

CONSIDERATIONS

RESPECTING THE

GENUINENESS OF THE PENTATEUCH,

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO A PAMPHLET

ENTITLED

THE CONNEXION BETWEEN

GEOLOGY AND THE PENTATEUCH:

BY THOMAS COOPER, M. D.

BY ROBERT MEANS, A. M.

COLUMBIA :

PUBLISHED BY J. R. & W. CUNNINGHAM, BOOKSELLERS.

SAMUEL WEIR, PRINTER.

1834.

PREFACE.

THE dissertation presented to the reader, in the following pages, originally appeared in the columns of the "SOUTHERN CHRISTIAN HERALD". The writer did not enter the field of controversy unprovoked, nor without manifest necessity. A point of great importance, in relation to the authority of revealed religion, had been assailed, in a spirit of uncompromising hostility, with a startling array of arguments and objections, and by an individual long accustomed to dictate to the public mind, upon all subjects, even upon those most beyond his appropriate sphere.

THE attack was, moreover, accompanied by a haughty defiance. It was repeatedly, and without qualification, stated, that no honest and intelligent man, acquainted with the merits of the question, would dare to maintain the genuineness of the Pentateuch. Under the circumstances of the case, then, the necessity of replying to the attack made, was commanding.

THE failure to do so, would be regarded as an abandonment of the point at issue.

TO the argument now submitted, the writer would most earnestly solicit the attention of the public. Whatever may have been their sentiments hitherto, in relation to the matter discussed, he hopes to obtain from his readers a candid and patient examination of his arguments. To those whose minds have not yet been satisfied, with respect to the claims advanced by the religious system exhibited in the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, he would respectfully suggest—that the inquiry prosecuted in the following sheets, can not be uninteresting to the general scholar, and that in a religious aspect, it must be of the highest importance, when the possibility only, is admitted—that our conclusions are just—that the obligations of religion are founded in truth, imperative in their character, and not to be neglected without incurring fearful guilt.

NOR are the considerations proposed on the present occasion, alone intended to satisfy the minds of unbelievers; they are designed to enable Christians, speculative or practical, to furnish reasons for the belief which they cherish. No one then, professing a submission to the claims of revelation, who is not well instructed respecting the evidence by which it is supported, should deem an attention to the following argument, in his instance unnecessary. It were a discreditable thing for him to receive opinions, with the reasons of which he is unacquainted. And were he even content to rest in this blind and irrational conviction, religion is in perpetual danger of being dishonored and injured, through his inability to meet the objections with which it is at all times assailed.

THE writer has no more to add, but that the publication, in a more permanent form, of what was originally offered to the community in the fugitive character of newspaper essays, has been induced by the hope of giving a wider circulation to what, it is thought may be useful, and the wish to furnish to those interested in the subject, a condensed, yet comprehensive view of the whole controversy respecting the genuineness of the writings ascribed to the Jewish lawgiver.

INTRODUCTION.

SECTION I.

AT the present period, a special call seems to be made upon the defenders of revealed religion to sustain the credibility of some of its most important records. No very long interval of time has elapsed since the publication of a tract entitled "The Connexion between Geology and the Pentateuch," which is intended to unsettle the popular belief in the divine origin of the Jewish, and by consequence of the Christian revelation also. Proceeding from an individual, who possesses so many real and adventitious sources of influence, this production is not to be disregarded, whatever may be the judgment which we may be called to pronounce upon its intrinsic merits. The author occupies a high literary station in this community, and with a great and extended reputation actually possesses an erudition exceedingly various, if not the most profound.

The style, moreover, of the essay in question, is such as to make a strong impression upon the unthinking, the uninformed, and those whose minds are already biased towards the conclusions which it is designed to establish. With a shew of logical precision and an affectation of considerable candor, there are joined much confident assertion, and many unwarrantable assumptions both of facts and principles. The author has also brought within a narrow compass, and exhibited in a popular manner all the difficulties, real or imaginary, which are attached to the theory of the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch. That question then, which is at all times one of importance, becomes now one of peculiar interest. By those who sustain the theory just mentioned, some attention must be paid to it, if they would prevent the prevalence of erroneous opinions derived from a one sided view of the subject. It is not meant that the matter has not hitherto been fully

