

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY

WITH ITS BEARINGS ON THE HIGHER
CRITICISM OF THE PENTATEUCH

... BY ...

JOHN WILLIAM McGARVEY, LL. D.,

President of the College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky.; Professor of
Sacred History and Christian Evidences in same; Author of
"Text and Canon of the New Testament;" "Credibility and Inspiration of the New Testament;"
"Lands of the Bible;" and Commentaries on
Matthew, Mark, and Acts of Apostles.

CINCINNATI, O.

THE STANDARD PUBLISHING CO.,

216-220 East Ninth Street.

Copyright, 1902, by
THE STANDARD PUBLISHING

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

§1. APOLOGY FOR WRITING.....	iii.
§2. HIGHER CRITICISM DEFINED	iii.
§3. THE ANALYTICAL THEORY OF THE PENTATEUCH	vii.
§4. THE SUSPICIOUS SOURCE OF THIS THEORY	xv.
§5. THE UNBELIEVING TENDENCY OF IT	xvii.
§6. THE RELATION OF DEUTERONOMY TO THIS THEORY	xix.
§7. THE PLAN OF THIS WORK	xx.
§8. AUTHORITIES AND ABBREVIATIONS	xxi.

PART FIRST.

EVIDENCES FOR THE LATE DATE ASSIGNED TO

DEUTERONOMY.

§1. FROM THE ACCOUNT OF THE BOOK FOUND BY HILKIAH	1
§2. FROM ALLEGED CONFLICTS WITH PREVIOUS LEGISLATION	28
§3. FROM THE EARLY DISREGARD OF A CENTRAL SANCTUARY.....	34
§4. FROM THE ALLEGED ABSENCE OF THE AARONIC PRIESTHOOD.....	49
§5. FROM ALLEGED CONTRADICTIONS	54
1. As to the Financial Condition of the Levites.....	55
2. As to Tithes	63
3. As to the Priest's Portion of the Peace-offering	67
4. As to the Sacrifices of the Passover	68
5. As to Eating that Which Died of Itself	69
6. As to Hebrew Bondservants	71
7. As to the Decalogue	78
8. As to Acts of Moses at Mount Sinai.....	83
9. As to the Mission of the Twelve Spies	88
10. As to the Time Spent at Kadesh.....	91
11. As to When the Levites were Consecrated	94
12. As to the Sentence on Moses.....	95
13. As to the Asylum for the Manslayer.....	97
14. As to the Year of Release.....	99
15. As to Eating the Firstlings	100
16. As to a Fragment of the Wilderness Itinerary	104
§6. INTERNAL EVIDENCE FOR THE LATE DATE.....	106
1. From the Expression, "Beyond Jordan".....	106
2. From Passages Implying Dates Long After the Events.....	112
3. From Differences Between Laws.....	115
4. The Date of the Blessing and Cursing, the Song of Moses, and His Blessing of the Tribes.....	125
§7. EVIDENCES FOR THE LATE DATE IN THE HISTORICAL BOOKS	137
1. Joshua and Chronicles Set Aside	137

2.	The Confession of Nehemiah and the Levites ..	139
3.	Religion in the Time of the Judges	141
4.	The Service at Shiloh	144
5.	Offerings Made by Saul and David.....	152
6.	The Priesthood of David's Sons.....	153
	7. Solomon's Career	155
8.	Foreign Guards in the Sanctuary.....	160
9.	The Toleration of High Places.....	165
§8.	EVIDENCES FROM THE EARLY PROPHETS	168
	1. From Elijah and Elisha.....	169
	2. From the Prophet Amos	171
	3. From the Prophet Hosea.....	175
	4. From the Book of Isaiah.....	180
	5. From a Passage in Micah.....	182
	6. From the Prophet Jeremiah.....	184
	§9. EVIDENCE FROM STYLE	190

PART SECOND.

EVIDENCES FOR THE MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP.

	§1. INTERNAL EVIDENCE	195
	1. From the Title of the Book.....	195
	2. From the Preface to the Second Discourse....	197
	3. From Directions as to the Ceremony at Mt. Ebal	197
	4. From the Preface to the Covenant.....	198
	5. From Assertions About the Writing.....	198
	6. From the Preface to the Song and to the Blessing	199
§2.	INDIRECT TESTIMONY OF THE AUTHOR	200
	1. Constant Allusions to Entering Canaan as Yet	
	Future	202
	§3. INCIDENTAL EVIDENCE	202
	1. The Decree Against Amalek.....	202
	2. The Order to Exterminate the Canaanites.....	203
	3. The Order Respecting Ammon, Moab and Edom...	204
	4. The Predictions in the Book.....	205
	§4. THE QUESTION OF FRAUD	209
	1. The Charge Preferred	209
	2. The Charge Admitted	210
	3. The Charge Denied	212
§5.	EVIDENCE IN THE BOOK OF JOSHUA	218
	1. Jehovah's Charge to Joshua.....	218
	2. The Case of the Altar Ed.....	220
	3. The Devoted in Jericho.....	223
	4. The Altar and Reading at Mt. Ebal.....	225

5. The Doom of the Gibeonites.....	226
6. The Cities of Refuge	227

TABLE OF CONTENTS 3

7. The Levitical Cities 228

§6. EVIDENCE IN THE BOOK OF JUDGES. 229

1. The Angel at Bochim 229

 2. The Nazirite Vow 230

 3. Peace-offerings 232

4. Micah's Levite Priest 233

 §7. IN THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL 236

 1. The Structure at Shiloh. 236

 2. The Contents of the Structure at Shiloh. 237

 3. The Existence of the Tabernacle Denied 239

 4. The Ritual Observed at Shiloh. 242

 §8. IN THE BOOKS OF KINGS 244

 1. Solomon's Temple 244

 2. The Service at the Temple. 246

 3. The Exclusiveness of the Temple Service. 247

 4. The Toleration of High Places. 248

 5. Hezekiah's Attack on the High Places. 249

 6. The Testimony Given to Joash. 251

 7. Sparing the Children of Murderers. 252

§9. IN THE BOOKS OF THE EARLY PROPHETS. 253

1. In the Book of Amos 253

 (1) His Opening Cry 253

 (2) What He Meant by the Law. 254

 (3) His Knowledge of the Levitical Law 255

 2. Hosea 256

 3. Isaiah 256

 (1) An Allusion to Deut, xviii. 10-12 256

 (2) An Allusion to Deut, xviii. 19, 20 257

 (3) The Law, the Ordinance, and the Covenant 258

 (4) Restricted Worship. 259

 (5) The Commandment of Men. 261

 (6) Sacrifices Exalted 261

 (7) Magnifying the Law. 262

 (8) Neglect of Sacrifices Rebuked. 262

 (9) Blessedness of Future Sacrifices 262

 §10. THE TESTIMONY OF JESUS 264

 1. Positions of the Parties on This Testimony. 264

 2. Did Jesus Know? 266

 3. Did Jesus Affirm? 269

 4. The New Critics on This Testimony. 281

 5. Did the Apostles Affirm? 294

 §11. CONCLUSION 296

 INDEX 299

INDEX II.—Scripture References 301

THE AUTHORSHIP OF DEUTERONOMY.

INTRODUCTION.

§1. APOLOGY FOR WRITING.

If an apology were needed for calling in question the conclusion of those scholars who deny that Moses was the author of the Book of Deuteronomy, it is furnished by these scholars themselves. They constantly insist that men of thought should hold their most cherished convictions subject to revision. They denounce as unreasoning traditionalists those who, rejecting further investigation, cling tenaciously to old beliefs. They are the last men, therefore, who should object to any fresh re-examination of their own conclusions. They would thus be imitating those whose unwillingness to hear them excites their displeasure. In no conclusion are these scholars more confident; than in the one just mentioned; and if I shall appear to them exceedingly rash in publishing at this late date an attempt to show that it is erroneous, they are still bound by their own principles not to condemn me without a hearing. If I shall not advance anything new, I may at least place old arguments and evidences in a form somewhat new; and I may be able to point out some defects in their work that have hitherto escaped their notice. I have a right, therefore, to expect among the most interested and appreciative of my readers those whose opinions I am constrained to combat—provided only that my work shall prove worthy the attention of serious men. I did not enter upon it hastily, but after an earnest study of the whole field of controversy for many years.

§2. HIGHER CRITICISM DEFINED.

The process by which the scholars referred to in the preceding section have reached their conclusions, is commonly styled The Higher Criticism. This title distinguishes it

from "Textual Criticism," or the discovery and correction of clerical errors in the original text. Strictly defined, higher criticism is the art of ascertaining the authorship, date, credibility and literary characteristics of written documents.¹ It is a legitimate art, and it has been employed by Biblical scholars ever since the need of such investigations began to be realized. Only, however, within the last hundred years has it borne this title.² Previously both the textual and the higher criticism were known under the common title, "Biblical Criticism." In scarcely needs to be added that the exclusive use of the title Higher Criticism for that application of it which seeks to revolutionize established beliefs in reference to the Bible, is erroneous: as is also the tacit claim of some advocates of these revolutionary efforts to the exclusive title of higher critics.³ All confusion in the use of these terms will be avoided if the definition just given is kept in mind.

This definition will be better understood if we add to it a statement of the method in which the inquiries of the art are properly conducted. This method is well defined by Prof. W. Robertson Smith in these words: "The ordinary laws of evidence and good sense must be our guides. For the transmission of the Bible is not duo to a continued miracle, but to a watchful Providence ruling the ordinary means by which all ancient books have been handed down. And finally, when we have

¹It is defined by Prof. W. H. Green in these words: "Properly speaking, it is an inquiry into the origin and character of the writings to which it is applied. It seeks to ascertain by all suitable means the authors by whom, the time at which, the circumstances under which, and the design with which they were produced" (*Higher Crit. of Pent., Preface, v.*). He omits credibility, and the literary characteristics.

²Johann Gotfried Eichhorn, author of a very learned *Introduction to the Old Testament*, was the first to use the new title, about the close of the eighteenth century. He accepted the analytical theory of the Pentateuch, so far as it had been elaborated, but, like Jean Astruc, who wrote a few years earlier, and who is usually credited with first propounding that theory, he held to the Mosaic authorship.

³W. L. Baxter says of these: "Their more proper designation would be, *Imaginationist Critics*: they are *higher* than others, solely through building their critical castles *in the air*. instead of on *terra firma*" (*Sanctuary and Sacrifice: A Reply to Wellhausen, viii.*).

worked our way back through the long centuries which separate us from the age of Revelation, we must, as we have already seen, study each writing and make it speak for itself on the common principles of sound exegesis" (*O. T.*, 18). In other words, the method is to employ the laws of evidence by which oilier questions of fact are determined, to do this with "good sense," and, when the meaning of the text is to be settled, to interpret, it "on the common principles of sound exegesis." When Prof. C. A. Briggs says, "The higher criticism is exact and thorough in its methods" (*Bib. Study*, 104), he speaks truly of these methods when properly defined and applied; but it is unfortunately true that the most exact and thorough methods may, in unskillful hands, or in the hands of men with sinister designs, be employed with disastrous results. Any method of procedure which proposes to apply the laws of evidence, may, by misapplication of those laws, lead to erroneous and unjust decisions. Our courts of justice bear constant witness to this fact. Any procedure in which "good sense," as Professor Smith expresses it, is to be our guide, may, by the lack of good sense on our part, guide us astray. Common sense is a very uncommon commodity, and not less so among men of great learning than among their less fortunate fellows. And as to "the principles of sound exegesis," the scarcity of the scholars who can steadily command and employ these is startlingly attested by the pages of countless commentaries on the various books of the Bible.

From these remarks it naturally follows that higher criticism, however correct the principles by which it seeks to be guided, is, in practice, an extremely variable quantity—so variable as to include the writings of extreme rationalists on the one hand and the most conservative of Biblical scholars on the other. From these premises there springs again the inference that those who have adopted the conclusions of certain critics should not be so confident of their correctness as to practically assume their infallibility. We hear much of "assured results," but there are none so assured as to be exempt from revision. The real issue between the two great parties to the criticism of

the Pentateuch lies here. It is the question, which of the two have employed aright, and do employ aright, the laws of evidence, the maxims of common sense, and the principles of a sound exegesis.

