

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XV.—NO. 2.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXII.

ARTICLE I.

Commentar ueber die Genesis von FRANZ DELITZSCH. Dritte durchaus umgearbeitete Ausgabe. Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke. 1860; pp. 648, 8vo.

Silent leges inter arma. In a sense quite different is this true, from that in which the words were pronounced by the Roman orator in his defence of Milo. He affirmed it of the observance of laws, and not of the principles which are their basis. Literature and science, the quiet studies of the scholar, and the profound researches of the philosopher and jurist, are unheeded amid the din of war. When the halcyon days of peace return, it may again be said, *Cedunt arma togæ*, and the sword will be beaten into the plough-share once more, and the spear into the pruning-hook. But when there is on the earth distress of nations, with perplexity, the waves and the sea roaring, and men's hearts failing them for fear and for looking after those things which are coming upon the earth, it requires an absorption in study, like that of Archimedes at the capture of Syracuse, to enable one to hold on his way in the ordinary pursuits of the scholar. Halls of learning are deserted of

VOL. XV., NO. II.—21

their votaries; professor and pupil, and in many instances the minister and men of his charge, have gone forth to do battle for their country. And the voice of wailing over our slain is heard amid the triumphs of victory. He alone can command attention who discourses on some topic directly connected with this great struggle.

In ordinary times, we could show to the reader's satisfaction that there are topics which cover all time and space occupied by human beings and their acts, more important than those things which agitate us now. Religion lifts its voice in war and in peace, and the sacred books which are the treasure-house of our faith and hope and consolation, are dear to us at all times, and especially in seasons of public sorrow.

The first book of the canonical Scriptures we have always esteemed as one of the most interesting and important in the entire canon. In the same light is it regarded by the author, the title of whose commentary we have placed at the head of this article. The book of Genesis, or of the beginning of the world and man, says he, is the anticipation of the Thora (or Law); and the Thora is the anticipation of the Old Testament; and this, the anticipation of the religion of redemption; and redemption, the anticipation of the present world and its history; so that upon the pillars of this book rests the fabric of our salvation, which projects forward into eternity. What the four Gospels are in the New Testament, the five books of the Law are in the Old. The parallel strikes deep. The Gospel of Matthew agrees, at its commencement, with the Genesis of the Old Testament. It is the *βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*; and the Gospel of John has so near a relationship with no Old Testament book as it has with Deuteronomy. Not merely their beginnings, but the beginning and the end of the Old and New Testament canon coincide. Genesis and the Apocalypse, the Alpha and Omega of the canonical Scripture, run into each other, forming a complete circle. The

creation of the present heavens and the present earth upon the first pages of Genesis, answers to the creation of the new heavens and the new earth upon the last pages of the Apocalypse; the first creation, which had for its scope the first Adam, to the new creation, which takes its beginning from the second Adam. Thus the Holy Scripture forms a rounded, finished whole, to show that not merely this or that book, but also the entire canon, is the work of the Holy Spirit. Genesis and the Law in general with its *σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων*, is the sacred root, the Apocalypse, the top of the tree stretching upward into the *αἰὼν μέλλων*.

Again: he claims that it is an exceedingly important book, on account of its rich contents. What is true of the entire Thora (or Law), is true of Genesis, that it is an unexhausted sea of knowledge, a mine of treasured wisdom not yet lifted to the light, a casket of undiscovered gems and mysteries, for which reason the Lord (Matt. 5: 18) says that ere heaven and earth shall pass away, every *ἰῶτα* and every *κεραία* awaits its fulfilment. *Nihil pulchrius Genesi, nihil utilius*, Luther takes pains to say, in reference to its wealth of contents. Indeed, Church exposition has always applied itself with more especial fondness to Genesis than to the other books of the Thora, though a path lies still before it, further than the eye can reach, to the complete understanding of it. The means of understanding and verifying this book lie not only in the depths of the soul, but in the depths of the earth, also, into which the description of the primeval world descends; and not merely the walls of Egyptian temples and catacombs, but the customs of the Tungusians and Delawares, not merely the rubbish of Babylonish ruins and the buried monuments of ancient Assyria, but the heights of the Himalaya and the depths of the Dead Sea, aid in the interpretation of this peculiar book. Its historical contents stretch over a term of two thousand three hundred years; or, more exactly, two thousand three hundred and six years, from the creation to the

death of Joseph. If we divide the whole history into the two great halves of a history of the primeval world and a history of the contemporaneous period, separated by the introduction of sin and the counsel of redemption consequent thereon, then the three first chapters contain a complete history of the primeval world; and the history of the author's own times follows, in three periods, of which the first reaches from the fall to the flood (ch. 4-8 : 14); the second from the covenant with Noah to the confusion of tongues and the dispersion of nations (ch. 8 : 15—ch. 11); the third from the vocation of Abraham to the settlement of Jacob's family in Egypt (ch. 12-50). These are the three first stages in the history of salvation, according to which, in divine mercy, universal and national history assumes its form. This universal and national historical foundation of the history of salvation gives to Genesis a richness of contents incomparable within the canonical literature.

The author argues the exceeding importance of this book from its very high antiquity in comparison with the literature of other nations, and even this inspires us with confidence in it. The Vedas in their present form were probably not composed after the seventh century before Christ, but were written not much earlier than this; the Rigveda only, Wilson, after the example of Colebrooke, removes back to the fourteenth or fifteenth century before Christ, and therefore to the Mosiac period, yet by a very unsafe conjecture. Of the Zend-books, those written in the later dialect, according to the investigations of Spiegel, belong to about the time of Alexander the Great; those in the older dialect are, notwithstanding this, later than Artaxerxes the Third, and scarcely as old as Cyrus. None of these books proceeded from Zoroaster himself. The Schuking of Confutse (Confucius) is of the sixth century before Christ. The question whether it contains older fragments, is, according to Gutzlaff's statement, still undecided. Only a few Egyptian papyri can measure in antiquity with the

Thora, and these, in comparison with it, are only annalistic fragments of limited contents. The Thora is a many-membered historical work, possessing unity of plan, embracing the entire world, and dating back to the sixteenth century before Christ, to which only a few of the papyrus rolls in the Egyptian collections at London, Turin, Leyden, and Berlin, reach back.

In words of similar import to these, does Delitzsch speak of the importance of the book of Genesis. Indeed, if it did not stand at the vestibule of the inspired Scriptures, how almost inexplicable would the whole volume which opens the plan of redemption be to us, and how many questions of interest to ourselves and to the entire race, as to the world and man, as to our moral disease and its remedy, as to the origin of nations and the Church of God, would be incapable of solution.

From the highest and sublimest summits of our New Testament Scriptures, we may well say, with Gregory of Nazianzen, "Let us descend to Moses, the Ocean of Theology, from which come all the rivers and every sea." *Πρὸς Μουσεία καταβαίνωμεν, τὸν τῆς θεολογίας ὠκεανὸν, ἐξ οὗ πάντες ποταμοὶ καὶ πᾶσα θάλασσα.* For, as every portion of the New Testament presupposes the Old, so does every portion of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments presuppose this sacred book, in which the sources, if not of their wisdom, yet of their just interpretation, are found.

