

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

---

No. 9.—January, 1882.

---

I.

THE COMPARATIVE CERTAINTY OF PHYSICS AND  
METAPHYSICS.

THEOPHRASTUS, or perhaps Andronicus, in editing the writings of Aristotle, arranged them in two classes: τὰ φυσικά and τὰ μετὰ τὰ φυσικά: physics and metaphysics. Whether the meaning was, that the latter class is to be *read after* the first, or whether it treats of objects that *exist beyond* those treated of in the first class, has been disputed. We shall adopt the latter explanation as much the most probable, and understand by physics those provinces of inquiry which relate to the irrational and material world, and by metaphysics those relating to the rational and spiritual. Aristotle's own division of knowledge favors this explanation of the running titles under which his writings have been placed. "If there is something," he says, *Metaphysics*, v. i., "that is eternal and immovable, and that involves a separate subsistence, it is evident that it is the province of ontological science to investigate this. It is not certainly the province of physical science, for physical science is conversant about certain movable natures." Under τὰ φυσικά, Aristotle included the doctrine of material motion as seen in the heavens and earth; the history of animals; the nature of sensuous perception; of memory; of sleep and dreams; of life and death. Under τὰ μετὰ τὰ φυσικά, he grouped ethics, politics, rhetoric, logic, and ontology or metaphysics proper. Some of these terms were wider than in modern usage. This is particularly the case with ethics and politics, which included considerable that now falls under the heads of psychology and philosophy. Aristotle regarded the metaphysical division as by far the most important part of human knowledge, denominating it the "first philosophy," implying that the physical division is secondary.

## VII.

### PROF. ROBERTSON SMITH ON THE PENTATEUCH.

PROF. ROBERTSON SMITH tells us on p. 216 of his recently published lectures on Biblical Criticism,\* that "the discrepancy between the traditional view of the Pentateuch and the plain statements of the historical books and the Prophets, is marked and fundamental." This view is accordingly discarded by him and another commended to us as representing "the growing conviction of an overwhelming weight of the most earnest and sober scholarship." He asks us to believe that Deuteronomy made its first appearance in the reign of Josiah, and that the Levitical law was not in existence until the time of Ezra.

The hypothesis which the Professor has undertaken to unfold and to defend has only very recently attracted any serious attention. Prof. Reuss, of Strasburg claims the credit of having given the original impulse to this newest school of Pentateuch criticism, by propounding this view in his lectures as early as 1833. His pupil, K. H. Graf, elaborated it more fully in his treatise, "*De Templo Silensi*," in 1855; in his "*Prophet Jeremiah*" (1862); and in his "*Geschichtliche Bücher des Alten Testaments*" (1866). As proposed by him, however, it was burdened with fatal inconsistencies which were speedily pointed out by its antagonists. The divisive critics, who parcelled out the Pentateuch among different writers, had previously conducted their analysis and based their conclusions upon literary considerations chiefly, the style and diction and quality of thought and acquaintance shown with other parts of the work. Graf drew his arguments from legislative considerations, the supposed development of laws, and the order in which successive enactments may be thought to have been made. And conceiving the legislation of Deuteronomy to be simpler and

---

\* "*The Old Testament in the Jewish Church.*" Twelve Lectures on Biblical Criticism, by W. Robertson Smith, M.A. New York, 1881. 12mo, pp. 441.

more primitive, and that of Leviticus to be more complicated and developed, he inferred, contrary to the prevailing sentiment of preceding critics, that Deuteronomy is of earlier date than Leviticus, and belongs to a prior stage in the history of the people. Meanwhile he allowed the conclusions of the critics in relation to the narratives of the Pentateuch to remain undisturbed, conceding a higher antiquity to the Elohist portion which is in the closest affinity with Leviticus than to the Jehovistic portion to which Deuteronomy attaches itself. This self-contradiction Kuenen undertook to remove by reversing the relation of the Elohist and the Jehovist, thus boldly challenging the position which all preceding critical investigations had been supposed to settle beyond peradventure.

To disinterested spectators of these hostile critical camps, this looks very like a fresh demonstration of the precarious and inconclusive nature of their entire process of argument. Experiments without number have been made of running the dissecting knife through the Pentateuch; and each fresh operator has pronounced, with the utmost positiveness, upon the various age of its several portions, and has pointed out the influences under which each was written and the condition of affairs when it was produced. And now everything has been thrown into a fresh jumble again; the whole order of production, confidently insisted upon before, is suddenly declared to be a mistake; everything must be reconstructed on a new basis. In the midst of this jargon of voices, clamoring on the one hand for the priority of the Elohist, and on the other for the priority of the Jehovist, it may be safe to wait a while before attaching ourselves to either party. Possibly the next critical discovery may be that they were contemporaneous.

We cannot deny to the authors of this latest hypothesis the praise of a high degree of ingenuity in its construction, of consummate dexterity in adapting it to the emergencies of the case, and in marshalling all available materials for its support, and of unflinching intrepidity, or rather a veritable audacity, in pushing it to its last results, so that it is absolutely beyond the reach of the *reductio ad absurdum* argument; for the most preposterous conclusions are accepted without hesitation, and paraded as genuine discoveries. Kuenen and Wellhausen have shown us by what clever tricks of legerdemain they can construct castles in the air and produce histories which have positively no basis whatever but their own exuberant fancy; while Lagarde makes the practical application of their principles by demanding the overthrow of the Christian Church and its institutions as the mere outgrowth of Pharisaical superstition. The temporary applause which has followed upon the performance of these novel feats is no augury of its abiding

popularity, much less of its assured success. The boastful claims of its advocates will not disturb the equanimity of those who remember with what rapidity hypothesis has succeeded hypothesis, and one phase of criticism has grown up after another in the fruitful soil of German speculation.

It is substantially a revival of ideas which were almost simultaneously suggested by Vatke, George, and Von Bohlen, in 1835, but which then fell utterly flat. De Wette,\* in his review of these "three young critics," dryly suggested that there was a reason for this hypothesis coming to the surface, inasmuch as the criticism of the Pentateuch could only thus complete the entire round of possible assumptions. And he said of the reconstruction of Israelitish history upon the basis proposed, that "the only thing lacking to make it attractive is truth"; "whether from a dread of individualism inspired by the Hegelian philosophy, a predilection for development and self-impelled struggles upward, or a love of paradox, they have linked the history of Hebraism not with the fixed point of the grand creations of Moses, but have suspended its beginnings upon airy nothing." Hupfeld† repudiated in the strongest terms the distinctive principle of their hypothesis (as of Graf's and Kuenen's) that Deuteronomy is the earliest instead of the latest portion of the Pentateuch, calling it "a monstrous error that turned everything topsy-turvy and perverted and entangled the questions at issue, but did not solve them." Riehm,‡ in 1854, considered it "a critical or rather uncritical view," which was already "antiquated" and unworthy of attention. And there is little likelihood that this hypothesis, even in its most recent phase, will win its way to universal favor, when critics such as Riehm, Dillmann, Kleinert, Marti, Delitzsch, Klostermann, Bredenkamp, and D. Hoffmann§ have pronounced against it, not to speak of the assaults made upon it from the rear by those who charge it with a timid conservatism and with not being thoroughgoing enough in the work of demolition. It is apparent that this hypothesis affords us no firm footing

\* "Studien und Kritiken for 1837," pp. 955, 981.

† "De Primitiva Fectorum Ratione," 1851, p. 1.

‡ "Die Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab, Vorrede."

§ Riehm reviewed Graf's positions in the "Studien und Kritiken" for 1868 and 1872; Dillmann, "Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus," 1880; Kleinert, "Das Deuteronomium und der Deuteronomiker," 1872; Marti, "Traces of the so-called Grundschrift of the Hexateuch in the Pre-exilic Prophets of the Old Testament," in the "Jahrbücher für Protestantische Theologie," 1880; Delitzsch, a series of articles in "Luthardt's Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben," 1880; Klostermann, in the "Zeitschrift für Lutharische Theologie und Kirche," 1877; Bredenkamp, "Gesetz und Propheten," 1881; D. Hoffmann, "Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums," 1876-'80.

were we to embrace it. If all that has thus far been asked were to be conceded, no guarantee is or can be given against fresh demands in the same direction. It is only the arbitrary pleasure of the critics and nothing in the nature of the case which leads them with their principles and methods to stop where they do.

In five passages in the Pentateuch (Ex. xvii. 14; xxiv. 4; xxxiv. 27; Num. xxxiii. 2; Deut. xxxi. 9, 22, 24), as Prof. W. R. S. correctly informs us, Moses is said to have written down certain things. The express statement of his authorship in these cases does not exclude it in others any more than it follows from Isa. viii. 1 and xxx. 8, that Isaiah wrote nothing but what is referred to in those verses. The natural presumption, on the contrary, is that if he wrote those scraps of the history and those sections of the law, he also wrote others which it was quite as important to have recorded. These recognitions of the fact that whatever was memorable should be committed to writing for safe preservation, and that Moses was the proper person to write it, would rather lead us to expect that Moses would record the history and the legislation in which he bore so prominent a part, and incline us to believe that "the book," to which reference is made, Ex. xvii. 14 *Heb.*, is such a comprehensive work upon which he was then already engaged, or which at least he intended to prepare.

But we shall lay no stress upon presumptions. We shall concern ourselves simply with duly certified facts; and as the discussion of Prof. W. R. S. relates merely to the laws of the Pentateuch, we shall confine ourselves to these. And here we adopt the appropriate division, which he gives us, pp. 316 ff., into "three principal groups of laws or ritual observances in addition to the ten commandments," viz: 1. The collection, Ex. xxi.-xxiii.; 2. The Deuteronomic code, Deut. xii.-xxvi. as distinguished from what is purely hortatory and historical in the book; 3. The Levitical legislation, which does not form a compact code like the preceding, but is scattered through several parts of Exodus and the books of Leviticus and Numbers. Three of the passages above adduced speak of Moses as writing laws. In Ex. xxiv. 4 he is said to have written "all the words of the LORD." This Prof. W. R. S., p. 331, would restrict to the ten commandments. But after God had uttered these by His own voice, and the terrified people had asked that Moses should henceforth speak with them and not God, the LORD gave them His commands through Moses, Ex. xx. 22 ff., including a body of judgments or ordinances, ch. xxi.-xxiii. Then (xxiv. 3) Moses came and told the people all the words of the LORD, of course not merely the ten words which they had themselves heard Him speak, but all that God had charged him to say to them, and

particularly "the judgments" which are therefore separately specified. "And all the people answered with one voice and said, All the words which the LORD hath said will we do." Now, unless any one is prepared to maintain that the people here promised obedience to the ten commandments only, and not to the judgments which Moses had just repeated to them from the mouth of God, he must admit that both are included in the words of the Lord, which the very next verse declares that Moses wrote, and which (ver. 8) entered into the covenant then formed between Jehovah and Israel. It could not be more explicitly stated than it is, that this first collection of laws dates from the time immediately following the exodus. It was then reduced to writing, formally read in the audience of the people, their submission to it pledged, and the covenant of God with Israel ratified on the basis of it with appropriate ceremonies. It even claims priority to the tables of the law deposited in the ark, whose authenticity and antiquity are vouched for in the most unimpeachable manner, and are not disputed by Prof. W. R. S.

Again, at the renewal of the covenant after the sin of the golden calf, Moses is directed to write certain words, which are not "expressly identified with the ten words on the tables of stone," but are, on the contrary, expressly distinguished from them (Ex. xxxiv. 27, 28). The ambiguity arising from the omission of the subject of the verb in the last clause of verse 28, is removed by a comparison of verse 1. It was the LORD, not Moses, who wrote the ten commandments upon the tables, which were carried to the summit of Sinai for this purpose. Moses wrote upon some material not indicated the words contained in Ex. xxxiv. 10-26, which is substantially repeated, from the book of the covenant (Ex. xx. 23; xxiii. 12-33), being the specifications there given respecting the service of God, and the pledge on His part to subdue the Canaanites before them. They had grossly violated their duty to God, which wrought a forfeiture of His pledge to them. Hence these portions of the covenant are singled out and enforced upon the people afresh. The rewriting of these extracts is an additional confirmation of the existence of the code from which they were taken, and is equivalent to a new assertion of its Mosaic origin.

In Deut. xxxi. 9 we read, "Moses wrote this law": and vv. 24-26, "When Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book until they were finished, Moses commanded the Levites . . . saying, Take this book of the law and put it in the side of the ark." If it is possible for words to convey the idea that the entire code of laws here spoken of, which cannot be less than Deut. xii.-xxvi., was written by Moses, this idea is here expressed. And no amount

of arguing about the various extent of meaning that may be given to the term "law" can make it different. The fact that "all the words of this law" were to be written on plastered stones on Mount Ebal (Deut. xxvii. 3), can create no difficulty. This statement finds abundant illustration in the walls of tombs and temples in Egypt, and its numerous monuments written all over with hieroglyphical legends. And it surely requires no great effort to believe it feasible to trace these laws in plaster as a symbolic declaration that they were thenceforth the laws of the land. Written in letters five times the size of those in ordinary Hebrew Bibles, they could all be embraced in the space of eight feet by three. The famous Behistûn inscription of Darius in its triple form is twice as long as this entire code, besides being carved in bold characters in the solid rock, and in a position difficult of access on the mountain side.

And the whole book of Deuteronomy purports to be a series of discourses delivered by Moses to the people in the plains of Moab, inculcating and enforcing this law. Prof. S. reminds us that these were not "taken down by a shorthand reporter." And he queries whether it is certainly the meaning of Deut. xxxi. 24, that we have this body of laws "word for word" as it was written down by Moses. But under cover of this regard for absolute precision, it will not do to fritter away the entire record. That Moses in his oral discourse uttered in every case exactly the words reported to us, just those and neither less nor more, we are not concerned to affirm; but that he did deliver such discourses, and that they are here preserved in their substantial import, is fully certified unless the credibility of the book can be impeached. And this code of laws is substantially as it came from the pen of Moses, if any reliance can be placed upon the record.

So, too, the Mosaic origin of the Levitical law is abundantly declared by the formulas with which they are introduced, and which recur over and over again: The LORD spake unto Moses, or The LORD spake unto Moses and Aaron; and the formulas, by which they are often followed, *e. g.*, Lev. vii. 37, 38; xxiii. 44; xxvi. 46; xxvii. 34. The occasion is recited upon which particular laws were delivered; and the circumstances connected with these enactments are inseparably united with the historical narrative of the time.

Now as to the origin of these several codes of laws there can be no possibility of mistake. It is not merely affirmed in a credible history, of whose truth we have abundant guarantee; but the nature of the case precludes falsehood or error. An accepted system of legislation, whose authority is confessed and submitted to, has, in that fact, the strongest possible proof of its genuineness. No forged body of laws

could ever be imposed upon any people. No supposititious code, issued in the name of Moses in a subsequent age, could have been accepted without inquiry, and installed as the law of the land. It is indeed supposable that the current laws and usages of any given period might be popularly supposed to be more ancient than they really were. But this is not what we are asked to believe. We are told that the first that is known of the book of Deuteronomy is that it was found in the temple in the days of Josiah. It claims to be the work of Moses, but it never emanated from him. Its enactments had never been in force before. No such laws were known at any time during the history of the people. They were not in harmony with existing customs or with prevailing ideas, but were in some essential points directly antagonistic to them. It was prepared with the view of inaugurating a new departure, of carrying into effect reforms which Hezekiah had made a vigorous attempt to introduce, but had failed. Such was the hostility of the masses, and such the influence of parties interested in opposing them, that "a violent and bloody reaction" followed under Manasseh, and "in Josiah's time the whole work had to be done again from the beginning" (p. 244). And yet a newly-found book, purporting to be the law of Moses, but which "had no external credentials" (p. 351), and which, if the facts be as alleged, every one must have known was not what it claimed to be, was at once accepted by Josiah, "to whom it was of no consequence to know the exact date and authorship of the book" (p. 363). One, at least, of its provisions was unwelcome to the priests (p. 362), but they raised no question as to the origin of a code so mysteriously discovered. And under its potent influence, regulations were readily carried into effect, which had been so stubbornly resisted before. And Ezra, it seems, met with similar success in introducing the Levitical code after the exile. If Mr. Gladstone could but find some law-book in Dublin which had never been heard of before, how easily and amicably the whole Irish question might be settled!

