

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER II.

OCTOBER, 1850.

ARTICLE I.

PHILOSOPHY IN THE CHURCH.

Until within the last two centuries, the empire of philosophy, in the Christian Church, has been divided, almost exclusively, between Plato and Aristotle. A modified Platonism invaded the Church (much to its detriment,) in the second century, and maintained its ascendancy for the next three hundred years. In the disputes of the fifth century, the dialectics of Aristotle began to be studied; and during this and the two succeeding ages, each of the great Grecian leaders had his admirers and followers. From the eighth to the sixteenth centuries, the empire of Aristotle was almost universal. It was entirely so, if we except a portion of the monks, the mystics, and the early reformers. With these exceptions, the authority of the Stagirite remained unbroken, till it encountered, in the first half of the seventeenth century, the more popular systems of Bacon and Des Cartes.

In the year 1605, Lord Bacon published his Chart of the Sciences, and his new method of pursuing them. This was followed, after some years, by his *Novum Organum*; in both which he inculcated what has been called the *Inductive Philosophy*. He insisted that, in our endeavours to advance the Sciences, and more especially the Physical Sciences, our reasonings must all be grounded on *facts*, and that these must be ascertained by reiterated and well conducted experiments. This can hardly

the removal of the sun from the planetary system would appear to the eye of the Astronomer.

2. If Jesus rose from the dead, the Gospel is no lucrative fable, but a message of truth as well as good news. The faith of the Christian is not in vain; neither are the faithful labours of ministers of Christ. The private Christian may confidently trust in that Saviour who was delivered for our offences, raised again for our justification, and who ever liveth to make intercession for us; while His ambassadors may firmly rely on the same truths, together with the promise that He will be with them in their official character, always even to the end of the world. The dark valley of the shadow of death will be illuminated with beams of Heavenly light, and their souls introduced by a convoy of Angels into the bright temple of the new Jerusalem. And their bodies, though reduced to original dust and trampled by the heedless tread of the living, will be raised by His Almighty arm when the trump of the Archangel shall sound. Their beauty will never be marred by the finger of decay, nor fade before the power of disease and despair; but ever fresh and blooming they shall spend a whole eternity in the service of their risen and immortal Saviour.

ARTICLE VII.

THE GENUINENESS OF THE PENTATEUCH.

1. *Dissertations on the Genuineness of the Pentateuch.* By Dr. E. W. HENGSTENBERG, Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin. Translated from the German, by J. E. Ryland: 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 462. 562. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh: MDCCCXLVII.
2. *Historisch-kritische Forschungen ueber die Bildung, das Zeitalter und den Plan der fuenf Buecher Mose's, nebst einer beurtheilenden Einleitung und einer genauen Charakteristik der hebraeischen Sagen und Mythen.* Von ANTON THEODOR HARTMANN, Professor

- der Theologie in Rostock* : 8vo. pp. 817. Rostock und Guestrou, 1831.
3. *Introduction to the Old Testament.* By JOHN JAHN. Translated by Samuel H. Turner, D. D. New York, 1827.
 6. *Lectures on the Four Last Books of the Pentateuch.* By the late Rev. RICHARD GRAVES, D. D., Dean of Armagh, Prof. of Divinity in Trinity College, Dublin: 4th edition. Dublin, 1831. pp. 486, 8vo.
 7. *Spinoza Opera, Vol. Prius. Tractatus Theologico-Politicus. Cap. viii.* Jenae, 1802.
 8. *Campegii Vitringa Observationes Sacrae, Lib 1.—Cap. iv.* Amstelodami, 1727.
 9. *The Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels.* By ANDREWS NORTON. Cambridge, 1844. Vol. II. Note D.
 10. *Academical Lectures on the Jewish Scriptures and Antiquities.* By JOHN GORHAM PALFREY, D. D., Prof. of Bib. Lit. in the University of Cambridge: 2 vols. 8vo. Boston, 1838.
 11. *The Connection between Geology and the Pentateuch: in a Letter to Prof. SILLIMAN, from THOMAS COOPER, M. D. To which is added the Defence of Dr. Cooper before the Trustees of the South Carolina College.* Columbia, 1833.
 12. *Two Lectures, &c.* By JOSIAH C. NOTT, M. D. of Mobile, Alabama. New York, 1849.
 13. *Considerations respecting the Genuineness of the Pentateuch, with special reference to a pamphlet entitled "The Connection between Geology and the Pentateuch: by Thomas Cooper, M. D." By ROBERT MEANS, A. M. of Fairfield District, S. C.* Columbia, 1834.

Our readers will not expect us to review in form, the long list of books which we have thus arranged before them. We have placed them here because they lie at our hand, and are the chief sources whence we shall draw what we have to say on the subject before us.—The Dissertations of Hengstenberg are an able refutation of what has been advanced in Germany, in opposition to the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, and are characterized

by the diligence and laborious detail which mark the scholars of his nation, and by a solid practical sense, a quick discernment of the point at which those whom he opposes have departed from the truth; and an uncompromising spirit towards all views which will impugn the inspiration and veracity of the Scriptures. Only now and then do we find him affected by the speculative spirit of his nation, of whom it has been said that Providence has given to the English nation the dominion of the seas, to the French the dominion of the land, and that nought is left for the German but the possession of the clouds. And yet we would recognize, under any English dress, the volumes of Hengstenberg as a German book. No one can follow him on the same side, without being largely indebted to him, as he has doubtless been, in some measure, to his predecessors.

Hartmann belongs to the opposition. He maintains the impracticable opinion that the law came into existence in separate portions, some of them as late as the exile. But he does not concern himself to show how these portions were brought together into their present form, and has little anxiety as to the effect his views may have upon the reception of the Scriptures as the Divine and infallible rule of faith. We suppose, indeed, that this doctrine of the Lutheran Church can hardly be held by him in any true and honest sense.

Jahn, among the German scholars, is one of the earliest advocates of the genuineness, and Rosenmueler in his prolegomena and his notes has contended for it, though with exceeding low views of Inspiration.

DeWette finds "no ground and no evidence to show that the books of the Pentateuch were composed by Moses." He has carried out the "Document Hypothesis" to its extreme issues.

The lectures of Dean Graves were written in answer to the objections of Paine and the earlier skeptics, and are an able argument for the authenticity and truth of the four last books of Moses. The appendix, too, embraces answers to Le Clerc, Dr. Geddes, and De Wette.

We refer to Spinoza, as he was one of the earliest who objected to the Mosaic origin of these writings; advancing indeed most of the objections which will be considered in

this article; and also to Vitringa as the earliest Christian Theologian who, with the highest views of the divine origin of the entire scriptures, maintained the pre-existence of documents from which Genesis was composed.

The two next works emanated from the Divinity School of Harvard University, Professor Norton contending that the Pentateuch was compiled from written documents and oral traditions, by some one who held the highest authority in the new state, after the restoration from the Babylonish captivity, and Professor Palfrey maintaining the Mosaic origin. The pamphlet of Dr. Cooper attacking the Pentateuch, appeared in Columbia some eighteen years ago, and the lectures of Dr. Nott have already been the subject of animadversion in our pages.

The reply of Rev. Mr. Means to Dr. Cooper, meets the arguments of that skeptical writer with decision and ability, and was an earnest of further service which he would have rendered to the Church, had he not been called away in the midst of his days.

In the efforts we have before made to defend the Unity of the human race, we have been more influenced by a desire to maintain the credibility and plenary inspiration of the scriptures than by any other motive. How violently these have been attacked by certain recent advocates for a diversity of races is obvious to every one who has read the late arguments on this subject.

Among the matters of controversy which have unexpectedly been brought forward in this connection, is the genuineness of the Pentateuch as a writing of Moses, and its entire truthfulness and credibility as a history, a certain proof that it was regarded as teaching the Unity of the human family. There is no portion of the sacred scriptures whose claims have, for various reasons, been more contested; and the literature of these controversies already amounts to many volumes, to read and master which requires no little time and patience. We refer those who are curious to know who have written on this subject to the note appended, which has been compiled from Hartmann, Havernick, and Hengstenberg.

The interest and zeal which have been manifested in these attacks on one side, and in the defence on the other,

will not be a subject of wonder to those who are properly informed of the relation the five books of Moses bear to the rest of scripture, and indeed to the whole of revealed religion. The rejection of these books of the Old Testament brings in its train the rejection of the books of the New Testament; the rejection of Moses, the rejection of Christ. "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he *wrote* of me. But if ye believe not his *writings*, how shall ye believe my *words*." These are the recorded words of Christ and should have been a warning to all the impugnors of the genuineness and credibility of the Pentateuch, that in denying the authorship of the books Christ ascribes to Moses, they either deny *his* veracity, or the truthfulness of the record the New Testament presents of his sayings, or the divinity of his mission altogether. The ancients correctly understood the true importance of the Mosaic writings. "Let us pass on," says Theodoret, "to Moses, the ocean of Theology, from which, to speak poetically, are all its rivers and all its seas.*"

"The Wolfenbutler Fragmentist," says Hengstenberg, "regarded the whole of the sacred history as a compact phalanx, and proceeded on the supposition that the disproof of the passage through the Red Sea, involved that of the resurrection of Christ, and the disproof of the resurrection that of the passage through the Red Sea. Bauer wrote a *mythology* of the Old and New Testament. De Wette avows that the principles of mythical interpretation carried by him through the Pentateuch must of necessity also be applied to the New Testament. The critical treatment to which Strauss subjected the gospels, is so completely like that employed by De Wette on the Pentateuch, that we can scarcely see how it is possible to abandon the one and yet wish to retain the other."

Our own country affords us now and then melancholy evidence that a false principle applied to the earliest scriptures is carried through to the latest, and that if these books are disparaged and regarded as unworthy of confidence, those of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and Paul will be brought under the same condemnation.