The interpretation of Genesis has reflected the different periods of Old Testament exegesis. The theological interpretation began with the Church Fathers, but was perverted and obscured by a foolish fondness for allegory. In Augustine, for example, against the Manicheans, the story of Eden is lost in clouds and vapor. Paradise stands for the *felicity of man*, the four streams are the *four virtues*, the coats of skins are a *life of immortality*, the cherubim are the *plenitude of knowledge*, the flaming sword is *temporal punishment*. He, however, afterwards, in his retractions, admits

that he had carried the figurative interpretation too far. The Middle Ages followed chiefly in the same track. By insisting on this spiritualizing and ethical method, all true exegesis was rendered impossible. The period of the Reformation, on the contrary, brought the verbal sense into favor, the word being valued as containing an exhaustless fulness of truth. The Holy Spirit, says Luther, is the simplest writer and speaker in heaven or in earth. His words can have no more than one simple sense, the one right, chief sense, which the letters give. His Latin Commentary on Genesis, which embodies his lectures on this book continued through a period of ten years and finished three months before his death, is the precious and ripe fruit of a true spiritual recognition of the letter of the Old Testament, and marks an era in Old Testament exegesis. But Calvin's distinguished gift for exegetical labors, his sagacious and penetrating mind, his earnestness of soul, and his knowledge which had its root in a deep experience of the things of God, give an unspeakable value to his Commentary on this book. In him the theological exposition of the Pentateuch reached its height. The Commentaries of these two reformers, contain more than all the Church Fathers put together; and in theological interpretation, in which Calvin especially excels, more than all who have followed after.

The Commentaries of Calovius and Gerhard among the Lutherans, and of John Mercerus among the Calvinists, are to be mentioned with respect. On the contrary, the two Arminian interpreters, Grotius and Le Clerc, regard Genesis from a mere deistical point of view—from one almost profane—and wholly foreign from that which reigns throughout the Old Testament Scriptures. Between these two writers appeared the celebrated work of Spencer, at that time head of Corpus Christi College at Cambridge. This work, which has had no small influence on subsequent writers, traces the rites of the Mosaic ritual to a heathen origin,

and holds that they were adopted by God to meet the superstitious feelings of the Jews, because they were consecrated by long use among many nations, and some of them He knew to be "*endurable trifles*." He held it to be probable that God delivered some things of peculiar sanctity under the veil of symbols and types, on account of a similar custom among the wise men of heathen nations, especially the Egyptians. He thus gave to all these rites a low and human origin; they were adopted by God on the low ground of expediency, and not with the view of foreshadowing the great atoning work which was to be accomplished in the person of His Son, and of setting forth our need of redemption through His blood.

Le Clerc (Clericus) followed in the same line. He takes a low view of all the peculiarities of the Sacred Scriptures. Circumcision is, in his apprehension, a rite so inconvenient, so devoid of decency, contributing so little to good morals, that it could not have been instituted by the Most High. Abraham had witnessed it in Egypt, and was favorably impressed by it; and out of condescension to our weakness, He commanded its practice. He suggests that the tree of life was probably a tree of medicinal virtue, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil a poisonous tree, which the prudent would avoid, but the imprudent would partake of and come to a knowledge of good and evil they did not possess before. The cherubim and flaming sword are explained of the flaming naphtha or bitumen, abounding on the plains of Babylon, as now on the shores of the Caspian, and debarring Adam from Paradise. Miracles are diminished down, and become merely extraordinary natural events; unusual, yet lying within the province of second causes.

John David Michaelis, in his Remarks for the Unlearned, (*Anmerkungen für Ungelehrte*), and in his Laws of Moses, (*Mosaisches Recht*), has followed in a path equally objectionable. Professedly, he is an apologist for the Bible,

not in the more ancient and noble sense of the word, but, alas! in the more modern sense. His own political principles, says Hengstenberg, were not the growth of a Christian soil. French writers were his teachers. With an inflated idea of his own supremacy in the walks of biblical learning, and standing almost on the low platform of those objectors to the Scriptures to whom he would recommend them, he patronizingly takes Moses under his protection, and in these intolerably gossiping works seeks to recommend him on the low grounds of political expediency. He attributed to the legislation of Moses a certain kind of artifice, in giving a religious air to rules of mere human prudence. The purification of the camp was made a religious rite, but its simple object was to prevent the existence of that noisome effluvia so apt to exist in such circumstances. The command forbidding the dressing of a kid in its mother's milk, was to accustom the people to dress their food with olive oil, and not with butter which would be less palatable. The prohibition of blood and fat, as belonging to the altar, and appropriate to rites of religious significance, was really to discourage the use of fat by a people liable to diseases of the skin. Every ceremonial law, he strives to show is based upon some medical, dietetic, or juridical principle, instead of possessing the lofty aim of religious instruction, and of adumbrating that great plan of redemption, which was the pattern shown to Moses in the Mount. The entire arrangements about leprosy, instead of being intended to symbolize the sad disease of sin, are explained as mere sanatory regulations, or as designed to remove the shocking cases of this disgusting disease from the eyes of refined society. Moses is thus drawn down into the circle of human legislators, and all reverence for the Bible as the book of God, and of its religion as a direct revelation from heaven, is wholly lost.

This decadence from the true spirit of Old Testament exegesis, reached its lowest depths in Germany in the arbi-

trary and dry Commentary on the Pentateuch, of Vater, 1802-1805; in the learned, but, alas! unbelieving and shameless exposition of Genesis by Pétér von Bohlen, in 1835. The Scholia of Rosenmüller, chiefly drawn from Le Clerc, the philologically able *Annotatio perpetua in Genesin*, of G. A. Schumann, and especially the independent, and, in all the externals pertaining to the text, careful Commentary of Tuch, 1838, leave so far a favorable impression, as we see that at last the natural earthly element of sacred history has reached a quiet and ascertained value, after interpretation has so long allegorized and dogmatized, apart from all historical truth. Herder did great service and gained great credit, by slaying rationalism with its own weapons; by teaching men to admire and love the Scripture as a human, popular, oriental, and ancient book, for the beauty of its poetry, the depth of its meaning, and the imperishableness of its contents. But, alas! he had no relish for the Scriptures as a divine revelation, no interest in Christianity as the religion of redemption. But what Herder was for the human side of Scripture, that Hamann became for their divine side. They supplement each other, and together represent the conception of the divine and the human in this wonderful book. Herder stands in the porch, and Hamann upon the threshold of the Holy of Holies. They (says Delitzsch, to whom and to Hengstenberg we are chiefly indebted for this historic view of the exposition of Genesis,) are not alone, but preceded others who have learned to keep in view the divine and the human, the eternal and the temporal, the spiritual and the natural of Scripture. We retain this language of Delitzsch, though aware that, unless properly understood, it may imply an erroneous view of the doctrine of inspiration.

Delitzsch speaks approvingly of the writings of F. C. Freiherrn and F. A. Krummacher, as replete with fine ethical hints of profound views of the history of redemption. And he bestows high praise on the unfinished Commentary

of J. N. Tiele, (Erlangen, 1836,) and still higher on the theological Commentary upon the Pentateuch of Mich. Baumgarten, (Kiel, 1843-44,) which he says is the first continued and complete Commentary which holds itself aloof from false spiritualism on the one side and superficial dullness on the other, and seeks to present the grammatico-historical and the spiritual as the two sides of true theological exegesis. These, with the two popular works—"Bible-Hours on the First Book of Moses," by F. J. Ph. Helm, (Stuttgart, 1845,) and "The First Book of Moses, expounded by F. W. J. Schröder," (Berlin, 1846,)—Delitzsch names, as affording delightful security that the Church has ripened to the *ætas virilis ac regia* of Scripture interpretation, and that the thunder-storm of rationalism must have served to bring a new fructifying rain upon the heritage of the Lord.