But this use of the name of Moses, we are told, is simply "a legal fiction"; "in Israel all law was held to be derived from the teaching of Moses" (p. 385). Such a notion could not have arisen unless Moses really was the great legislator of the nation, and something more than the ten commandments was directly traceable to him. This of itself creates a presumption in favor of the Mosaic origin of the codes ascribed to him, unless there be good reason to the contrary. The instances which are adduced to show that customs or statutes of a later date were imputed to Moses, admit of no such in-

terpretation, and could only be distorted to this end by one intent upon making out a case.\*

The style in which the laws are framed, and the terms in which they are drawn up, point to the sojourn in the wilderness, prior to the occupation of Canaan, as the time when both the Levitical and the Deuteronomic codes were produced (Lev. xviii. 3; Deut. xii. 9). The standing designation of Canaan is, The land which the LORD giveth thee to possess it (Deut. xv. 4, 7; xxi. 1, 23). The laws look forward to the time "when thou art come into the land, etc., and shalt possess

---

\* Prof. W. R. S. says (p. 387): "A peculiarly clear case of this occurs in the law of war. According to 1 Sam. xxx. 24, 25, the standing law of Israel as to the distribution of booty was enacted by David, and goes back only to a precedent in his war with the Amalekites who burned Ziklag. In the priestly legislation the same law is given as a Mosaic precedent from the war with Midian (Num. xxxi. 27)." The fact is that Moses gave no law upon the subject whatever. It is simply related, as one of the incidents of the battle with Midian, that the prey was divided into two parts between them who went out to battle and all the congregation. The circumstances were peculiar, and it was not made a general rule. David did not divide the booty into two equal parts, but ordered that the 200 who guarded the baggage should individually have like shares with the 400 who engaged in the conflict; and the division was not, as Moses directed, between the army on the one hand and the people on the other, but between the two divisions of his little army, while to the people at large he simply sent presents. A more exact precedent is found in Josh. xxii. 8, though even in that instance no law was enacted. David made the first statute in relation to the matter; though some critic may be able to discover that even this is only a "legal fiction," that being attributed to David which was really originated by Judas Maccabeus, who gave an equal share of the spoils of the enemy to the feeble and needy classes (2 Macc. viii. 28, 30). In Ezra ix. 11, "where a law of the Pentateuch is cited as an ordinance of the prophets" (p. 310), the prophets are inclusive of Moses (Deut. xviii. 18; Hos. xii. 13), not distinguished from him.

It is further alleged (pp. 319, 432) that there are conflicting statements respecting the position of the tabernacle with respect to the camp of Israel, only one of which can be true history, the other must be later law veiled in historic form. But the apparent discrepancy is due to the interpreter, not to the text. It is brought about by the fashionable method of dissecting the Pentateuch, and then viewing the separate paragraphs in their isolation, and without regard to their connection, or only so much regard to it as will choose variance where that is possible in preference to harmony. We protest against the entire procedure, notwithstanding the eminence and ability of those who indulge in it. It opens a boundless field for the display of the critic's ingenuity, but it is not rational interpretation, and would as easily create the semblance of self-contradiction in any author to whom it should be applied. If a meaning be given to Ex. xxxiii. 7-11, which it cannot bear in the connection in which it is found, but which it is assumed that it might have had in some other imaginable connection, and especially if with Dillmann, the sense of vv. 1-6 be altered by leaving out words or clauses *ad libitum*, it may be made to appear that according to this passage and a few others, the sacred tent stood outside of the camp; whereas it is elsewhere spoken of as pitched in the centre of the camp. But if we discard imaginary possibilities, and give to these verses their obvious sense as they stand, the alleged discrepancy disappears. Immediately after the ratification of God's covenant with Israel, Moses went up into the mount and received direction to make a sanctuary in which God might dwell among His people. The sin of the golden calf ruptured the covenant and put an end to all proceedings under it. Without going on to construct the tabernacle according to the specifications given him, he sets before the eyes of the people a visible sign of their altered relation to the Lord by pitching a provisional tabernacle outside of the camp, and at a distance from it, to

it"\* (Deut. xvii. 14; Lev. xiv. 34; xix. 23; xxv. 2), or "when the LORD hath cut off these nations and thou succeedest them and dwellest in their cities" (Deut. xix. 1), as the period when they are to go into full operation (Deut. xii. 1). The place of sacrifice is not where Jehovah has fixed His habitation, but "the place which Jehovah shall choose to place His name there" (Deut. xii. 5, 10 ff.; xiv. 23 ff.; xvi. 2, 6 ff.) Israel is contemplated as occupying a camp (Lev. xiii. 46; xiv. 3; xvii. 3; Num. v. 2-4; xii. 14, 15) and living in tents (Lev. xiv. 8; Deut. xvi. 7). All this, and much more of the same sort, we must suppose to be "legal fiction"; but it would be too "artificial" (p. 321), in the Professor's view, to imagine that Moses could speak of himself in the third person as Isaiah (vii. 3 ff.), Jeremiah (xxxvi. 4 ff.), Hosea (i. 2 ff.), and the evangelists Matthew (ix. 9) and John (xiii. 23) have done.

But suppose that we yield our assent to this notion that the Israelites had the singular custom of issuing all their laws in the name of Moses, and that they continued to do so down to the time of Josiah and after the exile, still expressing them as though Israel were encamped in the wilderness of Sinai or on the plains of Moab. It is true that no instance of the kind is recorded in any historical book of the Old Testament. David, and Solomon, and Jehoshaphat, and Hezekiah issue their orders and enforce their regulations in their own name and by their own authority. Ezekiel, who, we are told, represents an intermediate stage between Deuteronomy and Leviticus, makes no pretence of Mosaic authority in all that he says respecting the temple and

---

signify that God would not remain in the midst of them (Ex. xxxiii. 3). It is called "*the tabernacle*," ver. 7, because it is definitely conceived by the writer as the one used for the purpose, and which was well remembered by him and by his readers. (Comp. the use of the Heb. article in Ex. ii. 15; Num. xi. 27; Hab. ii. 2.) In Num. xi. 24, 26, 30; xii. 4, 5, persons are said to go out of the camp unto the tabernacle, and out of the tabernacle into the camp; but this does not prove the tabernacle to have been outside of the camp. If a gentleman goes out of his yard into his house, it does not follow that his house is not in his yard. So that all that the Professor tells us about early sanctuaries being outside of cities, and Ezekiel paving the way for the sanctuary being located in the midst of the people, is quite irrelevant. Num. x. 33 is adduced to prove that the sanctuary was outside the camp when the people were on the march, but it makes no mention of the sanctuary; it simply says that the ark went before them, when they left Sinai, as their guide. And this is not in conflict with ver. 21, comp. iv. 15-21. To suppose such a contradiction within the compass of a few verses is to impute the most extraordinary heedlessness to the writer, or, if any prefer, the compiler of the book. While the tabernacle and the sacred vessels had their place assigned them between the tribes as they moved forward, the ark, which was the symbol and the seat of God's presence, was singled out, as we are expressly told, to lead the way.

\* This is the case even in Deut. xix. 14, where the last clause of the verse makes it apparent that the setting of the landmarks did not precede the enacting of the law. The Hebrew for "they of old time" means simply "first," and is applicable to those who originally marked the boundary at whatever date.

its worship and the Holy Land. The idea of a legal fiction never dawned upon the author of the books of Kings, who records the finding of the law in the temple, but has no suspicion of its recent origin. Let us, however, waive all objection on this ground. But the further insuperable difficulty remains, that by the hypothesis under consideration laws are attributed to a period for which they have no meaning or fitness. Legislation, as Prof. W. R. S. himself insists—and this is, in fact, the basis on which his whole argument professedly rests—legislation must be adapted to the times in which it is issued. Its aim is practical; it concerns matters of present obligation, and its statutes are enacted with the view of being enforced and obeyed. Laws are never issued to regulate a state of things which had passed away ages before and could by no possibility be revived. What are we to think, then, of a hypothesis which assigns the code of Deuteronomy to the reign of Josiah, or shortly before it, when its injunction to exterminate the Canaanites (xx. 16–18) and the Amalekites (xxv. 17–19), who had long since disappeared, would be as utterly out of date as a law in New Jersey at the present time offering a bounty for killing wolves and bears, or a royal proclamation in Great Britain ordering the expulsion of the Danes? A law contemplating foreign conquests (xx. 10–15) would have been absurd when the urgent question was whether Judah could maintain its own existence against the encroachments of Babylon and Egypt. A law discriminating against Ammon and Moab (xxiii. 3, 4) in favor of Edom (vv. 7, 8) had its warrant in the Mosaic period, but not in the time of the later kings. Jeremiah discriminates precisely the other way, promising a future restoration to Moab (xlviii. 47) and Ammon (xlix. 6), which he denies to Edom (xlix. 17, 18), who is also to Joel (iii. 19), Obadiah, and Isaiah (lxiii. 1–6), the representative foe of the people of God. The special injunction to show no unfriendliness to Egyptians (Deut. xxiii. 7) is insupposable in a code issued under prophetic influence at a time when the prophets were doing everything in their power to dissuade the people from alliance or association with them (Isa. xxx. 1 ff.; xxxi. 1; Jer. ii. 18, 36). The allusions to Egypt imply familiarity with, and recent residence in, that land; an impressive argument for obedience is drawn from the memory of bondage in Egypt (Deut. xxiv. 18, 22; comp. ver. 15), or of deliverance from it (Deut. xiii. 5, 10; xx. 1; Lev. xix. 36; xxvi. 13; Num. xv. 41); warnings are pointed by a reference to the diseases of Egypt (Deut. vii. 15; xxviii. 60). And how can a code belong to the time of Josiah, which, while it contemplates the possible selection of a king in the future (Deut. xvii. 14 ff.), nowhere implies an actual regal government, but vests the supreme central authority in a judge

and the priesthood (xvii. 8-12; xix. 7); which lays special stress on the requirements that the king must be a native and not a foreigner (xvii. 15), when the undisputed line of succession had for ages been fixed in the family of David, and that he must not "cause the people to return to Egypt" (ver. 16), as they seemed ready to do on every grievance in the days of Moses (Num. xiv. 4), but which no one ever dreamed of doing after they were fairly established in Canaan? \*

And it is quite as incongruous to place the Levitical law after the exile. Prof. Dillmann, though he conceives that "the book of the law did not receive its final form and arrangement until after the exile, and in the time of Ezra," nevertheless protests against the hypothesis as "irrational" that "the priestly laws and those of the cultus were first committed to writing, or actually first framed, in the exile or in Babylonia, where no cultus whatever existed." † And then there are detailed accounts of the Mosaic tabernacle, reciting the contribution of materials for its construction, ‡ with minute specifications of the number and dimensions of its boards, their sockets, and tenons, and bars, of its various coverings, and the mode of their preparation, and how they are to be joined by loops and taches, of its various articles of furniture, and the instruments of the service, and precise directions as to the manner in which they should be wrapped, and by whom

---

\* It would not be surprising, even on natural principles, for Moses to have anticipated that the people might some time desire a king, and to prohibit, in that event, the display and luxurious indulgence which characterize Oriental courts. That Samuel disapproved of the people's hankering after a king under circumstances which implied an untimely setting aside of himself and a want of confidence in God (1 Sam. viii. 7, 8; x. 18, 19), does not imply that the law in Deuteronomy was unknown to him. On the contrary, the author of the book of Samuel plainly shows that it was then in existence, or that he believed that it was, by the allusions to it, or the adoption of its language, in this very narrative—*e. g.*, 1 Sam. viii. 3, "took bribes and perverted judgment" (Comp. Deut. xvi. 19); ver. 5, "make us a king . . . like all the nations" (Comp. Deut. xvii. 14); x. 24, "him whom the LORD hath chosen" (Comp. Deut. xvii. 15); xii. 14, "obey his voice and not rebel against the commandment of the LORD" (Deut. ix. 23; i. 43). The Hebrew expressions in these several passages are identical, even where the English version varies. Solomon's violation of the law only shows how men may, and do, transgress known law under strong temptation. And he may have palliated his offence as not contravening the real spirit and intent of the statute. His numerous alliances gave stability to his kingdom, and assurance of peace with surrounding nations, and he could surely avoid the snare of their idolatry. He amassed silver and gold, but he spent vast sums on the temple. He multiplied horses for the sake of adding to his military strength, but he had no thought of taking the people back to Egypt. Comp. Isaiah's description of a like state of things under Uzziah (Isa. ii. 6, 7).

† "Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus," Vorwort, p. viii.

‡ Delitzsch, in his preface to Prof. Curtiss' valuable treatise on "The Levitical Priests," notes the interesting circumstance that the original words for "fine linen, purple, and scarlet," which reappear so often in the Mosaic description of the sanctuary, are the ancient Hebrew terms, and not their Aramaic equivalents, which are found in writings after the exile.

they should be carried, and what place they should have in the ranks during the journeyings through the wilderness. All this is stated with the utmost precision, and every particular insisted upon as of real consequence. And we are asked to believe that this is all a fiction of the time of Ezra and of the second temple, when it could serve no imaginable purpose. Prof. W. R. S. tells us (p. 357), "It is very noteworthy, and, on the traditional view, quite inexplicable that the Mosaic sanctuary of the ark is never mentioned in the Deuteronomic code." It is mentioned in Deut. x. 1-8, not to speak of xxxi. 9, 25, 26; and by the common consent of critics, the whole book of Deuteronomy is one in its language, its character, and its aims. But why any one should expect the ark to be mentioned in a code which had no occasion to speak of it, we are not informed. It is, however, much more inexplicable, on the Professor's own hypothesis, that the ark is described in such detail and such prominence given to it in the Levitical code (Ex. xxv. 10-22, etc., etc.), if this was prepared for the guidance of the priests and the conduct of the ritual in the days of Ezra; whereas the ark perished in the destruction of the first temple, and was not reproduced subsequently. And why should directions be given about the Urim and Thummim (Ex. xxviii. 30; Num. xxvii. 21) which had ceased to be of any practical account (Ezra ii. 63; Neh. vii. 65)?

Now, what is there to hinder us from believing the laws of the Pentateuch to be the production of Moses, as they claim to be, and as their style and contents declare them to be? Prof. W. R. S. enlightens us upon this point (p. 333):

"It is a very remarkable fact, to begin with, that all the sacred law of Israel is comprised in the Pentateuch, and that, apart from the Levitical legislation, it is presented in codified form. On the traditional view three successive bodies of law were given to Israel within forty years. Within that short time many ordinances were modified, and the whole law of Sinai recast on the plains of Moab. But from the days of Moses there was no change. With his death the Israelites entered on a new career, which transformed the nomads of Goshen into the civilized inhabitants of vineyard land and cities in Canaan. But the divine laws given them beyond Jordan were to remain unmodified through all the long centuries of development in Canaan, an absolute and immutable code. I say, with all reverence, that this is impossible."

The idea of development is in the air; and yet it is possible that it may be applied to some things that do not call for it and will not admit of it. The "nomads of Goshen" had been settled for more than four centuries under the government of the most highly civilized and the most thoroughly organized empire in the ancient world. They were employed in building treasure cities for Pharaoh (Ex. i. 11), in the manufacture of brick (Ex. v. 7 ff.), in masonry, and in all manner of service in the field (Ex. i. 14). They were skilled in working metals, carving wood, and engraving gems (Ex. xxxi. 2 ff.; xxxv.

30 ff.), in spinning, weaving, and embroidery (Ex. xxxv. 25, 26). Their familiarity with the cultivation of the soil is attested not only by such statements as Num. xi. 5; xx. 5; Deut. xi. 10, but by the express provisions of what Prof. W. R. S. himself regards as their oldest extant code of laws (Ex. xxii. 5, 6), including the regulations respecting first-fruits (xxii. 29; xxiii. 19), the weekly Sabbath (xxiii. 12; xxxiv. 21), the sabbatical year (xxiii. 10, 11), the festivals of the harvest and the ingathering (xxiii. 15, 16), not to speak of the requirement of the shew-bread and of the meat and drink offerings. The Israel of the exodus could not, therefore, have been at so great a remove from "the civilized inhabitants of the vineyard land and cities in Canaan." Even though the Mosaic tabernacle were to be remanded to the region of fable, it would still be true that tradition attributed the arts employed in its construction to the generation that left Egypt, and the monuments of that land lend this abundant corroboration. But enough besides remains to rivet our conclusion, which even the wildest criticism must respect, unless it would destroy the whole basis on which it can rest itself, and deny that there is any certainty as to the condition of the Israelites under Moses, in which case the entire objection is admitted to be groundless.

