

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

ARTICLE V.

PROF. W. ROBERTSON SMITH FROM A CONSERVATIVE
STAND-POINT.¹

BY REV. JOHN PHELPS TAYLOR, NEW LONDON, CT.

WHO is Robertson Smith? A Scotchman, with the national acuteness and fervor; the son of a minister, inheriting high mental and spiritual gifts; a student of Semitic languages and letters in the schools of Göttingen, Berlin, and Bonn, under teachers like Paul de Lagarde, the brilliant successor of Ewald. At the age of six able to read Hebrew, he was made at twenty-four Professor of Old Testament Exegesis in the Free Church College, Aberdeen. His scholarly eminence raised him naturally to the membership of the Biblical Revision Committee, and to the staff of contributors to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. In the last capacity he wrote the famous Article "Bible." Its views were thought dangerously allied to those of Kuenen, Wellhausen, and De Wette, and resulted in a reprimand and a suspension. Meantime a second Article from his pen, on "The Hebrew Language and Literature," appeared. The vein was the same; the punishment was greater. Professor Smith was deposed from his chair. That gave him the opportunity to deliver in Edinburgh and Glasgow the twelve lectures composing "The Old Testament in the Jewish Church," which we are now to review.

We need to note the nature of this book with some precision. It is not an elaborate introduction to the Old Testament. It is not a polemical arraignment of his opponents in the special commission of the General Assembly. Those he had demolished by an extemporaneous address, which for cogency of logic, mastery of subject, and loftiness of appeal, was worthy of the ringing cheers it drew from a

¹ The Old Testament in the Jewish Church. By W. Robertson Smith, M.A.

house two thirds hostile. Not to the prejudices of clerical antagonists, but to the inquiries of laymen friends, is his book addressed. It aims to unfold the alphabet of biblical criticism. That biblical criticism is the legitimate interpretation of historical facts, and not the invention of modern scholars, is his postulate. That it has yielded certain definite results in opposition to the traditional theory of the Old Testament history, is his proposition. All that the scope of the work requires, all that the limitations of a quarterly permit the present writer, is a review confined to certain salient points, and addressed to the average educated reader of the Bible. To survey the volume from this specific and untechnical stand-point is the task on which he now enters.

Our opening word must be one of praise. It is hard to avoid even what may seem extravagant commendation. Few books combine so many excellences. It has research without pedantry, and freshness without sensationalism. Over an abstruse theme the author has flung the mantle of simplicity. His lucidity of phrase and grouping of material show the hand of a master. With the terseness of a soldier he blends the charm of the novelist. On every page one sees the clearness and candor, the courage and cogency, of an absolute loyalty to truth. There is no lecture of the twelve—least of all the opening one—which would not reward the shaft of a clergyman with rich intellectual and moral nuggets. Best of all, the tone of the book is thoroughly and beautifully Christian. Whatever sympathy Professor Smith may have with the methods and learning of unbelieving critics, he has no sympathy with their doubts and denials of the Christ of whom all Scripture is full. He is persuaded that in the Bible God himself speaks words of love and life to the soul. To him its glory is the personal Word. The devout heart goes out toward the Christian controversialist breathing Paul's charity, the Christian man of childlike faith in the things that cannot be moved, the Christian scholar clad in the high independence and sweet humility of a child of the Reformation to hold the reformation view of the Bible as the

history of the work of redemption from the fall of man to the ascension of the risen Saviour and the mission of the Spirit by which the church still lives. There is a spiritual, no less than an intellectual charm in our author's handling of "Criticism and the Theology of the Reformation," of "Christian Interpretation and Jewish Tradition," of "The Scribes, the Septuagint, and the Canon," of "The Psalms, the Prophets, and the Pentateuch with the first Legislation," of "The Law and History of Israel before and after the Exile in their relation to the Code of Deuteronomy and the Levitical Ritual." The first thing to be said about the book is a word of unequivocal and undiluted admiration. For beauty of diction, winningness of statement, affluence and minuteness of learning, and a Christian temper wherein sweet reasonableness and noble blamelessness vie with one another, the volume has few rivals, and no superiors, among modern publications of its kind.

We are ready now to take another step. We admit the validity of Professor Smith's assumption, that "biblical criticism is no invention of modern scholars, but the legitimate interpretation of historical facts." Far be it from us to deny that "a study which is exclusively practical and devotional is necessarily imperfect." Such a method is unfair to the word of God, and narrowing and biasing to the Christian mind. Our method accords rather with Professor Smith, where he says: "The systematic student must first and above all do justice to his text." "The first principle of criticism is that every book bears the stamp of the time and circumstances in which it was produced." "The ordinary laws of evidence and good sense we must apply to the Bible just as we should to any other ancient book." By all means read the volume "as nearly as we can from the stand-point of the author" (see *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan. 1882, p. 138). "To try to suppress the human side of the Bible in the interests of the purity of the divine word is as great a folly as to think that a father's talk with his child can be best reported by leaving out everything which the child said, thought, and

felt." Such views would appear to be axioms in the exegetical realm. They are the weapons of orthodoxy and heterodoxy, of conservative and radical, of supernaturalist and rationalist, of faith and science. In the interest of justice and of truth we are bound to allow, approve, and vindicate them in the method of our author.

So much for Professor Smith's *principle*. What now as to his *application* of it in the latter half of his book? Is his proposition sound that biblical criticism has yielded certain definite results in opposition to the traditional theory of the Old Testament history? To this point we shall restrict our attention in the remainder of the present Article, and from henceforth *reluctantly*, but *decidedly*, part company with our captivating author.

On the threshold of this our main theme, the author's statement of the traditional view of the Old Testament history is objectionable. In chap. viii. he says: "On this theory the ceremonial part of the law must always have been the prominent and most characteristic feature of the old covenant" (p. 209). "Sacrifice, atonement, and forgiveness of sin are absolutely dependent on the hierarchy and its service" (p. 211). "Knowingly and obstinately to depart from any ordinance is to sin against God with a high hand, and for this there is no forgiveness" (p. 212). "The Israelite had no right to draw a distinction between the spirit and the letter of the law" (p. 213). Is this a fair statement of the case? Not if the kernel of the law, the pantings of the Psalmist, the appeals of the prophets are to be our guide as to the traditional view. The God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob never laid down such an iron-bound ritualism. In that which he gave Israel the moral law was the supreme thing. For three months that was all he vouchsafed his people between the Red Sea and Sinai. At Sinai he gave the decalogue primarily and audibly, and wrote it with his finger on the stone tables. Nay, by as much as the jewel is better than the casket, he gave it the place of honor, putting it in the ark of the covenant underlying and uplifting

the whole Levitical worship. The sin of the golden calf was expiated by no hierarchical ceremonial. By Moses' prayer God's wrath was turned away (Ex. xxxii. 30-32). David ate the priestly shew-bread, and was justified (Mark ii. 25, 26). A multitude of people in Hezekiah's reformation ate the Passover otherwise than it was written (2 Chron. xxx. 19). But Hezekiah prayed, and the good Lord pardoned every one whose heart was prepared, though his body was uncleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary. God's grace was larger than the Levitical ritual. Obedience was the soul of sacrifice from the first. Professor Smith's sketch of the traditional ceremonial is an utter misconception.

Even more objectionable are the foundations of his own counter critical theory. What grounds does he offer for the identity of priest and Levite? How does he show the legitimacy of the worship of the high places in the time of the judges and early kings? What proof does he give us that under the first temple the principles of Levitical sanctity were never recognized? Why does he claim that Deuteronomy with its central sanctuary embodied the prophetic teaching of Isaiah, and first appeared in the days of Josiah? Why does he assert that Ezekiel is the outliner of the Levitical legislation? Why does he tell us that Ezra incorporated this torah of Ezekiel as ordinances of Moses, though when first promulgated every one knew they were not so? Why does he ascribe only the first legislation to Moses? Why does he prefer the legal fiction theory of the Pentateuch, with its countless new difficulties, to the traditionary theory that Moses, the man of God, was substantially its author? Our answer to these queries, taken one by one, shapes itself necessarily into an arraignment.

I. Our first objection to Professor Smith in his discussion of these weighty questions is that he *is arbitrary in his choice of authorities.*

He confines the reader's attention to the books earlier than the time of Ezra, and in particular to the histories in the earlier prophets from Judges to 2 Kings (pp. 218, 219).

Very good. Of course we turn to Joshua. But we find we have been too fast. Professor Smith excludes "the Book of Joshua because it, in all its parts, hangs closely together with the Pentateuch." But surely it was an independent book. Never was it bound together with the law as one volume. In contents and in language it stands in its own shoes. It cannot have been composed under Josiah or Manasseh, for according to Josh. xv. 63 the Jebusites are not yet driven from Jerusalem. But this occurred at the opening of David's reign (2 Sam. v. 5-9). Indeed, the book must have been written before David, for, according to Josh. xi. 8, Sidon (Zidon) is the chief city of Phoenicia. In David's day Tyre has succeeded it as capital (2 Sam. v. 11). Moreover, the book is a valuable authority. Its design is to show the faithfulness of the covenant God to his promises. Its graphic pictures of characters like Caleb and Phinehas show an eye-witness. Its lists, geographical and ecclesiastical, imply documentary sources. There is no good reason for disbelieving that the bulk of the book was the work of Joshua himself, as we know from Josh. xxiv. 26 a part of it was.¹ To reject the testimony of the Book of Joshua in matters of which it is the closest witness, no doubt disposes easily of Levitical cities in Josh. xxi., and of the one altar in Josh. xxii.; but it does so only by stamping the historic investigation with the brand of caprice. It is violating our author's own canon, "to begin with the records that stand nearest the events recorded, and are written under the living impress of the life of the time described" (p. 218).

Chronicles is a second book which Professor Smith politely, but peremptorily turns out of court. It was written long after Ezra's reformation, he tells us (p. 218). "The chronicler had no complete knowledge of the greatly different praxis of Israel before the exile." "The lively features of old Hebrew life reflected in the earlier prophets were obsolete, and only to be revived by archaeological research." "Israel was

¹ "If Josh. vi. 25 means anything it means that the book was written during the life-time of Rahab."

no longer a nation, but a church." "Only a Koran theory of inspiration can make the chronicler a primary authority." He uses the ritual of his age to give copiousness of detail. The chronicler is not a "historian, so much as a Levitical preacher on the old history." "He actually quotes among his sources a Midrash," i.e. a sermonizing exposition, common among the scribes. The passage 2 Chron. v. 4, "The Levites took up the ark," compared with 1 Kings viii. 3, "The priests took up the ark," is a correction according to the Levitical law. (Really the connection shows that Levites means such Levites as were also priests). On pp. 421, 422, Professor Smith gives six other discrepancies between Chronicles and Kings, and refers to De Wette's Beiträge, (Bd i. Halle, 1806), and Wellhausen's Geschichte, p. 177, in strong protest against the practice of modifying the unambiguous statements of the Kings. "When his statements [i.e. the chronicler's] seem to present the history in a somewhat different light from those of the earlier books, we must no more take him as our guide than we take St. Paul as our guide to the Old Testament chronology."¹

Than all this nothing could well be more subjective. The Books of Chronicles are not of the time of Alexander the Great. That error flows from the genealogy (1 Chron. iii. 19-24) of Zerubbabel, and is founded on the undemonstrable assumption that the names in verse 21 b. sq. are the names of direct descendants of Zerubbabel. But its form and matter are against this supposition. They favor rather that of a parallel genealogy of returned exiles, or another fragment of some genealogy added afterward. The completeness of the chronicler's knowledge for the purpose of this book appears in the multitude of historical statements for which we seek in vain in the parallel passages in Kings. The general exactness he manifests where he can be compared with Kings, he displays also in accounts peculiar to himself. Such, for instance, is the narrative of Asa's victory over the Ethiopians under Zerah (2 Chron. xiv. 9). This is shown

¹ For answers see Keil's Introduction to the Old Testament.

to be real history by its harmony with the historical relations of Egypt and the precision of its geographical and political details.¹ The temple worship is the central thought of the chronicler. On our author's own principles a good critic should enter into sympathy with it. No doubt occasional errors in dates and numbers occur, owing to the mistakes of transcribers. But the chronicler is no more open to the mass of Professor Smith's charges than to those of distortion, carelessness, miracle-mania, Levitism, and hatred of Israel, advanced by DeWette and refuted by Keil.²

Professor Smith wants the lively features of the old Hebrew life reflected in the earlier prophets. Then why shut his eyes to the words (הַבְּרִיָּה) of Samuel the seer (הַמְּאֵדָה), of Nathan the prophet (נָתָן), and of Gad the seer (גָּד), which in 1 Chron. xxix. 29 the chronicler quotes as among his sources for the history of David? Will he maintain that under these titles are meant merely the first, second, and third parts of our canonical Books of Samuel, or sections of an encyclopaedic work, like the "history of the times of the kings of Judah and Israel"? Both the *usus loquendi* and natural probability are against him. As a historian, not as a preacher, does the chronicler incorporate old documents in his pages.³

¹ Brugsch, *Histoire de l'Égypte*, i. p. 298.

² Apologet. Versuch über die Bücher der Chronik. Berlin, 1833.

³ He cites for the career of Solomon the words of Nathan the Prophet, the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite, the visions of the Seer Jehdi or Iddo against Jeroboam the Son of Nebat (2 Chron. ix. 29). What could be more valid? For the history of the Kingdom of Judah he refers to the following works, not to be confounded with our Canonical book of Kings, as we see from 1 Chron. ix. 1, and 2 Chron. xx. 34.

(1) A book of the Kings of Judah and Israel, 2 Chron. xvi. 11.

(2) A book of Kings of Judah and Israel, 2 Chron. xxv. 26; xxxviii. 26; xxxii. 32.

(3) A book of the Kings of Israel and Judah, 2 Chron. xxvii. 7; xxxv. 27; xxxvi. 8.

(4) A book of the Kings of Israel, 2 Chron. xx. 34.

(5) Words of the Kings of Israel, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 18 (E.V. Book).

