

ANTI-HIGHER CRITICISM

OR

TESTIMONY TO THE INFALLIBILITY

OF

THE BIBLE

BY

PROFESSOR HOWARD OSGOOD, D.D., LL.D.

PRESIDENT W. HENRY GREEN, D.D., LL.D.

PROFESSOR WILLIAM G. MOOREHEAD, D.D.

TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D.D., LL.D.

JAMES H. BROOKES, D.D.

GEORGE S. BISHOP, D.D.

B. B. TYLER, D.D.

PROFESSOR ERNST F. STROETER, Ph.D.

PROFESSOR JAMES M. STIFLER, D.D.

WILLIAM DINWIDDIE, D.D.

EDITED AND COMPILED BY

REV. L. W. MUNHALL, M.A.

*Author of "Furnishing for Workers," "The Lord's Return and Kindred Truth,"
"The Highest Critics vs. The Higher Critics," etc.*



NEW YORK: HUNT & EATON
CINCINNATI: CRANSTON & CURTS

1894

Copyright, 1893, by
HUNT & EATON,
NEW YORK.

Composition, electrotyping, printing, and binding by
HUNT & EATON,
150 Fifth Avenue, New York.

MOSAIC ORIGIN OF THE PENTATEUCH.

BY W. HENRY GREEN, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor in Princeton Theological Seminary.

IF the Pentateuch is what it claims to be it is of the greatest interest and value. It professes to record the origin of the world and of the human race—a primitive state of innocence from which man fell by yielding to temptation, the history of the earliest ages, the relationship subsisting between the different nations of mankind, and particularly the selection of Abraham and his descendants to be the chosen people of God, the depositaries of divine revelation, in whose line the Son of God should in due time become incarnate as the Saviour of the world. It further contains an account of the providential events accompanying the development of the seed of Abraham from a family to a nation, their exodus from Egypt, and the civil and religious institutions under which they were organized in the prospect of their entry into and occupation of the land of Canaan. The contents of the Pentateuch stand thus in intimate relations to the problems of physical and ethnological science, to history and archæology and religious faith. All the subsequent revelations of the Bible and the Gospel of Jesus Christ itself rest upon the foundation of what is contained in the Pentateuch, as they either presuppose or directly affirm its truth.

It is a question of primary importance, therefore, both in itself and in its consequences, whether the Pentateuch is a veritable, trustworthy record, or is a heterogeneous

mass of legend and fable, from which only a modicum of truth can be doubtfully and with difficulty elicited. Can we lay it at the basis of our investigations and implicitly trust its representations, or must we admit that its unsupported word can only be received with caution, and that of itself it carries but little weight? In the settlement of this matter a consideration of no small consequence is that of the authorship of the Pentateuch. Its credibility is, of course, not absolutely dependent upon its Mosaic authorship. It might be all true though it were written by another than Moses and after his time. But if it was written by Moses, then the history of the Mosaic age was recorded by a contemporary and eye-witness, one who was himself a participant and a leader in the scenes which he related, and the legislator from whom the enactments proceeded; and it must be confessed that there is in this fact the highest possible guarantee of the accuracy and truthfulness of the whole. It is to the discussion of this point that your attention is now invited. Is the Pentateuch the work of Moses?

1. It is universally conceded that this was the traditional opinion among the Jews. To this the New Testament bears the most abundant and explicit testimony. The Pentateuch is by our Lord called "the book of Moses" (Mark xii, 26); when it is read and preached the apostles say that Moses is read (2 Cor. iii, 15) and preached (Acts xv, 21). The Pentateuch and the books of the prophets, which were read in the worship of the synagogue, are called both by our Lord (Luke xvi, 29, 31) and the evangelists (Luke xxiv, 27), "Moses and the prophets," or "the law of Moses and the prophets" (Luke xxiv, 44; Acts xxviii, 23). Of the injunctions of the Pentateuch not only do the Jews say when addressing our Lord, "Moses commanded" (John viii, 5), but our Lord repeatedly uses the same form of

speech (Matt. viii, 4; xix, 7, 8; Mark i, 44; x, 3; Luke v, 14), as testified by three of the evangelists. Of the law in general he says Moses gave the law (John vii, 19), and the evangelist echoes, "The law was given by Moses" (John i, 17); and that Moses was not only the author of the law, but committed its precepts to writing, is affirmed by the Jews (Mark xii, 19), and also by our Lord (Mark vi, 5), who further speaks of him as writing predictions respecting himself (John v, 46, 47), and also traces a narrative in the Pentateuchal history to him (Mark x, 5).

