

ARTICLE VIII.

ESSAYS IN PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM.

BY HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B., BARRISTER-AT-LAW,
LINCOLN'S INN, LONDON.

II.

INSPIRED by the remarkable results of their labors on the narrative of the plagues, the critics turn with zeal to the crossing of the Red Sea. "The triple narrative of the plagues," writes Mr. Carpenter, "raises the presumption that the passage of the Red Sea was also related by all the three documents J, E, and P." (Vol. ii. p. 99, note on Exodus xiii. 17.) The rest of this note contains nothing that need detain us, being devoted to phrases like "make strong the heart" and similar matters, but verse 21 brings us to the first appearance of the pillar of cloud, and this is one of the main arguments for the partition of the narrative of the middle books. The Glory and the position of the Ark and the Tent of Meeting are necessarily involved in any discussion of the Cloud, and we purpose therefore to dispose of these topics without further delay.

THE CLOUD.

"Three representations of the divine presence in the cloud [writes Mr. Carpenter, on Ex. xiii. 21] are to be found in the Hexateuch. In P it covers the Dwelling at its consecration Ex xi 34 ff Num ix 15 ff, and remains over the Tent of Meeting until it is time for the camp to be moved, when it is taken up. A second set of passages also connects it with the Tent of Meeting, but places it at the entrance, where it comes down in the form of a pillar and remains in converse with Moses Ex xxxiii 7 ff Num xii 5 cp Deut xxxi 15: reasons will be given hereafter for ascribing these to E. But in the

text 21 [i.e. Ex. xlii. 21]nothing has yet been said of any sanctuary; the pillar with its twofold aspect by day or night serves another function, that of guidance and protection. In xiv 19 two symbols, the angel of Elohim, and the pillar, have been combined by R. As the 'angel of Elohim' naturally belongs to E, the guardian pillar must be regarded as the equivalent in J." (Vol. ii. p. 100.)

That passage may serve as an introduction to the higher critical case. In reply we intend to prove the following points: (1) It is not true that in P the cloud first makes its appearance at the erection of the Dwelling. On the contrary it is found before then and *in the same position* as in J. (2) The Lord comes down in a cloud in J as well as in E, but in both documents this is only on certain occasions. (3) Otherwise E locates the cloud in exactly the same position as J. (4) The discrepancy between P and JE can be manufactured only by the help of the redactor.

The pillar of cloud in Exodus xiii. 21 and 22 (J) really calls for no remark. The passage is entirely suitable to the first appearance of the cloud, and gives the necessary explanation of its presence.¹ The next passage is xiv. 19-20. We begin by printing the portion assigned to E continuously: "And the angel of God, which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them; . . . and came between the camp of Egypt and the camp of Israel; and there was the cloud and the darkness." This at once disposes of Mr. Carpenter's statement that "two symbols, the angel of Elohim, and the pillar, have been combined by R," for we see that when E has been disentangled it still recognizes the cloud either in addition to or as covering the angel. The representation is in fact exactly the same as in J when we remember that Hebrew thought did not always draw a sharp distinction between God and his angel,

¹ It will, however, hereafter be argued that these verses should be followed immediately by Exodus xxxiii. 7-11, a passage which is at present out of place.

the latter being regarded as a manifestation of Him. Many commentators think there is some corruption in verse 20; but, unless Mr. Carpenter can prove that the angel did not appear in the cloud,—and he is wise enough not even to suggest this,—the attempt to establish a discrepancy between J and E breaks down. It must be conceded that these two documents display precisely the same conception of the position of the cloud at this juncture.

The next passage is Exodus xvi. 10 (P). On this Mr. Carpenter, in his note on verse 2, writes as follows:—

“But the story implies the existence of the Levitical Dwelling with the ark containing the Sacred Testimony 34. It is not till the Dwelling is completed that ‘the Glory of the LORD’ (10) first appears in the cloud cp xl 34 ff. . . . Nor can the narrative be relieved of this anachronism by viewing 33 f as a later addition. The phrase in 9 ‘come near before the LORD’ similarly describes attendance at the sanctuary cp Lev ix 5 xvi 1 Num xviii 22. The story, then, in its present form implies the existence of a centre of worship which is not yet constructed, and must have been transposed to its present place from a later stage.” (Vol. II. pp. 104, 105.)

We confess that in reading the higher critics we often feel how much their writings would gain in accuracy if they were to be “redacted” by somebody who treated them on the principle which they apply to the Pentateuch. It makes our mouth water to think how many of Mr. Carpenter’s most questionable statements could be rendered quite defensible by such simple expedients as the judicious insertion of negative adverbs. Here is an instance. Suppose that for “implies” we write “does not imply” (or, better still, “excludes”), the first portion of the last sentence becomes absolutely accurate. For what does the chapter say? Moses tells Aaron to command the congregation to come near before the Lord. If this narrative implied the existence of the sanctuary, it is obvious that this must have directed their attention to the center of the camp. But it did

nothing of the sort. The Israelites—who appear not to have been informed that they were in a misplaced passage of P—were perverse enough to behave just as if they had been living in J or E. As yet the only symbol of the Divine presence was the cloud which went before them and had not yet removed to the Dwelling. Accordingly we are told that they looked in the direction of the wilderness (ver. 10). They seem indeed to have interpreted the command to come near before the Lord as referring to the visible symbol of his presence. Worse, still, their perversity was rewarded by seeing the glory appear in the cloud. And Mr. Carpenter does not even consign “the wilderness” to a redactor!

Dr. George Buchanan Gray does not take the matter so quietly. On page 154 of his volume on Numbers, he peremptorily orders his readers to read “tabernacle” for “wilderness.” No reason is assigned for the command—we think wisely.

It will be observed that in the passage we have quoted Mr. Carpenter asserts that the story “must have been transposed to its present place from a later stage.” Similarly Dr. Gray (Numbers, p. 86) says: “Ex. xvi 6–10 is a misplaced narrative.” We have no prejudice against transpositions—indeed we hope to propose some on our own account hereafter: but we would suggest to these gentlemen that before putting forward their schemes in future they should examine the chapters that they desire to transpose for *indicia* of place. In the present instance the first verse contains an important date—the fifteenth day of the second month. P, to whom this is attributed, does not bring the children of Israel to Sinai until the third month (xix. 1). It follows that he cannot have intended this story to relate to a subsequent period. That the children of Israel should have begun to live on manna very

soon after their departure from Egypt is so obviously in accordance with the necessities of the case that nobody would ever have questioned the position of the narrative but for the desire to manufacture contradictions.

It should also be noticed that Mr. Carpenter's allegation that "it is not till the dwelling is completed that the 'Glory of the LORD' first appears in the cloud" is quite incapable of being supported. The glory is found in the cloud over Sinai (xxiv. 16).

