the Anakims’ whom Israel were now to dispossess: but the gift of God had prevailed in their case, as it must shortly do in Israel’s victory. So too the sons of Esau had dispossessed the Horites, as Israel had done to Sihon and Og, of whose land they were now in possession. All these precedents taught the same lesson, that the Anakims must soon be driven out before the people of God. The words of v. 13, compared with v. 24, are the message of God rather than words of Moses. And thus the insertion of vv. 10–13 in the midst of the Divine message Moses had then received, is highly impressive in the lips of Moses himself, but, if referred to any other writer, is quite unnatural. It is wholly unlike the invention of an unscrupulous forger of later times.

129. Ch. ii. 20–23.

‘That also was accounted a land of giants: giants dwelt therein in old times, and the Ammonites call them Zamzumims: a people great, many, and tall, as the Anakims; but the Lord destroyed them before them, and they succeeded them, and dwelt in their stead. As he did to the children of Esau, which dwelt in Seir, when he destroyed the Horims from before them; and they succeeded them, and dwelt in their stead unto this day. And the Avims, which dwelt in Hazerim, unto Azzah, the Capthorims, which came forth out of Capthor, destroyed them, and dwelt in their stead.’

On this Hengstenberg truly remarks,—

‘The apprehensions, which these details were to obviate, are stated shortly before, i. 27. Compare Num. xiii. 28, 31, 33. To root out the prejudices here expressed, and by which the older

generation were excluded from the land, was the condition of victory for the succeeding one. Moses met them by reasoning *à minori ad majus*. What God did for the Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, and Caphthorites, will He not also do for His own people? Thus it appears that these passages break the connexion in outward appearance only, and were exactly suited to the state and disposition of those to whom Moses addressed himself. The reason, by no means unimportant, which others have adduced for the Mosaic origin of these portions, that their exact knowledge of the earliest times carries us back to the times of Moses, now assumes a subordinate position.'—*H. Pent.* ii. 195.

It may be remembered, further, that the repetition of the phrase, 'a people great, many, and tall, as the Anakims,' shows the purpose of the statement far more expressively than if Moses or the writer had said in so many words,—I say this for your encouragement. Also the repeated mention of the destruction of the Horims is fatal to the hypothesis that the paragraphs are inserted as curious historical facts alone. The encouragement of a people so timorous and faithless as Israel had been until now needed to be line upon line, with a threefold cord of precedents that could not be broken or explained away.

130. Ch. iii. 9, iv. 48.

'From the river of Arnon unto Mount Hermon, the Sidonians call Hermon Sirion, and the Amorites call it Shenir.' 'From Aroer, which is by the bank of the river Arnon, even unto Mount Sihon, which is Hermon.'

Here four different names are ascribed to the same mountain; one used by the Sidonians, another by the Amorites, a third, and perhaps also a fourth, by the Israelites themselves. Their insertion would be without

meaning in a later age, when Hermon had been used for centuries by the inhabitants of Palestine. But this mountain was the northern limit of Israel's destined inheritance, and is named on that account. There was an end to fulfil, by naming in the Law itself its titles among the two bordering northern tribes, who might dispute the limits. Comp. Josh. xiii. 4, 5. The name, *Sion*, *elevation* or *loftiness*, seems to have been given by the Israelites from the impression made on their senses by the height of this mountain. Hermon, from the root, *cherem*, like Hormah at the southern limit, seems to be a sacred memorial of the sentence on the Canaanites, inscribed alike on the southern and northern limits of the Land of Promise. This sentence, then, might be added by Moses in the writing, since its aim probably was not the present encouragement of the people, but to be a record of the limit of Israel's inheritance in the name usual among the bordering northern tribes, the Amorites and Sidonians. * The statement is natural in a writing of the Lawgiver, but not in any later composition.

131. Ch. iii. 11.

' For only Og, king of Bashan, remained of the remnant of the giants : behold, his bedstead is a bedstead of iron ; is it not in Rabbath of the children of Ammon ? nine cubits is the length thereof, and four cubits the breadth thereof, after the cubit of a man.'

An objection has been founded on these words,—

' Only a very short time could have elapsed since the conquest of Og. How, then, could his bedstead have been removed in that interval to Rabbath Ammon ? There was not one of his people left alive to bear off in safety this cumbrous relic. Or

how could Moses, so soon after the event, have spoken of Og in terms like these? It may be said that it had been taken to Rabbath before the death of Og, perhaps captured by the Ammonites in some former war, or sent by Og himself for preservation. The first supposition is hardly consistent with the fact that Og is said to have had his threescore cities fenced with high walls, &c. As to the second, it is very unlikely that an iron bed of this kind should have been deemed by him such a treasure as to be sent to the Ammonites for safe keeping. Scott observes that the Ammonites either saved it, or bought it of the Israelites, and carrying it to Rabbath, it was there preserved as a monument of his stature, and of Israel's victory. Kurtz thinks it most probable that it was at Rabbath before the Israelites came into the neighbourhood. But how could Moses have spoken of Og in such language at so short an interval after the conquest? Spenoza considers that in David's time, when he gathered all the people together and took Rabbath, an iron bed was found, and ascribed by the traditions of the people to the Amorite king.'—*Pent. Ex.* ii. 215, 216.

This passage, like the two before it, ch. ii. 10–13, 20–23, is really a strong evidence for the genuineness and historical reality of this discourse of Moses.

And first, the resort to the times of David for an explanation, and to his later conquest of Rabbah, is simply ridiculous. The encampment of Israel in the plains of Moab was not more than twenty miles from that town. It lay within two or three miles, at most, from the border of the land now occupied by the trans-Jordanic tribes.

The suggestions that Og might have sent his bedstead to Rabbah for safe keeping, or that some of his subjects took it thither after his death, are unworthy of notice. It is strange how any one could offer conjectures so improbable. The bedstead of this giant king was not likely to

be taken till he himself was slain. It is named as if meant for constant use, and not for show. But since Moab and Ammon were greatly distressed and alarmed by the victories of Israel over the Amorites, and the people had a strict charge not to disturb these tribes, or occupy their lands, an embassy to assure them of this friendly purpose would be natural, and almost necessary. In the similar case of the Edomites we know that such a message was sent. What could be more natural than to send some present with the embassy, as a pledge and token of the absence of any hostile design? Rabbah lay only just beyond the border of the Israelites. And if this bedstead, after the victories of Israel, were sent with an embassy to that city, it would fulfil a double object, and not only be a pledge of peace and good-will, but a visible sign of the power of Israel, who had now destroyed this mighty king, so lately an object of dread to the bordering nations.

The words, then, in the lips of Moses himself, would be forcible and appropriate. If added or composed at a later period, they would be perplexing and unnatural. The form of the question implies that the fact was notorious to the persons addressed. This might easily be true of the Israelites, when encamped within twenty miles of Rabbah, and only two or three months after Og had been defeated and slain, and this prize of victory sent to Rabbah as a pledge of peace and sign of power. But it would be most unlikely in the case of Jewish readers dispersed throughout Palestine in any later age.

Again, Moses had reminded the people how the Horims, Emims, Zamzummins, and Avites, earlier giant races on the skirts of Canaan, in circuit from south to north-east,

had been destroyed. He now adds that only Og and his people had remained, and these had now fallen already before the sword of Israel. The overthrow of the giant races outside of Canaan was complete. Within a few miles of the place where he addressed them, in Rabbath Ammon, this bedstead was a visible token of this completed destruction. Great, many, and tall, as the Anakims, they had now passed away, a sure pledge and earnest of the further conquest near at hand. Yet still the charge needs to be given,—‘Ye shall not fear them, for the Lord your God he shall fight for you:’ v. 22. Thus these so-called parentheses are convincing marks of the genuineness of these discourses, as truly addressed to the people by the Jewish Lawgiver before his death. On this view alone they are all emphatic and strictly in place, and capable of a full and clear explanation.

132. *BASHAN-HAVOTH-JAIR.* Ch. iii. 13–15.

‘And the rest of Gilead, and all Bashan, being the kingdom of Og, gave I unto the half tribe of Manasseh; all the region of Argob, with all Bashan, which was called the land of giants. Jaar the son of Manasseh took all the country of Argob unto the coasts of Geshuri and Maachithi, and called them after his own name, Bashan-Havoth-Jair, unto this day. And I gave Gilead unto Machir.’

The phrase, ‘unto this day,’ Gen. xix. 37, 38; xxii. 14; xxvi. 33; xxxii. 33; xxxv. 20; xlvii. 26; Deut. ii. 22; iii. 14; x. 8, has often been urged indiscriminately, as by Von Böhlen and Hartmann, in proof of the post-Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch. More cautious opponents confine the objection to this single passage, since in every other instance the phrase would plainly be quite

suitable, even in the time of Moses. Even the latest of the events thus referred to, the separation of the Levites, x. 8, had taken place thirty-nine years before. But since only a few months had elapsed since the conquest of Og, the use here of the same phrase is urged as a clear sign that the author wrote some time after the death of Moses. The objection is plausible, and requires an answer.

Now, first, it is plain that the verse is no interpolation, but an integral part of the whole sentence. Moses first reminds them what portion of the land he had given to Reuben and Gad. He then states that the rest of Gilead, and all Bashan, were given to the half tribe of Manasseh. And, next, he distinguishes the two parts of this allotment. Jair, the son of Manasseh, took all Argob, giving the towns a new name; 'and I gave Gilead,' that is, the rest of Gilead, named v. 13, 'unto Machir.' These two portions completed the allotment of this half tribe on the east of Jordan. Then the allotment to Reuben and Gad is named once more as a preface to the charge they had received. Thus v. 14 is plainly essential to complete his review of the allotments already made.

Again, the phrase 'unto this day' does not belong to the name only, but to the whole verse, which might be paraphrased: 'Jair took Argob, and has kept possession of it unto this day.' The stress and emphasis of the remark, it is clear from the whole context, refers to the occupation, of which the new name was only a sign. These cities could not bear the title of Havoth-Jair, unless the sons of Jair had held them now in actual possession.

Why, then, should Moses employ such a phrase when

the conquest had occurred, at the furthest, only three full months before? The context supplies an answer. This phrase has been used seven times in Genesis, and never once in the three later books. It reappears in Deuteronomy, and first in reference to the occupation of Scir by the Edomites, and the conquest or expulsion of the Horites, ii. 12, 22. This was the first instance of the overthrow of a giant race by the kindred or posterity of Abraham, and the possession of Bashan was the last. Five similar events had occurred,—the destruction of the Horims, Emims, Zamzummims, Avites, and Bashanites, completing a circuit of Palestine, and the latest, like the earliest, was now an accomplished fact, marked by an abiding and settled change of possessors. Though Jair had held Bashan only a few months, and Esau had held Scir for more than a century, and the eighth Edomite king was now reigning, both were facts of the same permanent character. Thus the use of the phrase, by Moses, is emphatic and significant. All the giant races outside of Canaan are now at length finally vanquished and displaced. It remains only for Israel to complete the destined work, to overthrow the dreaded Anakims, and enter in their promised inheritance. This day beholds Edom in the land of the Horims, Moab in that of the Emims, Ammon in that of the Zamzummims, the Caphthorims in that of the Avites, and Manasseh in the land of Og, the last remnant of the giants. To-morrow, then, must see the Anakims overthrown, and Israel settled in their stead. The use of the phrase is thus no objection to the Mosaic authorship, but its strong confirmation.

133. THE PRAYER OF MOSES.

This passage, Deut. iii. 23-29, is one of the clearest signs of the genuineness of the discourse, of which it forms the fitting and solemn close. It is a new fact, not recorded before, and every word bears the stamp of truth. The reverence and earnestness of the request, the firmness of the Divine refusal, so humbling to the aged leader of Israel, are equally conspicuous. It is implied that the request had been made even earlier, and was repeated when these eastern conquests were complete, and the Jordan alone parted them from the Land of Promise. At the same time the remark, 'The Lord was wroth with me for your sakes,' was a touching memorial to the people of their own sin. For their sake Moses, though far less guilty, was forbidden to enter the land which they were encouraged to cross over, in order to enjoy privileges he was forbidden to share. What forger could ever invent words of such tender pathos and deep moral power, and then take the name of God in vain to give currency to his own lie?

134. THE HISTORICAL PREFACE. Deut. iv. 44-49.

These verses introduce the main body of laws in this book, just as xxix. 1 marks their close, and their relation to God's earlier messages. They leave plainly no alternative open, except the admission of the genuineness and Mosaic origin of the record, or else the charge of a very carefully planned and most deliberate forgery. The twenty-four chapters that follow must either be the law of God by the hand of His servant Moses, or a gigantic falsehood from first to last. And yet they contain, along with the Decalogue, the three texts by which the Son of God repelled and overcame the temptations of Satan in

the wilderness, and that first and great commandment, which His lips have singled out from the whole word of God as pre-eminently Divine. Our Lord's own question is thus unanswerable: 'If ye believe not his writings, how can ye believe my words?' The whole passage before us has a kind of legal precision, in order to fix exactly the time and place when and where this crowning portion of God's law was given to His people. The comment, 'beyond Jordan toward the sunrising,' and the name Sion, given to Mount Hermon here only, are further signs that the words were penned on the eastern side of the river, before the name Hermon, dating from the Conquest, had superseded other and earlier names.

135. THE REPETITION OF THE DECALOGUE.

The variations between Exod. xx. and Deut. v. 6-21 have been turned into an objection against the genuineness of Deuteronomy in these words.