It has been said that our Lord here speaks not authoritatively, but by accommodation to the prevailing sentiment of the Jews, and that it was not his purpose to settle questions in biblical criticism; but the fact remains that he in varied forms of speech explicitly confirms the current belief that Moses wrote the books ascribed to him. For those who reverently accept him as an infallible teacher this settles the question. The only alternative is to assume that he was not above the liability to err; in other words, to adopt what has been called the kenotic view of his sacred person, that he completely emptied himself of his divine nature in his incarnation, and during his abode on earth was subject to all the limitations of ordinary men. Such a lowering of view respecting the incarnate person of our Lord may logically affect the acceptance of his instructions in other matters. He himself says (John iii, 12), "If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things?"

2. That the Pentateuch was the production of Moses and the laws which it contained were the laws of Moses was the firm faith of Israel from the beginning, and is clearly reflected in every part of the Old Testament. The final injunction of the last of the prophets (Mal. iv, 4) is, "Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I

commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments." The regulations adopted by the Jews returned from captivity were not recent enactments of their leaders, but the old Mosaic institutions restored. Thus (Ezra iii, 2) they built the altar and established the ritual, "as it is written in the law of Moses." After the new temple was finished they set priests and Levites to their respective service, "as it is written in the book of Moses" (Ezra vi, 18). When subsequently Ezra led up a fresh colony from Babylon he is characterized as "a ready scribe in the law of Moses" (Ezra vii, 6). At a formal assembly of the people held for the purpose "the book of the law of Moses" was read and explained to them day by day (Neh. viii, 1, 18). Allusions are made to the injunctions of the Pentateuch in general or in particular as the law which God gave to Moses (Neh. i, 7, 8; viii, 14; ix, 14; x, 29), or as written in the law (verses 34, 36), or in the book of Moses (Neh. xiii, 1).

In the captivity Daniel (ix, 11, 13) refers to matters contained in the Pentateuch as "written in the law of Moses." After the long defection of Manasseh and Amon the neglected "book of the law of the Lord by Moses" (2 Kings xxii, 8; xxiii, 25; 2 Chron. xxxiv, 14, 30; xxxv, 6, 12) was found in the temple, and the reformation of Josiah was in obedience to its instructions. The pass-over of Hezekiah was observed according to the prescriptions of "the law of Moses" (2 Chron. xxx, 16), and in general Hezekiah is commended for having kept the "commandments, which the Lord commanded Moses" (2 Kings xviii, 6). The ten tribes were carried away captive, because they "transgressed" what Moses commanded (2 Kings xviii, 12). King Amaziah did (2 Kings xiv, 6; 2 Chron. xxv, 4) "as it is written in the law of the book of Moses," Deut. xxiv, 16, being here quoted in exact terms. The high priest Jehoiada directed the

ritual "as it is written in the law of Moses" (2 Chron. xxiii, 18), while appointing the singing as it was ordained by David—a discrimination which shows that there was no such legal fiction, as it has sometimes been contended, by which laws in general, even though recent, were attributed to Moses. David charged Solomon (1 Kings ii, 3; 1 Chron. xxii, 13) to keep what "is written in the law of Moses;" and a like charge was addressed by the Lord to David himself (2 Kings xxi, 8; 2 Chron. xxxiii, 8). Solomon appointed the ritual of his temple in accordance with the "commandment of Moses" (1 Chron. vi, 49; 2 Chron. viii, 13). When the ark was taken by David to Zion it was borne "as Moses commanded" (1 Chron. xv, 15). Certain of the Canaanites were left in the land in the time of Joshua "to prove Israel by them, to know whether they would hearken unto the commandments of the Lord, which he commanded their fathers by the hand of Moses" (Judg. iii, 4). Joshua was directed "to do according to all the law, which Moses my servant commanded thee" (Josh. i, 7), and was told that "this book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth" (Josh. i, 8). And in repeated instances it is noted with what exactness he followed the directions given by Moses.

It is to be presumed, at least until the contrary is shown, that "the law" and "the book of the law" have the same sense throughout as in the New Testament, as also in Josephus and in the prologue to the Book of Sirach or Ecclesiasticus, where they are undeniably identical with the Pentateuch. The testimonies which have been reviewed show that this was from the first attributed to Moses. At the least it is plain that the sacred historians of the Old Testament without exception regarded the law of the Pentateuch as the law of Moses.

3. Let us next inquire what the Pentateuch says of itself. It may be roughly divided for our present purpose

into two parts: (1) Genesis and Exodus i–xix, historical; (2) Exodus xx to Deuteronomy, mainly legal. The legal portion consists of three distinct bodies of law, each having its own peculiar character and occasion. The first is denominated the Book of the Covenant, and embraces Exodus xx–xxiii, the Ten Commandments, with the accompanying judgments or ordinances, which were the stipulations of the covenant then formally ratified between the Lord and the people. This Moses is expressly said (Exod. xxiv, 4) to have written and read in the audience of the people, who promised obedience; whereupon the covenant was concluded with appropriate sacrificial rites.

