

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

THE

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

ARTICLE I.

PROPOSED RECONSTRUCTION OF THE PENTATEUCH.¹

BY REV. EDWIN C. BISSELL, D.D., PROFESSOR OF HEBREW LANGUAGE AND
LITERATURE IN THE THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION, HARTFORD, CT.

If we discover among us in these days any disposition to underrate or relatively disparage the Old Testament, any tendency to neglect it in our theological schools, we must see, too, that Providence is signally interposing on its behalf, and vindicating for it the highest claims to our attention. It is safe to say, bating from the statement whatever you please for any partiality one might have for favorite studies, that not a few of the problems with which the minds of thoughtful men are grappling to-day directly concern the Hebrew Scriptures. It is the Book of Genesis that we couple in our thinking with certain puzzling questions of geology and cosmography. It is the same book that serves as point of departure for the still mooted subject, when human history had its beginning, and how it began. It is to the Old Testament chiefly that the science of archaeology, opening up in our day so broad a field and awakening in its devotees so inspiring an ardor, comes to lay down its store of gathered facts and illustrations. From old Sophervaim of the Books of Kings and Isaiah some of the latest treasures of monumental literature have been welcomed to our Western world. It is significant, too, that an eminent Assyriologist published,

¹ Inaugural Address at Hartford, May 10, 1882.

not long ago, as the result of special study in this department, a discussion of the question — more practical in its bearing than might appear — Where was Paradise? ¹ And it is not geography or history or chronology alone that these priceless records are teaching us. They are enriching our lexicons and correcting our grammars as well. It is an open secret that there are in the sacred text not a few words, Hebrew and Aramaic, whose meaning as yet has only been surmised, and that a single Psalm of less than forty verses has thirteen so-called *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα*, words that do not elsewhere occur in the Bible. Hence, it is a gladdening consideration that scholars are now in process of constructing from these same monuments of the past lexicon and grammar of a closely allied Semitic tongue older, it is claimed, and more archaic in its forms, than any other known to man, and of such a character that the vocalization of every word has been exactly preserved.

And as if all this were not enough to quicken our flagging zeal, and teach us that the Hebrew Scriptures can never be divorced from the Greek Scriptures in our reverential study, the heaviest cannonading of biblical criticism is just now heard among these earliest records of our faith. Around the Gospels and Epistles there is, for the moment, a comparative lull in the conflict, while Moses and his great work are sharply challenged. Indeed, a certain style of biblical criticism has always found here an attractive field — where the scantiness of objective and contemporaneous elements has seemed to invite and permit a corresponding subjective fulness and assurance. We are already accustomed, in connection with the Pentateuch, to such names as “Jehovist,” “Elohist” and “Younger Elohist,” “Deuteronomist” and “Redactor,” although they are found in no accredited list of sacred writers, and have ever failed to impress us with the simple grandeur of him who smote the rock at Horeb, and spoke face to face with God, “as a man speaketh to his friend.” We have seen one scheme of the origin of Genesis and its companion books give place in quick succession to another. We have seen the

¹ Friedrich Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies?* 1882.

documents of which it is assumed that they are composed, submitted, on the basis of other assumptions, to every sort of kaleidoscopic arrangement, until, as it should seem, the very limit of possible combinations had been reached.

But it has been left to critics of our own day to propound a theory of the Pentateuch, and the course of Israelitish history, which totally eclipses all that have preceded it. Were the goodly towns and cities of these Eastern states, with their swarming millions of people, with all their glory of material, magnificence, and moral power, suddenly to be put down, in some way, conceivable or inconceivable, in the far-off valley of the Mississippi, leaving only scattered villages and hamlets where this surging tide of life had been before, it could not so affect our organic existence as a people, it could not so completely change the avenues of trade, revolutionize our social habits and methods of living and working, color and shape our national future, as would this latest scheme of criticism, were it to succeed, revolutionize our old-time theories of the composition and organic structure of the Old Testament, and the order, continuity, and contents of sacred history. It is nothing less than a tremendous critical cataclysm, an upheaval and a transformation that are continental in their reach and influence. The movement may be said to have taken its rise long since in the strictures of an Aben Ezra¹ on the current method of treating the Pentateuch as solely the work of Moses. From him it came down through a Carlstadt,² Spinoza,³ Astruc,⁴ continually taking broader sweep and clearer outline to the time of Reuss,⁵ George,⁶ and Vatke,⁷ of our present century. But until the appearance of

¹ For an account of his exegetical works, see Ersch u. Gruber's *Encyklopädie*, i., s. v. He held that the Pentateuch was mainly the work of Moses, excepting only certain interpolations.

² *De Canonicis Scripturis*, 1520.

³ *Tractatus Theologico-politicus*, 1670.

⁴ *Conjectures sur les Mémoires originaux*, etc., 1753.

⁵ *Thesen* (1833), Art. "Judenthum," in Ersch u. Gruber's *Encyklop.* His most recent work published is *Geschichte d. Heiligen Schriften d. A. T.*, 1881.

⁶ *Die Aelteren Jüdischen Feste*, etc., 1835.

⁷ *Die Religion d. A. T.*, i. 1835.

Graf¹ as its champion, somewhat less than a score of years ago, the theory had not really taken characteristic shape; had found no sufficient sponsor; had failed to awaken the serious attention of scholars to its claims; in fact, had sometimes met the smile of derision in the house of its friends. But under his skilful manipulations and masterly support, it took at once front rank among stirring questions; indeed, it may be said, shot like a meteor into the sky of human observation. And though men looked to see it pass away again, like our meteors, it blazes still, a growing and portentous wonder to this very hour. And this is one of the strangest things about the theory: its sudden and wide success in the land of its birth. Professor Robertson Smith, in a recent work, declares that it represents "the growing conviction of an overwhelming weight of the most earnest and sober scholarship."² And while I should wish to limit such a statement to Germany, and to change at least one of the adjectives applied to scholarship, there can be, I think, no doubt that a large majority of the younger theologians of Germany have really adopted the conclusions of Professors Kuenen³ and Wellhausen,⁴ and found in them a happy solution of many perplexing critical problems. And of this class, it is not enough to say, that the theory represents their convictions, or even dominates them. They flaunt it; wear it as a decoration; receive its principal supporters with clangor of trumpets, as though a sweeping victory had been won.

Excepting works relating exclusively to the text, nearly everything of weight that has appeared in Germany in the department of the Old Testament for the last two years has treated of this theme. Heavy reviews have been started in

¹ *De Templo Silonensi, etc.* (1855); *Die geschichtlichen Bücher d. A. T.* (1866); Art. in reply to Richm in *Merx's Archiv* (1869).

² *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 216.

³ His principal work has been published in England, *The Religion of Israel, etc.*, 3 vols., 1874; but numerous articles on the same subject have appeared from time to time in the *Theolog. Tijdschrift* (Leiden).

⁴ *Die Composition des Hexateuchs in Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, 1876, pp. 392-450, 532-602; 1877, pp. 407-479; *Geschichte Israels*, i. 1878.

defence of the new hypothesis, voluminous commentaries written, saturated with its spirit and methods; and even some of the later Hebrew grammars show on their supposed impassive pages marks of the theological revolution. Does any one ask, But what is it all to us in America? What are the books we read, or the moral atmosphere we breathe, to us? Take the German books, and the translations of German books, out of our theological libraries, and you would be amazed at the emptiness of the shelves. Nor is it a matter which concerns theologians and ministers only. The theory has already crossed the English Channel bodily, and is finding adherents also, here and there, among ourselves. It has learned to utter itself in an attractive English style; even found its way in a series of biblical Articles, how and why I know not, into the most prominent of English Encyclopaedias. One will still recall the vigorous protests made, some years ago, on the appearance of "Essays and Reviews." But the rationalism reprobated in "Essays and Reviews," was mildness itself compared with that of an Article entitled "Israel," by Julius Wellhausen, in Vol. xiii. of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. It cuts completely loose from all traditional views of Israelitish and early sacred history. If its positions be true, it makes dreadful havoc not only of a considerable part of the ancient Scriptures, but of many of the choicest classics of the English church and the English tongue. And though it be balefully false, still, from the stand-point of our times a certain plausibility cannot be denied it; and as one of the characteristic, culminating products of the lauded scientific method, it challenges our serious attention.