Omitting various popular works of German scholars and divines on Genesis, of which that of Otto von Gerlach, translated into English, and published in 1860, by Clark of Edinburgh, as part of their theological library, is the best, we come to the work of Delitzsch, now before us. It has reached its third edition, which the author informs us has been wrought over anew, so that but few pages retain their earlier form. The many-sided researches of modern times, so far, at least, as found in the German language, the writer has passed in review, availing himself of whatever could contribute to elucidate this ancient and inspired book. His Commentary is written with much spirit, shows the author to be a man of profound learning, who does not fear to hold forth amid the sceptical scholars of his own land believing views of the Sacred Scriptures, and to trace the successive stages in the plan of redemption which they reveal. The latter part of Genesis, from chapter 12, is dispatched in a manner far too summary. Yet every student of the book knows that the weightier matters, and those which, from the brevity of the narrative and the re.

mote antiquity of the events, require the most extensive research and the most elaborate treatment, are crowded together in the first pages. Delitzsch belongs to the evangelical school of German scholars; still, there are views of his which our readers will be slow to adopt. He has, however, selected his topics with judgment, and comprises in a moderate-sized octavo much learned and suggestive exposition. In our English literature, besides the old and well-known works on the whole Pentateuch; Ainsworth's Annotations, 1699; Kidder, Commentary on the Five Books of Moses, 1713; Parker, *Bibliotheca Biblica*, 1720, 1735; Jamieson's Critical and Practical Exposition, 1748; we have Graves' Lectures on the Pentateuch, 1815; Bush on Genesis, in 1839, followed by his Commentaries on the other books; Turner's Companion to Genesis, 1841; and Jamieson, (Robert, D. D., of Glasgow,) "The Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, with an original and copious critical and explanatory Commentary," republished by Martien, Philadelphia, 1860—a book which is indeed valuable, but hardly comes up in copiousness to the promise of its title-page.

Of the various points discussed by Delitzsch in his introduction, one of the first is the antiquity of the book of Genesis. The oldest papyri which preceded the Thora, the autographs of the primitive times of which they treat, as well as the autograph of the Thora itself, which was deposited in the Ark of the Covenant, are alike irrecoverably lost. The earliest manuscripts which introduced the Thora to Europe scarcely reach the ninth century of the Christian era. One only, at Odessa, (from Derbend in Daghestan,) boasts of a higher antiquity. Are we, then, justified, he asks, to place the composition of the Pentateuch, including Genesis, in the Mosaic times, and so defy the results of modern criticism, which refer it to a period far later?

To this he replies, that the authenticity of the Thora, and the integrity of its text as well, are securities for the high

antiquity of its composition, which no monument of Egyptian literature can produce. The Jewish people itself, with its entire post-Mosaic history and literature, is the living, unperishable, and infallible papyrus on which, as with the finger of God, the text of the Thora stands written. The post-Mosaic history presupposes the Sinaitic law as already reduced to writing. The post-Mosaic literature, the oldest as well as the latest, utters a many-voiced testimony for the priority of the Thora, in the form in which it lies before us in the Pentateuch. Both these propositions he holds with unlimited assurance against all the hypotheses, in their various forms, which place the composition of the Pentateuch more or less late in the post-Mosaic period.

In proof, he adduces (1) the relations of the post-Mosaic *history* to the Thora. Both the bright and the dark side of this history, presuppose the existence of the Thora. The bright side, because the consecrated nation of Israel, with its worship and institutions, its succession of kings and prophets, as well as all its literary products, points back to the radical unity of a divine documental basis. The dark side, because the constant conflict in which the natural temper of Israel, from the time of the Judges, finds itself with the government of Jehovah, shows that this already had an objective existence in Israel, in the form of a law, which, on this account, could not have sprung from the popular sentiment of that people, but must have been a divine attestation and institute, transplanted into the centre of its ordinary natural life. We may, in addition to this two-fold proof for the priority of the Thora from the post-Mosaic history, present the following considerations. Whence is it that the post-Mosaic history exhibits no trace of the developement of jurisprudence and legislation, observable in the history of other nations? How gradually did the Roman law develope itself, from its first indication in the Law of the Twelve Tables, (449 B. C.) till it was codified in the time of the Cæsars! In the

history of Israel, on the contrary, there was in existence, from the time of the Judges, a system of law which regulated the conduct of men. The law did not first come into being in the course of the post-Mosaic history. It existed already, and yet, for centuries, as in the times of the Judges and Kings, it remained so inactive and devoid of influence, that it could not have existed as a custom or usage, it must have existed as a letter, a writing, which could be forgotten and thrown into a corner, and again brought forth and read, and assert its divine authority over Israel. This actually took place in the eighteenth year of Josiah, when Hilkiah, the priest, found the Book of the Law in the Temple; 2 K. 22; 2 Chron. 34.

If the Mosaic Law had not existed at the rending of the nation into two kingdoms, in immoveable and acknowledged authenticity, says Delitzsch, how entirely differently would the religious institutions of the northern kingdom have been regulated! And if it was not already in existence in a written form when the kingdom was divided, when was there a time in the post-Mosaic period when it could have come into being? It could have been written in the times of the Judges, as little as the New Testament could in the Middle Ages. The period of the Judges was a period of comparative barbarism, in which Israel was dispersed into different clanships, and there was a mixture in them of Israelites and heathen of the Canaanites. There was no renowned prophet; the priesthood lay in a depressed condition; and the men of acknowledged influence knew how to handle the sword, rather than to guide the pen. Delitzsch proceeds to show that the Book of the Law could not have had its origin in the times of Samuel, or of Saul, or of David and Solomon, or in the times of the rending of the kingdom, or of the Exile, or of *Ezra*. He was a Luther, who, when the mass of the people had fallen into a heathenish barbarism and religious ignorance, as a סֵפֶר or Scribe, restored the written word of God to its former

valuation and honor. His agency was, throughout, only that of a restorer.

Thus the whole post-Mosaic history points back to the Sinaitic legislation, and a codex of the same. The Thora is the living and energetic word of God which pervades this history. The book of Genesis extends the farthest in its influence. The first chapter of Genesis contains the premises of the work of redemption, to which every atom of the world, and every pulse of its history, stands in causal relation.

But if the Thora already existed from the times of Moses as a written document, we would look for manifest traces of it in the literature as well as in the life of Israel. The sacred writers of the subsequent times would refer to it as a Mosaic writing, and would speak in expressions in which the Thora would be reëchoed. This Delitzsch illustrates, in the second place, by considering the *relation it bears to the post-Mosaic literature*. In this part of the argument he shows that its expressions are constantly repeated in the historic books, the Prophets and Psalms. That as Deuteronomy is the *δευτέρωσις*, or repetition of the Law, so the whole Old Testament is the repetition of Deuteronomy. All the history, prophecy, ethics, and poetry of Israel has its foundation and being in the Law of Moses. David is the great master of lyric song, and Isaiah of the prophetic word; but without Moses' Law, there would have been neither a David nor an Isaiah.

The Thora, or Law, is a book of *instruction*, which its name, Thora, (from *הָרָא* to show, to teach,) denotes. It has a unity of purpose, and a regular plan. In reference to the remaining books, it forms an independent and finished whole. The division into five books is no after-thought; it consisted of five books originally. It is a five-fold, and not, with the book of Joshua, a six-fold work. This is a supplemental writing, and no part of the original whole.

If we now inquire in reference to the book of Genesis, as to its position in this work of many parts, and its own internal plan, we discern, as to the first, that it contains the history preliminary to that which we are made acquainted with by the four remaining books. No more striking name can be thought of than the book of Genesis—*βιβλος γενέσεως*, the book of the generation, or origination—not of the world only—it describes not this alone—but the revelation of God as Jehovah, the redemption which was to come, the future Law, the future people of God, the future possession of the promised land. It points out to us the ancient divine or hallowed institutions, which the Law takes up and carries out; the beginnings of the Sabbath, of sacrifices, of the distinction between clean and unclean among animals, the prohibition of the eating of blood, the death penalty for the shedding of human blood, the rite of circumcision. In the organism of the Thora, or Law, it holds, throughout, a preparatory and introductory place. As to the disposition of its contents, these group themselves into five parts, holding forth the revelation of redemption in the history of Adam, (1-6 : 7 ;) of Noah, (6 : 8-11 : 25;) of Abraham, (11 : 26-25 : 18;) of Isaac, (25 : 19-35 : 29;) and Jacob, (ch. 36-50.)