By this solemn transaction Israel became the Lord's covenant people, and he in consequence established his dwelling in the midst of them and there received their worship. This gave occasion to the second body of laws, which has been called the Priest Code, relating to the sanctuary and the ritual. This is contained in the rest of Exodus, chapters xxv–xl (with the exception of three chapters—xxxii–xxxiv—relating to the sin of the golden calf), the whole of Leviticus, and the regulations found in the Book of Numbers, where they are intermingled with the history which suggests the occasion of the laws and supplies the connecting links. This priest code is expressly declared in all its parts to have been directly communicated by the Lord to Moses, in part on the summit of Mount Sinai, during his forty days' abode there, in part while Israel lay encamped at the base of the mountain, and in part during their subsequent wanderings in the wilderness.

The third body of law is known as the Deuteronomic Code, and embraces the legal portion of the Book of Deuteronomy, which was delivered by Moses to the people in the plains of Moab, in immediate prospect of Canaan, in the eleventh month of the fortieth year of their wanderings

in the wilderness. This Moses is expressly said to have written and to have committed to the custody of the Levites, who bore the ark of the covenant (Deut. xxxi, 24-26).

The entire law, therefore, in explicit and positive terms claims to be Mosaic. The Book of the Covenant and Deuteronomic law are expressly affirmed to have been written by Moses. The Priest Code, or the ritual law, was given by the Lord to Moses, and by him to Aaron and his sons, though Moses is not in so many words said to have written it.

Turning from the laws of the Pentateuch to its narratives, we find two passages expressly attributed to the pen of Moses. After the victory over Amalek at Rephidim, the Lord said unto Moses (Exod. xvii, 14), "Write this for a memorial in a book." The fact that such an injunction was given to Moses in this particular instance seems to imply that he was the proper person to place on record whatever was memorable and worthy of preservation in the events of the time. And it may perhaps be involved in the language used that Moses had already begun or at least contemplated the preparation of a connected narrative, to which reference is here made, since in the original the direction is not, as in the English version, "write in *a* book," but in "*the* book."

Again, in Num. xxxiii, 2, a list of the various stations of the children of Israel in their marches or their wanderings in the wilderness is ascribed to Moses, who is said to have written their goings out according to their journeys by the commandment of the Lord.

No explicit statements are made in the Pentateuch itself in regard to any other paragraphs of the history than these two. But it is obvious from the whole plan and constitution of the Pentateuch that the history and the legislation are alike integral parts of one complete work.

Genesis and the opening chapters of Exodus are plainly preliminary to the legislation that follows. The historical chapters of Numbers constitute the framework in which the laws are set, binding them all together and exhibiting the occasion of each separate enactment. If the legislation in its present form is, as it claims to be, Mosaic, then beyond all controversy the preparatory and connecting history must be Mosaic likewise. If the laws, as we now have them, came from Moses, by inevitable sequence the history was shaped by the same hand, and the entire Pentateuch, history as well as legislation, must be what we have already seen all after ages steadfastly regarded it, the production of Moses.

4. The style in which the laws of the Pentateuch are framed, and the terms in which they are drawn up, correspond with the claim which they make for themselves and which all subsequent ages make for them, that they are of Mosaic origin. Their language points unmistakably to the sojourn in the wilderness prior to the occupation of Canaan as the time when they were produced. They are forbidden alike to do after the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein they had dwelt, or those of the land of Canaan, whither God was bringing them (Lev. xviii, 3). They are reminded (Deut. xii, 9) that they had not yet come to the rest and the inheritance which the Lord their God was giving them. The standing designation of Canaan is the land which the Lord giveth them to possess it (Deut. xv, 4, 7). The laws look forward to the time "when thou art come into the land," etc., "and shall possess it" (Deut. xvii, 14; Lev. xiv, 34, etc.), or, "when the Lord hath cut off the 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, 8, 9). The place of sacrifice is not where Jehovah has fixed his habitation, but "the place which Jehovah