By what title these two parties should be distinguished, is as yet an unsettled question. As we have stated above, the party who favor the analysis have usually styled themselves critics, and their opponents traditionalists; but this is manifestly unjust to the latter; for while there are traditionalists on both sides—that is, men who accept what has been taught by their predecessors without investigation on their own part—yet it can not be denied that the leaders of this party have been as independent and as scholarly in their investigations as their opponents—Thomas Hartwell Horne not less so than S. R. Driver. Again, the analytical party have styled their system modern and scientific, whereas the system which opposes it is equally modern in its argumentation, and whether it is less scientific or not is the question in dispute. Prof. James Robertson, in his *Early Religion of Israel*, employed the titles “Biblical” and “Antibiblical;” but the more conservative school on the other side claim to be equally Biblical, in that they claim to have discovered the real significance of the Bible. Professor Briggs has employed, in his more recent writings, the titles “Critical” and “Anticritical;” but this is to assume that his party alone is critical. If we had, on the analytical side, only the unbelieving originators of the system, the difficulty would disappear, and the distinction of rationalistic, or unbelieving, and believing criticism would be appropriate and exact; but the difficulty is to find distinguishing terms which will include on that side both the radical and the evangelical wings of which it is composed. On the whole, it appears to the present author that the distinction is meet fairly preserved by the terms destructive and conservative. By common consent the unbelieving critics are styled destructive, seeing that they would destroy the whole superstructure of Biblical faith. But the so-called evangelical wing seek to destroy belief in the principal part of Old Testament history as it has come down to us, and consequently their

criticism is also destructive to a large extent. These two distinguishing terms are for these reasons employed in the body of this work.

§3. THE ANALYTICAL THEORY OF THE PENTATEUCH.

It is with the application of higher criticism to the Book of Deuteronomy that we are especially concerned in this work. As a result of the labors of a century on the part of a succession of writers, mostly German rationalists, a theory of the origin and structure of the Pentateuch has been evolved which meets with the general approval of those who deny that Moses was its author.⁴ This theory is styled the analytical theory, because of the peculiar analysis of the Pentateuch which it involves. The authorship and date of Deuteronomy is one of the subjects involved in this analysis, and this renders it important to present here a brief outline of the theory to which easy reference may be had in reading the following pages.

It is claimed by the advocates of this theory that the Book of Deuteronomy, or at least the legislative portion of it (chapters xii.-xxvi.), was the first book of the Pentateuch to come into existence. It was first brought into public notice in the eighteenth year of the reign of Josiah, king of Judah, and it alone was the book found by the high priest Hilkiah, when he was cleansing the temple, as described in the twenty-second chapter of II. Kings. This was in the year 621 B. C., or about eight hundred years after the death of Moses.⁵ The book had been written but a short time when it was thus found. Critics vary in judgment as to the exact time, but all agree that it had been composed within the previous seventy-five years. These

⁴For a brief historical sketch of this theory, the reader is referred to Wellhausen's article, "Pentateuch," in *Encyc. Brit.*; to Bissell's *Origin and Structure of the Pentateuch*, 42-83; or to either of two hand-books, *Radical Criticism*, by Prof. Francis R. Beattie, of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.; and *The Elements of Higher Criticism*, by Prof. A. C. Zenos, of McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago.

⁵This opinion was first suggested by De Wette in the year 1817. (*Wellhausen, Encyc. Brit.*; Art. "Pentateuch.")

years were occupied by the idolatrous reigns of Manasseh and Amon, and the first eighteen years of Josiah.

The more radical critics hold that no writing at all came down from the time of Moses, unless it was the Decalogue in a much briefer form than we now have it.⁶ The more conservative class think that the document described in Ex. xxiv. 1-11 as being written by Moses, consecrated by blood, and called "The Book of the Covenant," was really written by Moses. It contained the legislation found in Ex. xx.-xxiii. With these exceptions, all who have accepted the analytical theory agree that Moses wrote no part of the Pentateuch. The conception of Moses as an author and lawgiver, which has prevailed among the Jews and Christians alike for so many centuries, is a delusion which has been dispelled by the critical investigations of the nineteenth century.

While all this is held as to Moses, it is not denied that some of the writing which is now found in the Pentateuch came into existence before the date of Deuteronomy. In the ninth century B. C., about the time of Elijah and Elisha, or possibly in the eighth, about the time of Amos and Hosea (the exact time is unsettled), there came into existence two historical documents which contributed to the final formation of the Pentateuch. One of these was written in the northern kingdom, as appears from its more frequent references to persons and places among the ten tribes. It was an attempt at a history of early times, beginning with creation and ending with the death of Joshua. It contained such traditions of those times as had come down orally to the time of its author, and possibly some written document of an earlier period. Its author habitually used the Hebrew name Elohim for God, on account of which he is known as the Elohist writer, and is referred to briefly in critical writing as E. About the same time, some think earlier and some think later, a similar, but independent, document ap-

⁶Thus Kuenen says: "It need not be repeated here that Moses bequeathed no book of the law to the tribes of Israel. Certainly nothing more was committed to writing by him or in his time than the 'ten words' in their original form" (*The Religion of Israel*, II. 7).

peared in the kingdom of Judah, covering the same period of time, containing the stories afloat among the old people of the southern kingdom, and written by an author who uniformly called God Jehovah. He is called the Jehovistic writer, or briefly, J. The stories in the two were to some extent the same, with variations resulting from oral transmission, but each contained some stories not found in the other. It is not pretended that we have any historical account of either of these books, or that any ancient writer, either Biblical or secular, makes any allusion to their existence. It is only claimed that the fact of their existence is traceable in portions of our Pentateuch that were copied from them.

At a still later period, but how late no one pretends to say, except that it was earlier than the writing of Deuteronomy, a third writer took these two books of E and J in hand, and combined them into one, by copying first from one and then from the other, as he thought best, though sometimes, when he was doubtful as to which of two stories was to be preferred, copying both. Occasionally he added something of his own. He is called a redactor, the German term for editor, and for the sake of brevity is usually referred to as R. The resulting document is called JE, and it is supposed that, as a natural result of the compilation, the two older documents passed out of use, and soon perished. The document JE was therefore the only historical book in existence among the Israelites previous to the date of Deuteronomy.

The principal reason for holding that the Book of Deuteronomy came into existence as above described, and that none of the other three books of law existed earlier, is the revolution in worship effected by King Josiah under the influence of this book. It is alleged that, previous to Hilkiah's discovery every man was at liberty to build an altar and offer sacrifices where he saw fit, and that all the sacrificial altars that were erected, as Jeremiah expresses it, "on every high hill and under every green tree," were entirely legitimate when the worship was rendered to Jehovah. Many of these places of worship, however, had been consecrated by the Canaanites to the

worship of Baal and other deities, and the Israelites were constantly enticed by the associations of place, and other considerations, to fall into idolatry. It therefore occurred to the writer or writers of Deuteronomy to compose a book in the name of Moses which would pronounce worship at all such places unlawful, and would concentrate all the sacrifices at the altar in front of the temple in Jerusalem. In this way idolatry would be suppressed, and the priesthood of the central sanctuary would be exalted and enriched. The fact that King Josiah, believing the book to be from Moses, enforced this regulation, proves by its success the wisdom of this device.

Thus far, it is to be remembered, neither of the law-books, Exodus, Leviticus or Numbers, had been written; but between the time of Deuteronomy and the beginning of the Babylonian captivity, a priestly law was written containing the regulations now found in chapters xvii.-xxii. of the Book of Leviticus. It is called the law of Holiness, and it is designated by the letter H. We now see that when Judah was led captive into Babylon, they had in hand the legal part of the Book of Deuteronomy, six chapters of Leviticus, and the historical book JE, but no other part of the Pentateuch.

About the close of the Babylonian exile another book was written which contained both history and law. It covered historically the same period of time which had been covered by J and E, but it introduced much new matter. The first chapter of Genesis was now composed, the author J having begun his book with the second chapter. Many other parts of Genesis were also first written by this author, together with the main body of the Books of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers. He was a priest, and he is referred to under the letter P. He wrote about one thousand years after the death of Moses.

But the Pentateuch was not yet completed. The documents JE, D, H and P, out of which it was yet to be compiled, existed separately. The task of compiling them into one fell to the lot of another redactor or editor, who, at or soon after the close of the exile, took in hand the preceding books, and compiled from them the Pentateuch as we now have it, adding,

however, here and there, some matter of his own. This book of the law of Moses was read to the people by Ezra, as described in the eighth chapter of Nehemiah, and this reading was its first publication to the world.

As was said above, it is not claimed that there is any historical account of these various documents, or that any ancient writing contains the faintest allusion to their existence. But it is claimed that the fact of their separate existence and subsequent combination can be demonstrated by separating them now—according to their several peculiarities of style and subject-matter. This has been done, and the several documents have been published in separate form. So exact is the process, that in many instances a single short sentence, or a clause of a sentence, is assigned, one part to J, one to E, and another to P. The reader will find this analysis set forth to the eye in colors representing the several sources of the text, in Bissell's *Genesis in Colors*, and in the various volumes of the Polychrome Bible. The several documents are also printed separately in *Documents of the Hexateuch*, by W. E. Addis; and in two works by Prof. Benjamin W. Bacon, of Yale, entitled *Genesis of Genesis*, and *Exodus*. This analysis will not be considered on its merits in the following pages, because it bears only remotely on our subject, and also because in a work entitled *The Unity of Genesis*, the last work that came from the prolific pen of the lamented Prof. William Henry Green, of Princeton, the analytical theory is thoroughly exposed as contrary to the facts in the case. To argue the question again would be a work of supererogation; at least, until some formal reply shall be made to Professor Green.

There are certain important results which attend the theory, and constitute an essential part of it, that are to be stated next.

Should we grant all that has been thus far stated, and yet maintain that all of these supposed writers were divinely inspired so as to write with historical reliability, we could still maintain the authenticity of Old Testament history. But such inspiration is denied. Miraculous aid of any kind is denied by radical critics, and inspiration that guards historical narra-

tives from error is denied by all. Consequently the theory throws a mist of uncertainty over the whole of the historical writings of the Old Testament, and most positively discredits a very large portion of it.

We may state first, as a specific result, that the first ten chapters of Genesis are altogether legendary or mythical. The first two chapters are not, as they appear to be, a history of the creation of the universe and the formation of this earth as an abode for man; but they are two contradictory accounts, one presenting the author P's conception, and the other J's, while both are very far away from describing the reality. The story of the fall is a fable, and it falsely represents the change which took place in man. This change was an upward movement, as the theory of evolution demands. There was no fall of man. The stories of Cain and Abel are equally imaginary, and that of the flood, though self-consistent throughout as it stands, is resolved into two contradictory accounts of some local disaster in the valley of the Euphrates, one written by J and the other by P. The account of the confusion of tongues, and the consequent dispersion of the human race, is an idle attempt to explain by a miracle that which came about in a natural way.

As to the rest of Genesis, the stories of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph are also unreal with the radical critics, who in general deny that any of these men had a real existence. They are mythical heroes, such as were conjured up in the imaginations of the early heathen nations when trying to trace their primitive history. Thus the whole of the Book of Genesis passes away before the mind of the critic, except as its marvelous narratives may be used for illustrations. The more conservative critics retain the belief that these patriarchs had a real existence, but they hesitate to accept the details of much that is written respecting them. They accept some and reject the rest according to each man's individual judgment

With the radicals, the Israelites were never in bondage to the Egyptians, as described in the Book of Exodus and repeated so constantly in the later books of the Old Testament; but they were a desert tribe, and in the course of their wanderings they

settled on. the border of Egypt and incurred Egyptian hostility. The story of deliverance from the Egyptians is therefore wholly false, as is also that of the visit to Mount Sinai and the giving of the law. All the miracles in the wilderness are denied, and it is claimed that the tabernacle in the wilderness never had an existence, the account of it being an imaginary story spun from the brain of P, with Solomon's temple as its model.

The conservatives admit that Israel was in bondage, but they hold that the stories of the ten plagues are exaggerated accounts of natural events. The passage of the Red Sea they strip of all its miraculous incidents, and the law given at Mount Sinai contained nothing more than the little "book of the covenant" now found in Ex. xx.-xxiii. The laws in Leviticus were not given there as is declared both at the beginning and the end of that book, neither were those which are scattered through the Book of Numbers given by Moses. As to the Book of Deuteronomy, we have already seen how its contents are regarded by all these critics, both radical and conservative; for there is no material difference of opinion among them on this matter.

We now see what is made of the Pentateuch, if this theory is true. The question is sometimes raised, What difference does it make whether Moses or some other man wrote the Pentateuch? If this means whether Moses wrote it, or some other man who lived at a time to possess correct information, the difference might be immaterial. But this is not the question. It is, whether Moses is its author, or several unknown men who lived from seven hundred to one thousand years after Moses, and who had no means of correct knowledge. In other words, the question is, whether it came from a man who was the chief actor in much the greater part of its events, and could therefore give an authentic account of them, or from a set of men removed many centuries from the events, whose source of information was nothing better than a hoary tradition, and who have actually given us nothing that is certainly real history.