discussed. The contrary is the fact. As the objections to the genuineness and authenticity of the books, commonly ascribed to the Hebrew lawgiver, have been frequently produced; so they have been patiently considered, learnedly met, and we think satisfactorily refuted. In making this statement I am aware that the writer under view has asserted the direct contrary. He has pronounced with all authority, "that not one of the objections in question, has been refuted or attempted to be refuted."* The affirmation is an astounding one, and so utterly at variance with fact, that we cannot imagine under the influence of what hallucination it was made. Partiality to our own views may readily lead us to deny the soundness of arguments proposed against them, but it cannot surely pervert our apprehensions so as to render us unaware of the fact of their having been offered. Professing therefore an entire incompetency to explain this mystery, it is again affirmed that very many attempts have been made to answer the objections proposed. But these do not exist in a form fitted to produce an impression on the public mind in general; but are found in voluminous works of a grave character, which few persons excepting theologians consult. Of the multitudes who may read Dr. C's pamphlet—so pregnant with difficulties, which are alledged to be insuperable, so full of scornful denunciations of his adversaries, and sovereign contempt for their arguments—how few can be expected to seek information from any source such as those above indicated. On this account it has been thought desirable that this community should have presented to them, some considerations respecting the genuineness and authenticity of the Pentateuch, with a statement of the mode in which the usual objections can be obviated.

In the outset of the investigation, let us survey the ground which it is proposed to occupy. It is not then designed to mingle in the inquiry any personal or temporary considerations whatever. No reference will be had to the origin or merits of that controversy which seems to have been the occasion of the hostile demonstration against the Hebrew Scriptures, which it is now

*Geol. Pent. p. 50.

intended to meet in a spirit of candor, and with the weapons of legitimate argument.

The point at issue is this—Was the Pentateuch the production of Moses? Is it genuine, really proceeding from him to whom it is ascribed? Let it be remembered, that this is a consideration entirely distinct from the question respecting the authenticity of an historical record. Admit the Pentateuch to have been written by Moses; we may still inquire, are its statements authentic? Prove that it proceeded from some other source—still its historical details may be true. To say then that this book abounds with falsehoods and absurdities, is not, consistently with the views of the Infidel, to suggest any proof that Moses did not write it, although such would be the fact upon the principles maintained by the Jew or Christian.

Before proceeding any farther, it may be well to inquire—what influence the decision of this question may have upon the authority of revealed religion in general, and upon that of the Christian religion in particular.

What is the nature of the connexion between the Old and New Testaments, and between the religious dispensations which they severally established? To what extent does the latter affirm the authority of the former? And how far may the manifest error involved in any portion of the one, affect the question respecting the truth of the other? These are questions of importance. Let us hear in reference to them the observations of the judicious Paley: “Undoubtedly our Saviour assumes the divine origin of the Mosaic institution—undoubtedly also, he recognizes the prophetic character of many of their ancient writers. So far, therefore, as Christians, we are bound to go. But to make Christianity answerable with its life, for the circumstantial truth of each separate passage in the Old Testament, the genuineness of every book, the information, fidelity, and judgment of every writer in it, is to bring, I will not say great, but unnecessary difficulties into the whole system. These books were universally read and received by the Jews in our Saviour’s time. He and his apostles, in common with the other Jews, referred to them, alluded to them, used them; yet except where he

expressly ascribes a divine authority to particular predictions, I *do not know* that we can *strictly* draw any conclusion from the books being so used and applied, besides the proof, which it unquestionably is, of their notoriety and reception at that time. In this view our scriptures afford a valuable testimony to those of the Jews.”—*Evidences, part iii. chap. 3.*

It is not by this intended to say, that the inquiry concerning the genuineness and authenticity of the books of the Old Testament, is not an important one; nor that this inquiry cannot to our minds be satisfactorily terminated; it is only meant to affirm that this is a distinct question from the one respecting the divine authority of the Christian religion, excepting in so far as has been above stated.

It is no easy matter to follow our author in his somewhat desultory observations and arguments. He sets out with laying down many principles—some in a greater or less degree correct, others the reverse, but taken as a whole, covering the entire ground of the controversy. With respect to the admission of these, he professes to anticipate no difficulty. He, however, enters more into detail, and again and again suggests various theories, derived from others, respecting the origin of the Pentateuch; with many objections to its genuineness, and mixing up the question in reference to this, with the consideration of its authenticity, throws out many scornful accusations of falsehood, folly, and corrupt intentions on the part of its fabricators. In this essay a stricter method will be attempted. With a careful discrimination between the characteristics and proofs of genuineness and authenticity, I shall consider the reasons which induce the belief that the Pentateuch was written by Moses, examine the validity of the several objections to this hypothesis, correct various errors of the writer, upon whom I have already made some remarks—and then investigate the subject of the truth and divine origin of that book, which is the great depository of the laws of the Jews and the most important of their historical records.

SECTION II.

The Pentateuch traced to the Babylonish Captivity.