Were we disposed to present at this time a positive ar-

* Opp. iv. 749.

gument in favour of the Pentateuch as a writing of Moses, we would attempt to show that there is nothing in the common supposition of its authorship in itself improbable; that the style of the book itself points it out as belonging to the earliest literature of the Jews; that the internal evidence shows Moses to be the author, and is incompatible with any other hypothesis; that the whole religion and government of the Jews from the Exodus till now has been regulated by it; that it directly claims to have been written by Moses; that in the writings of Christians and Jews, embracing the apostles and the founder of Christianity himself, and the prophets of the ancient covenant, there is a distinct line of testimony referring it to Moses; that with this testimony all Pagan antiquity, so far as it speaks to the point at all, concurs; and that all the hypotheses which make the Pentateuch a more recent work are wholly untenable.

The *onus probandi* lies on the side of the impugners and not of the maintainers of the genuineness. Past ages have been satisfied with ascribing the book to Moses, and we propose now to consider the validity of those arguments which have been urged to the contrary.

Among the opponents of the genuineness we should, however, state, there is not a uniformity of opinion. Some deny it wholly; some deny it, brief portions excepted. To the first class belong De Weite, Hartmann, Von Bohlen, Vatke, and Professor Norton of Cambridge. Others admit the Mosaic origin of various important portions of the Pentateuch. Such was the opinion which Eichorn, perhaps, came to maintain who at first contended for the genuineness throughout. The same views have been advanced by Staudlin and Herbst. Most of these writers also hold that whatever in the Pentateuch is beyond the ordinary course of nature is of a mythical character, and may or may not have a historical basis.

1. One of the arguments to disprove the genuineness of the Pentateuch as a writing of Moses is the non-existence of Alphabetic writing at so early a period. "Not till the period of the Judges," says Hartmann, "when they reposed in their fortunately won possessions, were they able to advance in the path of civilization, and obtain from their diligent neighbours the precious gift of the art of writing."

Von Bohlen and Vatke still more strongly make the same assertions. The latter affirms that writing was unknown in the age of Homer. Others who admit the existence among the Egyptians of the hieroglyphic, contend that as yet they possessed no Alphabetic writing and that none other than this was suited to the purpose of writing so extensive a book as the Pentateuch. This argument was put forth by Voltaire, found an advocate in Hartmann and others, and has been more recently brought forward by Dr. Nott. As it was our intention to revert to this subject again when commenting on the lectures of this latter writer, we now state that his genealogy of Alphabetic writing, after Pauthier, is as follows: First, Hieroglyphic writing; second, the Hieratic; third, the Demotic or Enochial, a purely alphabetic writing. The kind, then, to which a writing belongs, may serve to determine its antiquity. All these stages are discoverable in the Egyptian writing, which consists, as the monuments show, and the ancients testify, of these three kinds. The Phœnicians first borrowed this writing from the Egyptians.

“From Phœnicia or Chaldea it passed to the Hebrews and Greeks; to the Hebrews during the captivity at Babylon, from whence they brought the Phœnician or Chaldean alphabet, which had its origin in Egypt, together with the Chaldean or Phœnician language, which Esdras the scribe and Hebrew high-priest used for the revision or rewriting the Bible, as the Jews themselves declare. And, in fact, the Hebrew character, such as it is preserved to our day, has the strongest resemblances to the different Phœnician alphabets published for nearly a century, as the language of the Bible has the greatest affinity, not to say identity, with the language of the Phœnician inscriptions discovered down to the present day. It passed to the Greeks with Cadmus and others”—*Lectt.* p. 105.

“These conclusions, then, which are the most reasonable that can be formed in the present state of *facts*, if confirmed by future investigations, will accord perfectly with exegetical criticism, which proves that the Pentateuch was not written by Moses fifteen hundred years before Christ; in fact, that nothing antedates the school of Esdras. Unless Egyptian hieroglyphics or hieratic characters were employed, no one could have written any part of the Bible before the age of Solomon, or about one thousand years before Christ, if then!”—*Ibid.* p. 111.

We have no objection to the supposition that writing is

a human invention and not a matter of direct revelation. It certainly existed before the giving of the law. We have no objection to the theory that Alphabetic writing originated from the pictorial or hieroglyphic. There is every reason to believe that the first mode of representing things was by pictures, and that *one* of the earliest senses of such a word as *γραφαι* was *to paint*. The very names of Hebrew letters are the names of natural objects. It was a step which it did not require men, who were no barbarians, ages to take, to pass from the hieroglyphic to a phonetic alphabet. It was easy to analyze words into the simple sounds heard in the name of the object which the picture represented. It was easy to take  or , the rude outline of the head of an ox, for the first sound heard in *Aleph* the name of an ox, and this is plainly the A of modern alphabets. It was easy to take  or , the rude form of the eye, for the first sound in *Ayin*, the word for eye, and this is the probable origin of the O both of the ancient and modern writing. In the same way the rude outline of waves was taken for the first sound in *Mayim*, water, and thus originated the M. Whether these were the actual forms of the Hebrew alphabet so early as Moses, we are not permitted by *history* to say, but we do not deem it improbable. The arts were cultivated, iron was wrought and music invented before the flood. The art of writing could not be far off. Man did not come from the hands of his creator a savage, and doomed to toil for ages before he could rise in knowledge and art. His development was early. And it is as probable that Mizraim, the son of Ham, carried the art of writing to Egypt as that it originated there. If it existed there, Moses, learned in all the wisdom of Egypt, was acquainted with it. But, says Dr. Nott, "we know positively that no alphabet existed in this country for a long time after his epoch." And yet in the next sentence he says "the only character possessed by the Egyptians were the hieroglyphic mingled with the *phonetic*." And what were the *phonetic* but alphabetic characters. Alphabetic characters did exist, then, in the days of Moses, in Egypt. He himself also admits p. 105, that there are strong reasons for supposing that the Phœnicians possessed an alphabet as early as Moses,

though it differed then from the Samaritan and square letter. Now what was the Phœnician language? It was the Hebrew language, with scarce a dialectic difference. If the Hebrew-speaking Phœnicians possessed an alphabet in Moses' day, why not the Hebrew-speaking Moses himself. The fact that the Chaldee square letter was introduced among the Jews after Ezra no more proves that they had not an alphabetic character before, than the introduction of the Roman letter among the English, and the present cursive Greek alphabet in the writing of Greek, proves that there was no alphabetic character in England till within the last two hundred years, or among the Greeks till the 10th century. It is perfectly vain to plead the defective nature of the Cadmean alphabet. The 16 letters which belonged to it, Plin. vii. 56, or even fifteen, are sufficient to spell any Greek or Hebrew word. The art of writing was known in the days of Job,* and when Joshua subjugated Canaan he took Debir, whose original name was Kirjath Sepher, *City of Books*, or Kirjath Saanah, *City of Letters*, and whose name Debir is equivalent to the Greek *λογος*.† How long must letters have been cultivated, before a town could become so great an emporium of learning as to receive the name "City of Books," or "City of Letters?" Dr. Nott says, "We find *embalmed Hebrews* in Egypt, yet not a trace of *Alphabetic* writing, much less of any *Hebrew* letters." We have already said the Phonetic hieroglyphics are alphabetic. We now say there are Hebrew letters found in Egypt, as may be seen in the fac similes of Gesenius' *Monumenta Phœnicia*, from No. LXXI. *a.* to LXXV. *b.* inclusive, which if not as old as Moses, may yet be as old as the "embalmed Hebrews" of which he speaks. The Pentateuch, also, itself continually speaks of writing as being in existence in the days of Moses, and if the whole is not a complete and bare faced forgery throughout, without *any* basis of truth, which not even all its opposers affirm, it

* Job xix. 23, 31, 35. Hales makes Job to have lived 200 years before the Exode.

† Josh. xv. 49. Judg. i. 11. The LXX. translate *πολις γραμματεων*, the Targum Kirjath Arke, *City of Archives*. See Bochart *Canaan*, II. c 17, and Keil *Commentar ueber Josua*, X. 38, and Bertheau *Das Buch der Richter*, p. 20.

must at least be admitted that it gives the view of the writer and his age as to the existence of alphabetic writing in the days of Moses. Thus in Exodus xvii. 14. The Lord said unto Moses, "Write this for a memorial in a book," xxiv. 4. And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord. This writing of the law, as Hengstenberg remarks, belongs to the solemnization of the transaction. In Numb. xxxiii. 2, it is said "Moses wrote their goings out" i.e. their stations "by the commandment of the Lord," xvii. 2. Moses took twelve rods according to the house of their fathers, and wrote every man's name upon his rod. Deut. xxxi. 19. "Now therefore write the song for you, and teach it the children of Israel," xviii. 18, 19. The future king also, when he should sit upon his throne, was to write him a copy of this law in a book. The name too of the Egyptian priests *hheartummim*, scribes, clerks, from *hheret*, a style, indicates the wide spread of the art of writing, at least in Egypt. See Gen. xli. 8, 14. Exod. vii. 11, 22. viii. 3, 14, 15. ix. 11. They were directed also to write the words which Moses commanded them that day, upon the posts of their houses and their gates. Deut. vi. 9. Moses summoned seventy men of the elders of the people, *in writing*, Num. xi. 24, 26, but Eldad and Medad were not of them that were *written*. The inscription on the mitre and breast plate of the high priest, the "book of life" spoken of by Moses, the writing of bills of divorce by the disaffected husband, the writing by the priest of the curse upon the adulteress, the inscribing of the law upon the stones of Mt. Ebal, will occur to all who are familiar with these books. These notices indicate a wide diffusion of the art of writing among the Hebrews in the Mosaic age, which is what we might expect from the wide diffusion of this art among the Egyptians. Mr. Gliddon, too, decides for the existence of alphabetic or phonetic signs 1000 years before Moses, and for the existence in Egypt of royal and national libraries cotemporary with, if not *prior* to his epoch; that the god Thoth was termed at so early a day as that, "the President of the Library," the "Lord of the divine writings;" and the goddess Saffk, "Lady of Letters."*