The reference to verse 33 which commands the deposit of a pot of manna in the sanctuary offers no criterion of the date to which the narrative of the earlier portion of the chapter relates. It is easily conceivable that either the original historian or (more probably) a subsequent editor should have here adopted a topical order and disposed of the divine command relating to the manna.

As Dr. Gray has been mentioned, we may pause to correct some of his statements. He writes (Numbers, p. 113) of the cloud that, "in both E and P, as distinguished from J, it is regularly associated with the tabernacle." We have seen that this is not true of E before Sinai, and the present passage (as also Ex. xxiv.) proves the same of P. On page 86 we read: "The cloud, according to P, first appeared at Sinai. . . . Before reaching Sinai, the Israelites marched according to the commandment of the LORD, Ex. xvii 1; such definite direction they still required; for the cloud in P does not, as in J (Ex. xiii 22), move at the head of the whole host to show the way." This statement as to the position of the cloud in P on the march is scarcely in harmony with Numbers ix. 17: "And in the place where the cloud abode, there the children of Israel encamped." This would naturally be understood as meaning that the cloud was in front during the march.

After Exodus xvi. the cloud is next mentioned in connection with the stay at Sinai. In xix. 9 (E) we read: "Behold, I come unto thee in a thick cloud," in verse 16 the same writer speaks of a thick cloud, and in xx. 21 he refers to it as thick darkness. We draw special attention to this, as it disproves the allegation of Dr. G. B. Gray (*Encyclopædia Biblica*, col. 3777) that "P differs . . . from both E and J with regard to the form of the phenomenon."

Exodus xxiv. 15b brings us to what the critics desire to regard as the first mention of the cloud in P—for it must be remembered that Exodus xvi. is "misplaced." P not unnaturally begins by speaking of "the cloud" as if it had been mentioned before. Mr. Carpenter offers no explanation of this: but to most readers it will seem that the article here refers to the last mention, which happens to be in E.

In Exodus xxxiii. 9 (E) we find the pillar of cloud descending, but exactly the same conception appears in xxxiv. 5 (J), and in P we also read of the cloud's rising and descending. In xxxiv. J is actually thoughtless enough to speak of the cloud—not the "pillar." Yet Dr. Gray writes in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*: "Deuteronomy i 33 is dependent on J, though the term pillar is not used" (col. 3776). In xl. 34 a late priestly writer once more speaks of *the* cloud, and tells how it came to occupy a position in the center of the camp. So that, if the narrative be read continuously, it appears that J, E and P all agree, and that no discrepancy can be proved.

We shall consider together Numbers x. 34: "And the cloud of the LORD was over them by day, when they set forward from the camp," and Numbers xiv. 14: "For thou, O LORD, art seen face to face, and thy cloud standeth over them, and thou goest before them, in a pillar of cloud by day, and in a pillar of fire by night." Mr. Carpenter deals with these two

passages, which contain precisely the same idea, in the following manner: The first is consigned to a late priestly stratum. The note informs us that "the description of the cloud as 'over' the advancing Israelites at once separates this statement from the narrative of J in which it is conceived as going before them xiv 14b Ex xiii 21 as a pillar. In P, on the other hand, it is always above them without definite form cp ix 17 ff." We have already seen the cloud descending in J—which implies elevation—and we have also found J (and D based on J) speaking of the cloud without the word "pillar." As to xiv. 14 Mr. Carpenter assigns the bulk of the verse to RJe (i.e. the redactor of J and E), but invokes another redactor, RP (i.e. the priestly redactor), to redact the earlier redactor, and so disposes of the words "and thy cloud standeth over them," alleging, in the note *ad loc.*, that "this clause seems due to a reminiscence of the account of the Dwelling in the midst of the camp and the cloud above it." Yet it should be tolerably obvious that "standing" and "going before" are mutually exclusive, and refer to the people in camp and on the march respectively.

We must just mention that in a late stratum of E (Num. xii. 5) the LORD comes down in a pillar of cloud, but in xii. 10 and xi. 25, "the cloud" is spoken of in the same stratum without the word pillar. We need not linger over any other passage.

To sum up. As to the form: Both J and E speak sometimes of the pillar and sometimes of the cloud. In Exodus xix. (E) the cloud can scarcely have been in the form of a pillar, and the representation is precisely the same as that found more frequently in P. It is not difficult to understand that the shape varied with the occasion in the Pentateuch as a whole, as it certainly did in E. As to the position: P and J and E place the cloud in exactly the same position before Sinai. At

Sinai it appears to have been in the first instance over the mountain in all the documents, but it descends sometimes for Moses. Accordingly in all three documents it is high up on normal occasions, that is above the Israelites. When the Tabernacle is erected it takes its normal position in the center of the camp over the sanctuary. In P and J it normally precedes the Israelites on the march after Sinai, but there is no sufficient indication of the exact form it assumes in P. In all three documents it is normally high up after Sinai, but in E it sometimes descends. We have seen it doing the same in J, and it will be found that it behaves likewise in Leviticus xvi. 2 (P). But on different occasions the descents occur in different places. It is of course suggested that in E the Tent of Meeting stood outside the camp after Sinai, and that would place the cloud in a different position, but we shall shortly see that this critical theory cannot be supported either.¹ A division into discrepant sources can of course be effected by the process of tearing the Pentateuch up and dividing the shreds between documents, redactors, and redactors of redactors; but this applies equally to any narrative in the world. On the other hand we are bound to point out that the statements of Messrs. Carpenter and Gray on the topics involved are marked by a recklessness and an inaccuracy which may doubtless be paralleled with supreme ease from almost any publication of the Wellhausen school, but are elsewhere not common in literature that professes to be scholarly.

THE GLORY.

This is so closely related to the cloud that we take it next. Dr. Gray writes thus on page 154 of his commentary on Num-

¹ On the other hand, it will be argued that before Sinai there was a tent of meeting which was frequently placed outside the camp, and that it is to this period that Exodus xxxiii. 7-11 relates.

bers: "According to P, *the glory of the Lord* was a fiery appearance manifesting the divine presence. . . . P's conception of the glory of the LORD is markedly different from that of other Hexateuchal sources." On page 158, in reference to xiv. 21 (redactor of JE), he adds: "Here and in the next verse, *the glory of the Lord* is the revelation of His character and power in history." Yet something very like the latter conception occurs in P also. In Exodus xxix. 43 (P) the Hebrew has: "And it [Greek and Syriac "I"] shall be sanctified by my glory." This can hardly be the fiery appearance.¹ On the other hand, in Exodus xxxiii. 18, 22 (secondary stratum of J) it cannot be claimed that the glory is a "revelation of God's character and power in history." This contention, therefore, goes the way of Dr. Gray's other assertions.