And where habits and manners remain fixed, as they proverbially do in the East, there could be little reason for change in the laws of the simple agricultural population of Palestine, eschewing as they did all foreign trade or travel, and holding so limited intercourse with other nations. Through all changes, even in the national government, the tribal organization continued at least until the time of the exile, the usages of society underwent little alteration, and the affairs of each community were managed very much in the same manner from age to age.

But the objection is completely neutralized when we consider further that the Mosaic code leaves abundant room for all the modifications that could be demanded by the progressive life of the people. It is not, and was not intended to be, a complete system of political institutions; and objections have been made to it on this very ground of its lack of completeness, urging that it could never have been put in actual operation without the supply of some important gaps in the legislation. The fact is, that the Mosaic regulations presuppose and were superinduced upon an already existing political constitution and customs that had the force of laws. The aim of Moses simply was to establish and perpetuate the covenant relation between Israel and Jehovah. It was not to give fixity to one particular system of civil administration, but to incorporate and express religious ideas in the

national life. Hence some of his laws are purely ethical, and were not intended to be enforced by the magistrate: Ex. xxii. 21-24; xxiii. 2, 3, 9; Deut. xv. 5, 6; xvi. 20; xix. 8, 9; xxiv. 13, 15. The specific regulations which they contain were adopted or modified, as the case might be, from pre-existing usages. And all that was not expressly ordained by divine sanction was left free either to remain as it was, or to shape itself as circumstances might require, or as the principles of the Mosaic religion and constitution might suggest. There was abundant flexibility here, and all the opportunity for development that could be desired. Thus submission to rulers is inculcated (Ex. xxii. 28), without prescribing any definite form of government. The authority of elders (Num. xi. 16), princes (Num. xxxii. 2; xxxvi. 1), and other existing officials is recognized, but there is nothing to require that public functionaries should preserve this unvarying type. A monarchy was contemplated in the future, but was not enjoined; it was left entirely to the wishes of the people and the course of events; and when the time arrived, the transition was made without a jar. Moses acting under a present necessity, created judges and based his appointment on a decimal division of the people (Ex. xviii. 21, 22); but this particular form of organization is not once mentioned in his codes of laws, much less perpetuated by express divine sanction. In Ex. xxi. 6; xxii. 8, 9, to come before the legitimate tribunal is to come before God; but who should be clothed with judicial functions, and how these should be exercised, is not specified. The Deuteronomic code directs that there shall be judges in every city (xvi. 18), and that the ultimate decision of controversies should lie with the priests and the judge at the religious centre of the nation (xvii. 8-12); but the terms are general, and Jehoshaphat was not hindered from enlarging the judiciary in accordance with the needs of his own time (2 Chron. xix. 5, 8).

The three codes of law above mentioned belong, it is claimed, to different periods in Israel's history and represent distinct grades of social culture and development, and particularly successive stages in their religious advancement. Prof. W. R. S. tells us that "In the first legislation the question of correct ritual has little prominence" (p. 343), and it "presupposes a plurality of sanctuaries" (p. 352). The law of Deuteronomy, on the other hand, is "a law for the abolition of the local sanctuaries as they are recognized by the first legislation" (p. 353). "The first legislation has no law of priesthood, no provision as to priestly dues." It "assumes the right of laymen to offer sacrifice," and "presupposes a priesthood, whose business lies less with sacrifice than with the divine Torah which they administer in the sanctuary as

successors of Moses ; for the sanctuary is the seat of judgment." This priesthood consisted of the entire body of the Levites, who were "priests of local sanctuaries" throughout the whole land (pp. 358-9). "Deuteronomy also knows no Levites who cannot be priests, and no priests who are not Levites"; and in abolishing the local sanctuaries it makes provision for the priests who had previously ministered in them (p. 360). But "Deuteronomy knows nothing of a sacrificial priestly Torah" (p. 371), such as the Levitical code. According to this hypothesis, then, these three codes severally represent three periods in the religion of Israel. The first sanctions various local sanctuaries where laymen offer sacrifice, and where the Levites, who are indiscriminately clothed with priestly prerogatives, administer judgment. Deuteronomy, which belongs to a later time, restricts worship to one sanctuary, whose priests consequently rise to new dignity, while the Levites previously ministering elsewhere are now thrown out of occupation, and in the need to which they are reduced, special provision must be made for their support. The fully developed ritual of Leviticus belongs to a period later still.

This is about as rational as though some critic were to deal with the Constitution of the United States in a similar manner, erecting its several articles into distinct codes, assigning them to different periods of the national history, and inferring from them that different forms of government have successively prevailed. The article upon the Executive treats only of a President and Vice-President as entrusted with power, and seems to represent a sort of elective monarchy, in which rude tribes summon one of their chieftains to the supreme command. Then the article upon the Judiciary places control in a body of judges, who hold office during life or good behavior, and thus represents a later aristocratic stage. And finally, the article which confers legislative authority upon Congress must have originated at a still later date, when popular ideas came into vogue, and the government was lodged with representatives elected by the people. This method of treating a system of laws, whose different parts are mutually supplementary, as though they were distinct and independent codes, can only lead to distortion and misconception.

It is the fashion now to ridicule the harmonistic treatment of the Mosaic laws; and the development theory is all the rage. Nevertheless every one must concede that if upon any fair interpretation of their language these laws can be shown to be mutually consistent and harmonious, this is entitled to the preference over any view which represents them as incompatible and conflicting. And even where the law has been changed in any of its provisions and a later

statute abrogates or modifies another given previously, this may still be consistent with the Mosaic record, provided it admits of a satisfactory explanation from the different times and circumstances under which the law was given and the different ends which it was intended to subserve. Unless variations should be found which it is impossible to account for in any other way, it is gratuitous and unwarrantable to assume that any of the laws ascribed to Moses are really of later date.

To prove that a plurality of sanctuaries is presupposed in the first legislation, appeal is made to Ex. xx. 24, 25 and to xxii. 30. The former of these passages can only afford an argument by putting a sense upon it which the words do not require, which is at variance with every other utterance of Hebrew law upon the subject, and which disregards the circumstances under which these words were spoken. It is the primary law of the Hebrew altar, given at Sinai, before the tabernacle was built, as preliminary to concluding the covenant between Jehovah and Israel (Ex. xxiv. 4). It directs the erection of an altar of earth or stone, and promises God's presence and blessing, not wherever they might choose to erect such an altar, but in every place\* where God should record His name, that is, make a manifestation of His being (Comp. Deut. xii. 5, etc.) This was their warrant for building an altar at Sinai, where He had so conspicuously manifested Himself, and at every future place of supernatural revelation, including the tabernacle which they carried with them in their journeyings through the wilderness; for the wooden frame described Ex. xxvii. 1 ff. took its name from the altar of earth which it enclosed. It is not co-existing sanctuaries in Canaan, but altars successively reared at different places in the wilderness, that are contemplated by the passage under consideration. Unless it can be shown that God "recorded His name" in various places at once, no sanction is here given to a multiplicity of altars. It was so even in patriarchal days in the Holy Land itself. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob built altars and offered sacrifices at their successive places of abode; but they did not establish rival sanctuaries to be simultaneously occupied.

And Ex. xxii. 30 is quite as little to the purpose: the firstling of ox or sheep "shall be seven days with his dam: on the eighth day thou shalt give it me." This is commonly understood to mean that it was sufficiently mature for sacrifice by its eighth day (Lev. xxii. 27). Its

---

\* The plural form in the A. V. (Ex. xx. 24) "in all places," which might seem to lend some color to plurality of sanctuaries, does not accurately represent the Hebrew.

presentation at the sanctuary, though admissible on that day, may have been postponed to one of the annual feasts, perhaps the pass-over, with which it is associated in Ex. xxxiv. 18-20, which is universally admitted to belong to the most ancient legislation. The law before us will then be substantially identical with that in Deut. xv. 20, which enjoins that it should be eaten at the sanctuary year by year. If, however, this very natural explanation be rejected, and it be insisted that the first legislation differs from Deuteronomy in requiring that the firstling should be sacrificed on its eighth day, still there is no need of supposing a reference to local sanctuaries in Palestine, accessible to every neighborhood. The law was given at Sinai, and regulated the presentation of the first-born in the wilderness, where all Israel was encamped in the vicinity of the tabernacle. When they were about to enter Canaan the old law was replaced by one in Deuteronomy, adapted to the changed circumstances. And while there is nothing in the first legislation implying a plurality of sanctuaries, the three annual pilgrimages enjoined to "the house of the LORD" (Ex. xxiii. 17, 19), on the contrary very decidedly imply its unity.\*

It is further charged that there is a serious discrepancy between Deuteronomy and the Levitical law in respect to the priesthood; that according to the former, all Levites are priests, and have an equal right to perform priestly functions and share the priestly revenues (pp. 360, 436), while in the latter none are priests but Aaron and his sons, and the Levites are servants or attendants upon the priests. All that is plausible in this representation arises from the assumption that Deuteronomy is a body of laws complete in itself; whereas it is really attached to, and co-ordinated with, the legislation of the preceding books. The mutual relations of priests and Levites and the special functions of each are developed at length in the Levitical law, which made it unnecessary to repeat this again in Deuteronomy. Prof. W. R. S. freely concedes the difference in subject and aim between these two bodies of legislation.† All that specially relates to the

\* The allegation that "the asylum for the man-slayer in Ex. xxi. 12-14, is Jehovah's altar," whereas "under the law of Deuteronomy, there are to be three fixed cities of refuge," can hardly be seriously meant in the face of the distinct reference to the future appointment of cities of refuge in the passage in Exodus.

† "The first legislation and the code of Deuteronomy take the land of Canaan as their basis. They give directions for the life of Jehovah's people in the land He gives them. The Levitical legislation starts from the sanctuary and the priesthood. Its object is to develop the theory of a religious life which has its centre in the sanctuary, and is ruled by principles of holiness radiating forth from Jehovah's dwelling-place. The first two legislations deal with Israel as a nation; in the third Israel is a church, and as such is habitually addressed as a 'Congregation' (*'edah*), a word characteristic of the Levitical law" (p. 318).

ordinances of worship and the ministers of religion finds its place in the former rather than in the latter.

In matters of this description Deuteronomy makes explicit reference to pre-existing laws. In xxiv. 8, 9, there is direct allusion to the law of leprosy previously given (Lev. xiii., xiv.) with an injunction to obey it, and mention of the case of Miriam which had arisen under it (Num. xii.) The introductory portion of Deuteronomy is filled with arguments and earnest exhortations based upon the antecedent history of Israel, which find their only illustration in the preceding books. Deut. x. 8, 9; xviii. 1, 2, speak of duties previously assigned and support allotted to the tribe of Levi, with specific reference in each case to former declarations on the subject and a verbal quotation from Num. xviii. 20, the context of which clearly defines the relative status of priests and Levites. Deut. xi. 6 appeals to the overthrow of Dathan and Abiram (Num. xvi.), which the critics have not yet succeeded in disentangling from the uprising of the Levite Korah against the special prerogatives of the Aaronic priesthood. The removal (Deut. xii. 15) of the restriction requiring every animal slain for food, to be presented at the sanctuary, is a plain allusion to the law (Lev. xvii. 3 ff.) which could only have been enacted in the wilderness, as its very terms imply, and was an important safeguard against idolatry as the people were then situated. It was, obviously, impracticable in Canaan,\* however, and is therefore formally abrogated before their entrance into the promised land. The blessing of Levi (Deut. xxxiii. 7-10) abounds in allusions to the preceding history and enactments. Deuteronomy thus by its own express statements recognizes the existence and binding authority of a more detailed antecedent legislation respecting matters to which it only alludes in a brief and summary manner.

It is to be observed further that Deuteronomy does distinguish between priests and Levites. In xviii. 1, "all the tribe of Levi" is a superfluous addition to the standing phrase, "the priests the Levites," if it is simply co-extensive in signification (comp. Neh. xi. 20: "Israel, the priests, the Levites.") The intention manifestly is to affirm, both of the priests and of the entire tribe to which they belong, that they are without inheritance. Accordingly in the following verses statements are made respecting first the priest (vv. 3-5), then the Levite (vv. 6-8). And throughout the entire book, wherever priests are spoken of, the functions ascribed to them are either those assigned to the priests in the Levitical law, or are entirely consistent

\* Even the local sanctuaries, by which Prof. W. R. S. seeks to account for it, would not render it tolerable.

with them; while on the contrary, the Levite is in repeated passages (*e. g.*, xiv. 29) associated with needy or dependent classes as with them an object of generous beneficence. The distinction between Levitical priests and Levites generally is also made in xxvii. 9, 12, 14. The priests of this book, as all admit, are those of the tribe of Levi who discharge priestly functions, and are distinguished from those Levites who do not. But who in the tribe are privileged to be priests? Deut. x. 6 tells us that Aaron was priest, and his son succeeded him. The Levitical law declares that the priesthood was limited to Aaron's family. The critics infer from Deut. xviii. 6, that any Levite who is disposed to do so, may become a priest by presenting himself at the sanctuary and claiming the right to exercise priestly functions. We think it more reasonable to understand the verse in a manner, which is equally consistent with its language and is moreover in harmony with the Levitical law, *viz*: that any Levite, whether belonging to the seed of Aaron or not, is privileged to go to the sanctuary and perform such ministrations as are allowed to Levites of the same grade; if of priestly stock, he may act as priest; if not, he may perform those subordinate offices which are allowed to Levites.\*

The characteristic expression for the priests in the book of Deuteronomy is "the priests the Levites," or rather as the words should be rendered, "the Levitical priests" (xvii. 9, 18; xviii. 1; xxiv. 8; xxvii. 9). In Leviticus and Numbers this phrase is never employed, but we find instead "the priests, the sons of Aaron" (Lev. i. 5, 8, 11; ii. 2; iii. 2; xiii. 2; xxi. 1; Num. iii. 3; x. 8). This striking difference, however, involves no real discrepancy, for the sons of Aaron were of course Levites; and "Levitical priests" no more proves that priests and Levites are convertible terms than "Egyptian priests" would imply that all Egyptians were, or, if they chose, might be priests. This expression is, moreover, found in books where the distinctions of the Levitical law are plainly recognized.† The occurrence in the preceding books of the Pentateuch of the expression "the priests the sons of Aaron," along with such phrases as Aaron the priest, the sons of Aaron the priest, Eleazar the priest, etc., is altogether natural, because these were the persons who filled the office at the time, and to

\* Ministering to the LORD was a function of the Levites as well as the priests (1 Chron. xv. 2; see also 1 Sam. ii. 11, 18; iii. 1).

† Thus Josh. iii. 3; viii. 33, comp. xxi. 4 ff.: "the children of Aaron the priest which were of the Levites"; also 2 Chron. v. 5 (where Prof. W. R. S. accepts the reading, "the Levite priests," in preference to that in the parallel passage 1 Kings viii. 4, "the priests and the Levites," p. 436), xxx. 27, where the sense plainly shows the insertion of "and" to be inadmissible.

whom the divine directions were immediately given; just as we read in later times of Eli the priest, the sons of Eli the priest, etc. (1 Sam. i. 3, 9), when these are the persons intended. But in Deuteronomy, which gives no personal directions to individuals, but contemplates the priests of the future as a body, a general designation, such as Levitical priests, was more appropriate.

That priestly functions should be attributed to the tribe of Levi\* (x. 8; xxxiii. 8, 10), because they were entrusted to a particular family in that tribe, is by the same familiar use of language, as in Gen. xlix. 10 the sceptre is ascribed to Judah because wielded by the royal line of David, or as we might speak of the house of Hanover as reigning in England because a member of that family is seated on the throne, or of the American troops at the siege of Yorktown without naming the particular colonies which were represented there.