* Ancient Egypt, pp. 13, 14. Since writing the above, we see that Mr.
VOL. IV.—No. 2. 34

And if search had been made in that direction, Lepsius would have been found declaring that he met with papyrus rolls pictured on the monuments of the 12th dynasty, the last but one of the old kingdom, and the stylus and inkstand on those of the fourth, and in the fifth century of the period of Menes. *Bunsen would have been found adding that we can trace the monumental writing a century higher, and that however it may damage preconceived opinions, the genuine Egyptian writing, consisting of hieroglyphics and phonetic, i. e. alphabetic characters, existed in its essential parts at least as early as Menes; that it began with the regular register of the Egyptian kings is the universal tradition of antiquity, and that there is no tradition which is better confirmed.†

"Several kinds of alphabetic writing were in existence in Asia from the earliest times," says Win. Von Humboldt. "The transition from hieroglyphic to alphabetic writing,

Gliddon (*Ethnological Journal* No. IX. p. 401.) has revoked his opinion. He has not informed us what he will do with his *facts*. The oscillations of the Egyptologists do not surprise us. The sunshine of truth will ere long explode many a theory which is pompously paraded before the world. We have not forgotten the scene in Boston a short time since, which we now quote from "the Presbyterian," of July 29, and which we have not seen contradicted.

"*Mr. Gliddon and the Mummy.*—The very peculiar and disagreeable predicament in which Mr. Gliddon was placed before a Boston audience, has already been made known to our readers. By special request, he agreed to unroll one of his Egyptian mummies, and to decypher the hieroglyphics which might be found connected with it. The mummy was, accordingly, submitted to the select audience, and the hieroglyphics, (Mr. Gliddon being interpreter,) very fully revealed that the subject was a young Egyptian woman, the daughter of a dignitary. This was very satisfactory to the wonder-loving and curious audience; but, when the various wrappings were unwound, lo! the buried and disinterred one was a robust man, and not a delicate female. This was an important error, for the occurrence of which Mr. Gliddon had no very plausible explanation. We advert to this subject again for a single purpose. Mr. Gliddon, who professes to be entirely at home among Egyptian antiquities, belongs, if we mistake not, to a school of philosophers who take peculiar pleasure in discrediting the Mosaic account of the creation. As he reads the Egyptian monuments, he finds that they go back far beyond the date ascribed by Moses for the creation of the world. Now we would respectfully ask him if he be not mistaken? Is it not possible he has made an error of a thousand or two years in his hieroglyphic readings? If Mr. Gliddon persists in his interpretation, and is very positive as to the accuracy of his statements, that the world is much older than the Bible says it is, then we shall be under the painful necessity of reminding him of—the *mummy*.

* *Todtenbuch der Eyppter.* s. 17.

† *Ægypten's Stelle*—Theil I. p. 33.

we find," says Gesenius, "very early among the Egyptians, at least 2000 years B. C." "In accordance with these historical premises, it is in the highest degree probable, that some Phœnician, connected in very ancient times with the neighboring Egyptians, invented his own alphabet, new and altogether more convenient and practical. Rejecting the hieroglyphics and their innumerable characters, he selected simply twenty-two signs for the twenty-two consonant sounds of his language." This discovery Gesenius believes to have been made somewhere near the time of the shepherd kings in Egypt, which Wilkinson supposes to have been before Joseph was carried there by the Midianite merchants.* "Whatever," says Ewald, "may be the primitive Semitic people, to whom half of the civilized world are indebted for this inestimable gift, (the gift of writing,) so much cannot be mistaken, that it appears in history as a possession of a Semitic people long before the times of Moses." "It appears to us not only probable, but rather certain that the earliest historians of Israel found already in existence a multitude of historical works of the kindred tribes."† And Schlosser remarks, that the composition of the four first books of Moses, "was rendered more easy and natural since Moses was educated in Egypt, where every thing, even law-suits, was carried on in writing, since among the Phœnicians he had found characters for the tones of his own language, and even had appointed a multitude of scribes in the country, who, partly to assist the police, partly on account of the disputes respecting the boundaries of lands, were obliged to write down the genealogies, and to note any remarkable changes."‡ "The Egyptians on one side," says Olshausen, "the Hebrews and Phœnicians on the other, we find at a time which extends back of all sure chronology, in possession of an alphabet, which has one and the same extraordinary principle to denote the sound. For this purpose an object was represented or pictured, whose name, in the various spoken languages of Egypt or the Semitic tribes, begins with this sound." ||

* Grammar Ed. 13th, App.

† Geschichte des Volker Israel.

‡ See Hengstenberg Genuineness, I. p. 12.

|| See other authorities quoted by Hengstenberg on the Genuineness of

We think these considerations, and the decisions of these various scholars, outweigh, *ex abundanti*, the objections of the opponents of the Pentateuch. That Moses *could* write the Pentateuch," says Hasse, "is beyond controversy." "Possibly," says Fritzsche, "Moses was farther advanced in the art of writing than Cadmus."

2. Another argument against the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, is the alledged want of suitable writing materials at so early an age.

First, it is argued that the words used in the early languages for the act of writing, indicate that it was first performed on some hard substance, as on stone, in which the letters had to be cut with the chisel or the graver. Γραφω χαρασσω, & γραω, and the Hebrew words *kathabh*, *kharat*, *be'er sa'phar*, all signify *to engrave, to cut in, to scratch*, and indicate that stone was the earliest material for writing. Again, it is argued from the slow improvement of the arts, that the more portable, flexible, and convenient materials were slowly discovered; and, thirdly, that hard substances were employed for writing, is said to be evident from the testimony of the books of Job and of Joshua, and from the Pentateuch itself.

The argument from the meaning of the words, Hengstenberg disposes of, by denying that this is their earliest signification. The words γραφω and *kathabh*, are the only ones properly applied to writing, and *to write* is their true and primary meaning. We cannot follow him in his philological argument. To us the most of these words sound like onomatopées, and are an imitation of the sound made by the instrument used in writing, as it passes rapidly over the material written upon, as we sometimes speak with a view to the sound so made, of "the *scrape* of a pen." If this be the origin of the words, they as easily express the sound of the *style* indenting a palm leaf, of the pencil upon the slate, of the pen or reed upon parchment or papyrus, as of the chisel or graver upon stone or metal. As to the slow improvement of the arts, we know that necessity quickens invention. The art of writing was of great and general interest, and we believe with the Count de Caylus, that "as soon as writing was found

the Pentateuch, and by Prof. B. B. Edwards in *Biblioth. Sacra*, 1845, p. 380—387.

out, it was laid on every thing which could receive it." We can hardly conceive of writing becoming any object, if it must be confined to inscriptions on rocks and metallic substances. Both writers and readers would certainly be few, so long as there was no more facile material than these. Nor indeed in our view, could writing ever come into use, or be at all perfected, unless portable and convenient materials were adopted. The supposition that writing was not used at first, as now, for familiar communication or popular instruction, but for the transmission of important knowledge to future times, does not meet the case, for such an application of the art of writing could only be thought of when it had been long in use, and its great utility and adaptation to such a purpose universally acknowledged. There are sufficient notices of the perfection it was believed to have attained, in the earliest books of the Bible. The signet ring of Judah is mentioned, Gen. xxxviii: 18, 25; and that this bore an inscription is more than probable. The onyx stones on the Ephod of Aaron were engraved "with the work of an engraver in stone, like the engraving of a signet."

This engraving of gems is one of the highest works of art, requiring great precision and skill, and indicating that, even at this day, writing had been long cultivated and had reached its perfection. The instance referred to also, is one connected with the solemn rites of their religion, respecting which a falsehood, if it were stated, were easily detected, and would be at once exposed.

Let it be granted that the surface of rocks was used to receive inscriptions in the days of Moses, and that inscriptions were made on stone. This also is the case in modern times. The Dighton rock is supposed by many to record the discovery of this country by the Icelanders, in the opening of the eleventh century. Hannibal cut an inscription on the Alpine rocks, celebrating his famous passage of the Alps, and the Chinese have adopted the same method, in modern times, of recording on the face of rocks those things they would desire to perpetuate.

These modern facts would invalidate the reasoning which is adduced to show that rock was the earliest material for writing, and that none other existed in the days of Moses. The fact is, that stone and metal were used

in that day, as now, for monumental purposes, or for the record of those important matters which it was desired to perpetuate in the memories of men. When parchment and papyrus were already in use, the Greeks engraved their *laws* on triangular tables of brass called *Cyrbes*, *κυρβεις*, and the laws of Solon, and sometimes those of the XII Tables, were inscribed on planks of durable wood. Hence the expression of Horace *Leges incidere ligno*.—Traces of the same usage, it appears to us, may be found in the Hebrew verb *hhakak*, which, while it primarily means *to cut in, to hew in*, in its derived or metaphorical signification, means *to decree, or enact laws*, its derivative *hhekek*, signifies a *decree or law*, and the participle *mehokek*, a *law-giver*.

Besides wooden tablets covered with wax, or otherwise, used by the Greeks and Romans, which we know the Hebrews to have used at a later day,* there were abundance of other materials they might have employed.—There was the byssus, or “fine linen,” of which the garments of the priests, and the covering of the tabernacle, were made, and which was used for mummy cloths by the Egyptians, as the microscope of Mr. Bauer has determined. They might have availed themselves of this, in lieu of a better material, and the Hebrews, as well as other nations of antiquity, have had their *libros linteos*. A writing of this kind has been found in the hand of an Egyptian mummy.