That the Deuteronomist had no very strong sense of the unspeakable sacredness of the earlier document is plain by the liberties he has taken with its contents, by altering several expressions, and modifying remarkably the fourth commandment. One would have thought that any one, even Moses himself, while repeating words believed to be ineffably holy, which had not only been uttered in the ears of Israel by Jehovah himself, but, according to the story, written down by the finger of God twice over on the tables of stone, would not have varied by a single word or letter from the Divine original. Yet how stands the case? There are several minor discrepancies, but the latter part of the fourth commandment is completely altered, and a totally different reason is assigned for sanctifying the Sabbath Each writer professes to give the identical words which were spoken by Jehovah himself, at the very same point of time.

This excludes the notion that one passage gives a mere reminiscence of the other, which might be vague or defective on some points, without affecting the general credibility of the narrative. Hence the two statements involve an absolute contradiction. The narration is so remarkable, that it cannot be supposed that Moses wrote the passage in Deuteronomy, either forgetting, or designedly modifying, the words of the original commandment. It is, therefore, enough of itself to show that the Book of Deuteronomy, at all events, could not have been written by Moses. As the Deuteronomist ventured to make so important a change, it is plain that he did not think it a sacrilegious act to alter the original form of the command, that he regarded it as merely a human composition, emanating from some writers of the previous age.'

The last remark amounts to an assertion that the Deuteronomist, being a consummate and hardened liar, capable of the worst profaneness, treated the writer of Exodus as another liar of the same stamp. The hypothesis is hateful and even horrible. It involves the necessary consequence that the Lord of Glory was a third deceiver, who endorsed and ratified these lies of the Elohist, and Deuteronomist, and thus gave them a tenfold, and hundred-fold wider currency than before. But the objection, when more closely examined, will prove as unreasonable as it is really in its own nature immoral and blasphemous.

i. First, the charge of direct contradiction, drawn from Deut. v. 22, rests on a critical error. 'These words' is not a vague expression for each letter and syllable, but denotes, 'these ten commandments.' This is plain by comparing Exod. xxxiv. 28, and Deut. iv. 13. 'And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten words.' 'And he declared unto you his covenant which

he commanded you to perform, the ten words, and he wrote them upon two tables of stone.' In both passages, 'the words' are ten in number, and refer to the ten commandments, each being viewed as a whole, and not to the grammatical elements of which they were composed.

ii. The reason alleged why the report in Deuteronomy could not be from Moses is just the clearest sign that Moses, and no other, gave this new recension of the Decalogue. Any mere historian, perhaps any inferior prophet, would have felt bound, by reverence, to reproduce unvaried those ten commandments which had been written on tables of stone by the finger of God. In Moses alone, the man of God, the Divinely appointed lawgiver, whose words were to be received as not less truly words of God the Supreme Lawgiver than the Decalogue itself, a deviation is conceivable, and consistent with the fullest sense of the sacredness of the earlier message. It was he who had with his own hands dashed to pieces the tables first given, in token that the covenant was broken by the open idolatry of the people. The actual tables were not the first, but the second. A mere annalist would naturally repeat these laws verbatim, just as first pronounced on Sinai. But Moses was God's own lawgiver, filled with the Spirit of God to complete a code already begun. And hence, in his case alone, there might be weighty reasons for some partial change in the way of expansion or comment, when the Decalogue was republished, without abating in the least degree the sacredness which belonged to the whole. In the preface, then, and the three first commands, where the first person is used, the repetition is exact. But in the fourth and fifth commandments Moses speaks as the Law-

giver, no longer as a mere annalist, and renews them both, as precepts now given them anew, with Divine authority, by adding that significant clause, ‘as the Lord thy God commanded thee.’ A fresh reason, too, is now given for the observance of the Sabbath, from the great work of deliverance and redemption which God had wrought for His people Israel. Such a change is quite natural, and adds to the force of this repetition of the Decalogue, transferring the command from past time to time present, when the speaker is God’s own inspired messenger, the dying Lawgiver of His people. Instead of a mere record of what had occurred forty years before, it now becomes a present voice of authority from the living God to His own people. But in any common historian such a change would be out of place. Nothing else than the high dignity of Moses, as the mediator of the old covenant, can fully explain this rapid transition from the simple annalist to the voice of authority and the tones of the legislator, so that the change increases and renews the impressiveness, without impairing the authority, of the original message.

136. THE DEATH OF AARON. Deut. x. 6, 7.

These verses, it has been said, interrupt the narrative, and are out of place, and every explanation proposed is too artificial to be adopted. The order of the stations, too, is different from that in the Book of Numbers. Aaron’s death is placed in Mosera instead of Hor, and seems to be joined with the separation of Levi, while there was really an interval of thirty-eight or thirty-nine years. The reason for the statement of v. 7, it is also objected, is not easy to understand.

These verses are, indeed, very hard to explain on the sceptical hypothesis of the spuriousness of the book, and its modern date. The sudden transition can only be explained, when the words are seen to be a genuine discourse of the great Lawgiver of Israel. The connexion is plain, omitting these two verses. The sin of the people in making the golden calf was the reason why the two tables were broken, and had to be renewed. At this time the tribe of Levi consecrated themselves to the Lord by their zeal against idolatry. *Exod.* xxxii. 25-29. Their appointment as the priestly tribe seems to have begun that day, and was ratified within a month after the completion of the tabernacle, when the tables were placed in the ark, and the ark in the most holy place, *Exod.* xl. 2, 3, 20, 21. 'At that time' the Lord separated the tribe of Levi, *Num.* iii. 1-51. The second forty days, twice named, *Deut.* ix. 25-29, x. 10, concurred with the first stage of that consecration; and the placing of the tables in the ark was the prelude to that final act by which this tribe took the place of the first-born.

Again, the mention of *Taberah*, *Massah*, *Kibroth-Hattaavah*, and *Kadesh-barnea*, also deviates from the order of time through a higher law of moral unity. The sin at *Massah* was before the worship of the calf, the three other events almost a year later. But they were all sins of the same kind, and lessons of humiliation to the people. They are grouped together, as no mere annalist would be likely to do, in a way that bespeaks the heart and voice of Moses the Lawgiver.

In *Num.* xxxiii. 31-33, successive stations are named at *Moseroth*, *Bene-jaakin*, *Hor-hagidgad*, and *Jotbathah*.

These answer to Beeroth, of the children (*beni*) of Jaakan, Moserah, Gudgodah, and Jotbath, in this later passage. The order of the two first is plainly different. But the people were twice in this neighbourhood, in the second year when the spies were sent, and again in the fortieth year, at the time of Aaron's death. The verses in Numbers refer to the earlier visit, since a return to Ezion-gaber, v. 35, is there named before Aaron's death. The order, then, of the two stations at Moseroth and Bene-jaakan might well be varied. Again, in Num. xxxiii. 37, they are said to have pitched in Mount Hor before the death of Aaron. But that this was near the mountain, not upon it, is plain from Num. xx. 22, 23, 25; where Moses, Aaron, and Eleazar, are said to go up from the camp to the mountain. The name Hor-hagidgah, implies that Gudgodah, the next station, bordered on the mount, and so doubtless did Moserah; and an encampment reaching from it nearly to the foot of the mount might bear either name.

137. The two verses, Deut. x. 6, 7, depart wholly from the order of time, since the death of Aaron was thirty-eight years later than the events which precede and follow. And, hence, their presence can be explained in the actual words of Moses, but in no other way. His aim throughout is to prove the patient mercy of the Lord to His people in spite of their aggravated sins. The calf-worship had brought on them a double token of the Divine displeasure. First, the tables of the covenant were broken, and the covenant itself dissolved, almost as soon as made. But in answer to the intercession of Moses new tables were provided, written upon by the finger of

God, placed in the ark, and remained there until that very day. Next, the Lord had been very angry with Aaron to have destroyed him; and with such a judgment on the high-priest, the covenant of grace to Israel would have come doubly to an end. But Moses prayed for Aaron at that time, and he was forgiven. Not only so, but, when the time of his death arrived, there was a new token of God's restored and enduring favour, when 'Eleazar, his son, ministered in the priest's office in his stead.' Thus doubly, at the close of their wanderings, by the presence of the new tables in the ark, and by the high-priesthood of Eleazar in the place of Aaron, mercy had rejoiced against judgment. These verses, then, are natural in a retrospect by Moses himself at the close of his life, and on this hypothesis alone.

The brief details, again, of the wells of the children of Jaakan, and of the rivers of waters found at Jotbath, are such as no later writer could be expected to supply. In the lips of Moses they have a singular force and beauty. To those wearied wanderers these 'streams in the wilderness and rivers in the desert' would be associations of delight and pleasure. The chief mercy, the renewal and continuance of the high-priesthood, was thus enshrined to their hearts in a setting of visible and external blessings. While the patience of Moses had been worn out and failed through their repeated murmurings, the patient love of their God was more and more clearly revealed. Wells first, and then rivers of water, had attended and sealed a higher gift, the confirmation in Eleazar of the priestly covenant. So strong is the proof afforded by these words, at first sight rather obscure and perplexing,

of the genuine, historical reality of the discourse in which they are found.

138. GILGAL. Deut. xi. 30.

‘It must seem strange,’ it is said, ‘that Moses, who had never been in the land of Canaan, should know all these places, and be able to describe them so accurately. But it is still more strange that he should know the name Gilgal, which, according to the Book of Joshua, was not given to the place till after the people had entered the land of Canaan. It is plain the text was written at a later age, when these places and names were familiarly known.’—*Pent. Ex.* ii. 200.

How could Moses, it is here objected, know anything precise of the geography of Canaan? We may well reply, how could he help knowing it? He held a high rank in Egypt, in the household of Pharaoh, nearly forty years. The constant intercourse of Egypt and Canaan, before the Exodus, is proved by Scripture and the monuments. Since then, he had passed forty years in Midian, with the constant hope of leading Israel to the land of their fathers. The Midianites were carriers between Egypt and the countries to the north. Moses was grandson of Levi, and Levi had lived 33 years in Canaan, before the Descent. Joshua and Caleb, with the other spies, had searched the land forty days, and had brought a full report to Moses of all that they had seen. With such motives for gaining full knowledge, and such various opportunities, ignorance on the part of Moses of the geography of Canaan, in all its main features, is incredible and impossible.

Again, is the Gilgal here named really the encampment between Jordan and Jericho? Even in this case, the name might have existed before, and the event in Josh. v.

9 have merely added to the old name a new association. This occurs in other instances. But here there is strong evidence that another Gilgal is meant, lying to the west of Ebal and Gerizim. For in Josh. xii. 23 a king of the nations of Gilgal is named, after Dor in the coasts of Dor, and before Tirzah. Now Tirzah lay about ten miles east of Ebal, and Dor to the north. Again, in 2 Kings, ii. 1-6, Elijah and Elisha came down from Gilgal to Bethel, and from Bethel, by Jericho, pass on to Jordan. This Gilgal, then, was higher than Bethel and more remote from Jordan. In 2 Kings, iv. 38, 42, we find Gilgal named once more, not far from Baal Shalisha, which lies south-west from Gerizim. Ruins with the name Jiljilieh are still found, fifteen or twenty miles north of Lydda, and near to the sea-coast route, nearly due west from Ebal and Gerizim. Hence it seems clear that this was the Gilgal of Deuteronomy, and that it adjoined the sea-coast route from Egypt through Palestine. 'The Canaanites which dwell in the champaign over against Gilgal, beside the plain of Moreh,' would then fix the site of these mountains, Ebal and Gerizim, by reference to a much-frequented route through Palestine, well known by report to the Israelites in Egypt, and during their stay in the wilderness. The place of Sichem, the plain of Moreh, was also the earliest station in Palestine of the patriarch Abraham. The words in question would be especially natural on the lips of Moses, and would define the position of Ebal and Gerizim in the way most familiar to those who had been dwellers in Egypt, and acquainted by report with the journeys of Abraham.

139. THE PRIESTS THE LEVITES.

The use of this title in Deuteronomy alone has been made a strong objection to the Mosaic authorship of the whole Pentateuch.

‘In the four other books the priests are *invariably* called the sons of Aaron, *never* the sons of Levi; whereas in Deuteronomy they are called *invariably* the sons of Levi or Levites, *never* the sons of Aaron; and, in fact, the Deuteronomist distinctly mentions Levi, not Aaron, as the root of the priestly office and dignity. It is obvious, that the same writer, whether Moses or any one else, cannot be supposed to have changed so completely in one moment, in the time intervening between the last act recorded in the Book of Numbers, and that in the first chapter of Deuteronomy, not only his tone and style, but his very phraseology, so as up to this point to have called the priests invariably by one particular designation, 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 were written by Moses.’—*Pent. Ex. ii. 359.* ‘In the other books the priests are always styled the sons of Aaron, and *never* the sons of Levi; yet, in Deuteronomy, they are *always* called the sons of Levi or Levites, and *never* the sons of Aaron. It is impossible to believe that any writer should have so suddenly changed his form of expression in such a case as this, in the very short interval of a few days or weeks at most, between the last act recorded in Numbers and the first in Deuteronomy. And let it be observed, that in Deut. xxvii. 9, the priests, the Levites, and in Deut. xxxi. 9, the priests the sons of Levi, are not the priests as they should be in future days, but those men actually living, or supposed to be living, Eleazar and Ithamar, the sons of Aaron.’—iii. 395.