“The increased provision for the priesthood,” which, we are told (p. 440), is “one of the chief innovations of the ritual law,” is a sheer creation of the critics. If by one section of a law a given officer is allowed certain fees for specific services, and another section assigns him a regular salary, critics of the modern school would infer that these sections are separate laws, which were in operation at different periods; and that the latter belongs to a time when these officials were more generously dealt with than they had been previously.

---

\* The Professor is mistaken in saying (p. 437) that according to “Deut. xviii. 1 *seq.* the whole tribe of Levi has a claim on the altar gifts, the first-fruits, and other priestly offerings.” This belongs to the priests, as explicitly appears from vv. 3-5; the Levites have a share in the LORD’s inheritance (ver. 1). What this embraces is not defined here, but is assumed as known from the Levitical law. When the LORD promises to be their inheritance, He surely does not design that the only subsistence of the entire tribe, except those who were on duty at the sanctuary, should be such occasional invitations as they might receive to religious festivals (Deut. xvi. 14; xxvi. 11, 12). This necessarily implies the Levitical tithe, of which Prof. W. R. S. says “Deuteronomy knows nothing”; and “the patrimony” referred to in ver. 8 implies the Levitical cities, notwithstanding the fact that at the date to which he has seen fit to assign Deuteronomy, they “lay outside the kingdom of Judah.” The list given of these cities in Josh. xxi. the Professor tells us, is “really part of the Levitical law,” which on his theory is post exilic; only he does not explain the puzzle that 35 cities are assigned to the Levites, and but 13 to the priests, though, as he informs us in another place (p. 383), “on the return from captivity very few Levites in comparison with the full priests cared to attach themselves to the temple (Neh. vii. 39, *seq.*)” That Gezer, though assigned to the Levites, was not conquered till the time of Solomon (p. 441), only shows what appears equally from other cases, that the entire land was divided among the tribes before all of it had been wrested from the Canaanites. That citizens of other tribes were joint occupants of some of these cities with the Levites, merely proves that the latter were not numerous enough to fill all the places allotted to them. That Abiathar could own a field in Anathoth, and Jeremiah buy one, is no infraction of law (p. 428), whether a plot of ground in the city is meant (Lev. xxv. 33), or a field in the suburbs, which could not indeed be sold so as to be even temporarily alienated from the tribe (ver. 34), but may, for all that we know, have been to a greater or less extent parcelled amongst individual owners.

The proper legal provision for the priests and Levites is fully stated in the Levitical law. Deuteronomy does not deal with this subject in any professed or formal way; it only incidentally makes mention of certain perquisites which they should receive, or attentions which should be shown them.\* And he who can find a discrepancy in this, must have a very keen critical sense. But it is alleged that there are no traces of the Pentateuchal law in the historical and other books of the Old Testament until ages after the death of Moses; and that both the facts of the history and the statements of the sacred writers are inconsistent with the existence of Deuteronomy before Josiah or of the Levitical law before Ezra. Of course if this is so, the Mosaic authorship of the law must be abandoned. But, on the other hand,

---

\* It is not surprising if we find it difficult to adjust some of the particulars in a system of legislation belonging to so remote a period, and to a state of things so different from our own. Jurists are sometimes in doubt as to the precise meaning of legislators in modern times; but in such cases they never admit a discrepancy, if there is any rational way of avoiding it. If critics would adopt the same rule, which is a simple dictate of common sense, they would find fewer perplexities. In Num. xviii. 18 the flesh of the firstlings is the priests'; in Deut. xv. 19, 20 the offerer is to eat it before the LORD with his household, "the priest of course receiving," as Prof. W. R. S. correctly suggests, "the usual share of each victim." In this class of victims the priest received the whole; but why might he not return to the offerer all that was needed for his sacrificial meal? The direction to the offerer to hold such a festival is an injunction to the priests to supply him with what was requisite for the purpose. There is a difference, however, which, in the Professor's judgment, "cannot be explained away, for according to Deut. xiv. 24, the firstlings might be turned into money, and materials of a feast bought with them. But in Num. xviii. 17, it is forbidden to redeem any firstling fit for sacrifice." But the thing prohibited and the thing allowed are quite distinct. The owner would "redeem" his firstling, if he paid an estimated sum, and retained the animal himself; this might be a temptation to cupidity, to cheapen the estimate, and thus pay an inadequate sum. But where the distance from the sanctuary was so great as to make literal transportation of the animal thither impossible or onerous, its alienation by an honest sale freed the owner from any selfish temptation, and the consecration of its equivalent in money fulfilled the spirit of the statute. The alleged discrepancy in tithes is removed by observing that the tithe spoken of in Deuteronomy is quite distinct from that in Leviticus and Numbers. It was additional to it, and was appropriated to a different purpose. The Jews paid both tithes, as there is abundant evidence—a burden which they would not have submitted to, if this had not been believed to be the meaning of the law, whether it was enacted after the exile or was ordained by Moses. "The priest's share of a sacrifice in Deuteronomy consists of inferior parts." But this, so far from conflicting with the more ample provision made for them in the Levitical law, necessarily implies the existence of that provision. The distinguished position assigned to priests in Deuteronomy as the LORD's ministers, and the highest judicial authority in the land, forbids the idea that a miserable pittance was doled out for their support. The perquisite in Deut. xviii. 3, is a special allowance from every animal slain for sacred purposes; the phrase rendered "offer a sacrifice" has a broader meaning than the regular sacrifices properly so called, and has even been supposed by some to embrace all animals slain for food. It is probably intended to indemnify the priests for the change made (Deut. xii. 15) in the law of sacrifice, as a substitute for what they received as their due when no animal was allowed to be slain even for domestic purposes elsewhere than at the sanctuary.

if that law is distinctly traceable through all the post-Mosaic history and writings, its genuineness is completely vindicated.

How then stands the evidence? The Professor begins his investigation by summarily ruling out two important witnesses (p. 218), "I exclude the book of Joshua because it in all its parts hangs closely together with the Pentateuch." It is our only source of information respecting the period immediately succeeding the life of Moses; but as it carries the "legal fiction" through another generation, it is untrustworthy and must be abandoned. "And, on the other hand, I exclude for the present the narrative of Chronicles, which was written long after the reformation of Ezra, and has not the character of a primary source for the earlier history." It claims to be based on early contemporary records, which Prof. W. R. S. admits to be the case with "the historical books from Judges to Kings." It names its sources, which were still accessible to its readers, and appeals to them in verification of its statements; so that its acceptance under these circumstances as a reliable history, and especially its admission to the canon, assure us that there has been no tampering with the facts. Chronicles, written after the exile, when the people were zealously engaged in restoring the institutions of their fathers, concerns itself largely with the history of worship. Samuel and Kings, though covering the same period of the history, were written with a different aim, and omit much upon this subject which Chronicles records. Does the silence of the former outweigh the positive declarations of the latter, and justify their being set aside as pure invention or as Levitical sermonizing? \* (p. 420).

However, let Joshua and Chronicles be excluded; what is the testimony of the remaining books? And first let us inquire respecting the period immediately succeeding Joshua, that of the Judges. In Judg. xix. 18, the Levite says, "I am going," not to one of the houses of the LORD, but "to the house of the LORD," as if he knew of but one, and this was near his residence "in the recesses of Mount Ephraim." From xviii. 31 we learn more definitely that "the house of God was in Shiloh," where "the tabernacle of the congregation" had been set up in the time of Joshua (Josh. xviii. 1, xix. 51), and where it had accordingly continued since. It is not here stated with exactness how much longer it remained there; other passages give infor-

---

\* We cannot here turn aside to answer the specific objections made to the truth and reliability of Chronicles further than to say that they all rest on the unproved assumption that the only sources accessible to the writer were the books of Samuel and Kings; so that everything additional to, or varying from, their statements falls under the suspicion of being inference, conjecture, or pure invention.

mation upon this point; but that it was a considerable period, appears from its measuring the duration of the worship of Micah's graven image in Dan. "The feast of the LORD"\* was also annually observed in Shiloh (xxi. 19). The people came to the ark to inquire of the LORD (Judg. xx. 27; comp. Ex. xxv. 22). This most sacred article of the Mosaic tabernacle (Ex. xxv. 10 ff.) is called by its ancient name "the ark of the covenant" (Num. x. 33; xiv. 44), implying that it contained the tables of the covenant (Ex. xxxiv. 28), as Moses had directed (Ex. xxv. 21; Deut. x. 1-5). It had been taken to Bethel (wrongly translated "the house of God," Judg. xx. 18, 26, 31; xxi. 2) temporarily, as appears from ver. 27, that it might be near the scene of conflict at Gibeah (ver. 31), as was done in later times in the battle with the Philistines (1 Sam. iv. 3), in the hope that the words of Moses (Num. x. 35) might be verified in their experience. The ark was in priestly custody, as the law required; and the priest who "stood before" it (Deut. x. 8) was Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron. Sacrifices were freely offered in the presence of the ark, though Bethel was only a provisional place of worship *pro hac vice*; hence it was necessary to build an altar for the purpose (Judg. xxi. 4), and as soon as the war was ended the camp was removed to Shiloh (ver. 12).†

\* Interpreters have not been agreed whether this was the passover or the feast of tabernacles. Prof. W. R. S. says of it (p. 257), "This appears to have been a vintage feast, like the Pentateuchal Feast of Tabernacles, for it was accompanied by dances in the vineyards (Judg. xxi. 21), and according to the correct rendering of 1 Sam. i. 20, 21, it took place when the new year came in, that is, at the close of the agricultural year, which ended with the ingathering of the vintage (Ex. xxxiv. 22)." If the considerations which he adduces have any force, it was so very "like the Pentateuchal feast" as to be identical with it. The characteristic expression borrowed from Ex. xxxiv. 22 implies acquaintance with that law of the three Mosaic festivals, and makes it strange that the Professor should say in the very same paragraph that Shiloh was visited "not three times a year according to the Pentateuchal law, but at an annual feast." Especially as on a subsequent page (p. 341) he affirms in evidence of the existence and operation of the first legislation at this very time: "The annual feasts—at least that of the autumn, which seems to have been best observed—are often alluded to. . . . The proof that this law was known and acknowledged in all its leading provisions is as complete as the proof that the Levitical law was still unheard of." We think it is a great deal more complete. But let that pass. The first legislation enjoins the three annual feasts (Ex. xxiv. 14 ff.) as explicitly and emphatically as the law of Deuteronomy and Leviticus. Either the three festivals were observed at this time, and then his suggestion of a departure from Pentateuchal law is gratuitous. Or the neglect of some of the festivals on his own admission does not disprove the existence of the law requiring them. The Professor may choose either alternative. When he says of the feast at Shiloh, "It had not a strictly national character, for in Judg. xxi. 19, it appears to be only locally known, and to have the character of a village festival," all the seeming plausibility of his remark arises from an inaccuracy in the Authorized Version. "There is a feast of the LORD" should be "The feast of the LORD is, etc." The idolatrous parallel in Shechem (Judg. ix. 27) is nothing to the purpose.

† The failure to exterminate the Canaanites with its natural result of alliances with them and the worship of their gods, to which all the troubles of the period are traced

The events recorded Judg. xvii.—xxi. belong, as is universally allowed, to the early part of the period of the Judges. And then, as we have seen, there was but one house of God and there was an Aaronic priesthood. The opening chapters of Samuel will tell us how it was at the close of that period. "The house of the LORD" (1 Sam. i. 7, 24) was still in Shiloh.\* In it was the lamp of God (iii. 3), which burned nightly (Ex. xxvii. 20; xxx. 8), and the ark with its cherubim (1 Sam. iv. 4). Thither Elkanah went up yearly to worship and sacrifice (i. 3). Shiloh was visited with this view, not, as the Professor tells us (p. 257), "by pilgrims from the surrounding country of Ephraim," but by all Israel (ii. 14, 22, 29). This was the one prescribed place of sacrifice (ii. 29).† Here there was an Aaronic priest-

in the book of Judges, was an offence against both the first legislation and the law of Deuteronomy, to both of which there are many verbal allusions. The historical references are also frequent, see particularly Judg. xi. 13 ff. Technical expressions also occur, borrowed from the language of the law. The term for the "Congregation" gathered for the sacred war against Gibeah (Judg. xx. 1; xxi. 10, 13) is the one Prof. W. R. S. tells us (p. 318) is "characteristic of the Levitical law"; another equally characteristic is rendered "lewdness" (Judg. xx. 6; see Lev. xviii. 17; xix. 29, where it is translated "wickedness.") The phrase "put away evil from Israel" (Judg. xx. 13), is frequent in Deuteronomy and peculiar to it (Deut. xiii. 5; xvii. 12, etc., etc.), and the punishment of Gibeah for its gross crime was in obedience to Deut. xiii. 12 ff. "Wrought folly in Israel" (Judg. xx. 6, 10; xix. 23, 24) is from Deut. xxii. 21; Judg. xxi. 17 alludes to Deut. xxv. 6, not only in thought, but with a verbal correspondence that does not appear in the English Bible; so Judg. x. 14 to Deut. xxxii. 37, 38. The law of the Nazirite (Num. vi. 1-5) was in force (Judg. xiii. 4, 5, 14; xvi. 17; 1 Sam. i. 11); the vow of irremediable destruction (Judg. i. 17; xxi. 11; comp. Deut. xx. 17; Lev. xxvii. 29); the irrevocable character of a vow (Judg. xi. 35, 36; comp. Deut. xxiii. 21-23.)

\* But says Prof. W. R. S. (p. 258), "We find glaring departures from the very principles of the Pentateuchal sanctuary. The ark stood, not in the tabernacle, but in a temple with door-posts and folding doors, which were thrown open during the day (1 Sam. i. 9; iii. 15). Access to the temple was not guarded on rules of Levitical sanctity." And this in the face of ii. 22, where the Shiloh sanctuary is called "the tabernacle of the congregation," identifying it with the old Mosaic tent of meeting (Ex. xxix. 4), and of 2 Sam. vii. 6, where God says to David, "I have not dwelt in any house since the time that I brought up the children of Israel out of Egypt, even to this day, but have walked in a tent and in a tabernacle." The Mosaic tent had been the sole sanctuary throughout this entire period, until the ark was removed to Zion. During its long abode at Shiloh, more solid structures would naturally be erected in and about the court for the accommodation of the resident priests, the reception of offerings, and other purposes of convenience, like the chambers subsequently in the temple (1 Kin. vi. 5; Jer. xxxv. 2, 4). The doors and door-posts were no doubt those of the court or the entire sacred enclosure. To throw open the innermost part of the temple to public view would be an inconceivable profanation, not only to Israelitish, but to pagan ideas. Because Samuel slept in the temple where the ark of God was—slept, that is, in one of the chambers already adverted to—the Professor seems to think that he made a bedroom of the holy of holies. If he were told of some servant who blacked boots in the mansion where President Garfield lay sick, we suppose he would straightway infer that this menial occupation was carried on by the President's bedside. And upon the basis of such perversions as this he concludes, "These things strike at the root of the Levitical system of access to God."

† This passage flatly contradicts the extraordinary comment which the Professor makes (p. 288) upon Jer. vii. 22, "It is impossible to give a flatter contradiction to the

hood, Eli and his sons (i. 3) being descended from Ithamar, the son of Aaron (1 Chron. xxiv. 3; 1 Sam. xxii. 20; 1 Kin. ii. 27). And this was the only lawful priesthood; for God says (1 Sam. ii. 27, 28) of his father Aaron, to whom He had appeared in Egypt, in Pharaoh's house, "I chose him out of all the tribes of Israel to be my priest, to offer upon mine altar, to burn incense, to wear an ephod before me; and I gave unto the house of thy father all the offerings made by fire of the children of Israel." And no other priesthood than that of Aaron is recognized at any subsequent time under the Old Testament; not a priest is named who was not descended from Aaron; and no other can be shown to have performed any priestly function at the sanctuary. The position of the Levites in the time of the Judges is also that which is assigned to them by the law. They are spoken of as sojourners (Judg. xvii. 7-9; xix. 1), because they had no inheritance like other tribes. They took down the ark of the LORD,\* when sent back by the Philistines (1 Sam. vi. 15), while the men who looked at the ark were smitten by a great slaughter (ver. 19), and Uzzah was smitten for presuming to take hold of it (2 Sam. vi. 7; comp. Num. iv. 15, 20). Beth-shemesh being a priestly city (Josh. xxi. 16) must have contained those who could rightfully offer sacrifices on the arrival of the ark. Samuel, who was a Levite† (1 Chron. vi. 28), notwithstanding the fact that his father is called an Ephrathite (1 Sam. i. 1) in consequence of his residing within the bounds of Ephraim (comp. Judg. xvii. 7), performed subordinate ministries at the tabernacle (1 Sam. ii. 11; comp. Num. viii. 22).