Another consequence which is a part of the theory is yet to be mentioned. It has been observed by those the least familiar with the new critical literature that it speaks no longer of the Pentateuch, but of the Hexateuch. This is because the Book of Joshua is involved with the Pentateuch in the same supposition as to dates and authorship. It will be remembered that J and E, the first writers, extended their narratives from Adam to the death of Joshua. P also did the same. The Greek translators of the Old Testament, who were the first to divide the Pentateuch into separate books, and to give them their Greek names, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, made the mistake of supposing that these constituted one original book of early history and law, and that the Book of Joshua was a later production. From this mistake originated the title "Pentateuch," signifying five books. But the critics have detected this mistake. They have found that the original work in the hands of Ezra, called the book of the law of Moses, instead of closing with Deuteronomy, extended to the close of what we call the Book of Joshua, and that Hexateuch (a work of six books), and not Pentateuch, is the correct title. The Book of Joshua is with them wholly unhistorical. It falsely represents the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites. It is not true that Joshua invaded the land with a great army, crossing the Jordan by a stupendous miracle, and subduing the tribes of Canaan in two decisive campaigns. It is not true that he divided the land among the tribes, as described in the latter part of the book. All these accounts are inventions of later ages. The true account of the invasion is that very imperfectly given in the early chapters of the Book of Judges; and this is interpreted to mean that one tribe at a time, or two tribes acting together, invaded Canaan, and, after many vicissitudes, finally obtained lodgment among a people much more civilized and enlightened than themselves.

The theory, then, if true, robs the first six books of the Bible of authenticity, and puts their several authors on a lower level than that of ancient heathen historians by separating them many centuries further from the events which they pretend to

record. To the critics themselves this makes the Hexateuch a much more precious work than it was when they gave it credit; for they are never tired, at least the "evangelical" wing, of repeating the assertion of this increased preciousness. However difficult it is to account for this, I suppose that we must credit them with tolling the truth; but with the great mass of believers in Christ and the Bible the feeling must ever be the reverse of this. They feel now, and will forever feel, the utmost disgust for a set of books with the pretenses made in these, that are after all nothing more than these critics represent them to be.

§4. THE SUSPICIOUS SOURCES OF THIS THEORY.

Before we consider the evidences for and against this theory, it is proper that we note some *prima-facie* considerations which cast upon it a cloud of suspicion.

Those who have wrought it out were unbelievers, and were moved in their labors by hostility to the Bible and the Christian religion. Especially is this true of the two scholars to whom, above all others, the present form of the theory owes its completion and defense, A. Kuenon, now deceased, and Julius Wellhausen, who is still living.⁷ They unhesitatingly reject as incredible all accounts of supernatural events, including those connected with the career of Christ. These statements are freely admitted by the advocates of the theory, and some of them strive, as best they can, to ward off the suspicion thence aris-

⁷In the introduction to his *Religion of Israel*, Kuenon says: "For us the Israelitish is one of these religions (the 'principal religions'), nothing less, but also nothing more" (p. 5). "As soon as it began to be clear that the testimony of Israel's sacred books could not stand the test of a searching inquiry; as soon as it appeared that they were least trustworthy just in those places where their accounts seemed to afford the most unequivocal proof of the truth of supernaturalism— from that moment, especially in connection with all the other motives which lead to the rejection of supernaturalism, its fall was an assured fact" (p. 11f.). "The representation of Israel's early history presented to us in the books named after Moses and Joshua, must be rejected as in its entirety impossible. Prejudice alone can deny that the miracles related in the same writings must be rejected at the same time" (P. 22).

ing. W. Robertson Smith acknowledges his own indebtedness to these two scholars in the following two sentences: "The first to attempt a connected history of the religion of Israel on the premises of the newer criticism was Professor Kuenen, the value of whose writings is admitted by candid inquirers of every school." "Taken as a whole, the writings of Wellhausen are the most notable contribution to the historical study of the Old Testament since the great work of Ewald, and almost every part of the present lectures owes something to them" (*Prophets*, 12, 13). Professor Briggs makes a similar acknowledgment, and seeks to guard against its effect: "We should not allow ourselves to be influenced by the circumstance that the majority of the scholars who have been engaged in these researches have been rationalistic or semi-rationalistic in their religious opinions; and that they have employed the methods and style peculiar to the Gorman scholarship of our century. Whatever may have been the motives and influences that led to these investigations, the questions we have to determine are: (1) What are the facts in the case, and (2) do the theories account for the facts (*Bib. Study*, 212). But it is vain to attempt to allay suspicion by such remarks as these. When the enemies of the Bible invent and propagate theories in the direct effort to destroy faith in the Bible, the friends of the Book must necessarily be suspicious of them; for such men would not be satisfied with their own works did they not believe that the Bible is discredited by them.

Prof. W. H. Green expresses himself on this point, with his usual calmness, in the following words: "It is noteworthy that the partition hypotheses in all their forms have been elaborated from the beginning in the interest of unbelief. The unfriendly animus of an opponent does not indeed absolve us from patiently and candidly examining his arguments, and accepting whatever facts he may adduce, though we are not bound to receive his perverted interpretations of them. Nevertheless, we can not intelligently nor safely overlook the palpable bias against the supernatural which has infected the critical theories which we have been reviewing, from first to last. All the

acknowledged leaders of the movement have, without exception, scouted the reality of miracles and prophecy and immediate divine revelation in their genuine and evangelical sense. Their theories are all inwrought with naturalistic presuppositions which can not be disentangled from them without their falling to pieces" (*H. C. of P.*, 157).

When the armies of one nation surrender to those of another it is usually understood that the latter has won its cause.

So, if the army of the Lord shall surrender to the enemies of the Bible in respect to the nature of the Bible itself, it is inevitable that the onlooking world will take it that the cause of unbelief has triumphed. It should also be said in this connection, that the same rationalistic scholars who have evolved the analytical theory of the Pentateuch have espoused all of the old infidel objections to the various books of the Old Testament, and have made these important parts of their argument in favor of the analysis. Their triumph, therefore, would be the triumph of infidelity in its oldest and most radical forms. If it is able to triumph thus, let it be so; but let no man who hopes for salvation in Christ surrender to the enemy unless he shall be compelled to do so after exhausting all the resources of evidence and logic within his reach. That the analytical theory of the Pentateuch originated with and has been developed by the enemies of the Bible, while it does not indeed necessarily prove it to be false, establishes a strong logical presumption that it is so, and demands of believers that they continue to combat it until their last weapon shall have been used in vain.

§5. THE UNBELIEVING TENDENCY OF THIS THEORY.

If the actual tendency of accepting the theory in question is toward unbelief in the Christian religion, this fact is the strongest, possible vindication of such a work as the present. That the theory is at least dangerous in this respect, is acknowledged by one of its most able advocates, Prof. Andrew Harper, in the following words: "The debate concerning the critical views of the Old Testament has reached a stage at which

it is no longer confined to professed teachers and students of the Old Testament. It has filtered down, through magazines first, and then through newspapers, into the public mind, and opinions are becoming current concerning the results of criticism which are so partial and ill-informed that they can not but produce evil results of a formidable kind in the near future." Again, after stating his own conclusions with respect to Deuteronomy, he says: "They have been reached after a careful consideration of the evidence on both sides, and are stated here not altogether without regret. . . . For, as Robertson Smith, has well said, 'to the ordinary believer the Bible is precious as the practical rule of faith and love in which God still speaks directly to his heart. No criticism can be otherwise than hurtful to faith if it shakes the confidence with which the simple Christian turns to his Bible, assured that he can receive every message which it brings to his soul as a message from God himself.' Now, though it can be demonstrated that the view of Scripture which permits of such conclusions as those stated above is quite compatible with this believing confidence, there can be little doubt that Christian people will for a time find great difficulty in accepting this assurance. The transition from the old view of inspiration, so complete, comprehensible and effective as it is, to the newer and less definite doctrine, can not fail to be trying, and the introduction of it here can not but be a disturbing influence which it would have been greatly preferable to avoid" (*Com.*, 2, 34). Such utterances as these, so candid and yet so reluctantly made, imply the consciousness of a danger much greater than they express. The actual results have been even more serious than these thoughtful men apprehended. J. J. Lias, one of the ablest writers on this subject in Great Britain, says in his *Principles of Biblical Criticism*: "A statement has been widely circulated in the public press that the number of persons in Germany who this year (1893) declared themselves to be of no religion is *fourteen* times as great as in 1871. Is there no connection between this fact and the manner in which German criticism has treated the Bible?" (216, note).

This necessary tendency of the theory in question will receive further notice in the body of this work, when we come to speak of its bearing on the assertions of Jesus and his apostles. It is but just to say, however, before leaving the subject at present, that many scholars, especially in Great Britain and America, have accepted the analytical theory without accepting the sweeping denial of all miracles which is common among its originators. But this makes the evil tendency inherent in the theory itself all the more dangerous from the common habit among men of accepting injurious teaching from apparent friends of the truth much more readily than from avowed enemies. On this point Professor Green very justly says: "It is only recently that there has been an attempt at compromise on the part of certain believing scholars, who are disposed to accept these critical theories and endeavor to harmonize them with the Christian faith. But the inherent vice in these systems can not be eradicated. The inevitable result has been to lower the Christian faith to the level of these perverted theories instead of lifting the latter up to the level of a Christian standard."

§6. RELATION OF DEUTERONOMY TO THIS THEORY.

The alleged late date and unknown authorship of the Book of Deuteronomy are so involved in this theory of the Pentateuch as a part of it, that the disproof thereof would shatter the whole superstructure. This is apparent when we remember that the theory assumes the pre-existence of the documents J and E in order to account for historical allusions, in Deuteronomy. If, then, this last, book is thrown back to the time of Moses, it necessarily carries back with it these preceding documents, and thus the whole scheme is broken to pieces: for it is inconceivable that J and E were written before the time of Moses. Prof. Andrew Harper indirectly admits this when he says: "Deuteronomy has been the key of the position, the center of the conflict, in the battle which has been waged so hotly as to the growth of religion in Israel. The attack on the views

hitherto so generally held within the church in regard to that matter has rested more upon the character and the date of Deuteronomy than upon anything else" (*Com.*, 2). It is for this reason, chiefly, that the authorship of this book has been selected as the subject of this volume. While it is a matter of importance in itself to know the authorship of a book so invaluable, its importance is greatly enhanced by the consideration that in settling this question we virtually settle the same respecting the other books of the Pentateuch. It would argue, perhaps, an extreme of self-confidence were the author to express the conviction that what he has said will settle this question, for doubtless the time and labor to be expended ere the critical superstructure of a century's growth can be undermined and demolished, as the present author believes it certainly will be, are likely to be somewhat commensurate with those by which it was built up. The conflict hitherto has been chiefly that between the warring factions among the advanced critics themselves; hereafter it will be between the united advocates of the finally accepted theory and the friends of the Bible as it is. It is for the purpose of taking an humble part in this conflict that this volume is presented to the public.

§7. Plan of This Work.

The natural order in which to discuss the authorship of a book is to begin with the claim set up in the book itself, and consider first the internal evidences for and against it. This would have been the order of the present discussion but for the fact that certain prepossessions have taken hold of the mind of many, and until these are removed a favorable consideration of this evidence would be well-nigh impossible. It therefore seemed to the author wiser to begin with the arguments and evidences which have been arrayed on the negative side of the question, and to divide the discussion into two parts, of which Part I. is a consideration of the grounds on which the Mosaic authorship is denied, and Part II. a presentation of those on which it is affirmed.

Even with this beginning we might have been expected to consider first the internal evidence against the Mosaic authorship, but there stands in the forefront of the negative position the assumption mentioned in a previous section (3, p. vii) as to the actual origin of the book, and this takes precedence of all other considerations. Our discussion begins, therefore, with what the adverse critics have said with reference to the hook discovered by the priest Hilkiah, as recorded in the twenty-second chapter of II. Kings.

In representing the positions and arguments which I controvert, I have not usually stated them in my own words, lest I might be suspected of misrepresenting them, and lest I should in some instances unwittingly do so; but I have quoted freely from representative authors. In pursuing this course, I have taken pains to follow on every leading issue the line of argumentation pursued by that scholar on the other side who seemed to present the case with the greatest force; and where it appeared important I have appended foot-notes referring for confirmation to other authors. If this method shall appear to any reader a more personal form of controversy than courtesy might suggest, I beg him to consider that it gives more directness and piquancy to discussion; and not to forget that when an author places himself before the public as an antagonist of established and cherished beliefs, he voluntarily exposes himself to direct attack. If, in this somewhat personal controversy, I have at any time overstepped the bounds of courtesy, I offer as my apology the indignation which must ever stir the breast of a friend of the Bible when he sees it assailed by arguments so shallow and sophistical as to be unworthy of their authors. And if at any time I have indulged in lightness, it should be remembered that ridicule, when justly administered, is a most proper and effective weapon in the defense of truth.