If now we inquire whether the existence of such a work as the Thora is conceivable in the Mosaic period, we answer: 1. That all the preparatory conditions for such a work existed. The objection raised by Bohlen and Vatke, that the art of writing was unknown in the times of Moses, is removed by the fact that there are Egyptian papyri in the hieroglyphic and hieratic character, not only of the Mosaic, but of the ante-Mosaic period. Seyffarth, who has had in hand more than ten thousand Egyptian papyri, is a trustworthy authority, who affirms that at least two thousand years before Christ, and therefore in the patriarchal age, writing upon the papyrus existed. The night in which Israel came forth out of Egypt was the birth-hour of history.

The Egyptians lacked the true idea of a nation, and still more the idea of a God, the creator of heaven and earth. These two ideas call true historical writing into being. Israel came forth out of Egypt a united people, as no other on the earth ever was, and the God who led them, and whom they worshipped, was one God, the God of gods. 2. *The Thora answers all the expectations which we can entertain in relation to a writing of Moses in view of his personal character.* Moses belongs to those powerful minds in whom the ripe end of one historic period coincides with the creative beginning of another; in which a long past culminates, and a far reaching future has its root. He is the end of the patriarchal and the beginning of the legal dispensation. We expect, therefore, in him, as the sacred writer of history, a practical uniting of the present revelation with its patriarchal and primitive presumptions. He is as the mediator of the Law, a prophet, and, indeed, the greatest of all the prophets. We therefore expect from him unequalled prophetic disclosures, respecting the ways of God in the past and in the future. He is learned in all the wisdom of Egypt. A writing from his hand will betray manifold and intelligent allusions to Egyptian usages, laws, and facts; and the well educated man of Egypt, his native soil. And as it respects the form of such a work, we would expect from him an arrangement of the materials according to the unities of some great plan; negligence in the particulars of the recital, and yet a comprehensive and spirited aiming at the total effect and the most important matters, and depth and sublimity in union with the purest simplicity. We shall recognize in the lofty unity of purpose, the powerful leader and ruler of myriads of people; in the child-like *naïvete*, the shepherd of Midian, who, far from the various pursuits of Egypt, pastures the sheep of Jethro in the luxuriant wadys of Mount Sinai. The answer to both preliminary questions results favorably, so far, to the Mosaic origin. And yet, says this author, it would be too hasty, should we now, with-

out further research, decide that the writing of the entire Pentateuch, from Genesis to Deuteronomy, was done by Moses. Only so much, says he, stands firm thus far, as the result: first, that the Pentateuch must belong to the first period of Israelitish authorship; and also, in general, that the striking particulars touching the times and personality of Moses *can* have been written down by him, but not that they *were* written down by him. To be certain of this, we must first see what the Pentateuch says of itself. If it claims to be the work of Moses, from Genesis to Deuteronomy, we must so receive it; for, aside from the above considerations, we hold it as certainly impossible, that a work which became the creative foundation of the holy nation of Israel, and whose divine sanctity is raised above all doubt, should bear a false testimony respecting itself.

Delitzsch next proceeds to consider the internal testimony, as presented in Exod. 24 : 4-7; 34 : 27; 17 : 14; and Numb. 33 : 2; in which the book of the covenant is referred to, and Moses is directed to write the words of the covenant and the slaughter of the Amalekites in a book, and a register is given of the encampments of the children of Israel. He regards it as too wide a conclusion from these premises, that he wrote out the whole Pentateuch. He ventures no further than to determine this, that of the five books of the Law, Deuteronomy expressly sets up for itself the claim that it was composed by Moses, while the intermediate books claim for Moses only the writing of two series of laws and a list of encampments.

Delitzsch notes the fact, which, in our view, can be seen as well in the other five books, Genesis more especially, that Deuteronomy is rich in Egyptian allusions, which one would expect only of a book written by Moses' own hand, and on the confines of Egypt and Palestine. He notes the archaisms in expression contained in it, which mark it as of the same antiquity with the other books, while the love for figurative language, seen also in the Mosaic psalm, (the 90th

in the book of Psalms,) he recognizes as a characteristic of Moses. To this is to be united the internal argument of a psychological nature springing from the independence and sublimity of style with which the legislation is reproduced and carried out, the testamentary character throughout, and the unceasing transition of the language of Moses into the language of Jehovah, a phenomenon so decided and involuntary, that it can only be comprehended on the supposition that these discourses are the immediate effusion of the high self-consciousness of the mediator of the Law.

Delitzsch now proceeds to the inquiry, whether the admission of the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy carries with it that of the other books. In respect to this, he claims that Deuteronomy bears a peculiar individual impress not elsewhere found; that while the other books of the Pentateuch are allied to it most intimately in spirit and form, there is still a difference not accounted for by the difference of the situation and materials of one and the same author.

In order to arrive at a judgment as to the authorship of the other books, which he acknowledges presuppose, and, indeed, contain, records of Mosaic origin, he recurs to the well-known observation that down to the section beginning with Exod. 6: 2, 7, (the preparation by Jehovah of Moses and Aaron as instruments for the deliverance of Israel,) the interchange of the divine name, Elohim, with Jehovah, characterizes the whole writing. In this portion, the use of the names of God enables us to designate sections of four classes: those in which the prevalent name of God is Elohim, those in which it is Jehovah, those in which the names are interchanged habitually, those in which no express name of God appears.

Delitzsch touches briefly on the derivation and signification of these names of God, but does not enter at length into the discussion their signification has called forth. We will endeavor to exhibit it more in detail. The

name אֱלֹהִים the plural of אֱלֹהָ which is found as the name of God only in the highly poetic style, is not derived from אָל as either a participle from אָל in the sense of *being strong*, nor as a primitive, which Gesenius, Thesaur. (1, p. 49) seems to intimate, nor from a verb, אָלָה, *to be strong*, which some wrongly suppose to be a form from the same root, as they would derive אָלָה from אָלָה=אָלָה. It rather is a noun of the infinitive, from the root אָלָה, now lost from the Hebrew, but found in the Arabic *alaha, aliha*. This word bears, in the Kamoos, or great lexicon of Firuzabadi, the significations, *to wander about without aim, not knowing how to help one's self; to flee to one for refuge; to adore, or worship*, which is its prevailing transitive meaning. From this signification the Kamoos derives the name of God—*Alahu*. One of its conjugations has the meaning *to be stunned, or smitten with fear*. We may believe, therefore, that the idea of religious fear, which leads to the worship and adoration of Him who is the object of fear, lies at the foundation of this name of God. He is so called because He is the object of veneration and worship. We are aware that it has been objected to this exposition, that fear is the product of guilt and of sin, and is utterly inconsistent with the genuine spirit of devotion. But we can not forget, in this connexion, that the common designation of pious men in the Hebrew Scriptures is יִרְאַי אֱלֹהִים *fearers of God*, and that the wicked are characterized as those who cast off this fear. He himself is called פֶּחַד and מוֹרָא *fear* (Gen. 31: 42, 53; Ps. 76: 12; Is. 8: 12, *et seq.* Comp. 2 Thess. 2: 4.) the Fear, *e. g.*, of Isaac, *i. e.*, the one inspiring fear, whom Isaac venerated and adored. Far more satisfactory is this derivation, in our esteem, than that which makes it from אָלָה in the sense to swear, either as indicating, as Cocceius thinks, Him whose prerogative it is to pronounce a curse, and so to bind the conscience by His commination as a judge, or, as has appeared to others, as representing the Trinity engaged

in an eternal covenant which was ratified betwixt them by a solemn oath. This is, indeed, a striking and beautiful thought. But the former explanation, that the Creator is called Elohim, as being the object of reverence and adoration, is much nearer the primitive meaning of the word. There must be the realization of a being to be feared and worshipped, and to whom we are responsible, before there can be an oath taken. And then the form of the verb to *swear*, is in the Arabic *aliya*, indicating a different root, a distinction preserved in the Hebrew also.