(6) Midrash of the Book of the Kings, 2 Chron. xxiv. 27 (E.V. Story).

Of these the first five titles seem different designations of one and the same work; for "Israel" in (4) is the whole Covenant people, and "words" in (5) is evidently an abridgment of "book." Now this work cannot be other than

Herodotus and Thucydides cannot boast so good credentials. Prophetic monographs and the great Israelitish blue book ought to content the most fastidious critic. Paul makes no claim to be our guide to Old Testament chronology. The chronicler does claim to be our guide to the Old Testament worship, and gives chapter and verse of his authorities. Can it be that Professor Smith feels, with De Wette, that, Chronicles removed, the Pentateuchal question takes a different shape, and many "troublesome and well-nigh invincible proofs of the Pentateuchal antiquity vanish away"? It would almost appear so, when we recall its discrimination of priest and Levite (1 Chron. xv. ; xxiii. ; xxiv., etc.), and its Levitical dedication of Solomon's temple (2 Chron. v.-vii.). These must be "troublesome" to him. And 2 Chron. xxvi. 16-21 showing King Uzziah smitten with leprosy for invading the priest's office, 2 Chron. xxix.-xxxi. recording the sin-offering (2 Chron. xxix. 21, לִשְׁמֹרֶת)¹ in Hezekiah's reformation, one hundred and fifty years before Ezekiel, and 2 Chron. xxxiv., that quoted in Kings as "the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah and Israel." Only in Kings the annals are separate; in Chronicles they have been combined. It might therefore be termed also as in (6) a *Midrash* of the Book of the Kings. For this "*Midrash*" was identical with the "Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel." Otherwise 2 Chron. xxiv. 27 drawn from this *Midrash* would not agree with 2 Kings xi. and xii. as thoroughly as the history of those rulers harmonizes in both books where Chronicles cites the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel, and Kings cites "the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah and Israel." This, perhaps, will remove our alarm when we find one more *Midrash* — the *Midrash* of the Prophet Iddo as his authority for the history of Abijah. Certainly it should excite the interest of this enthusiast for ancient records! See Keil's Introduction, Vol. ii. pp. 68-72. Add now to the foregoing

A Biography of King Uzziah by Isaiah the Prophet. 2 Chron. xxvi. 22.

For Rehoboam. The Words of Shemaiah the Prophet, }
The Words of Iddo the Seer, } 2 Chron. xii. 15.

For Jehoshaphat. The Words of Jehu the Son of Hanani (or 1 Kings xvi. 7, the Prophet). 2 Chron. xx. 34.

For Hezekiah. A collection of oracles (E.V. vision) of Isaiah the Prophet. 2 Chron. xxxii. 32.

For Manasseh. The Words of Hozai (E.V. "sayings of the Seers.") 2 Chron. xxxiii. 19.

And we have original sources too deep and pure to be dried up by the breath of assertion. Doubtless Samuel and Kings were added. See Curtiss's Levitical Priests, Appendix I.

¹ See Girdlestone's Old Testament Synonyms, p.

xxxv. expressly stating that Josiah's great passover was celebrated according to the written law of Moses (2 Chron. xxxv. 6, 12; *בְּכָתוּבֵי מֹשֶׁה* and *בְּכָתוּבֵי מֹשֶׁה וְאַתָּה*), may perhaps strike him as "well-nigh invincible proofs" that his own theory is wrong. However this may be, his setting aside of two vital and authentic sources of the Old Testament history is an arbitrary, suspicious, and discrediting step, which deserves to be kept in mind by all his readers.

II. Our next criticism is on *Professor Smith's illogical reasoning about Old Testament facts.*

He makes reckless conjectures, such as that Ex. xx. 26 implies that any Israelite may approach the altar (p. 435), and that local sanctuaries are the centre of Hebrew life (pp. 235, 424). He gives extraordinary definitions, such as God's word being synonymous with "the divinely sanctioned means for checking the rebellion of the Israelites" (p. 306). He makes audacious statements, such as "Priests of the temple and righteous kings like David were as ignorant of the Levitical theory of sanctity as the mass of the vulgar and the unrighteous kings" (p. 254). He resorts to sophistical dilemmas, such as "Either the ritual law was written down by the priests immediately after Moses gave it to them, or at least in the first years of residence in Canaan, and then completely forgotten by them, or else it was not written till long after, when the priests who forgot the law were chastised by exile, and a new race arose, who accepted the rebuke of the prophets" (p. 330). He abounds in unwarranted premises, such as "Jeremiah denies in express terms that a law of sacrifice forms any part of the divine commands to Israel" (pp. 372, 117, 268, 288, 370). He revels in perilous categories,¹ such as the argument from silence as proving the day of atonement not to have been in vogue in Ezekiel's day—a proof equally good that neither evening sacrifice nor high-priest existed at the same time (p. 376). He ventures on suicidal arguments,² such as citing 2 Kings

¹ See Prof. Green, in *Presbyterian Review* for Jan. 1882, p. 155.

² See *Watts's Newer Criticism*, pp. 34–39.

xxiii. to prove the Deuteronomic Torah in Josiah's day (pp. 246, 425), and skipping 2 Kings xvii. with its enumeration of the same sins, as a proof of Deuteronomy being known to the ten tribes in Hoshea's day, one hundred years before. He shows himself a special pleader, as "It must be remembered that even the speeches commencing and closing the code are not an exact transcript of Moses' words as taken down by a short-hand reporter" (p. 382). He is fond of rash and sweeping generalizations, as "Prophecy develops and enforces its own doctrine of the intercourse of Jehovah with Israel and the conditions of his grace, without assigning the slightest value to priests and sacrifices" (p. 286); and again: "Nowhere does the condemnation of the popular religion rest on the original consecration of the tabernacle, the brazen altar, and the Aaronic priesthood as the exclusive channels of veritable intercourse between Jehovah and Israel" (p. 267). Above all he hugs to his bosom the fallacy that non-observance of a law proves its non-existence—a fallacy by which thievish Levites' (Judg. xvii. 2; xviii. 20), corrupt priests' (2 Kings xvi. 11-16), idolatrous kings' (2 Kings xvi. 3; 1 Kings xi. 4-8), and backslidden peoples' practice (Israel under Jehu and Judah in the time of Micah) is made the mirror of the divine rule it so fearfully transgresses, from Judges to Ezekiel. Such argumentation would prove no law against blasphemy in New England because Robert Ingersoll speaks and publishes sacrilegious ribaldry without molestation.

Indeed, the learned author's slow but sure way of slipping out a logical and slipping in an illogical principle into his reasoning saps the life-blood of most of his conclusions. It allies him with the chaotic theories of Ewald, De Wette, and Knobel. He clothes himself in the shifting and pervious armor of Graf and Wellhausen. Not only are Riehm and Dillmann and Delitzsch committed against one aspect of his view; he has defied in another the verdict of Hupfeld against "a monstrous error that turned everything topsyturvy, and perverted and entangled the questions at issue, but

did not solve them.”¹ In biblical criticism he is guilty of the same non-sequitur as Professor Huxley in natural theology when he heralds the force of Paley’s argument from the watch to be null, “if only the watch was the result of the modification of another poorer watch.” Such arguments against traditionalism are arguments for it. Our second criticism upon our author is, the ludicrously illogical character of the reasoning by which he seeks to defend his startling views.

III. But our book demands here a third condemnation, from friend and foe. It deals inaccurately with the *recorded facts of the pre-exilian history*.

“As a rule the worship of Baal took a secondary place, and did not exclude the worship of Jehovah as the great God of Israel” (p. 222). But Judges ii. 11, 13; viii. 33; and x. 6, show repeated and prolonged turnings of the nation to Baal, in utter forgetfulness and forsaking of Jehovah their Deliverer. To cite the prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries to the fact of their contemporaries’ sin not being the denial of Jehovah’s paramount claim to national service is irrelevant to the sin of their ancestors in the thirteenth and twelfth centuries. “From the stand-point of the Pentateuchal ritual Israel’s repentance was itself illegal in form” (p. 255). But Judges ii. 1-6, which describes the people’s weeping and sacrificing unto the Lord, describes also the coming of the angel of the Lord, the captain of the Lord’s host, who extraordinarily upbraids them for their treachery in sparing heathen altars, and no less extraordinarily hallows a legal altar to himself. “The common law of the theocracy underlying Ex. xx. 24 and xxix. 43, exemplified in Gen. xii. 7; xxvi. 25; and xlv. 1, is exemplified in the sacrifices of Gideon and Manoah, where the fire of God (Judg. vi. 21; xiii. 20) consumed the flesh, and the angel of God ascended in the flame. A theophany creates an altar and ordains a priest so long as it lasts. “If these cases be exceptional, all true religion at the time was exceptional; for all God’s acts

¹ Cited by Prof. Green in *Presbyterian Review*, Jan. 1882.

of grace mentioned in the Book of Judges are connected with the same local worship" (p. 256). But Judg. xx. 18, 23, 26-28 shows us the whole nation, which in vs. 1 assembles judicially before God in Mizpeh (Nebi-Samwil?), assembling ecclesiastically in Bethel (House of God, in E. V.) before the ark of the covenant, and seeking the counsel of Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron the high-priest. The very cause of the war is an indignity offered to the Levitical order. The threefold worship begins with a bold challenge, continues with humble, tender, and affectionate inquiry, ends with united solemn public fasting till even, and offering atoning and thanksgiving offerings (עֲוֹנוֹתָם וְזִבְחֵיהֶם, Judges xx. 26) before Jehovah. Then it is that "Jehovah smote Benjamin before Israel." One sanctuary at Shiloh, one Aaronic priesthood, are the characteristic of the age.

Professor Smith's representation of worship in Samuel's day bears examination no better. "Under the Levitical ordinance the claim of Eli's sons (1 Sam. ii. 12 seq.) was perfectly regular — the worshipper handed over the priest's portion of the flesh along with the fat, and part of the altar ceremony was to wave it before the Lord" (p. 258). But when we read (vs. 14), "All that the flesh-hook brought up the priest took for himself," we read the precise contradiction of the Levitical ritual in Lev. vii. 30 seq., which restricts the priests to the wave-breast and the heave-shoulder. That even must not be taken till the fat has been burned (Lev. iii. 3-5). From what was boiled by the offerer after the priest's two portions have been withdrawn, nothing whatever was due the priest by law — still less, by force. "Access to the tabernacle at Shiloh was not guarded on rules of Levitical sanctity" (p. 258). "Samuel as a servant of the sanctuary actually slept in the temple of Jehovah where the ark of God was." But 1 Sam. iii. 3 refers to the lamp of God named in Lev. xxiv. 8 (see also Ex. xxvii. 20, where the word נֵר first occurs in the Old Testament), as without the veil of the testimony, and to Samuel as sleeping not in the holy of holies,

nor yet in the holy place, but in the palace (תַּיִדֶיךָ)¹ of God, i.e. the tabernacle-court with its Levitical cells. An apology for our English translators would seem less in order here than for our Scotch translator! "To make the thing more surprising, Samuel was not of priestly family, but here it is taken for granted that he becomes a priest at once." What all Israel from Dan even to Beersheeba knew was, that Samuel was approved to be a prophet (נְבִיאִים) of Jehovah (1 Sam. iii. 20). As to his being a priest, the ephod of ii. 18 is a linen ephod like that which David wore (2 Sam. vi. 14); and the "ministering unto the Lord" before Eli the priest is said of the Levites in 2 Chron. xxix. 11 (see also vs. 4, 5, 12; 2 Chron. xxiii. 6; cf. Num. iii. 6; Deut. xviii. 6, 7; xxi. 5; xvii. 12; Ezek. xl. 46; xlv. 15, 16). That Samuel was a Levite the chronicler tells us (1 Chron. vi. 22-28). The witness of an authority so careful to distinguish priests and Levites should be conclusive with Professor Smith. If not, let him find it corroborated in the Ephrathite (cf. 1 Sam. i. 1; Judg. xix. 1; Josh. xxi. 21). Had Samuel's genealogy been manufactured, why was it not priestly?²

What shall we say of the picture Professor Smith gives us next of the worship Samuel abets? Is it spontaneous and natural? Is every feast a sacrifice? Does every Israelite — yes, every layman — feel entitled to offer offerings to Jehovah without mediation? Are the long list of so-called patriarchal and Canaanitish shrines the scenes of so many harvest-homes and vintage-gifts to Jehovah, expressing gratitude alone? Does the sense of God's favor, not of sin, rule at the sanctuary? Is Samuel endorsing a local, in contradistinction to a national, worship by his sacrifices at Bethel, Gilgal, and Mizpah? Is it ignorance of the systematic and

¹ This is the word afterwards used by Isaiah vi. 1, by Jeremiah vii. 4 of the Temple; also by Ezekiel in iv. 1 sq.