The theory in its latest form, and stated in the very briefest terms, is this:¹ The Hexateuch, that is the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua, is made up of three leading documents, — omitting here a minor distinction, — belonging to wholly different writers and widely different times. The Jahvist document, which is the oldest and briefest, begins with the

¹ Cf. Wellhausen's edition of Bleek's *Einleitung d. Alten Testaments* (1878), pp. 177, 178.

fifth verse of the second chapter of Genesis, and while mainly appearing as history, contains the legislation of the so-called Book of the Covenant (Ex. xx.—xxiii.; xxxiv.). The second document originally embraced only the legislative portions of Deuteronomy (xii.—xxvi.). It was at once occasion and product of the so-called “Deuteronomic reforms” in the time of Josiah (624 B.C.), itself originating possibly in some collusion of priests and facile king. Later it was given its present historic setting by the “Deuteronomist,” who also worked over the document which had preceded it, making his hand especially prominent in the Book of Joshua: all, you will perceive, some centuries after the time of Moses. But the most important work of all, named from the nature of its contents the Codex of the Priests, which begins the Bible, contains almost the whole of Genesis and the Levitical legislation of the middle books of the Pentateuch, did not see the light, it is said, till after the Exile. True, it claims to be Mosaic, as does also Deuteronomy; but that is simply an histrionic, not an historic claim,—a representation made in the interest of its authority. In its narrative portions it is mainly a product of the fancy, although that narrative includes such matter as an account of the tabernacle and its furniture; and, as for the rest, it is the work of no one man, but of a school—a sort of precipitate from the literary activity of various priests and learned men. But still the Hexateuch is not complete. There is required another masterhand,—a masterhand, indeed,—a redactor, who shall unite this Codex of the Priests to the previous work of the Jehovist and the Deuteronomist, making the one supposed continuous history, by skilful trimming here and interpolating there, accord with the other continuous history, and the laws of the different periods fit together, as best he can. And he appears as these subjective personages usually do. He lives in the time and breathes the atmosphere of the last great work, the Codex of the Priests; and governed fully by its spirit he joins together in one grand whole these diverse products of a millennium, and deterred, as far as we know, by no scruples of conscience, leaves them

under the countenance of a supposititious Sinaitic lawgiver, whose name has been sagaciously painted in, and whose personality has been impressed at every convenient opportunity.

Now, from the point of view of this school of criticism, that is, accepting it as true that these men really did this work in the way described, it must be acknowledged that they did it extremely well. The Pentateuch as thus made up, and as a mere literary achievement, is an eminent success; in fact, a very prodigy of genius, call it a romance, or call it what you will. But there are those who are unable to take this point of view; and such will naturally look to see what is to be the outcome of this stupendous reconstruction of the records, possibly, even before they test the question of its probability. They will scarcely be able to resist the conviction that, if this be a true representation of the case, then the jewel set in the crown of the Scriptures reflects a false lustre; that we have in the Pentateuch simply a fivefold imposition, a nearly worthless composite of mingled cleverness and fraud. Real homogeneousness of texture there is none. Patriarchal history, excepting some floating myths, completely gone. Mosaic history, even, only represented in some scattered *débris* borne downward on the heaving waters of a beclouded tide. A sacred history of the Old Testament, properly speaking, there can be none. It is reduced simply to an account, more or less credible, of the rise, development, and decline of a Jewish sect that reached its bloom after the Exile. The principal contents of the Pentateuch have really nothing to do with the history of an Israel that sprang from the loins of Abraham, but solely with this post-exilic sect. Such a people as Israel there was; but all you can learn of them, to any purpose, must be learned from the Books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings, and the prophets of the pre-exilic period. The great lawgiver of the old economy, and withal the grandest figure in primitive history, not Moses after all, but Ezra the priest, who, with his straggling remnant, over-lived the heavy blows of Chaldea and Assyria! The standing designation, "the Law and the Prophets," sanctioned and sanc-

tified by the usage of Christ and his apostles, a misnomer ; it should rather be "the Prophets and the Law," the real historic order being just the reverse of the order as it now appears. The sources of the Old Testament religion are in the literature of the early prophets. Protevangelium there is none. The promise made to the seed of the woman, shining like another Bethlehem star over the birthplace of human sin, a Jehovistic conceit, meaning something or meaning nothing. There is as radical an overturning of biblical theology, you will see, as of biblical history as hitherto conceived. The idea of sacrifice, for instance, must be readjusted on a wholly different plan, and made to serve a totally different aim. It surely cannot take the widely comprehensive range supposed, while ever narrowing in concentric circles to one central, all-controlling fact, as the writer to the Hebrews seems firmly to have believed. For this new scheme, as it leaves the history of redemption without an orderly beginning, so it leaves it without a sufficient end. It smites off the roots of the development, and is only consistent in looking for nothing among the branches. The one fitting consummation of the national life and religion of Israel, the one glorious conclusion of the Old Testament premises, openly declared to be not Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, of the tribe of Judah, whose day Abraham saw and was glad, but the political catastrophe which overtook the Jewish state seventy years after our era began, and the rabbinical schools which then sprang up.¹ That, without extravagance of statement, is the startling discovery which scholars professing to be governed by strictly scientific principles, have made in our day ; that, in bare outline, is the scheme, with some of its more obvious results, which, with all seriousness, they offer for the acceptance of the Christian world, and of which Professor Robertson Smith says that it "represents an overwhelming weight of the most earnest and sober scholarship." Bear with me in stating a few natural reasons for supposing that a really sober and reverent scholarship will be extremely

¹ See Wellhausen's Art. "Israel," as above, pp. 428, 429.

slow in accepting it. And, first, such a scholarship will find it impossible, I think, to adopt many of those principles of criticism which are its necessary condition. One of them, for example, is, that persons of our day — I should perhaps say some persons of our day — have the ability to take up these ancient records, existing quite apart, with no native contemporaneous matter to which there can be appeal, and solely on the basis of inward characteristics of style and the like, decide with nice exactness upon their relative age. The recurrence of certain names of God, in fact, is the hinge on which the question turns; Jahveh marking the earliest document, and Elohim the latest. And yet, these hypothetical documents, as now found, would be wholly unintelligible if rent asunder, are both absolutely essential to the integrity and continuity of the history as we have it; and there are other passages equally essential, where both the characteristic words must be admitted to be integral parts of the same document. Imagine the conclusions, were any modern composition, a sermon or a religious book, to be subjected to the same process of dissection.

I know how widely this theory of documents prevails in Europe, even among scholars otherwise as far apart as Wellhausen and Delitzsch. But from thence, too, has justly come of late, in view of the tremendous conclusions which are drawn from it, a call for a serious review of the principles on which it rests.¹ Those principles are acknowledged to be but partially applicable to the Pentateuch, and scholars are far enough from being agreed just how to apply them. They are not, and cannot be, applied to other parts of Scripture, as Job and Ecclesiastes, the Psalms, Proverbs, and Nehemiah, where a use of these divine names scarcely less peculiar is found. And yet men build on these shifting sands as though they were foundations of imperishable stone; and alas! it is the temple of our common hope which they would build.