shall choose to put his name there " (Deut. xii, 5, etc.). Israel is contemplated as occupying a camp (Num. v, 2-4, etc.), and living in tents (Lev. xiv, 8) and in the wilderness (Lev. xvi, 21, 22). The bullock of the sin offering was to be burned without the camp (Lev. iv, 12, 21). The ashes from the altar were to be carried without the camp (vi, 11). The leper was to have his habitation without the camp (xiii, 46); the priest was to go forth out of the camp to inspect him (xiv, 3); ceremonies are prescribed for his admission to the camp (verse 8), as well as the interval which must elapse before his return to his own tent. In slaying an animal for food the only possibilities suggested are that it may be in the camp or out of the camp (xvii, 2). The law of the consecration of priests respects by name Aaron and his sons (viii, 2). Two of these sons, Nadab and Abihu, commit an offense which causes their death, a circumstance which calls forth some special regulations (Lev. x), among others those of the annual day of atonement (Lev. xvi, 1), on which Aaron was the celebrant (verse 3), and the camp and the wilderness the locality (verses 21, 22, 26, 27). The tabernacle, the ark, and other sacred vessels were made of shittim wood (Exod. xxxvi, 20), which was peculiar to the wilderness. The sacred structure was made of separate boards, so joined together that it could be readily taken apart, and explicit directions are given for its transportation as Israel journeyed from place to place (Num. iv, 5, *seq.*), and wagons and oxen were contributed for the purpose (Num. vii).

Specific instructions are given for the arrangement of the several tribes both in their encampments and their marches (Num. ii). Silver trumpets were made to direct the calling of the assembly and the journeying of the host (Num. x, 2). The ceremonies of the red heifer were to be performed without the camp (Num. xix, 3, 7, 9), and

by Eleazar personally (verses 3, 4). The law of purification provided simply for death in tents and in the open fields (verses 14, 16).

The peculiarity of these laws carries with it the evidence that they were not only enacted during the sojourn in the wilderness, but that they were then committed to writing. Had they been preserved orally the forms of expression would have been changed insensibly, to adapt them to the circumstances of later times. It is only the unvarying permanence of a written code that could have perpetuated these laws in a form which in after ages, when the people were settled in Canaan, and Aaron and his sons were dead, no longer described directly and precisely the thing to be done, but must be mentally adapted to an altered state of affairs before they could be carried into effect.

The laws of Deuteronomy are besides prefaced by two farewell addresses delivered by Moses to Israel on the plains of Moab (Deut. i, 5; v, 1), which are precisely adapted to the situation, and express those feelings to which the great leader might most appropriately have given utterance under the circumstances. And the most careful scrutiny shows that the diction and style of thought in these addresses are identical with those of the laws that follow. Both have emanated from one mind and pen. The laws of Deuteronomy are further followed by a prophetic song (Deut. xxxii), which Moses is said to have written (xxxii, 19), and by a series of blessings upon the several tribes, which he is said to have pronounced before his death (xxxiii, 1), all which are entirely appropriate in the situation.

The genuineness of these laws is further vouched for by the fact that a forged body of statutes could never be successfully imposed upon any people. These laws entered minutely into the affairs of daily life, imposed

burdens that would not have been voluntarily assumed, and could only have been exacted by competent authority. That they were submitted to and obeyed is evidence that they really were ordained by Moses, in whose name they were issued. If they had first made their appearance in a later age the fraud would inevitably have been detected. The people could not have been persuaded that enactments never before heard of had come down from the great legislator and were invested with his authority.

And the circumstance that these laws are said to have been given at Mount Sinai, in the wilderness, or in the plains of Moab is also significant. How came they to be attributed to a district outside of the Holy Land, which had no sacred associations in the present or in the patriarchal age, unless they were really enacted there? and if so, this could only have been in the days of Moses.

5. The Pentateuch is either directly alluded to or its existence implied in numerous passages in the subsequent books of the Bible. The Book of Joshua, which records the history immediately succeeding the age of Moses, is full of these allusions. It opens with the children of Israel in the plains of Moab and at the point of crossing the Jordan, just where Deuteronomy left them. The arrangements for the conquest and the subsequent division of the land are in precise accordance with the directions of Moses, and are executed in professed obedience to his orders. The relationship is so pervading and the correspondence so exact that those who dispute the genuineness and authenticity of the Pentateuch are obliged to deny that of Joshua likewise. The testimony rendered to the existence of the Pentateuch by the books of Chronicles at every period of the history which they cover is so explicit and repeated that it can only be set aside by impugning the truth of their statements and

alleging that the writer has throughout colored the facts which he reports by his own prepossessions, and substituted his own imagination for the real state of the case.

But the evidence furnished by the remaining historical books, though less abundant and clear, tends in the same direction. And it is the same with the books of the prophets and the Psalms. We find scattered everywhere allusions to the facts recorded in the Pentateuch, to its institutions and sometimes to its very language, which afford cumulative proof that its existence was known and its standard authority recognized by the writers of all the books subsequent to the Mosaic age.