Let us cross-examine the statements, on which this immense superstructure of unbelief is raised—the facts which alone are to convict Christ and His Apostles of a

palpable delusion, or of guilty collusion with the frauds of others. Are they true? They are untrue in every part. 'In the other four books the priests are invariably called the sons of Aaron, never the sons of Levi.' In Genesis and Exodus neither title occurs, or could naturally occur, since neither Aaron nor the Levites were set apart for their office. In Leviticus the title, 'priests the sons of Aaron,' or simply 'the sons of Aaron,' occurs thirteen times in the laws of sacrifice, but always in direct messages of God, and only twice after the consecration of Aaron. But instead of being invariable, the simpler title, priest or priests, occurs 170 times. In Numbers, again, the compound title occurs once only, x. 8. In the other three-fourths of the book, or during thirty-nine years of the history, it never once recurs, while priests are mentioned, generally, once or twice only. In either book, the compound title is never once employed by the historian, but only in direct messages of God, and even here only in ten chapters out of forty-five; in Lev. i.-vii., xiii., xxi.; Num. x. Its entire absence, then, in Deuteronomy, in the lips of the historian, is a feature common to this book with all the rest. Its absence there, even in Divine messages, is a feature common with the twenty-six chapters of Numbers just before, and with the whole of Exodus.

But when we examine still further, this boasted proof of plural authorship changes sides, and yields a strong argument for the unity and historical reality of the whole Pentateuch. For the thirteen examples of the title in Leviticus all precede the consecration of the tribe of Levi to share in the work, and in many important distinctions of

the priestly office. The title, which thus appears to exclude them, is found afterwards in one passage alone. The history then reveals a double and triple sin,—the murmuring of Aaron and Miriam against Moses, the rebellion under Korah against the honours of Aaron and his house, and of Dathan and Abiram and the whole congregation against the special holiness of Levi, the priestly tribe. The sin, in each case, is severely punished. Miriam is smitten with leprosy, and Aaron has to humble himself before his brother. Fire consumes the two hundred and fifty leaders, headed by Korah the Levite, who claimed equality of priestly honour with Aaron and his sons; while the earth opens and swallows up the rebels, who claimed equal holiness for the whole congregation. Num. xvi. 40, &c. But this solemn warning against rebellion is followed by mercy, when the rod of Aaron, *for the tribe of Levi*, bloomed and yielded almonds. The special prerogatives of Aaron and his seed having once for all been upheld by so signal a judgment, the whole tribe of Levi, by this striking and symbolical miracle, were henceforth publicly instated in the dignity and honour of a priestly tribe. Its meaning is expounded in the next chapter, Num. xviii. 1, 2. The Levites were to be ‘joined’ to the house of Aaron. All were to be priests, in contrast to the other tribes, though Aaron and his sons were to be priests in contrast to the other Levites, who were also to serve around the tabernacle.

140. The style used in Deuteronomy answers, then, to the changed circumstances at the close of the sojourn. The judgment on Korah, the Levite ringleader in rebellion, had made the deepest impression. Aaron had died, full

of years and honour, second only to Moses in the reverence of the people, and Eleazar had succeeded in his stead. Phinchas, Eleazar's son, had received the high approval of God, and the promise of an everlasting priesthood. The house of Aaron were still few in number, and their honour for the present was secure; but the Levites were a tribe of many thousands. They were made to depend for their subsistence on the tithes and offerings of the people, and their honour and privilege needed new and strong safeguards after Moses was gone.

This key explains the partial change of style in Deuteronomy, which no dual authorship can ever do. Moses first mentions the death of Aaron, and that Eleazar, his son, ministered in the priest's office in his stead. After this he dwells mainly, if not entirely, on the privileges and duties of the whole priestly tribe. First, he records their Divine consecration to priestly work, x. 8: 'At that time the Lord separated the tribe of Levi, to bear the ark of the covenant of the Lord, to stand before the Lord, to minister to Him, and to bless in His name unto this day.' Upon this, a sevenfold charge that Levi should have no part with his brethren, because the Lord was his inheritance, and that his brethren should not forsake him, is placed in the front of the whole legislation, x. 9; xii. 12, 19; xiv. 27, 29; xvi. 11, 14. Mention follows twice of 'the priests the Levites,' xvii. 9, 18, where the second passage confirms the wider reference, for the law is afterwards given in custody to the whole tribe. The next passage expressly expounds the phrase in its wider sense: 'The priests the Levites, all the tribe of Levi, shall have no part or inheritance with Israel,'

xviii. 1. As the sequel of the command, a Levite, and 'all his brethren the Levites,' are named in the same context, xviii. 6, 7. In ch. xxi. 5, the ordinance of the slain heifer, 'the priests the Levites' are named again, and defined by marks that apply to the whole tribe: 'for them the Lord thy God hath chosen to minister to him, and to bless in the name of the Lord,' an allusion to ch x. 8, which has gone before: 'The Lord separated the tribe of Levi, to minister unto him, and to bless in his name.' In ch. xxvi. the Levite simply is mentioned again three times, and solemnly commended to the faith and piety of the whole nation. In the closing chapters, 'the priests the Levites' are joined with Moses in the address to Israel, xxvii. 9. They speak together to all Israel, and then the Levites, v. 14, receive the charge to fulfil just the same office, and pronounce aloud the curses to the other tribes, after the entrance into the land. Still later, the final delivery of the law is twice described in these words:—

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

'And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, Take this book of the law,' &c., xxxi. 25, 26.

Last of all, in the blessing of Moses, the priestly privilege is assigned, without distinction, to the tribe of Levi: 'They shall put incense before thee, and whole burnt sacrifice upon thine altar.'

141. This feature, then, of Deuteronomy, which has been alleged as a decisive proof of separate and later authorship, is really a sign of its historical truth and Mosaic origin. The relation to the history is of that delicate and real kind, which no forger of later times could invent or observe. The priests are called ‘sons of Aaron’ eleven times in the laws of sacrifice, in Divine messages, before Aaron’s consecration; but after this, thrice only, also in Divine messages, and forty years before the death of Moses. After the separation of the Levites, and the vindication of Aaron from the rebellious rivalry of Korah and other Levites by solemn judgment, the blossoming of the rod ‘for the tribe of Levi,’ and the laws that follow, join the whole tribe in an important share of priestly honour and service. And now, when Aaron has died amidst the mourning of the people, and Eleazar and Phinehas have the promise of an everlasting priesthood, and the leadership is about to pass, in Joshua, to the tribe of Ephraim, one object of the dying Law-giver is to confirm that priestly dignity of the tribe of Levi, on which the very preservation of the whole legal economy would depend. Hence its distinctive honours are enforced more than twenty times, while the prerogatives of Aaron’s family are left to depend on the Sinaitic legislation. This is doubly natural, when we remember that the very first promise of the Covenant to all Israel, is that they should be ‘a kingdom of priests and a holy nation,’ and the sacred honours of the tribe had been more signally displayed in Moses the Levite, than even in Aaron the founder of the priestly line.

On the other hand, no hypothesis of a later origin of

the book affords the least key to this peculiarity. For the later the date, the longer would be the series of precedents for the contrast between the priests, the sons of Aaron, and the rest of the Levites, and it would grow less likely that a mere inventor of legends would pass it by in silence. It enters so deeply into the whole course of later Jewish history, that its absence in Deuteronomy can only be explained by the fact, that this book is simply the completion of a code of laws, not a separate whole. The prophets, it is owned, like the Deuteronomist, call the priests 'Levites,' or 'sons of Levi,' and never 'the sons of Aaron.' But this destroys the objection it is brought to confirm. For the two prophets in question (Jer. xxxiii. 18, 21, 22; Ezek. xliii. 19; xliv. 15; xlviii. 13) were themselves priests of the seed of Aaron, and could neither be ignorant of the priestly distinction of his family, nor tempted to make light of it. The usage, then, of Deuteronomy must be quite as natural and consistent in the lips of Moses, the Levite, as of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, descendants of Aaron. We are taught, in both cases, that the consecration of the whole tribe of Levi to God's especial service was a truth even more fundamental than the special prerogatives of the sons of Aaron alone. The voice of the latest prophet is here an echo to the parting words of Moses: 'Ye shall know that I have sent this commandment unto you, that my covenant might be with Levi, saith the Lord of hosts. My covenant was with him of life and peace, and I gave them to him for the fear wherewith he feared me, and was afraid before my name,' Mal. ii. 4, 5; Exod. xxxii. 26, 29; Deut. xxxiii. 8-11.

The Book of Deuteronomy consists mainly of a repetition and enforcement of laws already given at Sinai, with some added precepts. Viewed as history, it occupies only the eleventh month of the fortieth year. But the links are very numerous which bind it to the earlier histories. These are natural and impressive, when we view it as a genuine record of the words of Moses. But when it is ascribed to some forger of later date, or even of the age of Jeremiah, they involve such a combination of subtle invention with reckless and deliberate lying, as to degrade the Law of God, the bright reflection of His perfect holiness, into nothing higher than a frightful masterpiece of Satanic falsehood.

The following events of the earlier histories are referred to in Deuteronomy, and the allusions are inwrought throughout into the very texture of its legislation.

(1) The creation in Genesis, iv. 32. (2) The Sabbath, v. 14. (3) The dispersion of mankind, xxxii. 7, 8. (4) The oath to the patriarchs (twenty-five times), i. 8, 35; vi. 10, 18, 23; vii. 8, 12; viii. 1, 18; ix. 5, 28; x. 11, 15; xi. 9, 21; xix. 8; xxvi. 3, 15; xxviii. 11; xxix. 13; xxxi. 7, 20, 21; xxxiv. 4. (5) The genealogy of Lot, ii. 9, 19. (6) The overthrow of Sodom, xxix. 23. (7) Jacob's danger and exile, xxvi. 5. (8) The descent to Egypt, seventy persons, x. 22; xxvi. 5. (9) Joseph's separation from his brethren, xxxiii. 16. (10) The blessing on Ephraim and Manasseh, xxxiii. 17. (11) The increase in Egypt, i. 10; x. 22; xxvi. 5. (12) The bondage of Egypt, iv. 20; v. 6, 15; vi. 12, 21; vii. 8; viii. 14; xiii. 5, 10; xv. 15; xxiv. 18; xxvi. 6. (13) Mode of cultivation in Egypt, xi. 10. (14) Vision to

Moses at the bush, xxxiii. 16. (15) His age at the Exodus, i. 3; xxxi. 2; xxxiv. 7. (16) Plagues and diseases of Egypt, i. 30; iv. 34; v. 15; vi. 22; vii. 15, 19; xi. 3; xxviii. 27, 60. (17) The Passover and Exodus, xvi. 1-7. (18) Consecration of the firstlings, xv. 19, 20. (19) The pillar of cloud and fire, i. 33; xxxi. 15. (20) Passage of the Red Sea, xi. 4. (21) The Manna, viii. 3, 16; xxix. 6. (22) Rephidim and Massah, vi. 16; viii. 15; ix. 22. (23) War with Amalek, xxv. 17-19. (24) Appointment of judges, i. 9-15. (25) Sojourn in the wilderness forty years, i. 31, 33; ii. 7; viii. 2, 15, 16; xv. 5; xxxii. 10-12. (26) Law at Sinai in fire, iv. 11, 12, 15; v. 4; xxxiii. 2-4. (27) Fears and alarm of the people, v. 22-27; xviii. 16. (28) Answer of God, v. 28-31. (29) Moses forty days in the mount, ix. 9. (30) First tables written, ix. 10; x. 2. (31) Golden calf made, x. 16, 21. (32) Aaron's sin, x. 20. (33) Tables broken, ix. 17. (34) Calf turned to dust, and drunk, ix. 21. (35) Consecration of Levi, x. 8. (36) Second forty days of intercession, ix. 18, 25; x. 10. (37) Second tables written, x. 1-4. (38) Ark made, x. 3. (39) Law of leprosy in Leviticus, xxiv. 8. (40) Journey from Sinai, Num. x. 13; Deut. x. 11. (41) God's choice of each resting-place, i. 33; Num. x. 33. (42) Sin at Taberah, ix. 22. (43) Sin at Kibroth-hattaavah, ix. 22. (44) Hazeroth and Miriam, xxiv. 9. (45) Pre-eminence of Moses (Num. xii. 7, 8), xxxiv. 10-12. (46) Mission of the spies, i. 22, 23. (47) Grapes of Esheol, i. 24, 25. (48) Rebellion of the people, i. 26-28; ix. 23. (49) Oath of rejection, i. 34, 35. (50) Promise to Caleb and Joshua, i. 36, 38. (51) Presumption of the people and defeat at

Hormah, i. 41-44. (52) Vain weeping and regret, i. 45. (53) Rebellion of Dathan and Abiram, xi. 6. (54) Shoes and raiment in the wilderness, viii. 4; xxix. 5. (55) Miracle at Kadesh, viii. 15. (56) Death of Aaron at Horeb, x. 4. (57) Stations of Bene-jaakan, Moseroth, and Gudgodah, x. 5. (58) Journey southward from Kadesh to Ezion-gaber, ii. 1, 8. (59) Wilderness of Moab, i. 8. (60) Brook Zered and river Arnon, ii. 13, 24. (61) The interval of thirty-eight years, ii. 14. (62) The wasting of the numbered generation, i. 35; ii. 14. (63) The message to Sihon, ii. 26-29. (64) His defeat at Jahaz, ii. 30-35. (65) The defeat of Og at Edrei, iii. 1-3. (66) The hiring of Balaam, xxiii. 3-5. (67) The sin of Baal-peor, iv. 3, 4; ix. 7. (68) The exclusion of Moses, i. 37; xxxi. 2. (69) The appointment of Joshua, i. 38; iii. 28; xxxi. 3, 7. (70) The Urim and Thummim, xxxiii. 8. (71) The three festivals, xvi. 1-16. (72) The inheritance of Reuben and Gad, iii. 12, 16, 17. (73) That of Machir, iii. 15. (74) Havoth-jair, iii. 14. (75) Cities of Refuge, iv. 41-43. (76) The death of Moses in Pisgah, Num. xxvii. 12; Deut. xxxii. 49.