§8. AUTHORITIES AND ABBREVIATIONS.

a. List of works chiefly consulted in preparing this volume:

- The Prophets of Israel: W. Robertson Smith.
 Old Testament in the Jewish Church: same author; second edition.
 Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament: S. R. Driver; sixth, edition.
 International Critical Commentary: Deuteronomy: same author.
 Expositor's Bible: Deuteronomy: Andrew Harper.
 The Documents of the Hexateuch: W. E. Addis.
 International Critical Commentary: Judges: George E. Moore.
 The Canon of the Old Testament: Herbert E. Ryle.
 The Expositor's Bible: Isaiah: George Adam Smith.
 Biblical Study: Charles A. Briggs.
 Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch: same author.
 The Prophecies of Isaiah: T. K. Cheyne.
 Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges: Hosea: same author.
 Polychrome Bible: Isaiah: same author.
 Polychrome Bible: Joshua: W. II. Bennett.
 Polychrome Bible: Judges: George E. Moore.
 Articles "Israel" and "Pentateuch," in Encyclopedia Britannica: ninth edition: Julius Wellhausen.
 Prolegomena to Old Testament: same author.
 The Religion of Israel: Abraham Kuenen.
 The Oracles of God: W. Sanday.
 Triple Tradition of the Exodus: Benj. W. Bacon.
 The Unity of Genesis: William Henry Green.
 Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch: same author.
 The Pentateuch: Its Origin and Structure: E. C. Bissell.
 Lex Mosaica: Essays by Twelve Eminent Scholars of Great Britain.
 Sanctuary and Sacrifice: W. L. Baxter.
 Principles of Biblical Criticism: J. J. Lias.
 Early Religion of Israel: James Robertson.
 Prophecy and History in Reference to the Messiah: Alfred Edersheim.

Did Moses Write the Pentateuch after A11: J?. E. Spencer.

Inspiration of the Old Testament: Alfred Cave.

The Veracity of the Hexateuch: S. C. Bartlett.

The Higher Critics Criticised: Rufus P. Stabbing, and H. L. Hastings.

The Ancient, Hebrew Tradition: Fritz Hommel.

a. Abbreviations used in citing books in, the preceding list that are most frequently referred to:

In connection with the name of W. Robertson Smith, *Prophets* stands for "The Prophets of Israel;" *O. T.*—"Old Testament in the Jewish Church."

In connection with the name of S. R. Driver. *Int.*—"Introduction to Old Testament Literature;" *Com.*—"Commentary on Deuteronomy."

In connection with Andrew Harper, *Com.*—"Commentary on Deuteronomy."

In connection with W. E. Addis, *D. of H.*—"Documents of the Hexateuch."

In connection with Charles A. Briggs, *Bib. Study*—"Biblical Study;" *II. C. of II.*—"Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch."

In connection with T. K. Cheyne, *Isaiah*—"The Prophecies of Isaiah;" *Hosea*—"Commentary on Hosea;" *Pol. Isaiah*—"Isaiah in the Polychrome Bible."

Encyc. Brit.—"Encyclopedia Britannica;" *Encyc. Bib.*—"Encyclopedia Biblica;" *Lex M.*—"Lex Mosaica."

In connection with W. II. Green, *II. C. of P.*—"Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch."

In connection with W. L. Baxter, *Sane, and Sac.*—"Sanctuary and Sacrifice."

In connection with Alfred Edersheim. *P. and H.*—"Prophecy and History in Reference to the Messiah."

In connection with Alfred Cave, *I. O. T.*—"Inspiration of the Old Testament."

PART ONE

EVIDENCES FOR THE LATE DATE.

PART ONE

EVIDENCES FOR THE LATE DATE.

§1. EVIDENCE FROM THE ACCOUNT OF HILKIAH'S DISCOVERY.

There is nothing on which destructive critics are more fully agreed, or more confident in their convictions, than that the book found in the temple by the priest Hilkiah, as described in the twenty-second chapter of II. Kings, was the legal part of the Book of Deuteronomy; and that this was the first time that a book of law existed in Israel. This conclusion is argued with great confidence from the account of the book given in the chapter named and *the* chapter *following*. I regard the second chapter of Ryle's *Canon of the Old Testament* as the strongest and clearest presentation of this line of argument known to me, and he shall be my guide in the discussion of it. Professor Ryle introduces the discussion with the following paragraph:

It is not till the year 621 B. C., the eighteenth year of the reign of King Josiah, that the history of Israel presents us with the first instance of a book which was regarded by all—king, priests, prophets and people alike—as invested not only with sanctity, but also with supreme authority in all matters of religion and conduct (p. 47.)

To avoid misunderstanding on the part of readers not familiar with the subject, I should remark that the author does not here mean to deny the previous existence of the conjectural documents J and E of the critics, which, according to the analytical theory, had been written from one to two hundred years earlier; but these documents, according to hypothesis, were historical in their contents, and not books of law. (See *Int.*, p ix.)

Before entering upon his argument, Professor Ryle makes another statement as to the appreciation which was at once accorded the book, in the following paragraph:

In this familiar scene, "the book of the law" stands in the position of Canonical Scripture. It is recognized as containing the words of the Lord (xxii. 18, 19). Its authority is undisputed and indisputable. On the strength of its words the most sweeping measures are carried out by the king and accepted by the people. The whole narrative, so graphically told by one who was possibly a contemporary of the events he describes, breathes the conviction that the homage paid to "the book" was nothing more than its just due (p. 48).

These words we must not forget, for they have a potent bearing on the arguments by which the author proceeds to support his first proposition.

To the minds of all scholars opposed to destructive criticism, these words are perfectly acceptable; and all the results of finding the book are precisely what should be expected. For if, as they believe, and as the Scriptures assert, the whole Pentateuch had been in existence since the clays of Moses, it would have disappeared from public view during the long reign of Manasseh, who abolished the religion which it inculcated, turned the temple of Jehovah into a heathen pantheon, practiced every idolatrous rite known to the pagan tribes around him, and shed innocent blood from one end of Jerusalem to the other. It would have been as much as the life of any Jew was worth during that period to have possessed a copy of the divine law and sought to propagate its teaching. And that period had lasted, though not in its greatest darkness, for seventy-five years, including the fifty-five of Manasseh's reign, the two of his son Amon, and the first eighteen of Josiah. Josiah himself, being the son of Amon and grandson of Manasseh, had enjoyed during their lifetime no opportunity to see the book of the law, or to learn anything of its contents. It was only after his father's death, when he was eight years old, that men and women of faith who had lived through the period of apostasy, and who remembered some of the contents of the law of Moses, had an opportunity to impart to his young mind what they themselves remembered of the word of God. That some such knowledge was imparted to him is evident, from the fact that in the eighth year of his reign "he began to seek after the God of his father David;" and in the twelfth year of the same "he

began to purge Jerusalem and Judah from the high places, and the Asherim, and the graven images, and the molten images" (II. Chron. xxxiv. 3). At this time he had undoubtedly learned that Israel once had a law; that under the leadership of his grandfather they had departed from it; and that it was his duty to lead the people back to it. He knew from what worship his grandfather had departed, and knew that idolatry in all its forms was unlawful in Israel. He was well prepared then, should the book of the law be put into his hands, to receive it as the ancient law of his God and his country, and to give it the reverence which it deserved.

Again, when Hilkiah found the book of the law in the temple, he found it just where it ought to have been; and the finding caused no surprise, unless it was because it had not perished while the temple was so grossly defiled. For an express provision of the law required that the Book of Deuteronomy should be kept in the temple "by the side of the ark of the covenant" (Deut. xxxi. 24-26). And though we find no express command like this in regard to the preservation of the other portions of the Pentateuch, we may infer with full confidence that, if they existed, the priests and Levites realized that they must be kept in the same place of security.

With all this agree perfectly the words of Hilkiah when he handed the book to Shaphan, the scribe or secretary of the king. He said, "I have found the book of the law in the house of Jehovah" (II. Kings xxii. 8). This is the style of one to whom the title of the book was familiar. He did not say, "a book containing the law of Jehovah;" nor, "a book which appeareth to be the law of Jehovah;" but, "the book of the law of Jehovah." It is not the language of one to whom the book was a new thing, but that of one to whom it was perfectly well known, but had been in some sense lost.

The words, "I have *found* the book," do not necessarily imply that it had been hidden, although it may have been. It may be that some faithful priest, at the beginning of Manasseh's desecration of the temple, had hidden it to prevent its destruction, and that in thoroughly cleansing the walls and floor

of the temple its hiding-place was disclosed; but the words may be as well accounted for if, after the long time in which it was exposed to destruction, he found it where it had been kept ever since the erection of the temple. The agents of Manasseh, notwithstanding their hatred of the book and its contents, may have permitted it to remain in its place, because in that place it was out of the reach of the people and in their own possession. The history which it contained might have served as a motive for leaving it undisturbed so long as the worship which it enjoined was being effectually suppressed.

Finally, when the book was read to the king, then by the prophetess Huldah, and then by the king himself to the people, the consternation and alarm which its threatenings excited are precisely such as would naturally occur if the book was known to be the old law-book of the nation given by God through Moses; but they are unnatural, and even incredible, on any other hypothesis.

We may also remark, in addition, that every single act of the reformation which resulted from the discovery of this book would just as naturally and certainly have resulted had the book been the whole Pentateuch, as if it had been only the legal portion of the Book of Deuteronomy. What, then, can be the motive for denying that it was the whole Pentateuch, and by what course of reasoning is that denial supported? Professor Kyle undertakes to formally answer this question, and I copy his argument in full:

When we inquire what this "book of the law" comprised, the evidence at our disposal is quite sufficiently explicit to direct us to a reply. Even apart from the knowledge which we now possess of the structure of the Pentateuch, there never was much probability in the supposition that the book discovered by Hilkiah was identical with the whole Jewish "Torah," our Pentateuch. The narrative does not suggest so considerable a work. Its contents were quickly perused and readily grasped. Being read aloud, it at once left distinct impressions upon questions of national duty. Its dimensions could not have been very large nor its precepts very technical. The complex character of the Pentateuch fails to satisfy the requirements of the picture. Perhaps, too (although the argument is hardly one to be pressed), as it appears that only a single roll of the Law was found, it may not unfairly be remarked that the whole Torah was never likely to be contained in one roll; but that, if a single roll contained

any portion of the Pentateuch, it was most probably the Deuteronomic portion of it; for the Book of Deuteronomy, of all the component elements of the Pentateuch, presents the most unmistakable appearance of having once formed a compact independent work (p. 48f.).

The question here raised is vital in this discussion; that is, it is vital as respects the analytical theory. With those who credit the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy, it is immaterial whether the book was the whole Pentateuch or Deuteronomy alone; but with the other party it is absolutely essential to show that it was not the whole Pentateuch, because it is an essential part of their theory that much the greater part of the Pentateuch had not been written when this book was found. For this reason nearly every writer in favor of the theory makes some attempt at argument on this point.

The first point of argument in the preceding extract is that the book was read in too short a time, and that it left impressions too distinct for the whole Pentateuch. In making this argument the professor draws on his imagination; for there is nothing said in the text about the time consumed in the reading. Mr. Addis goes further still. He says: "It would have been a sheer impossibility to read the Pentateuch, or even the legal portions of the Pentateuch, through aloud, in one day; much less could it have been read twice in one day." He says further that "the kernel of Deuteronomy (*i e.*, Deut. iv. 45 to xxvi., or possibly xii. to xxvi.; xxvii. 9, 10; xxviii. 9-13) exactly meets the required conditions. It could be read through aloud in between three and four hours at most" (*D. of H.*, lxxv.).

Doubtless Mr. Addis is right in asserting that the portions of Deuteronomy which he selects as the probable contents of the book could be read through in between three and four hours; but, in order to reduce the time to this limit, he has to assume that the book contained only the chapters and verses which he cites. If it was the whole Book of Deuteronomy, it would have required six hours to read it through, and to have read it twice in one day would have filled the day from sun to sun. But Shaphan read it once to himself; he read it. to the king once;

But, while freely admitting, and even insisting, that Hosea had a quarrel with the calves, our professor sees no evidence in this that Hosea had any knowledge of the law. He says: "If the prophecy of Hosea stood alone, it would be reasonable to think that this attack on the images of the popular religion was simply based on the Second Commandment." So it would, and so it does. "But," says Smith, "when we contrast it with the absolute silence of the earlier prophets, we can hardly accept this explanation as adequate" (176). He ought to have said. The absolute silence of Robertson Smith; for, as I have plainly showed above, he is absolutely silent in regard to all those passages in Amos in which the latter calls the people to come to Bethel and transgress, to Gilgal and multiply transgression, etc. Amos speaks plainly enough, and often enough in his own book, but he is gagged and made absolutely silent on this point in W. Robertson Smith's *Prophecies of Israel*.

Persisting in this denial, he says on the next page (177) :

Hosea does not condemn the worship of the calves, because idols are forbidden by the law; he excludes the calves from the sphere of true religion, because the worship which they receive has no affinity to the true attitude of Israel to Jehovah.

If Professor Smith were still alive, it would be pertinent to ask him how he knows all this. Where in the Book of Hosea does he give the latter reason for excluding the calves? And when we find a prophet of Jehovah who knew the second commandment of the law, as he admits that Hosea did, denouncing the worship of idols, how can he dare to say that the prophet does not condemn this worship because it is forbidden by the law? The truth is that neither he nor any other man who ever lived has known, or could know, that it is sinful to worship Jehovah under the symbol of calves, without a law forbidding it. Roman Catholics have not learned that it is wrong to worship Christ by bowing before a crucifix, even though they have been reading for a thousand years the express prohibition of such worship in the Scriptures.