The Jewish people is the most remarkable of all those to whom the earth has been assigned as an habitation. Other nations have been more renowned in arts or arms, in literature or civil polity. No one has been comparable to it, in its religious distinctions, or resembled it in its peculiar destiny. Presenting for ages, amid the almost universal defection of the human race from the primeval and pure worship, an example of a monotheistic faith and elevated moral system; possessing historical and sacred records extending into the remotest antiquity; and after a national existence of fifteen centuries, and the continuance in a state of dispersion for a still longer period, yet remaining an insulated portion of the family of man, resisting all the amalgamating influences of time, servitude, and an active spirit of proselytism in those among whom they live—the Hebrews have occupied and still possess a station of solitary pre-eminence on the pages of history. Nor are they alone distinguished, by the circumstances just indicated; they possess a more remarkable prerogative derived from the fact, that the religious systems, which sway the minds and influence the conduct of the most important portion of mankind, are founded upon that which was promulgated among the descendants of the renowned individual, to whom the divine promise was given, that in “his seed should all the families of the earth be blessed.” The Christian and Mohammedan religions, widely differing in their genius, their moral influence and the character of the evidence upon which they rest—alike refer to the revelations made through Moses and the prophets. And while the disciples of the former, regard themselves as the spiritual children of Abraham; the tribes of the desert among whom the latter originated, glory in him as their natural progenitor. And with respect to the great law-giver of the Jews, as observed by J. Von Muller, “his institutions, his history and his name, are now, after near four thousand years, the objects of veneration among all the

nations from the Tagus to Hindoostan, from the frozen seas of Scandinavia to the country of myrrh and frankincense." Apart therefore from the sacred considerations associated with the Hebrew scriptures, there should be produced in reference to them, a high respect and lively curiosity—as records of an age long gone by, as a picture of a very primitive condition of society, and as the great original depository of those religious truths or errors, as they may be differently esteemed by various persons, which have powerfully and permanently influenced the human mind in these latter ages. Such being the interest attached to these writings, the inquiry into their antiquity, genuineness and credibility has been often prosecuted, and must ever be deemed an important one, in a point of view both literary and religious.

It is intended in the following essay to attempt a brief outline of the reasons, which induce a belief of the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, the most ancient of those writings which constitute what is called the Old Testament. The name has respect to the division of this production into five parts. The four last of these divisions, contain a full account of the organization of the Jewish polity, civil and religious, with a narrative of those events which preceded or attended its establishment. The first book furnishes a necessary historical introduction to the others, exhibiting brief notices of the origin of the human race, and the distribution of it into several tribes and nations, with a more particular account of the immediate progenitors of the Jewish people.

It will be recollected that reference has already been made to the distinction between the genuineness and authenticity of any book. It is not doubted that both these characteristics can be shown to belong to the work under consideration. These topics will, however, be made the subjects of separate investigation, and in the first place the proposition will be maintained—that the Pentateuch was written by Moses, at or about the time, to which it is usually assigned. Pursuing this course we shall not be liable to embarrassment from the extravagant requisitions, which are grounded upon the supposition of the perfect accuracy and divine inspiration of

this production ; a thing which however true, it is not necessary in the first instance to establish, being more properly the subject of after consideration. The point which it is incumbent on us first to ascertain, is that the Pentateuch possesses the same character of genuineness which marks other productions of antiquity—the works for instance, of Herodotus, Thucydides, Tacitus or Livy. It is manifest that evidence of a higher nature or of a different kind should not be sought in one instance, which is not required in the other. But here the principle is interposed by our objectors, that the extraordinary or miraculous nature of the facts detailed in any book demand that a more exalted standard of proof in reference to its genuineness should be applied—The principle might have force with respect to the authenticity, or truth of the incidents recorded in any author; otherwise it is perfectly futile and irrelevant. And no one ever thought of doubting that Livy wrote the history which bears his name, because there are many prodigies recorded in it.

It is now between three and four thousand years, since the delivery of their law to the Israelites in the Arabian desert. In tracing the existence of any literary production through so prolonged a period, it will be convenient to fix upon some great land marks; some intermediate points, at which we may pause in our investigation, and taking a survey of the results already ascertained, prepare to penetrate into a still more remote antiquity. There are two such epochs as those above referred to—the more recent, the coming of Christ; the more remote—the return from the Babylonish captivity, about five hundred years before. We might, indeed, at once, advance to this earlier period, and assume the existence at that time, in their present form, of the books ascribed to Moses. Of all the theories respecting the origin of the Pentateuch, to which more particular reference may be made in the sequel, whether proposed by theologians, heterodox as well as orthodox, or even by infidels, *not one* ascribes it to any writer later than Ezra. This fact, while it ensures the admission of our principle, does not preclude the necessity of some reference to the grounds upon which it rests. Have we then