---

traditional theory that the Levitical system was enacted in the wilderness." He might as well quote Luke xiv. 26, in proof that the Gospel prohibits filial affection.

\* Prof. W. R. S. (p. 427) finds an "irregularity" in the fact that "according to the Levitical law it is the function of the Levites to carry the ark; in the history the ark is borne by the priests (Josh. iii. 3; vi. 6; viii. 33; 1 Kin. viii. 3)." But this is no "irregularity" whatever. The priests, being themselves Levites, had of course a legal right to do whatever was performed by the latter. Hence on occasions of special solemnity priests were bearers of the ark; while on all ordinary occasions the Levites were competent. Accordingly 2 Sam. xv. 24, 29 where "the Levites aid the chief priests in carrying the ark" does not need for its explanation the unfounded suggestion "that before Ezekiel priests and Levites are not two separate classes." Conveying the ark in a cart (2 Sam. vi. 3) was in violation of the law, and led to a disastrous issue (vv. 6, 7); this was recognized and corrected (ver. 13).

† Samuel did not become a priest, as Prof. W. R. S. affirms (p. 259). The ephod, which he wore, is not that "which the law confines to the high-priest," for it was a "linen ephod" (1 Sam. ii. 18), while that of the high-priest (Ex. xxviii. 6) was of more costly materials. Nor is it true that he wore "the high-priestly mantle." One article of the high-priest's dress was a mantle (A. V. robe) made as is described (Ex. xxviii. 31 ff.) But others besides priests wore mantles; so that when Samuel's mother made him a little one (A. V. coat) year by year, she did not invade the high-priest's prerogative. Thus "the startling irregularities" after all amount to nothing.

The alleged departures from the ritual law at Shiloh were not really such. Eli's sons "made irregular exactions, and, in particular, would not burn the fat of the sacrifice till they had secured a portion of uncooked meat (1 Sam. ii. 12 *seq.*) Under the Levitical ordinance this claim was perfectly regular . . . (Lev. vii. 30 *seq.*; x. 15). But at Shiloh the claim was viewed as illegal and highly wicked" (p. 258). The sin of Eli's sons, and that which so disgusted the worshippers, was, that they forcibly insisted on having their share before the LORD had His; and further, they claimed over and above what the law allowed. Their legal portion was a matter of course, and is not particularly spoken of; but when the servant, with his fleshhook, seized upon whatever he could get without leave or license, this was both offensive and unauthorized. And when the priestly perquisite was demanded before the fat was given to God upon the altar, and violence was threatened if this was not conceded, the worship of Jehovah was plainly subordinated to priestly gain. The abominable character of the proceeding cannot be glossed over by any reference to the Levitical requisitions.\* Resistance to such impiety and selfish greed is not fitly spoken of as "attaching importance to details."

But what is to be thought of the sacrifices offered elsewhere than at the sanctuary in the period of the Judges and by others than priests the sons of Aaron? Two facts are obvious upon the surface which regulate this whole matter. The first is, that there is no mention in the entire book of Judges, from beginning to end, of any legitimate sanctuary but that at Shiloh, or any lawful priest not descended from Aaron. In every instance of reputed irregularity it appears by the record that there was no stated or continuous departure from Levitical rules, but only a deviation strictly limited to the occasion which called it forth. A second fact, equally apparent, is, that these deviations are invariably linked with immediate divine manifestations. In the lamentable condition to which the people were reduced, Jehovah, or the angel of Jehovah, appeared from time to time on their behalf. In every such instance sacrifices were offered on the spot by those to whom the Lord thus appeared; and in the absence of such a theophany, sacrifices were never offered except at Shiloh or in the presence of the ark, and by priests of the house of Aaron. Wherever

---

\* The ritual of the peace-offering as given (Lev. iii. 1 ff.) required the presentation of the victim, laying on of hands, slaying the animal, removing the fat and burning it upon the altar as a sweet savour unto the LORD. A supplemental law (vii. 28 ff.) specifies the portion to be given to the priests and the religious ceremonies to be observed in connection with it; but it affords no justification for the atrocious claim that the priestly portion should have precedence over that which was destined to the altar, or that these should ever be ranked on a par.

God appears, the place becomes, for that moment, holy ground (Ex. iii. 5; Josh. v. 15; 2 Sam. xxiv. 16, 18). It possesses, for the time, the sanctity of the tabernacle. And the law that restricts sacrificial worship, in ordinary times, to the place where God statedly manifests Himself, cannot forbid due worship being paid to Him in any other place which He may make the scene of an extraordinary revelation. To this extent only Ex. xx. 24 authorizes altars elsewhere than at the sanctuary. Similarly, the divinely-appointed priests alone were authorized ordinarily to draw near to God and officiate at His altar. Other men could approach Him acceptably only through their intervention. But if God himself sees fit, in any case, to dispense with sacerdotal mediation, the man to whom He comes near by an immediate gracious manifestation, is thereby warranted to present his homage directly to Him in whose presence he stands.

Thus (Judg. ii. 1-5) the angel of the LORD appeared to the people at Bochim, and they sacrificed there unto the LORD; so to Gideon, with a like result (vi. 20-22); a second appearance to Gideon, with explicit directions which he obeys (vv. 25 ff.); a supernatural manifestation to Manoah and a sacrifice (xiii. 16 ff.) And these are positively all the instances of irregular sacrifice in the book of Judges which are not distinctly stigmatized as idolatrous. No one of these places was subsequently a place of sacrifice; and Gideon and Manoah are nowhere said to have sacrificed again. The altar of Gideon, said to be still remaining in Ophrah (Judg. vi. 24), was, in all likelihood, a monumental altar, as Ex. xvii. 15; Josh. xxii. 26 ff. It does not appear that Gideon ever offered upon it; when directed to make a sacrifice immediately after (ver. 25), he built another altar. Much less does it appear that it was used for sacrifice after his time. If a writer were to tell us that the fort of Ticonderoga is there to this day, we need not infer that the ancient hostilities are still continued. Judg. xi. 11, "Jephthah uttered all his words before the LORD in Mizpeh," east of the Jordan, and (xx. 1) "the congregation was gathered together unto the LORD in Mizpeh," west of Jordan; these statements do not imply that either Mizpeh was a sanctuary. There is no allusion to sacrifices in either instance. "Before the LORD" simply implies a solemn recognition of God's presence (Gen. xiii. 13; xxvii. 7; 1 Sam. xxvi. 19; Ps. cxvi. 9). That they who bring a sacrifice are said to "offer" it (Judg. xxi. 4; 1 Sam. ii. 13) does not imply that every one could perform priestly functions; for like expressions are used in the Levitical law itself (Lev. xix. 5). We do not suppose that the Professor will dispute the reality of the divine appearances recorded in Judges; but if he did, this would not disturb our argument. For the theophany

nies and the sacrifices are firmly linked together; and if there is no evidence that the former took place, there is none that the latter were offered.

But the Professor tells us (p. 256) that

—“all God’s acts of grace mentioned in the book of Judges, all His calls to repentance, and all the ways in which He appears from time to time to support His people . . . are connected with this same local worship. The call to repentance is never a call to put aside the local sanctuaries, and worship only before the ark at Shiloh. . . . If the Pentateuchal programme of worship, and the rules which it lays down for the administration of the dispensation of grace, existed in these days, they were at least absolutely suspended. It was not according to the law that Jehovah administered His grace to Israel during the period of the Judges.”

There were no “local sanctuaries,” as we have seen, except the idolatrous shrines; and every call to forsake Baal and Ashtoreth and return to Jehovah, was a summons to abandon them and worship in Shiloh; and their cries unto the Lord (Judg. iii. 9; iv. 3, etc.) doubtless found expression at the altar and the sanctuary. The infrequent mention of the sanctuary in Shiloh in the course of this period can throw no doubt upon its continuity; for we find it at the end of the period just where and as it was at the beginning, and as it had been from the days of Joshua. The regular operation of established institutions is taken for granted by historians, and seems to demand no special record. And the writer of Judges professedly devotes himself to reciting the instances of apostasy, punishment, and deliverance (ii. 11–19), while the intervals of rest and pious obedience are passed over with a simple mention of their existence (iii. 11, 30; viii. 28, etc.) But if Shiloh was the religious centre of the true worshippers of Jehovah, why was it not the fountain-head of religious power, the spring of every religious movement? Why did not the trumpet-call to repentance issue from its priests, and each recurring revival spread from Shiloh outward? Why this seeming paralysis of the regularly instituted ordinances and means of grace, and of the duly authorized ministers of religion? the Church may well ask, and hang her head in shame. With all the deduction for the unrecorded influence that emanated from the sanctuary, and this was doubtless great at this, as at every, epoch, it must still be confessed that things are not altogether as on theory might have been expected. Nor were they when the Redeemer came to His own and His own received Him not. Nor were they at the reformation of Luther.

But how does this discredit the existence of a central sanctuary and an Aaronic priesthood? The body is nourished and strengthened by its ordinary food; and nothing more might seem requisite when it is in a healthy condition; and yet remedies may become necessary which

are quite aside from the regularly prescribed diet. The people had no other medium of acceptable approach to God, of expressing their homage or obtaining His saving help, than by the established ordinances of worship. But God was not limited to these in His dealings with His people; His grace is broader than the channels through which it ordinarily flows. Special divine influences were not restricted to the sanctuary even in the days of Moses (Num. xi. 26-29). The Romish error of an external Church as the sole dispenser of grace finds no sanction under the Old Testament more than under the New.

And no exposition of the Levitical institutions, which places regularity of ritual observance upon a par with the spirit it was designed to express, can make them tally with the history of Israel, the devout breathings of the psalmists, or the teachings of the prophets. The ritualism of the law may be emphasized to such a degree as to bring Leviticus into disharmony with the abundant inculcations of spiritual obedience in Deuteronomy; to make it antagonistic to the declarations of Isaiah i. 11 ff., Amos v. 21 ff., and Micah vi. 8 (p. 287); and to represent it as the grand essential of a religious reformation under the law "to re-establish the stated burnt-offering, and the due atoning ritual before the ark in the hands of the legitimate priesthood, and on the pattern of the service in the wilderness" (p. 263). And then the fact may be established that no such system is traceable in Israel before the rise of post-exilic Pharisaism. But the question will recur, is it Leviticus that is at fault, or the wrong interpretation which has been foisted upon it? Is Leviticus post-exilic, or has Prof. W. R. S. simply misconceived the spirit of the law and the method of its administration? He tells us (p. 213), "The Israelite had no right to draw a distinction between the spirit and the letter of the law." He was obliged to do this on numberless occasions. David and his men, in danger of perishing with hunger, ate the shewbread. The priests in the temple profaned the Sabbath and were blameless. The rites of burial were defiling. Ezekiel threatens Israel that they shall be compelled to eat defiled bread among the Gentiles. Aaron, in his grief, burned the sin-offering instead of eating it in the holy place, and was justified in so doing (Lev. x. 19, 20). Hezekiah prayed (2 Chron. xxx. 19) that the good LORD would pardon every one that prepareth his heart to seek God, the LORD God of his fathers, though he be not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary. The law, whose fundamental tenets are (Lev. xix. 2), "Ye shall be holy, for I the LORD your God am holy," and (ver. 18), "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," not only makes the spiritual meaning the essential thing in every rite, but puts that

spiritual meaning above any external rite whatever. Samuel is a true interpreter of it when he says (1 Sam. xv. 22), "Hath the LORD as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of the LORD? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams."

When Israel sinned with the golden calf and broke their covenant with God which had just been ratified, the offence was not atoned, nor the breach repaired by any ritual. On the contrary, the tabernacle was removed outside of the camp (Ex. xxxiii. 7). There was no demand of sacrifice or lustration, but only of repentance and humiliation (vv. 4 ff.) The people were sorely punished (xxxii. 27, 35), but at Moses' earnest intercession they were forgiven (vv. 30 ff.) When they sinned at Kadesh by refusing to go into the promised land, not a word was said of sacrificial expiation or of greater zeal in the ceremonial. The tabernacle and the altar and the ritual drop out of sight as completely as if they did not exist. It was upon Moses' fervent intercession (Num. xiv. 11 ff.) that the people were spared from instant destruction, though still condemned to perish in the wilderness; and as appears from Josh. v. 5 ff., the rite of circumcision was suspended, the breakers of the covenant being deprived of its seal. According to Lev. xxvi. and Deut. xxviii. the transgression of the people will be visited by ever-increasing judgments, culminating in exile from the LORD'S land; and the return of God's favor is suspended (Lev. xxvi. 40 ff.; Deut. iv. 29), not upon a punctilious observance of rites and ceremonies, but upon confession of their iniquity and the humbling of their uncircumcised hearts.

The principles thus outlined in the law itself govern the book of Judges. It records the inflictions by which the Lord from time to time recalled the offending people to a sense of their duty and their need of divine help. These were enforced by communications from "the angel of the LORD" (Jud. ii. 1 ff., etc.), as promised (Ex. xxiii. 20 ff.), and by prophets (Jud. iv. 4; vi. 8, etc. See Deut. xviii. 15 ff.) It was not to be expected that the leaders raised up to judge and to deliver the people would be from the sacerdotal tribe; Moses' own successor was from the tribe of Ephraim. That Gideon and Samson were called to their extraordinary mission not by a summons from the sanctuary, but by an immediate divine manifestation at their homes, is in accordance with the analogy of the call of Moses. And yet neither these judgments nor these leaders effected a genuine and thorough reformation. The people were gradually sinking from the days of Joshua and the elders that overlived him (Judg. ii. 7) to the time of Jephthah and Samson; and the priesthood, it must be added, fell from the level

of Phinehas, the grandson of Aaron, to that of his namesake, the son of Eli. The first effective measures for a true religious reform had their source in Shiloh; they were the work of Samuel, who was trained at the sanctuary.

But the Professor tells us (p. 263): "Samuel did not know of a systematic and exclusive system of sacrificial ritual confined to the sanctuary of the ark"; (p. 261), "He continued to sacrifice at a variety of shrines; and his yearly circuit to Bethel, Gilgal, and Mizpeh, returning to Ramah, involved the recognition of all these altars." The Lord declares through Jeremiah (vii. 12, 14; xxvi. 6), that He has abandoned Shiloh, "where He set His name at the first," on account of the wickedness of His people Israel, and He will do the same to His house in Jerusalem, "which is called by His name." Ps. lxxviii. 60, 68: "He forsook the tabernacle of Shiloh," and "chose Mount Zion." The prophet and the psalmist know of but two sanctuaries in Israel, successively sanctioned by the Lord: Shiloh and Zion. As the tabernacle was removed from the midst of the camp in consequence of the idolatry at Sinai (Ex. xxxiii. 7), so, for a like reason, Israel was bereft of the ark, which was sent into captivity in the land of the Philistines (1 Sam. iv. 11). God had no sanctuary in Israel from that day forward. The ark was restored again by the discomfited Philistines. But the slaughter of the men in the priestly city of Beth-shemesh showed that Israel was not prepared to have Jehovah fix His residence among them; and it was an embarrassing question how to dispose of the ark, which only spread terror in Israel as it had done among the uncircumcised. It was finally placed provisionally in the obscurity of a private house, and guarded, so far as appears, by a pious layman (1 Sam. vii. 1).

Here is a novel and most extraordinary state of affairs. The ark, which as the symbol and pledge of Jehovah's presence has always hitherto been the confidence and the glory of Israel, is now a source of alarm. It was not taken back to Shiloh, nor was it taken to Nob, when the tabernacle was carried thither (1 Sam. xxi. 1, 6). It was not put in any sanctuary. It was simply sheltered in the dwelling of an ordinary Israelite. No priest or Levite ministered before it. No sacrifices were offered where it was. No pilgrimages were made to it (1 Chron. xiii. 3\*). And during its long abode in Kirjath-jearim, "all the house of Israel lamented after the LORD" (1 Sam. vii. 2). The covenant between Jehovah and Israel was severed, and they knew it. The Lord no longer had a dwelling-place in the midst of them.