6. Separate mention should here be made, and stress laid upon the fact, which is abundantly attested, that the Pentateuch was known and its authority admitted in the apostate kingdom of the ten tribes from the time of the schism of Jeroboam. In order to perpetuate his power and prevent the return of the northern tribes to the sway of the house of David, he established a separate sanctuary and set up an idolatrous worship. Both the rulers and people were under the strongest temptation to disown the Pentateuch, by which both their idolatrous worship and their separate national existence were so severely condemned; and yet the evidence is varied and abundant that their national life, in spite of its degeneracy, had not wholly emancipated itself from the institutions of the Pentateuch, and that even their debased worship was but a perverted form of that purer service which the laws of Moses had ordained.

It was at one time thought that the Samaritan Pentateuch supplied a strong argument at this point. The Samaritans, while they recognize no other portion of the canon of the Old Testament, are in possession of the Pentateuch in the Hebrew language, but written in a peculiar character, which is a more ancient and primitive

form of the alphabet than that which is found in any Hebrew manuscript. It was argued that such was the hostility between Jews and Samaritans that neither could have adopted the Pentateuch from the other. It was consequently held that the Samaritan Pentateuch must be traced to copies existing in the kingdom of the ten tribes, which further evidence that the Pentateuch must have existed at the time of the revolt of Jeroboam, and have been of such undisputed divine authority then that even in their schism from Judah and their apostasy from the true worship of God they did not venture to discard it. Additional investigation, however, has shown that this argument is unsound. The Samaritans are not descendants of the ten tribes, but of the heathen colonists introduced into the territory of Samaria by the Assyrian monarchs after the ten tribes had been carried into captivity, and the Samaritan Pentateuch does not date back of the Babylonish exile. The mutual hatred of the Jews and the Samaritans originated then. The Samaritans, in spite of their foreign birth, claimed to be the brethren of the Jews, and proposed to unite with them in rebuilding the temple at Jerusalem (Ezra iv, 2, 3); but the Jews repudiated their claim and refused their offered assistance. The Samaritans, thus repulsed, sought in every way to hinder and annoy the Jews and frustrate their enterprise, and finally built a rival temple of their own on the summit of Mount Gerizim. Meanwhile, to substantiate their claim of being sprung from ancient Israel, they eagerly accepted the Pentateuch, which was brought them by a renegade priest.

While, therefore, in our present argument no significance can be attached to the Samaritan Pentateuch, we have convincing proof from other sources that the books of Moses were not unknown in the kingdom of the ten tribes. The narrative of the schism in 1 Kings xii

describes in detail the measures taken by Jeroboam in evident and avowed antagonism to the regulations of the Pentateuch previously established. And the books of the prophets Hosea and Amos, who exercised their ministry in the ten tribes, in their rebukes and denunciations, in their descriptions of the existing state of things and its contrast with former times, draw upon the facts of the Pentateuch, refer to its laws, and make use of its phrases and forms of speech.

7. An additional argument of great force can be drawn from the doctrinal development of the Old Testament. The teaching of the Pentateuch is elementary, and is expanded in the later Scriptures. This is obviously the case in regard to the Messiah, the future state, angels, providential retribution, ritual and spiritual worship. The necessary conclusion is that the Pentateuch antedates the rest of the Old Testament, and lies at the basis of the scheme of divine instruction more fully unfolded in the books that follow.

These, briefly stated, are the principal arguments of a positive nature for Moses's authorship of the books which bear his name. They are ascribed to him by unanimous and unbroken tradition from the days of Moses himself through the entire period of the Old Testament, and from that onward. This had the inspired and authoritative sanction of the writers of the New Testament and of our Lord himself. It corresponds with the claim which these books make for themselves, corroborated as this is by their adaptation in style and character to their alleged origin, and by the evidence offered in all the subsequent Scriptures of their existence and recognized authority from the time of their first promulgation, and that even in the schismatical kingdom of Jeroboam, in spite of all attempts to throw off its control. And this is confirmed by the elementary character of its doctrinal

contents as compared with those of the other books of the Old Testament and particularly with the teachings of the prophets.

The assaults which have been made in modern times upon the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch have been mainly in one or other of three distinct lines or in all combined. It will be necessary for us to take such a cursory view of them as our few remaining moments will permit.

1. It is affirmed that, from a literary point of view, the Pentateuch cannot be the work of any one writer, least of all of Moses, but that it is of composite origin, formed by the combination of different writings which were themselves produced long posterior to the Mosaic age. There is a remarkable alternation, as was long ago observed, in the words "God" and "Lord," in the early chapters of Genesis. In i, 1-ii, 3, God occurs in almost every verse; ii, 4-iii, Lord God is the prevailing name; in chapter iv, Lord; in chapter v, God; in chapter vi, 1-8, Lord; vi, 9-22, God; vii, 1-5, Lord; and so on in alternate paragraphs. It has accordingly been conjectured that these different paragraphs represent distinct writers, one of whom was in the habit of saying "God," or, in Hebrew, Elohim, when speaking of the divine Being, and is hence called the Elohist; and the other, who with like uniformity uses Lord or Jehovah, is called the Jehovist. The prevalent theory with eminent European critics is that there were two Elohist, a Jehovist, and a so-called Deuteronomist, or author of Deuteronomy; that the earliest of these writers wrote six or seven centuries after the time of Moses, and the latest perhaps a thousand years after the same date, recording such legends and traditions as had up to that time been orally preserved. Others admit the existence of such distinct writers, but dispute the date assigned to them.