More than seventy facts, recorded more fully in the previous history, are thus woven into the texture of this closing book of the law. Twenty-five of these are in the three opening chapters, and fifteen more in the exhortation, chh. ix., x., but the rest are spread throughout its whole course. Nothing can be more spontaneous and natural than the way in which they are introduced. Some fresh particulars are added, but so naturally, and in such agreement with the rest, as to bespeak their own reality. Such are the mention of the mode of cultivation in Egypt,

xi. 10; the implied age of Moses at the Exodus, i. 3; xxxi. 2; xxxiv. 7; the occasion of Amalek's warfare, xxv. 18; the words of Moses before the appointment of judges, i. 9-15; the supply of raiment, viii. 4; xxix. 5; the command about their children, iv. 10; the alarm of the people, v. 24; the answer of God, v. 28-31; the anger of God with Aaron, ix. 20; the words of Moses' intercession, ix. 26-29; the description of Jotbath, x. 7; the message of God, x. 11; the request of the people for spies to be sent, i. 22; their words of despondency, i. 27, 28; the exhortation of Moses, i. 29-31; the weeping, i. 45; the threefold charge about Edom, Moab, and Ammon, ii. 4, 9, 19; the mention of the giant races, ii. 10, 20, 23; the full message to Sihon, ii. 26-29; the sixty cities of Argob, iii. 4; the names of Hermon, iii. 9; iv. 48; the bedstead of Og, iii. 11; the share of the Ammonites in hiring Balaam, xxiii. 3, 4; and the choice of the three cities of refuge, iv. 43.

143. Besides these historical references, which link this book so closely with the whole previous history, and disprove its later origin, its moral features and tone make the hypothesis of a forgery insufferable and monstrous to every mind which retains any spiritual instinct, and has learned 'to fear that great and terrible name, the Lord our God.' How real and earnest, how lofty and sublime, is its tone, from first to last, of Divine authority! How tender and delicate are its touches of human sympathy from the dying Lawgiver to the people he so dearly loved, and whom, for their sins, even more than his own, he was forbidden to lead into the Land of Promise! Whoever can ascribe this holy book, this overflowing

from the heart of one who had been on the mount with God, to some shameless forger, eight centuries or more after the death of Moses, must come under the description of the Apostle, of those who are 'corrupted in understanding, undiscerning, or reprobate in the faith,' and the solemn caution of our Lord: 'If they believe not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.' These messages of the living God, by which the Son of God, filled with the Spirit of Truth, repelled and overcame the most subtle attacks of the great Deceiver, can never, without blasphemy against the God of truth, and the honour of Christ, be degraded into one of the most hateful and profane falsehoods, which that Deceiver has ever practised on the religious credulity of sinful men. He who speaks in this book might seem almost to have entered already within the skirts of that cloud of glory, where the three disciples saw him conversing with Elias and their Lord Himself, on the holy mount. The Christian who obeys the Divine command, to delight in this book of the law, and to meditate therein day and night, will soon leave behind him, as at the foot of the mount, the janglings of sceptical criticism, like the jarring sounds in the camp of Moab and Midian; and will rise, through meditation on God's holy law, to the clear vision of His Divine glory, to whom Moses in the law and the prophets bear witness,—the Incarnate and Living Word, the promised Saviour and Redeemer of mankind.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE SINAITIC LEGISLATION.

144. THE Book of Deuteronomy, when its authenticity has once been established by the full concurrence of external and internal evidence, throws a clear light, backward, on the historical reality of the whole Pentateuch. For it does not profess to be a code complete in itself. It claims to be the repetition and completion of a code already given and committed to writing. It defines itself plainly in xxvii. 1: 'These are the words of the covenant which the Lord commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel in the land of Moab, beside the covenant which he made with them in Horeb.' That this later covenant, the completion of the first, was committed to writing, is twenty times affirmed, iv. 2, 9, 14; vi. 6-9, 20; xi. 18-21; xvii. 18-20; xxvii. 1-3, 8, 26; xxviii. 58, 61; xxix. 20, 21, 27, 29; xxx. 14; xxxi. 9, 24, 26, 46; xxxiii. 4. It is thus plainly implied that the earlier covenant, of which it is the completion, was also written, and is ten times affirmed of the Decalogue, the basis and centre of the whole. The central portion of the three earlier books, *Exod.* xix.—*Num.* x., answers all the conditions required by the statements in Deuteronomy re-

specting this earlier covenant made at Sinai. Not only the external, but also the internal evidence, proves that these form the code of written laws, to which Moses alludes so often in his parting discourses as already given to the chosen people. They form a connected series of Divine messages, with a few historical chapters of connexion, beginning with the Decalogue, and ending with the march from Horeb to take possession of the promised land. The references to these facts and laws in the later book are so numerous, that only a very condensed list of them can be given. They confirm the unity of these two main portions of the Pentateuch in the clearest and strongest way.

145. Exod. xix.-xxiv. EARLIEST LEGISLATION AT SINAI.

In these six chapters we meet with the following links of connexion with Deuteronomy :—

χ 1. Continuous notation of time from the Exodus, Exod. xix. 1; Deut. i. 3; Comp. Exod. xvi. 1; xl. 2; Num. i. 1; ix. 1; x. 11.

γ 2. Scene of the first covenant, Exod. xix. 1, 2, 11, 18, 20, 23; xxiv. 16, 18; Deut. i. 2, 6, 19; iv. 10; v. 2, 4, 22; ix. 8, 15; xviii. 16; xxix. 1; xxxiii. 2.

✱ 3. Message of God to Moses, xix. 9-13; Deut. iv. 10.

★ 4. Assembly at the foot of Sinai, xix. 14-17; Deut. iv. 11; v. 5, 22.

× 5. The fire and thick darkness, with no similitude, xix. 16, 18, 21; xx. 18, 21; xxiv. 17; Deut. iv. 11, 12, 33, 36; v. 4, 22, 24, 26; xxxiii. 2.

χ 6. The voice of God amidst the fire, xix. 9, 19; xx. 1, 19, 22; Deut. iv. 12, 33, 36; v. 4, 22-26.

κ 7. The ten commandments, Exod. xx. 2-17; Deut. v. 6-21. The changes in the fourth and fifth commandments are suitable in the lips of the Lawgiver himself, but of no later and inferior writer.

λ 8. The fear and alarm of the people, xx. 18-21; Deut. v. 23-27. The more brief report of their words of terror in Exodus is replaced by a fuller account, agreeing perfectly with the earlier summary. And it is followed by a message of God to Moses, given in Deuteronomy alone, full of Divine pathos and sublimity: 'O that there were such an heart in them,' &c. &c.

χ 9. The prohibition of idolatry, deduced from the solemn circumstances of this Divine message, Exod. xx. 22, 23; Deut. iv. 15-20, 23-26; vi. 14, 15.

1 — x 10. The manumission of Hebrew servants, Exod. xxi. 1-4; Deut. xv. 12-15.

κ 11. The law of abiding service, xxi. 5, 6; Deut. xv. 16-18, with its reason adjoined.

× 12. The provision for the maid-servant or captive, xxi. 7-11; Deut. xxi. 10-14.

× 13. The sentence on presumptuous murder, xxi. 12-15; Deut. xix. 11-13.

2 — 14. The judgment on rebellious children, xxi. 17; Deut. xxi. 18-21.

γ 15. The law of retribution, xxi. 23-25; Deut. xix. 16-21.

3 — x 16. Sentence on witchcraft and idolatry, xxii. 18-20; Deut. xvii. 2-5; xviii. 9-12.

χ 17. Care for the stranger and the widow, xxii. 21-24; xxiii. 9; Deut. x. 18, 19; xiv. 29; xvi. 11, 14; xxiv. 17, 18.

✕ 18. Restoration of the pledge from the poor, xxii. 25-27; Deut. xxiv. 10-13, 17.

✕ 19. Consecration of the first-fruits and first-born, xxii. 29, 30; Deut. xii. 6, 17; xv. 19-23. ~~27:15, 19a~~

✕ 20. False witness and unrighteous judgment, xxiii. 1-3, 6, 7; Deut. xix. 16-19; xxv. 1

~~✕~~ ✕ 21. Prohibition of bribery, xxiii. 8; Deut. xvi. 19.

✕ 22. Restoration of property and help of neighbours, xxiii. 4, 5; Deut. xxii. 1-4.

✕ 23. The seventh year of rest, xxiii. 10, 11; Deut. xv. 1; xxxi. 10.

✕ 24. The three main festivals and national gatherings, xxiii. 14-17; Deut. xvi. 1-17.

✕ 25. The seething of the kid, Exod. xxiii. 19; Deut. xiv. 21.

✕ 26. The promised expulsion of the seven nations, xxiii. 23, 24; Deut. vii. 1-6, 16. ~~27:15~~ ~~22:15-16~~

✕ 27. Promises of health and fertility, xxiii. 25, 26; Deut. vii. 14, 15; xxviii. 11, 27, 60, 61.

✕ 28. Expulsion of the Horites by hornets, xxiii. 29, 30; Deut. vii. 20-23.

✕ 29. The ensnaring effect of Canaanite idolatry, xxiii. 33; Deut. vii. 16, 25; xx. 18.

✕ 30. The ascent of Moses to receive the tables, Exod. xxiv. 12-18; Deut. ix. 9.

146. Exod. xxv.-xxxi. LAWS OF THE TABERNACLE AND THE PRIESTHOOD.

This part of the earlier legislation contains details of the structure of the tabernacle, which needed no repetition after it had been set up thirty-nine years. But still

the references to the Divine instructions here given are not few.

1. The ark of Shittim wood, xxv. 10–15; Deut. x. 1, 2, 3, 5, 8; xxxi. 9, 25.

2. The testimony or tables within the ark, xxv. 16, 21; xxxi. 18; Deut. x. 3–5.

3. The altar of sacrifice, xxvii. 1–8; Deut. xii. 27; xvi. 21; xxvi. 4.

4. The priesthood of Aaron and Eleazar, xxviii. 1–4; Deut. x. 6; xvii. 12; xviii. 3.

5. The Urim and Thummim of the high-priest, xxviii. 29, 30; Deut. xxxiii. 8.

6. The consecration and its fulfilment, Exod. xxix. 1–35; Lev. viii. ix.

7. The promise to speak with Moses at the tabernacle, xxix. 42, 43; Deut. xxxi. 14, 15.

8. The incense and incense-altar, xxxi. 9, 34–36; Deut. xxxiii. 10.

9. The Sabbath in connexion with Israel's redemption, xxxi. 13–17; Deut. v. 15.

10. The writing of the Law on the first tables, xxxi. 18; Deut. iv. 13; v. 22; ix. 10, 11.

147. THE LATER LEGISLATION. Exod. xxxii.–xl.

All the main features in the historical episode of the worship of the golden calf reappear in Deuteronomy. But in the lips of the aged Lawgiver, just before his death, they assume a wholly different form, and are the ground of an earnest call to humility, in the prospect of new and greater mercies from God. The facts recalled to their memory are the idolatry of the whole congregation, the

share of Aaron in their sin, its disclosure to Moses by God himself, the proposal to make of him a greater nation, his descent with the tables in his hands, their destruction in his anger, the destruction of the golden calf itself, and the mingling of its powder with the brook, the consecration of the whole tribe of Levi, the intercession of Moses, his fear of the total rejection of the people, the preparation of the second pair of tables, the second forty days on the mount, the writing of God on the second tables, the renewal of the covenant. All these are set before them in tones of earnest and holy love, to stir them up to gratitude to the God of Israel. Viewed as a forgery, nothing could be more impious; but as the real words of the dying Lawgiver, nothing could be more tender, earnest, and morally sublime. And we have also internal proof, *Exod.* xxxiv. 27, that this earlier covenant was recorded at the time, in these words: ‘And the Lord said unto Moses, Write thou these words, for after the tenor of these words I have made covenant with thee and with Israel.’ And, since this renewal of the covenant plainly required the history of the golden calf for its explanation, we may infer, assuming the legislation to be real, that the whole passage, *Exod.* xxx.–xxxiv., must have been written down soon after the events occurred.

To the later legislation, *chh.* xxxv.–xl., there are few direct references in Deuteronomy. It consists mainly of the fulfilment of instructions, given before the sin of the people. But it also prepares the way, by the building of the tabernacle, for all the legislation in Leviticus, where the messages are given from the tabernacle in every case. The closing verses, also, find a striking counterpart in

Deut. i. 33; xxxi. 14, 15, which marks the unity of plan in the whole message, and in the most indirect way.

148. THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS. Ch. i.—xviii.

The first part of this book contains chiefly the detailed laws of sacrifice, which needed no repetition after thirty-nine years. Their existence, however, is assumed in every part of Deuteronomy. The following particulars of the earlier or Sinaitic legislation reappear in the course of the book, and show how thoroughly the last book of the law is linked, here also, with those which come before it, and how far it is from being a complete and independent code.