a perfect assurance of the existence of these writings at the period of our Saviour's birth? We have the most unquestionable evidence of this fact. Independent copies have been preserved both by Jews and Christians, between whom there can be no collusion. We possess besides, the Samaritan Pentateuch, of which we shall presently speak more particularly. In the New Testament, which, without any reference to its divine origin, is good evidence on this subject, we find manifest reference to these more ancient documents, as then existing. More particularly there is a distribution of the entire sacred writings of the Jews into the three classes, in which they have been at all times arranged; the law, the prophets and the Psalms or poetical books. In Josephus, an author living in the first age of Christianity, of a priestly family, well versed in the learning and antiquities of his nation, we find the following testimony: "For we have not innumerable books which contradict each other; but only twenty-two which comprise the history of all times past, and are justly held to be credible. Five of these books proceed from Moses; they contain laws and accounts of the origin of men, and extend to his death. Accordingly they include a period not much less than three thousand years.—From the death of Moses onward to the reign of Artaxerxes, who, after Xerxes, reigned over the Persians, the prophets who lived after Moses, have recorded in thirteen books, what happened in their time. The other four books contain songs of praise to God, and rules of life for man. Since Artaxerxes, up to our time, every thing has been recorded; but these writings are not held to be so worthy of credit, as those written earlier, because after that time there was no regular succession of prophets. What faith we attribute to our Scriptures is manifest in our conduct. For although so great a period of time has elapsed, no one has yet undertaken, either to add any thing, or to take away, or to alter any thing. For it is, so to speak, innate with all Jews, to hold these books to be God's instructions, and firmly to stand by them, nay, if necessity required, gladly to die in their behalf."—*Contra Apion, Lib. 1, S. 8.* Philo, the learned Alexandrian Jew, also expresses himself in the

strongest terms respecting Moses and his books. The Targums or Chaldee paraphrases on these writings, likewise furnish evidence of their existence at the time for which we are contending.

Let us now examine the proof of the Pentateuch, having been extant since the age of Ezra. In the passage of Josephus above cited, we find it stated, that "since Artaxerxes, up to our time, every thing has been recorded, but these writings are not held to be so worthy of credit, as those written earlier," &c. i. e. not having been written by prophets, they have no divine authority attached to them. Many of them however, are useful moral and historical writings—of this character is Ecclesiasticus, written two or three hundred years B. C.—and in it we find express reference to the ancient sacred books of the Jews, under the expressions: "the law, the prophets, and the rest of the books."

The celebrated translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, into Greek which is termed the Septuagint, moreover took place 280 B. C. in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus. It is not to be supposed that the original work did not exist long before this time, the more especially since the Hebrew ceased to be a spoken language about the era of the captivity, and books were no longer composed in it. But the least shadow of doubt is removed from this subject, by a reference to the fact, that a totally distinct edition of the Pentateuch is preserved by the Samaritans. This people received their name from Samaria, the capital of the kingdom of the ten tribes, after their revolt from the house of David. About 700 years B. C. this kingdom was subverted by the Assyrians, a great part of its inhabitants transported, and their place supplied by colonies, brought from beyond Euphrates. The new inhabitants of the land becoming incorporated with those of its original occupants, who remained, and being instructed by an Israelitish Priest, formed a mingled race, with a religion substantially Jewish, but with sundry modifications derived from their ancient Heathenism. There had been a long religious and political rivalry between the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel, previously to the overthrow of the latter. For the first Jeroboam had not only gained for

himself a throne, but had established a schismatical worship. It was not then to be expected that relations more amicable, would exist between those contiguous nations, now that new and still greater differences had arisen.

Two hundred years afterwards when the Jews returned from the captivity in Babylon, the Samaritans proffered their assistance in rebuilding the temple of Jerusalem; which being rejected, they threw every obstacle in the way of the accomplishment of the work. Out of these incidents, grew up a still more bitter animosity. Eventually the son of the Jewish high priest, having married the daughter of the Samaritan leader, and having been driven from Jerusalem, a temple was built on Mount Gerizim in which he might officiate.— During the career of the Macedonian conqueror, and in the age of Antiochus Epiphanes, many circumstances of an exasperating nature, took place between these already hostile races; and to the time of our Saviour there had yet arisen among them “no friendly dealings with each other.”

Of the Samaritans, there are yet existing some remnants in their original seat, and elsewhere. They have in their possession a copy of the Pentateuch, written in the Phœnician or ancient Hebrew character, such as was used previously to the captivity. This has been obtained from them in modern times only, by the learned of Europe, although several of the early Christian fathers were apprised of its existence in their age.