That this name assumes a plural form, while the words standing in grammatical relation to it are usually singular, has attracted much attention. Some have connected with it the expressions, "Let us make man," or, as Delitzsch translates it, "We will make man in our image, and according to our likeness": Gen. 1: 26. The various theories respecting this plural name of God are: 1. That it is a simple plural of majesty. This is a common explanation among the Rabbins, some of whom took a low view of its use, as being merely for the purpose of bestowing honor upon God; and others, as indicating that He embraced all lordships and dominions within Himself. 2. A second view is of more modern origin, that the plural originated in polytheism, which it is assumed was the earliest form of religion, from which monotheism was gradually developed—a view advocated by LeClerc, Herder, deWette, and others, but contrary to all history as revealed in the Scriptures. Monotheism was the first religion man had upon the earth. It was when his foolish heart was darkened, that he changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things. 3. That it is a plural, such as is used in abstract nouns, to express the quintessence of the separate individuals in which the quality is found, or, in individual names, to denote that the individual concentrates in himself the sum of all that quality or assembly of qualities the

name suggests. 4. That it is a numerical plural, including the angels as well as God; that it refers to God as far forth as he reveals Himself and works through a multitude of spiritual beings. 5. That it is founded on the doctrine of a trinity in the Godhead, the view taken by Peter Lombard, and current among our orthodox divines, though rejected by Calvin as *parum solida*. He seems to have been satisfied with the third view mentioned above. Sufficient for me, says he, is it that the plural number suggests those powers (*virtutes*) of God which He put forth in creating the world.

Delitzsch says the plural Elohim is not an abstract noun denoting Divinity. In the mouth of the heathen it is numerical, though then not without exception; comp. Exod. 32: 4, where it is intensive. It is, as Schelling, after Storr, has quite correctly remarked, *pluralis magnitudinis*. The idea of the majestic is, so to say, inwardly magnified to imply the highest capacity for the same. Comp. Kedhoshim, Prov. 9: 10; Hos. 12: 1. Thus the name Elohim denotes God as the one infinitely great, the transcendent, the absolute; but it designates Him according to its derivation, not as subject, but only as object; and, moreover, the plural represents the oneness of the person in the background, leaving in front the plenitude or wealth which it indicates. This is true as well of Elohim without the article, which, when used of the true God, is a proper name, as of the appellation Ha-Elohim, in which the article does not make the personality, but the unity of God prominent. The multiplicity of the one God, which Elohim, as the name of God, expresses, is wholly within God. One, adds he, can not say without obliterating the distinction between the two Testaments, that Elohim is the plural of the trinity, but may say perfectly correctly that the *trinity* is the plurality which Elohim denotes, now disclosed in the New Testament. That is, if we correctly understand what Delitzsch would say, he holds that, while the doctrine of the trinity is not expressly taught in the Old Testament,

but its full declaration was reserved for the New, it is, nevertheless, implied in this plural name of God, which does not simply mean that there is a plenitude of wealth in the Divine Being, but also the plurality in His nature which the doctrine of the trinity implies.

On the name Jehovah, derived from the future, and either to be pronounced יהוה or יהוה *Jahaveh*, or *Jahavah*, (in the Masoretic text, always with the points of אֲדֹנָי or אֱלֹהִים *Adonay*, or *Elohim*, but by us, wherever it occurs, printed יהוה according to its proper pronunciation,) is the idea of personality already stamped, because it is originally a proper name; but Elohim, from Ha-Elohim, the Adorable, became so by usage. According to its signification, Jehovah is more than the personal God. For the divine declaration, *I am that I am*, אֲהִיָּה אֲשֶׁר אֲהִיָּה *I will be what I will be*, Exod. 3: 14, in which the name Jehovah is explained, proves not merely this, that God determines wholly from within Himself, and so is wholly and altogether a free personality, but, since the idea of the verb יהוה or יהוה *φύσσει, fieri*, is not that of continuing, but rather of active existence, that is, of becoming; it points to the future, and teaches that He, in a way corresponding identically with Himself, that is, with His own independent will, controls and will control all history. In spite of Hengstenberg and Hölemann, Delitzsch was always of the opinion that Jehovah indicates not so much He who becomes—that is, we suppose, becomes what He was not, and so undergoes change—but He that is; not the one whose being, but the revelation of whose being, is taking place. (*Existens* = *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, as the Apocalypse explains it.) It designates God as He who ever puts Himself forth anew, in a way cognizable by man, who, through all the *Æons*, (ages,) reveals Himself, and is, in short, the God of historic revelation. One can not venture to distinguish the one name as designating God as super-mundane, and the other

as indicating Him as mundane, for Elohim is mundane, [i. e. in the Kosmos,] as the present and acting power over all creatures ; but Jehovah is God, as the framer and disposer of history in the entire limits of the creation. Strikingly does Baumgarten remark, that Elohim is the God of the beginning and of the end, and Jehovah designates the God of the middle, that is, He also, from the beginning to the end, animates and develops all. The kingdom of power will become the kingdom of glory. Between lies the kingdom of grace, a long history, whose real substance is redemption. Jehovah is the God of the beginning and the end, acting as mediator through the course of this history—in one word, is GOD THE REDEEMER.

The name Jehovah is rightly made by Delitzsch from the future. It is not, as Grotius, and lately Ewald, (after the modern Jews,) have maintained, compounded of the future יהיה, the participle הוה, and the præter היה. For the pronunciation, Jehovah, in the Masoretic text, represents not its own vowels, but those of Adonay, which the Jews, since the captivity, in their reading, have substituted for it. Nor does the passage—Apoc. 7: 8—evidently founded on this name of God, *ὁ ὢν ὁ ᾔν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, which is, and which was, and which is to come—establish this tripartite derivation. It is all included in the sense of the future, which, with peculiar emphasis, expresses duration without any bounds, to which is to be added the idea of the sufficiency of God within Himself, and His immutability, and faithfulness to His own promises. Jehovah is strictly a proper name. It has no other form, no construct or suffix state, and no plural. Elohim is sometimes used of creatures, but this never. It is the incommunicable name of a personal God, and while it marks Him as self-existent, all-sufficient, and immutable, it especially indicates Him as a God of grace and truth, standing in covenant relations to His people. How natural, in different states of mind, to pass from one name of God to the other, to

pronounce His name Elohim when viewed as the almighty Creator, to be adored and worshipped, to pronounce or write it Jehovah, when His covenant relations to His creatures are present to the view, and He is regarded as their Saviour. Beautifully expressive, often, is this interchange of the Divine names, coming, as it does, without warning to the reader.