It is claimed that each of these writers has his own characteristic style and mode of thought and range of ideas, by which the paragraphs and clauses belonging to him may be recognized; and when these are singled out and put together they form as many distinct narratives or documents, which are nearly or quite continuous. The original sources can thus be reproduced, which, combined together by some editor or redactor, constitute the Pentateuch as we now have it.

The criteria by which these alleged documents are distinguished are of a subtle and complicated character, and the conclusions based upon them are, in my judgment, precarious. In the brief space at my disposal it would be impossible to state intelligibly the reasons which are urged in favor of them or against them. But even if it were allowed that the Pentateuch was compiled, as is alleged, from antecedent documents, the age of these documents would still be an open question. The arguments adduced to show that they are post-Mosaic can be successfully rebutted. For all that appears, Moses might himself have been the compiler, or the compilation might have been made under his superintendence and direction; and even though a given paragraph or paragraphs could be proved to be post-Mosaic, this would merely demonstrate that such paragraph or paragraphs could not have belonged to the Pentateuch as it came from the pen of Moses, not that the work as a whole did not proceed from him. It is far easier to assume that some slight additions may here and there have been made to the text than to set aside the multiplied proofs that the Pentateuch was the production of Moses.

2. A second ground for contesting the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is found in the relation subsisting between the three codes of law which it contained.

It is maintained that these are so diverse in character and so inconsistent with one another in their respective provisions that they cannot have originated at any one time or have proceeded from any one legislator; they must belong to distinct periods and represent successive stages in the growth of the national institutions. The Book of the Covenant, as the briefest and simplest, is the most primitive; this was followed by the Deuteronomic law, which is more fully developed; and this in turn by the Priest Code, which is the most complicated and elaborate of all, and hence the latest in the series. The Book of the Covenant makes no mention of a priesthood as a separate order of men alone authorized to perform sacred functions. The Deuteronomic Code speaks of priests who are constantly designated "the priests the Levites," from which it is inferred that the sacerdotal prerogative inhered in the tribe as such, and that any Levite might be a priest. The Priest Code limits the sacerdotal office to the family of Aaron; other Levites were simply their servants and attendants, performing menial functions at the sanctuary, but not allowed to offer sacrifice.

In the Book of the Covenant sacrifices are not regulated by statute, but are the free spontaneous gift of the offerer unto God in grateful acknowledgment of the divine benefits. In Deuteronomy certain kinds of offerings are specified, but with no fixed requisition of number and quality, and these are to be joyously partaken of by the offerer and his family and friends before the Lord. In the Levitical Code additional kinds of sacrifice are required, not mentioned elsewhere, and everything is rigorously fixed by statute; what particular animal is to be offered in each species of sacrifice or on any given occasion, its sex and age, and sometimes even its color, its accompaniments, and the precise ceremonies to be ob-

served, are specified. The whole has become a matter of ritual, an affair of the priests, who absorb as their perquisites what had previously fed the devotion of the offerer.

All this, and much besides, is urged as indicating the progressive development in the Israelitish institutions as represented in these codes, which are hence regarded as separated by long intervals of time. The fallacy lies in putting asunder what really belongs together. All belong to one comprehensive and harmonious body of law, though each separate portion has its own particular design by which its form and contents are determined. That the Book of the Covenant is so brief and elementary in matters of worship is because of its preliminary character. It was intended simply to be the basis of God's covenant with Israel, not to develop in detail the duties growing out of that covenant and relation. That Deuteronomy does not contain the minute ceremonial requirements to be found in Leviticus is no indication that the latter is the subsequent development of a more ritualistic age. It is simply because there was no need of repeating details which had already been sufficiently enlarged upon elsewhere. The Priest Code was for the guidance of the priests in conducting the ritual; Deuteronomy for the people at large, to whom the great law-giver addressed his earnest warnings and exhortations as he was on the point of being taken from them. The differences and discrepancies alleged in these laws are for the most part capable of being satisfactorily harmonized. If a few puzzles remain insoluble by us they are not more than might be expected in matters of so ancient date, so foreign from modern ideas and usages, and in regard to which we are so imperfectly informed. If we had a little more knowledge, in all probability our difficulties would vanish.