Another canon of the newer criticism is, that a law or

¹ Marti, Die Spuren der sogenannten Grundschrift des Hexateuchs in Jahrb. für Protestant. Theologie (1880), p. 152.

ceremonial rite can only then be regarded as really in existence when it can be shown to have been enforced. And on the basis of this canon it goes on to reason that as there is no sufficient evidence that the Pentateuchal laws were executed, — the Deuteronomic before the time of Josiah, or the Levitical before the Exile, — therefore, they did not respectively come into being before these periods. Now, if the premise were to be admitted, so sweeping a conclusion would by no means follow. For though it might be shown that these laws were often but poorly enforced, it can never be shown that there was no effort to enforce them. But the premise is not, and will not be admitted. Nothing, in fact, could be more fallacious. There is no one century of Christian history, indeed, in which it cannot be demonstrated to be conspicuously false.¹ It was Jesus who said: "Did not Moses give you the law, and yet none of you doeth the law?" Make the life of a people the test to determine the nature of the laws of the people, and that for this people whose neck was iron, and forehead brass! It is quite true that even good men, like Samuel, sometimes turned aside from the letter of their code. But is he the only good man who has done it? Had we for the first fourteen centuries of our era no other literature than the New Testament, what would be easier, on such a principle as this, than to establish conclusions the most absurd and misleading! Does the church of the fourteenth century adequately, even decently, represent that book? This great complex and corrupt organism of popes and prelates, it might be said, could never have come from a mould so simple, with a spirit so diverse! Luther was no mere translator; consequently, he must have been originator, author! The New Testament is mainly from his pen. Under cover of a new rendering, as a matter of fact, he wrote the Gospels and many of the Epistles. Nothing else could have furnished the basis for a reformation so radical and far reaching as that of his day.²

¹ Stebbins has well shown the absurdity of this canon in a note on p. 24 of his excellent work, *A Study of the Pentateuch*, 1881.

² So essentially Bredenkampf, *Gesetz u. Propheten* (1881), p. 5.

A third fundamental canon of the latest criticism, really held and acted upon by its leading representatives, and not infrequently confessed, is that a supernatural revelation, prophecy, and miracle are incredible. That is, it dogmatically assumes the impossibility of that which as believers in the Christ we must make an unalterable premise in all our reasoning. Nothing else will explain either the activity of this criticism or the form it everywhere assumes. That, indeed, is the principal ground of objection to a Mosaic Torah. Moses, it is said, on the traditional view, would be a greater miracle than Jesus, who simply came in the fulness of time; for he came wholly out of time and out of place.¹ Hence, there must be such a readjustment of the records as shall put Moses in his place, and show a gradual development of the history and laws. One may not begin with Genesis, and then follow up with the Levitical code, but with the Judges. The real sources of Israelitish history were there. A straight line of development is demanded, contrary to the actual order of historic development, which is not in straight lines. A straight line of development is demanded: it cannot be otherwise, they say, than that Israel first built a house, and not till afterward a church.² But, if the history of Israel teaches anything, it teaches that his house and church were one. There is not the slightest documentary evidence that in conception or practice any such dualism ever existed among them. In fact, we take direct issue with this method of reasoning. We do not find ourselves under any such logical compulsion to reconstruct the Pentateuch. We see no such imperative need for denying supernaturalism in the Bible, but quite the contrary. The logic here used against it in the Old Testament is as futile when applied to the New as feathered arrows against a rampart of stone. And admitting the miracle of Jesus, the miracle of Moses is no anachronism. But as in the Christian religion, so in that from which it sprang, we might expect to find the essential peculiarities of it in its

¹ Bredenkampf, *ibid.*, p. 181 f.

² Wellhausen, *Geschichte*, p. 267.

original sources, might be surprised not to see it exhibiting itself in its greatest purity and power at the outset of its course.¹

But there must be no appeal to the New Testament, — that is another principle hotly insisted on. It is unscientific. “We must either cast aside as worthless,” says Kuenen, “our dearly bought scientific method, or must forever cease to acknowledge the authority of the New Testament in the domain of the exegesis of the Old.”² But the New Testament is at least an equal sharer in the glory or the dishonor of the Book! You cannot lay the hand of violence on any fundamental truth of the elder dispensation, but the shrine of the later shall tremble in every part! And yet the Master and his apostles must not be heard as witnesses! We treat our criminals with more respect. Has the fact that, if the New Testament were allowed to utter itself in the matter, its utterances would be final, nothing to do with such a canon? The Master says that Moses, about whom this conflict chiefly centres, wrote of him. Shall that, and similar things, have no infinitesimal weight in a discussion of the question, what Moses wrote, or whether he wrote at all? The Epistle to the Hebrews accepts the doctrine of sacrifice in its Levitical form as of Mosaic origin — the very point in debate. Is it therefore to be silenced, and forever silenced, for the church of Christ, as it inevitably must be if this theory prevail? However this may be, we should regard any mere critical method too dearly bought at such a price. With an early Christian writer, we would rather choose to say: “To me Jesus Christ is the sum of all records; my inviolable records are his cross and death and resurrection and the faith through him.”³

But, besides this, the principles of this new school of criticism allow them to impute to Old Testament writers motives and practices which totally unfit them to be the medium of spiritual instruction. The Scriptures, it is true,

¹ So Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung d. Theolog. Studiums*, § 83.

² *The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel* (1877), p. 487.

³ *Ignat. ad Philadel.*, viii.

have a human side; but it has been left to these critics to charge upon not a few of its writers conscious trickery and imposition. And that they fully believe their own charge is sufficiently evinced by the treatment they themselves accord to the sacred writers. They seem to think it needful to meet this supposed *finesse* not only with exposure, but with an irreverence, a triviality, a spirit of depreciation, which show that a feeling of contempt has overcome the natural sense of sorrow and shame which such a fact might be expected to produce. Wellhausen has been at special pains to show that whatever in the sacred history has a decidedly religious coloring — “pious” utterances, “unctious speeches, to break the monotony,” is his flier at them¹ — is pure hypocrisy, the work of an artist, and not the real experience of living men who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

I have already alluded to some of the fraudulent practices of which the various scriptural writers, with no exception of age, have been accused. Deuteronomy, a fabrication of the seventh century; a clever stratagem to secure respect for legal enactments from a reluctant people. The Book of Joshua, for the most part, a similar forgery to bolster up the first. The Levitical laws, with their framework of history, reaching from the creation of the world, through the Exodus, to the promised land, essentially a fraud of the time of the Exile. The Books of Chronicles, written of design to sustain this spurious document, and in all their history, which runs parallel to that of the Books of Samuel and the Kings, adroitly keeping up the mystification. The Books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings themselves, where, if anywhere, we might expect genuine history, widely interpolated and retouched in the interests of this same counterfeit of the exilic priests. Is this criticism, or is it caricature? Is it interpreting history, or is it manufacturing history? Our Christian instincts revolt at such a profanation. How much is actually left us that will reward the pains of investigation? Where can we

¹ See *Geschichte*, pp. 340, 347, and p. 309: “Was der israelitischen Geschichte vorzugsweise den Namen der heiligen Geschichte eingetragen hat, beruht zumeist auf nachträglicher Uebermalung des ursprünglichen Bildes.”

set our feet on really solid ground? In a perverse effort to show that the history must have taken a certain course, the history itself has been sacrificed. The theory has been adjusted, but at the expense of the facts. In an effort to reconstruct an ancient temple, according to the rules of modern taste, a beginning has been made by defacing and crushing its precious material, smiting a cruel pathway through arches, and pillars, and statues of renown, until, at last, it is found that there is too little left to build so much as a creditable house, much less a shrine for our sweetest memories and most sacred hopes. Now it is safe to predict from the very start where those adopting such canons of criticism are sure to come out. It is a foregone conclusion. A truly serious and reverent scholarship will neither accept the canons nor enter into serious argument with those who do. For a full hundred years critics have been discussing the text of Homer on the Wolfian basis, and have as yet failed to achieve among themselves an agreement even in leading points.¹ But how poor an arena are the pages of Homer for an active subjectivity to disport itself compared with the Pentateuch! Better far for us to take the morsel that is left after the paring and trimming are over, and try to nourish our spiritual being on it, in our generation, than to enter, with terms like these, on a wrangle at once so wearisome and profitless.