---

\* In 1 Sam. xiv. 18, as Prof. W. R. S. correctly informs us (p. 94), there seems to be an error in the Hebrew text; and there is much to recommend the reading of the LXX, which substitutes "ephod" for "ark."

Now the one purpose of Samuel's life was to bring Israel back to God, and thus restore these ruptured relations. And absolutely the Professor thinks (pp. 262-3), that the thing for him to have done was to have taken the ark to Nob, "for the distance between these towns is only a forenoon's walk," and to have set up the Levitical service under the conduct of the Aaronic priesthood! And because he did not do this, the Levitical law could not have been in existence! Such reasoning betrays the most astounding misconception of the relation between Jehovah and Israel, and of the ritual institutions by which that relation was expressed and maintained. Outward regularity in the prescribed ceremonial had nothing in it that was acceptable, so long as the hearts of the people were alienated from God. Leaving the people in their profound but salutary grief at the loss of the sanctuary, and of God's visible presence among them, he sought "to have them return unto the LORD with all their hearts," "to prepare their hearts unto the LORD and serve Him only" (1 Sam. vii. 3). The worship which he conducted was sacrificial, of course; that was the symbolic form by which penitence and consecration were expressed. But the sacrifice was without a sanctuary and without a priesthood. Samuel officiated, not because he was a regular priest, for he was not; nor by virtue of his being a Levite, which would have given him no legal right to offer sacrifice; but in his prophetic character as God's ambassador and representative. But that this function was an extraordinary one appears from the fact that it was limited to Samuel alone (1 Sam. ix. 13). There is, from the time that the ark was laid up at Kirjath-jearim till David removed it to Zion, scarcely a recorded instance of sacrifice when Samuel\* was not present, except the rash and luckless act of Saul, which brought upon him Samuel's stern reprobation and the loss of his kingdom, in spite of his apology that he was forced to do as he did by the unavoidable pressure of circumstances (1 Sam. xiii. 8-14). Samuel is plainly the centre of the religious life of the period. The presence of God, so far as its gracious manifestation to Israel is concerned, is for the time linked with the prophet, not with the ark.

The new religious fervor awakened by the ministry of Samuel found expression as it could. In the absence of any divinely authorized sanctuary we read of men going up to God to Bethel (x. 3), where God

---

\* In 1 Sam. vii. 9, 17; ix. 12, 13; x. 8; xi. 14, 15; xvi. 2-5, Samuel is distinctly named as the offerer, or at least sanctioned the sacrifice by his presence and participation. Saul built an altar (xiv. 35), and he spoke (xv. 15, 21) of the people's proposing to sacrifice the spoils of the Amalekites in Gilgal; but he cannot have thought of offering in the absence of Samuel after the rebuff which he had already received.

had met with Jacob; of a high place at Gibeah (x. 5), visited by a company of prophets and established probably on account of its proximity to their residence; of a yearly sacrifice of David's family (xx. 6), at their home in Bethlehem. These are the only instances of the sort which are mentioned except the sacrifices conducted by Samuel himself. All the ado made about "local sanctuaries" prior to the reign of David dwindles down to this; and in it there is no departure even from the strict letter of the law (1 Kings iii. 2\*).

The worship in high places was irregular and illegal after the temple was built. But the fact that they were tolerated by pious princes, who contented themselves with abolishing the emblems and practices of idolatry found there, only shows that they did not do their whole duty; not that the law which had ruled ever since the days of Moses did not exist. They may very easily have persuaded themselves that the spirit of the law was maintained if only the abuses were rectified; that if God was sincerely and piously worshipped in these local sanctuaries, there could not be much harm in suffering them to remain. How much of the New Testament must have been written after the Reformation of Luther, if the habitual disregard of its teachings is to be accepted as evidence against their existence? and especially if the "popular religion" is made the measure of primitive Christianity?

---

\* What is said of David's want of orthodoxy (p. 264) seems for the most part captious. David did not wear "the priestly ephod" (2 Sam. vi. 14), but a linen ephod, which was worn by priests, but was no part of their prescribed dress; and, as shown by this instance and that of Samuel when a child (1 Sam. ii. 18), might be worn by others on sacred occasions. "He offered sacrifices in person" (ver. 13), and so Prof. W. R. S. tells us (p. 248): "Solomon officiated at the altar in person (1 Kin. ix. 25)"; and by a like principle of interpretation it might have been added that he built the altar with his own hands. If Solomon really "offered two and twenty thousand oxen and an hundred and twenty thousand sheep" in person, at one time, he must have had a weary task (1 Kin. viii. 63). "He blessed the people as a priest in the name of Jehovah" (ver. 18), where "as a priest" is without any warrant in the text. "David's sons were priests (2 Sam. viii. 18)"; but though this is the usual sense of the word, it must have a different meaning here, since the priests properly so called had already been named in the verse preceding. In 1 Chron. xviii. 17 it is paraphrased "chief about the king," which is justified by the primary sense of the term, and perhaps by the consideration that this high and confidential office was commonly entrusted to priests (comp. *eunuch*, Gen. xxxix. 1, not in its proper sense, but as an official title). That he weakly allowed Absalom to visit Hebron under pretence of a sacrificial vow, may be justified by 1 Kin. iii. 2. His marriage with a princess of Geshur (2 Sam. iii. 3), is not a violation of the letter of the law, but offends as much against the spirit of the first legislation (Ex. xxxiv. 15, 16), as against that of Deuteronomy; and, as this was Absalom's mother, the history records the dreadful penalty he incurred. "Solomon building new shrines for the gods of his wives" (p. 248), could not plead ignorance of the law, on the Professor's own theory (Ex. xxii. 20; xxiii. 24). Prof. W. R. S. further proves that the priest received his consecration not from Jehovah, but from the people, by the case of Micah (Judg. xvii. 5, 12), the idolater, who stole his mother's money (ver. 2), and by the case of Eleazar, son of Abinadab (1 Sam. vii. 1), who was not a priest at all (p. 264).

How plain is it upon these principles that the doctrine of justification by faith could never have been formulated by the apostle Paul, if it was not apprehended in its integrity by the early fathers and the theologians of the Middle Ages? Hezekiah's admitted reform (2 Kings xviii. 4) recognized the binding obligation of the Deuteronomic law a century before the book was found in the temple. That book, according to the explicit testimony of the author of Kings, was no recent production of the reign of Josiah. It was "the book of the law" (2 Kin. xxii. 8), *i. e.*, the well-known volume so designated (comp. Josh. i. 7, 8; viii. 31; xxiv. 26), which was found "in the house of the LORD," just where it might have been expected to be (Deut. xxxi. 9, 26). It is further characterized as "the law of Moses" (2 Kin. xxiii. 24, 25), and is, as Prof. W. R. S. acknowledges, the standard of judgment which the writer of the book of Kings applies to all preceding reigns. The people and their rulers do right, or do evil in the sight of the LORD, as they heed or disregard its injunctions. This law is expressly referred to (2 Kin. xxi. 7-9), as known and disobeyed by Manasseh, and in fact as enjoined by the LORD upon David and Solomon; also as obeyed by Hezekiah (xviii. 6), and by Joash (xiv. 6), where the very words of the statute are quoted from Deut. xxiv. 16. "The testimony" given to Joash at his coronation (2 Kin. xi. 12) was a copy of the written law as directed by Deut. xvii. 18, comp. Ps. xix. 7; lxxviii. 5. It is appealed to by Solomon in his prayer at the dedication of the temple (1 Kin. viii. 53, 56), as well as implied throughout in the language of his supplication; and is commended by David to Solomon for the rule of his life (ii. 3). It is represented as equally binding on the ten tribes as upon Judah, and their transgression of the covenant of the LORD and the commandments of Moses led to their overthrow (2 Kin. xviii. 12). The idolatrous corruptions of the northern kingdom, which Prof. W. R. S. is at great pains to show (p. 230), were "not a mere innovation due to the schism of Jeroboam," are expressly and in detail imputed to him (1 Kin. xii. 26 ff.; xiii. 33; xiv. 9), so that his standing designation is "Jeroboam the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin" (2 Kin. x. 29, etc., etc.) And what the Professor persists in calling "traditional worship," under which term he heaps together all the idolatries and glaring violations of the Mosaic law that are recorded at various times, the sacred historians with one voice denounce as defections from the true worship of their covenant God, and as due to criminal association with the nations around them. If they are not to be trusted in so fundamental a point as this, they are not to be trusted in anything. It would be better to remand the entire history of Israel to the region of fable, and to confess that we have no posi-

tive knowledge about it, than to attempt this revolutionary process of reconstruction, which is professedly based upon authorities that are perpetually discredited.

But if historians may have incorporated their own ideas with their narrative, and committed the mistake of transferring the institutions of their own day to antecedent periods, contemporaneous writings will be free from this error, and represent truly the state of things in which they were produced. Let us turn then to these. The book of Psalms, as the Professor with all his distrust of their titles confesses, contains some ancient songs. He admits that tradition, in imputing the first portion of the Psalter (Ps. i.—xli.) almost without exception to David, “doubtless expresses the fact that these are the oldest Psalms, belonging to the early ages of Hebrew psalmody from David downward” (p. 202). Now, in all these Psalms, as in the entire collection in fact, Zion is God’s earthly dwelling-place; no other is once alluded to. The Professor does not indicate which Psalms in particular are to be accounted David’s. Hitzig, that prince of doubters, regards Ps. iii.—xix. as the genuine Davidic kernel, with the exception of Ps. v., vi., xiv. Professor W. R. S. excepts to Ps. ix., x. Suppose that we content ourselves with the modest residuum. We still find that Jehovah’s abode is in His holy hill (iii. 4), His tabernacle (xv. 1), His temple or palace which applies to the sacred Tent as the residence of the great King (xi. 4; xviii. 6); and mention is made of the winged cherub attached to His throne (xviii. 10). also of Jehovah’s law (xix. 7–10), and His judgments and statutes (xviii. 22), with expressions in Ps. xv. and xix. borrowed from legal phrases and ideas, not to speak of the historical allusion in Ps. xi. 6, and the abundant references to the Pentateuch in Ps. xviii.

We do not know what the Professor thinks of Ps. xl. It is in its title ascribed to David. But Smend—to whose commentary he refers us (p. 377) for “the detailed proof that in every point Ezekiel’s Torah prepares the way for the Levitical law, but represents a more elementary ritual”—remarks on Ezek. xl. 39, “Sin-offerings and trespass-offerings are here mentioned for the first time outside of the Priest-codex.” If Ezekiel is the inventor of sin-offerings, Ps. xl. 6\* must have borrowed them from him or from the Levitical law, which he pioneered. Such language, when found in Micah vi. 8, Jer. vii. 22, is interpreted (p. 288) as affirming that “Jehovah has not enjoined sacrifice,” that He has, in fact, given no law upon the subject; the Levitical law was consequently still unknown. But, if

\* “Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire, . . . burnt-offering and sin-offering hast thou not required.”

Ps. xl. 6 can speak thus after Ezekiel's law or the Levitical law had been announced, Micah and Jeremiah could do the same; and then, for all that appears, the Levitical law may antedate their utterances.\* Or if Ps. xl. was prior to the time of Ezekiel, the sin-offering was not introduced by him; though not mentioned elsewhere, it was part of the pre-exilic ritual, and Moses may have ordained it after all. And then still further, the Psalmist speaks (ver. 7) of all this as written in a book-roll, which he identifies (ver. 8) with the law of God; a written law respecting peace-offering and meat-offering, burnt-offering and sin-offering, which lays its supreme stress not upon the presentation of the animal required, but upon the surrender to God of the person of the offerer. The Professor tells us (p. 364), and we preserve his italics, "The old Israelite *consecrated himself* before a sacrifice." By an "old Israelite" he plainly means in the connection one who lived under "the first legislation" and prior to the time of Isaiah. The author of this Psalm was then an "old Israelite," and may have been David, as the title declares. And, accordingly, David or the "old

---

\* This conclusion cannot be evaded by imputing to Ps. xl. 6 a sense which the Professor (p. 416) follows Hitzig in attributing to Ps. li. 16, 17: "At present, says the Psalmist, God desires no material sacrifice. . . . But does the Psalmist then mean to say, absolutely and in general, that sacrifice is a superseded thing? No; for he adds that when Jerusalem is rebuilt the sacrifice of Israel (not merely his own sacrifice) will be pleasing to God. He lives, therefore, in a time when the fall of Jerusalem has temporarily suspended the sacrificial ordinances." Hitzig thinks Ps. xl. to be pre-exilic, and ascribes it to Jeremiah. Olshausen, who is for sweeping everything into the Macabean period, places it during the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, when the temple-worship was interdicted. But these passages in the Psalms, as well as Ps. l. 8-15, are so clearly akin to Hos. vi. 6; Isa. i. 11 ff., etc., that they must be interpreted on the same principles. If, as is confessed, there is no absolute discarding of sacrifice in Ps. li., neither is there in Ps. xl., nor in those passages of the prophets which are quoted to show that sacrifice, if not actually disapproved, was yet in itself a matter of indifference. And the Psalmists declare, just as plainly as the prophets, God's permanent attitude toward sacrifice. There is nothing in the language of Ps. li. to suggest the thought, which it is proposed to put into it, viz, that sacrifices are not required "at present" because providentially rendered impossible. And the prayer in the last two verses of the Psalm, "that God will build the walls of Jerusalem," does not refer so manifestly to the period of the "captivity" as the Professor seems to suppose. Nebuchadnezzar could speak (Dan. iv. 30) of "this great Babylon, which I have built," without its being necessary for us to suppose that it did not exist or was in ruins when his reign began. To "build" a city, in Scripture phrase, is not merely to construct it *ab initio*, but to strengthen or enlarge it (Josh. xix. 50; 1 Kin. xii. 25; xv. 17; 2 Kin. xiv. 22; 2 Chron. viii. 2; Mic. iii. 10; Hab. ii. 12, etc., etc.) Solomon built "the wall of Jerusalem round about" (1 Kin. iii. 1; ix. 15), though his father had not left it defenceless and no victorious foe had dismantled it; and, as Delitzsch suggests, David's prayer found in this a partial accomplishment. There is no reason, therefore, for setting aside the title of this Psalm, which at least represents a very ancient and credible tradition of its origin. And no person, surely, who is untrammelled by a hypothesis, would ever dream of dating the grateful thanksgiving for divine benefits in Ps. xl. 1-5, from either the Babylonish captivity or the Syrian persecution.

Israelite" had a written law embracing precisely the forms of sacrifice included in Leviticus; moreover, he understood it in a very different sense from the rigid ritualism which Professor W. R. S. insists upon finding there.

From the Psalms we turn to the Prophets. Hosea and Amos are among the earliest from whom we have any writings. They prophesied in the northern kingdom, which had been severed from Judah for nearly 200 years. In casting off subjection to the house of David, the ten tribes had abandoned the temple at Jerusalem, its priesthood, and its worship. The separatist worship of the calves, the Professor tells us, was regarded by the people as perfectly legitimate. "They still believed themselves loyal to Jehovah" (p. 231). They were simply maintaining their old ancestral forms. The law, which they are charged with violating, had as yet no existence in Judah; and the ten tribes went into exile long before it was enacted. The prophets were the real innovators. Leaving out of view that Israel's idolatrous worship was in open violation, not only of the Deuteronomic and Levitical codes, but likewise of the ten commandments which are admitted to be Mosaic, and the basis of Jehovah's covenant with His people, in violation, too, of the first legislation (Ex. xx. 23), which even on the theory of Prof. W. R. S. antedated this period, what do the prophets say about it?