Concerning the antiquity of this copy and the source whence it has been derived, there has been much controversy among the learned. Two different opinions however, have gained for themselves, the greatest support. Some suppose it to be very ancient, and think, that in the form in which we now have it, it existed among the ten tribes before Jeroboam. Others on the contrary, who do not refer the Pentateuch to Moses, but to some author about the time of the exile, conclude that the fugitive priest, Manasseh, to whom allusion has already been made, took with him from Jerusalem, the Jewish copy of the law and translated it into the ancient Phœnician character, to which the Samaritans

were more accustomed. This is the theory of R. Simon, Fulda, Paulus, DeWette, and Gesenius.* Rosenmuller Pro. in Pent. S. 6. referring to these two opinions gives in his adherence to the former; alleging as a very forcible reason for this belief, that in the whole space of time which elapsed from the revolt of the ten tribes until the destruction of the Samaritan kingdom, the prophets, Israelitish as well as Jewish, always and earnestly exhorted the people to render worship to Jehovah alone, such as is enjoined in the Pentateuch; and to the observance of the whole mass of laws prescribed in it; the same remarkable care in guarding the Mosaic institutions, being exhibited by the true prophets, both of Judah and Israel; and this entire agreement, proves that there must have been a code of laws, common to both kingdoms. These considerations, we think, enable us to trace the Pentateuch to the age of Solomon, B. C. 1000—at all events, the second theory above mentioned, *proposed by our adversaries*, enables us to establish the fact of its existence *immediately subsequent to the captivity*. As then, our investigations are likely to be protracted and may become tedious to some, and as the fact under discussion is on all hands admitted, we shall regard it as incontrovertible, that the Pentateuch did exist in the age of Ezra, who flourished 444 B. C.

* It may be well to observe, for the information of some, that no particular authority should be attached to the opinion of any German writer, in virtue of his being a *Theologian*, inasmuch as the wildest and most daring spirit of speculation, untrammelled by any regard to the truth or inspiration of the Scriptures, has long prevailed in the churches of Germany.

SECTION III.

Concerning the agency of Ezra, in reference to the Pentateuch; the authority of the books which bear his name, and the subject of the Jewish canon in general.

The age at which we have now arrived, is celebrated in the annals of the world, and of the highest interest in the Jewish history. Cyrus, the illustrious founder of the Persian Empire had lived, and his successors had undertaken those memorable expeditions against Greece, in which was remarkably demonstrated, the inefficiency of mere physical force, when opposed to the energies of freedom, and in which such moral, and intellectual qualities were developed in the invaded people, as have covered them, with imperishable renown. The illustrious schools of Grecian philosophy then originated.—Herodotus, the father of profane history, was preparing his immortal work. The various nations of the earth, were becoming introduced to nearer connexion with each other. And the shadows which rested over a remote antiquity, were in the act of being lifted up.

To the Jews, however, this was a period of still greater moment. It was the era of their renewed political existence, of the rebuilding of their desolated capital and temple, and of the re-establishment of its imposing worship. During several successive irruptions into Judea, the King of Babylon had carried into captivity, multitudes of Jews—the holy city had been captured, and the house of Jehovah destroyed by fire.

At the expiration of seventy years, the period announced by the prophet Jeremiah, as the term of their captivity, an edict of Cyrus was issued authorizing their return to their own country. Successive colonies, led by Zerubbabel of the royal line, by Ezra and by Nehemiah, between the years 536 and 444, B. C. amid many obstructions and delays, succeeded in rebuilding the temple and city walls. The Jewish polity, civil and religious, was under the auspices of the two leaders last mentioned, placed upon that basis substantially, on which it continued until the final dispersion of the nation. Of the general history of Ezra, we know not

much, except what is furnished by the record that "he was a ready scribe in the law of Moses, which the Lord God had given," and by the narrative of the reforms which he effected, and the observances which he restored among his countrymen, in conformity to the requisitions of that law.

As in the discussions respecting the genuineness of the earlier portion of the Old Testament scriptures, much has been said, in relation to the agency of this distinguished individual, in writing, compiling, or issuing a new and corrected recension of those Scriptures—it will be necessary to inquire, what are the decisions upon this subject—of contemporary documents—of trustworthy national tradition—and of probable conjecture.

What documents have we then existing, derived from that age? Besides the works of the prophets, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, we have the historical books of Ezra and Nehemiah, all furnishing corroboration to each other. In addition to these, the writer of "Geology and the Pentateuch," wishes to introduce two other sources of evidence: what are termed in our translation of the Bible, 1st and 2d Esdras,* but in the primitive Church, 3d and 4th Esdras; Ezra and Nehemiah being reckoned the 1st and 2d books of that name. It is indeed only the 4th book of Esdras, which will at all serve his purpose, inasmuch, as in this alone is contained the legend, respecting the burning of the law and its miraculous restoration through the instrumentality of Ezra. We may, however, institute an inquiry into the credit due to each of these books, not as inspired, but simply as contemporary documents, bearing upon their face a presumption of truth. In this aspect of the case, it is not necessary that we should enter at all upon the subject of the Jewish canon of Scripture, either in a general view, or with reference to these books in particular, yet since our author has led the way, we shall not shrink from following him. Let us then hear his objections to the *determinateness* of the canon in general. There is no known criterion of the books called "apocryphal,"—every ancient ecclesiastical author, and every division of Christians, have different notions of books "canonical,"