Another material accessible to the Hebrews, was the skins of animals, prepared either as parchment, vellum, or tanned as soft leather. Parchment is often ascribed to Eumenes, as its inventor, who lived 200 years before Christ. But Herodotus tells us the Ionians wrote on sheep and goat skins from the earliest period. Eumenes only improved the manufacture, and introduced it into general use instead of paper, made from papyrus, whose export had been prohibited by the reigning Ptolemy. This manufacture of leather existed among the Hebrews in the days of Moses. In Exod. xxvi: 14, we read that ram skins dyed red, were used as a covering of the tabernacle, and the adaptation of such a material to the purpose

* Is. viii. 1: xxx. 8. Hab. ii. 2. 2 Esdras, xiv. 24.

of writing, is not a matter of doubt. Dr. Buchanan, in 1806, obtained a roll, written on soft, flexible goat skins, dyed red, containing most of the Hebrew Scriptures, from a synagogue of the Black Jews in the interior of India. It is one of the rules of the Jews contained in the Mishnah, that the law can only be written on polished skins, of clean beasts, which would seem to indicate this as the material on which it was first written. The curse against the adulteress was to be written in a book, and then washed with the bitter water, which would imply a material different from paper, and which would not be destroyed by the action of water.

Another substance which could have been used, was paper from the papyrus, a plant mentioned in Exod. ii : 3, as the material of the ark, or boat in which Moses was exposed when an infant, and Is. viii : 2, as the material of the skiffs used by the swift ambassadors of Ethiopia. Paper from the papyrus, is of easy manufacture. Pliny is wrong in saying that it was not used before Alexander the Great. Papyri are in existence of the remote Pharaonic period. Wilkinson speaks of papyri of the age of Cheops, Champollion of papyrus rolls of the date of Sesostris the Great, and Heeren of papyrus rolls found in the catacombs of Thebes, of unknown antiquity.

It is sufficient for us to show that there were materials which Moses could have used other than stone. But we believe there are few readers who will not admit that the book so often referred to in the Pentateuch, the *sepher* of the Hebrew, was something else than a writing on wood, stone, or metallic plates.

With what face one could assert in view of these facts, that "the best mode known to Moses, was to write on stones covered with soft plaister; and that this mode of writing was recommended to the Israelites, and was practised by Joshua at the recommendation of Moses," we cannot comprehend. "To write out the Pentateuch in the way recommended by Moses," says the same author, "would have taken all the stones of Mount Horeb."*

In relation to the transaction thus referred to, there are various opinions. The direction to Joshua to write the

* Dr. Cooper's Geology and the Pentateuch, pp. 35, 36.

law upon plastered stones, may be found in Deut. xxvii: 2, 8, and its fulfilment in Josh. 8: 32. Dr. Kennicott, and after him Adam Clarke, supposed the letters were *in relievo*, and the plaster fitted up the intervals between them, to protect them from abrasion. Michaelis and Rosenmueller, that the device fallen upon by Sostratus, the architect of Pharos, was adopted by Moses, that of cutting the characters in stone, and covering the whole with plaster, that when this should fall off, in future times, the inscription might be discovered and produce the greater effect. Mr. Means, in his answer to Dr. Cooper, suggests that the inscription was to be on an altar, constructed of unhewn stones, and that the plaster was used to obtain a smooth surface, to receive the inscription, because if a tool of iron were raised on an altar of stone, it would be regarded as polluted. See Exodus xx: 25. The Egyptians, too, were accustomed to cover stone walls, when the material was too coarse for inscriptions and paintings, with mortar, on which the sculptures or paintings were wrought, and yet it would hardly be plead that they had no other material than this on which to write. Few interpreters have believed the whole Pentateuch so written. Cornelius a Lapide supposed the whole of Deuteronomy inscribed: Seb. Munster, Stendel and Clarius, an extract from the law; Grotius, Kennicott, and Hasse, the curses and blessings of Deuteronomy, 27: Vater, Hengstenberg, and Maurer, the second law, or the repetition of the law, Deut. iv, 44: 26, 29; and Maurer, Hengstenberg and Keil, think the writing was more for effect, to convey the impression that these laws should be written on the heart and practised in the life, rather than for the purpose of transmission to future ages.

In reviewing these facts, we are sure, if objections to the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch are based on the absence of suitable writing material in his day, they must fall to the ground. For the first writing of the Koran, the materials were most unsuitable. It was written on fragments of leather and hide, on palm leaves, on flat white stones, and on the shoulder-blades of sheep. And yet the Koran is larger than the Pentateuch.

3. The language of the Pentateuch has furnished an-

other objection to its genuineness. It differs so little from the later Hebrew, for example, that of the period of David, that it cannot have been written, it is alledged, in the days of Moses, which was at least 500 years before. But we cannot judge of ancient oriental idioms, by the variableness of the modern tongues of civilized Europe. The permanence of the manners and customs of the Orientals extends also to their language. There is hardly greater difference between the style of David and of Jeremiah, although the Hebrew literature was disturbed by foreign influences in later times, than there is between that of the Pentateuch and that of the Davidic age. An influential literature, especially a sacred one, has a great power to keep language permanent. The writings of Confucius, 550 years B. C., and those of a commentator upon them, written 1500 years after, are said to differ very little, except that the original is more concise. The Koran of Mohammed, Luther's translation of the Bible, and in some degree our English version, have tended to fix the Arabic, the German and the English languages. Yet the Hebrew has its golden, its silver, and its iron ages. And as we would not, judging from the style, refer the poems of Homer to the age of Demosthenes, the orations of Demosthenes to the times of Origen, or the commentaries of Origen to the days of Lascaris, so we would not refer the five books of Moses to the times of David, nor the Psalms of which David is the author to the times of Malachi.* The style of the Pentateuch betrays its antiquity. It abounds in Archaisms, in words and forms not in use so late as the time of David. Some of these are noted by Rosenmueler in his Prolegomena to the Pentateuch. "Many words and phrases," says Jahn, "occur in the Pentateuch which are peculiar to it, and many peculiar to later books are never found in it; many also which are common in the Pentateuch, are elsewhere of rare occurrence, and the contrary." Of these different sorts of words and phrases, Jahn collected more than two hundred.† We are unable, both from the want of proper type and space, to enter more fully into this subject, but it is

* Bp. Marsh *Authenticity of the Five Books of Moses vindicated*, pp. 6, 7

† *Introduction to O. T.*, translated by Turner, p. 178.

sufficiently plain, that the language of the Pentateuch, when compared with that of the other Hebrew writings, exhibits marks of a higher antiquity. We may seek, therefore, among the historic personages of the earliest age of Hebrew literature, for the probable author of these ancient writings, and whom shall we find so likely to have composed them, as their reputed author, Moses?

4. Again, it is objected that the Pentateuch is a compilation, made up out of the writings of various persons, and put together by some one, long subsequent to Moses. That it is devoid of unity—a cento, composed of scraps of various authors, exhibiting frequent repetitions and manifest diversities of style.

This objection must be first resolved into its several particulars. It is possible that it should be in part a compilation, and yet that the compiler should be Moses himself. It is in Genesis that the chief evidences of compilation are alleged to be found. And so long ago as Vitringa the opinion was maintained that Moses availed himself, as Luke did in the composition of his gospel, of pre-existing documents. The proof of this Vitringa brings forward in his *Observationes Sacrae* L. 1. iv. Then arose the question as to the sources whence the Pentateuch was drawn. The opinion advanced by Otman, that the pyramids and other monuments of Egypt were among these sources, has not met with much favour. Some have supposed that he availed himself of the traditions which were in existence, and which in consequence of the great age of the earliest men were handed down with great correctness, seven persons only intervening between Adam and Moses. The idea that written documents, as the genealogical tablets of families, and other early records, were the sources, in whole or part, of the book of Genesis has approved itself to many.*

These writings may have themselves been inspired, or if adopted, and wrought over by one possessing inspiration; would have received the sanction as far as adopted, of the Holy Spirit under whom he acted.

* So Vitringa, Richard Simon, LeClerc, Calmet, Bishop Gleig, Professor Turner. "Doubtless," says this latter writer, "he availed himself of documents and other sources of information previously existing, and agreeably to Hebrew usage he retained the very phraseology of these documents so far as was consistent with his main object." *Comp. to Genesis*, p. 24.

The hypothesis of different documents was carried to a great extreme by the physician Astruc, who professed to find in Genesis the traces of 12 different documents. Eichhorn pruned away this theory and reduced the documents to two. Ilgen contended for three. Vater came forward with the "fragment hypothesis," which maintains that the book of Genesis is comprised of a multitude of disjointed fragments. To this theory De Wette lent the weight of his talents, and it was in its turn extensively adopted. It was attacked by Sack, violently shaken by Ewald, and has been abandoned by many of its former adherents.

The arguments brought forward to sustain these theories are evidently insufficient. In the first place the alleged repetitions may be explained as well, or better without the hypothesis. Some of them are merely the variations of phraseology which are found in all writers; some are a mere resumption of the narrative on again recurring to it after the thread has been broken by a more full dilata-tion of a particular matter; some are for the purpose of enforcement, according to an obvious usage among the Hebrews when there is a desire to give an intensive view of something important; and others for the sake of greater clearness and perspicuity, or to prepare the way for other topics about to be introduced.

Again, the recurrence of the title, "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth." *Sepher toledoth ha-Adham*, "The book of the generations of Adam." *Tholedhoth Beni Noah*, "The generations of the sons of Noah." *Tholedhoth Shem*, "The generations of Shem," &c. although regarded by many as the indubitable titles of the different documents compiled,* may be merely the titles of the several sections of the book, not set forth distinctly, as is the custom in modern writing and printing, from the body of the text. While, therefore, they may be the titles of different documents, it is quite as natural to suppose that they are intended either as the heads of sections, or premonitions, to attract the attention of the reader to the matter in hand.