This denial is not only irrational in itself, but it is inconsistent with what Hosea says of the law. In the beginning of his special denunciation of this sinful worship, he says: "My people are destroyed: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no more priest to me: seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I also will forget thy children" (iv. 6). Here the knowledge which they lacked, the knowledge which they had rejected, is proved by the collocation of the clauses to be the knowledge of the law of their God; and the charge, "Thou hast forgotten the law of thy God," shows that they had formerly known it. A few verses below he adds: "They shall commit whoredom, and shall not increase: because they have left off to take heed to Jehovah" (verse 10). They had ceased to take heed to Jehovah by forgetting and rejecting the knowledge of his law. Words could not make it plainer that they had formerly known the law of God. Again, speaking for God, he says: "I desire mercy, and not sacrifice; and knowledge of God more than burnt offerings" (vi. C). The first clause of this sentence, as is proved by the parallel in the second, is an example of the well-known hebraism of an absolute negative where the relative is meant; and it means, "I desire mercy more than sacrifice." He desires sacrifice, and he desires burnt offerings; but he esteems mercy toward their fellow men, and knowledge of himself, more highly than either. This is also the teaching of Christ, who adopted these words of Hosea on two different occasions (Matt. ix. 13; xii. 7). But the knowledge of God, without which they would have no incentive to mercy, was derived only from his law, another proof that they had once possessed the law, but had rejected and forgotten it.

Finally Hosea, speaking in the name of Jehovah, covers the whole ground by the well-known words: "Because Ephraim hath multiplied altars to sin, altars have been unto him to sin. Though I write for him my law in ten thousand precepts, they are counted as a strange thing" (viii. 11, 12). Here is an unquestionable reference to written law; and the clause "they are counted as a strange thing," is equivalent to the rejecting

and the forgetting of the law in the previous citations. This clause, moreover, being expressed in the present tense, shows that the writing spoken of had already taken place. The first clause, then, can not mean, "though I should write my law." Neither can the clause mean, "though I am writing my law." It is a law which had been written. The alternative rendering in the margin of the Revised Version brings out this thought. "I wrote for him the ten thousand things of my law, but they are counted as a strange thing." The connection of this sentence with the preceding, "Because Ephraim hath multiplied altars to sin, altars have been unto him to sin," shows that the sin of these altars is the one chiefly referred to as counting the written law a strange thing.

The position taken by the destructive critics is so completely overthrown by the evidence in these passages, that they have taxed their ingenuity to the uttermost in seeking to attach to them a different meaning. The Hebrew word rendered "law" is torah; and we are gravely told that in these early prophets it means, not a written law, but the oral teaching of the prophets. "Torah," says Robertson Smith, "is the living prophetic word." And again he says: "The torah is not yet a finished and complete system, booked and reduced to a code, but a living word in the mouth of the prophets" (O. T., 300).¹⁸ But where was this "living word in the mouth of the prophets," by which the calf-worship had been so severely condemned? Just three prophets had figured in Israel

¹⁸ With this Kuenen agrees, but he modifies the thought by adding: "Nothing hinders us from even assuming that they had also in view collections of laws and admonitions to which a higher antiquity or even a Mosaic origin was attributed" (*Rel. of Israel*, I. 56). Wellhausen differs from Kuenen at this point. He says: "It is certain that Moses was the founder of the Torah;" but he explains it by adding: "In fact, it can be shown that throughout the whole of the older period the Torah was no finished legislative code, but consisted entirely of the oral decisions and instructions of the priests" (*Israel*, Encyc. Brit., p. 409, c. 2). He escapes the absurdity of referring it to prophets, when there were none before Amos and Hosea to promulgate laws, but in doing so he stands against his fellow critics, who deny that there was a regular priesthood in "the older period" of which he speaks.

since the calves were set up; and with reference to them Professor Smith has already dug away the ground from under his own feet, by saying that Elijah and Elisha had no quarrel with the calf-worship, and that Amos said nothing against it. Where, then, is the torah, the "living word in the mouth of the prophets," to which Hosea appeals? It vanishes into thin air as soon as you make the inquiry.

On another page (303) Professor Smith says that when Hosea says to the priests, "Thou hast forgotten the torah of thy God" (Has. iv. 6), it "can not fairly be doubted that the torah which the priests have forgotten is the Mosaic torah;" but he still denies that it was written. He says, "It is simple matter of fact that the prophets do not refer to a written torah as the basis of their teaching, and we have seen that they absolutely deny the existence of a binding ritual law" (302). But if Hosea appealed to a torah in his denunciation of the calf-worship, whether a "living word in the mouth of the prophets," or a traditional torah transmitted orally from Moses, this torah must of necessity have been more or less of a ritual character, in that it condemned the worship of the calves. The light or the wrong of worshiping Jehovah, or any other god, under the symbol of calves, is a question of ritual, and nothing else. Unwittingly, then, in the very act of affirming that the prophets "absolutely deny the existence of a binding ritual law," our critics prove that they recognized one. Such is the self-contradiction in which this form of criticism repeatedly involves itself.

While Smith, in common with his German teachers, thus boldly denies that the prophets refer to a written torah as the basis of their teaching, here comes Prof. T. K. Cheyne, more radical in some respects than he, to flatly contradict him. In his introduction to the Book of Hosea (Cambridge Bible for Schools), he makes the following statements:

All that is certain in regard to Hosea's relation to the law, is what he tells us himself; viz.: that laws with a sanction which though ignored by the northern Israelites, he himself recognized as divine, were in course of being written down (viii. 12). Our present text

makes him even say that the divine precepts might be reckoned by myriads, but this would not apply even to our present Pentateuch, and we should probably correct *ribbo*, "myriad," into *dibhre*, "words" (of my law). There may, of course, either have been various small law-books, or one large one; we can not determine this point from the Book of Hosea (36, 37).

It is morally certain that so radical a critic as Cheyne is known to be, would not have made this admission in opposition to his fellow critics had he not been constrained to do so by the evidence in the case.

It will be observed, however, that in making this concession, Professor Cheyne is by no means willing to concede that the written law-book referred to by Hosea could have been our Pentateuch; and his reason for holding that it was not, is curious enough. It is, that the exact term "myriads" could not apply to our present Pentateuch. I suppose that no one pretends that in its literal sense it could; but when Hosea speaks of God's law as being written in ten thousand precepts, where is the simpleton who ever supposed that he used the numeral literally? But, further, if this huge numeral could not apply to the precepts of the Pentateuch, what about the precepts in his "various small law-books"? Had they as many written precepts as we find in our present Pentateuch? No critic will answer yes. Then, why try to cut off the head of the Pentateuch with a knife which, in the very attempt, cuts off the critic's own head?

4. Isaiah. In further proof that "the theology of the prophets before Ezekiel has no place for the system of priestly sacrifice and ritual," Prof. Robertson Smith quotes a well-known passage in the first chapter of Isaiah; and he quotes it as follows:

"What are your many sacrifices to me, saith Jehovah: I delight not in the blood of bullocks, and lambs, and he-goats. When ye come to see my face, who hath asked this at your hands, to tread my courts? Bring no more vain oblations . . . my soul hateth your new moons and your feasts; they are a burden upon me; I am weary to bear them"—Isa. i. 11, seq. (O. T., 293).

Quoted thus, Isaiah would prove not merely that he had no place for the priestly sacrifice and ritual, but that Jehovah

hated such, things, and rebuked the people for presenting them—that he forbade such worshipers to “tread his courts.” This is to prove too much; for on another page the same author says that the prophets have “no objection to sacrifice and ritual in the abstract;” they only deny that God has enjoined sacrifice (294).

But in thus quoting the passage, a part is omitted where the dots are printed, which, if copied, would prove, by the same line of argument, that Jehovah also hated the Sabbath. It reads: “Incense is an abomination to me; new moon and sabbath, the calling of assemblies—I can not away with iniquity and the solemn meeting.” Whatever may be thought of the new moon holy day here mentioned, and of the solemn meetings referred to, no sane man can believe that Isaiah, in the name of Jehovah, held the Sabbath to be an abomination.

Furthermore, this quotation stops too soon. It leaves out the words: “And when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide my face from you: yea, when you make many prayers, I will not hear.” Did Jehovah hate prayer? And was prayer one of the ritual observances for which the early prophets had “no place in their theology”? So it would seem if there is any sense in the use which Robertson' Smith, in common with his fellow critics, makes of this passage. But the climax of misquotation and misapplication is reached in omitting the last clause of Isaiah's philippic, which explains all that precedes: “Your hands are full of blood!” This is the reason which Jehovah himself gives why the sacrifices, the incense, the new moon holy days, the sabbath, the solemn meetings and the prayers of that people, were an abomination to him. The same is true to-day, and it ever has been. If a church were crowded today with worshipers whose hands were full of blood, every prayer they could offer, and every hymn they could sing, would be as abominable as were those denounced by Isaiah. It is therefore a fearful abomination to employ these words of the prophet as if the specified acts of worship, when rightly rendered from clean hands and pure hearts, were hateful to Jehovah. It is high time that this perversion of Jehovah's

words, first invented by the enemies of the Bible, were abandoned by those who profess to be its friends.

Immediately after quoting this passage in his own way, together with one from Amos, which we have noticed, Robertson Smith says: "It is sometimes argued that such passages mean only that Jehovah will not accept the sacrifices of the wicked, and that they are quite consistent with a belief that sacrifice and ritual are a necessary accompaniment of true religion. But there are other texts which absolutely exclude such a view." We shall examine these other texts.

5. Micah. The first of these which remains to be noticed is the oft-quoted passage in Micah, which Professor Smith introduces thus:

Micah declares that Jehovah does not require sacrifice. He asks nothing of his people but "to do justly, and love mercy, and walk humbly with their God"—Mic. vi. 8 (*ib.*, 294).

We shall best understand the passage by having the whole of it before the eye at once: "Wherewith shall I come before Jehovah, and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt offerings, and with calves a year old? Will Jehovah be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth Jehovah require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (Mic. vi. 6-8).

The four questions here expounded by the prophet require negative answers. They all point to the one end brought out in the last, the removal of "my transgression," the "sin of my soul." The one point of inquiry is, when I come before Jehovah to obtain his favor, will I secure it by burnt offerings? Will the offering of even a thousand rams secure it? Will offerings of oil secure it, even if I offer ten thousand rivers of it? Having failed with all of these, can I secure it by offering my firstborn? The answer is, No. And this is the answer, whether we think that the Levitical law was in force at the time or not. No man of intelligence ever lived under

that law who would have answered otherwise. Only the superstitious and hypocritical under the Levitical law ever pretended that God's favor to men depended on the multitude of his sacrifices, or their costliness. The law itself precluded any such pretense by prescribing as the sin-offering, whether for the sins of an individual, or those of the whole people, only a single victim, and this most usually only a lamb or a kid. It was also made perfectly plain by the law that even by these a man's sins could not be removed. The sinner was required to bring the victim to the altar, lay his hand upon its head, confess his sin, and slay the victim; and without these he knew that the offering would be ineffective (Lev. iv. 27-vi. 7). Seeing, then, that under the full sway of the Levitical law these questions would be pertinent, and would be answered in the negative, it is absurd to use them as proof that the Levitical law was not yet in existence.

To this conclusive reasoning we are able to add demonstration; for it is admitted by all the negative critics that the law in Deuteronomy recognizes the ritual of sacrifice, and even restricts the offering of sacrifices to the altar at the central sanctuary; but the author of that law employs almost the identical words of Micah when he demands: "And now, Israel, what doth Jehovah thy God require of thee, but to fear Jehovah thy God, to walk in all his ways, and to love him, and to serve Jehovah thy God with all thy heart and all thy soul, to keep the commandments of Jehovah, and his statutes, which I command thee this day for thy good?" (Deut. x. 12, 13). Does the Deuteronomist, then, whosoever he may be, exclude here the sacrifices which he elsewhere enjoins? or does he include them in walking in Jehovah's ways, serving him, and keeping his statutes? There is only one answer. And how could a man, if he lived under the Levitical law, "walk humbly with his God," as Micah requires, without offering such sacrifices as God's law required of him? A neglect of these would be pride and rebellion. On the other hand, offering a thousand rams, or ten thousand rivers of oil, if it were possible, would

be a piece of vainglory, while offering his firstborn would be heathenism.

This method of perverting the Scriptures would have a parallel, if one should argue that Jesus, in saying, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven," excludes the ordinance of baptism from his requirements. It would be a stupid fellow indeed who would not see that we do the will of our Father in heaven in part by being baptized. So the Jew walked humbly with his God by offering without fail for his sins the sacrifices appointed.

6. Last of all we come to the prophet Jeremiah. He is constantly quoted by negative critics as denying that God appointed sacrifice when he led Israel out of Egypt. Thus Robertson Smith (*O. T.*, 294) :

Jeremiah vii. 21, seq., says in express words, "Put your burnt offerings to your sacrifices, and eat flesh. For I spake not to your fathers, and gave them no command in the day that I brought them out of Egypt concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices. But this thing I commanded them, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people, etc. (Comp. Isa. xliii. 23, seq.)