I by no means intend to say that every individual who belongs to this school would take each one of these principles in the full sense here explained. But they are all thoroughly characteristic of the school. Professor Robertson Smith, it is likely, would disclaim being governed by some of them. But Robertson Smith's acknowledged masters would not disclaim them. And sooner or later, under the silken glove of the mild-mannered Scotch professor, you will surely feel the mailed hand of a Paul de Lagarde or a Julius Wellhausen.

I remark, in the second place, that it will be just as impossible for a sober and candid Christian scholarship to accept

¹ Cf. Zöckler in *Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft*, etc. (1882), p. 49.

the style of interpretation needful to defend successfully the theories of this school of criticism. It is necessary for it, placing Deuteronomy in the time of Josiah, and the Levitical legislation a couple of centuries later, to show that no slightest trace of them appears earlier than these respective periods. A single undisputed passage in an earlier book necessarily presupposing their existence, is quite enough to render the argument, which is mainly an argument from silence, null and void. And is it needful to say to any student of the Hebrew Scriptures that, even allowing the widest scope for the convenient, but always to be suspected, theory of interpolations and omissions, it is here confronted with an impossible task? Culling out individual parts, and imputing them to later hands, however extended the process, can never destroy the coloring and spirit of the witnessing records: the records themselves must first be annihilated. I can select, under this head, but a few more prominent examples, some of them already ably urged by others.¹

Look first at the Deuteronomic legislation, making a definite and repeated claim to being Mosaic, and which this school holds for a product of king Josiah's time. It has laws not one, but many, which would be utterly senseless as productions of this later period. The order, for instance, is given to Israel, after their settlement in Canaan to wipe out Amalek, and not to forget it; when in the time of Josiah Amalek had already long since wholly disappeared from history.² They are also commanded to destroy the Canaanites, who had then ceased to be of any importance whatever.³ A law is made against Ammon and Moab, and in favor of Edom, which exactly reverses the real relations of these peoples to Israel in the time of Josiah.⁴ Directions are given for choosing a king,

¹ I would call attention especially to the scholarly and conclusive Article of Prof. W. H. Green, D.D., in the *Presbyterian Review* for Jan. 1882, which is directed against the work of Prof. Robertson Smith above referred to.

² Deut. xxv. 17-19; cf. 1 Sam. xiv. 48; xv. 2 ff.; xxvii. 8; xxx. 1 f.; 1 Chron. iv. 43.

³ Deut. xx. 16-18.

⁴ Deut. xxiii. 3, 4, 7, 8; cf. Jer. xlviii. 47; xlix. 6, 17, 18; Ps. cxxxvii. 7; Joel iii. 19; Obad.; Isa. lxiii. 1-6.

it being assumed that they have none, several hundred years after the anointing of Saul.¹ An organization of the Israelitish army is presupposed wholly out of place in the days of kingly authority.² Mourning customs are forbidden, clearly allowed and practiced in the time of Josiah and later; which, whatever else it may prove, is entirely inconsistent with the theory that Deuteronomy originated in his day.³ To say of these laws that they are a part of the fictitious coloring given by the writer to his work that it might seem Mosaic, is to make of the deception a monstrosity, to no one more embarrassing than to these critics themselves.

And then, consider the connection between the Deuteronomic and the Levitical legislations. It is assumed by the criticism that the former chronologically precedes. It can be shown, on the contrary, by arguments that no candid mind will be likely to resist, that the order of the Bible is the actual, chronological order; that Deuteronomy is what it purports to be, a repetition and modification, under other circumstances, of older laws, at the hands of him who himself had been their medium at first, and who therefore had the right to modify, as well as repeat, them.

It is said, for example, in Deuteronomy of the Levites, that they are to have no inheritance among their brethren, that the Lord is their inheritance, as he *had said unto them*. Where had this been said? It is a direct citation of a part of the Elohistich Torah, falsely dated in the time of the Exile.⁴ Elsewhere, the people are charged in their treatment of the leprosy to observe implicitly, and do all that the Levitical priests should teach them, as he had commanded them. Where was this commanded? To the extent of two whole chapters in the Levitical legislation, and nowhere else.⁵ In

¹ Deut. xvii. 14-20.

² Deut. xx. 9.

³ Deut. xiv. 1, 2; cf. Jer. vii. 29; xvi. 6; xli. 5.

⁴ xviii. 2; cf. Num. xviii. 20, 23, and Delitzsch in *Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft*, etc. (1880), p. 448. Prof. Delitzsch has a series of Articles on the Criticism of the Pentateuch, extending through all the numbers of this *Zeitschrift* for 1880, whose value cannot well be overestimated. The same subject is also taken up by him in *Hefte*, iii and iv of the year 1882.

⁵ Deut. xxiv. 8, 9; cf. Lev. xiii., xiv.

the law relating to animals clean and unclean, there is a direct dependence of the Deuteronomic on the Levitical form, an obvious textual corruption serving to make assurance doubly sure.¹ In a law relating to sacrifice found in Deuteronomy, the Israelites are prohibited from sacrificing anywhere else than at the central sanctuary. But with the prohibition a concession is joined, specifically introduced as a concession, that they may slaughter animals for private use at home. The concession points unequivocally back to the Levitical form of the law, which had prohibited the killing of animals at all, as might have been expected in the wilderness, except at the central sanctuary.² In the Levitical legislation provision had been made for six cities of refuge in Canaan; in Deuteronomy we find Moses selecting three of them on the east of Jordan, and strictly enjoining the establishing of the other three after the conquest of the land.³ In the Levitical code, absurdly imputed to Ezra and his colaborers, circumcision is made the seal of the Abrahamic covenant. But it is a remarkable fact, and on the basis of this theory an unaccountable one, that already in the Book of Deuteronomy circumcision has passed over from the natural use to a figurative sense, the people being called to circumcision of heart.⁴ In Deuteronomy, moreover, there are a number of explicit references to the historical portions of this Levitical document. I say references to that, simply because we are shut up to such a conclusion. They are references to something. They correspond in matter and in minute distinctions of form to it. And there is absolutely nothing else that we know of to which they could refer.⁵

And now, how is such a line of argument met by the critics of this school? Sometimes with evasions; sometimes with

¹ Deut. xiv. 3-20; cf. Lev. xi. 2-19, and Dillmann in his recent Commentary on Exodus and Leviticus (*Kuragefasstes exeget. Handbuch*).

² Deut. xii. 6-16; cf. Lev. xvii. 1-9.

³ Deut. iv. 41; xix. 1-13; cf. Num. xxxv.

⁴ Deut. x. 16; xxx. 6, as in Jer. iv. 4; ix. 26.

⁵ Deut. x. 22; cf. Gen. xlvi. 27; Deut. i. 23; cf. Num. xiii. 3 ff.; Deut. x. 1, 2; cf. Ex. xxxiv. 1.

depreciation, or a denial of pertinency. And when this is impossible, there is a resort to the elastic theory of interpolations. Deuteronomy has been manipulated in the interests of the later documents ; or, there are omissions in the original Jahvist document which, if extant, would be found to have furnished the foundation on which Deuteronomy built. I have marked, in fact, a number of instances where, to avoid the conclusion to them impossible, that Deuteronomy depends on other parts of the Pentateuch, which they assign to the Exile, they have taken refuge in this asylum for imbeciles, an hypothesis of omissions in a document of which they can know literally nothing but what is written in the Bible.¹ Could there, indeed, be an audacity more astounding ? They scout the idea of supernaturalism and miracle in the Scriptures, and yet arrogate to themselves the very attributes of Deity ! Sidney Smith speaks of some one whose forte was astronomy, but whose foible was omniscience. Now, whatever the forte of our critics may be, they certainly have a very decided foible for omniscience. They claim to be able not only to tell us exactly, and by the score, where passages have been inserted in the text, and the hand that did it, but, something inconceivable to any one but God alone, where they have been left out. And this to us is the vital point of the matter : they must be able to know, and to tell us, as much as this, or their theory is worthless for the ends they seek to establish.