² See Curtiss's Levitical priests, pp. 15-18, 94, 104. If it is insisted on pressing the Hebrew לְשֵׁרֵיךָ, confining this phrase to the priests, then the phrases מְשֵׁרֵי־יְהוָה (1 Sam. ii. 11) and מְשֵׁרֵי אֱלֹהֵי יְרֵחוֹ (1 Sam. ii. 18) and מְשֵׁרֵי אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה (1 Sam. iii. 1) applied to Samuel absolutely exclude him from the priesthood.

exclusive ritual of the ark and of the priesthood that keeps Samuel from reuniting the two when but a forenoon's walk apart? So our author (pp. 260-266, 343) would have us believe in the interest of a worship of simple gladness and free homage to the God of Israel.¹

This is biblical romance. The times of the Judges (xvii. ; xx.), in their cruelty and superstition, basking in innocence! The times of Samuel, with their judgment that made the ears of every hearer tingle (1 Sam. iii. 11), walking in the light of Jehovah's favor! The period between Shiloh's desertion (Jer. vii. 12; xxvi. 6) and Zion's election (2 Sam. xxiv. 18; Ps. lxxviii. 60-68) by the Holy One of Israel, which the rabbins termed a captivity, transfigured into an Eden! The awful terror and long lamentation of the nation because of the ark (1 Sam. vi. 20; vii. 2) blotted out of mind! The humiliation of idolatrous hearts and the confession of penitent lips, "We have sinned against Jehovah" (1 Sam. vii. 6), poetized into thin air! Not so easily can we disguise Samuel's great work as a restorer. The alienated spirit of Israel must be transformed into an inner shrine of Deity ere the outward shrine could be a means of grace. Of this work Samuel, not the ark, is the ordained mediator. He does it in connection with the burnt-offering (קָרְבָּן, 1 Sam. vii. 9) whose substitutive laying on of hands and expiatory blood-sprinkling are the symbol of atonement. Not even the king may officiate, instead of the prophet at sacrifice. Saul's act at Gilgal is a disobedience that costs him the kingdom, instead of a right shared by the meanest of his subjects (1 Sam. xiii. 8-14; x. 8). At the high place of 1 Sam. ix. God draws near in the person of his prophet and representative to bless the sacrifice which till Samuel come the people can neither offer nor eat. There is not one undoubted allusion to acceptable sacrifice in Samuel's life unless Samuel himself is the extraordinary offerer (1 Sam. vii. 9, 17; ix. 12, 13; x. 8; xi. 14, 15; xvi.

¹ The high places were tolerated by kings after the first temple was built. Expediency or timidity may have prompted their conduct. That the worship was not legal and righteous appears from the inspired comment of the writer of Kings. "But the high places were not removed" (1 Kings xv. 14.)

2, 5). In him the spot itinerates ere it can become stationary. Practically and prophetically Samuel is the altar where heaven and earth meet. For him to have restored the ark and priesthood would have been to have shared the fate of the Beth-shemites, and to have belied the obedience in the tabernacle (1 Sam. iii. 10; vi. 19). The so-called "local sanctuaries" were either heathen shrines, abandonment of which was the people's bounden duty, or temporary meeting-places of the God of mercy with a people who had severed the covenant, and now had no other possible access to God. Professor Smith's view is totally at variance with 1 Sam. ii. 27, 28; 2 Sam. vii. 6). As well accept Renan's portrait of Christ for a Gospel portrait as our author's picture of the pre-exilian worship for a prophetic picture. It is fancy run mad.

IV. After this our readers will not be surprised at a fourth criticism. We must tax our distinguished author reluctantly, but roundly, with *bad exegesis of classical passages*.

Take, to begin with, Ex. xx. 24-26. This Professor Smith terms the "principle of many altars" (p. 352). Its form assumes the right of laymen to offer sacrifice (pp. 358, 435). It presupposes a plurality of sanctuaries (p. 338). If Professor Smith be right, the passage is in strange discord with the context. For the people have just cried out for a mediator (vs. 19), and are standing afar off while Moses draws nigh the thick darkness where God is (vs. 21). The statute is now revealed as the fundamental ceremonial law of the theocracy. In place and time it is thus linked with the fundamental moral law. To say it is for laymen, and not priests, is to overlook the composition of the priestly nation. To contrast the altar of earth or stone it names with the brazen altar of Ex. xxvii. 1-8 is to ignore the simple fact that the latter contained the former, and was its permanent framework. To pretend a discrepancy between this passage and Deut. xii. 6, 11, 13, 14 (Lev. xvii. 8, 9; Josh. xxii. 28, 29) is to make nothing of the similarity of phrase, "in every place where I record my name" and "the place which the

Lord your God shall choose to put his name there”¹ (Deut. xii. 5, 11; xiv. 23; xvi. 2, 6; xxvi. 2), and to overlook the obvious order by which the general precedes the specific legislation. As the creation is woven into the basal moral, so the fall is woven into this basal ritual code (vs. 26). The statute authorizes the erection of the altar at Sinai, in the wilderness wanderings, at Shiloh, at Zion, and wherever Jehovah should bring his name to remembrance, i.e. manifest his supernatural glory. It is the law not of many altars, but of one, shifting indeed, in situation at first with the shifting worshippers, but stationary at last on Mount Zion, the hearth of God. Why it should be dreamed that Ex. xxii. 30, providing that the firstling should be presented on the eighth day is inconsistent with the one sanctuary, we must leave critics to explain who assure us one moment that the first legislation is real, and the next moment empty the tabernacle out of the centre of the camp where it would be exactly at hand to receive the offerings the first legislation has named.

Look next at our author's interpretation of passages to prove that priests and Levites are one. “Levite is regularly used as a priestly title.” The only exception is the Levitical legislation, Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah. Deuteronomy knows no Levites who cannot be priests, and no priests who are not Levites” (pp. 360, 436).²

¹ The first (Ex. xx. 24) being אֱלֹהֵי שְׁמֵי, in the first person; the second (Deut. xii. 5) being אֱלֹהֵי שְׁמֵי, in the third person. The first being אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, the second אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה.

² Priests and Levites nowhere in the Old Testament are synonyms. Num. xviii. 6 which makes the Levites a gift to the priests is supposed to contradict Deut. x. 8, which says the Lord separated the whole tribe of Levi for priestly functions. Really the statements are no more at variance than the statement that a shield is red or black, according to the different side on which it is seen. Levi was the priestly tribe. Their consecration was general, Ex. xxxii. 25-29. Num. i. shows their substitution for the first-born. Mal. ii. 4 emphasizes the covenant. But that did not forbid Aaron and his sons being set apart for priestly duty. While Aaron lived it was most natural to speak of the priests as his sons. After his death, on the eve of conquest, Moses might well emphasize the *tribe* to which the priests belonged. Viewed as subordinate helpers the humbler Levites were truly given to the priests for service. Viewed

What can we think of this position held by Wellhausen, Kuenen, Graf, in company with our author, when we turn to 2 Kings xxiii. 4? Do we not there read of a threefold distinction between high-priest, priests of the second order, i.e. common priests, and keepers of the door, i.e. Levites?

Do we not know that the *שְׁמֵרֵי הַמַּשְׁקֵה*, also mentioned in 2 Kings xxii. 4, — “the keepers of the threshold,” — are the Levites, whose duties, according to 1 Chron. xxiii. 5, were those of (*שְׂרָרִים*) porters? And does not the parallel passage, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 9, expressly name the Levites *שְׁמֵרֵי הַדָּלֵת*, as making unmistakable who are the keepers of the door? Does Professor Smith make it plain that the only mention of Levites in the Books of the Kings is that which, according to his own admission, discriminates between the two classes, and therefore he holds to be an interpolation? Is there anything in the two sole references to Levites in the Books of Samuel (1 Sam. vi. 15; 2 Sam. xv. 24) which at all forbids the inclusion of those not priests? Is not the statement (1 Sam. xxii. 17) “The servants of the king would not put forth their hand to fall upon the priests of the Lord” suggestive of a reverence not extended to a simple Levite? Is not the natural and reasonable interpretation of Deut. xviii. 1 the same as the traditional, severing priests and Levites under the whole tribe? Is it not plain that the word “Levite” has a wider and a narrower use throughout the book? Can it be denied that the wandering, landless dependant is always termed “Levite,” never termed “priest,” or “Levitical priest”? Above all, does not Deut. xxvii. 9, 12, 14 show us beyond a peradventure the priests the Levites—i.e. the Levitical priests—pronouncing blessings and cursings, and the tribe of Levi—i.e. all but the Levitical priests—i.e. simple Levites

as members of the tribe of which Aaron the Levite was one, they might well be called the priestly tribe. But Deut. x. 8 by no means specifies the Urim and Thummim, and the offering incense which belonged to priests only. So, too, the wearing of ephod and the ministrations of the altar, the teaching and judging, etc. See Oehler's *Old Test. Theol.*, Vol. i. pp. 295 sq.; also Hengstenberg's *Die Authentie des Pentateuchs*, Vol. ii. p. 401 sq., and Curtiss's *Levitical Priests*, chaps. iii. and iv.

—standing with five other tribes on Mount Gerizim? By what right does Professor Smith tell us (p. 245) that 2 Kings xxiii. 8, 9 means that the priests of the local high places were “recognized as brethren of the temple priests, and admitted to a share in the altar-dues, though not to full altar-privileges?” The Hebrew and the English alike state that these Levitical offenders (Ezek. xliv. 10) came not up to the altar of Jehovah in Jerusalem, but rather ate unleavened bread at home in their family (among their brethren). How can he say that Deut. xviii. 6, 7 provides that any provincial Levite who chooses to come up to the capital shall be admitted not to the privilege of a servant in the sanctuary, but to the full priesthood. This by the express terms used (pp. 360, 361)? Really the terms used provide that a Levite shall minister as his brethren the Levites—neither more nor less. What shadow of justification has he for saying (p. 436) that Ezekiel knows nothing of Levites who were not priests in days past, when Ezek. xlv. 4 calls the priests the ministers of the sanctuary (מְשִׁבְּתֵי הַמִּזְבֵּחַ), and xlv. 5 the Levites the ministers of the house (מְשִׁבְּתֵי הַבַּיִת), as precisely as if he had lived about the tabernacle in the days of Aaron.¹

How does our author expound the passage of passages relating to ritual, i.e. 1 Kings viii.? Mainly by skipping it. Partly by branding Solomon's later erection of heathen shrines. Partly by a slur on Zadok the high-priest as the creature of royal fiat, and by Solomon's own officiation at the altar three times a year. Partly by a sweeping assertion

¹ “But Ezekiel knows nothing of Levites who were not priests in time past; he knows only Zadokite levites, the priests of the temple, and other Levites once priests, but to be degraded under the new temple, because they had ministered at the idolatrous shrines of the local high places” (p. 436). Not so says the Hebrew carefully examined. “Once priests,” is Prof. Smith's language, not Ezekiel's. Levitical priests seem referred to, however, in verses 10 and 15 alike, compared with vs. 13. If the latter be sons of Zadok, the former are sons of Ithamar. Num. iii. 4; 1 Chron. xxiv. 1-5; 1 Sam. ii. 36; xiv. 3; xxii. 9, 20; 1 Kings ii. 26, 27; 1 Chron. xxiv. 3, 6; 2 Sam. xv. 24, 35; xix. 11; 2 Kings xxiii. 8, 9, are passages which more than neutralize Prof. Smith's assertion that the guild of Ithamar appears only after the exile as a subordinate family of priests who were never degraded as the prophet prescribes.—See also, 1 Chron. vi. 8, 63; xxvii. 17. See Oehler's Old Test. Theol., Vol. i. p]

that the temple of Solomon never stood contrasted with the popular high places as the seat of the Levitical system. Partly by declaring (1 Kings viii. 62) that, contrary to Levitical law, the altar of dedication is at once assumed to be fit for use, according to Ex. xx. 24. Such trifling is beneath a historic interpreter. How is it that Professor Smith fails to see the Levitical code standing out in its great features? Is not the seventh month under its old name Ethanim, not Tishri, the Levitical month for such a consecration? Do not the priests take up the ark, and bring it into the most holy place, precisely as the Levitical code (Num. iii. 31; iv. 5) would lead us to expect? Are not the ends of the staves seen from the holy place, according to the Levitical precept of Ex. xxv. 15? Is not the word קָרָן—according to Professor Smith himself characteristic of the Levitical law (p. 318)—used in vs. 5 to mark the congregation of Israel? Are not priests distinguished from Levites in vs. 4, as clearly as from the elders in vs. 3, and that by a text not to be superseded by the LXX, or to be aught but corroborated by the chronicler? Does not the wonderful prayer of Solomon, from first to last eloquent of the one sanctuary, begin with an allusion to the Levitical law (Lev. v. 21–24), as well as continue in the glow of Lev. xxvi.? Does not vs. 64 imply the hallowing of the brazen altar as it states the hallowing of the middle of the court before Jehovah? Do not the burnt-offerings, the meat-offerings, and the fat of the peace-offerings point to the chief forms of stated representative offerings and atoning sacrifices as things with which king, people, and priests are alike familiar? Do not the seven days of the feast of dedication, preceding the seven days of the feast of tabernacles, fix and suppose the great day of atonement, itself described in Lev. xxiii., and falling on the tenth day of the seventh month? Assuredly, answers a patient, candid, and reverent exegesis, such as Professor Smith has conspicuously failed to give us.¹

¹ See Watts's *Newer Criticism*, pp. 21–25. The following are a few of the many other misinterpretations defacing the book. Ezra ix. 11, (p. 299), where Professor Smith makes Ezra speak of the law forbidding Canaanite intermar-