We pass to a more important matter.

THE POSITION OF THE ARK.

Mr. Carpenter has slightly modified the language of one of his observations on this topic in the "Composition of the Hexateuch" (1902), which is a second edition of Volume I. of his Hexateuch. We therefore quote the later work. The passages we have to examine are three in number.

(1) Of J:—"The ark is mentioned Num x 33, and appears (contrary to E's view of the sanctuary chap xii §2e) to have been habitually guarded in the centre of the camp Num xiv 44." (Composition, p. 183.)

(2) Of E:—"The Mosaic sanctuary, however, is of a different order. It is a tent, fit for the conditions of nomad life in the desert, pitched outside the camp xxxiii 7 ff, bearing the name of the Tent

¹ We think the same applies to Exodus xvi. 7. The glory of the LORD is there manifested in the morning by the manna. Perhaps verses 9-12 should stand before 6-8. In that case they would owe their present position to the misunderstanding of somebody who confused the "glory" of verse 7 with the fiery "glory" of verse 10, and therefore thought that verse 7 was a prediction of the occurrence related in verse 10.

of Meeting. . . . It was no doubt intended to enshrine the ark, which in its turn held the sacred stones." (Composition, p. 209—Hexateuch, vol. 1. p. 114. This is the passage referred to in the last extract as chap xii §2 e.)

(3) "The Tent of Meeting is still outside long after the camp order has been established Num xi 24-30 xii 4. It is in harmony with this representation of the isolation of the sanctuary that the ark does not travel in the midst of the tribes, but in front of them x 33." (Composition, p. 49—Hexateuch, vol. 1. p. 30.)

Now unfortunately Numbers x. 33 belongs to J, who, according to extract (1), represented the ark as being "habitually guarded in the centre of the camp." Therefore its position on the march is no criterion of its position in camp.

In treating of the position of the Ark we take its position on the march first. In the Pentateuch there are two passages in J. The first is Numbers x. 33: "The ark went before them three days' journey, to seek out a resting place for them." The second is the passage (verses 35 f.) where we are told what Moses said when it set forward and when it rested. Most modern commentators think—no doubt rightly—that the words "three days' journey" (in the second part of x. 33) are due to dittography, and should be expelled from the text. This is borne out by the second passage, as Moses would not have been in a position to say anything if the Ark had been three days' journey distant. Then reading 34 ff. continuously it becomes clear that the Ark led the way with the cloud over it. It is alleged by Dr. Gray (Numbers, p. 93) that in verse 21 (P) "the ark is carried in the midst of the people," but his reference does not support his statement, particularly as he insists that in that verse *מקדש* cannot mean "sanctuary," but must be rendered "holy things." Certainly any fair reader finding the statement "And the Kohathites set forward, bearing the holy things and the ark went before them to seek out a resting place for them," would not infer an incon-

sistency. He might hold that the ark was not here included in the expression "holy things," or he might infer that this position of the ark was abnormal, and intended only for the three days' journey. And he would be strengthened in this view by a further fact, a fact that even a whole army of indefatigable redactors could not eliminate. Perhaps, after what we have seen of the higher critical methods, some readers may feel tempted to ask whether there is anything for which one or more redactors cannot be held responsible. We think there is; for it happens that the whole book of Joshua has slipped from the minds of Messrs. Carpenter and Gray! We turn to Joshua iii. f. Omitting a few harmonists and glossators, this narrative is adroitly divided between J, E, a Deuteronomic reviser and a late priestly stratum; and, alack-a-day! all these four separate individuals treat of the Ark in precisely the same manner. And none of these sources—not even P^s, who ought surely to support our critics in a matter of this kind—knows anything of Dr. Gray's position for the Ark. After this it is scarcely necessary to add that Joshua vi. has also been neglected by our commentators, but it too shows clearly that the Ark (which was a portable object) was not always or necessarily in the same position, even in JE.

It is therefore quite impossible to manufacture any discrepancy between the various sources with regard to the position of the Ark on the march.

We turn to its position in the camp. It appears from the passages cited by Mr. Carpenter, and also Joshua vii. 6, that J locates the ark in the camp. So does P (Ex. xl. 20 ff.). And E? Except on the march he is never permitted to mention the ark at all, either in the Pentateuch or Joshua. The only "evidence" that in his view the ark was kept outside the camp is the fact that when Moses (in Ex. xxxiii.) pitched the Tent

there *before the ark had come into existence*, he did not take the ark with him. And indeed the Hebrew text of the passage expressly states that Moses pitched the Tent for himself (not for the ark). Probably that is why Mr. Carpenter writes that the Tent pitched outside "was no doubt intended to enshrine the ark." We have observed that a really good higher critic who has no evidence for what he wishes to believe habitually asserts that it was "doubtless" so, or "must have been" so, or uses some other similar phrase to supply the lack of evidence. But as E in Joshua represents the ark as being under the charge of priests (not of Moses or his minister), it is clear that he did not conceive of Moses as taking the non-existent ark outside the camp with him. It therefore appears that here again the critical case breaks down hopelessly under examination.

THE TENT OF MEETING.

Mr. Carpenter's case on this is stated as follows:—

"In Ex xxxiii 7 ff Num xl 24 ff xli 4 ff the Tent of Meeting is pitched outside the camp. The first of these passages assumes the existence of the tent and describes the sacred usage connected with it: the others supply incidental confirmation by depicting incidents which happened at its door. With these conceptions Dt xxxi 14 f is in harmony. It is a singular circumstance that (in the present text) the first mention of the place of this Tent Ex xxxiii 7 ff represents it as in actual use before it was made. It is a part of the sanctuary which is to be constructed xxvii 21 xxviii 43 xxix 4 ff xxx 16 ff xxxi 7; but its preparation is not begun till after the second sojourn of Moses on the Mount xxxiv, its erection being solemnly completed xl 2-23. Must it not be admitted that the two long corresponding sections xxv-xxx and xxxv-xl together with Num li-iii present an account which is entirely independent of the story in Ex xxxiii 7 ff and inconsistent with it?" (Vol. i. pp. 51-52.)

Professor Van Hoonacker, a great and singularly acute scholar, has suggested a series of transpositions on page 146 of his "Sacerdoce lévitique," with a view to removing the diffi-

culty. On testing his theory we found it unworkable; but, out of respect for him, we begin by setting it out, together with the facts that disprove it. In the first column of the following table we give the order suggested by the Professor, in the second the indications of the places at which the various incidents occurred, and in the third the parallel data of Numbers xxxiii. It will be seen that columns 2 and 3 disprove column 1.