And if we move downward from the Deuteronomic period, we shall find it just as hard to make our way along the track of Israelitish history without the postulate of its code, and the elder one on which it clearly rests. The temple of Solomon in its furnishing, its peculiar rites of dedication, its swarming priests and Levites, who without instruction know each his place and duty, is nothing less than a glaring anomaly in history, if this hypothesis be true. And why the scathing denunciations of Jeroboam, the separatist, who with

¹ See last citation of passages, and with Gen. xxxiv. 15, cf. Gen. xvii. 10 (Wellhausen, *Geschichte*, p. 364 f.).

his golden calves at Dan and Bethel sought to breed political discord among the people by pandering to an idolatrous taste? Why is he reprov'd for devising "of his own heart" a festival on the eighth month, except that he did it in contravention and defiance of one already legally, that is Levitically, ordered for the seventh? Why did his memory haunt, like an evil spectre, all the subsequent history of Israel to the very end, so that the writer of the Books of Kings can utter no heavier censure over its wickedest rulers than that they walked in the steps of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who caused Israel to sin? There can be but one answer. There was an acknowledged law against which he was a conspicuous and arrant offender.

And the existence of such a law is not only proved by a certain line of conduct which is everywhere branded as transgression, but by numerous efforts at reform in the express direction of this code. Jehoash was a reformer, and Amaziah, and Azariah, and above all Hezekiah, the very last of whom lived a full hundred years before our critics' date of Deuteronomy. They have a single aim. They face one way, and that, the way of the Mosaic laws. Their fault was never one of direction, but only of lack of force and thoroughness. Again and again are they rebuked for stopping short of the goal; altars were still left to blaze for Baal as well as God.¹ And Josiah himself, claimed as the first great reformer under Deuteronomic inspiration, is simply one in a loyal line that reaches back to Samuel and the heroic judges who preceded him. He had no suspicion that he was undertaking what was new. It was over a broken and disregarded law, which ought to have been supreme in Israel, that he rent his clothes, humbled himself, and wept in sorrow and penitence.

And our critics have, also, the wonder of the Psalter to explain, which certainly had its beginning considerably before the sixth century, and yet echoes and re-echoes in every part the Mosaic law.² One of its psalms recognizes every form

¹ Cf. Watts, *The Newer Criticism* (1882), p. 29 f.

² I am indebted for some suggestions here, and in other parts of this Address,

of sacrifice known to the ritual of Leviticus, save one. In its fivefold division it is directly based on the Pentateuch. Its proem is a psalm describing the blessedness of him whose delight is in the law of the Lord; and elsewhere, as we believe through the lips of David himself, it breaks forth into ecstatic praise of it: "The law of the Lord is perfect converting the soul." "The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart." If a single one of the earlier psalms can be shown to rest upon the Torah rather than on the teachings of the prophets, that of itself is enough to overthrow the main positions of our critics. And a great deal more than this is possible. Take one of them, the eighth, which by almost universal consent is ascribed to David. Note carefully the line of thought along which it moves. It is a night scene. The gaze of the shepherd and poet is fixed on the spangled skies: "When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers; moon and stars which thou hast ordained; What is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man that thou visitest him? For thou didst make him a little lower than God (אֱלֹהִים), and crownedst him with glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands." What amazing language is this? How does David know these things? How does he, in the wildest flights of fancy, dare to say that man has been made but a little lower than God? He had gratefully read it, where we may still read it to-day, in the opening chapter of the Bible, whose thought not only he appropriates, but the precise order of it. And yet these very words of Genesis are an inseparable part of the document assigned by our critics to the period of the Exile, six hundred years after the reign of David.

And aside from the individual psalms, they must tell us how the collection came to reach in Israel that high plane of spiritual feeling and utterance, which has never yet been passed, and that, amidst the densest moral darkness of neighboring peoples. There is but one Psalter for the

to remarks made by Prof. Franz Delitzsch in a Gesellschaft held for English-speaking students in Leipzig during the winter Semester of 1880-81.

whole Bible. And it has proved sufficient. Its buttresses are deep and strong enough to bear up a structure that was twenty centuries building; its invisible arch lofty enough to cover the grandest architectures of prophetic vision and of Christian hope. On any principle of development, let them inform us, if the Mosaic laws and institutions were not behind it, what was behind it, to push it upward, before the period of the Exile, and to some extent before the acme of prophetic influence had been reached, to such a pitch of moral grandeur, to such hitherto unknown ideas of God and man's relations to him? What long stretches of time, what mighty moral forces, what terrible wrestlings of the human spirit must have gone before that story of temptation and blessed escape found in the seventy-third Psalm! What an experience of precious rest in God, whose sweet depth no plummet has since fully sounded, is found in Psalm twenty-third! How striking, and how Christian withal, the solution of the mystery of individual immortality conveyed in the words: "Whom have I in heaven *but Thee!* My flesh and my heart faileth: God is the strength of my heart and my portion forever." First a house, then a church, is the maxim of our critics. But surely here is an altar and holiest worship, souls who pant after God. Here are songs in every key, from the tumultuous depths to serenest heights, and hearts to feel them and voices to sing them. And here is he who dwelleth not in temples made with hands; who inhabiteth the praises of Israel; and dwelleth with him that is of a contrite heart and who trembleth at his word.

And then, further, those who are seeking to make everything clear on the principle of natural development have not only the anomaly of reforming kings without a standard of reform and the furnished temple of the Psalter without priesthood or ritual, to explain, but also the attitude and work of the pre-exilic prophets. They, it is claimed, were the real sources of Israelitish history and religion. But who and what were their sources? Moses was too great, too developed a character to have arisen in the period of the exodus!

But what a soil the period of the Judges for such a growth as that of Samuel! Whence came Elijah the Tishbitoe? and Obadiah and Joel, Amos and Hosea, Isaiah and Micah? Unlike in natural gifts and training, they were yet impelled by one spirit; uttered really but one message. Prophets of two fiercely rival kingdoms, they never waver in their loyalty to one invariable standard and to one King.¹ It was Amos of Judah who, while tending his flocks in Tekoa, heard the call of God, and hurried to confront the haughty king of Israel and his false priests at Bethel. It was Elijah of Israel who won from the people of Judah such love and reverence that, to this day, in certain ceremonies, their descendants still set for him a chair as an invisible guest.²

What gave to these men this unity of spirit, this fiery zeal, this mysterious power over kings and people? What was it that took away all sense of fear in the discharge of duty? Whence that idea of solemn, imperative duty? It was the Mosaic law given amidst the awful sanctions of Mount Sinai, that was at once their bond and inspiration; that ruled them and heartened them. They severally make direct and unmistakable allusions to it, or its essential historic setting.³ All their utterances are based on such a presupposition. They recognize a covenant made with God through Mosaic mediation. That covenant had not been kept. Their whole activity proclaims a perverse trend of thought and conduct against which they relentlessly fight, one and all. Founders of a religion they were not, and could not be, men like these, without a sign of collusion; but mighty reformers they were, who set their faces like a flint against a prevailing degeneracy and lapse of the people whom God had chosen for his own. Caroline Fox, in her *Memories*, tells of a Quaker of literary turn who would not undertake a translation of the *Iliad* lest he should catch the martial spirit of its heroes. But our

¹ The order of the Minor Prophets is particularly to be noted, a prophet of Israel being joined with one of Judah, with obvious intent.

² So Delitzsch, *Old Test. History of Redemption* (1881), p. 110.