Commenting further on this and similar passages, Smith says:

This does not prove that they (the prophets) have any objection to sacrifice and ritual in the abstract. But they deny that these things are of positive divine institution, or have any part in the scheme on which Jehovah's grace is administered in Israel. Jehovah, they say, has not enjoined sacrifice. This does not imply that he has never accepted sacrifice, or that ritual service is absolutely wrong. But it is at least mere form, which does not purchase any favor from Jehovah, and might be given up without offense. It is impossible to give a flatter contradiction to the traditional theory that the Levitical system was enacted in the wilderness (*ib.*, 295).

(1) If this is the real position of the prophets, it is most unaccountable; for if Jehovah had never enjoined sacrifice in his service, how could it be supposed by the prophets, or by any sane person, that it could be acceptable—that the daily slaughter of innocent victims, and frequent holocausts in which thousands of animals were slain and burned, making the house of God, as some irreverent skeptics have expressed it, a verita-

ble slaughter-house, could be accepted by him at any time or under any circumstances? Such will-worship would have been met by every true prophet of God with the rebuke which Isaiah administered to the hypocrites whose hands were full of blood, and who yet had the impudence to bring a multitude of sacrifices into the temple. "Who," says the indignant prophet, "hath required this at your hands, to trample my courts?" (Isa. 1. 10-15). And how could Solomon, without rebuke, have erected his costly and splendid temple, whose every appointment was arranged with reference to the offering of sacrifices, if God had never enjoined sacrifice as a part of his worship? The position is absurd in the highest degree; and if Jeremiah assumed it, he is either guilty of absurdity himself, or he charges it upon the whole host of Israelite worshipers from the beginning to the end.

(2) Again, if Jeremiah, or any of the prophets, is to be thus understood, then they deny what all of our critics except the most radical admit, the divine origin of the "book of the covenant." For in that book we have this well-known divine enactment: "An altar of earth thou shalt make unto me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings, and thy peace offerings, thy sheep and thine oxen: in every place where I record my name I will come unto thee and I will bless thee. And if thou make me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stones: for if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it" (Ex. xx. 24, 25). Here is a positive enactment of sacrifice, accompanied by precise directions as to the kind of altar on which they could be acceptably offered. Jeremiah, if he could have had the motive, could not have had the daring to unite with our modern critics in denying that God had thus legislated.

(3) It is admitted by even the radical critics that Jeremiah knew the Book of Deuteronomy, and believed that it was God's law by the hand of Moses. But to understand him as denying the divine enactment of sacrifice, is to make him contradict that book in which he believed, and the teaching of

which he was zealously assisting King Josiah to enforce upon the consciences of the people. For this book represents Moses in the last year of the wanderings as saying: "Unto the place which Jehovah your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put his name there, even unto his habitation shall ye seek, and thither thou shalt come: and thither ye shall bring your burnt offerings, and your sacrifices, and your tithes, and the heave-offering of your hand, and your freewill offerings, and the firstlings of your herd and of your flock" (xii. 5, 6). Our critics are never weary of quoting this passage when they are seeking to prove that it was the introduction of a law never before known in Israel; but here they come with the Book of Jeremiah in their hands—Jeremiah, who believed in the divine authority of this law, and whose book they tell us is saturated with reminiscences from Deuteronomy—and make him flatly deny the truth of this passage. Was ever inconsistency more glaring or more inexcusable? Scientific criticism!

(4) The absurdity of thus interpreting Jeremiah's words appears still more monstrous when we take into view some of his own utterances on this subject in other passages. In xi. 3, 4, he expressly cites the covenant given at Mount Sinai in these solemn words: "Thus saith Jehovah, the God of Israel: Cursed be the man that heareth not the words of this covenant, which I made with your fathers in the day that I brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, out of the iron furnace, saying, Obey my voice, and do them, according to all which I command you: so shall ye be my people, and I will be your God." But one of the things commanded when this covenant was made, was that they should erect an altar, as we have quoted above, on which to offer sacrifices and burnt offerings. In xiv. 11, 12, he says: "Jehovah said to me, Pray not for this people for their good. When they fast, I will not hear their cry; and when they offer burnt offering and oblation, I will not accept them: but I will consume them by the sword, and by the famine, and by the pestilence." Here it is clearly im-

plied that but for the extreme wickedness of the people, on account of which they were to be no longer subjects for prayer, and their burnt offerings and oblations would not be accepted, all these acts of worship would be accepted; and it is just as reasonable to say that fasting and prayer were not authorized by God, as to say that sacrifices were not.

Finally, passing by several other passages having a similar bearing, in xvii. 24-26 Jehovah promises, on condition that the people "hearken to him," that Jerusalem shall remain forever, and he adds: "They shall come from the cities of Judah, and from the cities round about Jerusalem, and from the land of Benjamin, and from the lowland, and from the mountains, and from the South, bringing burnt offerings, and sacrifices, and oblations, and frankincense, and bringing sacrifices of thanksgiving, unto the house of Jehovah." Here the whole round of Levitical sacrifices is described, and the fact that all are to be zealously observed is the crowning blessing in a gracious promise. Can we imagine Jehovah through the prophet speaking thus of a ritual which he had never authorized, and which, though observed in the right spirit, could secure no favor at his hand?

What, then, is the meaning of Jeremiah in the passage so confidently employed by the critics to prove that Jehovah had never spoken to the fathers concerning such a service? If men will but use the knowledge which they easily command when they are not swayed by prepossessions, it is not far to seek. It is found in that well-known Hebrew idiom by which, in comparing two objects or courses of action, the universal negative is used with the one that is inferior. A few examples of it may remind the intelligent reader of that which he already knows, but is apt, on account of its difference from our own usage, to forget. When Joseph had revealed himself to his guilty brethren, and was seeking to comfort them, he said: "Be not grieved, nor angry with yourselves that ye sold me hither: for God did send me before you to preserve life. . . . So now it was not you that sent me hither, but God"

(Gen. xiv. 5-8). In Deut. v. 2, 3, Moses says to the people: "Jehovah our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. Jehovah made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day." He means, Jehovah made a covenant not with our fathers only, or specially, but with us also. Jesus says: "Think not that I came to send peace on earth. I came not to send peace, but a sword" (Matt. x. 34). The people of Samaria say to the woman who had met Jesus at the well: "Now we believe, not because of thy speaking: for we have heard for ourselves, and we know that this is indeed the Saviour of the world;" and yet it had just been said, "Many of the Samaritans believed on him because of the word of the woman" (John iv. 39-42). They believed finally, not because of her speaking alone. Paul says to the Corinthians, "I was sent not to baptize, but to preach the gospel" (I. Cor. i. 17)—not to baptize alone, or chiefly, but to preach the gospel. He also says to Timothy: "Be no longer a drinker of water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities" (I. Tim. v. 23). These are a few examples of the idiom, and others are to be found in all parts of the Scriptures. Instances of its use are determined, as in the case of all other figurative language, by the nature of the case, by the context, or by the known sentiments of the writer.

The passage under discussion in Jeremiah is an example of this idiom; and the prophet means by it, "I spake not to your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices as their chief service; but this I commanded them as the chief thing, saying, Hearken unto my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people." We are forced to this conclusion, both by the sentiments of the prophet expressed in the other passages quoted above, and by the context preceding this passage. The discourse in which our passage is found begins with the chapter. It was delivered as the prophet stood in the gate of the temple. He first denounces the men of Judah for trusting to the temple of

Jehovah, as false prophets had taught them, for security against the disasters which he predicted; and tells them that they are trusting in "lying words." He demands of them, as their ground of safety, the abandonment of crimes which they were committing; and with respect to the temple and its services, he indignantly demands: "Will ye steal, and murder, and commit adultery, and swear falsely, and burn incense to Baal, and walk after other gods, whom ye have not known, and come and stand before me in this house which is called by my name, and say, We are delivered; that we may do all these abominations? Is this house which is called, by my name become a den of robbers in your eyes?" Then he reminds them of the destruction of Shiloh, where he caused his name to dwell at the first, and he tells them: "I will do unto the house which is called by my name, wherein ye trust, and the place which I gave to you and to your fathers, as I have done to Shiloh." He then tells Jeremiah not to pray for the people. Even now, since Josiah's reformation had taken place, and public idolatry had been suppressed, they were still worshiping the heavenly bodies in secret. "The children gather wood, and the fathers kindle the fire, and the women knead the dough, to make cakes to the queen of heaven, and to pour out drink-offerings to other gods, that they may provoke me to anger." It was in view of this hypocrisy that the prophet declares in the name of Jehovah: "I spake not to your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings and sacrifices: but this I commanded them, saying, Hearken unto my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people." In view of this context, and in view of the indisputable fact that both Jeremiah and the people whom he addressed recognized as true what is said of the "book of the covenant" and in Deuteronomy of God's commands in respect to sacrifice, why have our critics, who are quick to recognize this idiom in other places, so blindly failed to see it here? "There are none so blind as those who will not see."

We have now examined all of the principal passages which are used to prove that the pre-exilic prophets had no knowledge of the Levitical law, and that all of them except Jeremiah were ignorant of Deuteronomy; and we are seriously mistaken if every unprejudiced reader will not agree that they furnish no such proof. On the contrary, all of them, when fairly construed, are in perfect harmony with such knowledge, some of them presuppose it, and many passages which these critics have overlooked bear positive testimony in its favor. So elaborate and painstaking an attempt, to sustain a false assumption has seldom proved so complete a failure.

§9. Evidence from Style.

In the early stage of destructive criticism its advocates depended chiefly on peculiarities of style for determining the relative ages of documents, and for distinguishing one writer from another in composite documents. For the latter purpose it is still almost their only reliance. But this method, called literary criticism, has been abandoned to a large extent in discussing such questions as the authorship and date of Deuteronomy. Its relegation to an inferior place is the result of the many glaring exposures of its unreliability which have been published by conservative scholars. These exposures have recorded a decisive victory of conservatism, which may be taken as a token of the victory yet to be won in the whole field of controversy. Professor Driver, in his Introduction, shows the effect upon himself of this victory, by minimizing the argument from this source. He devotes but little more than four pages to the subject, and nearly three of these are taken up with the (notation of forty-one phrases characteristic of Deuteronomy. It is not claimed, in reference to any of the forty-one, that Moses could not have used it. Of many it is asserted that they were adopted from the pre-existing document JE; but this is only to acknowledge that they were adopted from what we now read in the Book of Exodus, and it conforms with the Biblical representation that this book was written before Deuteronomy. Of the author of Deuteronomy he says:

His power as an orator is shown in the long and stately periods with which his work abounds: at the same time, the parenthetic treatment which his subject often demands, always maintains its freshness, and is never monotonous or prolix. In his command of a chaste and persuasive eloquence, he stands unique among the writers of the Old Testament (102).

What orator among all that graced the history of Israel is more likely to have deserved this encomium than Moses, whose training in all the learning of the Egyptians, and whose practice through forty years in the wilderness with people whom he was almost daily addressing, gave him pre-eminent opportunities to acquire unique oratorical powers? It is not too much to say that Driver abandons the argument from style as respects the authorship of Deuteronomy.¹⁹

This completes our review of the evidences on which those critics who deny the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy depend for their conclusion. If not exhaustive of these, numerically considered, it is exhaustive, we modestly think, of their force as a whole. The refutation will derive additional force from the positive evidence for the Mosaic authorship which we shall next present.

¹⁹ The reader who is curious to trace the arguments and illustrations by which this citadel of the earlier critics has been stormed, is referred to the following works: Edersheim's *History and Prophecy in Reference to the Messiah*, 261-263; Stanley Leathes' *Witness of the Old Testament to Christ*, 282 ff.; Green's *Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, 113-118; Bartlett's *Veracity of the Hexateuch*, 300-302; *The Higher Critics Criticised*, by H. L. Hastings and R. P. Stebbins, lxii., lxiii.; 152-172.

PART II.

**EVIDENCE FOR THE MOSAIC
AUTHORSHIP.**

EVIDENCE FOR THE MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP.

I. INTERNAL, EVIDENCE.

§1. The Direct Testimony of the Writer.

It is a rule of evidence recognized in our courts of justice, that the claim of authorship which any written document sets forth within itself has a presumption in its favor. This presumption has such force that upon it alone the document must be received as a genuine product of said author, unless the claim is proved to be false. The burden of proof lies on him who calls it in question. This is true of bank checks, notes of hand, deeds to real estate, wills, and all such writings. It is equally true of books. This presumption is the natural starting-point for such a discussion as the present, but on the preceding pages we have considered evidences by which certain critics have attempted to set it aside. This reversal of the natural order seemed prudent, as we have remarked in the Introduction (§7), on account of the fact that the minds of many have been for a generation preoccupied with the belief that the Mosaic authorship has been disproved. Having examined all of these evidences which can be claimed as decisive in the case, and found that none of them has the force claimed for it, and that many have a bearing in the opposite direction, we now propose to set forth in contrast with these the evidences which have led Biblical scholars in the past as in the present to believe that Moses is the author of the book. We shall dwell first on explicit statements of the book itself.