* Greek Orthography of Ezra.

and books "apocryphal." "Professor Michaelis uses the term apocryphal for authentic, as distinguished from "inspired," and merely in opposition to "canonical." "There was no enumeration of canonical books by any christian writer, until the time of Melito, Bishop of Sardis, A. D. 170." "No canon settled by authority, until the Council of Laodicea, A. D. 468." "Council of Carthage, A. D. 397, admitted the two books of Esdras." "The Greek and Romish Church receive Esdras as canonical." These passages occur Geo. and Pen. p. 51. 52. and on p. 7. it is said the canon was settled by Church authority, at the Council of Carthage. A. D. 397, although as is seen above, it is alledged not to have been settled by ecclesiastical authority until the council of Laodicea, A. D. 468, and on the same page, we read: "There is no Jewish writer on the canon, now known anterior to the Talmudists," several centuries after Christ; although on p. 52, the author observes "I am aware of the argument in favor of the present canon, drawn from Philo, Josephus," &c., who were certainly Jewish writers. These however, are trivial inconsistencies, in comparison with others which shall be cited in the course of this essay.

We here observe that the first objection to the determinateness of the Jewish canon, is grounded upon the ambiguity of the terms used in the discussion. It is granted that those terms have by different persons been used in various significations, at one and another period. There is no doubt that, according to the statement of Eichhorn, the term "Canon," meant: 1st, a publicly approved catalogue of all the books which might be read in the assemblies of Christians for instruction and edification; 2nd, a collection of divine and inspired writings. In like manner the term apocryphal was first applied to obscurely written books, which in consequence were "set aside," and from them, nothing allowed to be read publicly. It was then used to designate supposititious writings, which in consequence of their worthlessness, were not used for public instruction, and finally writings not inspired. It matters not however, what *terms* were used by the writers on the subject which we have now in hand; provided there be an entire consent re-

specting the matter itself. Eichhorn has well stated, as the true and perspicuous notion of the canon, "that at the time of our Saviour's appearance, there was in Palestine a collection, which made up a complete whole, and in the New Testament, was sometimes comprised under the appellation Scripture or Holy Scriptures; sometimes paraphrased by law and prophets, or by law, prophets and psalms." That there did exist such a collection, is fully demonstrated by this writer, in a lucid and beautiful treatise on the canon of the Old Testament, a translation of which may be found in a volume, entitled "Essays and Dissertations on Biblical Literature," published in New York, 1829.

With the "learned and condensed arguments," presented in this work, our author professes to be well acquainted, as also, with those of a later writer, *Jahn*, whom he terms "far more suspicious." And in reference to both, in his usual uncourteous style, he observes, "they do well perhaps to defend the cause, which they were *employed* to support, and which supported them." He did not advert to the fact, that German theologians allow themselves all freedom of thought and discussion, and that Eichhorn especially was far from being subject to any trammels of authority. But to return—by these arguments it does not appear that our learned antagonist was convinced, and he therefore presumes that they will be equally ineffectual with others.

I have no hesitation however in asserting my conviction that they must prevail with all intelligent and candid persons, who will bestow upon them a proper attention.

The great variety of topics which must necessarily pass under our review, does not permit the attempt to give an exhibition of these arguments. The reader is earnestly recommended to examine them, in the above cited work of Eichhorn, and in *Jahn's* Introduction to the Old Testament, a translation of which, has also been made in this country. The confident assertion "that every ancient ecclesiastical writer, and every division of Christians, have different notions of books canonical and apocryphal, is there shewn to be entirely

unwarranted. And with regard to the statements, that there was no Christian writer on the subject of the Jewish Canon, until Melito, Bishop of Sardis, A. D. 170, nor any canon settled by Church authority, until the Councils of Carthage or Laodicea, A. D. 397 or 458, I would merely observe, that it is difficult to conceive for what purpose they were made. I do not know how much earlier than the period first indicated, a Christian writer could have been expected to advert to the subject, in a *systematic* way. Little more than a century had passed, since the first preaching of Christianity.—Where the great object was to extend the knowledge of the truth, by the oral communications of living teachers, there were few writers; and those who did exercise themselves in this way, were engaged with subjects which presented more urgent claims upon their attention. The few literary productions of the first century, and of the earlier portion of the second, were brief addresses to Christian Churches principally of an hortatory nature; and apologies to the Roman Emperors, in which were repelled the calumnies, with which the new religion was assailed both by Jews and Heathens.