PROF. VAN HOONACKER'S PROPOSED ORDER.	INDICATIONS OF PLACE IN THE PASSAGES NAMED.	DATA OF NUM. XXXIII.
Ex xv	ver 27 people come to Elim and encamp there	Num xxxiii ver 9 reach Elim
Ex xxxiii 7-11	No indication of place except what may be gleaned from the Tent and its position	ver 10 Red Sea
Ex xvi 1	The people leave Elim and come to the wilderness of Sin between Elim and Sinai	ver 11 wilderness of Sin ver 12 Dophkah
Num xi 1-32 (less 6b-9 assigned to a redactor)	Taberah (ver 3)	ver 13 Alush
Num xii	Apparently the scene is Hazeroth which the people leave (ver 16) for the wilderness of Paran	
Ex xvii and further (unspecified) narratives leading to	ver 1. The Israelites leave the wilderness of Sin and pitch in Rephidim: 6 Horeb mentioned: 7 the place called Massah and Meribah	ver 14 Rephidim no water to drink ver 15 wilderness of Sinai
Num x	ver 12 leave the wilderness of Sinai for the wilderness of Paran: verse 33	

PROF. VAN HOONACKER'S PROPOSED ORDER.	INDICATIONS OF PLACE IN THE PASSAGES NAMED.	DATE OF NUM. XXXIII
	set forward from the Mount of the LORD, three days' journey	
Ex xvi 2-36	No place named, but (ver 11) the cloud is not in the centre of the camp (see <i>supra</i> on the cloud)	
Num xi 33-4	The place called Kibroth-hattaavah	ver 16 Kibroth-hattaavah
Num xiii ff	ver 3 wilderness of Paran	ver 17 Hazeroth

Numbers xi. 35 appears to be left out of the scheme altogether.

Now apart from the unsatisfactory treatment of this verse and Numbers xi. 6b-9 (assigned to a redactor), it is evident that the scheme breaks down through the impossible order of the places. Stated continuously they are as follows: Elim, wilderness of Sin, Taberah, Hazeroth, wilderness of Paran, then suddenly the Israelites leave the wilderness of Sin for Rephidim. Next they leave the wilderness of Sinai and set out for the wilderness of Paran, then the cloud is not in the center of the camp (pointing to pre-Sinaitic days), then Kibroth-hattaavah, and lastly Paran. And if the order proposed breaks down for internal reasons, it is also difficult to reconcile with the external testimony of Numbers xxxiii. We are, therefore, justified in looking for the solution elsewhere. But it is highly characteristic of the stimulating quality of Professor Van Hoonacker's work that the view which we have to propound grew out of a train of thought which was originally suggested to us by the very note in which the above transpositions are put forward: and we desire to acknowledge the bene-

fit we have derived from his work in this as in other instances.¹

In dealing with this question, it is important that we should understand exactly what the case is that we have to meet. It is said that in E the tent is outside the camp, but in P (and probably J) it is in the center of the camp. Bound up with this are statements that in E Joshua is the custodian of the sanctuary, that E (in contrast to J and P) locates the Ark outside the camp, that the cloud is in a different position, and so on. We have already disposed of all these subsidiary allegations, and are therefore free to consider the main proposition in all its nakedness. Is it the case that E represents that Tent which elsewhere stands in the center of the camp as being pitched outside it?

We begin by eliminating Deuteronomy xxxi. 14 f. (E), which, according to Mr. Carpenter, is "in harmony with" the representation attributed to E. If that passage be examined,

¹ We wish, however, to add a few remarks on one or two other points.

(a) As to the Taberah incident. Professor Van Hoonacker here relies on Deuteronomy ix. 22, where Taberah, Massah, Kibroth-hattaavah, are mentioned in the order named. It may be questioned whether this is sufficient evidence to warrant a transposition at all. If it be, perhaps the Deuteronomy names are in the wrong order, not the Numbers narratives. Assuming, however, that Deuteronomy be held to evidence derangement in the latter, we think the transposition should affect only xl. 1-13. The episode of the quails in this chapter stands in intimate relation with the name Kibroth-hattaavah (ver. 33), which the Deuteronomy verse dissociates from Taberah. Hence the very passage which is advanced for the transposition of verses 1-3 affords an argument for retaining the present position of verses 4-35. (b) As to the seventy elders: Professor Van Hoonacker thinks that Exodus xxiv. 1 assumes the narrative of Numbers xl. 16 ff. We cannot agree. Indeed, we think that if, at the time Moses ascended the mountain, seventy elders had already been invested with a portion of his spirit, the arrangement by which Aaron and Hur were intrusted with judicial business would probably have been unnecessary, or at any rate would have utilized the seventy in some way. In Exodus the elders are present to rep-

it will be observed that it contains nothing in any way suggestive of a position outside the camp. We have already pointed out that it is not "in harmony with" a theory making Joshua the permanent resident attendant of the Tent: and there is not a syllable in the passage that is decisive of the location of the Tent. That may therefore be left out of consideration.

Turning now to Exodus xxxiii. 7, we read that "Moses used to take *the* Tent [Greek and Syriac, *his* tent] and pitch it for himself [Greek omits "for himself"] without the camp, afar off from the camp; and he called it, The Tent of Meeting." Now in Hebrew this can mean that Moses used to take *a* tent (cp. Deut. xv. 17; and see Strack on this passage, or Driver on 1 Sam. xix. 13). From the latter note the following may be cited: "The garment [i.e. in 1 Sam. xiv. 13, where the Hebrew and R.V. have "the," A.V. "a"], the cord [i.e. in Josh. ii. 15, Heb. "the," A.V. and R.V. "a"], the pots [i.e. 2 Kings x. 7, Heb. "the," A.V. and R.V. "in baskets"] are each not resent the people—nothing more: in Numbers they are chosen to assist Moses in dealing with the people, though it is true that their business was not chiefly judicial. (c) As to the manna: Numbers xl. 4 ff. is much more vivid and natural if the people had been on the manna diet for a considerable time than if the narrative be placed at the beginning of the wanderings. Moreover, the people have no obvious means of subsistence till after Sinai in this arrangement of the text. (d) As to the quails: Attention should be drawn to the dates. We shall discuss these more fully when we consider this chapter of Numbers. For the moment we note the following facts: The first flight of quails occurred on or soon after the fifteenth day of the second month of the first year (Ex. xvi. 1). The second flight must have been at the same season of the year, for the Israelites left Sinai on the twentieth of the second month of the second year (x. 11), and appear to have arrived at Kibroth-hattaavah a few days later. The details of the Mosaic calendar are, of course, unknown to us: but it is reasonably clear that in both narratives the same season is contemplated, and as the Exodus fell in the early spring it is reasonably clear (*pace* Dr. Gray), that "in the original source this story was referred to the spring season." (See, further, Gray, Numbers, pp. 117 f.)

determined by some antecedent reference or allusion, but are fixed in the writer's mind, and defined by the article, by *the purpose to which it is, or is to be, put.*" Dr. Driver then cites various examples, including Numbers xxi. 9 on "a [Heb and R.V. "the"] pole"; Judges vii. 13 "a [Heb and R.V. "the"] tent." Finally, he adds that "a difference between Hebrew and English idiom must here be recognized."