V. Still a fifth blemish which forces itself upon our attention is the author's *misrepresentation of the prophets*.

He appears unjustifiably to make them independent of their own order, of the priests, and of any written law of Moses. Amos says: "I am no prophet, nor the member of a prophetic guild, but a herdsman and a plucker of sycamore

riage as an ordinance of the prophets, as if this excluded instead of included Moses, the prophet of the Pentateuch (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, p. 152, Jan. 1882). 2 Sam. viii. 18 (p. 264), says David's sons were קֹהֲנִים . This Hebrew word means priests, and can mean nothing else according to Professor Smith. Really it means "standers by to help," according to Arabic and context, and is well rendered "counsellors." 2 Kings xii. 16 (p. 251), is supposed to show that sin-money and trespass-money were given to the priests in Jehoiada's day. The exact translation is "the money of the trespass offering, and the money of the sin-offerings was not brought into the house of the Lord — they were the priests'." 1 Sam. ii. 18, 19 (p. 259), is incorrectly made to teach that Samuel the child wears the *high-priestly* mantle. But בְּיָצִיף no more means that in Samuel's case than the word does in Jonathan's case of the robe he stripped himself of and gave to David (1 Sam. xviii. 4). 1 Sam. xiii. 12 (p. 224) is adduced, as though in Saul's mouth, to make supplication to Jehovah were a synonym for doing sacrifice. In reality the passage keeps the two things distinct, — the latter covering the former, the former by no means co-extensive with the latter. Judges xi. 11, 29; Gen. xxxi. 45, 54 (p. 255), are adroitly made to signify Jephthah's sacrifice at the ancient sanctuary of Jacob. In fact, the Hebrew phrase "before Jehovah" contains no hint of a sanctuary, still less of a sacrifice, but merely of a devout sense of the nearness of God." 2 Sam. xv. 18; xx. 23 (p. 249), makes the Kerethim and Pelethim of David's guard Cretans and Philistines on the strength of one doubtful etymology, and 2 Kings xi. 4 adds another link of the same alloy in the introduction of Carians. Deut. xvi. 7 (p. 371) presumes, according to Prof. Smith, that the paschal victim is to be boiled not roasted. According to the Hebrew בִּשְׁל by itself this would be true. But the Hebrew in connection with Ex. xii. 8, and 2 Chron. xxxv. 13 cannot mean "boil," and must be understood "cook," which, indeed, is its primary force according to Gesenius. How it should be "cooked," 2 Chron. xxxv. 13 tells, "roasted with fire according to the ordinance" $\text{שֶׁבִישׁוֹ בְּאֵשׁ כְּצִוְיָתוֹ}$. So Prof. Smith (p. 354), misapprehends the word and the purpose of the stone in Josh. xxiv. 26 to disparage Deuteronomy; p. 263 makes Jer. vii. 21, 22 contradict the *usus loquendi*, and his own teaching in later chapters, as if he denied positive sacrificial legislation; p. 297 maintains the hypothetical instead of the declarative sense of Hosea viii. 12 in the teeth of Smend; pp. 249, 250, 425 interprets Ezek. xliv. 6-15 against his own phrases and allusions as though he recognized no pre-exilic priestly Torah, and did not simply repeat Josiah's penalty on idolatrous priests. For further specimens of Prof. Smith's crude, rash, and captious exegesis, see Prof. W. H. Green, in *Presbyterian Review* for Jan. 1882, in a masterly paper to which we owe much.

fruit," which seems to convey to Professor Smith the idea that the sons of the prophets were a guild of enchanters (pp. 279, 280). But it cannot be that Amos here is repudiating the sons of the prophets. From the days of Samuel they had been God's intimates and organs. Through them the religion of Moses, with his predictions and types of the Messiah, had been kept alive. They had caught from Samuel the torch of pious zeal in the pastures of Ramah, where they learned reading and writing and music over the sacred records surviving the tabernacle. They had diffused justice and mercy amid social and political chaos. By hundreds they had suffered martyrdom for the truth in the days of Jezebel's persecution (1 Kings xviii. 4). Under Elijah and Elisha they were God's gracious compensation to the northern kingdom for the loss of the temple service and the withdrawal of the temple priesthood (1 Kings xvii. to 2 Kings xiii. inclusive). The humblest was a protest against idolatry and a champion of the one spiritual Jehovah. The grandest stood out as bulwarks of pure morals, of theocratic simplicity, of politics disdaining foreign alliance, of Messianic hope embracing the world. As in Israel, probably in Judah, their schools did a vast silent work for the Scriptures, — preserving, pondering, copying, transmitting. The church of Christ is their debtor for spiritual praise and thanksgiving, which has flowed from them through the lips of the sweet singer of Israel (1 Sam. xix. 18).¹

Not these sons of the prophets, but false prophets rather, does Amos scorn. He wants no fellowship with men devoid of moral enthusiasm and eaten up with covetousness. Not for him a prophecy whose only earnestness is to seduce preacher and people from Mosaic righteousness. These men of flattering promise and lax principle he feels have no insight into the present or the future. They are utterly without divine illumination or divine authority. Their prophecy is

¹ See *Prophecy a Preparation for Christ* (Bampton Lectures, 1869), R. Payne Smith, D. D. ; *Knobel, Der Prophetismus des Hebräer.* 1837 ; *Ewald, Die Propheten des Alten Bundes* ; *Condes on the Minor Prophets*, 1871 ; *Oehler, Theology of the Old Testament*, Vol. ii. p. 137 sq. ; *Keil, Commentary on the Books of Samuel.*

mere human invention. In them dwells the spirit of error. The stamp of their spuriousness is written on unfulfilled predictions and backslidings from Jehovah. Nay, theirs is the coarsest immorality of heart and life, deceiving, plundering, and committing adultery. They are a wider class than the diviners with their foreign superstitions and permanent popularity. But, acceptable as they might be, and remunerated at the king's chapel of idolatrous Bethel, they are men signally odious in Amos' anointed eyes. He has heard, amid his herds and under his mulberry trees, the word of Jehovah the God of Hosts. By this exaltation of a true prophet he will stand,—enthusiasm, imagination, eloquence, sympathy, conscience, courage, all true to his heavenly trust,—though a hundred Ahaziah's urge him to flight.

Nor are the prophets one whit more antagonistic to the true priests. "Spiritual prophecy assigns not the slightest value to the priests, and moves in a different plane from the Levitical ordinances. Under the Levitical system Jehovah's grace is conveyed to Israel through the priest; according to the prophets, it comes through the prophetic word. The theology of the prophets before Ezekiel has no place for the system of priestly sacrifice and ritual" (pp. 285, 286, 288). These and similar sentences of Professor Smith not only beg the question respecting Moses' priestly legislation as prophet of the nation he founded. They leave out of sight Samuel's prophetic use of the Levites in his schools and the altars in his sacrifices to turn the hearts of the people back to Jehovah. They fail to account for the fact that on Levites like Jahaziel in the days of Jehoshaphat, and priests like Jeremiah in the days of Josiah, came the spirit of Jehovah as prophets of peculiar power. They deny the word behind priest, as well as prophet, as the positive source of all divine grace. They strain the line of the prophets, as Caiaphas the line of false witnesses against Christ, in predetermined condemnation of the priestly order and Levitical ritual.

The truth of this arraignment comes out the moment we

cross-examine Professor Smith's witnesses to the contrary. Isa. i. 11 sq., "I delight not in the blood of bullocks," etc., no more represents God as indifferent to true sacrifice than i. 15, "When ye make many prayers I will not hear," shows God indifferent to true prayer. Nay, Isa. xix. 21, in that fearful burden where Egypt's idols are moved and Egypt's heart melts, makes ritual the symbol of Egypt's restoration. What means "The Lord shall be known unto Egypt, and the Egyptians shall know the Lord in that day, and shall do sacrifice and oblation (זָבַח וּמִנְחָה)," save that in the great Isaiah's day the altar was a positive means of God's grace? Amos v. 21, 22, "I hate, I despise your feast-days. . . . Though ye offer me burnt-offerings (זֹבְחֵיכֶם), and meat-offerings I will not accept them," is no divine repudiation of the Mosaic forms of worship. It is repudiation of the monstrous injustice toward man which vitiated them. Nor does v. 25 exclude this view by reminding the people that they offered no sacrifice nor offerings to him in the wilderness during the forty years of wandering in the wilderness. On the contrary, the passage taxes, by implication even the wilderness sacrifices with the leaven of idolatry, and threatens for the repetition of the old sin excluding from the entrance of the holy land a new judgment excluding from its possession.¹ Micah's declaration that Jehovah does not require sacrifice; he asks nothing of this people but "to do justly, and love mercy, and walk humbly with thy God" (Micah vi. 8), is but the moral and spiritual element pervading all acceptable religion. The very phraseology alleged to condemn the Mosaic ritual is found on examination to echo Mosaic words (Deut. x. 12. Notice particularly the אֵלֶי אָבָה which is identical Micah and Deuteronomy). "I spake not to your fathers nor commanded them concerning burnt-offerings and sacrifices, but this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice" (Jer. vii. 22 and 23) does not mean that ritual was

¹ Calvin says, "In this place the prophet proves more clearly that he is not merely reproving hypocrisy among the Israelites, or the fact that they only obtruded their external pomps upon the notice of God, without any true piety of heart, but he also condemns their departure from the precepts of the law."

of no divine institution in the wilderness. It does mean that it followed in time and worth the moral legislation (Ex. xv. 25, 26; xix. 1; xx. 2, 24), and this it says rhetorically, not logically. And when we summon Joel (878-858 B.C. according to Kuenen) behold he alludes to priests, the Lord's ministers, so solemnly and affectionately, he seems almost to be a priest himself. Hosea's long plaint over Israel's unfaithfulness to her divine Husband yet clearly magnifies the priesthood (iv. 4), and stigmatizes sin against the one altar (viii. 11). It is impossible for the prophets themselves to give a flatter contradiction to the critical theory of their antagonism to the priests. Against spurious, hypocritical, covetous, merciless, lying priests their words are heavy; against true priests they utter no syllable which does not imply the favor of the Holy One of Israel.

What now must we think of our author's statement that the prophets of the eighth century never speak of a written law of Moses (p. 297)? Certainly his own account of written prophecy, "The prophets write what their contemporaries refuse to hear," would account for a written law — for a written Leviticus, as well as a written Jeremiah. So too his definition of Torah, "any decision or instruction on matters of law or conduct given by a sacred authority," does not forbid it. Nor does the thirst for God's word slaking itself at an oral prophetic Torah at all conflict with a past written prophetic Torah. Does the phrase "Thou hast forgotten the torah of thy God" (Hosea iv. 6) undoubtedly teach us that this Mosaic priestly Torah was merely oral and traditional? Is it absolutely sure, according to the prophets, that worship by sacrifice is no part of the divine Mosaic Torah to Israel, but a part of natural religion they share with other nations? Our author appeals to Hosea. Let us see how far Hosea upholds these startling assertions.

The three first chapters of Hosea turn on the idea of Israel's spiritual adultery towards God with the Baalim, using the very term (זָנָה) which Ex. xxxiv. 15; Lev. xx. 5; and Num. xiv. 33 had made classical in the Pentateuch. There too

occur unmistakable allusions to Gen. xxii. 17, "as the sand of the sea" (Hos. i. 10); to Deut. vii. 13 and xi. 14, "corn and wine and oil" (Hos. ii. 8); to Ex. i. 10, "come up out of the land" (חַרְשֵׁי אֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם, Hos. i. 11); to Lev. xxiii., the three festivals, the Sabbath, the new moon, and appointed seasons, i.e. solemn feasts (מוֹעֲדֵי, Hos. ii. 11). In Hos. iv. 4, "For thy people are as they that strive with the priest," the reference is plain to Deut. xvii. 8-12, where capital punishment is made the penalty of presumptuous disregard of the priest's judicial authority. In Hos. iv. 8, "they eat up the sin of my people," there is an equally clear allusion (see Lev. iv. 22-v. 13; vi. 26, 30; x. 18; xvi. 27), with their sharp discriminations between the burnt-offering and sin-offering of the laity, when blood sprinkled the brazen altar, and that of the high-priest and the whole congregation on the day of atonement, that sprinkled the mercy-seat between the cherubim. In Hos. iv. 13, "They sacrifice on the tops of the mountains, and burn incense upon the hills under oaks and poplars and elms," Hosea cites textually the prohibition of Deut. xii. 2, save that he expands "under every green tree," from the generic to the specific. So Hos. v. 6, "They shall go with their flocks and herds to seek the Lord," points to Ex. x. 9, quoting part of Moses' exact recorded words to Pharaoh. Hos. vi. 9 reproduces the word מַרְאֵי, which in the Pentateuch is limited to the Levitical law (Lev. xviii. 17; xix. 29; xx. 14) in designation of unnatural sin: "As robber gangs waylay men, so bands of priests commit murder on the way to Shechem; yea, they have committed infamy."¹

Such testimonies to a written Pentateuch would be striking in a prophet of Judah. How much more in what Ewald calls "the Ephraimitish prophetic book the truest and tenderest divine voice, which not merely resounds over the northern kingdom, but is a spirit brought forth from the womb of that same kingdom to rescue it from itself in its dying throes." From Mizpeh to Tabor he sees nought but

¹ For fuller particulars see Hengstenberg's *die Authentie des Pentateuches*, Vol. i.

blood. Judah is the star of hope. Then it is imperilled and corrupted by Israel's guilty example. The whole state is convulsed by the death of Jeroboam II. and the outbreaking strife at the removal of the military hand. Perjury, lawlessness, and boundless immorality are all around the prophet. The priests are chief in corruption. The Assyrian is the popular reliance. Hosea is full of tragic pain and burning indignation. With it he has a sympathy which ends his pregnant phrases and bold images with a sob. Yet on the horizon of the nation's gathering doom there rises for him the assurance of a healer and a victory. The everlasting love of Jehovah, electing, wounded, chastening in sorrow, restoring in salvation, is the great message of the Spirit which moves his high imagination and pours from his glowing lips.

Of the highest significance is Hosea's witness to the Mosaic history in the Pentateuch. In Hos. xii. 8, 4, "He took his brother by the heel in the womb," does he not quote Gen. xxv. 26? In Hos. ix. 10, "I found Israel like grapes in the desert; but they came to Baal-peor," etc., hear we no refrain of Num. xxv. 3; and Deut. xxxii. 10? When in viii. 5, 6 he says, "Thy calf, O Samaria, hath cast thee off; the calf of Samaria shall be broken in pieces," do not the very words (אֶרְבֵּבָה), *ashes* or *fragments*, breathe of Ex. xxxii. 20-24 and Deut. ix. 21? To no primitive simplicity of the first, but to the stately ceremonial of the Levitical, legislation is he ever pointing back. How tersely (Hos. viii. 11) he recalls the Deuteronomic law of the one sanctuary! How sadly (Hos. viii. 13) he bemoans the lost joy of the Deuteronomic sacrificial feasts (Deut. xii. 13)! How scathingly (ix. 4) he portrays the abominableness of Israel's worship in terms borrowed from the Levitical code concerning the defilement from the dead (Num. xix. 11; cf. Deut. xxvi. 14). How winningly (Hos. xii. 9) does he make Lev. xxiii., Ex. xxiii., and Deut. xvi. all speak again in the promise, "And I that am the Lord thy God from the land of Egypt will yet make thee to dwell in tabernacles as in the days of the solemn feast." Is his direct testimony impressive (Hos. viii. 12) to

a written law of Moses, "I wrote to him the ten thousand precepts of my law"? Not less impressive is his indirect testimony, as he ends his scroll (Hos. xiv. 9) with a reminiscence of Moses' song (Deut. xxxii. 29), "Who is wise, and he shall understand these things? prudent, and he shall know them?"¹

VI. Yet another and a sixth defect which stamps the work is *its dislocation of the Mosaic legislation*.

According to Professor Smith (p. 316 sq.), Ex. xxi.-xxiii. is the first legislation, simple and primitive. The Deuteronomic code (Deut. xii.-xxvi.) is more civilized and ecclesiastical, but still national. Quite distinct from both these codes is the Levitical legislation. This centres around the sanctuary, and alone treats of the threefold sanctity of priest, Levites, and people. It is scattered throughout Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, and might be removed from the Pentateuch without making the rest of it unintelligible. Israel has become a church. These three bodies of law are in a certain sense independent of the historical narrative of the Pentateuch in which they occur. Each is complete and self-consistent. They may well have existed as separate and successive law-books ere they were taken up into the history. To suppose that the first was immediately superseded by the second or third, before the people had a chance to put it in operation in Canaan, is an hypothesis dishonoring to the divine legislator, and refuted by the whole tenor of the code.