Moreover, when Christianity was principally confined to Judea, and the regions adjoining, when in all places there were many Hebrew Christians, from whom the associated Gentile believers, would necessarily learn the number and names of the books anciently accounted sacred; what could be expected other than such incidental allusions to this collection in general or to its particular parts, as abound in the New Testament, and in the writings of those, who immediately succeeded the apostles. At a somewhat later period, however, when Jerusalem was finally destroyed, under the reign of Hadrian, and the Jews dispersed from their own land; and when in many parts of the world, where the Gospel had been preached, there existed little acquaintance with Jewish opinions, and no minute knowledge of that previous religious system, out of which Christianity had grown; we might expect Christian writers to refer to these subjects in a more systematic way. Accordingly, we find Melito, Bishop of Sardis, who travelled

into the East, with a view to ascertain from the accounts of the Jews there, the contents and number of their sacred books, communicating to his brother Onesimus, the result of his investigations.

In almost every Christian writer of repute, during the next three or four hundred years, we meet with enumerations of the Old Testament scriptures, agreeing in all important particulars. Many of these are cited by Eichhorn, and other writers on the canon, and all may be found in "Lardner's Credibility of the Gospel History."

It is, therefore, ridiculous to talk of no canon being established by church authority, previously to the Council of Carthage, or that of Laodicea. In truth, the Christian Church had no authority to declare any thing in relation to this matter. It is a mere subject of historical inquiry—what was the collection of sacred writings extant among the Jews, in the time of our Saviour, to which he and his apostles gave their sanction? In determining this, all we need is the testimony of credible witnesses living at, or near the time. And of this we have all that can be desired.

We are now to examine the assertions of our author, in relation to some particular books—the 1st and 2d, or, as they were anciently reckoned, 3d and 4th books of Esdras. "The Greek and Romish Church, receive Esdras as canonical." The Council of Carthage admitted the "two books of Esdras;" and page 11, it is said, the Greek Church and the Roman Catholics admit this book of Esdras, (the fourth,) as genuine. A quotation is also made from Prideaux, which will presently be cited; by which the authority of this book is attempted to be supported. The first remark which I would make upon these statements is, that here we have an artful blending together of the claims of two books, having no necessary or actual connection with each other. What may be true of the third book of Esdras, he attempts, in this way, to establish respecting the fourth. Of the various portions of Christendom, the Greek Church alone recognizes the canonical authority of the third (called in our Apocrypha, the first) book of Esdras—and this recognition, it is attempted

by a skilful generality in terms, to extend to the fourth book, (or second of our Apocrypha.) A still more striking illustration of this remark, is furnished by the mode in which Prideaux's testimony is used. The fact of a suspension of the building of the temple, for the space of two years, being referred to by this author, in his "Connexion," &c., gives occasion to the following remark: "so saith the writer of the first apocryphal book of Esdras; and although he be an apocryphal writer, and is, in most things wherein he doth not translate from the canonical book of Ezra, very fabulous, yet, in this particular, he may be well supposed to deliver himself according to the received traditions of the age in which he lived and the histories then extant; and this was very ancient; for it is certain he wrote before Josephus: and an ancients evidence than this, we cannot have from any writer, since the Scriptures of the Old Testament, concerning this matter."—*Vol. II. p. 31.*—*Charlestown, 1815.* Now this passage is quoted by our author, and prefixed to an attempt to prove that Ezra wrote the Pentateuch, a thing asserted not by the writer of the 3d, but of the 4th book of Esdras. Prideaux's testimony is therefore clearly irrelevant; but the uninformed might be thence led to conclude that this distinguished divine intended to guaranty the competence and credibility, as an historical witness, of the writer of fourth Esdras. But what does Prideaux say, concerning this book? Controverting the opinion of certain fathers, he observes, p. 103, Vol. II. *Connexion*,—"They had no other foundation for it, than that fabulous relation which we have in the second (4th) apocryphal book of Esdras; a book too absurd for the Romanists themselves to receive into their canon."

The second remark which I would make, respecting the statements now under view, is, that with an exception or two they are grossly incorrect. The Greek Church does not receive 4th Esdras; neither does the Roman Catholic; nor did the Council of Carthage. What could have led our author into these errors? He seems to have forgotten that Ezra and Nehemiah were anciently reckoned as the 1st and 2d Esdras. For once his universal learning has failed him, or he has