But the chief argument for the different documents, and also for the fragment hypothesis, is the different names of

* So Vitringa.

God used in different parts. Thus they speak of the Elohim document, the Jehovah document, and the Jehovah-Elohim document, the Elohistic fragments, the Jehovistic, and the Jehovah-Elohistic. In Gen. i.—ii : 3. The name of God is Elohim in the Hebrew, for which our translators have given the usual name of Deity, viz. *God*. In Gen. ii. 4.—iii. 24, the name is Jehovah Elohim, for which we have in the English version *Lord God*, in this following the Vulgate and Septuagint. In iv. 1—26, the name is Jehovah, in our version *Lord*. The same change of the Divine names, the advocates of the document and fragment hypothesis have attempted to trace throughout the Pentateuch, and accordingly assign the several portions to several original documents from which they affirm them to have been compiled.

There has arisen, therefore, an enquiry among the advocates of the genuineness, as to the signification of these Divine names, and the reason of their use, that by this means these hypotheses may be tested. A very full examination of this subject may be found in the work of Hengstenberg, and a very comprehensive and judicious view of the argument also in the introduction to Turner on Genesis.

Hermogenes, Tertullian, and Augustine had perceived that there is a difference in these Divine names, and that *Dominus* marks a more special relation than *Deus* and *Chrysostom* acknowledged that there was a reason for the change of the Divine names, but the former of these striving to illustrate the difference from the Latin and Greek names of the version before them, failed to perceive their true meaning.

“ During the middle ages as might be expected, the investigation was carried no further by Christian scholars. An obstacle, indeed, lay in their way, which remained there for centuries. First of all, PETER LOMBARD (*Sentent. l. i., dist. 2*) asserted that the plural form of the name *Elohim* was to be explained by the plurality of persons in the Divine essence. This view, which was recommended by an appearance of credibility, soon obtained universal acceptance, which was only partially, and for a short time, interrupted by the opposition of such men as *Calvin, Mercer, Pareus, Drusius, Bellarmine* (compare the proof in Buxtorf, *de nomm. dei Hebraicis* in his *Dissertatt.*, p. 270). As long

as it lasted, nothing else could be done. By means of it, *Elohim* from being the most general indefinite appellation of the Deity, was changed into the most definite and special; from being the lowest name, it became the highest. Henceforth the relation between Jehovah and Elohim was distorted and inverted.

“But if we turn to the Jewish scholars of the middle ages, we find among them, in reference to the ground-work of the investigation,—the determination of the relation between Jehovah and Elohim,—some highly valuable remarks.”—*Hengstenberg, I. pp. 215, 216.*

The Rabbi Judah Hallevi, (*the Levite*), the author of the book *Cosri*, in the 12th century, surprises us by the discriminating views he presents as to the true force of these divine names. The plural form *Elohim* he regards as being intended to oppose idolaters, who, personifying the powers of nature, call each by the name *Eloah*, and all together, *Elohim*, having no respect to that supreme power from whom all these powers proceed. In opposition to these, the name Elohim was given to the one true God. It is the most general name of Deity, distinguishing him only as to the fulness of his power, without reference to his moral qualities, to his personality, and the relation he sustains to men. “Where God has given witness of himself, and is truly known, another name is added to *Elohim*—the name *Jehovah*, peculiar to the people who received his revelation and his covenant. The name *Jehovah* is the *nomen proprium* of God, expressing the inmost nucleus of his essence, and is only intelligible where God has come forth out of himself, laid open the recesses of his heart, and has permitted his creatures to behold them, so that, instead of an obscure, undefined being, of whom thus much only is known and affirmed, that he is powerful, that he is immense; he here exhibits himself the most personal of all persons, the most characteristic of all characters. The sense of the name *Elohim* can be apprehended by reason, because the understanding teaches that the world has a governor and director. But what is understood by *Jehovah*, cannot be apprehended by ratiocination, but only by that prophetic vision by which man is, as it were, separated from his own species, and approximates to the species of angels, and another spirit enters into him.” Maimonides also says: “all the names of God are derived from his works except

only *Jehovah*, which is the *nomen dei proprium*." Moreh Nebhochim, p. 106. Abarbanel also acknowledges this difference in the signification of these names of Deity.

It is now very plain, if these names of Deity are of different signification, that there may be reasons why one and the same writer should introduce them into his discourse, why when the more general is most suited either to the subject in hand, or to his own state of mind, he should use it, or when the particular is best suited to express his views, he should either introduce it by itself, or in connection with the more generic designation.

Astruc, however, proceeded on the hypothesis, that there was no internal difference in these names which could have induced one and the same writer to use them, and that the remarkable interchange of these names in different paragraphs or sections of these books, indicated different authors, extracts of whose writings were subsequently brought together by some unknown hand. And when this theory was set forth by the genius of Eichorn, it obtained a wide currency among the scholars of Germany, whence it has passed over to those of other countries.

This theory has been successively attacked by Sack, Ewald and Ranke, who have pointed out a difference in the divine names, as the reason of the variation in their use, and have likewise shown the essential unity of the five books of Moses. But no one has entered into the subject of this difference so thoroughly as Hengstenberg. He first takes up the origin of the name *Jehovah*. We cannot follow him in those investigations by which he has shown that it neither has an Egyptian nor a Phœnician origin, that no traces of the name are found in China, for which some have contended, and that there is no connection between the *Jovis* of the Latins and the *Jehovah* of the Hebrews; the original form of *Jovis* being *Diovis*, from *Zeus Διος*. Being of purely Hebrew derivation, it must be traced to the verb of existence *havah*, in the *kal* of which the proximate form is found. Its original pronunciation could not, therefore, have been *Jehovah*, but must have been *Jahaveh*, or *Jahveh*.* And since the future is often used in the signification of the present

* So also Havernick.

tense, *Jehovah*, *He who is to be*, (i. e. *forever*,) is equivalent to THE BEING, i. e. THE ABSOLUTE BEING. Immutability is therefore suggested by the name *Jehovah*. Mal. iii, 6. "I am *Jehovah*, I change not." Rev. i:4. "Which is, and which was, and which is to come;" Heb. xiii, 8. "The same yesterday, to-day, and forever," are paraphrases of this name.

As to the other name of God, *Elohim*, it is derived from a root *alah*, lost from the Hebrew, but preserved in the Arabic, which signifies *to adore or worship*. *Eloah*, therefore, signifies *the object of worship, venerandus, the Worshipful*. The great invisible who inspires with awe and dread. This is all which the name in itself expresses. And as to the reason of the plural form of the word: 1. The Rabbins have resolved it as a simple plural of majesty; 2. Peter Lombard and many who have followed him, have regarded it as involving the mystery of the Trinity; 3. Le Clerc, Herder, De Wette and Hartmann, have conjectured that it came from polytheism, from which they suppose the religion of the Jews originated, a theory which is contrary to all history: 4. that it comes from the idiom of the Hebrew, by which the plural is used in abstract nouns, to denote the quintessence of the separate individuals, or in individual nouns, to denote that the individual concentrates in himself the sum of all that quality or assemblage of qualities which the name suggests.

According to this last view, which is the true one, the use of the plural in *Elohim*, says Hengstenberg, "answers the same purpose which is elsewhere accomplished, by an accumulation of divine names, as in Joshua xxii. 22. "Jehovah, God of God, Jehovah God of Gods," the thrice holy, in Is. vi. 3, and the "God of Gods and Lord of Lords," Deut. x. 17. It calls the attention to the infinite riches, and the inexhaustible fulness contained in one Divine Being, so that though men may imagine innumerable Gods, and invest them with perfections, yet all these are contained in the one *Elohim*." "While the plural is in some respects more comprehensive than the singular *Eloah*, it is also lowering." "It could not, with propriety, be employed in a name of God, which, like

Jehovah, is intended to express the innermost being of God, the essence of his personality." *

That these names are significant, and used in accordance with their signification, the whole analogy in respect to names, establishes. Especially in the early Scriptures, they are significant, and seem to be given by some overruling influence from God. *Eve, the life-imparter*; *Cain, the acquisition*; *Abel, vanity*; *Seth, the appointed*; *Noah, the rest-giver*, are all instances in point. And it agrees, therefore, with the general analogy, that these names should be used in accordance with their signification.—When God, therefore, is spoken of in Genesis 1, as the great Creator, the name *Elohim*, implying his superiority over all creatures, is used. To those persons who never go beyond the creative act of God, to whom all his other acts are, as if they had never been, this name suffices. "To them God remains a distant God: they know only of the *Elohim*; this is shown by their partiality for the most vague designations of God—the *Deity, Heaven, Omnipotence, Providence, &c.*; and by their dread of all names which express God's personality, and indicate the absolute dependence of all existences upon him."

In the second section, chap. ii. 4—iii, instead of the ordinary name of God, *Jehovah-Elohim* is used, and *Elohim* is only retained where it is necessary.

"We here take the first step in the transition from ELOHIM to JEHOVAH. We are here met by the living, personal, self-revealing, holy God. He appears as the loving preserver of mankind, as the director of moral life, commanding and forbidding, as the author of punishment, as the opener of the prospect that reaches to the final consummation. Had the author merely had in view those who had attained to a firm and clear knowledge of the relation of ELOHIM to JEHOVAH, he would have been satisfied with using the name JEHOVAH alone. But since it was rather his design to lead into the depths of the relation

* "The idea of Elohim sinks to the lowest point in 1 Sam. xxvii. 13, where the witch of Endor says to Samuel: "I see Elohim ascending out of the earth." Here nothing remains but the vague notion of an unearthly, superhuman power, which the woman beheld entering into the sensible world in one appearance. How much those who have not correctly understood the fundamental nature of Elohim, are at a loss on this passage, may be seen in the remarks upon it by Kimchi, Grotius and Seb. Schmid."—Hengstenberg, I. p. 273.

of JEHOVAH and ELOHIM, the transition from ELOHIM to JEHOVAH simply, appeared to him as too precipitate. He feared a misunderstanding—feared that man might regard that God who held converse so humanly with man, as personally different from the Creator of heaven and earth, as a mere subordinate God and Mediator. In this section, therefore, he uses JEHOVAH ELOHIM in combination, in order that in the sequel where JEHOVAH occurs, the ELOHIM manifested in him may be acknowledged, and where ELOHIM occurs, that the JEHOVAH concealed in him might also be acknowledged.”—Heng. I. p. 315.