In repudiation of the foregoing plausible statements, we remark: (1) The people had a chance to put the first legislation in operation during the thirty-eight years of wandering, when the old generation was passing away, and the new generation rising up under the training of the covenant God of judgment and mercy. (2) Whatever in this first legislation was suited to the agricultural life and theocratic mission of the Israelites, entered upon the possession of the land of Canaan, is incorporated and supplemented in the Deuteronomic code given in the land of Moab, just before Moses'

¹ The notation in Hosea is given from the E. V. throughout.

death. (3) All the Mosaic regulations imply for their foundation an existing constitution, with customs equivalent to laws, and with institutions open to growth. (4) The Deuteronomic code, so far from being independent of the history, is interwoven with a hortatory and expository address by the leading figure in the history, which makes the statutes throb with life and love. (5) The first legislation flows directly out of, and is explained by, the great historic scene of the giving of the law on Mount Sinai (Ex. xix.), as it is succeeded by the solemn sprinkling of the altar and the people with the blood of the covenant (Ex. xxiv.). (6) The Levitical legislation, even to Professor Smith, appears not less, but more dependent on the history — “a great part of the ordinances of law or ritual taking the form of narrative,” i.e. in the impressive consecration of Aaron and his sons by Moses at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. (7) The three codes, instead of being separately complete and self-consistent, are interlocked and interwoven — number one leading to number two, and number two presupposing number three.¹ (8) The apparent discrepancies between the Deuteronomic and the Levitical legislation are due to the popular character of the former and the hierarchical character of the latter book.

Nor is our author's attitude in conflict with the foregoing general considerations alone. His view of the Levitical legislation as completed by the hand of Ezra is contradicted by the implications of Deuteronomy respecting the Levitical titles. It has been already shown that Deuteronomy (see xviii. 6) does not provide for any Levite that he may minister in the metropolis with priestly functions and for priestly dues (p. 861). Yet it is well again to emphasize that the terms used do not expressly signify the ministry of the full priesthood, but of the ordinary Levite. “As all his brethren the Levites do.” 2 Chron. xxix. 4, 5, 11, 12, explains Deut. x. 8. Standing before Jehovah is sometimes used of priests and Levites without discrimination. The aim of the passage

¹ Deuteronomy supporting Leviticus.

is not to teach the privilege of ministering, but the certainty of common compensation to the minister. According to the rabbins, this was the priest; according to Keil, priest and Levite equally, but each in his own work and with his own pay. Nor is it true that Deut. xviii. 1 proves that the Levites dispersed through the provinces have no property in land. Rather in connection with Deut. xviii. 8: "They shall have like portions to eat, besides that which cometh of the sale of his patrimony," it presumes property. Here the very word "sale," (מִכְרָא), points back to Lev. xxv., where it occurs seven times (i.e. verses 14, 25, 27, 28, 29, 33, 50). Verse 33 speaks of the house of the Levite being sold, as verse 32 speaks of their being redeemed at any time. Verse 34 tells of the fields of the suburbs of the Levitical cities, which might not be sold, but might be rented. Deut. xviii. 1, "shall have no part nor inheritance with Israel," means then merely "no such compact tribal territory" as did the eleven other tribes. The Levite could sell his house and rent his land while serving in the sanctuary and enjoying the tithes, sacrificial portions, and free-will-offerings not set apart solely for the priests. Deut. xviii. 1, "They shall eat of the offerings of the Lord made by fire," refers to the priests. It makes use of a word become familiar by forty-two repetitions in the Levitical legislation, and sends us back therefore to Leviticus to learn what these were (See. Lev. vii. 32 and 34). The wave-breast (חֵזֶק or חֵזֶק חֵזֶק), also the skin of the burnt-offering (Lev. vii. 8), and heave-shoulder (שֵׁק חֵזֶק חֵזֶק) of the peace-offerings, herd or flock, all the sin-offering save the fat, the trespass-offering except the fat, be it female lamb or kid or young pigeons, most of the food-offerings with fine flour, unleavened pastry, green corn, oil, and frankincense are there enumerated. "And his inheritance" refers to priests and Levites. It is an inheritance specifically promised: The Lord is their inheritance, as he said unto them. Where? In Num. xviii. 20, 21, 24. Deut. xviii. "fails to mention a Levitical tithe, and therefore proves its non-existence," says Professor Smith. Better say, Deut. xviii., in

its cursory allusion to Levitical support, uses language that presupposes the very Levitical legislation we find in Num. xviii.

Nor does the fact that the tithe described fully in Deuteronomy is not a Levitical tithe at all militate against what has been said. It ought to be just what it is in this popular book, a popular tithe. The Deuteronomic tithes are more limited in value and more universal in possession than the Levitical (Lev. xxvii. and Num. xviii.). They belong to the Israelites as Israelites, to be eaten in the great and glad sacrificial feasts (Deut. xii. 17; xiv. 22) by rejoicing households. The Jewish explanation of it has always been as of a second tithe. "If the Levite within thy gates" is specially commended to the Israelitish hospitality, it by no means implies this is his sole provision, any more than a donation party proves a minister to have no salary. In times when piety was low, the Levitical tithe would first feel the declension from Jehovah. For it was always a thing of conscience, never of coercion. At such times this second tithe, with its selfish good-nature, might save him from starvation. And once every three years, with the widow, the fatherless, the stranger, on the year of tithing, he could come and eat and be satisfied (Deut. xiv. 22; xxvi. 12-14). No doubt Deut. xxvi. 12-14 offers a difficulty; but it cannot fairly be said to be greater than the town tax, school tax and internal-revenue tax would offer to a Greenlander who started with the outrageous blunder that each law belonged to an independent, not to a co-ordinate code.¹

No more reasonable is the attempt to array the Levitical legislation against the Deuteronomic, on the score of increased provision for the priesthood (p. 440). It is not true that in Deuteronomy the priest receives but part of the firstlings at the annual feast (Deut. xii. 18), whereas in Numbers he receives the whole (Num. xviii. 18).² In both he receives the whole

¹ On the foregoing and following sections, see the acute and admirable work of Prof. S. I. Curtiss, *The Levitical Priests*. (T. and T. Clark).

² The word "as" is not so pregnant and precise as this exegesis would make it.

(except blood and fat) which is to be applied to a sacrificial meal, and which is intended to be shared by the offerers. The command in Deuteronomy is simply given to Israel as a people, including priesthood and laity (Num. xviii. 11; Lev. vii. 15, 16; Ex. xiii. 15). The passage in Numbers (xviii. 17) forbidding to redeem a firstling fit for sacrifice is not contradicted by the passage in Deuteronomy (xiv. 25) permitting to turn it into money, because Deut. xv. 19 expressly sanctifies such firstlings of herd and flock unto the Lord God. Nor is it correct that the Deuteronomic code gives the priest the poorer parts, while the Levitical legislation gives him the better parts of the sacrifice (Lev. vii. 31, 32). The reference of Deut. xviii. 8 "shoulder and two cheeks and the maw" (תֵּיבֵי וְתֵבֵי וְתֵבֵי), is to a new regulation, appropriating to the priests so much of the animals slain by their owners for food. This connection and tradition demonstrate. It does not affect the older and operating law of wave-breast and heave-leg which 1 Sam. ix. 24 shows to have been practised before the days of the kings. Equally hopeless is the pitting of Deuteronomy against Numbers in Levitical revenues. Deut. xviii. does not give the Levites as a tribe the slightest claim on the altar gifts and first-fruits of the priests. It cannot therefore contradict the Levitical cities of Num. xxxv., any more than the Levitical tithes of Num. xviii. To say that the list of such cities in Josh. xxi. is part of the Levitical law, embraces some that were not conquered till Solomon, and had an unlevitical population in the day of the Judges, is but to reveal how sorely our author is pressed, and how near he is to the charge of interpolation, which is doubtless his real opinion.

Such dislocation of the Mosaic legislation is not simply in the face of minute scholarship; it is abhorrent to the great general lines of relationship between the three so-called bodies of law. The wayfaring man need not err as to the unity of a legislation which is authenticated by such inward bonds and bolts. Read the list of correspondences between Deuteronomy

and the first and Levitical legislation which Rev. T. R. Birks¹ gives with many others.²

¹ Rev. T. R. Birks, *The Pentateuch and its Anatomists* (London.)

² I. Ex. **xxi-xxiii.**

1. The law of abiding service, **xxi. 5, 6**; Deut. **xv. 16-18.**
2. The provision for maid-servant or captive, **xxi. 7-11**; Deut. **xxi. 10-14.**
3. The law of retribution, **xxi. 23-25**; Deut. **xix. 16-21.**
4. The law of restoration of the pledge from poor, **xxii. 25-27**; Deut. **xxiv. 10-13, 17.**
5. False witness and unrighteous judgment, **xxiii. 1-3, 6, 7**; Deut. **xix. 16-19**; **xxv. 1.**
6. Prohibition of bribery, **xxiii. 8**; Deut. **xvi. 19.**
7. Expulsion of the seven nations, **xxiii. 23, 24**; Deut. **vii. 1-6, 16** (not in so-called code).
8. Promises of health and fertility, **xxiii. 25, 26**; Deut. **vii. 14, 15**; **xxviii. 11-27, 60, 61.**
9. Expulsion of Horites by hornets, **xxiii. 29, 30**; Deut. **vii. 20-23.**
10. Ensnaring from Canaanite idolatry, **xxiii. 33**; Deut. **vii. 16-25**; **xx. 18.**
11. Ascent of Moses to receive the tables, **Ex. xxiv. 12-18**; Deut. **ix. 9.**

Every one of these is a witness to a code repeating and completing a prior code, and clamping the two together with hooks of steel. The same thing is still more striking in the following list, where the structure of the tabernacle, set up thirty-nine years before, is alluded to so unconsciously and convincingly,—the Deuteronomic code based upon and echoing back the priestly code with a power the newer criticism cannot break.

II. LEVITICAL LEGISLATION.

A. *Laws of Tabernacle and Priesthood, Ex. xxv. 1-xxxi. 18.*

1. Ark of shittim wood, **xxv. 10-15**; Deut. **x. 1, 2, 3, 5, 8**; **xxxl. 9, 25.**
2. Testimony or tables within ark, **xxv. 16, 21**; **xxxi. 18**; Deut. **x. 3-5.**
3. Altar of sacrifice, **xxvii. 1-8**; Deut. **xii. 27**; **xvi. 21**; **xxvi. 4.**
4. Priesthood of Aaron and Eleazar, **xxviii. 1-4**; Deut. **x. 6**; **xvii. 12**; **xviii. 3.**
5. Urim and Thummim of high-priest, **xxviii. 29, 30**; Deut. **xxxiii. 8.**
6. Consecration and fulfilment, **Ex. xxix. 1-35**; **Lev. viii., ix.**
7. Promise to speak to Moses at tabernacle, **xxix. 42, 43**; Deut. **xxxii. 14, 15.**
8. Incense and incense altar, **xxx. 9, 34-36**; Deut. **xxxiii. 10.**
9. Sabbath in connection with Israel's redemption, **xxxi. 13-17**; Deut. **v. 15.**
10. Writing of law on first tables, **xxxi. 18**; Deut. **iv. 13**; **v. 22**; **ix. 10, 11.**

And yet again how vitally and unanswerably does the Deuteronomic code flow out of, and evolve itself from the Levitical legislation in the succeeding table, making Deuteronomy's priority to Leviticus a ridiculous *hysteron proteron*.

B. *Laws of Sacrifice.* — 1. *Laws of burnt-offerings, Lev. i, vi. 8-18*; Deut. **xii. 6, 13, 14, 27**; **xv. 21**; **xxxiii. 10.**

2. *Meat and peace-offerings, Lev. ii, iii.*; Deut. **xii. 6, 11, 17, 27**; **xvii. 7**; **xviii. 3, 4.**
3. *Provision for priests, Lev. vi. 16-18, 26*; **vii. 6. 28-36**; Deut. **xviii. 3-5.**
4. *Death of Nadab and Abihu, Ex. xxiv. 1, 9*; **Lev. x. 1, 2**; implied Deut. **x. 6.**
5. *Distinction of clean and unclean beasts, Lev. x*

“The so-called middle books of the Pentateuch link themselves with the last words of Moses on the plains of Moab in almost a hundred distinct particulars.” To tear such repeated, incidental, consentient evidences of the one Mosaic legislation out of the Pentateuch is like tearing out the evidences of the supernatural from the Gospels of our Lord. It is massacre, not war. Our sixth objection to the book under review is, its dislocation of the Mosaic legislation it professes to explain.