Once this rendering comes into view, it becomes evident that the difference of reading between the Greek and the Hebrew does not cover any important difference of meaning. Whether Moses took *his* tent, or whether he took *a* tent and pitched it *for himself*, does not matter much from the point of view of the sense conveyed. As at present advised we prefer the Hebrew text, but either will serve equally well. Neither in any way suggests the Dwelling, which had not yet been constructed. And on any view of the passage it is extraordinarily improbable that Moses should take the Tent that sheltered the ark and pitch it (without the ark) *for himself*, leaving the ark bared and unguarded, which is the only case the critics can set up on the Hebrew text.

To this Tent those who wished to seek the LORD used to repair: and at this stage it becomes necessary to consider another passage of E, which contains a similar representation, but with important differences. Exodus xviii. narrates certain incidents that happened before Moses left Sinai. It is not at present in its proper position chronologically. We learn (ver. 5) that Jethro came unto Moses into the wilderness, where he was encamped at the mount of God (cp. xix. 2), and Deuteronomy i. 6-19 appears to support this. Mr. Carpenter places it "among the last of the Horeb scenes," and verse 16 would certainly fit in well enough as a statement made after the Sinaitic covenant. Moreover, Numbers xii. 1 becomes much more

intelligible if the Cushite woman had only recently arrived in the camp, as would be the case if Jethro's visit fell shortly before the departure from Horeb,¹ and the language of Deuteronomy i. suits this date. Now it is noticeable that in this narrative, referring apparently to a later time than the events recorded in Exodus xxxiii., Moses does not sit in a tent outside the camp. The differences are striking. In Exodus xxxiii. 7, Moses goes out to the Tent: in Exodus xviii. 13 he sits to judge the people. In Exodus xxxiii. 8 ff. all the people rise and stand at the doors of their tents, looking after Moses. When they see the cloud standing at the door of the tent, they worship. In xviii. 13b, 14, they stand about Moses from the morning unto the evening. It will be observed that both passages alike belong to E, and both narrate the practice whereby the people consulted the Divine through Moses. It would appear, therefore, that in the interval separating the events re-

¹Both Mr. Carpenter and Dr. Gray regard the words "for he had married a Cushite woman" as a gloss. With this view we heartily concur. Our present Pentateuch contains *variorum* notes: and we think that, after the existence of the North Arabian Cush had been completely forgotten, some reader who thought Cushite meant Ethiopian added these words as an explanatory note. It is interesting to note how the narrative gains in vividness when the words are removed. Dr. Gray (Numbers, p. 121) writes: "In its present position, it is true, the clause itself, apart from any particular interpretation of Cushite, reasonably implies that the marriage was recent." We would substitute the word "grievance" for "marriage"; and we think that with this alteration the point is well taken. Although the marriage was not recent, Zipporah's presence in the camp and her contact with Miriam and Aaron could then have been of no long duration if she had only arrived shortly before the departure from Sinai. The language used, "the Cushite woman" instead of her name, faithfully reflects the method by which Miriam and Aaron sought to arouse prejudice against her, for union with Midianitish women was perfectly legal in the Mosaic age (Num. xxxi. 18; Deut. xxi. 10-14, etc.) for all Israelites except the high priest (Lev. xxi. 14). Unhappily it has always been only too easy to rouse the feeling of any people against foreigners.

corded the practice had changed. The reason is not far to seek. The sanctuary had been erected, and Moses sat at the door of what had now become the Tent of Meeting, where he could commune with God (Ex. xxv. 22) should need arise (Num. vii. 89; Lev. xxiv. 12; Num. xxvii. 2 and 5 (all P)). Thus the position of Moses when sitting as a judge in E supports and in turn is supported by the statements of P. The tent which figures as the Tent of Meeting in Exodus xxxiii. was disused after the erection of the sanctuary in accordance with the instructions of Exodus xxv., and the very document which tells of the location of this earlier Tent outside the camp plainly shows us that the business which had once been transacted in it was dealt with at a later date in a more central position.

It only remains to consider Numbers xi. and xii., where it is said that the Tent once more stands without the camp. We begin with the latter of these two chapters, as in this way we can use the involuntary assistance of Dr. Gray in destroying the theory he so firmly believes. On verse 5 he writes as follows (p. 124) :—

“The Lord descends in the pillar of cloud, and stands at the door of the tent. He then summons Miriam and Aaron, and they both step forward, viz., from the position which they had taken up together with Moses. Certainly this gives the verb *וַיִּקְרָא* a sense different from that in which it is used in verse 4, and in itself unusual (yet cp. Zech. v 5). Dillmann explains the verb in both cases of going out from the camp, regarding verse 4 (J) and verse 5 (E) as doublets. But (1) it is not in accordance with E's representation elsewhere that the theophanic cloud should appear, and wait for people to come out from the camp; the persons summoned to or seeking God await His appearance, not He theirs; see Ex. xxxiii 7-11, Num. xi 16 f. 24 f. (2) Verse 4 by its reference to the tent, no less than verse 5 by its reference to the cloud, seems to belong to E.”

Dr. Gray's argument that the persons summoned to, or seeking, God await His appearance appears to us unanswerable,

and his reference to Zechariah v. 5 is apt. This fixes the sense of the verb in verse 5. But if the word has this meaning in verse 5, it follows of necessity that in verse 4 it need not mean anything more than stepping forward from the encampment of Moses and Aaron east of the Tent (Num. iii. 38) to the Tent itself. It is true that in verse 10 the R.V. translates: "And the cloud moved *from over* the Tent," and this might be thought to conflict with P; but Messrs. Carpenter and Gray are both careful to insist that this meaning is here unsuitable, and Dr. Gray renders "from beside the Tent," citing xvi. 26, 27, and other passages. It must be remembered that the language of Numbers xvi. 42 (Heb. xvii. 7) certainly implies that the cloud did not always actually touch the Tent in P. It was always over it, but the height may have varied. This is also in harmony with Leviticus xvi. 2.