1. Laws of burnt-offerings, Lev. i., vi. 8–18; Deut. xii. 6, 13, 14, 27; xv. 21; xxxi. 10.

2. Meat-offerings and peace-offerings, Lev. ii. iii.; Deut. xii. 6, 11, 17, 27; xviii. 3, 4; xxvii. 7.

3. The provision for the priests, Lev. vi. 16–18, 26; vii. 6, 28–36; Deut. xviii. 3–5.

4. The death of Nadab and Abihu, Exod. xxiv. 1, 19; Lev. xii. 1, 2, implied Deut. x. 6.

5. The distinction of clean and unclean beasts, Lev. xi.; Deut. xiv. 1–20.

6. The law of leprosy, Lev. xiii., xiv.; Deut. xxiv. 8.

Here the fulness of the original law, occupying 116 verses, is in striking contrast with the brief and simple enforcement of it,—‘Take heed in the plague of leprosy, that thou observe diligently, and do according to all that the priests, the Levites, shall teach you: as I commanded them, ye shall observe to do.’ It is thus clearly implied that the laws of leprosy had been already given, with full details, in a written and permanent form.

7. Laws of ceremonial pollutions and cleansing, Lev. xv. ; Deut. xxiii. 9-14. Here the later instructions agree in spirit with the first, and extend them further.

8. The one place of sacrifice, Lev. xvii. 1-9 ; Deut. xii. 5, 8-11, 13, 14, 18, 28 ; xiv. 23-25.

Here, again, the later precepts enforce and repeat many times the general instruction which had been given before. But the passage, Deut. xxvii. 4-7, proves that this enforcement of the unity of national worship, at the place which the Lord would choose, did not supersede the wider promise, Exod. xx. 24 ; to which the command in Deuteronomy itself, forbidding the use of an iron tool in raising the altar at Ebal, makes a clear allusion.

9. The sacredness of blood, Lev. xvii. 10-14 ; Deut. xii. 16, 23-25 ; xv. 23.

10. Prohibited marriages, Lev. xviii. ; Deut. vii. 3 ; xxii. 30.

149. Lev. xix.-xxvii.

As this later portion of Leviticus is less occupied with ceremonial details, the allusions to its precepts and the repetitions of them are more abundant, and prove clearly that Deuteronomy continues and completes the legal code already given.

1. Lev. xix. 2. 'Ye shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy.'

Deut. vii. 6. 'For thou art an holy people to the Lord thy God.' xiv. 2. 'For thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God;' v. 21 the same. xxiii. 14. 'Therefore shall thy camp be holy.'

2. xix. 3. 'Ye shall fear every man his mother and his father;' Deut. v. 16 ; xxi. 18-21 ; xxvii. 16.

3. xix. 4. 'Turn ye not unto idols, nor make to yourselves molten gods,' Deut. iv. 16-18, 25; vii. 25, 26; xii. 3; xvi. 22; xxvii. 15; xxix. 17.

4. xix. 10. Law of gleaning, Deut. xxiv. 19-22.

5. xix. 12. False swearing, Deut. v. 11; vi. 13; x. 20; xxiii. 21.

6. xix. 13. Wages of the hireling, &c., Deut. xxiv. 14, 15.

7. xix. 15, 16. Righteousness in judgment, Deut. i. 17; x. 17, 18; xvi. 18-20; xxiv. 17.

8. xix. 19. Law against unnatural mixtures, Deut. xxii. 9, 10, 11.

9. xix. 26, 31. Enchantment and divination, Deut. xviii. 9-14.

10. xix. 27, 28. Forbidden marks and cuttings, Deut. xiv. 22.

11. xix. 29. Sensual sins forbidden, Deut. xxiii. 17, 18.

12. xix. 33, 34. Care for the stranger, and its reason, Deut. x. 18, 19; xxiii. 7; xxiv. 17; xxvii. 19.

13. xix. 35, 36. Justice in weights and measures, Deut. xxv. 13-16.

14. xx. 1-5. Condemnation of Moloch worship, Deut. xii. 29-31.

15. xx. 10-16. Unnatural crimes accursed, Deut. xxvii. 20-23.

16. xxii. 17-25. Sacrifices without blemish, Deut. xvii. 1.

17. xxiii. 4-44. The three annual festivals, Deut. xvi. 1-17.

18. xxiv. 10-16. Stoning for the sin of blasphemy, Deut. xiii. 6-10; xvii. 2-5.

19. xxiv. 19-22. Law of retribution, Deut. xix. 18-21.

20. xxv. 1-7. Sabbath year of rest, Deut. xv. 1-6; xxxi. 10-12.

21. xxv. 35-38. Relief of the poor and needy, Deut. xv. 7-15.

22. xxvi. 3-13. Blessings promised to obedience, Deut. xxviii. 1-4.

23. xxvi. 14-39. Cursings of national disobedience, Deut. xxviii. 15-68; xxix. 18-28.

24. xxvi. 40-46. Promises of mercy on repentance, Deut. xxx. 1-10; xxxii. 36-43.

150. Num. i. x. 10.

These first chapters of Numbers complete the Sinaitic legislation, before the journey northward towards the land of promise. Their direct links with Deuteronomy are few; but they have a most intimate relation with the journeys that follow, and with the laws, from the Exodus onward, which have gone before. The numbering of the twelve tribes, the disposal of their places in the encampment round the tabernacle, the separation of the Levites, the appointment of the work of each Levitical family during the march, and in setting up the tabernacle, the separation of the lepers, the description of the pillar of cloud and fire as the guide of their journeys, and the preparation of the silver trumpets, all are the natural preface to the record of the successive journeys that follow. We see the people thus arranged, as the army of the Lord, to march in due order, like a marshalled host, and take possession of the promised land. On the other hand, the links with the previous history and legislation are very

plain and strong. The number of the tribes, Num. i. 44-46, refers back to the collection of the atonement money, Exod. xxx. 11-16; xxxviii. 25-28; and thus binds together the whole Sinaitic legislation. The separation of the tribe of Levi refers back to the history of the golden calf, Exod. xxxii. 26-29, and is the fulfilment of the promise made to them after their zeal against the idolatry of the people. The mention of Elishama as the captain of Ephraim is an historical link with the previous mention of Joshua, his grandson, in the war with Amalek, Exod. xvii., and in the ascent of Moses to the mount of God, xxiv. 23. The mention of the four sons of Aaron, Num. iii. 1-4, refers back to the record of their sin and death, Lev. x. 1, 2. The numbering of the Levites, and their substitution for the numbered first-born, refer to the command, Exod. xxii. 29, as well as the earlier precept at the time of the Exodus. The instruction to exclude the lepers repeats and enforces the previous law, Lev. xiii. 46,—‘He shall dwell alone, without the camp shall his habitation be.’ The law of trespass, and the addition of the fifth part in repayment, Num. v. 5-8, answer to the repeated directions at the close of Leviticus, xxvii. 11-13, 15, 19, 27, 31. The law of the Nazarite, Num. vi., seems to extend the briefer direction, Lev. xxvii. 1, 2. The statement, Num. vii. 89, after the full consecration of the altar by the princes, answers to the promise, Exod. xxv. 22, and is an instance of its fulfilment. The description of the candlestick, Num. viii. 1-4, refers back to the command, Exod. xxv. 31-40, with its allusion to the pattern shown on the mount. Lastly, the ordinance for the pass-over in the second month completes the historical inter-

lacing of the whole, and links the last act of the Sinaitic legislation with the fundamental ordinance of the first Passover, one year earlier, at the time of the Exodus.

151. The Book of Deuteronomy, it thus appears by a full induction of evidence, implies the existence of the earlier Sinaitic legislation in a written form before the death of Moses; while the central portion of the Pentateuch, *Exod. xix.*, *Num. x.*, fulfils every condition required in this earlier written code, and links itself with the last words of Moses in the plains of Moab, almost in a hundred distinct particulars. These are also inwrought so curiously into the texture of the later book, that nothing else than the truth of both documents, the earlier and the later, can explain their correspondence, and their entire variation of form and arrangement. But these two partial codes could not stand alone without that historical setting on which their meaning very mainly depends. The Historical Preface, *Exod. i.-xviii.*, containing the record of the bondage, the plagues, the first passover, and the Exodus; and the Historical Sequel, *Num. xi.-xxxvii.*, containing the brief account of nearly thirty-nine years of wilderness sojourn, are plainly required to connect, harmonize, and explain, the Sinaitic lawgiving, and its later expansion and repetition before the death of Moses. Accordingly, the links which unite Deuteronomy with these historical portions of the three earlier books are as striking, and as decisive of their common unity of authorship, as those which bind together the earlier and later legislation. Let us trace them in order, beginning with the later portion.

THE SOJOURN AND JOURNEYS IN THE WILDERNESS.
Num. x. 11-xxxvi.

1. Num. x. 11. 'It came to pass on the twentieth day of the second month, in the second year, that the cloud was taken up from off the tabernacle of the testimony.' This refers backward to the fundamental date of the Exodus, Exod. xii. 2, 3, 6, 41, to the first mention of the pillar of cloud, xiii. 21, 22, and the later description, at the very close of the book, of its resting on the tabernacle, xl. 34-38, with the renewed and fuller statement, Num. ix. 15-23. But it also points onward to the use of the same era in later passages of this book, Num. xx. 1; xxxiii. 3, 38, and its continuation in the opening words of Deuteronomy, i. 3: 'In the fortieth year, in the eleventh month, on the first day of the month.'

2. v. 12. 'And the cloud rested in the wilderness of Paran.' To this there seems a double allusion, at the beginning and close of Deuteronomy, i. 1; xxxiii. 2.

3. v. 13. 'And they first took their journey according to the commandment of the Lord by the hand of Moses.' So, Deut. i. 6-8; x. 11, where this command is twice mentioned, and once with fuller detail.

4. vv. 17, 21. The Levites bearing the tabernacle, Deut. x. 8; xxxi. 9, 25.

5. vv. 25, 27. Dan, Asher, Naphtali, the three last tribes in order, Deut. xxxiii. 22-25.

6. vv. 33, 34. The ark searching out a resting-place, Deut. i. 33.

7. xi. 1-3. The sin of the people at Taberah, Deut. ix. 22.

8. xi. 4-34. The lusting at Kibroth-hattaavah, Deut. ix. 22.

9. xii. 1-15. The leprosy of Miriam at Hazeroth, Deut. i. 1 ; xxiv. 9.

10. xii. 5-8. The pre-eminence of Moses as a prophet, Deut. xxxiv. 10-12.

11. xiii. 1-20. The mission of the twelve spies, Deut. i. 20-23.

12. xiii. 23-27. Their report, with the grapes of Eshcol, Deut. i. 24, 25.

13. xiv. 1-4. The murmuring and rebellion of the people, Deut. i. 26-28, 32 ; ix. 23.

14. xiv. 20-23, 26-30. The oath of exclusion from the land, Deut. i. 34, 35.

15. xiv. 24, 30, 31. The promise to Joshua, Caleb, and the little ones, Deut. i. 36, 38, 39.

16. xiv. 39-45. The presumption and defeat of the people, Deut. i. 41-44.

17. xvi. 1-34 ; xxvi. 9, 10. The rebellion of Dathan and Abiram, Deut. xi. 6, 7.

18. xvii. 7-10 ; xviii. 2. The consecration of the house of Levi, Deut. xii. 12, 19 ; xiv. 27, 29 ; xvi. 11, 14 ; xviii. 1, 6, 7 ; xxiv. 8.

19. xix. 1-22. Purification by a heifer unyoked, Deut. xxi. 1-9.

20. xx. 1-11. The smitten rock in Meribah Kadesh, Deut. viii. 15.

21. xx. 12, 13. The exclusion of Aaron and Moses from the land, Deut. i. 37 ; iii. 26, 27 ; iv. 21, 22 ; x. 6 ; xxxi. 2 ; xxxii. 48-52.

22. xx. 14-21. The command respecting Edom, Deut. ii. 4-6.

23. xx. 22-29. The death and burial of Aaron in Hor, near Moserah, Deut. x. 6.

24. xxi. 4-10. The compassing of the land of Edom, Deut. ii. 1-8.

25. xxi. 12, 13. The crossing of the brook Zered and Arnon, Deut. ii. 13, 14, 24.

26. xxi. 21-31. The message to Sihon and his overthrow, Deut. ii. 24-37.

27. xxi. 33-35. The victory over Og at Edrei, Deut. iii. 1-10.

28. xxii.-xxiv. The hiring of Balaam by the Moabites, Deut. xxiii. 3-6.

29. xxv. 1-17. The sin of Baalpeor, Deut. iv. 3; xxxii. 15-17.

30. xxvi. 63-65. The wasting of the numbered generation, Deut. i. 35; ii. 14-16.

31. xxvii. 12-14. The scene of the vision of Moses and cause of his death, Deut. xxxii. 48-52; xxxiv. 1-4.

32. xxvii. 15-23. The appointment of Joshua as leader, Deut. i. 38; iii. 28; xxxi. 3, 7, 8, 23; xxxiv. 9.

33. xxx. 1-16. The binding nature of a vow, Deut. xxiii. 21-23.

34. xxxii. 1-38. The inheritance of Gad and Reuben, Deut. iii. 12, 16-20; xxxiii. 20, 21.