VII. Still a seventh criticism of our historical critic is *the insufficiency of his arguments against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.*

“Moses is spoken of in the third person” (p. 320). But that no more shows Moses not to have been the author than a similar use of their own names by Caesar in his Commentaries and Xenophon in his Anabasis and Memorabilia belies their notorious authorship of these works. That, too, was the usage in the prophetic books of the Old Testament, i.e. Isaiah (vii. 3) and Jeremiah (xxxvi. 4); the opposite, as in Ezra and Nehemiah, was the exception. To call such a diction artificial, and demand proof that it is as old as Moses, is a mere rhetorical phrase. It ignores Moses’ special motive, too, in that he has to write of the earlier bearers of the covenant, as well as of himself, and consistency impels him to the uniform employment of the same person in speaking of Abraham and Jacob and himself. “Could Moses write such a verse of himself as Num. xii. 3?” (p. 321). Assuredly, when we recall the context. Miriam and Aaron had made an assault on Moses officially. God heard it, and would judge it. Meantime, to explain how Moses, with his fiery temper, under great provocation could have swallowed the injury in silence, the objective statement is added, “Now

6. Law of leprosy, Lev. xiii., xiv; Dent. xxiv. 8 (a very strong proof that the traditional order is exact).

7. Law of ceremonial pollution and cleansing, Lev. xv; Dent. xxiii. 9-14.

8. One place of sacrifice, Lev. xvii. 1-9; Dent. xii. 5, 8-11, 13, 14, 18, 28; xiv. 23-25.

9. Sacredness of blood, Lev. xvii. 10-14; Dent. xii. 16, 23-25; xv. 23.

10. Prohibited marriages, Lev. xviii; Dent. vii. 3; xxii. 30.

the man Moses was very meek above all the men which were upon the face of the earth." It is no glorifying of his own gifts. It is a needful magnifying of the grace of Jehovah. If Goethe could say of Tieck, "He is a man of distinguished talent; but to compare him with me is a blunder. I can say this point-blank, since I did not make myself,"¹ how much more may Moses praise himself without pride, as the servant and vicegerent of God, in this crisis where God's own prophetic institution is set at naught. Not that we are shut up to this hypothesis alone, but that it is ample to rebut the argument above. "The mention of Dan in Deut. xxxiv. 1 cannot really have been written till Joshua, as well as Moses, was dead and gone." Why? "Because Dan is the new name of Laish, given after the conquest of the Danites in the time of the Judges." This fancied unanswerable proof of anachronism rests on an assumption and an omission. The assumption that there cannot be a second Dan is arbitrary. The omission to note the Dan-Jaan of 2 Sam. xxiv. 6 is slovenly. The conservative student can rest, if need be, on the proleptic use of the name. Better still, he can start with Gen. xiv. 14, and, supposing that this most brilliant victory of Abram over the kings would leave a trace in a name, find in the very next chapter (Gen. xv. 14) the word דַּן אֵינִי, as at once the memorial of the old triumph and the prophecy of new ones. The name Dan, given thus to the camp near the springs of the Jordan, clung to them, according to Josephus (Arch. i. 10, 1), not to the Canaanite city in their neighborhood. As Bethel was a name of a spot current side by side with the name of a city Luz, so Dan by the side of the city Laish. The threefold repetition of the word "city" in Judg. xviii. 28, 29 would mark the transfer of the significant name from the fountain, and the obliteration of the name of Laish by the name of Bilhal's first-born on other grounds. Lasha in Gen. x. 19 is possibly the earlier form of Laish in Judg. xviii. 29 as the northeastern frontier of the Canaanite possessions.²

¹ Eckermann's Conversations, p. 143, quoted by Hengstenberg in loco.

² Bib. Sac., Jan. 1882, p. 153. President S. C. Bartlett, D.D., gives another

Nor has Professor Smith proved that the Pentateuch was written in the land of Canaan not before the period of the kings (p. 322). Gen. xxxvi. 31, "And these are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom before there reigned any king over the children of Israel," is cited in vain to carry the authorship to the time of Saul at least, of David at most. For the non-reigning of a king in Israel is the fact to be emphasized, in contrast with the swifter bloom and decay of the profane kingdom. Paraphrased the thought is: Seven elective monarchs in Edom have seen their sceptres fall; the eighth, Hadar by name, is now on the throne. But amid this flourishing of the descendants of Esau Israel is far from enjoying the promise, "Kings shall come out of thy loins" (Gen. xxxv. 11).¹ John Calvin says admirably: "It must be remembered that the wicked are suddenly exalted and suddenly abased, like the grass on the housetops, which for lack of root has a precocious vigor, but a more speedy withering. To the two sons of Isaac was the promise of this dignity, that kings should be among their descendants. The Idumaeans are the first to begin reigning; the condition of the Israelites seems therefore the worse. But at length the success of time teaches how much better it is by creeping on the ground to put forth deep roots than to acquire an overweening excellence in a moment, in a moment to vanish away." The incidental allusion to Midian in the fourth reign synchronizes too with Moses' residence there. A monarchical destiny assured them, a monarchical atmosphere around them, might well impel this not trifling nor interpolated passage in the historian of the Jews.

We need not pause to refute the interpretation of Deut. i. 1, which infers from *בְּצַדְרָיִם הַיַּרְדֵּן* (on this side Jordan) that the writer lived in western Palestine (p. 322). The solution borrowed from Ewald's *Geschichte*, Vol. i. p. 73, which makes Dan supersede an older and obscurer name by a change of text. This is based on reading Baniyas in the Samaritan Pentateuch. It is open to no reasonable objection. The facility of the change is in its favor.

¹ See Delitzsch's argument and Kalisch's admissions, mentioned by President Bartlett.

same word in Josh. i. 15 is proof positive that it means sometimes "this side Jordan," as our English version gives it rightly. But since Professor Smith waives the point, it is needless to linger on it. Pass we rather to examine phrases which to our author are unambiguous proofs that the Pentateuch was written in Canaan. The Hebrew word for westward is מִן . But the fact that this is seaward (מִן , elsewhere מִן הַיָּם) even in the Levitical description of the tabernacle in the wilderness (Ex. xxvii. 12) does not in the least conflict with the extra-Palestinian origin of that portion of the Pentateuch. The Hebrew language was not formed in Egypt, where (מִן) would mean north, or in Arabia, where it would mean west. It was formed in Palestine,¹ and kept distinct in Egypt. The patriarchs' two hundred years' sojourn in Palestine was enough to fix the terms for cardinal points of compass in the national tongue. To suppose that in a brief word, in constant use for a common idea, the original meaning long since dropped is to be resumed, instead of the secondary, is absurd. Do we use the word "candlestick" in that way? מִן , the proper name of the dry steppe south of Judah, once become the word for south, where Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob lived, would certainly continue to mean south to their descendants, speaking their language, wherever they went. It is no more nonsense to say that for four hundred and thirty years the word would not be given up, when the Israelites in Egypt spoke Hebrew, than it is not sense to say it would be given up in case they spoke Egyptian. The use of מִן for west, and מִן for south, incorrectly alleged to prove the origin of the Pentateuch, in reality witnesses the residence of the patriarchs in the Holy Land.

The Pentateuch's exacter knowledge of Palestine than of the peninsula is a no less imaginary proof of its Palestinian composition. The site of Mount Sinai uncertain because the narrative lacks "the topographical color of an eye-witness!" Why, topographical color is its key-note. This is the one thing beautifying that painful Israelitish march from the Red

¹ See Gesenius's Hebrew Grammar, Introduction, § 2. 2.

Sea. Those three days in the waterless wilderness of Shur (Ex. xv. 22), the "wall" whose low, long sandstone range upon the left corroborates the story to the most careless traveller, do not lack it. Marah still murmurs in Ain Hawwárah's — Ghurkud shrubs and water so brackish that Ebers's guides cried, "Morra, morra," *bitter, bitter*, as he approached it.¹ Elim (Wady Gharandel), too, is to-day the same paradise of singing bird and gurgling stream, which wooed the Israelites to camp by its twelve wells and seventy palms, ere they started for that Wilderness of Sin where, in El Murkha, their route skirted the blue sea, over a carpet of flints, under a sky of brass, till they murmured against Moses and Moses' God, and God "rained down manna upon them to eat, and feathered fowls like as the sand of the sea" (Ps. lxxviii. 24, 27). Rephidim, where they chide and fight, is the lovely Feiran, whose running brook, lovely palm grove, fantastic cliffs of red and green, and rounded sacred hill of *Táhúneh* seem to Palmer, the very spot for Moses smiting the rock, and Moses sitting in prayer, with upstayed hands, while Joshua discomfits Amalek. And Stanley's artistic eye and Robinson's patient rule alike fix on the great plain of Er Rahah, with its tufted floor, its jagged pinnacles against the sky, its fence of mound arresting man and beast, its colossal monolith of granite rising twelve hundred feet in height, — at oncé man's altar and his Maker's throne,² — fix upon it, I say, as the foreordained and incontestable scene where, amid thunderings and lightnings, a holy Jehovah gave the law, through Moses his servant, to affrighted Israel.³

That the Pentateuch cites as authorities poetical records not earlier than the time of Moses (p. 324) is surely not at

¹ Ebers, *Durch Gosen*, p. 117.

² Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*, pp. 42, 43; Robinson's *Bib. Res.*, Vol. i. p. 107.

³ E. H. Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus*, pp. 136, 145. See also S. C. Bartlett, *Egypt to Palestine*, p. 244. In the same fresh, learned, and convincing book, President Bartlett says (p. 271), after visiting Wady Sebaiyeh and taking subsequent careful views of Er Rahah, "I could not for one moment hesitate to add my vote to that of Robinson, Stanley, Palmer, Holland, and the whole ordinance survey; and I could appreciate the surprise with which Ebers walked Wady Sebaiyeh, and called it rather strongly, "a rock-and-hill-abounding defile, in no wise fitted for a camping-ground."

variance with the Mosaic authorship. But Num. xxi. 14, "Wherefore it is said in the book of the wars of the Lord," is not cited as an authority, to begin with. It is quoted, rather, as poetry. Its pertinence lies in its enlivening a dry narrative, and its reflecting the exalted mood of the congregation. The last act of the Exodus and the first act of the entrance are linked in the heading of a popular song. Like verses 17, 18, bursting out into lyrical expression, as the people burst from the desert to watered pasture: "Spring up, O well; sing ye unto it," the sense of victory is strong in Israel's heart and musical on Israel's lips. Conquered at the time of this composition were the Amalekites, the king of Arad, the Midianites, Sihon king of the Amorites, and Og the king of Bashan. The great conception of Moses' song on the Red Sea's farther shore is revived, and the Spirit of the Lord recalls the words, "The Lord is a Man of war" (Ex. xv. 1). The book of the wars of the Lord was simply a collection of national chants in the line of Ex. xv.—a collection which breathed gratitude and wonder to her covenant Leader out of the nation's inmost genius and heart, and said in freshest and most thrilling strains: "I will sing unto the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea." Not to have felt and sung thus on the eve of the Land of Promise, and at the end of the wilderness of wandering, would have been contrary to the experience of nations and the constitution of the soul. Not to have gathered the most beautiful and spirited of these anthems into a current psalter would have been out of harmony with Moses' own poetic gift and Israel's mighty musical capacity toward Jehovah. To sneer at the ballad-singers as "reciters of sarcastic verses" will hardly discredit so life-like a trait of the Mosaic authorship (מִלְחָמָה, Num. xxi. 27). Still less will the obvious misapprehension that the quotation in question is for the sake of authenticating, instead of animating Moses' own inspired narrative.

Nor can the Mosaic authorship be shaken by statements (p. 331) that till Deuteronomy we find no statement that Moses

wrote down more than the ten commandments (Ex. xxiv. 4). Do we not read in Num. xxxiii. 2, "And Moses wrote their goings out according to their journeys by the commandment of the Lord"? And does not Ex. xvii. 14, "And the Lord said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial in *the book*" (E. V. *a book*, but in the Hebrew סֵפֶר) imply that Moses the servant of God did as he was told? No Hebrew scholar will pretend that this is merely in *a book*; for Jer. xxx. 2; xxxvi. 2; Deut. xxxi. 24 are demonstrations of the reverse. What but an assertion of a larger written whole is wrapped up in this written part? In Ex. xxxiv. 27 does not The Lord say to Moses, "Write thou these words," i.e. the record of this whole divine interview at the renewing of the tables, just as distinctly as the record tells us, "The Lord himself wrote the words of the ten commandments"? Nay, the very passage, Ex. xxiv. 4-7, which Professor Smith would empty of its obvious meaning by vs. 3, which distinguishes Jehovah's words — i.e. the decalogue — from the judgments (Ex. xxi.-xxiii.) can hardly be thus rendered. For vs. 3, in the final clause, "all the words of the Lord will we do," manifestly includes the "judgments" of the opening clause, and extends thus, beyond a doubt, the meaning of the same phrase in vs. 4, "Moses wrote all the words of the Lord. When, therefore, in vs. 7, Moses took the book of the covenant in which he had thus written, can we believe that the people of the covenant assented formally by the blood of sprinkling to but one fourth of what they had by word of mouth already pledged themselves to do? Impossible! The book of the covenant, itself sprinkled with blood, (Heb. ix. 19), never excluded that civil and religious code (first legislation) which, in its next to closing verse, alone of the four chapters contains the word "covenant," prohibiting the covenant with heathen and with idols, of which it was the sublime and everlasting contrast. Our seventh criticism of The Old Testament in the Jewish Church is the inadequacy of its arguments against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.¹

¹ For further details consult Hengstenberg die Authentie des Pentateuches, Berlin, 1836; Keil, Introduction to Old Test., and H

VIII. Another, and an eighth, indictment against our author is *his cavalier treatment of the positive proof of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.*

On page 308 he says, "It is plain that no thinking man can be asked to accept the Pentateuch as the literal work of Moses without some evidence to that effect. But evidence a thousand years after date is no evidence at all, when the intervening period bears unanimous witness in a different sense. By insisting that the whole Pentateuch is one work of Moses, and all of equal date, the traditional view cuts off all possibility of proof that its kernel is Mosaic."¹ Again, on page 322, speaking of insertions by Ezra, he says, "This might be a fair enough thing to say, if any positive proof were forthcoming that Moses wrote the mass of the Pentateuch; but in the absence of such proof," etc. Such words distort the traditional view of the Mosaic authorship. What traditionist believes that Moses wrote the account of his own death, in Deut. xxxiv.? No more does the orthodox view claim that Moses originated the older documents underlying Genesis, which he inserted, or had inserted, in the antediluvian and patriarchal history. It holds that the bulk of the middle books was recorded or dictated by Moses contemporaneously with the events or legislation they contain. It believes that Deuteronomy up to xxxi. 24 was Moses' own composition. It believes that the final revision in the time of Ezra, while ample to explain minor chronological, geographical, and historical difficulties, left the essence of the Pentateuch as it left the hand of Moses,—meriting then and now the name of the book of the law of Moses, and by the rights of ordinary speech entitled as a whole to bear Moses' name as its author.²

What are some of the positive arguments for this thesis which orthodoxy offers, and Professor Smith avoids? First, the testimony of the Pentateuch itself. Deut. xxxi. 9 is part

¹ Bib. Sac., pp. 150, 151, Jan. 1882.