Hosea constantly sets forth the relation between Jehovah and Israel under the emblem of a marriage covenant (ii. 19, 20), a form of representation borrowed from the books of Moses (Ex. xx. 5; xxxiv. 15, 16; Lev. xvii. 7; xx. 5, 6; Num. xiv. 33). His ever reiterated charge is that Israel is an unfaithful wife, who had responded to her Lord in former days, when she came up out of Egypt (ii. 15), but had since abandoned Him for other lovers (i.-iii., etc.), Baal and the calves (xiii. 1, 2). She has broken her covenant, has dealt treacherously (v. 7; vi. 7), has backslidden (iv. 16; xi. 7; xiv. 4), is repeating the atrocity of Gibeah (ix. 9; x. 9). The prevalent sacrificing on the hills and under shady trees is a shameless and criminal desertion of her lawful husband for a base and profligate prostitution (iv. 13). Nothing certainly can be further from the prophet's conception, than that this was Israel's original and hereditary worship. If the Professor is right, Hosea is radically mistaken. His language is not that of one who is seeking to lift a people to purer and more spiritual ideas from gross and degrading superstitions, in which they have always been involved. His effort is to reclaim those who have apostatized from God's true service to the standing from which they have fallen. The "knowledge of God," whose absence he deplors (iv. 1), is not a theoretical appre-

hension of His being and attributes, as though his hearers had never been instructed about Him; but as appears from its concomitants, that practical acquaintance with the Most High which is synonymous with true piety, and which had well-nigh vanished from the land.

It appears from Hos. viii. 12,\* that Israel had a written law of very considerable extent; this must have related in part, as the connection implies, to altars and sacrifices, and no doubt embraced the duties which the people are elsewhere charged with violating (comp. also Hos. iv. 6; viii. 1; Am. ii. 4). We learn from Hos. ii. 11; ix. 5; xii. 9; Am. v. 21; viii. 5, that the annual feasts, new-moons, Sabbaths, and festive assemblies were observed in Israel, and held in high esteem, and that they occupied a prominent place in the life of the people, so that their abolition would be reckoned a serious disaster. We read also (Am. v. 22; Hos. viii. 13) of burnt-offerings, meat-offerings; peace-offerings; (Am. iv. 5) thank-offerings, free-will-offerings; (Hos. ix. 4) drink-offerings; (Am. iv. 4) the daily morning sacrifice; Hos. iv. 8 alludes to the law of the sin-offering; Hos. ix. 3, 4 to the law of clean and unclean meats. Instead of the simplicity of worship, which the Professor finds represented in the first legislation and in Deuteronomy, and which he would have us believe prevailed until the Babylonish

---

\* Prof. S. translates this verse hypothetically, as is done by several critics and commentators, who seek thus to evade its explicit testimony. To this there are serious objections. But even thus it would establish the existence of a detailed and copious law embracing the subject of sacrifice, and which the prophet held to be from God, and charged both priests and people with neglecting. "Though I wrote to him the ten thousand precepts of my Torah" (not "my Torah in ten thousand precepts," as Prof. S. has it) by the very hypothesis avers that there is such a law to write. But the past tense of the verb in the second clause stands in the way of the hypothetical construction, and makes it, if not absolutely certain, yet highly probable on grammatical grounds alone that it is historical, and that the future in the first clause is to be explained as in Ps. ciii. 7. To this add the incongruities which attend the hypothetical explanation. Why speak of imposing *ten thousand* requirements, as though these would be more likely to secure obedience than a smaller number? and why of *writing* instead of enjoining or declaring the law? The very mode of putting the hypothesis implies that written law was a familiar idea, that law to have its highest validity should be in written form; and such a notion could only be begotten of usage. So that Smend gives up the hypothetical construction as untenable ("Moses apud Prophetas," p. 13): "The words of Hosea prove that the Ephraimites had many written laws in the eighth century, which, whether contained in one or more books, although they were neglected by a large part of the people, were yet known to all, and in the judgment of the prophet demanded the obedience of all, since they were of divine obligation, as much so as if written by Jehovah himself." Nowack, one of the most recent commentators on Hosea, confesses that this verse is not hypothetical, but seeks to bend it to the views of the latest critical school, by giving to the first verb a progressive sense, *I am writing*, as implying that the legislation was not given at one time in the age of Moses, but was gradually produced from that time forward. Perhaps he infers from the "*creating*" in Isa. xlii. 5, that in the prophet's estimation, the work of creation was still progressing, and that he thus anticipated the cosmical-development hypothesis.

exile, they must have had an elaborate ritual closely corresponding to the Levitical institutions. So that Smend himself says ("Moses apud Prophetas," p. 75): "It is sufficiently evident that the cultus of Jehovah, as it existed in the time of the earlier prophets, and doubtless long before, is by no means at variance with the character of Leviticus. Whatever judgment may be formed of the age of this book, the opinions hitherto entertained of the birth, growth, and maturity of the religion of Israel will undergo no change."

In Hos. vi. 6, "I desired mercy and not sacrifice," the very next clause shows that the negation is not absolute, "and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings."\* This affords a very simple key to the passages with which the Professor confronts us on p. 287, and which he interprets to mean that in the judgment of the prophets "sacrifice is not necessary to acceptable religion." "Amos proves God's indifference to ritual by reminding the people that they offered no sacrifice and offerings to Him in the wilderness during those forty years of wandering which he elsewhere cites as a special proof of

---

\* It is remarkable how many allusions to the Deuteronomic and Levitical codes there are in Hosea and Amos, and even striking coincidences of language. In addition to those already cited in the text, the following may be mentioned as among the most obvious. The law of the unity of the sanctuary is presupposed in charging them with sin for multiplying altars (Hos. viii. 11; xii. 11); the prohibition of removing landmarks (Deut. xix. 14; xxvii. 17) is referred to Hos. v. 10; iv. 4, the final reference of causes in dispute to the priest, refusal to hear whom was a capital offence, Deut. xvii. 12; viii. 13, ix. 3, penalty of a return to Egypt, Deut. xxviii. 68; ix. 4, defilement from the dead, Num. xix. 14, 22, Deut. xxvi. 14; ix. 10, Baal-peor, Num. xxv. 3, 5, which is a Levitical passage (p. 433); x. 11, comp. Deut. xxv. 4, the ox not to be muzzled when treading out corn; vi. 11, Am. ix. 14, "return the captivity," Deut. xxx. 3. Amos, though delivering his message in Bethel, knows but one sanctuary, that in Zion, i. 2; ii. 7, the law of incest, Lev. xx. 11, Deut. xxii. 30; ii. 11, 12, Nazirites, Num. vi. 2, 3, and prophets, Deut. xviii. 15; iv. 4, triennial tithes, Deut. xiv. 28; xxvi. 12, for which in their excess of zeal they may substitute tithes every three days; viii. 5, falsifying the ephah, shekel, and balances, Lev. xix. 36, Deut. xxv. 13, ff.; ii. 7, "to profane my holy name," Lev. xx. 3; ii. 9, comp. Num. xiii. 32, 33; v. 11, ix. 14, comp. Deut. xxviii. 30, 39; vi. 14, "entering in of Hamath," Num. xxxiv. 8; ix. 13, comp. Lev. xxvi. 5. Prof. W. R. S. deduces from Hos. iii. 4, the inference (p. 226) that "sacrifice and *maççêba*, ephod and teraphim, were recognized as the necessary forms and instruments of the worship of Jehovah." This finds its sufficient reply in his own note upon this passage (p. 423), according to which Jehovah "breaks off all intercourse *between Israel and the Baalim*" as well as between Israel and himself. That teraphim are spoken of in connection with Jacob and were found in David's house, only shows that their wives were not free from superstitious practices. That Micah had them in his idolatrous sanctuary (Judg. xviii. 14, ff.) can surely create no embarrassment. And if Micah's Levite, as he adds in the same connection (p. 227), was really a "grandson of Moses," this is no more damaging to the great legislator than it is to Luther that his descendants have deserted the Protestant faith, or than it is to Isaiah that he once summoned the priest Urijah as a witness to certify a fact (viii. 2), (whence the Professor dignifies him [p. 253] with the title of Isaiah's "friend"), though he had "co-operated with King Ahaz" in a change of altars.

Jehovah's covenant grace (Am. ii. 10; v. 25). 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). And Jeremiah (vii. 21, *seq.*) says in express words, etc., etc." (Comp. also Isa. i. 11, *seq.*; Am. v. 21, *seq.*); Am. v. 25 is a greatly disputed passage and has been very variously understood. It is unnecessary to go into a discussion of its meaning here. If we accept the sense which the Professor puts upon its terms, it will simply mean that the Mosaic system of sacrifice did not go into full and developed operation in the wilderness; a fact of which we have hints elsewhere (*e. g.* Deut. xii. 8, 9), and which is implied in the language of several of the laws themselves (Ex. xii. 25; xxxiv. 12; Lev. xiv. 34; xxiii. 10; xxv. 2, etc., etc.) But the Professor's deduction from these passages is too sweeping for his own theory. If they are irreconcilable with the idea that any divine law of sacrifice then existed, they will not only abolish Leviticus, as he contends, but the first legislation as well (Ex. xxii. 30; xxiii. 14-18; xxxiv. 19, 25), and Deuteronomy (xii. 6, 11, 27; xv. 19; xvi. 2, etc.), of which Jeremiah is the acknowledged champion, some adventurous critics having actually claimed that he wrote it himself; and even nullify the plea which the Lord directed Moses to urge with Pharaoh as a reason for leaving Egypt "that we may sacrifice to the LORD our God" (Ex. iii. 18), which is not classed among the Levitical passages (p. 432).

Our space will not permit us to trace the Mosaic codes through the rest of the prophets. But one view is common to them all: Jehovah's seat is in Zion\* (Joel ii. 15, ff.; iii. 21; Mic. iv. 1, ff.) Isaiah leaves us in no doubt as to the place of Jehovah's sanctuary. Not only in the reign of Hezekiah, to whose reform he doubtless contributed, but from the outset of his ministry under Uzziah he declares his mind on this subject in unambiguous language. Zion is the mountain of the LORD, which shall be so conspicuously exalted, and shall be the resort of all nations, and from which God's law shall go forth (ii. 2, 3). It is upon Zion that He shall create a cloud and smoke by day, and a flaming fire by night, a glory and a defence (iv. 5). In the

---

\* The sole prophetic utterance, which bears the semblance of approving a plurality of sanctuaries, is the complaint of Elijah, "They have thrown down thine altars" (1 Kin. xix. 10). But in the anomalous condition of the northern kingdom, cut off from access to the temple at Jerusalem, it is not surprising if the fearers of Jehovah maintained His worship in local sanctuaries. And the hostility to Jehovah's service, which overthrew these altars, was not palliated by the fact that from a strictly legal point of view they were unauthorized. We might be indignant at an infidel government for suppressing the Roman Catholic worship, without approving of the celebration of the mass. Elijah's own sacrifice at Carmel was by immediate divine direction (1 Kin. xviii. 36).

year that King Uzziah died he had the sublime vision of Jehovah, whom he saw in the temple, and his lips were purged by a coal from the altar (vi. 1, ff.) It was when Sennacherib presumed to shake his hand against the mount of the daughter of Zion that his doom was sealed (x. 32; comp. 2 Kin. xix. 34). Zion is "the city of our solemnities" whose protection is secured by the presence of Jehovah (xxxiii. 20). He repudiates a plurality of altars (xvii. 8), which with him has only idolatrous associations; such an altar has no sacredness beyond mere chalk-stones (xxvii. 9). He predicts the time when there shall be "an altar to Jehovah in the midst of the land of Egypt" (xix. 19), as a symbol that this land shall be as truly as Canaan the Lord's land, and its people the Lord's people. Like Mal. i. 11, it is one of the prophetic intimations of the passing away of the local and national restrictions of the former dispensation. But that Isaiah had no thought of a separatist worship appears from ii. 4, where the same truth is clothed in the more strictly Old Testament form of all nations making their pilgrimages to Zion. The Lord cannot tolerate ritual observances as an offset to wicked lives (i. 11, ff.); but He has the same disgust for prayer (i. 15) and the language of the lips (xxix. 13) similarly offered. There is no depreciation of sacrificial worship in this, for the acceptable service that Egypt will one day render unto God is described by saying, "They shall do sacrifice and oblation; they shall vow a vow and perform it," xix. 21.

But does not Isaiah in the same connection predict "a pillar" (*maççêba*) in the land of Egypt, the very symbol which Deut. xvi. 22 forbids? "This passage," says Prof. W. R. S. (p. 354), "gives us a superior limit for the date of the Deuteronomic code." "Isaiah could not refer to a forbidden symbol as a *maççêba* to Jehovah." There is a slight confusion of ideas here. In the first place, it proves too much. This symbol was prohibited likewise by the first legislation (Ex. xxiii. 24; xxxiv. 13, for "images" read "pillars"), which required the destruction of Canaanitish altars and pillars, not their purification and rededication to the service of God. Secondly, the thing forbidden was the erection of pillars in the neighborhood of altars with the view of worshipping them (Lev. xxvi. 1; Deut. xvi. 21, 22). Moses himself had set up twelve pillars about the altar at the ratification of the covenant with Jehovah (Ex. xxiv. 4), each tribe as it were erecting its memorial on that solemn occasion. Stone monuments to commemorate God's goodness or to mark signal events were repeatedly erected in post-Mosaic times. When this was done with no view to sacrifice or adoration, it was no violation of the Pentateuchal statute. The monumental

pillar, of which the prophet speaks, at the border of Egypt, had no connection with the altar which was to be in the midst of the land. It simply marked the sacred character of Egypt, and was not intended for any idolatrous purpose.

But Ezekiel is the great stronghold of the hypothesis which we are considering. Here we are told we can see the very process of the formation of the Levitical law. The prophet is convinced by the failure of all his predecessors to reclaim the wayward people, that a new departure must be made. A barrier must be erected to shut out heathen influence, and to confine Israel rigidly to the service of Jehovah. Acting on this idea he lays down (Ch. xl.-xlviii.) a ritual to be observed on the return from exile, in which the worship which had hitherto been spontaneous and free is reduced to a fixed and unvarying form, and all the ceremonies are described in minute detail. This scheme of the cultus at the sanctuary was enlarged and modified by Ezra, and thus arose the Levitical law which he brought forward in its completed form, and which thenceforth became the law of Israel's worship. Ezekiel's projected system represents a stage between the simplicity of the former cultus and the greater complexity of the Levitical legislation.

These closing chapters of Ezekiel, where it is proposed to find the key to the origin of the middle books of the Pentateuch, have always been a puzzle to commentators. And a hypothesis which professes to relieve them of all mystery (p. 374), to accept them in their most obvious sense, and to suggest a sufficient reason for those various regulations and an important purpose to be answered by them, thus converting what has seemed like a barren waste into a fruitful field, can scarcely fail to attract attention if it has the slightest plausibility. Some perplexities, however, force themselves upon us in advance.

1. There are items in Ezekiel's description of the sanctuary, the worship and the holy land of the future, which can scarcely have been intended to be literally understood, but seem to have been introduced for the sake of giving an ideal character to the entire section. Zion could not possibly be called "a very high mountain" (xl. 2), unless with a view to the exaltation promised (Isa. ii. 2) and assumed (Ezek. xvii. 22, 23). Its utmost extent could not afford a site for a sacred enclosure measuring 500 reeds, or 3,000 cubits, *i. e.*, nearly a mile on each of its four sides (xlii. 16 ff.) The critics have been at great pains to correct "reeds" into "cubits" in order to bring it within some reasonable probability; but this is directly in the face of the repeated statements of the text. The entrance of Jehovah's glory into the house represents a spiritual fact, not an occurrence in the form exhibited in the vision (xliii. 2-4).

The stream flowing from the sanctuary (xlvii. 1-12), swelling as it advanced, and carrying life, fertility, and healing even to the desert and the Dead Sea, is manifestly symbolical, and can no more represent an actual river than its counterpart in Rev. xxii. 1, ff. The symmetrical division of the land parcelled among the tribes in parallel strips, with a holy oblation unto the Lord in the centre, is as unpractical as possible, and, in the case of the tribes located to the south, assumes a complete reclaiming of the arid desert. It is as plainly ideal as the uniform numbers of the tribes in Rev. vii. 5 ff., or as the resurrection of the dry bones (Ezek. xxxvii. 1 ff.) and the destruction of Gog (xxxix. 9 ff.), which are preliminary to these closing chapters.