35. xxxii. 39-42. The inheritance of Manasseh, Machir, and Jair, Deut. iii. 14, 15; xxix. 8.

36. xxxiii. 30-34. The stations of Moseroth, Bene-jaakan, Hor-hagidgad, and Jotbathah, Deut. x. 6, 7.

37. xxxiii. 44-50. The final encampment in the plains of Moab, Deut. i. 1, 5; iii. 29; iv. 45-49.

38. xxxv. 14. Three cities of refuge east of Jordan, Deut. iv. 41-43; xix. 7.

39. xxxv. 13-34. Three other cities west of Jordan, Deut. xix. 1-6, 8-13.

40. xxxv. 31-34. The land defiled by unpunished murder, Deut. xxi. 1-9.

152. THE HISTORICAL PREFACE OF THE LAW. Exod. i.-xviii.

The relations of the Book of Deuteronomy to the history which precedes the Sinaitic legislation are hardly less intimate than with the account of the wilderness sojourn in the Book of Numbers. We may note the following references, many of them indirect, as evidences of the unity of the whole.

1. Exod. i. 1-5. The descent into Egypt with seventy persons, Deut. x. 22; vii. 7; xxvi. 5.

2. i. 7, 12, 20. The increase into a mighty nation, Deut. i. 10; x. 22; xxvi. 5.

3. i. 8-14; ii. 23. The severity of the Egyptian bondage, Deut. iv. 20; v. 6; vi. 21; viii. 14.

4. iii. 1-6. The vision to Moses at the bush, Deut. xxxiii. 16.

5. iii. 7-10. The message of God and its fulfilment, Deut. xxvi. 6-9.

6. iii. 12. The prophecy of worship at Horeb, and its fulfilment, Deut. iv. 10-14; xxxiii. 2.

7. iv.-xi. Signs and plagues in Egypt, Deut. vi. 22; vii. 18, 19; ix. 26; xi. 2, 3.

8. xii. 1-36. The ordinance of the Passover, Deut. xvi. 1-10.

9. xii. 11-13. The consecration of the firstlings, Deut. xii. 6; xv. 19.

10. xiii. 14, 16. The question of children, and the answer, Deut. vi. 20-25.

11. xiii. 21, 22. The pillar of cloud and fire, Deut. i. 33; viii. 15; xxxii. 10-12.

12. xiv. 1-31. The overthrow at the Red Sea, Deut. xi. 4.

13. xv. 26. The promise of freedom from Egyptian disease, Deut. vii. 15.

14. xvi. 1-4, 14-21. The gift of the manna, Deut. viii. 3, 16; xxix. 6.

15. xvii. 1-7. The temptation at Massah and Meribah, Deut. ix. 22; viii. 15; xxxiii. 8.

16. xvii. 8-16. The war with Amalek and the Divine sentence, Deut. xxv. 17-19.

17. xviii. 1-27. The appointment of judges to relieve the burden of Moses, Deut. i. 9-17.

153. This review of the three books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, in their relation to Deuteronomy, shows how close and intimate is the union of the whole. The later message, besides the external evidence of the Jewish nation, of our Lord and His Apostles, contains the strongest internal proofs of its genuineness, as the parting voice of the great Lawgiver of Israel. It is a legislation committed to writing from the first, but refers throughout to an earlier code, the covenant at Sinai, of which it is only the completion. The portion of the Pentateuch which reaches from Exod. xix. to Num. x. answers in every respect to this earlier written code of laws, which

the message in Deuteronomy presupposes and requires. There are nearly a hundred links of mutual correspondence, most various in their character, from a verbal repetition of the same law, to supplemental developments of historical facts, or kindred laws where the principle is the same.

But this earlier legislation, the central portion of the Pentateuch, is inseparably linked with the history of the Desert, the Sojourn in Egypt, the Plagues, the Passover, and the Exodus, which have gone before, and with the forty years of journeying in the wilderness, which follow. And the allusions to these histories in Deuteronomy are, in proportion, not less numerous than to the Sinaitic legislation which intervenes, and includes about sixty particulars, and all the main incidents of the sacred narrative. The coat may be said to be woven without seam from the beginning of Exodus to the end of Deuteronomy, so multiplied are the mutual references which bind the whole together. If Moses must indeed be stripped of his robe of honour confirmed to him by the lips of the Lord of glory, it would have been wiser for the negative critics to have borrowed a lesson from the Roman soldiers, who said, 'Let us not rend it, but cast lots for it, whose it shall be.' The seamless robe resists, and bids defiance to the hand of the spoiler.

CHAPTER XV.

THE UNITY AND INSPIRATION OF THE BOOK OF
GENESIS.

154. THE Book of Deuteronomy has its truth and genuineness confirmed, not only by the voice of our Lord and His Apostles, and the consenting testimony of the Jewish people in every age, but by the clearest internal signs of historical reality as the parting words of Moses. Its moral earnestness and pathos of appeal, its tone of holy reverence, its sublime and solemn grandeur, both in the opening exhortation, and the Song and Blessing at the close, make the view which degrades it into a subtle and complicated forgery of some later age incredible, impossible, and monstrous. Most of the objections brought against it only turn, when fairly examined, into powerful evidences of its truth. The differences in style and diversities of statement, as compared with the earlier books, are such as any later forger would be likely to have avoided with care, while they result naturally from the circumstances of the latest message of the Lawgiver before his own death. To this book of the law, even more than the others, the warning of our Lord will clearly apply,—‘If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.’

But this truth of Deuteronomy is the direct proof of a like origin and authority in the three previous books. The covenant of God with Israel by Moses in the plains of Moab, once accepted as real history, implies and requires, not only the fact of an earlier code of laws given at Sinai, but their previous existence in a written form. The Books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, always associated with Deuteronomy under the common title of the Books or Law of Moses, have all the features required in that earlier code, to which the Lawgiver refers so often in his later and final message. A hundred and fifty particulars have been pointed out, in which there is a direct or indirect correspondence of the later with the earlier books. Their common acceptance as the writings of Moses through fifteen centuries of national existence, and eighteen more of Jewish dispersion, puts a key-stone to this body of consenting evidence, which the voice of God sealed long ago in the parting words of the Old Testament,—‘Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments.’

It remains now to complete this course of inductive inquiry by internal proofs that the Book of Genesis is no cento or patchwork of historical fragments, loosely thrown together in some far later age, but is really the first book of God’s perfect law to Israel by the hand of Moses; and linked inseparably with the four books that follow, not only by an unbroken series of external evidence, more lasting and extensive than in the case of any other work, but by clear internal signs, which prove that it is the historical groundwork of all the Sinaitic and Transjordanic legislation. We may trace at once its unity and harmony of

structure in itself, its close connexion with the later books of the law, and its wider harmonies with the whole course of God's later messages to mankind.

155. HISTORICAL LIMITS AND RANGE.

The law of Moses, from the facts in the four later books, and from the miraculous writing of the two tables at Sinai, professes to be the first beginning of Divine revelation in a written form. It is natural, and almost necessary, that such messages should begin with some record of man's creation, and of his first condition as a responsible creature under the moral government of God. This is doubly essential, since the fourth commandment introduces a direct reference to the fact and order of creation in the most central part of the Sinaitic covenant. On the other hand, Exodus begins with the descent of the sons of Israel into Egypt, and the death of Joseph. The first book, then, of the law needs, first of all, to satisfy this condition, that it shall begin with a record of the six days' creation, announced in the tables written with the finger of God, and shall reach to the death of Joseph. These are the exact historical limits of the Book of Genesis. Hereby it fulfils the first and simplest condition required in any book which claims to be the writing of Moses, introducing four later books, that contain the double covenant with Israel at Mount Sinai and in the plains of Horeb.

To comprise, however, in a book of moderate size the record of twenty-four centuries at least, so as to avoid enormous breaks on the one hand, and meagre, barren abstracts on the other, is no easy task. No accidental weaving together of broken fragments or independent

documents could possibly succeed in a work so difficult. Yet in the Book of Genesis it is accomplished with the greatest apparent ease. There is no discontinuity from first to last. The parts, though distinct, in point of chronology overlap each other. Two chapters of genealogy are the chief means of effecting the needful progress, without resolving the whole into a barren epitome. Still these genealogies are firmly rooted in the history; and each of them is connected, both at its opening and close, with a special promise and covenant of God, on which the whole history depends. Thus the historical limits of the book are the first sign of its genuineness, as one integral part of the Law of God by the hand of Moses.

156. MAIN DIVISIONS OF THE HISTORY.

The book resolves itself easily and naturally into five main portions: (1) the Record of Creation and the Fall, chh. i.-iv; (2) the History of the Flood, chh. v.-ix.; (3) the History of Abraham, with its prefatory genealogies, chh. x.-xxiv.; (4) the History of Isaac and Jacob, with the like genealogies, chh. xxv.-xxxv.; (5) the History of Jacob and Joseph, with the prefixed genealogy of Edom, chh. xxxvi.-L. These are parted from each other by the genealogy of Adam down to Noah; of the sons of Noah and of Shem, to Abraham; of the other sons of Abraham, and Ishmael, and of the sons of Esau. The two first, being more remote, occupy together rather less space than each of the rest. Now, of these five historical portions the first is plainly required by the words of the Sinaitic law, and the nature of God's earliest written message to man; and the three last by the nature of the whole law, which is based on the truth and reality of a

covenant which God had sworn to the three patriarchs. This fundamental oath of God is named twenty times in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, and no less than thirty times in Deuteronomy alone. But the covenant with Noah and the record of the dispersion of mankind, is as plainly essential, assuming the general truth of the events, in order to link the early record of creation with the history of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, after an interval of two thousand years.

157. THE GENEALOGIES OF GENESIS.

But the unity of plan in the whole book is still more apparent, when we examine its structure with reference to the genealogies which separate, and still combine, the five main periods of its sacred history.

First of all, the Record of Creation and the Fall, chh. i.-iv., begins with a whole chapter of 'the generations of the heavens and the earth,' ii. 4. Such is the title given to Gen. i. in the book itself, and its regular, formal outline of the successive work of the six days answers well to the name. That the title only follows in this case, instead of coming before, as in ch. v. 1, or of both preceding and following, as in the case of the sons of Noah, Ishmael, and Edom, is explained at once by the nature and dignity of this opening message of all revelation. But the fact is plain, that Gen. i. is called 'the generations of the heavens and earth, when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens.' And it is followed by three chapters of sacred history, which include the state of Paradise, the history of the Fall, and its moral consequences in the sin of Cain and murder of Abel, reaching on to the seventh generation in Cain's posterity ;

and to Enos, the third from Adam, in the sacred line of promise.

The second historical division, chh. v.-ix., begins with a genealogy, as before. 'This is the book of the generations of Adam.' By this the transition is made from the first to the second period. Yet, brief as is this record of sixteen centuries and upwards, it begins with a summary of the first, in the creation of Adam and Eve, i. 26-28; and the birth of Enos from Seth, the seed appointed in place of Abel; and it closes within the times of long-suffering, v. 32, vi. 3, with the birth of Shem, Ham, and Japheth, the three sons of Noah, whose genealogy forms the opening of the third historical period, and with a prophecy fulfilled, viii. 21, at the close of the second period. In other words, it condenses into itself, at its opening, all the previous history; and its close is the stem, from which branch out all the details of the six chapters that follow. The history has seven portions, all closely connected with each other, and with the genealogy that precedes them; the moral state of the world before the Flood, ch. vi. 1-8; the charge to Noah to build the ark, vi. 9-22; the second charge after the ark was built, vii. 1-9; the actual rising of the Flood till its decline, vii. 10-24; the abating of the Flood, viii. 1-14; the sacrifice and covenant of Noah, viii. 15-ix. 17; the sequel of the covenant, or the sin of Ham, and prophecy of Noah, till his death.

The third main division contains the history of Abraham, till the marriage of Isaac and his own death, chh. x.-xxv. 10. The transition is made, as before, by means of genealogies. But in this case we have two, and not one

only; the first of the sons of Noah in general, and of the seventy families by whom the earth was peopled after the Flood; and the second, of the sacred line of Shem the heir of promise, down to Abraham. The opening of each is closely linked with the previous history, v. 32; vi. 10; ix. 18-27; x. 1, 2, 6, 15-19, 21; xi. 10; while the mention of Abraham, Nahor, Haran, Lot, Sarai, and Milcah, at the close of the latter, contains the fruitful seeds of all the later history of this third period. The genealogical stem, which seems so dry, buds and blossoms, like the rod of Aaron, and yields both fruits and flowers.

The opening of the fourth period follows the same law. The list of Abraham's sons by Keturah closes the third period, and fitly prepares the way for his death and burial. But before the main line of sacred history is resumed, we have first, as in v. 1, x. 1, and xi. 10, a genealogy to prepare the way, 'Now these are the generations of Ishmael, Abraham's son, whom Hagar the Egyptian, Sarah's handmaid, bare to Abraham,' xxv. 12-17. We have the names of his twelve sons, answering earlier to the twelve patriarchs in the sacred line, and his own death. Then the history resumes with the words, 'These are the generations of Isaac, Abraham's son: Abraham begat Isaac,' &c. The main history is then pursued in ten chapters, till we come to a summary of Jacob's sons after the birth of Benjamin, answering in place to the earlier list of Abraham's sons by Keturah. Then follows the death and burial of Isaac, in words exactly resembling the death and burial of Abraham, ch. xxv. 7-9; xxxv. 27-29.