² Prof. Bartlett in Bib. Sac., Oct. 1863, excepts possible errors of transcription in text and minor modifications by inspired men, and we willingly do the same.

of it: "And Moses wrote this law." It is too late to say that Deut. xxxi. is outside the Deuteronomic code because the third person, not the first person, is used. That argument has been met already. Nor is our author at liberty to skip into denials of the certainty of the inference that the Deuteronomic code is a book existing separately and accepted as an actual writing of Moses. To do this on the alleged elasticity of the word "Torah" becomes no candid student. If the author of Deut. xxxi., claiming to be Moses, does not mean to convey as a historic fact that the very code (Deut. xii.-xxvi.) in all its fulness was written down, word for word, by Moses, it is because he means that the framework and code (Deut. i. 1-xxxi.) were both so written down. The explicit statement of the text may mean very much more. Keil may be right in referring it to the whole Pentateuch, on philological and traditional grounds alike. The term "book of the covenant" looks strongly that way. The text must mean that Moses wrote the Book of Deuteronomy, at least, and handed it over to the priests and elders with the solemn symbolic charge to read it every seven years at the feast of tabernacles. And Deut. xxxi. 24-26 is the independent testimony of the continuator that Moses wrote the words of this law in a book till they were finished, and handed it over to the Levitical priests (Levites in vs. 25 being abridged from the priests and the sons of Levi in vs. 9) to be deposited at the side of the ark of the covenant, and serve as a witness against rebellious Israel after his death. But Deuteronomy is so knit to the preceding books that the author of one must be the author of all.

Secondly, other books of the Old Testament assert and imply the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.¹

¹ Joshua refers repeatedly and unmistakably (i. 7, 8; viii. 31, 34; xxiii. 6; xxiv. 26), to the Book of the Law of Moses, so that the newer criticism seeks to silence his voice by the hypothesis of a Hexateuch. Judges does not quote from it by name, but is full of traits, civil, political, and ritual, based on the Mosaic law. Thus Gideon has repeated the great original promise (Judges vi. 16) to Moses, Ex. iii. 12. Jephthah's negotiations with the Ammonite King presuppose Moses's narrative in Num. xx. and xxi. and Deut. ix. 4, 5; xviii.

A third argument for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch lies in the identity of language and diction between parts admitted and parts denied to be Mosaic.¹

But a fourth and no weaker proof of the Mosaic authorship is the manifest dissimilarities between Deuteronomy and the first and Levitical legislation with their Mosaic framework. With a different subject, a different audience, a different end, Moses would not have been Moses had he manifested no differences of style and tone. A new personal relation to the

12. Deborah's song echoes back Gen. xlix.; Ex. xix. 16; Deut. xxxiii. 2, with almost the primitive Mosaic ring, while Ruth marries her redeeming kinsman's substitute according to Lev. xxv. 25, 48, 49, and Deut. xxv. 5-10. The Books of Samuel do not contain the words "the book of the law of Moses," but they pulsate in every vein with Pentateuchal currents, quotations, and memories. Tabernacle, ark, priesthood, death for sacrilege, Urim and Thummim, ephod necromancy, eating blood, authority of prophets, feasts and sacrifices, meet us with the old familiar features, and in the choice of a king the very desire of the elders, 1 Sam. viii. 5, and Samuel's response to it x. 24, are couched in words taken from the Deuteronomic law of the kingdom (Deut. xvii. 14, 15). Equally striking is the reference in vs. 25, "Samuel told the people the manner of the kingdom, and wrote it in *the* book, and laid it up before the Lord" to Num. xvii. 7, and to Deut. xxxi. 26, specifying where *Moses'* well known Book was put. The Books of the Kings in Solomon's dedication prayer and Elijah's sacrifice on Carmel are but a commentary on Lev. xxvi. and Deut. xxviii., Lev. i. 6-8 and Lev. ix. 23, 24; and 1 Kings ii. 3 at David's death refers no less verbally to the written law of Moses than 2 Kings xxiii. 21 to the Mosaic book of the covenant in Josiah's reformation. The Books of the Chronicles are so full of the evidences of the existence and the influence of what the chronicler calls (2 Chron. xxxv. 12) the book of Moses, that enemies of the Pentateuch stigmatize them as unhistorical. In Ezra and Nehemiah, even DeWette admits the following traces of the Mosaic law — Ezra iii. 2; vi. 18; vii. 6, 12; ix. 1; Neh. i. 7; viii. 1; ix. 3; xiii. 1. The Psalms in i., xix., cxix., is a glowing testimony to the priority and glory of the law in its legislation, as lxviii., lxxviii., xcv., cv., cvi., cxxxvi., is to its history.

¹ Thus the antique forms **אָנֹכִי** for the personal pronoun of the third person of both genders and **אָנֹכִי**, run through all five books alike, and are not found elsewhere — **אָנֹכִי** being found but eleven times, and **אָנֹכִי** but once in the Pentateuch. Again, **אָזְבִיב**, an ear of corn, **אָזְבִיב**, a young bird, **אָזְבִיב**, a sickle, **אָזְבִיב**, a lamb, **אָזְבִיב**, a veil, are found in Exodus, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy; Genesis and Deuteronomy; Deuteronomy only in Old Test.; Genesis, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy; Exodus alone; never in Joshua, Chronicles, or later books. So equally such figures as devouring fire and eagles wings are common to the book of the covenant and Deuteronomy (Ex. xxiv. 17; Deut. iv. 24; ix. 3; Ex. xix. 4, and Deut. xxxii. 11). A host of citations corroborative may be found in Schultz on Deuteronomy.

people and his life-work ought to tinge the closing discourses of the prophet of the old covenant, as they tinge the similar discourses of the prophet of the new. When Professor Smith cites Deut. xix. and Num. xxxv. as an example of the fundamental difference in legal style between the Levitical and the Deuteronomic code, he is really fortifying the theory he means to explode. The technical expression "city of refuge" ought to appear in the dry priestly code. The more popular periphrasis is just what a legislator enforcing his law at a town-meeting would be compelled to adopt. The fifty different words in Deuteronomy, in conjunction with half as many common to both and peculiar to Moses, are fifty different proofs of the same mind working oratorically, instead of legislatively.

And a fifth evidence of the Mosaic authorship lies in Moses' office as legislator. Was Moses called to be a legislator more sagacious, ancient, humane, spiritual than Solon or Justinian? Are the Books of Leviticus crowded with the declaration, "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying" (Lev. i. 1; iv. 1; vi. 1; viii. 1; xii. 1; xiii. 1; xiv. 1; xvi. 1; xvii. 1, etc.), heading almost every chapter and statute, and ending with the words, "These are the commandments which the Lord commanded Moses for the children of Israel in Mount Sinai" (Lev. xxvii. 34)? Then to suppose that the man who as legislator had the brain and the destiny to enact and declare a code was not, *ipso facto*, the man to perpetuate the code in writing, is to violate every fitness and probability. To Moses the statutes of the Lord were too weighty to be intrusted to the corruptions of oral transmission. "Each nation early commits to writing what it values most, — Romans, law; Greeks, poetry, — did the Hebrew through its illustrious representative refuse to record religion?"

Not so says the sixth proof of the Mosaic authorship, i.e. the tradition of the Jewish nation. To talk of the uncritical character of the scribes is idle in offsetting this. One does not need to be a scholar to bear witness as to a matter of fact.

And no witness ever was more competent or unimpeachable than the witness of the Jewish people as a whole to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. However opposed to each other on other points, on this pharisee, sadducee, essene, the Jew of Palestine and of Alexandria, the Samaritan of Gerizim, were a unit. The stream of tradition is mighty as Niagara.¹

But the life of Israel is yet another and a seventh proof of the Mosaic authorship. This book so uniformly and universally ascribed to Moses was the foundation of the whole Jewish polity. That people lived in the full blaze of history in the days of Tacitus. In the great cities of the known world they had one national type. The belief in the one spiritual Jehovah marked them off from all foreigners. Their phylacteries, their meats, their circumcision, their passover, their Sabbath, their songs, their oracles, their education, their jurisprudence, their worship were so many living monuments of the Pentateuch, of which Moses was the author. "Were the men of the Restoration mistaken as to the fact of the Captivity which they had experienced according to Moses' threats? Were the men of the Exile wrong about Jerusalem's being taken and destroyed? Were the men of the two kingdoms deceived about common blood and common law? The men of Solomon about temple and sacrifice and psalter? The men of David about the bringing up of the ark of the covenant? The men of Joshua about the crossing of the Jordan and the conquest of Canaan? The men of Moses about his institution and record of the civil, social, moral, ceremonial law?" The "wandering Jew" bears in his features and institutions to-day the ineffaceable stamp of a Pentateuch which Moses, and Moses only, under God first wrote into his body and soul.²

For, in the eighth place, Moses was the sole person in all

¹ See Philonis Opera, Mangey's ed., Vol. ii. p. 141, and Josephus cont. Ap. i. 8, Bekker's ed., "It is the unanimous, unhesitating testimony of the nation concerning the relation of the man who certainly founded their institutions to the documents in which these institutions were certainly embodied.

² See Smith's Bible Dictionary.

the Jewish history with the qualifications for the Pentateuchal authorship. Only a founder of a nation could so interweave its laws and history. Only a miracle-worker could have emancipated the horde of slaves, and authenticated the revelation to them of which he was the medium. Only a man, summing up an old and beginning a new civilization, could write a work dating back to the creation and forward to the advent. Only a mind conversant with the splendors of art and the glories of nature could tell the story of the tabernacle and the law-giving in colors so warm and bold. It needed a patriot such as he to sketch the lives of the patriarchs so simply, vividly, and lovingly in Genesis. It needed a poet such as he to sing so stirringly, solemnly, and adoringly the songs of Ex. xv. and Deut. xxxii. No smaller ritualist, no lower priest, could have codified that wondrous Levitical legislation. Ezra, the pious worshipper, the stern reformer, the learned scribe, lacks the originality and the majesty. No narrower moralist, no secondary prophet, could have breathed such a heavenly mercy and justice into the covenant and Deuteronomic legislation. Jeremiah, the dependent writer, the plaintive politician, the discouraged teacher, the last flickering spark of prophecy ere the downfall of his country, lacked the simplicity and hope to record the nation's glorious birth, lacked the primeval grasp of everlasting principles which was the atmosphere of Moses face to face with God. Only one man ever appeared on the stage of Hebrew history gifted so variously and precisely for this master work. That man was the shepherd of the burning bush, the sufferer by the circumcision, the instituter of the passover, the general of the Exodus and the wanderings, the nation's blameless judge, the statesman toiling indefatigably for the murmuring people's health and education and righteousness, the historian with an eagle eye for bold outlines and a firm hold on minute details; the man of God, hating idolatry, loving prayer, magnifying the curses and blessings of the law, incorruptible, enthusiastic, disinterested, firm toward the church, living in the fore-gleams of Messiah's victory and reign,

dying with a view of the earthly land of promise, to ascend into the heavenly. Moses' transcendent features are stamped upon Deuteronomy's words and phrases, its whole matter and manner, its magnificent discourses, its parental solicitude, its moral earnestness, its holy reverence.

Still a ninth reason for ascribing the Pentateuch to Moses lies in the Egyptian allusions. They are so many, minute, and accurate that no one who had not lived there like Moses could have made them.¹ Each of these incidental allusions is natural on the hypothesis of the Mosaic authorship. For Moses was learned in the wisdom and brought up at the court of the Egyptians, and the Israelites at the date of the composition of the Pentateuch kept yet fresh in memory their Egyptian experiences. But how unnatural such allusions in Josiah's time. Thus viewed, the law of the kingdom, Deut. xvii. 16, is not an argument for the Josian date. At that date horses could be procured in Palestine, and the people had reacted from Egyptian alliances. But just out of Egypt, whose chariot horses they had seen cast into the sea, and into whose slavery they feared to be dragged, the statute almost mirrors Moses' face.