We return now to chapter xi. The case here rests on verses 26, 27, and 30, and turns on two points: (1) the phrase "gone out" in verse 26, and (2) the opposition between the Tent and the camp in all three verses. The first point has already been disposed of, the verb used being the same as in xii. 4, 5. With regard to the antithesis of camp and Tent this reappears in P. In Numbers ii. 17 the R.V. has "the tent of meeting shall set forward, with the camp of the Levites in the midst of the camps." Unfortunately, as Dr. Gray (*ad. loc.*) remarks, this does not translate the Hebrew, which means "the tent of meeting, the camp of the Levites." Dr. Gray speaks of the awkwardness of this, and we think it probable that the true text is preserved by the Greek, which has "and the camp," etc. This only means the addition of the single letter ם to the Hebrew, and gives a far superior reading. But even if this be incorrect, the antithesis between the Tent and the camps comes out clearly in the latter part of the verse.

For these reasons we can see no ground for supposing that chapter xi. locates the Tent elsewhere than in the center of the camp. Professor Green's language may be adopted:—

“It is claimed that in the conception of these passages the Tabernacle was located altogether outside of the camp, contrary to ch 11 which places it in the centre of the host. But this is an unwarranted inference from expressions which readily admit a different interpretation, and one in harmony with the uniform representation of all other passages relating to the subject. The camp was a vast hollow square with the Tabernacle in the centre and the tribes arranged about it, leaving of course a respectful distance between the house of God and the tents of men. In approaching the Sanctuary it was necessary to go out from the place occupied by the tents and traverse the open space which intervened between them and the Tabernacle.” (Hebraica, vol. viii. p. 183.)

Once this is grasped, it is clear why xii. 5 speaks of God's coming down in the cloud, i.e. the cloud which from the erection of the Dwelling onwards normally stood above the Tabernacle in the center of the camp: and the last shred of justification for the theory that the various sources contain divergent representations of the cloud finally disappears.

We have now disposed of some of the most formidable arguments for the higher critical partition: and this discussion will tend to shorten our treatment of many of the later chapters.

THE ANALYSIS OF THE NARRATIVE EXODUS XIII.—NUMBERS XI.

We return to the crossing of the Red Sea.

Mr. Carpenter raises one or two points of textual criticism which do not fall within the scope of these essays. His other notes on Exodus xiv. really put forward nothing that is worthy of discussion. Thus, on verses 10b, 11 (“and the children of Israel cried out unto the LORD, and they said unto Moses”), he writes: “In J the Israelites expostulate with Moses; with 11 cp xvii 3 Num xiv 3 Ex v 15. According to Josh xxiv 7 they cried to the LORD; this prayer, therefore, is assigned to

E." The "therefore" is certainly noticeable as an epitome of higher critical logic, but it would be mere waste of time to discuss such arguments.

Exodus xv. contains the song of Moses. It falls outside the main narrative, and will therefore be passed over here.

Exodus xvi. need not now detain us long. Mr. Carpenter makes two main points: first, that in 6 f. Moses and Aaron announce to the people what is not communicated to Moses till 11 f.; and, secondly, that the song implies the existence of the Dwelling. We have already suggested a transposition which meets the first point, and we have shown the baselessness of the second. Mr. Carpenter further asserts that verses 4 and 11 f. "can hardly be from the same writer." We confess that we fail to see why. He makes a more substantial point when he says that the intention to prove the Israelites in verse 4 fits in with xv. 25b. Certainly chapter xv. has no record of any proof of the Israelites, and it is therefore possible that 25b, 26 have accidentally suffered displacement, and really belong to chapter xvi. In that case they would follow verse 30. And this leads us to speak of one of the quaintest of the higher critical vagaries. It is tolerably obvious that verse 31 (And the children of Israel called the name thereof Manna (Heb. *man*)) is closely connected with verse 15 (they said one to another, What (Heb. *man*) is it), but Mr. Carpenter holds that this portion of verse 15 contains a trace of E, and assigns it to a later priestly editor, while giving its sequel (31) to the main body of P, which of course is earlier than the editor! It may be a question whether verse 31 did not originally stand immediately after "for they wist not what it was" in verse 15. Indeed that alteration of place could easily be accounted for by a very common MS. error, the copyist's eye having possibly slipped from the "and Moses said" in verse

15 to the same phrase in verse 32, and the omitted passage (15b-30) having then been written in first in the margin and subsequently (on recopying) one verse too soon.

In verse 32 the Septuagint actually reads "of manna" where the Hebrew has "of it": and this involves no change in the consonantal text as originally written, for the *matres lectionis* and the distinct forms for the final letters are of course comparatively recent: and this reading would remove any awkwardness resulting from the removal of verse 31 to the earlier position. It is curious that Mr. Carpenter, while remarking (note on 22) that verse 31 "is not the proper sequel of 30," did not also add that it is the proper sequel of 15a.

Passing to Exodus xvii., we are speedily confronted with some delicious higher critical reasoning. Doublets—by which the higher critics mean two similar narratives—are regarded as proving diversity of source. At present the Pentateuch contains two narratives in which Moses draws water from a rock, Exodus xvii. and Numbers xx. The critics hold it impossible that any author should have told two such stories, and therefore proceed to apply their curious methods. The result is startling. In place of one author who writes two such narratives, we double the number and get two (J and E). "J's traditions," writes Mr. Carpenter (vol. ii. p. 107), "attached parallel incidents to two names, Massah and Meribah. E appears also to have contained explanations of both designations." In addition, P had a Meribah story.¹ So that we reach the result that when the higher critics desire to divide two by two, their arithmetical labors lead them to believe that the quotient is five!² Truly a wondrous cure for the Pentateuchal doublets!

¹ Perhaps, also a Rephidim story (Num. xxxiii. 14) unless this be based by P^s on the combined Pentateuch.

² Or perhaps six, if P had a Rephidim story.

It seems unnecessary to follow the details of the reasoning by which the perfectly straightforward narrative of verses 1-7 is reduced to a chaotic collection of unintelligible fragments. All the difficulties that the higher critics experience here are of their own making, and find no support in the undivided text. Mr. Carpenter, however, takes "Horeb," in verse 6, as proving that "the story has been placed too soon . . . for Israel has not yet reached the sacred mountain." But this is due to a misunderstanding. Verses 5 and 6 represent Israel as not yet having reached Horeb. On the contrary, Moses is to pass on to Horeb before the people, and God will stand before him there (*not* here). No doubt the water would issue from the rock at Horeb into a channel which would bring it to the people at Rephidim.