The last division of the history, like all the rest, begins

with a genealogy. In length it resembles chh. v. and x., for it occupies a whole chapter; but in character it resembles most the opening of the fourth period. Edom, like Ishmael, was the elder brother, born after the flesh, and not by promise; and his genealogy is given, like that of Ishmael, only at greater length, before the writer resumes the main course of the sacred history. The form of resumption is just the same, and here is doubly significant, because all the births have been recorded previously: xxv. 19, 'And these are the generations of Isaac, Abraham's son: Abraham begat Isaac, and Isaac was forty years old when he took Rebekah to wife,' &c.; xxxvii. 1, 2, 'And Jacob dwelt in the land wherein his father was a stranger, in the land of Canaan. These are the generations of Jacob: Joseph being seventeen years old,' &c. &c.

Now this unity of plan, running through the whole book from first to last, in the use of the genealogies, and their orderly position, so as to sum up the previous history and prepare the way for the portion that follows, and the subordination of the more general or collateral genealogy to that of the sacred line, is alone a strong proof of the Mosaic authorship. We have here no cento of fragments, no loosely cemented compound of two or three independent documents, but a history marked by unity of plan and harmony of execution from first to last; where extreme simplicity, as in a message to an infant church, is joined with secret depths of wisdom, which disclose the presence of One greater than even the Jewish Lawgiver, the revealing Spirit of the living God.

158. THE USE OF THE SACRED NAMES.

The use of the two sacred names, Elohim and Jehovah, has been made the primary argument for denying the unity of Genesis, and parting it among two, three, or four writers, much later than Moses. But when fully and fairly examined, it supplies a strong and clear proof of the common authorship of the whole. Let us resume, in a few words, the main facts of the case, and the evidence they supply.

The features to be explained are these: (1) the use of Elohim alone in the first record of creation, i.-ii. 3; (2) that of Jehovah-Elohim, the compound title, twenty times in succession in the next section, ii. 4-iii., and there alone; (3) the use of the sacred name in ch. iv., with one exception at the close; (4) of Elohim in ch v., with one exception at the close; (5) the mixed use in the history of the Flood and its sequel, chh. vi.-xi., where Elohim occurs twenty and Jehovah eighteen times; (6) the use of Jehovah alone, about fifty times, in the eight first chapters of Abraham's life, except ch. xvii., where it occurs only once, and Elohim ten times; (7) their alternate use in the earlier and later part of the account of Isaac's sacrifice; (8) their mixed use in the middle period of the narrative, chh. xxv.-xxxv. (El. 42, Jeh. 27), but with a less frequent use of Elohim at the beginning (El. 8, Jeh. 22), and more frequent towards the close (El. 34, Jeh. 5); (9) the use of the sacred name, chh. xxxviii., xxxix. (Jeh. 11, El. 1); and (10) the purely Elohistic usage of the last eleven chapters (El. 36, Jeh. 1). None of these facts are really explained by any form of the sceptical hypothesis. The view of Exod. vi., from which it starts, is contradicted by the whole context. If true, it would

simply require the transfer of two or three chapters to some second writer, while the theory leaves the Elohist only one-sixth part of the whole. The fundamental document, which results from the proposed dissection, is an historical monster, which could never have a real existence. It must either make a sudden leap from the six days' creation to a barren genealogy of Seth and his sons, and thence to the covenant of circumcision, and thence again to the history of Joseph, or supply the void by renouncing and contradicting the basis on which the whole structure professes to be reared. The use of the compound title in ii. 4-iii., the purely Jehovistic usage in xii.-xvi., xviii., the transition in ch. xxii., and the purely Elohistie usage in chh. xl.-l., receive on this view no explanation that is plausible in the least degree.

On the other hand, all these facts have been simply explained by the two principles, both involved in the Mosaic authorship, that each name is used, in main portions of the history, with reference to a contrast in their meaning, taught clearly to Moses in a direct revelation of God Exod. iii., vi.; and still that in other passages, and partly even where the distinction is observed, it is a further object, by their interchange, to keep it clearly in view that Elohim, the God of power, is Jehovah, the God of unchangeable holiness, and that Jehovah, the revealed God, in covenant with Israel, is also Elohim, the God of the whole earth, a Being mysterious and unsearchable. The use of the compound title in the second section of the history, and there alone; the Jehovistic usage in Abraham's history; the Elohistie use in the message of promise, ch. xvii., to contrast with its later fulfilment in Exodus;

the transition in the account of Isaac's sacrifice; the mixed usage, passing from the name of revelation to that of providential mystery, in the middle period; and the purely Elohist character of the closing chapters, all are explained simply and naturally by the key already given, and resist the utmost ingenuity of our modern anatomists to account for them by a plurality of unknown authors. The book is carved out into three hundred fragments, every rule and test of separation is contradicted in turn, to meet some new exigency, and the final result, as in the history of Joseph, and the thirty fragments of ch. xxxvii., is a palpable *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole theory.

159. THE CREATION AND THE FALL. Gen. i.-iv.

Let us now examine the five main divisions of the book, and trace their unity in themselves and with each other, their connexion with the later books as parts of the same Divine law, and their harmonies with the whole course of later revelation.

The first section, chh. i.-iv., consists of three portions. The first of these is a worthy and sublime opening of the whole code of written revelation. Here the name Elohim alone is used, as the simpler title of Divine power and greatness. The next portion is marked by the use of the double title, like a solemn proclamation at the entrance on the moral history of mankind, that Elohim is Jehovah, and Jehovah is Elohim. But it links itself with the first chapter by the direct reference, ii. 4, and resumes the mention of the dry land, or earth's geography, of the plants and trees, of the animals, and of the creation of men and women, in connexion with the first moral probation of mankind. The third chapter refers to the second,

almost in every verse. Again, ch. iv. is equally linked with the previous account of the Fall, of which it reveals the fatal consequences. Thus iv. 1 refers to iii. 20, and 16; v. 7 to iii. 16; v. 12 to iii. 17; v. 16 to iii. 8; and v. 25 at the close to v. 1 at the beginning. The whole is one continuous and inseparable history.

160. But this first portion of the book has also links in every part with the rest of the law, and with the later messages of God. The first verse answers plainly to the opening of the Fourth Gospel: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God: All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made.' It corresponds also with the title of Christ: 'the Beginning of the creation of God,' and with the final promise: 'Behold, I make all things new.' The account of chaos, i. 2, is made a parable of the national ruin and desolation of Israel, Jer. iv. 22-27. The light-creating word, v. 3, is made a symbol of the most glorious truth of redemption, 2 Cor. iv. 6: 'God, that caused the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ.' The successive creation of the beasts of the sea and the earth, followed by that of man himself, is the groundwork of an antitype in the last prophecy of the New Testament, Rev. xiii., xiv., xix. The account of man's creation in God's image, with large dominion, is linked by Ps. viii., midway in God's providence, with two prophecies of the New Testament, which look forward to the redemption to come, 1 Cor. xv. 24-28; Heb. ii. 5-10. Its authority is sealed by the lips of Christ: 'Have ye

not read, that he which made them in the beginning made them male and female.' And again by the Apostle, who borrows from it the description of the new and Divine nature, the fruit of redeeming grace, 'which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him.' The whole account of the six days, and the Sabbath that followed, is made the basis of the fourth commandment, revealed in cloud and fire, and twice written by the finger of God on the tables of stone. And it is further appealed to by Christ in His noted saying, 'The Sabbath was made for man' (that is, in the message of God next after his creation) 'and not man for the Sabbath.'

161. In the next division, the Law of Marriage, and of the wife's subjection to the husband, link the history with the later books, as one part of the revealed law of God; while the first curse on the ground for the sin of Adam finds its later expansion in Lev. xxvi. 18-20, 32-35; Deut. xxviii. 15-24, 38-42; xxix. 22-25. But the words are further linked with an august series of later revelations. Thus ii. 7 is quoted by St. Paul, where he reveals the mystery of the resurrection: 'And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul: the last Adam is made a quickening spirit.' The garden of Eden is referred to in Genesis itself, xiii. 12; in the second book of Kings and Isaiah, xix. 12; in repeated prophecies, Isa. li. 3; Ezek. xxviii. 13; xxxi. 8, 9, 16; and in the visions of St. John, Rev. ii. 7; xxii. 1, 2. The tree of life reappears in the Book of Proverbs, iii. 18, and in the visions of Ezekiel and the Apocalypse. The land of Havilah refers to the later genealogy of the sons of Shem, and the frequent mention of gold of Ophir, while the mention of

the onyx is linked with the building of the tabernacle, and the glorious foundations of the New Jerusalem, Exod. xxv. 7 ; xxviii. 9-12, 20 ; xxxv. 9 ; Rev. xxi. 20. The river Hiddekel is named again once only in Dan. x. 4, xii. 5 ; but the Euphrates is found in the covenant to Abraham, Gen. xv. 18, in the parting exhortation to Moses, Deut. xi. 24, and in the whole course of sacred history and prophecy, down to the close of Revelation. The warning, ii. 15-17, is the root and pattern of every later threatening on disobedience. The words, ii. 23, 24, are quoted by our Lord as a Divine law 'from the beginning,' and made by St. Paul the ground of a main ordinance of the Church of Christ, 1 Tim. ii. 11-13. The Old Serpent reappears in Isaiah's prophecies, xxvii. 1, and in St. Paul's Epistles, 2 Cor. xi. 3 ; but still more plainly in the closing prophecy of Scripture, Rev. xii. 3, 9, 15 ; xx. 2. The threefold temptation finds its counterpart, and its result a contrast, in our Lord's temptation in the wilderness. The excuses of Adam are made a moral warning in the Book of Job, xxxi. 33, 34, and in Hosea, vi. 7, while the results of death are made the ground, by St. Paul, of a glorious antithesis between the sin of Adam and redemption in Christ, Rom. v. 12-19. The sentence on the serpent is renewed by the prophet, Isa. lxv. 25, and expounded by Apostles, Rom. xvi. 20 ; Rev. xx. 1, 2. The Seed of the Woman is a description of the promised Redeemer, which forms the text of all later revelation (Isa. vii.-ix. ; Mic. v. 1-6 ; Matt. i. 18-25 ; Gal. iv. 4) ; while the first mention of cherubim at the gate of Paradise is the germ of a truth, which is unfolded in the structure of the tabernacle and the temple, and in the visions of Isaiah, Ezekiel,

and St. John. The whole section is one condensed summary of facts and truths, of warnings and promises, which are unfolded in the later series of Divine messages for four thousand years.

162. THE HISTORY OF THE FLOOD, chh. v.-ix.

This second division of the book resolves itself into nine sections,—the genealogy, the state of the old world, the charge to Noah, the second charge when the ark was built, the beginning and continuance of the Flood, its abatement, the sacrifice of Noah, the covenant that followed, and the later history of the curse and blessing.

These sections are so closely connected, that they cannot be parted from each other without extreme violence. The genealogy, from Adam to Noah, and the birth of his three sons, brings us down from the earlier to the later period. The account, vi. 1-8, begins twenty years before the close of the last portion, and is the moral key of the judgment that follows. The first charge, vi. 9-22, resumes the genealogy from v. 32, and refers back to the account of Enoch, v. 22, 24, and gives the main outlines of the coming deliverance. The second charge, vii. 1-10, implies that the ark was now built, adds further directions about the clean beasts and birds, and gives a definite warning of the exact time of the approaching Flood. The account, vii. 11-24, links itself by the year date with v. 32; vi. 3, and by the month date with the warning, vii. 4, 10, by v. 13, with vi. 18; vv. 14-16, with vi. 19, 20; vii. 2, 3, by v. 20, with vi. 15; and by vv. 21-23, with vi. 7-17; vii. 4. The account of the Flood's abatement contains eight or nine of these backward references, and the next section, viii. 16-21, is

full of them. Comp. vi. 18; vii. 13; vi. 19; i. 28; vii. 2, 3; iv. 4; iii. 17; v. 29; vi. 5; vi. 7, 17. The covenant also points in every part to the earlier history. Comp. i. 28, 26, 29; iv. 11; vi. 13; i. 26; v. 1; i. 28; vii. 13-16. The prophecy of Noah, ix. 18-29, also refers to v. 32; vi. 10; vii. 13; iv. 11; v. 32; vii. 6, 11.

163. This period is less closely linked with the other books of the law than those which follow. Yet the Song of Moses alludes plainly to the dispersion (Gen. x.) of the seventy families of the sons of Noah after the flood. The reckoning of months and days, which meets us here for the first time, agrees with the old Egyptian calendar, and finds its further key in Exod. xii. 1, 2. The descriptions of Enoch and Noah, who 'walked with God,' reappear in the charge to Abraham, xvii. 1, and in the blessing on the sons of Joseph, xlviii. 15. The time of forbearance, vi. 3, is the first of a series of prophetic times, of which a second occurs in the promise to Abraham, xv. 13, and a third in the forty years' sojourn in the wilderness, Num. xiv. 33, 34. The description of Noah, vi. 6, is repeated fivefold to Moses, Exod. xxxiii. 12-17; xxxiv. 9; and his exact obedience to God's instructions in building the ark, vi. 22, vii. 15, answers to the sevenfold notice of the like obedience of Moses when the tabernacle was raised, Exod. xl. 16-32. The distinction of clean and unclean beasts and fowls, is given twice, with fuller details, in the earlier and later legislation, Lev. xi.; Deut. xiv. 3-21. The seven days' interval, thrice named, refers to the appointment of the weekly Sabbath. The removal or mitigation of the curse, viii. 21, points onward to the caution which closes the Old Testament, Mal. iv. 6, and to one of the

latest promises of the New, Rev. xxii. 3. The strict prohibition of blood is one main feature of the law of Moses, Exod. xxi. 12-23; Lev. xxv. 16-19, 31, 33; Deut. xix. 11-13. The curse upon Canaan, and the blessing of Shem, are like the root of all the history to the close of Joshua. The waters of Noah are named, Isa. liv. 9, as a pledge of God's faithfulness, and his history is twice quoted by our Lord as a warning of judgment. In Ezek. i. 27, 28; Heb. xi. 5-7; 1 Pet. iii. 19-21; 2 Pet. ii. 5; iii. 6, 7; Jude, 14, 15; Rev. x. 1; iv. 3; ix. 5, 10; we have repeated allusions, in the Old and New Testament alike, to the events in this section of the sacred history.