2. These directions of Ezekiel were not in fact obeyed by the returning exiles, which shows that their intention as understood by those immediately addressed was not to guide the present, but to forecast the future. The temple of Zerubbabel was not built by Ezekiel's plan; nor did its cultus or the partition of the land correspond with the model sketched by him.

3. If the Levitical law was based upon that of Ezekiel, why did it not adopt the regulations given by him, instead of departing from them so often and so capriciously as it would seem? Why, for example, was the burnt-offering of seven bullocks and seven rams prescribed by Ezekiel (xlv. 23-25) for each of the seven days of passover, and of the feast of tabernacles, converted into two bullocks, one ram, and seven lambs daily at the passover (Num. xxviii. 19-24), and thirteen bullocks, two rams, and fourteen lambs on the first day of tabernacles, to be repeated from day to day with a gradually diminishing number of bullocks to the end? We can understand how a prophet, speaking in the name of God and presaging the Church of the future, could freely modify the established Mosaic ritual for the very purpose of intimating that the forms of the old law were not immutable and would one day suffer change. But this recent hypothesis is quite incomprehensible; that, after Ezekiel had with divine authority proclaimed a new and elaborate ritual, it should have been altered and added to and subtracted from by the priesthood in numberless particulars before it was set in operation.

4. It is not very clear that the time when the ceremonial had been for the present providentially abolished was the one for doing what by the hypothesis had never been done so long as the temple stood and the priests were performing its daily service, viz., prepare a complete formulary for its worship. One would think that there were more practical and pressing needs of the exiles than this. But if

Ezekiel did undertake to do it, it is strange that the larger part of his scheme is occupied with an utterly abortive, though most minute description of a temple, which did not so differ from the plan of Solomon's as to further any important end. And stranger still, the Levitical law, which was meant as an improvement upon Ezekiel, instead of giving the exiles intelligible directions for the rebuilding of their temple, substitutes an almost interminable account of the tabernacle in the wilderness, which is a pure fancy sketch of a structure that never existed.

5. The so-called Torah of Ezekiel was issued with his own name as revealed to himself. There was no "legal fiction" in the case, and no pretence of being from Moses; which is an additional warrant for believing that any other law published at that time or subsequently by competent authority would not have appeared under an assumed name, but have frankly and honestly announced the authority from which it proceeded, and on which it rested its claim to be obeyed.

6. And we are still further puzzled to understand how the new ritual could have been gotten into operation under the circumstances. By the hypothesis it was a totally new departure made under false pretences. Every one knew that it was not only not Mosaic, but was diametrically opposed to the Mosaic system. All the prejudices that clung to the ancient ritual were opposed to it. So were the class-interests of the priests, who, it is alleged, were now degraded from their former prerogatives to the inferior rôle of Levites; and the attachments to local sanctuaries, which it is supposed were now summarily abolished. And when we remember the persistence with which open idolaters faced Jeremiah, and even carried their point in spite of his remonstrances (Jer. xliii. 2 ff.; xlv. 15 ff.), the opposition from these various quarters could not have been slight. The new law could not have gained prevalence from the authority of Ezekiel, for it freely deviates from the law which he had given. It ran directly counter to the instructions of Jeremiah, as these are interpreted to us by the advocates of the new hypothesis, for "he knew no divine law of sacrifice under the first temple" (p. 374); counter also to Isa. lxvi. 1-3, which, on the Professor's critical principles, was by a prophet of the captivity later even than Ezekiel, in which, upon the same method of interpretation, Jehovah repudiates all earthly sanctuaries and sacrificial rites. And yet, in spite of all these elements of a formidable opposition, the Levitical law was no sooner brought forward by Ezra than it was at once accepted and submitted to as "the law of Moses, which the LORD had commanded to Israel" (Neh. viii. 1, 14; x. 29), and that, too, as distinguished from post-Mosaic enactments (xii. 45).

But waiving these difficulties of a general nature, how is it with those particulars in the Torah of Ezekiel which, recent critics affirm, must have preceded the law of Leviticus? We quote from Professor W. R. Smith (p. 374):

"The first that strikes us is the degradation of the Levites. The ministers of the old Temple, he (Ezekiel) tells us, were uncircumcised foreigners,\* whose presence was an insult to Jehovah's sanctuary. Such men shall no more enter the house, but in their place shall come the Levites not of the house of Zadok, who are to be degraded from the priesthood because they officiated in old Israel before the idolatrous shrines (xliv. 5 *seq.*) This one point is sufficient to fix the date of the Levitical law as later than Ezekiel. In all the earlier history, and in the code of Deuteronomy, a Levite is a priest, or at least qualified to assume priestly functions; and even in Josiah's reformation the Levite priests of the high places received a modified priestly status at Jerusalem. Ezekiel knows that it has been so in the past; but he declares that it shall be otherwise in the future, as a punishment for the offence of ministering at the idolatrous altars. He knows nothing of an earlier law, in which priests and Levites are already distinguished, in which the office of Levite is itself a high privilege."

The distinction of priests and Levites, though rarely alluded to in the pre-exilic history, since there was no occasion so to do,† is yet explicitly recognized in 1 Sam. vi. 15; 2 Sam. xv. 24; 1 Kin. viii. 4. Upon the first return of the exiles under Zerubbabel, ninety years before the alleged date of the Levitical law, we not only find priests and Levites sharply distinguished and separately enumerated, but distinctions are made among the Levites themselves, who are variously classed, as by hereditary descent, singers, porters, etc. (Ezra ii. 36 ff.; Neh. vii. 39 ff.; xii. 1-9); comp. also the account of the first inhabitants of Jerusalem after the exile (1 Chron. ix. 1). The same thing recurs upon the going up of Ezra, fourteen years before the supposed origin of the Levitical law (Ezra vii. 7, 24; viii. 15 ff.)

---

\* The allegation that "uncircumcised foreigners" were employed to "keep the ward of the sanctuary" "as long as Solomon's temple stood" (p. 250), is based on an extraordinary series of *non sequiturs*. David's bodyguard of Kerethim and Pelethim has been conjectured to be "Cretans and Philistines" on the basis of a doubtful etymology, which was not accepted by Gesenius, and has not been by the subsequent editors of his Lexicon. The mention of "Carians," either in 2 Sam. xx. 23 or 2 Kin. xi. 4, is much more doubtful and improbable still. The men "who were clad in foreign garb, and leaped over the threshold" (Zeph. i. 8, 9), has nothing in the world to do with "Philistines" or "foreign janissaries." So that the inference that these imaginary foreign guards "are unquestionably identical with the uncircumcised foreigners whom Ezekiel found in the temple" rests merely upon a series of positive, but unfounded, assertions. The unlawful presence of uncircumcised foreigners in the temple is of a piece with the open practice of idolatrous rites within those sacred precincts (Ezek. viii. 3 ff.; 2 Kin. xxi. 4 ff.) This shameless violation of law is no proof that the law was not in existence. The Nethinim (Ezra viii. 20) and children of Solomon's servants (ii. 58) do not fall under the same condemnation (Neh. x. 28, 29). They were, no doubt, circumcised, and performed such menial services for the Levites as were permissible for proselyted foreigners (Josh. ix. 27).

† The distinction is not even made in Malachi (see ii. 4-8; iii. 3), though he could not, on any critical hypothesis, have been ignorant of its existence.

These distinctions cannot have been introduced by Ezekiel's Torah; they could not have arisen in the exile, when there was no temple service and no occasion for singers and porters. They must, of necessity, have been transmitted from the period before the exile, and represent the distribution of functions then made among those that were employed at the sanctuary. Priests and Levites must, therefore, have had separate duties, and formed distinct classes while Solomon's temple still stood. But further, the subdivisions of the Levites above referred to are also unknown to the Levitical law, which apportioned them in quite a different manner, having no possible relation to post-exilic times, but only to the wandering in the wilderness, viz., the functions which they severally performed in the transportation of the tabernacle and its furniture (Num. ch. iv.)

Again, that the Levitical law of the priesthood was prior to Ezekiel, and not *vice versa*, appears from the nature of the case. While the former limits the priesthood to the family of Aaron, Ezekiel goes still further, and restricts it for cause to the line of Zadok, one of his descendants.\* While the Levitical law does not define the sanctuary duties of the Levites, but leaves them, as they might naturally be left at the outset, to perform such services as the priest might require of them (Num. xviii. 2); long usage gradually assigned to them specific tasks, as the charge of the gates, slaying the sacrifices, boiling their flesh, etc. (2 Chron. xxiii. 4; xxx. 17; xxxv. 13). And this is what Ezekiel expects them to do (xliv. 11; xlvi. 24). Indeed, Ezekiel seems to make allusion to the Levitical law in the very passage under discussion. He calls the employment of the uncircumcised foreigners in the temple a breach of God's covenant (xliv. 7). It was, therefore, in his eyes, the violation of a positive divine statute, which can only be (Num. xviii. 4), where any "stranger," *i. e.*, non-Levite, is prohibited from doing the work assigned to Levites. And if Levite had always, prior to the time of Ezekiel, been synonymous with "priest," or at least denoted one who is "qualified to assume priestly functions," it is remarkable that he should employ it as he does without any modifying epithet (xlviii. 11-13), in contrast with priests, and in the sense of those who are disqualified from assuming priestly functions.

"A second point in Ezekiel's law is a provision for stated and

---

\* It has, indeed, been denied that Zadok (1 Kin. ii. 35) was of the seed of Aaron. But such a groundless denial of what is explicitly settled by his genealogy (1 Chron. vi. 8, 53; xxiv. 3; xxvii. 17), is fitly characterized by Delitzsch as "manufacturing history." And how the Levitical regulation could, in that case, have been built upon that of Ezekiel, and the restriction of the priesthood to the family of Zadok could have led to its restriction to another family of quite different descent, becomes still more inexplicable.

regular sacrifices." Nehemiah engages the people to "a voluntary charge of a third of a shekel for this purpose (Neh. x. 32)." "In Ex. xxx. 16 the service of the tabernacle was defrayed by the fixed tribute of half a shekel." If this "refers to the continual sacrifices," it differed from Nehemiah's rate plainly enough, but it does not follow that "this law," which bears no evidence of being a permanently obligatory precept, "was still unknown to Nehemiah, and must be a late addition to the Pentateuch." And, on the other hand, if it does not refer to them, it is a rash and unwarranted conclusion on the part of the Professor that stated offerings were ordained with no provision for supplying them.

"A third point in Ezekiel's law," and the last which Prof. W. R. S. insists upon, "is the prominence given to the sin-offering and atoning ritual. The altar must be purged with sin-offerings for seven consecutive days before burnt sacrifices are acceptably offered on it (xl. 18 *seq.*) The Levitical law (Ex. xxix. 36, 37) prescribes a similar ceremony, but with more costly victims. At the dedication of Solomon's Temple, on the contrary (1 Kin. viii. 62), the altar is at once assumed to be fit for use, in accordance with Ex. xx. 24, and with all the early cases of altar-building outside the Pentateuch. But, besides this first expiatory ceremonial, Ezekiel appoints two atoning services yearly, at the beginning of the first and the seventh month (xlv. 19, 20, LXX.), to purge the house. This is the first appearance, outside of the Levitical code, of anything corresponding to the great day of atonement in the seventh month, and it is plain that the simple service in Ezekiel is still far short of that solemn ceremony. The day of atonement was also a fast day. Now, in Zech. vii. 5, viii. 19, the fast of the seventh month is alluded to as one of the four fasts commemorating the destruction of Jerusalem, which had been practised for the last seventy years. The fast of the seventh month was not yet united with the 'purging of the house,' ordained by Ezekiel. Even in the great convocation of Neh. viii.-x., where we have a record of proceedings from the first day of the seventh month onwards to the twenty-fourth, there is no mention of the day of expiation on the tenth, which thus appears as the very last stone in the ritual edifice."

Prof. W. R. S. affirms that there were no expiatory rites for cleansing the altar of Solomon's temple; but the sacred historian in explicit terms declares the very reverse. In the summary account of the transaction given in Kings the order of the ceremonial is not particularly stated, except that the services were continued "seven days and seven days." This of itself suggests a distinction between these two periods, and implies that there was a week preliminary to the proper week of the annual feast; and the most obvious purpose of such a week is that of sacrificial purgation. This very natural presumption is confirmed by the express language of 2 Chron. vii. 9: "they kept the dedication of the altar seven days, and the feast seven days."

The day of atonement, it is true, is not mentioned by Ezekiel, but his silence does not prove that he knew nothing of it. For he likewise makes no allusion to the feast of weeks, which belonged even to the first legislation (Ex. xxiii. 16; xxxiv. 22), and this though he speaks of passover and tabernacles (Ezek. xlv. 21, 25). He does not

allude to the daily evening sacrifice (1 Kin. xviii. 29, 36; 2 Kin. xvi. 15; see Ezek. xlvi. 13 ff.); nor to the high-priest (2 Kin. xii. 7, 10; xxii. 4; xxiii. 4); nor to the priestly dues enjoined in Deut. xviii. 3; see xlv. 28 ff. It is also true that no mention is made of its observance in the Old Testament history, nor in fact for a long time after. The earliest allusion\* to it is by Josephus (*Ant.* xiv. 16, 4), who tells us that Herod took Jerusalem (B.C. 37) on the solemnity of the fast, as Pompey had done twenty-seven years before. The feast of weeks is spoken of but once between Moses and the exile (1 Kin. ix. 25; 2 Chron. viii. 13). The Sabbatical year is not mentioned until the period of the Maccabees (1 Macc. vi. 53). The fast of the seventh month, alluded to by Zechariah, in commemoration of the murder of Gedaliah (2 Kin. xxv. 25), was entirely distinct from the annual humiliation for sin. The Professor seems to think that the day of atonement was not instituted for some years after the Levitical law was brought out by Ezra. This will involve him in fresh difficulties; for, as Delitzsch remarks, it will be necessary to exclude from Ezra's law not only Lev. xvi., where the services of the day are described in detail, but also all the allusions to it elsewhere, as Ex. xxx. 10, which speaks of one annual atonement; Lev. xxiii. 26-32; xxv. 9; Num. xviii. 7, which speaks of a priestly duty within the veil; Num. xxix. 7-11; and all passages containing the name given to the lid of the ark in consequence of the expiation effected there, "the mercy-seat"; and it would be very extraordinary, if the ritual of the day of atonement, in which the mercy-seat occupies so conspicuous a place, dated from a time when the ark and mercy-seat had ceased to exist.

It is a significant fact also that Ezekiel's Torah was revealed to him (xl. 1) "in the beginning of the year, in the tenth day of the month"; if the tenth of Tisri, the first of the civil year, be meant, this was the day of atonement, and likewise the day on which the trumpet was blown to usher in the year of jubilee. The combination of this day with the release of prisoners is clearly shown by Isa. lviii. 6, and that the prophet was acquainted with the law (Lev. xxv. 8-10) is shown by his allusion to its terms (Isa. lxi. 1 ff.) Ezekiel was acquainted with the year of jubilee and speaks of it as well known, which consequently involves a knowledge of the day of atonement, with which it began.†

We have now completed our task. And as we lay down our pen,

\* It is perhaps referred to, though this is not certain, in Josephus, *Ant.* xiii. 10, 3, where the high-priest Hyrcanus is spoken of as alone in the temple, offering incense.

† We add some further particulars from Delitzsch's very thorough and satisfactory discussion of the day of atonement, considered in relation to this recent critical hypothe-

may we not say of this latest critical attempt to roll the rentateuch off of its old foundations, that it has not achieved success? It has enveloped Mt. Blanc in a cloud of mist, and proclaimed that its giant cliffs had forever disappeared. But, lo, the mist blows away, and the everlasting hills are still in place.

W. HENRY GREEN.

---

sis, from which the above discussion of this point has been for the most part borrowed. The word צום *to fast*, which is already found in the prophet Joel, is foreign to the law of the day of atonement; the standing phrase there is ענה נפש but without using the post-exilic derivative תענית (Ezra. ix. 5); the post-exilic language and literature offer nothing for the explanation of עזאזל; עתי *opportune obvius* (Lev. xvi. 21) and ארץ גזרה *terra abscissa* (ver. 22) are expressions found nowhere else, which, if they were post-exilic, might have been expected to reappear in post-biblical writings.