How striking, says Delitzsch, does this stand in the section—Gen. 2: 4–24—in which the world, created by Elohim, passes over into a history of redemption, which has man for its central and final point, and which testifies that God the Creator, and God the Redeemer, is the Ruler of history, is Jahavah Elohim, יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים throughout. And who would mistake it as unintentional, that Noah should call the Elohim who should enlarge Japhet, Jehovah, the God of Shem, and that Abraham more accurately designates the God whom Melchisedek names God Most High, אֱלֹהֵי עֵלְיוֹן, as Jahavah God Most High, יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי עֵלְיוֹן. Such evidently designed cases prove much. Why, again, is it, that in the entire sections Gen. 6: 9–23; 9: 1–17; 20: 1–17, the name Jehovah is never used? It can not be blind chance which here prevails. And yet the author, while he honored and loved both names as holy and deeply expressive, evidently took a pleasure in adorning his work with both alternately, being influenced sometimes by reasons of which he was conscious, sometimes by an unconscious or even an æsthetic preference. So the Psalter divides itself into Elohim Psalms, in which Elohim is the predominant, but not exclusive name of God, (Psalms 42 to 48,) and Jehovah Psalms, in which this name, in like manner, is prevalent. Asaph's are Elohim Psalms. Those of David and the Korahites are of a mixed character. Delitzsch considers the reasons which Henstenberg has assigned for the occurrence of these names, but comes to the conclusion that they are not always satisfactory, but that in the Psalms, as in the Pentateuch, the custom prevailed of

adorning the style with both these significant names of God. Both were dear to the writer, and he honors God in the use of both, to the neglect of neither. Signal instances of this alternate use are Gen. 7 : 15 ; "They went in [to the Ark] as Elohim commanded him, and Jehovah shut him in"; 27 : 27, 28. "The smell of a field which Jehovah hath blessed, therefore may Elohim give thee of the dew of heaven, and the fatness of the earth"; Exod. 3 : 4. "And when Jehovah saw that He turned aside to see, Elohim called unto Him out of the midst of the bush."

Delitzsch next discusses the passage—Exod. 6 : 2, *et seq.*—"I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name El-Shaddai, God Almighty, but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them." He agrees that this passage does not prove that the name of Jehovah was unknown to the patriarchs, and was first revealed to Moses, but only that God had not made known to the patriarchs all the extent of its signification as He had revealed it to Moses. It is peculiar to the Scriptures to let the incomplete stages lose themselves and vanish in the light of the more complete, so that there is only the semblance of an absolute distinction apparent. When, for instance, it is said, in John 1 : 17, "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth, ἡ χάρις καὶ ἀλήθεια, came by Jesus Christ," we must not deny to the Old Testament *all* acquaintance with grace and truth. Yet are תְּהִלָּתוֹ וְאֱמֶתוֹ grace and truth the stars of the Old Testament heavens; but starlight does not amount to the light of the rising sun. But though the name Jehovah was not unknown, it was more rarely used; and there is a probability, he says, that from Gen. 1 to Exod. 6, two different species of historical writing are before us, of which the one renders prominent the peculiar present of the patriarchal knowledge of God, the other, the dawning future of the same, of which the one lies nearer to the form of contemporaneous history, the other to the contents of future history. He then main-

tains that there are favorite forms of expression peculiar to the Elohist sections, and others to the Jehovistic, and gives forth his theory for the composition of the Pentateuch thus: That the kernel, or central part, of the same is the covenant roll, (Exod. 19–26,) written down by Moses himself, and wrought out in the historical order of the legislation. The remaining laws of the wilderness of Sinai, down to that of the plains of Moab, Moses announced orally, but they were written down by the priests, in whose calling this duty lay. As Deuteronomy does not suppose the written state of the entire ancient legislation, and still more, as it recapitulates the law with great freedom, we need not suppose that the entire codification had already taken place. Upon the soil of the Holy Land they began to write the history of Israel, which now reached a full period. The historiography of the Mosaic times, then necessitated of itself the record of the Mosaic legislation. Such a man as Eleazar the priest, the son of Aaron, (see respecting him, particularly, Numb. 26 : 1; 31 : 21,) may have written the large work beginning with בְּרֵאשִׁית בְּרָא “In the beginning God created,” etc., in which he incorporated the roll of the covenant, and the last words of Moses, (only more briefly,) because Moses had written them down with his own hand. A second historian, like Joshua, (see Deut. 32 : 44; Josh. 24 : 26; comp. 1 Sam. 10 : 22,) who is a prophet, and speaks as a prophet, or one of the זְקֵנִים elders, upon whom the spirit of Moses rested, (Numb. 11 : 25,) and many of whom survived Joshua, (Josh. 24 : 31,) completed the work—not certainly by the prompting of his own will, or from the dictate of his own nature—but by the authorization of some one else, and incorporated in it the whole of Deuteronomy, the spirit of which had moulded that of the compiler himself. So, perhaps, arose the Thora, not without advantage being taken of other written documents by both narrators. Exod. 11 : 3, and Numb. 12 : 3, in which Moses

is renowned as being very great in the land of Egypt, and as being meek above all the men upon the face of the earth, and Deut. 34 : 10, compared with Numb. 12 : 8, "And there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom Jehovah knew face to face," we must ascribe to the Jehovist, his disciple, and perhaps his friend. Both of them, the priestly Elohist and the prophetic Jehovist, are, each in his own way, but the echo and the copy of the great Lawgiver, their teacher and prototype. As after the ascension of Jesus, the evangelists wrote His Gospel in His Spirit, so did these two, after the removal of Moses, write his Law and the history that contains it. The note-worthy passage—Ezra 9 : 10–12—where a commandment of the Thora, given during the wandering in the wilderness, is cited as the word of the servants of Jehovah, the prophets, is due to the consciousness that the Thora had been written in this way.

We have now followed our author till we have reached his view as to the authorship of the Pentateuch, and of Genesis as a part of it. To enable us to understand the relation which his theory bears to the others which have from time to time been adopted, it may be useful to give, somewhat after his own manner, the history of the various opinions which have been ventilated by ingenious, but not always reverential scholars, as to the same point. We find Vitringa, in his *Observationes Sacrae*, chap. 4, pp. 3–6, *et seq.*, offering his own conjectures as to the origin particularly of the first book, Genesis. He supposes that the first Fathers of the Church held frequent assemblies long before the Mosaic age, in which they frequently and mutually discoursed concerning the origin of the world, the fall of man, the promise of grace, which was often repeated, and the revelations made to themselves or their ancestors, and that this was necessary for the strengthening of their faith, the sustaining of their hope, and the conviction of those ungodly Cainites by whom they were surrounded; and that these

men wrote down, for the use of their children after them, those truths made known to them by divine revelation, or the testimony of others. This was specially done as the human race multiplied, and faith in the divine promises was threatened and tried by the increasing wickedness of the race. Those parchments and portfolios (*scrinia*) of the Fathers, he supposes Moses to have collated, digested, set in order, and supplemented, and from them to have composed the book of Genesis. If Noah, Shem, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, or even antediluvian patriarchs, left any fragments of Scripture, they were equally inspired with other holy men of old, but of a later date, who were moved by the Holy Ghost. Moses also enjoyed the Spirit's aid while perfecting this work, no less than Luke, who composed his Gospel from the narratives and annotations of those who from the beginning were *αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου*, eye-witnesses and ministers of the word. This harmless hypothesis, as propounded by Vitringa, was set forth by others in a different vein. In 1753 appeared, at Brussels, a treatise from the pen of Astruc, entitled, Conjectures respecting the Original Memoirs which it appears Moses used in composing Genesis,* in which he sought to show, from the interchange of the names of God, that Moses compiled the book of Genesis from two principal documents, availing himself also of ten others. This hypothesis, which is called *the Document Hypothesis*, was advocated by Eichorn and Herder, and was modified and perfected by Ilgen and Gramberg. By the side of this was introduced, first by Vater, the *Fragment Hypothesis*, which regards the Pentateuch as a mosaic, composed of fragments of various authors. Both these attempts to account for the origin of the Pentateuch, Delitzsch says, have had their day. The mechanical method they contemplate is inconsistent with that living unity which these

* Conjectures sur les Mémoires originaux, dont il paroît que Moïse s'est servi pour composer le Livre de Genèse.