164. THE HISTORY OF ABRAHAM. Gen. x.-xxiv.

The unity of this portion of Genesis is complete. It begins with a double genealogy, by which the transition is made from the times of the Flood to the life of Abraham. One is general and collateral, of all the sons of Noah; the other special and successive, in the sacred line of Shem, thus alluding to the promise, ix. 26. The seventy families, ch. x., answer to the like number of souls at the descent, ch. xlvi., and to the seventy elders, Num. xi.; and have also a more secret relation to the seventy palm-trees at Elish, and the Mission of the Seventy in our Lord's ministry. The mention of Nimrod and Babel prepares the way for that account of the dispersion which follows. The mention of the Canaanites and their border, and of Shem as father of the children of Eber, points onward to the future contrast between the doomed tribes and the Hebrew race, the people of God's covenant. The second genealogy, xi. 10-32, like that of Seth, ch. v., links itself in its first words with the whole previous history; and at its

close introduces all the chief persons of the history that is to follow ; in one case, Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth ; in the other, Abraham, Nahor, Haran, Lot, Milcah, and Sarah.

The interlacing of the history is most complete. Thus, ch. xii. has six references to the chapters immediately before it ; and there are six in ch. xiii., seven in ch. xiv., five in ch. xv., two in ch. xvi., six in ch. xvii., four in ch. xviii., five in ch. xix., four in ch. xx., twelve in ch. xxi., six in ch. xxii., four in ch. xxiii., and twelve in ch. xxiv., or almost eighty in the whole period. Each part of the history grows naturally out of that which precedes. The separation of Lot and Abram is occasioned by their added wealth on their return from Egypt. Lot's choice of Sodom occasions his captivity, and this leads to Abraham's victory. His self-denial is rewarded by a fuller renewal of the promise. The episode of Hagar is the consequence of its long delay. The covenant of circumcision, the vision at Mamre, the fall of Sodom and rescue of Lot, the sojourn at Gerar, the birth of Isaac, the exile of Ishmael, Isaac's sacrifice, Sarah's death and burial, and Isaac's marriage, are all linked by the simplest and firmest signs of historical succession. No single stone can be wrenched out of this Divine structure without a sensible disturbance and dislocation. Thus every verse, almost, of ch. xxi. refers to facts or promises which have gone before. The faith of Abraham reaches its highest triumph when he offers Isaac on the altar, and receives its glorious recompense in that oath of mercy, which is to a thousand generations. The genealogy of Nahor and Milcah prepares briefly for the account in ch. xxiv. Then follow, in due order, the

death and burial of Sarah, the marriage of Isaac, the list of the sons of Abraham by Keturah, and his own death and burial, full of years and honour.

165. The sacred history, in this central portion of Genesis, is the stem on which all the later messages of the Law depend. It is mainly Jehovistic in its use of the sacred name, as Gen. i.-v. are Elohistic, ch. xxxix. Jehovistic, and ch. xl.-L. Elohistic. And since all these portions are plainly essential to the outline of the book, this fact alone is a full disproof of the dual or composite theory. Again, the oath, ch. xxii., which crowns the other promises to Abraham, is mentioned twenty times in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, and thirty times in Deuteronomy alone. Abraham's deliverance from Egypt is a type and earnest of the later Exodus. Hebron, which is Mamre and Kirjath-arba, one chief scene of the sojourn, and also of the burial of Sarah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, reappears in the journey of the spies, and in the fulfilment of the promise to Caleb, whose inheritance it became. The history of Melchizedek prepares the way for the solemn oath in the Psalms, cx. 4, and for the full exposition, in the New Testament, of the priestly perfection of Christ. The command 'Fear not,' xv. 1, is repeated seventy times in the Law, the Prophets, and the New Testament, down to the latest vision of Christ in Patmos to the beloved disciple. The title, 'I am thy shield,' is renewed at the very close of the law in the blessing of Moses. The promise, xv. 6, is the groundwork of two main Epistles of the New Testament. The date, xv. 13-21, and its attendant warnings, find their common fulfilment at the time of the Exodus. The history of

Hagar and Ishmael enters into the later history of the Ishmaelites, of Kedar and Nebaioth, and supplies one of the most striking types or parables in the whole word of God. The covenant of circumcision is the first basis of the whole law of Moses, and finds its completion at the Exodus in the ordinance of the Passover. The rescue of Lot from Sodom, like that of Noah from the flood, has its echoes through all later ages. Compare Deut. xxix. 23; xxxii. 22; Ps. xi. 6, 7; Isa. iii. 9; xxxiv. 8-10; Ezek. xvi. 46-50, 53; Hos. xi. 8; Joel, iii. 18; Amos, iv. 11; Zeph. ii. 9; Matt. xi. 23, 24; Luke, x. 12; xvii. 28-30, 32; 2 Pet. ii. 6-9; Heb. xiii. 2; Jude 7; Rev. xix. 3. The sacrifice of Isaac and the oath which followed, are linked with the whole series of Divine promises both in the Old and New Testament.

166. THE HISTORY OF ISAAC AND JACOB. Ch. xxv.-xxxv.

The unity of the whole book is shown in the way in which its main divisions, though successive, slightly overlap each other, so as to bind the whole into one. Thus the first period closes with the birth of Enos, iv. 26; but the genealogy resumes earlier, and includes Adam, Seth, Enos, as the three first links of the series, down to Noah. It closes one hundred years before the Flood, with the birth of the sons of Noah; but the history of the Flood is resumed twenty years earlier, vi. 3. This second period closes with the death of Noah, three hundred and fifty years after the Flood; but the genealogies both resume from the Flood itself. They close with the death of Terah in Haran, but the history resumes from the call of Abraham in Ur of the Chaldees, before reaching Haran. The

period closes with the death of Abraham. The next resumes with the generations of Ishmael about sixty years earlier, and with the marriage of Isaac, and birth of his sons, thirty-five and fifteen years before Abraham's death. It closes with the death and burial of Isaac. The last period resumes with the history of Joseph, when only seventeen years old, or twelve years before Isaac's death. Thus all the separate portions of the narrative are dovetailed firmly into each other. The links of connexion are here too numerous for distinct mention. Three only may be specified. The internal unity of this division, from the death and burial of Abraham to that of Isaac, is marked by the genealogy of the twelve princely sons of Ishmael at its opening, xxv. 13-16, and of the twelve sons of Israel at its close, xxv. 22-26. Its connexion with the previous history is shown by xxv. 19-23, compared with xvii. 19, 21; xviii. 10; xxi. 1-12; xxii. 23; xxiv. 15-67; xvi. 1, 2; and with the opening of the part that follows, by xxv. 27, 30-34; compared with ch. xxxvi., the genealogy of the sons of Esau.

167. THE HISTORY OF JACOB AND JOSEPH.

The unity of the main part of this final division, the history of Joseph, is so apparent and striking, as to make the sceptical hypothesis, which would decompose and dissect ch. xxxvii. alone into thirty fragments, a marvel of learned folly. But even the parts where the unity is less apparent can be shown to have an organic connexion with the rest. Thus the opening genealogy of the Edomites conforms to the law of the four previous divisions, which begin with 'the book of the generations of the heavens and earth in the day they were created,' ii. 3; 'the book of the gener-

ations of Adam,' v. 1; 'the generations of the sons of Noah,' and 'the generations of Shem,' x. 1; xi. 10; and again, 'the generations of Ishmael, Abraham's son,' and 'the generations of Isaac, Abraham's son,' xxv. 12, 19. In these two latter cases the more general or less sacred precedes the sacred line,—'That is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual.' The order here is the same. 'Now these are the generations of Esau, which is Edom,' xxxvi. 1, 'according to their habitations in the land of their possession,' v. 43. 'These are the generations of Jacob,' xxxvii. 2. Again, ch. xxxviii., which seems like a digression, continues the sacred line of the true seed of Abraham in the tribe of Judah, and thus enters into the genealogy in the opening of the New Testament,—'And Judah begat Pharez and Zara of Tamar.' The vision to Jacob at Beersheba refers to the whole history of Abraham and the promises, xv. 13; xvii. 6. The list, xlvi. 8-27, is the ground of many successive statements in the later books of the law; the heading of Exodus, i. 1-5; the genealogy, vi. 14-25; the fuller genealogy, Num. xxvi. 5-50; and the historical allusions, Deut. i. 10; vii. 7; x. 22; xxvi. 5; xxxii. 8. The blessing on the two sons of Joseph enters into the whole later history of the two tribes, Ephraim and Manasseh; and that of the twelve patriarchs finds its counterpart in the blessing of Moses, the man of God, at the close of the Law; while the charge of Joseph concerning his bones serves to unite this first sacred book, at its close, with the first step of the fulfilment of the Abrahamic covenant in Exod. xiii. 19; and with its final completion in the Book of Joshua,

by the full possession of the land of promise, Josh. xxiv. 31-33.

168. It would require many volumes to trace the deeper harmonies of this wonderful book, not only within itself, and in relation to the four books of the Law for which it prepares the way, but with the higher messages of the Gospel, and the whole series of revelations from God to man. The questions raised by the comparison of its statements with the real or supposed discoveries of modern science open another field of inquiry, which the wisest of men, in our present state of imperfect knowledge, cannot hope fully to explore. I have confined myself here to a view of the internal signs of unity and Divine authority in the Books of the Law as the genuine writing of Moses, the foundation of all genuine faith in the later revelation of the Gospel. All other evidence, how full and decisive soever, must range itself, like the armies of Michael in Milton's poem, under a still higher standard—the express testimony of the Incarnate Son of God. He, whose name is the Truth, has given His separate attestation to each book of Moses, and to all of them in one.

The Father speaks to us from the cloud of glory: 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him.' Then the Son Himself speaks to us: 'Have ye not read, that He which made them in the beginning, made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh. Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.' 'That on you

may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel.' 'As the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be.' 'The same day that Lot went out of Sodom, it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all.' 'Remember Lot's wife.' These are his repeated seals to the truth and authority of Genesis.

'Have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but the living.' 'Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.' 'God commanded, saying, Honour thy father and mother; and He that curseth father or mother, let him die the death,' Matt. xv. 4; Exod. xx. 12; xxi. 17. 'If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments . . . Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy mother,' Matt. xix. 17, 18; Exod. xx. 'Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead.' Here our Lord has set His seal to the laws and the facts in the Book of Exodus.

'Shew thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them,' Matt. viii. 4; Lev. xiv. 3. 'The shewbread, which it was not lawful for him to eat, nor for them which were with him, but only for the priests,' Matt. xii. 4; Lev. xxiv. 5-9. 'If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments . . . Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,' Matt. xix. 19; Lev. xix. 18. 'And the second is like unto it,

Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets,' Matt. xxii. 39, 40. 'Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth,' Matt. v. 38; Lev. xxiv. 20. Here the like seal is put on the Book of Leviticus.

'As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up,' John, iii. 14, 15; Num. xxi. 4-9. 'Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and died,' John, vi. 49, 58; Num. xxvi. 63-65. 'Ye have heard that it hath been said to them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths,' Matt. v. 33; Num. xxx. 2. These are His testimony to the history and commands in Numbers.

'It is written, Man doth not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God.' 'It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.' 'Get thee behind me, Satan; for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him alone shalt thou serve.' 'It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement,' Deut. xxiv. 1. 'In the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall be established,' Matt. xviii. 16; Deut. xix. 15. 'Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives,' Matt. xix. 8; Deut. xxiv. 1-4. 'Master, Moses said, if a man die, having no children,' &c. 'Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God,' Matt. xxii. 29; Deut. xxv. 5-10. 'Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and

with all thy soul, and with all thy mind; this is the first and great commandment On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.' These are direct attestations to the truth and inspiration of Deuteronomy. And all these are crowned by the more comprehensive sayings: 'Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle shall not pass from the Law, till all be fulfilled,' Matt. v. 18. 'Whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven,' v. 19. 'Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets,' vii. 12. 'It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail,' Luke, xvi. 17. 'If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead,' xvi. 31. 'Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how can ye believe my words,' John, v. 46, 47.

With these words our inquiry may well close. Let God be true and every man a liar. The Lord of glory Himself has proclaimed that faith in His words, and in the writings of Moses His servant, stand and fall together. Whoever rejects Moses, in so doing rejects the words of Christ. The Law, given by Moses, and the grace and truth which have come by Jesus Christ, form one twofold, but harmonious message from the Creator, the Preserver, and the Judge of mankind.

BS1225.4 .B61
The Pentateuch and its anatomists; or,

Princeton Theological Seminary - Speer Library



1 1012 00039 5303