³ Amos ii. 10; Hos. xii. 13; Mic. vi. 4; vii. 15.

critics, so far from catching the spirit of the Hebrew prophets, have not even comprehended its distinguishing features. To overlook the higher truth in their burning metaphors and startling paradoxes, and charge them with hostility to the idea of sacrifice, because they denounce an unworthy dependence on altar gifts as an *opus operatum*, and properly brand the sacrifices of the wicked as an abomination,¹ is not only to bring them into conflict with themselves,² but also with the whole current of biblical teaching, from the lesson of those first offerings of Cain and Abel to the words of Him who made love to be more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices (Mark xii. 33).

And further still, these critics, who make the Mosaic law essentially a product of the post-exilic Judaism, have to explain what has been noted as a conspicuous peculiarity of the Hebrew people as of no other people, stamped on their whole history from the beginning, through this very period, too, when if there was no law there could be no transgression: a peculiarly active conscience, and that an evil conscience; "a feeling of guilt; a feeling that a lofty task had been assigned them, which they neither can nor will perform; a feeling of contrariety between knowledge and will, so that sins are heaped on sins."³ What could have so awakened this feeling in them of all the ancient peoples that we know, so that it must be recognized as one of the dominant factors of their history, before the Exile as after the Exile? It was the coming in of the law, to put it as Paul in Romans puts it, that made the transgression abound, that kept the conscience, even though an evil conscience, alert, an unsilenced oracle of power and dread within, and brought ever heavier burdens of guilt upon them, till they should come at last to Him who is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.

Now these are things which we find in the books themselves, an inseparable and undeniable part of the records;

¹ Cf. Prov. xxi. 27.

² Cf. Green, *ibid.*, p. 147 f.; Watts, *ibid.*, p. 83 ff.

³ So De Wette in *Stud. u. Kritiken* (1833), p. 1003.

and they militate decisively against the theory we have been considering. If the theory be true, they ought not to be there, and could not be there. But there they are. No hypothesis of interpolations or omissions can affect the most of them any more than it would the history written in stone, of a Sargon or a Sennacherib. They are wholly beyond the critic's art. It is a spirit that breathes and moves outside the letter; that utters itself, indeed, in words, but yet is something more than words, and will still live on, confuse and mutilate the letter as you will. It is a mysterious coloring reaching to deepest depths, and can no more be blotted out than its radiant blue can be wiped from the summer's sky.

But, finally, it is safe to say that a really sober Christian scholarship will never abandon a position against which so little valid objection can be urged for one involving the extraordinary inconsistencies of that before us. I do not deny that there will be difficulties with any theory which would account for the origin and structure of a work of the character of this, antedating all other native records. But, it is neither reasonable, nor in any true sense scientific, if there be a feasible way of harmonizing the documents as they are, to reject the solemn and oft-repeated testimony which they give of themselves, sustained as it is by an unflinching tradition, Jewish and Christian, to take refuge in an hypothetical scheme such as we have been considering.

I have already pointed out a few of the sacred objects, supposedly established truths, some of them, as it seems to me, fundamental to the Christian faith, as well as whole books of Scripture, that it has been found needful to offer up to this imperious theory. But the list is not yet exhausted. The Book of Joel, until of late, has been held by the almost unanimous consent of scholars to be among the very oldest of the prophets. One of the critics of the Wellhausen school wrote a work as late as 1875¹ in defence of this position.

¹ Smend, *Moses apud Prophetas*, Halis. Cf. also his "Ueber die von den Propheten des achten Jahrhunderts vorausgesetzte Entwickelungstufe der israelit. Religion" in *Stud. u. Kritiken* for 1876. In his *Commentary, Der Prophet Eszechiel* (1880), however, he goes wholly over to the theory of Wellhausen.

But Joel recognizes no other place of worship than Jerusalem; lays great stress on sacrifices, regarding it as something to be bewailed when they are hindered; names the people by the so-called Elohist term, *בְּרַבִּי*, *congregation*. Hence, Joel can be no pre-exilic prophet. He must move down, and still further down, and take his place among the very last and lowest.¹ It is the exigency of the theory, mind you, that makes this requirement, nothing else. It is the dilemma into which they would be brought who say that no traces of this Codex of the Priests are discoverable before the Exile, if this mighty prophet of Judah were allowed to stand in his place and give his testimony. And a similar exigency accounts for the misplacing of another quite as important portion of Scripture—the patriarchal history and its sequel in Exodus and other books. It is supposed to belong, for the most part, as I have said, to this Codex of the Priests made up in the Exile. But there was a time when our critics took another view. They dated only the Levitical code of laws so late. But it was shown them, and they were compelled at the edge of the sword to yield the point, that unless all hitherto acknowledged critical principles were abandoned, the history must go with the code. They were an inseparable part of the same Elohist document.² And so, humbly, but as we may well believe far from thankfully, they took the history. An exigency of another sort was upon them. But, if I am not greatly mistaken, they have plunged themselves thereby into vastly greater difficulties, wholly unforeseen at first. It has obliged them to separate themselves from some of the very ablest of their friends, who still regard this history as among the oldest parts of the Bible. It has forced them to reverse the old-time order of Elohist and Jahvist, and thus to leave at the

¹ Cf. Merx, *Die Prophetie Joel und ihrer Ausleger*, Halle, 1879; Stade, *Das Populo Javan* (academical Programme), Giessen, 1880; and Delitzsch's Article on the other side in the *Lutherische Zeitschrift* (1851), "Zwei sichere Ergebnisse im Betreff der Weissagungsschrift Joels."

² See Riehm's Article in review of Graf, in *Stud. u. Kritiken* (1868), pp. 350-379.

chronological head of the Bible those two infinitely weighty chapters of Genesis which are the record of the Fall and its accompanying promise justly claimed to be of more importance than the whole Pentateuch besides. And, more than all, they have in this very Elohist history itself a document which carries within it the condemnation of their hypothesis. It simply does not agree, on any principles of theirs, with the laws to which they have reluctantly joined it. As actual history of those ancient times, it is intelligible, and can be accounted for; but as an invention of the time of the Exile, to preface and introduce the Levitical legislation, it is preposterous! The contents of these chapters are heterogeneous. Their teachings respecting sacrifice; the technical names they apply to various offerings; the practices they allow or forbid, in other respects, and their whole point of view can be harmonized on no such supposition. The man, or the set of men, capable of originating the legislation of Leviticus and Numbers in the fifth century, B.C., or in any other century, certainly was incapable of so absurd a thing as to invent the history that precedes it as its introduction, or finding it at hand consciously to use it as such.¹

And then, besides, there is the abnormality of reasoning, as these critics do, about this Codex of the Priests. They claim that it is essentially a fiction, written to compass certain ends. It has its nucleus in the tabernacle and its rites, which never really existed, since it is only a reflection of Solomon's temple projected back into the Mosaic age. But, forthwith, they go on to reason about the document as though it were actual history, able to sustain the weightiest historical conclusions. They tell us of the emphasis it lays on the centralization of worship, on the distinction it makes between the priests and Levites, and the like, and insist that this shows an historical development appropriate only to the time

¹ See Article by Delitzsch "Opfer," in Riehm's *Handwörterbuch der Bib. Alterthums*, p. 1114. Our critics are obliged to assume that the Jehovistic (!) as well as the Elohist account of the deluge as found united on the Assyrian monuments was composed at the time of the Exile. Cf. note in *Bredenkauf*, *ibid.*, p. 70; and *Marti*, *ibid.*, p. 146.

of the Exile. But, if the Codex of the Priests be fiction, then it is not a history. And if it invented the story of the tabernacle and made it Mosaic simply for effect, who shall say that it did not invent the distinction between the priests and the Levites, and all the other details, also for effect? Who has a right to pronounce just where fancy ends and fact begins? It would appear that our boasted critical method is again at fault. True it is, that a romance may take the coloring of its time, and teach us history. But when we have only the work itself to depend upon, who may decide where to draw the line? How, especially, can we know in the case of an imaginative writer like the present, who would carry us back into the Mosaic age, how much the castles in the air he builds will be modelled on principles that rule in his own, and how much be the reflection of other times?¹