Mr. Carpenter holds the fight with Amalek in verses 8-16 to be misplaced. "Joshua enters in 9 without introduction as though he were well known: he is already the tried captain on whom devolves the choice of men for military enterprise. Yet in xxxiii 11 he is formally described, apparently for the first time, and he is then still 'a young man.'" (Vol. ii. p. 107.) "Tried captain" is an imaginative touch, and in the critical scheme the same source that describes him "apparently for the first time" in xxxiii. is permitted to refer to him for a couple of ante-first times in xxiv. 13; xxxii. 17. It is not obvious why Mr. Carpenter should be surprised at a young man's being still a young man after the lapse of a few weeks. If he is astonished at a young man's being intrusted with a large command, he need only think of the ages of the great captains of the world, Alexander, Hannibal, Napoleon, etc. Nor is it clear why Moses—who was eighty when the Exodus took place—should be spoken of as "no longer able himself to sustain his hand outstretched with the rod." Let Mr. Carpenter experiment

with a rod, and see whether he finds it easy himself to sustain his hand outstretched with a rod for a number of hours. To speak of the location of Amalek elsewhere near Kadesh as an obstacle is to ignore the whole drift of the narrative. "Then [Heb. and] *came* Amalek," i.e. unnecessarily and gratuitously, to attack the Israelites: and the reference in Deuteronomy xxv. 17 f. certainly appears to confirm the early dating of this episode. There is, therefore, no ground for holding that "the identification of the incident with Rephidim (8) is editorial."

Exodus xviii. calls for no further comment. We have already recognized that it is not in place at present. Mr. Carpenter thinks that "J"'s narrative may have stood before Numbers x. 29 originally, and we think this would be a very suitable place for the whole chapter.

On the other hand, Exodus xxxiii. 7-11 appears to be out of place in its present position. (1) It clearly has no connection with the narrative which at present surrounds it. (2) Exodus xxiv. 14, providing for the interim transaction of judicial business by Aaron and Hur during the absence of Moses and Joshua, appears to refer to some such arrangement as that here described being already in full swing. (3) It would be very suitable to the introduction of Joshua, in which case it must precede Exodus xvii. If it be placed after Exodus xiii. 22, it will be found that all difficulties disappear, and the constant practice of Moses in going outside the camp and speaking to the cloud attaches naturally to the description of the cloud in the preceding verse. Let the notices relating to (a) Joshua, (b) the seat of judgment, (c) the cloud, (d) the judges, (e) the Tent of Meeting (including Ex. xxv. 22), be read continuously as suggested, with Exodus xxxiii. 7-11 after xiii. 22 and Exodus xviii. before Numbers x. 29, and it will be seen that the narrative gains in intelligibility.

Chapter xix. is cut up in the usual fashion, but no discrepancies are alleged, save one, which depends on the state of the text. Verse 25 ends abruptly with the words "said unto them," leaving in doubt what Moses did say. Obviously something has here fallen out, and no doubt the missing passage contained the sequel to verse 24 (Moses and Aaron to come up) as well as the speech to the people. The "coming up" cannot have been to the summit, for xx. 19 excludes this: but presumably Moses and Aaron came within the barrier. The rest of the analysis of the chapter is effected by the usual methods. At this stage it is unnecessary to weary our readers with any detailed examination of them.

Nothing of moment is urged against chapter xxiv., and we come to xxxii., where the narrative is resumed.

The first point of importance is raised on verses 25-29. Mr. Carpenter thinks that in 29 "the tribe of Levi is apparently consecrated as the sacred tribe . . . this is altogether different from the programme of P in xxviii." (Vol. ii. p. 131, note on Ex. xxxiii. 25a.) His inference as to the meaning of 29 is, we think, erroneous. It is not suggested in the text that the priesthood was conferred on the tribe as the result of its zeal. If this were the meaning, a ready parallel could be found in Numbers xxv. 10-13 (P); but the difficulty really only arises from a misreading of the passage. The rest of Mr. Carpenter's note clearly betrays the perplexity in which his critical principles have here involved him. But he makes one further remark which should be noted. He thinks that verse 35 refers to some further punishment of the people. It appears to us that verses 30-34 are out of place, and that verse 35 should follow verse 29. Thus it does not seem to us to refer to any new punishment.

We have already suggested that xxxiii. 7-11 should be re-

moved to an earlier position in the narrative. We would point out that xxxiii. 30-34 would follow xxxiii. 6 quite suitably, "bring up this people," in verse 12a, following conveniently on xxxii. 34, but the rest of the chapter contains difficulties that are still unsolved, and indeed appear to indicate textual corruption. Mr. Carpenter writes as follows:—

"The expostulation of Moses in this passage seems directly connected with the command in 1-3. But it may be doubted whether the materials of 12-23 are now arranged in their proper order. The words quoted in 12 'Yet thou hast said' etc. are not uttered till 17: either, therefore, 17 once stood before 12, or, if 17 is in its place, some other divine utterance must have preceded 12. The latter is the view of Bacon who unites 3 with 12 by means of Num xi 10b-15 and a conjectural passage containing the required phrase (it must be remembered that before the union of JE with P Ex xxxiii-xxxiv 28 was followed immediately by Num x 29-xii). Another suggestion is that of Kautzsch who proposes to translate 14 as a question, 'Shall (or must) my presence go with thee, and must I give thee rest?' while Dillmann regards 14-16 as the sequel of xxxiv 6-9, a suggestion which has the support of Driver. The difficulty may be partially met by a simple re-arrangement of the verses; if 17 be transferred as the antecedent of 12, the prayer of Moses 13 'Make me to *know* thy way' is answered by the promise 'My presence shall go with thee.' Of this (16) Moses desires immediate assurance which the Lord grants with the announcement (19) that he will make his goodness pass before him. But Moses, still urgent, prays that the Lord will enable him to *see* his glory, his very self (18). The prayer cannot be satisfied (20), 'Thou canst not *see* my face' (the 'presence' of 15): but in the cleft of the rock he shall behold his back as the Lord passes by 21-23. The more natural order would seem to be 17, 12-16, 19, 18, 20-23 leading directly to xxxiv 6-9." (Vol. ii. p. 133, on 12a.)

But Mr. Carpenter's proposed order is also open to objection, for 17 says, "I will do this thing *also that thou hast spoken*" and must therefore be preceded by some intercession of Moses which is wanting in the scheme suggested. Moreover, verse 15 f. should apparently come before verse 14. On the whole, it seems best to suppose that the phrases in verse 12 do not refer to anything in our present Pentateuch, but em-

body an appeal which either has some hidden meaning, or else refers to something of which we have no record.

We conclude this essay by considering the points raised on Numbers xi. 4-34.