1. The first sentence of the book, which is evidently intended as its title, reads thus: "These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel beyond Jordan in the wilderness, in the Arabah over against Suph, between Paran and Tophel, and Laban, and Hazeroth, and Di-zahab." This represents

the contents of the book as having been delivered orally to all Israel by Moses. It also very definitely locates the place in which this was done. Of the words defining the place we have spoken fully in Part First, Section 6. The author next states very definitely the time at which Moses began this oral communication: "It came to pass in the fortieth year, in the eleventh month, on the first day of the month, that Moses spake unto the children of Israel, according to all that Jehovah had given him in commandment unto them." In the next sentence he again defines the place in different words, saying, "Beyond Jordan, in the land of Moab, began Moses to declare this law." Then follows a discourse, beginning with verse 6, and ending with the fourth chapter and fortieth verse.

These statements affirm nothing about committing the discourse to writing. They refer only to its oral delivery; but in doing this they make Moses the author of what is written. On this point they could not be more explicit. These prefatory remarks may have been written after the discourse was; but whether written before or after does not appear from the text. Neither does it appear whether they were written by Moses himself, or by another person; for although the third person is used in speaking of Moses, this was the frequent custom of ancient historians when speaking of themselves. In the speech itself the first person is necessarily employed.

One thing more in these prefatory remarks demands our attention. The words of Moses which follow are called a "law." "Moses began to declare this law" (verse 5). But in the first discourse, while there are very solemn exhortations to keep the laws which Moses had previously given, there are no laws propounded. The discourse is historical, not legal. But the second discourse is legal and not historical. These considerations show that the expression "this law" is intended to include both; just as, in later times, the whole Pentateuch, law and history was called "the law." The preface then affirms the Mosaic authorship not merely of the first discourse, but of that which follows. It includes, in reality, the contents of

all the rest of the book as it existed at the time; and we should understand it as including all as we now have it unless we find good reason to suppose that some of it has been added since.

2. Preface to the Second Discourse. At v. 1 a second discourse begins, and it closes at xxvi. 19. It is introduced by prefatory statements in iv. 44-49, of which this is the first: "And this is the law which Moses set before the children of Israel: these are the testimonies, and the statutes, and the judgments, which Moses spake to the children of Israel, when they came forth out of Egypt; beyond Jordan, over against Beth-peor, in the land of Sihon king of the Amorites, who dwelt at Heshbon, whom Moses and the children of Israel smote, when they came forth out of Egypt." Here the expression, "And this is the law," refers back to the words, "Moses began to declare this law" (i. 5), and means this also is the law; that is, a continuance of the law which Moses set before Israel. It is further defined here as containing "testimonies, statutes and judgments." This is the second declaration of the Mosaic authorship, and in compliance with it we are told that "Moses called unto all Israel, and said to them, Hear, O Israel, the statutes and the judgments which I speak in your ears this day, that ye may learn them, and observe to do them" (v. 1).

3. After the Close of the Second Discourse. Next after this second discourse by Moses, directions are given for the erection of great stones at Mt. Ebal, which were to be covered with plaster, and in the plaster, while soft, were to be written "all the words of this law;" and the singular ceremony of pronouncing curses and blessings was there to be observed (xxvii. 1-26). In the directions here given, Moses is three times said to have been the principal speaker. First, "Moses and the elders of Israel" command the people, saying, "Keep all the commandment which I command you this day" (1); second, "Moses and the priests the Levites" spake to all Israel, saying, "Keep silence, and hearken, O Israel" (9); and third, "Moses charged the people the same day" (11). Thus the

twenty-seventh chapter is ascribed to Moses three times. Then the twenty-eighth chapter, which is a prophetic outline of the history of Israel down to the Roman captivity, and on to the present day, is a continuation of what he says in the twenty-seventh.

4. In the Preface to the Covenant. The section including chapters xxix. and xxx. is introduced with the statement, "These are the words of the covenant which Jehovah commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel in the land of Moab, beside the covenant which he made with them in Horeb;" and the words themselves are preceded by the statement, "Moses called unto all Israel, and said to them." Thus the contents of these two chapters are explicitly ascribed to Moses, and the thirty-first chapter opens with the statement, "And Moses went and spake these words unto all Israel." Then the next seven verses of chapter xxxi. are occupied with what Moses said by way of encouraging the people, and Joshua his successor.

5. Committing this Law to Writing. Thus far nothing has been said in the book about committing its contents to writing. All has been spoken by Moses, in the form of public addresses to "all Israel." Now we have the statement (xxx. 9): "And Moses wrote this law, and delivered it to the priests the sons of Levi, who bore the ark of the covenant of Jehovah, and unto all the elders of Israel." This is immediately followed by the command, "At the end of every seven years, in the set time of the year of release, in the feast of tabernacles, when all Israel is come to appear before Jehovah thy God in the place which he shall choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing." Farther on in the same chapter (24-2G) provision is made for the preservation of the book thus written, and it is said: "And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites, who bore the ark of the covenant of Jehovah, saying, Take this book of the law, and put it by the side of the ark of the covenant of Jehovah your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee."

We thus have the most explicit testimony of this book itself, that its contents up to the close of its thirty-first chapter were first delivered orally to all Israel by Moses, and then written by him in a book, and that this book was then delivered to the guardians of the most sacred symbol of Jehovah's presence, the ark of the covenant, as if it were of equal sanctity, and to be preserved with equal vigilance. It is vain to except any of the preceding contents, such as the first four chapters, and ascribe to them a later origin, for the repeated expression, "this law," found in every part as we have seen, like the links of a continuous chain binds all the parts in one.

6. In the Preface to the Song, and that to the Blessing. We have already, in a previous section (§6, 4), called attention to the four explicit statements of the Mosaic authorship of the "song of Moses" (xxx. 19, 22, 30; xxxii. 44); and to the one which asserts that he blessed the children of Israel with the blessing contained in the thirty-third chapter (xxxiii. 1); and we have answered the arguments by which adverse critics have tried to set this testimony aside. Nothing more needs to be said on these points.

We have now reached the end of the book, with the exception of the account of the death of Moses, and some comments on his career, all of which undoubtedly came from the pen of some later writer or writers. A very small number of persons, with extreme views of inspiration, have expressed the opinion that Moses, by inspiration, wrote this account and these comments; and destructive critics have sometimes cited this fact, in order to throw discredit on the whole company of scholars who believe in the Mosaic authorship. This is unworthy of men claiming to be critics. We could as well retort by quoting some of the silly opinions advanced by unskilled advocates of their own theory, of which many can be found, and hold their entire school responsible for these.

The reader is now better prepared to appreciate the oft-repeated assertion that the Book of Deuteronomy does not claim Moses as its author. No assertion could be more reck-

less on the part of any man who has gathered up the book's account of itself; and the man who has not done this has no right to make any assertion at all on the subject. Unless this internal evidence shall be set aside by such proofs as have never yet been brought forth, it must stand good before the bar of enlightened opinion.

§2. Indirect Testimony of the Author.

The formal claim of authorship made in a document may often be confirmed, or thrown into doubt, by remarks incidentally made when the question of authorship is not in the author's mind. A large number of such remarks, confirming the formal claim which we have just considered, is found in the Book of Deuteronomy. They consist in incidental allusions to the fact that when the speeches and poems which make up the body of the work were composed, the speaker and his auditors had not yet crossed over into the promised land. There are none of these in the first discourse, for the evident reason that in it the speaker was reciting and commenting on past events. But in the twenty-seven chapters which begin with the sixth and end with the thirty-second, they are as numerous as the chapters. They are not expressed in a stereotyped formula, as if they had been inserted for effect. Once we have, "In the land which ye go over to possess it" (vi. 1). Three times we have, "When Jehovah thy God shall bring thee into the land which he sware to thy fathers to give thee" (vi. 10; vii. 1; xi. 29); twice, "That thou mayest go in and possess the good land" (vi. 18; viii. 1); once, "Thou art to pass over Jordan this day" (ix. 1); once, "They shall go in and possess the land" (x. 11); three times, "The land which thou goest in to possess it" (xi. 10, 11; xxxii. 47); once, "When ye go over Jordan and dwell in the land" (xii. 10); three times, "When thou shalt come into the land" (xvii. 4; xviii. 9; xxvi. 1); four times, "The land which Jehovah giveth thee to possess it" (xix. 2; xxi. 1, 23; xxv. 19); twice, "On the day when ye pass over Jordan" (xxvii. 2, 4); one "Jehovah thy God will go over before thee" (xxxi. 3); twice; "Joshua shall go

INDEX.

A

Ahaz, his heathen altar, 163.
Altar of the two and a half tribes, 230.
Altar at Mt. Ebal, 225.
Amalek, the decree against, 202.
Ammon, Moab and Edom, 204.
Amos, his relation to calf-worship, 171, 253.
Antiquarian notes in Deuteronomy, 114.
Apostles, did they affirm the Mosaic authorship? 294; did Peter? 295; did John? 295; did Paul? 296.
Assertions of authorship in Deuteronomy, 195, 197, 198.
"At that time," argument from, 112
Authority of Christ on the subject, 265.

B

"Beyond Jordan," argument from, 106.
Blessing and cursing, 125.
Blessings of the tribes, 132.
Bochim, sacrifice at, 35, 141; a back reference to Exodus, Leviticus and Deuteronomy, 229.
Book of the covenant, its altar and sacrifice, 185.
Briggs, Prof., on Samson, 231.

C

Canaanites, decree of extermination, 203, 219.
Children of murderers spared, 252.
Chronicles set aside, 138.
Cities of refuge, 97, 227.
Claim of authorship in the title, 195.
Contradictions as to financial condition of the Levites, 55; as to tithes, 63; as to the peace-offerings, 67; as to the Passover sacrifices, 68; as to the flesh of animals not slaughtered, 69; as to Hebrew bondservants, 71; as to the Decalogue, 78; as to movements of Moses at Mt. Sinai, 83; as to the time of making the ark,

85; as to the mission of the spies, 88; as to the sojourn at Kadesh, 91; as to the consecration of the Levites, 94; as to the cities of refuge, 97; as to the year of release, 99; as to eating firstlings and tithes, 100; as to the wilderness itinerary, 104.
Criticism, proper method of, iv.

D

Date of Deuteronomy, vii.
David, did he officiate as a priest? 152; priesthood of his sons, 153.
Deborah's forty thousand, 233, note.
Decalogue, its forms, 78.
Deuteronomy, the key of the critical arch, xix.
Deuteronomy a "reformulation of old laws," 214.
Dishonest motives on part of D, 213
Documents J and E, viii.
Document H, x.
Document P, x.
Documents distinguished, how, xi.
Doom of the Gibeonites, 236. 233, note.

E

Elijah and Elisha, 169.
Elkanah's feast, 145.
Ezra's book our Pentateuch, 139.

F

False prophets abounding, 123.
Foreign guards in the temple, 160.
Fraud, the question of, 209; the charge admitted, 210; the charge denied. 312.

G

Gideon's altar, 36, 142; his ephod, 235,

H

Hexateuch, xiv.
High places, in Judah, 46; in Israel, 47, 155; Solomon's relation to, 156, 165; their condemnation, 248. 260.
Hosea, his relation to calf-worship, 175; his knowledge of the law, 176; his 10,000 precepts, 180.

Hilkiah's book, was it the Pentateuch, or only Deuteronomy? 1, 4—10; when written, 17-84; how its reception accounted for, 24-38.
Historicity of Pentateuch, xii, xiv.
Host of heaven, when worshiped, 121.

I.

Infidel sources of analytical theory of Pentateuch, xvi.
Infidel tendency of analytical theory, xvii; its effect in Germany, xviii.
Indirect testimony as to authorship of Deuteronomy, 200.
Inspiration of Deuteronomy, 216.
Isaiah's philippic, 180.
Isaiah's knowledge of Deuteronomy, 250, 259; of the other law-books, 258, 261, 263.

J.

Jehovah's charge to Joshua, 218.
Jephthah's vow, 142.
Jeremiah on sacrifices, 184.
Jericho, its property "devoted," 223.
Jesus, his authority in criticism, 264, 265; did he know the facts? 266; bearing of the Kenosis, 267; bearing of his ignorance of the day and hour, 268; did he affirm the Mosaic authorship? 260, 277, 285; Prof. Briggs on this issue, 270, 276; Prof. Driver on the same, 273, 274, 281; Prof. Cheyne on the same, 274.
Joshua, Book of, set aside, 137, 228.
Jubilee, release from bondage, 76.
Judges, Book of, Levitically false, 141, 143.

K.

Kadesh of Naphthali, alleged sanctuary at, 142.
Kadesh-Barnea, sojourn of Israel at, 91.