And still further, we find it just as anomalous and inconsistent to claim, as this theory does, that works like ours should be imputed to Moses at all. Who was Moses? According to the theory, a half-mythical hero living away back beyond the barbarous period of the judges whose mysterious figure is abnormally enlarged by the mists that envelop it. Why, then, this feverish anxiety of a people through a whole millennium to attribute their highest achievements in legislation to him who was at home in a period that knew no law? No one thinks of imputing the Magna Charta of England to Arthur of the Round Table. What gives to Moses a right to so high a position, when we must go by the royal David and the great Samuel to reach him? And why especially fictitiously ascribe to him two great codes of laws so diverse and from this point of view so contradictory, as the Book of Deuteronomy and the Codex of the Priests. For we can understand how Moses himself after the experience of twice a score of years might modify, on entering Canaan, his own statutes. But that a priest of the time of the Exile, or a company of priests, should seek

¹ This argument has been well put by Kittel, in *Theologische Studien aus Württemberg* (1881), pp. 40, 151 f.

to palm off as Mosaic the Levitical legislation on a reluctant people, in the face of Deuteronomy already, a little while before, ostensibly received as Mosaic, would be the height of absurdity: it would be invoking the name and authority of Moses for that which was demonstrably un-Mosaic.

And this course appears still more unreasonable when it is noted that our critics are making ever less of the man of whom the books themselves have made so much. Until of late a modicum of the Pentateuchal laws has been allowed a great antiquity, at least in an oral form, the so-called Book of the Covenant, i.e. four chapters in Exodus including the ten commandments. But now there is a weakening also here, Wellhausen seeing no good reason why the Mosaic origin even of the ten commandments should be maintained.¹ What is the cause? One reason is obvious: the existence of the ten commandments, especially the second of them, cannot be made to harmonize with the supposed earlier attitude of Israel towards idolatry. And do not all these ancient documents mysteriously "hang together," to use an expression of the critics? Place side by side this Book of the Covenant and the Codex of the Priests. Is there any falling off? Are not the ten words fully up in form and spirit to any part of it? But admit a Moses of the ten commandments, and their Sinaitic setting, and where can you stop, where is your theory of development? You have admitted the work of a master, and you must admit the master himself. You have got a monument chiselled in stone that we are still proud to set high above any work of uninspired genius—there must have been an artist, too, greater and nobler than his work.

But I find another inconsistency quite as great, in the fact that this Codex of the Priests is ascribed by our critics to the time of the Exile. Why there especially? Objections to placing it there are numerous enough, and not one reason for it, if you except the simple matter of getting, in this way,

¹ *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vol. xiii. p. 399.

the time required by such a theory of development. Outside of this supposed production, there is not in the entire period the first trace of any Mosaic tradition. You will look in vain in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah for a single suggestion of the possibility of such an enterprise as this. The Torah Ezra introduces is conspicuously the old Mosaic. That part of it now called the Codex of the Priests is never even cited in his writings. It is obviously not that which is mirrored in the peculiar legislation of the Exile; is even directly opposed to it in some important respects. The high-priest of these post-exilic books, for instance, is far from holding the commanding place assigned in the Levitical law. The whole organization of the priesthood has undergone a decided change—new offices with new names, Nethenim, Sopherim, various leaders of music, being introduced of which this Codex of the Priests knows nothing.¹ So that, aside from the serious difficulty of explaining how a work could have been written in the Exile without a sign of the grammatical forms, syntax, and language of that period, but agreeing exactly in its archaisms with the oldest portions of the Pentateuch, we have this still weightier objection, of its essential, material inappropriateness to the age said to have produced it as the culmination of a process then reaching its bloom. The conclusion is scarcely to be resisted that here, again, an awkward theory needed to be accommodated. Our critics have at last simply unloaded at this point, with an apparent sense of relief, a document which they had tried in vain to adjust to every previous age succeeding Moses. But this age, too, equally protests against it; simply will not have it; scornfully repels with a reforming zeal, heightened by seventy years of Exile, a literary imposture thus groundlessly charged upon it.

An important fact seems to have been strangely overlooked thus far in this whole discussion: that the time of the Exile was the period when, as it is universally agreed, the synagogues came into prominence. Long musing by the rivers

¹ I am indebted for some of these facts to Delitzsch's unpublished lectures on Introduction to the Old Testament, delivered in Leipsic in the Spring of 1881.

of Babylon had borne its fruit. Under the common guidance of priest and prophet it was beneath the open sky that prayer had been wont to be made. The false idea that worship was solely a matter of priestly functions and of brilliant shrines had been effectually exploded. Not alone the hard lot of exiles, but the disappointment of the second temple had brought it about, and the spiritual lesson which the seers of Judah and Israel alike had all along been striving to teach was at last acknowledged: that to understand the law and do it, was more than all burnt-offering. And on his return from Babylon, it was Ezra himself who set the example of liberty from ceremonial observances. At the very time when, as our critics think, he was surreptitiously introducing a priestly code of his own from his pulpit of wood before the water-gate, he was acting in positive contravention of its exclusive spirit. Under the very shadow of the temple he was doing that for which these laws would have pointed him to the temple courts. Now the same century could never have produced on any theory of development tendencies so directly antagonistic—the centripetal and the centrifugal. A Codex of the Priests can never have sprung, on naturalistic principles, from an age so bare of priests and priestly power. It demands exclusiveness just when men are pining for greater breadth and freedom. It saddles with a burdensome ritual a people who have learned by recent experience how high the spirit is above the form. It makes centralization imperative, when God's providence is teaching the worth of a larger measure of diffusion and independence. It turns all eyes and calls all worshippers to the degenerate temple at the very crisis when began historically that grand popular movement in the direction of the synagogues which ended in supplanting altogether the dominant influence of the temple and its Sadducean hierarchy.

And this, moreover, suggests the consideration that the post-exilic history of the Jewish people down to this very day is just as much a matter that needs explanation on the basis of the present theory. For such a mighty growth as

this you must have depth of soil, and you must have time. The decade of centuries antedating the Exile are none too numerous. The clear-cut schism of the Samaritans; the singular attitude of the Israelitish nation over against the great world-powers — the Persian, the Greek, the Roman; the tremendous earnestness displaying itself in sects like those of the Pharisees and Sadducees; the heroic, and in the annals of religious wars as yet unequalled, struggle of the Maccabees: they have no sufficient ground in the shallow sacerdotalism of an aspiring priesthood of the Exile. This is no mere zeal for ecclesiastical observances. "We fight," said Judas Maccabeus, "for our lives and for our laws."¹ And elsewhere, respecting the temple services of which they had been deprived, in a sentiment worthy of the Epistle to the Hebrews, "God did not choose the people for the place's sake, but the place for the people's sake."²

And the marvel of the Jewish race through eighteen Christian centuries, without political power, without a home, without a standing among the nations of the earth, forever ground between the upper and nether millstone of civil disabilities and moral obloquy, clearly resting under what one has called the "sacred anger" of their God, and yet ominously preserved, keeping unchanged every national peculiarity, succumbing to nothing, as little to the detestable ostracism and Jew-baiting of our day as to the barbarous cruelties of the Middle Ages: it can be accounted for by no theological riff-raff, no easy-going system of history and laws, which you may turn end for end without essential injury. No agnostic misconception indeed can veil the fact that in this people we have the archetype of a religious principle, rather a redemptive plan in its unfolding reaching backward to the beginning, and in its very indestructibility a striking prophecy of the approaching consummation. You have heard of the demand which the sceptical Frederick II. of Prussia once made upon his chaplain: an unanswerable proof of the divinity of the Scriptures, plain and short, if possible, a single word. And you know how

¹ 1 Mac. iii. 21.