We take first the question of the doublets. We have seen that when the higher critics wish to deny the unity of the narrative they rely on duplicate narratives—a feature which they profess to be able to remove. Then they perform their arithmetical operations, and triumphantly produce a larger number of duplicates as the solution of the problem. We witnessed the process in the case of Massah and Meribah, and it may be seen again in the case of the manna. Numbers xi. 4-6 clearly implies that the Israelites had been on the manna diet for a long time and were heartily tired of it. Accordingly it becomes necessary to postulate an earlier reference to manna in JE to make up for the loss of Exodus xvi., most of which has gone to P. If with Mr. Carpenter Exodus xvi. 4 be given to E while the present passage is assigned to J, we shall have at least four manna stories, viz. J two (Num. xi. and its antecedent in the same document); E one (Ex. xvi. 4 and its original context); P one (Ex. xvi., except verse 4). Moreover, E and P inserted their manna stories at precisely the same point in the narrative, and J's first manna story, being long before Kibroth-hattaavah, must also have come soon after the Exodus. Such are the results of "Critical" analysis!

With regard to the quails the matter is different. It is true that once before the people had had quails, but in Exodus xvi. they play a very subsidiary part, whereas, on this occasion, the flight lasted a whole month. The dates raise some presumption that there really were two flights of quails. The Exodus occurred in the early spring, and the first flight of quails took place on or about the fifteenth day of the second month. They

left Sinai on the twentieth day of the corresponding month of the next year. If, as many think, their year at this time was a lunar year, the solar anniversary of the fifteenth day would fall on the twenty-fifth day of the second month. After the departure on the twentieth day they set forward three days' journey. The season of the year was, therefore, as nearly as possible the same as that of the first flight of quails. The difference in the duration of the two flights may perhaps be due to the altered position of the Israelites or to some temporary circumstances that were peculiar to one or other of the particular years: certainly it explains the surprise of Moses in verses 21 f. If the desert of the wanderings lay near the ordinary route of the quails in their annual northward flight, nothing is more probable than that the Israelites did in fact benefit annually, though after the first two years the incident may not have called for special notice. The annual recurrence of a phenomenon that is well known to happen every year cannot reasonably be regarded as a ground for denying the same authorship to the accounts relating to different years.

From what the critics will not believe we pass to what they will. Mr. Carpenter's note on 10b runs as follows:—

"The expostulation of Moses 10b-12, 15 does not seem in harmony with the cause implied in the context. His 'displeasure' is plainly directed, not like the anger of the LORD against the people, but against the LORD himself. The language of 12 suggests that he repudiates a responsibility which really lies upon the God of Israel. But that responsibility has not here been thrown upon him, except by remote implication. On the other hand it is formally laid on him in Ex xxxiii 1, 12. Now in the original document of JE the Horeb section Ex xxxii-xxxiv immediately preceded the departure in Num x 29 ff, and stood consequently in near proximity to the manna scene. Bacon accordingly conjectures that this passage once stood after Ex xxxiii 3 and before xxxiii 12. In the combination of J and E these verses were displaced by the insertion of the account of the Tent of Meeting, and were woven into the nearest appropriate situation, where (on this view) they have dislocated the connexion of 13 with 4-10a."

In plain English this means that an imbecile (called a redactor) found certain narratives, chopped them up into sections of unequal length, and subsequently put them together in a different order without regard to their sense. "The insertion of the account of the Tent of Meeting" in a place where it produces endless confusion and the "weaving" of these verses into their present position are among the results of this remarkable procedure. On the whole the theory affords striking illustration of the boundless credulity of the higher critics.

The fact is that these writers have not the slightest understanding of human nature. Consequently they will believe anything except that there is a deal of human nature in man; and it is to be feared that for this reason this chapter must always remain unintelligible to them. But this does not exempt us from the duty of explaining it.

Attention must be given to two points, the feelings of the people and the feelings of Moses. The Israelites had been supported mainly on manna for more than a year. Of course there had been the first flight of quails, and no doubt there were occasional slaughterings of animals belonging to their flocks and herds, but the staple and continuous diet had been manna. That it had grown monotonous and nauseating was an inevitable result, and so far the complaint of the people was entirely reasonable and was probably viewed by Moses with some sympathy. But as frequently happens, a reasonable grievance led to conduct that may more easily be understood than justified. The people used language that savored of doubt of the Divine power and more than savored of ingratitude and infidelity. As a natural result their complaints produced in their leader a feeling of despondency from which no man could have been exempt in similar circumstances. In his

discouragement he felt the task that had been set him too much for his strength and he took the profoundly human course of blaming Him who had laid the burden upon him.

Again in human affairs the proximate or immediate cause of any action frequently differs from and conceals a motive which, though really efficient, appears more remote. It is the last straw that breaks the camel's back. This principle finds illustration in the complaint "I am not able to bear all this people alone, because it is too heavy for me." It would probably be wrong to regard these words as the expression of a feeling experienced for the first time on this occasion. Rather should we see in them the final utterance of a sentiment which had grown in strength with each successive incident. "Ye have been rebellious against the LORD from the day that I knew you" (Deut. ix. 24). And the rebelliousness would be felt the more keenly at each successive episode—especially after the great events at Sinai. Hence the complaint and prayer of verses 14 and 15. Hence, too, the appointment of the seventy elders in verses 16 f., 24–30, in direct reply (verse 17 *ad fin.*) to the prayer of 14 f.

It would be impossible to frame a narrative which would be truer to human nature—and therefore less in accordance with the standards of the higher critics—than that contained in these verses.

It need scarcely be said that the critics wrench 16 f., 24b–30, from the context, claiming that a fatuous redactor, finding two utterly unrelated stories, tore them in shreds and then made a chess-board pattern out of the fragments. Mr. Carpenter, on the ground of the alleged position of the Tent of Meeting, the appearance of Joshua and the "prophetic conceptions," wishes to give these verses to E; but, as Exodus xviii. has already been assigned to that source, he is in a difficulty. Therefore to

quote his own expression: "By the side of the secular judges over the 'small matters,' the coadjutor-prophets must be assigned to E^s." It is a pity that Mr. Carpenter did not succeed in carrying his discrimination between a judge and a prophet a little further, and recognize that the relief here sought by Moses has little or nothing to do with the transaction of judicial business. An excellent example of the activity of these elders is to be found in Numbers xvi. 25. It cannot reasonably be claimed that there is anything judicial about the action there attributed to them. They support Moses in a rebellion against his authority. In saying this we do not mean to suggest that these seventy elders did not assist in hearing difficult matters (not easy cases like the captains of thousands, etc.) and transacting public business. But the narrative leaves no doubt that the primary object of their appointment was to give Moses much-needed human support in maintaining his influence and authority over a people who were unfortunately prone to rebellion, and that this object was achieved by conferring on the elders a portion of the Divine spirit, and so rendering them effective and whole-hearted exponents and supporters of the aims and policy of their leader. The relief given was chiefly by means of their sympathy, their coöperation, their family influence, and their general effect on public opinion, and only in a very minor degree by their assistance in the judicial determination of cases.