Tenthly, and lastly, the testimony of our Lord to the five

¹ Such are the existence of eunuch's (Gen. xxxvii. 36); the bad morals of Egyptian women (xxxix.); carrying baskets on the head (xl. 16); shaving of the hair and beard (xli. 14); wearing of golden necklaces (xli. 42); storing grain (xli. 48, 49); sitting instead of reclining at table (xlili. 32, 33); divining by cups (xliv. 5); Egyptian tenure of land (xlvii. 13-26); embalming (Gen. i. 2, 3); use of straw in making brick (Ex. i. 14 and v. 7); baskets made of papyrus covered with asphalt and pitch (Ex. ii. 3); custom of writing שָׁמַר (v. 15); bastinado as punishment (v. 14); incantation with serpents (vii. 11); plagues of frogs, flies, boils, locusts, etc.; chariots in army (xiv. 6, 7); musical instruments, specially the timbrel (xv. 20, 21); cutting and setting precious stones (xxxv. 33 and xxxix. 14); purifying and working metals (xxxv. 32; xxv. 11; xxxix. 3; xxv. 31; xxxv. 22; xxxviii. 8); skill in carving wood and working leather (xxvi. 14); spinning, weaving, and embroidering (xxvi. 1, 31; xxviii. 32); prohibition against lying with cattle (Ex. xxii. 19 and Lev. xviii. 23; xx. 15, 16); familiar and favorite food, fish, cucumbers, melons, grass (קִיץ), onions, garlic Num. xi. 5); Zoan (Num. xiii. 22); familiar Egyptian diseases (Deut. vii. 15; xxviii. 27, 35, 60; Ex. xv. 26); irrigation with the foot (Deut. xi. 10); threshing with oxen (Deut. xxv. 4, etc.).—Hengstenberg, Egypt and the Books of Moses.

books of the Pentateuch, separately and combined, shows its Mosaic origin. To that point the Saviour spoke. What was universally believed by his nation on this subject Christ did not denounce as he was wont to denounce pharisaic traditions. He explicitly and implicitly sanctioned it. Not only did he say, in general, "For the hardness of your heart Moses wrote you this precept"; he lays his hand on Deut. viii. 8 in the temptation; on Num. xxi. 4, 9 in the talk with Nicodemus (John iii. 14, 15, "As Moses lifted up the serpent," etc.); on Lev. xiv. 8, 4 in the healing of the leper (Matt. viii. 4, "Offer the gift that Moses commanded," etc.); on Ex. iii. 5, 6, in answer to the lawyer who said, "Master, Moses wrote" ("Have ye not read in the Book of Moses how God said," etc.). Nay, looking backward and forward, he ends his sermon at the second passover at Jerusalem to the official leaders of Israel with the unequivocal and unanswerable words, — alluding to Genesis in particular and the Pentateuch as a whole, — "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" (John v. 46, 47; see also John vii. 23; Acts xv. 5; Heb. x. 28; John i. 17; Luke xx. 37; Matt. xix. 8).¹ These are but samples of passages whereby the King of truth himself authenticates to all lands and times the Mosaic origin of the well-known fivefold book. Our eighth objection to Professor Smith's volume is his scorn of this tenfold positive, cumulative argument for the Mosaic authorship.²

¹ "That these writings formed the beginning of the Old Testament," Professor Bartlett well says, "is implied in Luke xxiv. 27, where, when Christ expounded in all the Scriptures 'the things concerning himself,' it was by 'beginning at Moses and all the prophets' (i.e. as DeWette, Winer, and Meyer explain), he began with Moses and proceeded to the prophets." No retort of prejudice, ignorance, irrelevancy, accommodation can silence this and other voices of our Lord.

² 1. We have merely outlined the clear, coherent, uniform, uncontradicted testimony for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch against which Prof. Smith's jaunty assumption of worthlessness without offering a plausible substitute can

IX. Yet a ninth objection must be briefly stated to Professor Smith's work under review, i.e. *its absurd, immoral, and irreligious theory of the origin of the middle books of the Pentateuch.*

"When the Levitical law first comes on the stage of actual history in the time of Ezra it presents itself as the law of Moses."¹ It cannot be assumed to have been literally given in the wilderness. It was so only by a legal fiction. Not that "falsehood was meant or conveyed thereby. The cases of all Roman law being supposed to be derived from the twelve tables, and our rules for Indian water-works purporting to emanate from antique water customs, are parallel. So "the new laws of the Levitical code are presented as ordinances of Moses, though when first promulgated every one knew they were not so" (pp. 385-387).

Had Professor Smith followed the advice he volunteers on page 158, and looked away from fabulous tradition to the plain and categorical account of the Bible itself as to what

hardly commend itself to candid investigators. President S. C. Bartlett, D.D. (Bib. Sac., Oct. 1863, p. 799), in his able article "Authorship of the Pentateuch," draws out the argument with great logical and historic force. He affirms "God is represented as giving special instructions to Moses to deposit his future communications in the ark" (Ex. xxv. 16, 21, 22). "I will commune with thee of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel." Also a vast number of passages assert themselves to be an exact statement of God's utterances to Moses (some fifty in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers: "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying"). The two together are nothing less than a reiterated and all-persuasive claim of these passages to have been put on record by Moses.

2. The three common Pentateuchal words of measurement in dry, liquid, and long measure are of Egyptian origin. אֵפָה , Egyptian *epi*, ephah; הֵינָה , Egyptian *hn*, hno, hin; מֵאָה , *mahi*, cubit. So אֲרוֹן ark, chest, Egyptian *ta* (chest), and *tbt* (hull).

3. The wood of the Tabernacle and its furniture, the אֲרָז , was the acacia of the Sinaitic peninsula, but the צִפְרִיָּה , the cypress of Palestine, never appears in the Pentateuch. The latter word is used three times by the so-called deutero-Isaiah, twice by Ezekiel, Why never by the author of the middle books of the Pentateuch? Distinctions of clean and unclean animals are in order where the gazelles and the long-horned ibex abound. They are "the game of the wilderness for a nation of hunters." The cities of refuge well restrict the nomadic blood-revenge, and are unheard of after Joshua.

¹ Bib. Sac., Jan. 1882, p. 150.

Ezra and Nehemiah did, he would have been saved from so ludicrous a hypothesis. There we find (Ezra ix. 1) priests and Levites separated already according to the levitical law Ezra came to introduce. Scandalized at the unlevitical conduct of the holy seed, and ere Ezra recovers from the astonishment and possible disappointment that his new law has escaped from his keeping, like a telegram stolen from the wire, into the hands of the hierarchy, behold the masses take the initiative also, by asking him for the well-known Book of the Law of Moses to Israel, which book nevertheless was unknown save to Ezra, and to Ezra known not to be of Moses! And yet the people are as serious in the midst of this masquerade (Neh. viii. 1) as if it were a matter of life and death, instead of a gigantic farce! And then, forsooth, the moment this fictitious book, with provisions distasteful to the priests and opposed to every passion and prejudice of the people, is read the people at once proceed to covenant with the God of truth (Neh. ix. 38), and by priests and by Levites to enter on a reform which is for the first time to separate Levites and priests from one another (Ezra x. 18-23; Neh. x). Oh, for an old anonymous law book, to be dubbed by the name, say, of Madison, thus magically to settle the Mormon question to-day!

But who does not feel that this legal-fiction theory is wrong, as well as absurd? Professor Smith is very careful to exonerate Ezra and Israel from deceit. But, consciously or unconsciously, he injects a Jesuitical canon into Protestant interpretation. Mosaic principles he leaves not a shred of. His dogmatic generalization, "It would be the highest presumption to affirm that what is found in all other ancient laws cannot occur in the Old Testament," overlooks the very essence of revelation and the glory of the people possessing the lively oracles of God. It is peculiarly revolting in the hands of one who has so magnified the pure lips and the right heart of the prophet as against the priest.* In a plain book for plain people common morality, if not common sense, requires fable to announce itself as fable. How degrading

to Ezra's character if, with his overpowering sense of God's anger against old sin, he is yet committing himself to a new sin against the first principles of truth. — How deadly a blow does such a theory inflict on the candid interpretation of Moses' preliminary tent and the order of Israelitish march (p. 319).¹ How uncharitable a judgment does it beget toward conservative scholarship, i.e. "People who have not understood the Old Testament are accustomed to say with the usual presumption of unhistorical rationalism that this is either literally true or a lie." How reckless an association does it prompt with men who have neither humanity nor divinity in their treatment of Holy Writ, "If we must choose between the Pentateuch being the literary work of Moses or a barefaced imposture, it is impossible to deny that all the historical evidence that has come before us points in the direction of the second alternative" (p. 307).

And this same legal fiction theory is irreligious. There has been an assassin at Washington filling the air with outcries that he was inspired to murder President Garfield. The nation has sickened at the blasphemy. But is the inspiration of the real author of Deuteronomy (who is covered by the same theory, if it rose in Josiah's day) less tainted? He has not only stripped the dead Moses of his personality. He has invented divine messages, and taken the great and terrible name of God in vain. He has shown a contempt for the ineffable holiness of the decalogue by handling it as a human composition. Unless the writer of Deuteronomy was the great mediator of the old covenant, the prophet to whom God spake face to face, he must have penned the loftiest prayers and praises, uttered the most searching blessings and curses, with the hard heart and seared conscience of an impostor given over to the very spirit of error. It is grieving the Spirit who came down in a cloud, and rested upon the faithful servant of Jehovah, to assume a theory that makes the author of Deuteronomy a viler transgressor than Balaam — "de-

¹ See Prof. Green in *Presbyterian Review* for January, 1882, p. 118.

“serving the blackness of darkness forever.” Our ninth objection to our author’s volume is its absurd, immoral, and irreligious view of the origin of the greater portion of the Pentateuch.

X. We will only tax our reader’s patience to note a tenth and last criticism of the Old Testament in the Jewish Church. *Our author creates by it greater difficulties than those he professes to solve.*

It is his boast that his theory of successive redactions of the sacred law of Israel corresponding to similar stages in the revelation marked in the historic and prophetic literature removes contradictions and harmonizes discords in the Old Testament record.¹ How many of these contradictions are imaginary, and how far short of his magnificent promise to reconcile such as are not he has come, we have partially seen. Meanwhile, a host of new difficulties spring up, like dragon’s teeth, to which Old Testament interpretation was a stranger, and for which the newer criticism has no explanation. Instead of superficial difficulties relating to the antiquities of the Bible, we are beset with fundamental ones relating to its being and beneficence. Thanks to the new theory, we must now ask why Ezekiel was issued in his own name instead of Moses’, why his temple differs so little from Solomon’s, why his Torah was never obeyed by the exiles, why his regulations, enacted only to be ignored, bear traces of prior Levitical legislation. Professor Smith’s theory has to explain how Ezekiel speaks of the year of jubilee as universally known, and yet can be ignorant of the day of atonement which opened it.² How happens it that Ezra codifying Ezekiel in the Levitical legislation leaps from the temple which was in existence to the tabernacle which was lost? Is that in accordance with contemporary legislation? How is it that the scribe formulates a code containing thirty-five Levitical to thirteen priestly cities, in connection with a ten-fold number of occupants of the latter to the former (Num.

¹ Bib. Sac., Jan. 1882, pp. 148, 149.

² Keil, Bibl. Archaeol., i. p. 379.

xxxv., Josh. xxi.)? ¹ How is it that he institutes three cities of refuge on the eastern side of the Jordan centuries after his nation had ceased to inhabit that portion of the land? (Num. xxxv. 14; Deut. iv. 41; Josh. xx. 7, 8.) How is it that the law of the kingdom first appears when the kingdom is within less than a century of its downfall, and assigns the supreme authority to judges (beside the priest) centuries after the judges have disappeared? (Deut. xvii. 9, 14.) How can Deuteronomy reflect the teaching of Isaiah when it is full of the menace of that Egyptian alliance which is the national sin denounced by Isaiah himself (Isa. xxx. 2)? What pertinence have Deuteronomy's exterminating ordinances against the Amalekites in the reign of Josiah, long after the Amalekites have been exterminated? (Deut. xxv. 19.) How is it that the priests and Levites who came up to Jerusalem ninety years before Ezra, know the Levitical work and altar, and offer burnt offerings morning and evening, and keep the feast of tabernacles, as it is written in the Law of Moses the man of God, before the foundation of the second temple is yet laid? (Ezra iii. 2, 6.) How does the ark of the covenant first become a shrine of positive legislation after it is lost never to be recovered? How can the passover, which was the birth-institution of Israel witnessing God's mercy and God's wrath in the blood of a substitute and the salvation of the first-born, be first enacted and celebrated one thousand years after the event it commemorates? (Ex. xii., xiii.) How could the second temple, which was so inferior to that of Solomon that the aged men wept at the contrast, be the fit cradle of the gorgeous Hebrew priestly ritual? (Ezra iii. 12.) How could the mighty revolution hierarchically wrought by Ezra leave in the post-exilian Malachi no trace of the name of the sons of Aaron? How can the Messianic teaching of David and Isaiah be explained apart from a ritual of tabernacle

¹ Four thousand two hundred and eighty-nine priests, Ezra ii. 36, and Neh. vii. 39-42; 341 Levites according to Ezra ii. 40 — 74 Levites, and 128 singers, and 139 doorkeepers; and 360 Levites according to Neh. vii. 43. Also see Oehler, *Old Testament Theology*, Vol. ii. p. 252.

and candlestick and table and shewbread and vail and golden censer and ark and tables of the covenant and the cherubim of glory overshadowing the mercy-seat, such as the Epistle to the Hebrews ascribes to Moses' historic dispensation, and such as Jesus the mediator of the new covenant with his own precious blood fulfils? (Heb. ix. 2-5.)¹

ARTICLE VI.

NECESSITY AND INFINITY.

BY REV. THOMAS HILL, D.D., LL.D., FORMERLY PRESIDENT OF HARVARD COLLEGE.

A BRIEF, but admirable Article by William T. Harris defines three species to which all the varieties of necessity may be reduced. The first is *causal* necessity; by which something is determined to be, or compelled to appear, by something else external to it. This necessity is assumed by many modern evolutionists to be universal. The second species is *logical* necessity; the connection between the various aspects of a single truth, or between the various parts of a complex truth. This kind of necessity may be defined as that, the opposite of which is inconceivable. And thirdly, there is a *moral* necessity, the necessity of obligation. Each of these three species of necessity includes a great variety of distinctions, to each of which a special name has been given. The idea of necessity governs and controls all processes of reasoning. There is a unity in the universe making each thing dependent on all others. In the attempt to trace this unity we continually meet unavoidably with apparent or real contradictions; which it is the province of philosophy to solve. "By the evolution and solution of these contradictions," says Dr. Harris, "the subsidiary character of physical necessity may be shown."

¹ On this head and throughout, see *Newer Criticism*, by Prof. Robert Watts, an acute and elaborate refutation of Prof. Smith of special value on the theological points at issue. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.) Also Prof. Green.