“The master-stroke of the Tempter’s policy was then, and is still now, to change JEHOVAH into ELOHIM—the living, holy God, into a *nescio quod numen*: (with what vagueness the term ELOHIM is used by the serpent, is shown by the expression, “Ye shall be as ELOHIM;” ye shall be raised to an unearthly nature and dignity.) Having done this, and not before, he could venture upon deluding them with a downright falsehood. JEHOVAH is not a man that he should lie. The woman should have employed the name JEHOVAH as an impenetrable shield, to repel the fiery darts of the Wicked One. The use of the name ELOHIM (that this is not to be accounted for from ignorance of the name JEHOVAH is proved by ch. iv. 1) was the beginning of her fall. First, there was a depression and obscuration of the religious sentiment; then the tree appeared good to eat, and pleasant to the eye—God died in the soul, and sin became alive.” p. 317.

In the section beginning with chapter iv., the name Jehovah is prominent. The presentation of the offerings and all religious services, depend on the recognition of a God revealed as a rewarder and finisher. “Cain went out from the presence of *Jehovah*.” ‘Jehovah’s presence, the revelation of the living and personal God, was confined to the Church. Out of Eden there was only *Elohim*.’ It were as unsuitable to represent him as going from the presence of *Elohim*, as it would have been for Jacob to say, ‘truly *Elohim* is in this place;’ or, for it to be said of Jonah: ‘Jonah rose up to flee unto Tarshish, from the presence of *Elohim*. And in verse 26: “Then began men to call upon the name of *Jehovah*.” The phrase does not denote every kind of calling upon God, but the solemn calling on God in a consecrated place, in church fellowship. In Psalm xix. we see the same usage, verse 2, “The Heavens declare the glory of *El*.” But in

verse 8. "The law of *Jehovah* is perfect; converting the soul; the testimony of *Jehovah* is sure making wise the simple." First, the glories of the God of nature are described, then the grace and mercy of the God of revelation.

This contrast between the names of God, Hengstenberg endeavors to illustrate throughout the Pentateuch, whenever they occur, and maintains that the peculiar meaning of the names, is the reason in each instance of their use. But, as we should naturally expect, he fails to make these reasons appear in a multitude of instances. The interchange of these names is very frequent in some portions of these books, and the reason of their interchange oftentimes not apparent. And although the theory is undoubtedly true, that these names do differ in meaning, and that the difference in their meaning is the true ground in a multitude of instances, why one was used rather than the other, yet in many other instances the reason appears to have been, the avoidance of monotony and sameness, and in many other cases, some association in the mind now undiscoverable by us. As the names of Christ, *Son of God*, and *Son of Man*, were given, the one because of his connection with God, the Father, and the other, because of his connection with man, the creature; or as the name *Jesus* denotes *Jehovah* the Saviour, and *Christ*, the anointed king; and yet we cannot tell in each particular instance, why one name rather than the other is used, so is it here. And yet so much as this is apparent, that from the variation in the names of God in Genesis, and the subsequent books of the Pentateuch, a difference of authorship can by no means be established. And this famous argument thus falls to the ground.

As to the charge of a want of unity: In the first place, there is all the unity in these books we could expect.—The great length to which this topic has already extended itself, prevents our drawing out the plan of the writer of the Pentateuch in detail. Whoever will devote his attention to it, will perceive this plan, and the interdependence of one part of these books upon the others. The wonderful connection, and perfect unity of principle and design pervading the books, will be most convincing. And yet while this unity of general design is sufficient—

ly apparent, we perceive that the book still has, if we may so speak, a fragmentary structure. It consists of a great number of historical narratives, each often having its own distinct conclusion or preceded by its own peculiar title. The order of the narrative is often interrupted and the style unequal. The introductory portion gives those events of the most ancient history which tend to prepare the way for the subsequent legislation, as the worship of one God, the sacrifices of the Patriarchs, the delivery from Egypt. Those incidents are related which give rise to the laws. The laws are recorded in the order of their promulgation, and repeated or explained when in the lapse of time they were forgotten or perverted. And in Deuteronomy the writer is evidently an aged man, who was alive to the faults of the people who had grown up beneath his eye. He addresses them as one would who had been accustomed to command, as one who had led them up out of Egypt and established their peculiar form of government. He addresses himself to a people who had seen and experienced what he related, and speaks with the freedom, boldness and affection of one who had lived long on terms of intimacy with them. In the midst of this people he stands warning and exhorting them, recalling to their memory the past, republishing the laws which he had before communicated, and anticipating, with prophetic spirit, their future destiny.

All this coincides entirely with the situation and character of Moses. He was a man oppressed with weighty cares and engagements. He was overwhelmed with the charge of a nation breaking away from oppressive bondage, headstrong, difficult to please; such a nation he was leading out of the land of their task-masters, through the deserts of Arabia, to the land of their forefathers. The writings of such a man would be fragmentary, though not in the sense which the advocates of "the fragment hypothesis" intend, and perhaps the pens of the scribes would sometimes aid him, in preparing copies of public documents, and of genealogical tablets, to be inserted in his history. It would be just what we would expect, if the train of the narrative were sometimes interrupted, if historical statements should, if we may so speak, *overlap* one another, and if formal conclusions and new commence-

ments and titles should often appear. Moses was a legislator recording, as it occurred, his own inspired legislation. *Such was the author of this book.* A compiler of the Mosaic laws would have *codified* them and digested them under different heads. He would not have repeated, he would not have changed them. He would not have related them in connection with the events which were the occasions of their enactment. It is Moses, the busy leader of the Jewish nation, whom we hear speaking in the earlier books; and in the last, it is this same Moses worn out with toil, whom we hear repeating the same laws, and inveighing with severity against their infraction. Whatever, therefore, there is in these books of inequality of style, whatever of repetition, and whatever of fragmentary structure, is wholly consistent with the Mosaic authorship, and an argument for it and not against it.

5. A fifth objection to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch springs from the alleged indications that the author intended to make himself known as a different individual from Moses. It is said that the writer speaks of Moses as a third person, and uses of him language of praise and approbation such as no writer would use of himself.

The mere use of the third person cannot be seriously alleged against Moses as the writer, by any one who considers how frequently this method is resorted to by men who give an account of things in which they themselves bore a conspicuous part. How often has it been adopted by military writers, giving the history of their own campaigns. And in ancient times the examples of the same method are patent to all. Cæsar's commentaries on the Gallic war, Xenophon's *Anabasis* and *Memorabilia* of Socrates are cases in point, from classic literature, and the gospels of Matthew and John in the New Testament scriptures and the books of Ezra, Nehemiah and Daniel in the Old. And when a historian attempts a history of his own times, if he has taken a prominent part in public affairs, he becomes a historic personage himself, and faithfulness would seem to suggest that he should be spoken of even by his own pen as others are spoken of. Moses, moreover, wrote under divine inspiration. It was important to the world, and it was the will of the Holy Spirit, that he should be described even by his own pen as the other patriarchs were described.

The passage Num. xii. 8. "Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men that were upon the face of the earth," and that in Exod. vi. 26, 27. "These are that Aaron and Moses, to whom the Lord said, bring the children of Israel from the land of Egypt according to their armies. These are they which spake to Pharaoh, king of Egypt, to bring out the children of Israel; these are that Moses and Aaron;"—these passages are confidently brought forth to prove that the writer of these books was some one other than Moses.

In relation to the first of these passages, some defenders of the genuineness have allowed that it was inserted in the book of Numbers by a later hand, and this probably by some inspired man, as Joshua or Ezra. Others have insisted on the meaning *harrassed* instead of *meek*, as being equally true to the original and more accordant with the context. And others still, admitting the ordinary translation as most probable, have seen in it nothing at war with the supposition that Moses is the writer. He had been deeply wounded, grieved, and insulted by Miriam and Aaron, not only as to his public character, but in a private way well suited to disturb his domestic peace. Any other person would have been filled with resentment and have stood aloof even from his own flesh. But he, Moses, was very meek and free from resentment. The Holy Spirit who inspired him to record his own delinquencies and shame, inspired him also to speak of this the cause of his patience under so great an injury. He was accused of arrogance and usurpation, but he was far from it, the pattern of meekness. In like manner He who spoke as never man spake, says, "learn of me for I am meek and lowly of heart." And either of these solutions disposes of the difficulty which the words occasion.

The other passage, "These are that Aaron and Moses," cannot have been inserted to show who were the persons by whom the deliverance from Egypt was effected. This was known to all, small and great, and could not be forgotten. It was rather designed to shew the importance of the genealogy there inserted, and to show too why this genealogy was inserted at all and in that place.

6. And finally, it is alleged that in the Pentateuch are found traces of a later age than that of Moses.

It is impossible for us now to consider all these. The more important must serve as an example of the rest.