writings exhibit. In the place of both these, the *Supplementary Hypothesis* is now the prevailing one among the critics of the German school, according to which, the author of the Pentateuch, the Jehovist, had before him an older account—that of the Elohist—extending from the creation to the death of Joshua, and wrought it over and enlarged it. This hypothesis is, after the precedent labors upon it of De Wette, Ewald, Bleek, Von Bohlen and Stähelin, carried out, with the most subtle and careful thoroughness, by Tuch, in his Commentary on Genesis. There is no better name for the hypothesis advocated by Ewald in his History of the People of Israel, than the *Crystallization Hypothesis*. He divides the Pentateuch in four non-contemporaneous parts, which have received their last form from the author of Deuteronomy, who is, also, the last author of the book of Joshua, which belongs likewise to the Pentateuch. Of these, the book of the Covenant is the oldest portion, and was written in the times of Sampson. The next is the *Liber Originum*, תולדות, to which are assigned the chief portion of the Elohistic fragments, a work throughout of a religio-historical and legislative object, written by a Levite of the last third of Solomon's reign. There is further to be distinguished a first prophetic narrator of the primitive history, a citizen of the kingdom of Israel in the age of Elijah and Joel, and a second prophetic narrator of the times between 800 and 750 B. C., who, like the author of the book of the Covenant, calls God by the name Jehovah, rarely by the name Elohim. He had the works of the three others before him, and is the author of the Pentateuch and Joshua in their present form. Kurtz represents Ewald as pointing out no less than ten different writers, including these four, as being concerned in the production of the Pentateuch, and sarcastically remarks that "Ewald is able not only to assign to each of these ten authors his own part in the great work, even to single verses and words, but generally, also, to distinguish and to characterize the sources

from which each of them had, again, drawn his original materials!"* Such is the wonderful sagacity or effrontery of modern unbelieving criticism.

There remains the one theory which the Church, both Jewish and Christian, have held for ages, that the Pentateuch has but one real author, and that author, Moses, which belief is not impugned by the few additions by a later hand, the most obvious of which is the last chapter of Deuteronomy. The usual arguments for this are: 1. The regular plan and unity of purpose displayed in the entire five-fold book, pointing, it is believed, to one author. This unity and regular progressive plan Delitzsch admits and pleads for, and strives to represent as consistent with his theory. But it is far more consistent with the ordinary belief.

2. The fact that the book is the basis of all Jewish history, civil and ecclesiastical, and, so far as history goes, the beginning of its literature; that it exhibits throughout, manifold traces of the Mosaic age, and evidently belongs to that period. This, too, is argued by Delitzsch, and in this respect his modification of the *supplemental hypothesis* is not open to the objections of others who have advocated it, and who have located its composition at various points in the post-Mosaic centuries.

3. A third argument has been adduced from the passages in the Pentateuch itself in which Moses is represented as having written the Law and delivered it unto the priests, and ordered them to deposit it in the side, or by the side, of the Ark. In the book, too, he was directed to write the conflict with the Amalekites. He is said to have written all the words of the Lord; to have taken the book and read in the audience of the people; to have written in the book the journeyings of the children of Israel. The book of the Law is referred to, and throughout the sacred writings is called *the Law of Moses*. Not conclusive is the protest of

* Kurtz, *Hist. of the Old Cov't*, 1, p. 61.—Note.

Delitzsch, that the Pentateuch could be called the Law of Moses, with far greater right than the Book of Psalms could be called the Psalms of David, without being in all its parts immediately Mosaic. The Pentateuch is one continuous book, with a regular plan; the Psalms are a collection of detached compositions, probably receiving increment from time to time. The earliest portion of the collection consisted of the Psalms of David, and these gave the style or title of the whole when referred to in popular speech. The same reason could not be given for the ascription of the Pentateuch to Moses. We are persuaded that the common reader would take these expressions to point out Moses as the author of the book, and that there is far more reason for affirming it than for maintaining that Julius Cæsar wrote the Gallic War, in which the same indirect way of speaking of himself occurs.

But the entire argument for the genuineness of the Pentateuch as a writing of Moses is cumulative, embracing a multiplicity of details. These may be found fully handled in the apologetic writings of Hengstenberg, Hävernick, Drechsler, Ranke, Welte, and Kurtz, but can not be brought forward by us now, after these protracted remarks.

In reference to the peculiar theory of Delitzsch, that the Pentateuch was written partly by the hand of Moses, and the rest by two like-minded men, one of the priestly, the other more of the prophetic order, which subsequently arose, we see no advantage it has over the opinion that Moses either wrote the whole himself, or was assisted in some portions by others, over whom he exercised his superintendence. So that he was, under the divine inspiration, the human author, the Holy Spirit being the Divine Author of the book. This does not exclude the hypothesis that there may have been writings of the patriarchal age, authentic and inspired, which Moses used in the primeval history that preceded his own times. The difference of phraseology, which has been presented as characterizing the

Elohistic, as compared with the Jehovistic portions, may thus be accounted for as to the book of Genesis; and for this difference, so far as it appears in the four remaining books, the consideration that an author's own style as to favorite expressions alters with the circumstances and times in which he writes, may furnish a sufficient solution. He who has heard the same speaker, or read the productions of the same living writer, through the lapse of years, must have observed this fact. The same thing occurs in the writings of Paul, Peter, and John, in the New Testament, and has given rise to various theories of a different author, among the critics of Germany, of books and portions of books through all past ages ascribed to them.

Numbers 12: 3, which speaks of Moses as meek above all the men upon the face of the earth, and other similar passages where the Jewish Lawgiver is mentioned in terms of praise, admit of several explanations well known to scholars, more probable than the theory of Delitzsch, and which neither require nor justify his view as to their author. The last chapter in Deuteronomy, which speaks of the death of Moses, and a few other expressions, could have proceeded from a later, but authorized hand. Much more accordant is this view with the traditionary opinion, which certainly goes back beyond the New Testament times, for Christ and the apostles acknowledged the Law not only as given, but written, by Moses. "Had ye believed Moses," says our Saviour, "ye would have believed me, for he *wrote* of me. But if you believe not his *writings*, how shall ye believe my words."

Delitzsch's view does, indeed, place the last writer of the Pentateuch in the age next succeeding Moses, making him contemporary with Joshua, and, probably, through a part of his life, contemporary with Moses himself, and in this respect is not to be confounded with that of De Wette, who locates the Elohist in the time of Samuel or Saul, 1120 or 1050

B. C., or 400 years after Moses, and the Jehovist in the time of Solomon, 1015-975, B. C.

And yet, while Delitzsch speaks nobly and truly in defence of the Pentateuch, and especially against the charge that it repeats itself without reason, we are sorry that he should have said that inspiration does not altogether exclude unconscious historical errors. If it does not, then the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures must be given up. But, in our view, the Holy Spirit never left these holy men whom He moved to write, at any moment when thus employed on these documents of our faith. However freely their minds may have moved, and however each one may have shown forth the mental peculiarities which distinguished each, He never withdrew His influence till the record was completely finished. This record, therefore, must have been infallible truth, as it flowed from the pen of him who was moved by the Holy Ghost.