² 2 Mac. vii. 19.

the demand was met, and met as was required, by a single word, and that word, just as full of mysterious meaning to-day as ever before, was — Israel.¹

But a crowning inconsistency which I find in the methods and conclusions of our critics is, that while busy with codes and their proper distribution among the centuries, they have strangely overlooked the lawgiver himself, have completely failed to account for the conception of such a character as that of Moses and the unique portrayal of it in the Pentateuch. Dazzled, as it should seem, by the glare of their own torches, they have never fully gauged the magnitude of the problem which they undertake to solve. When the destructive critics of the New Testament have finished their work, if such a supposition be allowable, and torn piecemeal the four histories of our Lord, parcelling out the fragments to different hands and different times, there still remains untouched, and forever above the reach of critical experts, the peerless Christ to be accounted for; and here, in like manner, is the Moses

¹ Cf. Naville, *The Christ* (1880), p. 204; and for other works and articles bearing on the general subject: — Stähelin, *Krit. Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch*, 1843, *Specielle Einleitung*, etc., 1862; Hupfeld, *Commentatio de primitiva . . . festorum ratione*, etc., 1852, 1858, 1865; Riehm, *Die Gesetzgebung Moses im Lande Moab*, 1854; Graf, *Der Segen Moses*, 1857, *Commentar zu Jeremia*, 1862, *Der Stamm Simeon*, 1866; Popper, *Der Biblische Bericht über die Stifftshüte*, 1862; Merx, "Kritische Untersuchungen über die Opfergesetze, Lev. i-vii." in *Hilgenfeld's Zeitschrift*, 1863, p. 41 ff.; Schrader's ed. of *De Wette's Einleitung*, 1869; Nöldeke, *Untersuch. zur Kritik d. A. Test.*, 1869; Lagarde, *Göttingen Gelehrte Anz.*, 1870, p. 1557 ff.; Symmicta, 1877, p. 116; Klostermann, "Das Lied Mose u. das Deuteronomium" in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1871, p. 249 ff.; 1872, pp. 230 f., 450 f.; Kleinert, *Das Deuteronomium*, etc., 1872; Keil, *Einleit. in die Kanon. u. Apok. Schriften*, 1873; Kaiser, *Ueber das vorexilische Buch der Urgeschichte Israels*, 1874; also Articles in *Jährbb. für Protestant. Theologie*, 1881; Hallenberg, "Die Deuteronom. Bestandtheile des B. Josua" in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1874, p. 462 ff.; Duhm, *Die Theologie des Propheten*, 1875; Baudiss, *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, 1876, and Art. "Höhendienst," in *Herzog's Encyk.* (2^{te} Aufl.); Curtiss, *The Levitical Priests*, 1877; Ryssel, *De Elohistae Pentateuchici sermone*, 1878; Bruston, *Histoire Critique de la littérature prophetique des Hebreux depuis les origines jusqu'à la mort d'Jesaie*, 1881; Giesebrechts, "Der Sprachgebrauch des hexateuchischen Elohisten" in *Zeitschrift für alttest. Wissenschaft*, 1881, Heft 2; Jülicher, "Die Quellen von Ex. vii. 9; xxiv. 11," in *Jahrbücher für Protest. Theologie* 1882, Heft. 1; Prof. Robertson Smith, *The Prophets of Israel*, 1882.

of the Pentateuch coming with radiant face from God's presence. A greater miracle than Jesus, he is called, if he be a product of the early age. But is it easier, then, to believe that a priestly coterie of Josiah's time and Ezra's time made him than that God made him? Is the miracle one whit lessened, if he be regarded as a cheap composite, the patched-up mannikin of half a score of different hands, plying their crafty arts through half a score of centuries? As a gift of God's good providence sent for a special purpose, the character is intelligible. It has been ever so in human history, that great sons of their times have, sooner or later, responded to the clarion call of great opportunities. But, as the puppet of a show, the result of some hocus-pocus of Jehovist and Elohist, Deuteronomist and Redactor, a mere toy-picture, made of blocks, squared and painted by different hands — that strains our credulity too far. It is incredible.

Would any one venture the hypothesis that Raphael's *Madonna di San Sisto* might have been the mutual product of a number of different artists, who employed themselves in different periods upon it, while Raphael himself was but a sort of final redactor of the work? Is it a possible supposition that any half dozen hewers of marble, though each one were gifted with a master's skill, could ever have realised the conception which Michael Angelo attained in his statue of Moses? It is not to be thought of. The marble itself must speak to brand it as false. But here is a unity and a completeness higher than that of art, — the unity of nature, the unity of a noble human life. Perfect it is not, for then it would be other than human; but — from that first sweet picture of the little child nestling in its cradle of papyrus leaves, among the reeds of the Nile, to that last, solemn journey to the top of Nebo, to get one glimpse of the dear land which, because of sin, he might not set his foot upon — unique, and to the final stroke beyond the possible reach of invention.

Greatest of all names in these ancient records, great as deliverer and leader of Israel; great as lawgiver and religious

reformer in a savage age, what form more worthy than his to stand beside the shaggy Elijah as fit exponent of Israelitish history amidst the transfiguring glory of Him who was its chiefest end and ripest bloom ?

Conjured into the history he was not, and could not have been ; and just as little can he be conjured out of it. But in it and of it, then the miracle, if miracle it be, is God's, and cannot be overthrown. And with the overshadowing personality of a Moses, indisputably fixed in the age of Moses, you have not only a sure and steadfast anchor for the documents that bear his name, but also a sufficient pledge of their genuineness and order.

The material universe during these cycles of time since the Exodus has been slowly undergoing change. The "everlasting hills," of which the Psalmist speaks, have taken on other shapes, gradually yielding to the touch of time. But this sublime figure of the ancient books, and those first great truths he uttered so long ago, remain unchanged. Our critics may succeed in obscuring, for some and for a time, the image and its historic setting ; but to efface or greatly alter it were impossible. Like the palimpsest of the gospel, it may be written over and over with other thoughts. But there will also be happy discoverer in the good time to come. The human will fade out at last, and the divine shine through.

And now, my hearers, I have given you a few of the more obvious reasons why the reconstruction of the Pentateuch proposed should not succeed. It has not been altogether a gracious task. I have some sympathy for that gentle soul who could not dispute for her religion, though she could die for it. But dispute, also, sometimes we must. Smend has expressed the thought that our opposition in the present case is largely due to the emphasis we put upon the sacrificial theory.¹ But this is a great fact: the altar of the cross and the book whose one chief aim it seems to be properly to set it forth ! We cannot but be deeply moved by whatever

¹ "Ueber die Genesis des Judenthums" in *Stade's Zeitschrift* (1882), pp. 116-117.

may seriously affect them. Still, not as jewels in a casket do we cherish and defend the Bible and its truths; rather, as mighty moral forces, that work in human lives and systems for infinite betterment. And it is that we too may work, have faith to work amid sore discouragements. We can never dispute in place of work, but only when needful to clear a passage to our work. Our ambition is to be accounted builders — if we must, builders of the Nehemiah type, sword in hand; but still builders only, in the great architectures of the kingdom of our Lord.

ARTICLE II.

THE CONCEPTION ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY PROF. E. BENJ. ANDREWS, BROWN UNIVERSITY.

MATTHEW xvi. 18 is, manywise, an interesting scripture: “And I also say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” But the interest has usually not been fixed upon that limb of the verse which most deserves it. The relation of Peter to the church is, indeed, a fit subject for study; but still more so is Christ’s conception of the church itself. This is the earliest passage containing that conception; and what is still worthier to be noticed, it presents it to us directly from Christ. It will not end, but will more than begin, the task which this paper proposes, if we can ascertain with a measure of exactness what thought confronted Christ’s mind corresponding to the word “church” in this address to Peter.

It is an instant suggestion to proceed at once to study the word *ἐκκλησία*. But it is almost certain that Christ did not speak these words to Peter in Greek. Renan thinks that he always used Aramaic, never uttering a single sentence in another tongue. This is, perhaps, going too far. However, considering, among other things, Christ’s social condition,