3. It is further claimed that, as appears from statements of the history, the laws of the Pentateuch were not in fact obeyed; whence it is inferred that they could not have been in existence. It is admitted, of course, that there were numerous departures from God and repeated open violations or continued neglect of his laws. The history records such instances again and again, but it brands them in every case as willful transgressions against God and his known law. It does not follow from the perpetration of murder and theft that such acts were not regarded as criminal, nor that the sixth and eighth commandments were unknown. When it is over and over charged that the people forsook the Lord and worshiped Baal and Ashtaroth, this can be explained in no other way than as an apostasy from Jehovah to these foreign deities. For if there is anything that is obvious it is that Jehovah was Israel's God from the beginning. Such open declensions from the true God have no bearing, therefore, on the subject before us. They were plain offenses against known and acknowledged obligation.

But it is affirmed that good men at different periods acted habitually at variance with the requirement of the ritual laws without incurring censure, and apparently without being sensible that they were doing wrong or transgressing any commandment.

Thus, while the law required that sacrifices should be offered only at the sanctuary and only by priests—the sons of Aaron—repeated mention is made of sacrifices being offered to the Lord, and, so far as appears, with acceptance, though it was elsewhere than at the sanctuary, and the offerer was not a descendant of Aaron. Thus the children of Israel offered sacrifice at Bochim (Judg. ii, 5) in a penitential spirit when rebuked for their neglect of duty by the angel of the Lord. Gideon built two altars in Ophrah, and offered a bullock upon

one of them to the Lord (Judg. vi, 24-27); Manoah offered a kid in sacrifice upon a rock to the Lord (Judg. xiii, 19). This, it is said, is in direct violation of the law of Deut. xii, 6, 13, 14; Num. xviii, 7, though it accords with the prescriptions of the Book of the Covenant, which recognizes no separate order of priests and permits sacrifices (Exod. xx, 24) "in all places where the Lord records his name." It is hence inferred that the laws of Deuteronomy and the Priest Code were not in existence, but only the Book of the Covenant.

There was, however, no such difference between these laws as has been alleged. The Book of the Covenant sanctions an altar in every place where God records his name; that is, wherever he reveals himself and appoints a place of worship; but this by no means contemplates a multiplicity of altars in different places at once, or that men might offer sacrifice at any place at their own discretion. This law was enacted upon the arrival of Israel at Mount Sinai, and when no sanctuary had yet been instituted. After the tabernacle was built it was the ordinary place where God recorded his name, and hence that became under the terms of this law the customary place of sacrifice. Israel was then in the wilderness, journeying from place to place. Whenever they halted, the sanctuary and the altar were set up and sacrifices were offered. Israel had not various altars at different sanctuaries, but one sanctuary and one altar transported with them as they pursued their way to the promised land, and Deuteronomy gave direction that when God had given them rest in the land to which they were going the tabernacle should be no longer removed from place to place, but sacrifices should be offered only at the place which the Lord should choose. Accordingly, when the conquest of Canaan was effected, the tabernacle was set up at Shiloh (Josh. xviii, 1), and that

was thenceforth the place of worship for all Israel. The laws are, therefore, in perfect harmony on this point. The altar at the tabernacle was the one appointed spot for sacrifice.

How then are the sacrifices at Bochim and the sacrifices offered by Gideon and Manoah to be accounted for? Plainly, by the extraordinary circumstances that called them forth. On all ordinary occasions the sanctuary was the place for sacrificial worship, and this was to be offered only by the priests who were appointed specially for this service. But when God manifested himself in an extraordinary manner in any place remote from the tabernacle, that place became for the time a sanctuary, and the person to whom he thus manifested himself became for the time a priest. God must be worshiped wherever he appeared, and by whomsoever he honored by such special manifestation. Accordingly, whenever throughout the Book of Judges the Lord or the angel of the Lord appeared to men they offered sacrifice on the spot, and no sacrifices were offered elsewhere than at the sanctuary or by any other than a priest, except upon the occasion of such a special manifestation of the divine presence.

It is further to be observed that sacrifices might be offered anywhere in the presence of the ark of the covenant. The ark was the symbol of the Lord's presence. It was the ark in the tabernacle which made the latter a holy place, and when the ark was taken from the tabernacle it was still the throne of God, who dwelt between the cherubim. Wherever the ark was, there was the symbol of God's presence, and hence when the ark came back from the Philistines to Beth-shemesh (1 Sam. vi, 14) sacrifices were offered to the Lord. And so when David was transporting the ark to Zion oxen and fatlings were sacrificed before it (2 Sam. vi, 13).