In Gen. xii. 6, it is said, "The Canaanite was then in the land" and in xiii. 7. "And the Canaanite and Perizzite dwelled then in the land." These passages, it is maintained, could only be written after the expulsion of these tribes by Joshua, and therefore were not written by Moses. Some have met the difficulty by supposing that the original dwelling of these tribes was on the Red Sea, and that the writer affirms that they had already migrated to the region where Abraham was. Others, as Hengstenberg, that the first mention of these tribes is to show how destitute and forlorn Abraham, the possessor of the promise, was, that he owned not a foot of land, and that the better portions were already occupied by the Canaanites. And, in the last instance, the presence of the Canaanite and Perizzite showed more strongly how Abraham and Lot were hemmed in, and how unfortunate the dissensions between them were, in the presence of numerous and hostile tribes. Again, it is alleged that the city of Hebron, Gen. xiii. 18, xxxiii. 2; Num. xiii. 2, 3, did not receive this name till after the death of Moses. See Josh. xiv. 15, xv. 13. But it is plain that Hebron was the original name, that the city was afterwards called after Arba, a noted man among the Anakim, and the name Hebron was subsequently restored by the Israelites. The writer of the book of Joshua affirms that the place which had been called Kirjath Arba, was now called Hebron, but does not affirm that Hebron was not its original name. It is plain from Gen. xxxv. 27, that it bore also the name of Mamre, in the days of Abraham, but neither of these temporary names permanently displaced the original.

It is affirmed that the name Dan, Gen. xiv. 14, is post-Mosaic. Its early name, Josh. xix. 47, Judges xviii. 29, was Laish or Leshem, and it is also alleged that it was not called Dan till it was captured by the Danites in the days of Joshua. Some of the advocates of the genuineness have resorted to "the spirit of prophecy," which is supposed to have enabled Moses to anticipate the name, others have conjectured that the hand of a later prophet who substituted the more modern for the more ancient name in the writings of Moses here appears. Others contend,

with more probability, that there were two towns of the same name, one Dan-Jaan, 2 Sam. xxiv. 6, the other Dan-Laish, and that it is the first which is spoken of in the books of Moses, and which was, at that time, called Dan; and the last, which had conferred upon it this name after the conquest, which is spoken of in Joshua and Judges

Another of these difficulties is presented in the following quotation from Dr. Nott, quoted by him, from Munk.

“In chapter xxxii. of Numbers, verses 34—38. mention is made of a number of towns built by the tribes of Gad and Reuben. Moses being dead a short time after the conquest of the country which he gave to these two tribes, could not have witnessed the construction of these towns. In the same chapter, verse 41, the *villages of Jair* are mentioned, thus called after Jair, a descendant of Manasseh. Deuteronomy, chap iii verse 14, says that they are so called *to this day*, which leaves the inference that the author was not a cotemporary of the building of the villages; but what augments the difficulty is, that according to Judges (chap. x. verse 4) the name *villages of Jair* is derived from the *Judge Jair* who inhabited the country of Gilead. How could the author of the book of Judges be ignorant of what the books of Moses say of the origin of this name? Thus the existence of the villages of Jair, in the time of Moses, becomes very problematical, and Moses could not have written the two passages of Numbers and Deuteronomy.”

In reference to this we remark, in the first place, that there is nothing said of the building of “the villages of J. air,” but only of their conquest; in the second place that the conquest and settlement of the trans-Jordanic country was made in the life time of Moses; that the conquest was in the first incursion of the Israelites into the territory of Bashan; that the temporary settlement of their families would occupy no very long time; that the phrase “unto this day” while it refers to past time and may refer to the *distant* past, does also not unfrequently refer to a *nearer* past,* Comp. Josh. xxii. 3 xxiii. 9 That names given to places do not always hold. It was proper to remark that the name Havoith-Jair given to the towns assigned to Jair, now after some months was still retained,

* So the Latin *Usque hodie*. A phrase of this kind becomes stereotyped and hackneyed, and loses a part of the force it originally had.

that Jair still held possession of them, and that they had not been wrested from his hands. And what is more natural than the supposition that the Jair in the days of Moses may have transmitted his honorable name (*the illustrious,*) to his descendant. It was common with the Hebrews, as it is with the moderns, to name children, even for generations, after a parent or illustrious ancestor. With the new fortunes and honours of the family in the person of Jair the eighth judge of Israel, the ancient name Havoth Jair, towns of Jair, which still belonged to this family, as their domain, acquired a new currency.

The author speaks of "the other side Jordan."—"These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel on the other side Jordan."—Deut. i. 1; iii. 8. These indicate, it is said, a writer different from Moses who lived in Palestine after the conquest. The difficulty was noted by Aben-Ezra, is urged by Spinoza, Hartmann, Dr. Cooper and all the opponents of the Mosaic origin. But it is evident that the Hebrew term *be'eber* sometime means, by usage, *on this side*, and sometimes *on the other side* of the Jordan, or rather it *refers* now to countries on the one side, and now to countries on the other side. But in how many instances have the terms *on this side* and *on the other side*, in different languages, come to have a standing geographical signification. Transalpine and Cisalpine Gaul, the Trans-Danubian and Cis-Danubian provinces, Hither and Further India, are familiar examples. So in the Scriptures, both Hebrew and Greek, the Trans-Jordanic and Cis-Jordanic country are spoken of in a similar way, and have been from the earliest times. The name *Peræa* for the land beyond the Jordan, is a more modern designation signifying the same thing. An English or an American Missionary might write us from the Burman Empire, and refer familiarly to it as *India beyond the Ganges*. Again, forgetting this ancient geographical designation and referring only to his own local position, he might speak of the same country as the region *this side* the Ganges. Precisely the same usage exists in scripture, and the phrase, therefore, is no proof that the writer using it was on the west side of the Jordan.

The iron bedstead of Og, king of Bashan, Deut. iii. 11, has furnished material for another of these objections.

His iron bed-stead would not have been described, and it would not have been circumstantially mentioned as being in Rabbath of the children of Ammon by Moses. The facts would all be known to the men of that day. There was no necessity of referring to such a voucher of Og's extraordinary size. But it must be remembered that Moses wrote for posterity, and not for his cotemporaries alone; that his object was to show the greatness of the conquered enemy, and to magnify that divine intervention which secured the victory. And as to the dimensions stated, men of gigantic proportions have existed in modern times, bedsteads are always longer and broader than the men who sleep upon them, and something, we may well suppose, was added by the gigantic king from motives of ostentation.

We pass by all other alleged anachronisms in the Pentateuch to notice Gen. xxxvi. 31. "And these are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel."

There are those who from this passage and Deut. xvii. insist that the Pentateuch could not have been written till after the times of David, when kings were actually reigning "over the children of Israel." But the establishment of a kingly government was not an accident, which was unforeseen and unprovided for. In the promise to Jacob, Gen. xxxv. 11, it said, "a nation and a company of nations shall be of thee; and *kings* shall come out of thy loins." So also Gen. xvii. 6, 16. The erection of a kingdom was a necessary step in the developement of the divine plan respecting the people. The kings were to be the precursors and types of the Messiah, on his mediatorial throne, as the priesthood were to be his types in the sacerdotal office. The words "before there reigned," &c. may be a gloss inserted by a later hand. If so, as perhaps most of the defenders of the Pentateuch regard it, it can furnish no objection against the genuineness of the book at large. Yet it will always be evident that to a prophet like Moses, under the illumination of the spirit, future things may be referred to with the same certainty as the past, and the fulfilment of the prophecy be as much regarded by the mind, as the prophecy itself.

But we are compelled to bring this article abruptly to a

close. The Pentateuch has in all ages, except by those few men who have of late opposed it, been acknowledged to be the writing of Moses. Unmistakeable traces of it may be found in the books of Joshua, Judges, and Kings, in the prophecies of Hosea and Amos, and in other parts of the Old Testament, plainly showing that the existence of that book preceded the composition of these. No period can be fixed upon for writing of the Pentateuch if it is assumed to be a forgery. Nor can we reconcile such a supposition with the inspiration of Christ and the Apostles, who continually quote the Pentateuch as "the words," "the writing," "the law of Moses." These are points which we would be glad to expand and establish. There are others, also, belonging to the subject, of equal importance, which we must at present omit to notice. We are fully conscious that those even which we have touched upon, might have been treated with greater completeness and fulness, and if opportunity shall serve, the subject may be resumed hereafter.

NOTE TO PAGE 259.

The controversy respecting the composition of the Pentateuch, is by no means of recent origin. The early Gnostics, Manichæans and Nazarenes are said to have doubted its Mosaic origin. But Prof. Palfrey has shown that these were dogmatical difficulties arising out of their peculiar notions, rather than objections to its Mosaic origin. Lect. vol. i. p. 78, et seq. Isaac Ben Jasos, in the beginning of the eleventh century, put forth some obscure objections to its genuineness. But it was not until the 12th century that the voice of doubt, respecting its authorship, was fully heard. Aben-Ezra, who wrote in this century, pointed out a number of passages as written by a later hand than that of Moses, but without intending to impugn the authority of the Pentateuch as a genuine production of the Jewish lawgiver, nor indeed any portion of it as an inspired writing.

*Andrew Masius** also, in the latter part of the 16th century,

*In his Commentary on Joshua xix. 47.

suggested that the particular portions of the five books of Moses were brought together by Ezra or some other inspired man, who lived long subsequent to Moses.

Thomas Hobbes, the celebrated English Deist, in his *Leviathan*, published in London in 1651, advances the opinion that the Pentateuch takes its name from Moses, because he was the principal actor in the events recorded in these writings, and not because he wrote them. He believed, however, that those portions of which it is expressly asserted in the book itself that Moses wrote them, and the law as contained in Deut. from the xith to xxviiith chaps. are the composition of the Jewish lawgiver.

Isaac Peyrere, in 1655, author of the theory of the *Praeadamites*, believed that the Pentateuch was compiled from journals left by Moses, and from documents which existed before him, from which Moses made out a chronicle of events reaching down to his own times. The first compilation was "the Book of the Wars of the Lord," and this was the foundation of the book of Numbers. Deuteronomy he supposed was not composed until after the times of David.