L.

Landmarks, 124.
Law of the kingdom, 115, 157.
Law of evidence as to authorship, 195.
Levitical cities, 228
Levitical law known to Amos, 254.
Levitical law known to Hosea, 255.

P.

Peace-offerings, 232.
Pillar to Jehovah in Egypt, 20.
Plan of the book, xx.

Predictions in Deuteronomy, 205.
"Priests and Levites," 49.
Priests disqualified by Josiah, 53.
Priesthood in book of the covenant, 53.
Proper method of criticism, iv.

Prophetic teaching of Deuteronomy, 122.
Prophets, the early, and sacrifice, 169.

R.

Ryle's canon of Old Testament, 1.

S.

Samuel's offerings, 38; was he a priest? 150.
Saul's offering at Gilgal, 38, 152.
Shechem, sanctuary at, 37.
Shiloh, ritual at, 144, 147, 150, 236, 842.
Single sanctuary, was it an innovation? 89-34.
Solomon, his worship at high places, 155; his new shrines, 156; his pillars, 158; did he officiate at the altar? 158; his temple ritual, 159; his deposition of Abiathar, 164; his forbidden marriages, 164.
Song of Moses, 127.
Speeches in historical books, 813.
Spies, the mission of, 88.
Style of Deuteronomy, 181, 190.
Supreme tribunal, when instituted, 119.

T.

Tabernacle, its location at Nob, 44; its location at Gibeon, 44; was it the structure at Shiloh? 148, 150, 151, 236; its contents, 237; its existence denied, 239.
Tabernacles, feast of, 140, 146.
Temple, Solomon's, to supersede the tabernacle, 244; its service exclusive, 247.
Testimony, the, given to Joash, 251.
Titles of parties in criticism, vi.
Torah, the; what it was, 178, 254, 258.

W.

"When we came forth out of Egypt," argument from, 114.
Worship restricted to Jerusalem, 254.
Writing Deuteronomy, 198.

Z.

Zadok, his ancestry, 164.

SCRIPTURE REFERENCES.

GENESIS	Page		Page.
Chapter	ix. 16	" xxxiv. 22 145
" xxi. 13 23		" xxxiv. 26 237
" xxxi. 40, 41, 52 23		" xxxvii. 186
" xxxiii. 18-22 23		" xi. 17-21 86
" xxxv. 14, 20 23		
" xxxviii. 1-30 137		
" xiv. 5-8 187		
EXODUS.			
Chapter iv. 10 122		
" 1-8; xii. 6, 18,	69, 241		
" xiii. 5, 11 201		
" xvi. 1-3 241		
" xvii. 8-16 203		
" xviii. 1 54		
" xix. 22, 2454, 84		
" xx.-xxiii. .viii,	xiii, 7, 15,		
16, 27, 49, 169		
" xx. 23 53		
" xx. 24, 25 185		
" xxi. 4 76		
" xxi. 7 74		
" xxii. 37 69		
" xxiii. 19 236		
" xxiii. 27, 33 220		
" xxiii. 32 229		
" xxiv. 1-10 viii		
" xxiv. 18 86		
" xxv. 10. 21 86		
" xxv. 22 238		
" xxv. 22, 30, 37 246		
" xxvii. 1-8 32		
" xxvii. 20 246		
" xxix. 28 232		
" xxx. 7-9, 17-21 240		
" xxxii. 7-9 84		
" xxxii. 31, 19 85		
" xxxiii. 7-23 86		
" xxxiv. 1, 2 85		
" xxxiv. 1-4 86		
" xxxiv. 11-16 164		
LEVITICUS.			
Chapter ii. 11255		
" iii.232.		
" iv. 27183		
" vi. 7183		
" vii232		
" vii. 9, 10256		
" vii. 13255		
" xiv. 34201		
" xvii. 15, 1670		
" xix. 31258		
" xx. 6, 27258		
" xx. 2713		
" xxiii. 869		
" xxiii. 10201		
" xxv. 2201		
" xxv. 32, 3359		
" xxv. 44229		
" xxv. 44-4676		
" xxvi10		
" xxvi. 30 249,250		
" xxvii. 28, 29224		
" xxvii. 30-3363		
NUMBERS.			
Chapter vi230		
" x. 5-895		
" xi. 18-22174		
" xii. 188		
" xii. 1693		
" xiii. 2093		
" xv. 1-4192,256		
" xv. 2, 18,201		
" xvi. 40, 41, 50,201		
" xvii. 1-13201		
" xviii. 1-32,201		
" xix. 16248		
" xx. 1, 2294, 95		
" xxii. 1107		
" xxv. 3030		
" xxviii256		
" xxix256		
" xxxi. 25-4768		
" xxxii. 19107		
" xxxii. 38-4094		
" xxxiii93		

	Page
Chapter xxxiii 19.....	100
“ xxxiii. 31-33	104
“ xxxiii 38	94
“ xxxiii. 38-414	93
“ xxxiii. 50-56	220
“ xxxiii 51	201
“ xxxiv. 2	201
“ xxxiv 15	107
“ xxxv. 1-8	227, 228
“ xxxv.10	201
“ xxxvi 13	218
DEUTERONOMY	
Chapter i. 1	195
“ i. 1, 2	196
“ i. 22, 23, 36, 38	88
“ i. 37, 38	95
“ i. 46-ii. 1	93, 94
“ iii 8	107, 110
“ iv. 8, 9	62
“ iv. 16	253
“ iv. 41-43	227
“ iv. 44-49	197
“ iv. 45	5
“ v. 2, 3	187
“ vi. 1, 10, 18	200
“ vii. 1	200
“ vii. 1-3	164
“ vii. 2	229
“ viii 1	200
“ ix 1	200
“ ix. 17	84, 85
“ x. 6, 7	104
“ x. 11	200
“ x 12, 13	183
“ xi 29	200, 225
“ xi 30	107
“ xii. 5, 6	103, 186
“ xii. 10	200
“ xii 12	58
“ xii 18	58
“ xii 19	58
“ xiii 12-18	221
“ xiv 21	70
“ xiv 22, 23	64
“ xiv 27	58
“ xiv 29	70
“ xv 17	74
“ xv 19	103
“ xvi 8	12
“ xvi. 11, 14	58
“ xvi 18-20	73
“ xvi 22	21

	Page
Chapter xvii 4	200
“ xvii 14-20	115
“ xvii 18	58
“ xvii 18, 19	251
“ xvi 1 18-20	15
“ xviii 1	58
“ xviii. 3	67
“ xviii 6-8	59
“ xviii 9	200
“ xviii 10-12, 14-17	257
“ xviii. 11	258
“ xviii 15-19	255
“ xix 1-13	98, 227
“ xix 4	200
“ xix 14	124
“ XX 16-18	204, 220
“ xx 16,17	224
“ xxi 10-14	165
“ xxi 11	200
“ xxii 3-7	204
“ xxiii 18	237
“ xxv 8	58
“ xxv. 16	15
“ xxv 19, 17-19	200, 204
“ xxvi 11-13	58
“ xxvi	5
“ xxvii 1-26, 1-14	197, 228
“ xxvii 14, 9	58
“ xxviii	298
“ xxviii 1	200
“ xxviii 36	205
“ xxviii 37	9
“ xxviii 49-51, 53	126, 207
“ xxviii 63-68	208
“ xxix	198
“ xxix 1-13	6
“ xxix 24	9
“ xxx	198
“ xxx 1-5	208
“ xxx , xxxii	290
“ xxxi	198
“ xxxi 3 18, 20	200
“ xxxi 19, 20, 22	127
“ xxxi 24-26	3
“ xxxii 40	96
“ xxxii 44	128
“ xxxiv	199
JOSHUA	
Chapter 1 7, 8	278
“ i. 18	15
“ iii. 3	50
“ vi.	107

	Page.
Chapter vi. 17, 18	223
“ viii. 1-8	225
“ viii. 30-35	225
“ ix. 23, 27	225
“ xviii. 1	33
“ xxi. 1-3	228
“ xxii	220-223
“ xxiii. 13	229

JUDGES.

Chapter ii. 1-3	229
“ ii. 1-5	35
“ vii. 25	157
“ viii. 27	235
“ xiii. 5, 7	255
“ xiii. 15-20	35
“ xvi. 1, 7	255
“ xvii	52
“ xvii	233
“ xviii	52
“ xviii. 30	234
“ xx. 26, 27	232
“ xx. 20-28	237
“ xxi. 4	232
“ xxi. 21	145
“ xxi. 24	147

I. SAMUEL.

Chapter i. 3	40, 159
“ i. 7, 8	236
“ i. 20, 21	145
“ ii. 15, 22, 24	236
“ ii. 17	40
“ ii. 18	235
“ ii. 22	239, 241
“ iii. 3	236
“ iii. 20	42
“ iv. 4	238
“ vi. 20-23	153
“ vii. 1	151
“ vii. 3-9	42
“ vii. 20	42
“ viii. 6-8	119
“ viii. 8	152
“ viii. 18	155
“ x. 25	252
“ xii. 25	151
“ xiii. 6-12	119
“ xiii. 9-14	38
“ xiii. 15, 16	142
“ xiv. 1-3, 18, 19	152
“ xiv. 3	44
“ xiv. 4	110

Chapter xiv. 35	38
“ xxi. 1-9	44
“ xxi. 3-6	238
“ xxii. 18-23	44
“ xxii. 19	44

II. SAMUEL.

Chapter vi. 14	235
“ vi. 20-23	153
“ vii. 1-13	224
“ viii. 18	155
“ xv. 12, 32	33

I. KINGS.

Chapter ii-3	15
“ ii. 26	164
“ v. 3-5	244
“ vi. 1	245
“ viii. 1-4, 64	245
“ xi. 1, 2	160
“ xi. 7	247
“ xii. 26, 29, 51	247
“ xii. 33	248
“ xiii. 2	248
“ xiv. 28	160
“ xvi. 30, 31	170
“ xxii. 1-6, 16	viii

II. KINGS.

Chapter xi. 12	251
“ xii. 2, 3	166
“ xii. 16	163
“ xii. 20, 21	252
“ xiv. 5, 6	253
“ xiv. 6	15
“ xiv. 24	108
“ xv. 3	121
“ xviii. 1-5	168
“ xviii. 3-6, 22	249
“ xviii. 6	18
“ xxiii. 2	6
“ xxiii. 25	7

1. CHRONICLES.

Chapter vi. 1-12	164
“ xv. 11, 12	153
“ xvi. 37-42	45
“ xviii. 17	155

II. CHRONICLES.

Chapter v. 5	50
“ xi. 13, 14	58
“ xi. 13-16	48
“ xix. 11	120

	Page
Chapter xxiii 18	50
“ xxx 27	50
“ xxxiv 3	3
EZRA	
Chapter viii 36	208
NEHEMIAH	
Chapter viii, ix	139
PSALMS.	
Chapter xvi.....	274
“ cx	272
ISAIAH.	
Chapter i 10-15	185
“ ii 6-8	256
“ viii 19,20	257
“ ix 7	263
“ xvii 7,8	259
“ xxiv. 5, 6	258
“ xxiv 13	261
“ xxvii 9	260
“ xxxi. 3	118
“ xxxvi 9	118
“ xl 16	261
“ xl -xlviii	263
“ xlii 21 24	262
“ xliii 22-24	262
“ lxvi 3	263
JEREMIAH	
Chapter vii. 12-14	44
“ viii 8	261
“ xi 1, 4.	186
“ xiv. 11, 12	186
“ xvii 24-26	187
“ xxxiv 8-22	73
“ xxxvi. 6-9	44
HOSEA	
Chapter iv 6	127
“ vi 6	127
“ viii 11, 12	127, 261
AMOS	
Chapter i. 2	253
“ ii 4	253
“ ii 11, 12	255
“ iii. 13, 14	172
“ iv 4, 5	172
“ iv 5	255
“ v 4-6. . . . 172 “ v 22	256

	Page
Chapter vi 6 8.	182

MATTHEW	
Chapter ix 13	177
“ x 34	188
“ xii 7	177
“ XV 1-9	261
“ xix 3-9.	270
“ xix 7	287
“ xxii 41-46	273

MARK	
Chapter i 44	287
“ vii. 10	288
“ xii 26	275, 285
“ xii 35-37	273

LUKE	
Chapter xx 41-44	273

JOHN	
Chapter i 17	295
“ i 45	290
“ iii. 34	267
“ v 6	290
“ v i 7 0	278
“ v i i 1 3	278, 287, 288
“ vii 23	285
“ viii 56, 58	268
“ xvii. 4, 5	268

ACTS	
Chapter iii 22-24.	290
“ iii. 22,23	295
“ vii 37	290
“ xxvi 22	290

ROMANS	
Chapter x 5 . . 296 “ x 5-19	290

I CORINTHIANS	
Chapter i 13	278
“ 11 10	268
“ ix. 1 4	289
“ xi 23	289

HEBREWS	
Chapter vii. 14	287, 288
“ x. 28	289