But how is it that we find the prophet Samuel offering sacrifice (1 Sam. vii, 9, 17) away from the ark and tabernacle, and without any special divine manifestation having been made? This was, again, because of the peculiar circumstances of the case. In consequence of the sins of Eli's sons, and in general the wickedness of both priests and people, God suffered the sacred ark to be taken captive by the Philistines. Suffering the symbol of his presence to be thus taken away was significant of God's forsaking Shiloh and forsaking his people. The Philistines were compelled by the heavy plagues sent upon them to return the ark, but the ark was not taken back to Shiloh. It was hid away in the seclusion of a private house; God had abandoned the sanctuary, and there was no legitimate sanctuary in Israel again until the ark was taken to Zion, and the Lord chose that for his abode. During this period when Israel was without a lawful sanctuary Samuel, as God's prophet and representative by divine authority, assumed the functions of the degenerate priesthood and sacrifices were offered on high places. This state of things continued, as we are told (1 Kings iii, 2), until the temple of Solomon was built, when that became God's dwelling place; and as that was the spot which God had chosen to place his name there, it henceforth was the only lawful place of sacrifice. We do indeed read after that of offerings made on high places, but they were illegal and were regarded as such, and pious princes endeavored to suppress them with varying success, until at last Hezekiah and, more effectually still, Josiah succeeded in abolishing them.

It is confessed, accordingly, that sacrifices were in repeated instances offered elsewhere than at the sanctuary; but whether these were justified by extraordinary circumstances, or whether they were irregular and con-

demned as such, they cannot disprove the existence of the law restricting sacrifice to one common altar in all ordinary cases.

It has been maintained, on such grounds as have now been recited, that the law of Deuteronomy was unknown until the time of King Josiah; that the worship on high places continued until his reign; that the prophetic and priestly party then became convinced, in consequence of the idolatrous taint which infected the worship on high places, and the abuses and excesses prevalent there, that the purity of religion demanded that they should be abolished and sacrifice restricted to the temple at Jerusalem. Accordingly the Book of Deuteronomy, which strenuously insists upon the overthrow of the high places and the confining of sacrifice to the place which the Lord should choose, was prepared with the view of legalizing this measure and paving the way for its enforcement. This was attributed to Moses in order to give it a higher sanction. A copy was deposited in the temple, where it was found, as it was intended that it should be, by Hilkiah the high priest, and taken to the king, who carried the projected reform into effect (2 Kings xxii, 8).

The Priest Code, it is alleged, is later still. That was the work of Ezra, and was prepared with reference to the needs of the period after the exile and the ritualistic spirit which then prevailed. This is the book of the law produced by Ezra the scribe and read to the people, as recorded in Neh. viii, to which they solemnly engaged to render obedience. This code, however, it is contended, was not complete even in the days of Ezra. Additions were subsequently made to it, and continued to be made for some time thereafter. The day of atonement is not mentioned in either Ezra or Nehemiah, and its peculiar services were introduced at a later date. The altar of incense, with the special sacredness attached to the

offering of incense, indicates, it is said, the later strata of the Priest Code, and from some peculiarities in the Greek and Samaritan text of the description of the Mosaic tabernacle it is confidently affirmed that changes and alterations in the Hebrew text continued to be made until after the time when those versions were prepared.

This whole theory of the successive origin and gradual growth of the different codes of the Pentateuchal law is not only directly in the face of the explicit statements of the Pentateuch itself, but is utterly inconsistent with the history on which it is professedly based. Both the book found in the temple in the reign of Josiah and that brought forward and read by Ezra after the exile are expressly declared to have been not recent productions, but the law of Moses. The assumption that laws were fraudulently attributed to the great legislator is gratuitous and without foundation. The idea that such a fraud could be successfully perpetrated is preposterous. It is utterly out of the question that a body of laws never before heard of could be imposed upon the people as though they had been given by Moses centuries before, and that they could have been accepted and obeyed by them, notwithstanding* the fact that they imposed new and serious burdens, set aside established usages to which the people were devotedly attached, and conflicted with the interests of numerous and powerful classes of the people. And it further involves the incongruity of assuming that three codes, which were at variance in their provisions, the first having been superseded by the second, and the second in turn superseded by the third, came subsequently to be regarded as entirely harmonious, and as one body of law which had been united from the beginning and was all alike obligatory.

It has been necessary in this rapid survey to condense into a single lecture what would require volumes for its

full and satisfactory statement. I hope, however, that even by this hasty and imperfect presentation I have succeeded in showing you that there are reasons for believing Moses to be the author of the Pentateuch which cannot be easily set aside, and that the objections which have been urged against it have not the weight that has sometimes been attributed to them. I shall be gratified if enough has been said to stimulate your interest in the subject and lead you to further reading and study, that you may acquaint yourselves with it more thoroughly.