Benedict Spinoza, a learned but skeptical Jew, and author of the modern Pantheistic System, in his *Tractat. Theol. Polem.* Hamburg, 1670, was the first who entirely denied to the Pentateuch a Mosaic origin. He maintained that Deuteronomy was the earliest of the historical books of the O. T. and maintains that this and all the other historical books were written by Ezra. The same opinion was expressed by *Anthony Van Dale* in his dissertation *De Origine et Progressu Idololatriae*, published at Amsterdam in 1796.

Richard Simon,* a learned writer of the Roman Church in 1678, conjectured that the *substance* of the Pentateuch was derived from Moses, *i. e.* that Moses wrote the Laws, that public Scribes appointed by him kept a daily record of public transactions, that from these a compilation was made by some Scribe or Prophet, at a later day, in that form in which the Pentateuch now appears.

Le Clerc,† a Dutch Divine in 1685, conjectured that the Pentateuch was the work of the Priest sent by the King of Babylon to Samaria, to instruct the colonists who had been settled there, in the Mosaic form of religion.‡ *Le Clerc* lived to retract this opinion.

One hundred years after *Le Clerc*, *J. G. Hasse*, a German,

* *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament*. Rotterdam, 1685; Dupin on the Canon, vol. i. page 61, 62. † *Le Clerc*, *Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande*, &c. Amsterd. 1681. ‡ See 2 Kings, xvii. 27 seq.

conjectured that the Pentateuch was composed in the Babylonish captivity. But he, like his predecessor Le Clerc, retracted his opinion. Fulda maintained that some parts were derived from Moses, but that the whole was first reduced to order in the times of David. Nachtigal, that the five books were compiled from many old collections during the exile, perhaps by Jeremiah.* Staudlin,† that much of the Pentateuch is later than the days of the Jewish Legislator; that the book has either been composed at a later period, or has been greatly interpolated by a later hand. Bauer, that the Pentateuch cannot be older than David.‡ Vater, that Deuteronomy is later than David, and that the whole was not brought into its present form until the time of Ezra || De Wette is of the opinion that the five books of Moses were composed, substantially, some time between the reign of David and the Babylonish captivity; but received their present form after the exile.¶ Augusti agrees substantially with De Wette.¶ Berthold supposes that the Pentateuch was brought into the form in which we have it by Samuel and that the copy written by him was the copy found by Hilkiah, the Priest in the days of Joshua. Hartmann supposes that all excepting the registers of names, and of the encampments of the Israelites, and the ten commandments, were composed between the reign of David and the Exile.* Herbst of Tübingen, believes the materials genuine, but supposes them to have been first brought together by Ezra and the one hundred and twenty elders who composed the Great Synagogue.† Gesenius, that Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers, contain many portions which belong in the days of the Prophets. but that Deuteronomy was composed after the captivity, at which time the whole Pentateuch first received its present form ‡ Schumann makes Ezra the author. Ammon supposes the Pentateuch was planned by Moses, continued down to Solomon, forgotten in the season of idolatry, rediscovered under Josiah; retouched and edited under the name of Moses. Pustkuchen,|| Hoffman of Jena,§ Ilgen, Gramberg. Staehelin, Von Bohlen, Vatke, and Tuch, follow on the same side.

* Neue Versuch, &c. Helmstadt, 1796. † Geschichte der christliche Sittenlehre, Göttingen, 1799. ‡ Entwurf einer hist. kritisch. Einleit. in die Schrift. d. Alt. Test. Nürnberg, 1806. || Abhandlung ueber Mose und die Verfasser d. Pent. Halle, 1805 § Beitragen zur Einleit. in das Alt. Test. Halle, 1806, 1807. ¶ Grundriss einer hist. krit. Einleit. in's alt. Test. Leipzig, 1806.

* Linguist. Einleit. u. s. w. Bremen, 1818, and Hist. krit. Forschungen ueber d. fünf Bücher Mose's, Rostock, 1831. † Observat. quaedam de Pent. quatuor libr. poster. auctore et editore in the Commentationes Theologicæ, Lips. 1825. ‡ Geschicht. der Heb. Sprache und Schrift, Leipz, 1817, also Commentatio de Pent. Samar. Halae, 1815. || Urgeschichte der Menschheit, Lemgo, 1821. § In a periodical at Leipzig, 1822.

On the other, and in favor of the genuineness of the Pentateuch as a writing of Moses, are found Mansveldt,* Kuper,† Daniel Hu-
et,‡ Le Clerc in his later and maturer writings,|| Du Pin, Bol-
ville,§ Heidegger, Carpzov, Herman Witsius¶ in his *Miscellanea
Sacra*. John Dav. Michaelis in his *Einleit in Schrift. des A.
Bundes*,* Jerusalem in his *Letters on the Mosaic Writings*,† the
celebrated Eichorn,‡ Eckermann,|| Jahn § Kelle,¶ Kritzsch,*
Kanne,† Griesinger,‡ Scheibel of Breslau,|| E. F. C. Ro-
emueler,§ De Luc,¶ Krummacher,* Hagel,† Pfister,‡ Ranke,
Hengstenberg. Drechsler, Havernick, Bleek, Koenig, and Sack;
Pästoret|| and Salvador,§ in France; and Graves,¶ Horne,* and
Marsh,† in England; and Schacht,‡ Woerman.|| Pareau,§ and
Muntinghe,¶ in Holland; and Mr. Means, Prof. Stowe, and
Prof. B. B. Edwards, in America.

In addition to these, the great body of theologians of all
countries, have been convinced that the Pentateuch is none
other than the genuine production of the Jewish Legislator;
and that the fact is as clearly proved by tradition, as we have
any right to expect in relation to a book of such high antiquity.

Those who have impugned the genuineness of the Pentateuch,
have been men whose theories have predisposed them to over-
look the evidence in its favor. A large portion of these have

* Regneri a Mansvelt. *adv. Theologo-Policum*, Amstel. 1674. † *Ar-
cana Atheismi*, Rotterdam, 1676. ‡ *Demonstratio Evangelica*, Lips. 1703.
|| *Dissertat. III. de Scriptore Pentateuchi Mose*, prefixed to his *Comm.* Am-
stelod. 1696. § *Reponse au Livre intit. Sentimens, &c.* Rotterdam, 1686.—
¶ *Miscellanea Sacra*, Lugdun, Batav. 1736.

* Hamburg, 1787. † Braunschweig, 1783. ‡ *Versuch einer Beleuchtung
d. Geschichte des jud. und Christ. Bibelkanon's*, Halle, 1792. || *Theol.
Beitragen* Altona, 1796. § *Jahn's Einleitung*. Vienna, 1803. Translated
by Prof. Turner of New York. ¶ In a work published at Freyburg, 1811,
1812

* *Prufung der Grunde mit welchen die Aechtheit der Bucher Mose's bes-
tritten worden ist*, Leipz. 1814. † *Biblische Untersuchungen*, Erlangen,
1819. ‡ *Ueber den Pentateuch*. Stuttgard, 1806. || *Untersuchungen ueber
Bibel*, Breslau, 1816. § In the third edition of his *Commentaries*, Leipzig,
1821. ¶ *Grundsätze der Theologiae, Theodicee, und Moral.*

* *Paragraphen zu der heiligen Geschichte*, Berlin, 1818. † *Apologie des
Moses*, Sulzbach, 1828. ‡ *Gedanken und Betrachtungen ueber die funf Bu-
cher Mosis*, 1826. || *Aistoire de la Legislation*, Paris, 1822. § *Loi de Moise*,
Paris, 1822. ¶ *Lectures on the Pentateuch*, London, 1808.

* *Introduction, &c.* † *Authenticity of the five books of Moses vindicated.*
‡ *Animadversiones ad Antiq. Heb. Traj. ad Rhen.* 1810. || *Commentatio
de libr. Vet. Foed. præstantia Traj. ad Rhen.* 1821. § *Commentatio de im-
mortalitatis, ac vitae futurae notitiis*, Daventriae, 1807. Also *Instit. Interp.*
Traj. ad Rhen. 1822. ¶ *Brevis expositio critices Vet. Fœderis*, Gronin-
gae, 1827.

been infidels, as Spinoza, Volney,* Voltaire, Hobbes, the author of the Wolfenbittel Fragments, and others. The rest have mostly been men who, with Gesenius, Berthold, and De Wette, have no belief in the Scriptures as a book penned by Inspiration.

ARTICLE VIII.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *A Sermon on Election, by FRANCIS BOWMAN, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Greensborough, Ga.*
2. *The Doctrine of Election, stated, defended and applied, in three discourses, by Rev. E. P. ROGERS, Pastor of First Presbyterian Church, Augusta, Ga., with an Introductory Essay by Rev. THOMAS SMYTH, D. D., Charleston, S. C., 12 mo. pp. 104.*

We are presented here with a series of discourses on an important and often assailed doctrine of the Scriptures; which, though drawn from the same text, is viewed in different aspects by their respective authors.

The sermon of Mr. Bowman, which comes in the modest dress of a pamphlet, aims not so much to vindicate the doctrine, as to show its accordance with the Scriptures, and with the general experience of all true Christians. He says: "My design is not so much to prove the truth of this glorious doctrine, as it is to illustrate the meaning of it, and to show that there is a substantial agreement respecting it, among all truly evangelical Christians." This agreement he affirms in the following language: "True believers in Christ, however, have, in every age, held it with unyield-

* Volney supposes that the Pentateuch contains some things written by Moses, but that the compilation is the joint labour of Hilkiyah the Priest, Jeremiah the Prophet, Shaphan the Scribe and Achbor, King Josiah superintending and giving his aid. That the book was compiled to afford encouragement to the Jews in their conflicts with the nations around them.