Yet, with much force does Delitzsch charge upon the modern criticism of his own times and country, that it is unfree, *i. e.*, that it is a bond-slave. For when innumerable external and internal reasons make the Mosaic origin of the Thora evident, it must hold its contents as a web of intermingled history and myth, of times not contemporaneous. For it is held bound, by its dogmatic prejudices, to maintain that there is no preternatural revelation, no miraculous agency of God in nature and human life, no prophecy proceeding from inspiration. Modern criticism is driven to the three following foregone conclusions: 1. The Pentateuch represents itself as the history of a supernatural divine revelation, of an actual commerce of God with our first parents, with the patriarchs, with Israel. Therefore, it is neither strictly historical nor Mosaic. DeWette can not allow the causes and consequences of events, as related in the Pentateuch, to be true; and thus the Pentateuch is regarded by him as the theocratic epos of the Hebrews, and the Jehovah of the Pentateuch, so far as He steps forth

acting in history, is to him the product of legend—in the same category with the Homeric gods. So Ewald designates the fact, that the Godhead appears acting and visible in history, as the peculiarity of the Hebrew Mythos. It avails nothing to deny, says he, that the Hebrew tradition approaches the heathen mythology in this. With such presumptions to the contrary, it is impossible to hold to the historicalness and contemporaneousness of the Thora, were both ever so well attested. 2. The second is of the following import: the Pentateuch is full of miraculous occurrences, which, as DeWette expresses it, are beyond the thought of the thinking mind, at least are doubtful, and so it is and must be post-Mosaic, for its stories of miracles are an ideal poetic robe, which was first thrown around the genuine historical tradition at a date subsequent to the events. 3. The Pentateuch contains prophetic discourses, which bespeak a knowledge of the events of times subsequent to Moses. Such a knowledge is not conceivable. These prophecies are, therefore, *vaticinia post eventum*—prophecies after the event—or they at least came into existence in those times when these events could be surely foreseen. De Wette characterizes the prophecies of the Pentateuch as invented, with the remark, “Such prophecies have the Indian Puranas put into the mouth of their old heroes.” From this predetermined denial of all true prophecy, there results a peculiar procedure for determining the date of the composition of the Pentateuch. The *vaticinia post eventum* serve as marks for determining the date. Because, according to the Elohist, it was promised the patriarchs that kings should descend from them, the Elohist could not have written before the elevation of Saul to the throne of Israel. Because Isaac announces to Esau his independence of Jacob, and Balaam predicts the subjugation of Amalek, Edom, and Moab, the Jehovist could not have written till after the victory of Saul over the Amalekites, and David over the Moabites and Edom-

ites. But Isaac speaks—27 : 40—of the attempt of Edom to free himself from the yoke of Israel, which removes the time of the Jehovist to the reign of Solomon, towards the end of which Edom rose in revolt. This procedure, which turns the head of prophecy, looking to the future, backwards, is one of Ewald's sources of proof. The oldest portion of the Pentateuch is, according to Ewald, the so-called Book of the Covenant. The author lived in the times of Sampson. How does Ewald know this? Because—Gen. 49 : 17, "Dan shall be a serpent by the way"—he refers to the times of the Danite, Sampson, as a *vaticinium post eventum*. To the fourth narrator (of his theory) is ascribed the assumed prophecy of Balaam, in which is predicted the coming of ships from the coast of Chittim, and the affliction of Asshur. This, also, is a *vaticinium post eventum*, and the fourth narrator wrote near the time of the victory of the Tyrian king Eluläos over the piratical fleet of the Phenician Cypriots. Menander, compared with Josephus, must determine the time in which the fourth supplementer lived, which, in addition, will be settled by the prophetic words of Isaac concerning Esau—chap. 27 : 39. Is this criticism, asks Delitzsch, not forced, and devoid of all true freedom and independence? True criticism presupposes the Pentateuch neither as Mosaic nor post-Mosaic, but decides from external and internal grounds. But this criticism is forced to hold it as post-Mosaic, in spite of all external and internal arguments, because it contains words and theophanies of God, miracles and prophecies; and yet, in the Mosaic times, all must have gone on quite naturally as now! But every thing of this present day moves, according to the laws of nature, only to those who have never heard that God speak within them, who gave His fiery Law on Sinai, who have no realization that they have been translated from the kingdom of nature into that of the Spirit, and have tasted the powers of the world to come, to whom the eye of faith is not yet

opened to see the majesty of God revealing itself marvelously, ever and anon. The possibility of miracle and prophecy is agreeable to the experience of the believer; and the miracle of the new birth, and the Spirit's influences, are his security for the same. For this reason, he stands free in reference to the miracles and prophecies of Scripture, without being forced credulously to admit them, or incredulously to deny them beforehand. Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. There also is true and unslavish criticism; a criticism which neither is doomed to affirm *a priori*, nor *a priori* to deny, but is placed in a position to form an unbiassed judgment, as the state of facts, in the present or past, may demand.

Thus we approach, says Delitzsch, the historical contents of Genesis with confidence. The following two considerations will strengthen us against the mistrust of unbelief. This history of the primitive times, which Genesis gives, *can* be authentic. The source whence it is borrowed is the oral tradition, transmitted in the family of the patriarchs, by which, according to the divine command—Gen. 18: 19—the remembrance of the divine revelations was handed down during the lifetime of the Fathers, which could be the more easily done, the longer their lives, the more simple their mode of living, and more secluded from foreign influences they were. Over this tradition they certainly watched with the greatest care. It was to the chosen race the foundation of its existence, the bond of its union, the mirror of its duties, the security of its future, and so its most precious inheritance. The credibility of the historical contents of Genesis might, with certainty, be expected. For, as the true religion, the religion of redemption, declared in the Scriptures, rests upon the facts of revelation, it is by the true tradition of these that its own security is effected; and to this end religious feeling and a regard for historical truth converge. Not only the universally conceded character of the people of Israel, but the

work and testimony of Christ, as given in the New Testament, presuppose, and so establish, the truth of the historical contents of Genesis, and of the history of the Old Testament. Should we compare the Old Testament literature with that of the pagan East, it has not its like in sobriety, in child-like objectivity, in pure morality, in its universal aspect, and its interest in mankind at large. One will thus acknowledge the prevalence here of another power than that power of nature heathenism exhibits. The literature of Israel is a miracle of grace. It is the literature of redemption from the jurisdiction of the principle of nature; the literature of the spirit which has laid hold again on God as that power which is above nature; the literature of the regeneration of the old heathen East by the grace of the one everlasting God. It is, for this reason, not so gorgeous to the senses, not so dazzling in speculation, not so imposing in the eyes of men, as, for example, the literature of India. The Orient, in the Old Testament literature, has become a child, that it may enter into the kingdom of God. There rests upon it a tranquil peace, whose rainbow arches over the deepest excitement. It has found every thing in the one personal God, who is in history and over history, its safe measure and its firm boundary. As Hellenism brought back, at a later period, the gigantic, and, in great part, distorted forms of the East, to the measure of human beauty, thus, in Israel, divine truth lifts itself out of the chaos of the mythic, fantastic nature-life of the Orient, quiet and chaste, without noise and pomp.

These things are beautifully and nobly said.

We have thus given our readers an outline of the introduction to this commentary on Genesis. To a very large extent, and far beyond what we at first purposed, we have allowed the author to present his own views, merely exchanging the German for an English dress. It was our purpose to have commented upon the expository part of the

work, especially his explanation of the cosmogony contained in the first chapter, which, he says, lies not outside, but within the orbit of the history of salvation, which begins its course from eternity, and circles back to eternity again. For God had, in creating the world, the earth for His aim; and on the earth, man; and among men, Israel; and in this redeemed nation, His redeemed Church; and in the Church of the redeemed, the consummation of all created things. These words are refreshing, and though there are defects in the treatment, and views from which we must express our dissent, and there are illustrations from the traditions of other nations, perhaps more than is meet, and a less elaborate and ample handling of the latter part of the book, where the foundations of the Church are represented as laid in the institutions of the patriarchal age, there is much in this volume to commend, and much that places it far beyond those cold and unevangelic commentaries which have proceeded from the German school in this our age.



ARTICLE II.

SUPERIORITY OF THE GREEKS IN LITERATURE AND THE FINE ARTS.

The superiority of the ancient Greeks in literature and the fine arts, has often been a theme of wonder and admiration; and many causes have been proposed to account for so striking a phenomenon. There is one, however, which has not received the notice it deserves, to which we desire briefly to call attention. We mean the intense spirit of emulation, the panting desire to excel, which distinguished that people beyond those of any other age or coun-