voluntarily erred to serve a purpose. But were Ezra and Nehemiah accounted as 1st and 2d Esdras, as I have asserted? The proof is abundant. Let us hear the Council of Trent, in its "Decretum de Canonicis Scripturis." In the enumeration of the books of the Old Testament, we perceive "Esdræ primus et *secundus qui dicitur Nehemias*." No notice is taken of the 3rd and 4th books. Lactantius, whom Gibbon has pronounced the most eloquent of the Latin fathers, A. D. 306, quotes Nehemiah, under the name of Esdras, because it was reckoned the 2nd book, under that title.—Lardner, Vol. III. p. 527, London Edition, 1831. Jerome, A. D. 392, in that preface, concerning all the books of the Old Testament, which he terms, "Prologus Galeatus," giving an enumeration of them, consistently with our received canon, only grouping two together, in some instances, after the manner of the Jews, who aimed at a correspondence with the number of letters in their alphabet, observes—"The 8th of the class Hagiographia is Ezra, which among the Greeks and Latins, makes two." And in the preface to his translation of Ezra and Nehemiah, he says, "by the Hebrews, they are reckoned as one book, called Ezra; but reckoning them as two, *he* had not translated the dreams of those apocryphal books, 3rd and 4th Esdras, which were not found among the Jews, and were therefore not to be regarded." Lardner IV. p. 420. Origen, A. D. 230, speaks of Esdras 1st and 2d, as being in one book, called by the Jews, Ezra. To the same purpose express themselves, Epiphanius, Rufinus, and Athanasius, in his Paschal epistle. We need no farther proof of our position, and when in the canon recognized by the Council of Carthage, we find mentioned 1st and 2nd Esdras, no man of common intelligence, can suppose that any other books are referred to, but those of Ezra and Nehemiah. In relation to the 4th book of Esdras, I would only remark farther, that it is not extant in Greek, and never was in Hebrew, and subjoin the observation of the learned Basnage: "We suppose the author to have been a Jew who was educated in Chaldea. In his writings, he has borrowed his arrangement, style and prophetic expressions from Daniel." "He was in reality a Chris-

tian, for he often speaks of Jesus the Son of God; but he retained after his conversion, the reverence which was felt by all the Jews in the time of Christ, for their cabalistic learning and traditions.”—Basnage, appended to Jahn’s Heb. Com. p. 578. Such then is the poor authority, upon which rests the legend of the miraculous restoration of the law by Ezra, after it had been burnt; a writer living 500 years afterwards, utterly unsupported by any contemporary, or intermediate document, at variance with national tradition, and opposed by authentic records. That some of the early Christian fathers should have confided in his statements, can add nothing to his authority. We have access to all the sources of evidence which they possessed. And we thus perceive, of how little force is the remark of our author: “Esdras, would never have ventured to publish this, as a fact, to the whole Jewish nation, which the production of one copy could confute, if the assertion could be contradicted.” This remark would have full force, provided the spurious Ezra had made his statement at the time when the fact was alleged to have taken place; but with the understanding, that it was made five hundred years afterwards, it is entirely futile. To this we may add the consideration stated by Jerome, that this 4th Esdras, was not found among the Jews.

But we have it again suggested, “that it is not true, that certain ancient fathers had no other reason for their opinion, than the passage in 4th Esdras—they were supported by the traditions of the whole Jewish nation, leaving it uncertain, whether the Pentateuch was a composition, or compilation by Ezra, or partly one, and the other.” How very logical is the conclusion arrived at, in this remark; the fact that the book of the law, was burnt and restored by Ezra, is *proved*, by the universal tradition of the Jewish nation, declaring what?—why “*leaving it doubtful* whether, the Pentateuch was composed, compiled, or partly one, or partly the other.”

And here, I would note, once for all, the artful and disingenuous use, which our author, makes of the phrase, “the Pentateuch, *as we now have it*.” If Ezra had added a single note, or modernized a single name, it might be

said, that the book *as we now have it*, was not the work of Moses. So, also, if in the lapse of ages, any, the least accidental corruption, or omission in the text had occurred. When, therefore, an author is cited by our antagonist, as holding that the Pentateuch, *as we now have it*, was not the work of Moses; let him state what degree of change, was believed to have passed upon it. Let him also, more particularly explain his meaning, when he declares, that he would not believe upon his oath, any well informed man, who should assert, that the Pentateuch, *as we now have it*, was written by Moses. But we are told, that “after the complete destruction of Jerusalem no positive evidence of the loss of all documents, is necessary. In reference to this, let us remember our objector’s favorite adage, “*affirmantis est probare.*” It is no where said, that all the copies of the law were in Jerusalem, much less in the temple.—Had it been so, they might have been preserved among the precious things; the vessels of the house of God, which were carried off, by the conqueror. But Daniel, had long before gone into captivity, and being an individual of great learning and piety, doubtless had with him the sacred books of his nation. So would we remark of Ezekiel, who prophesied among the exiles—and of Jeremiah, who remained in Judea, until a party of his countrymen compelled him to accompany them into Egypt. Surely also, some of the priests and Levites, a body of men especially devoted to performing the ceremonial observances, and teaching the moral precepts of their law, must have had copies of it. Confirmation of this conjecture is furnished by contemporary documents, as will be shewn in the next section.

SECTION IV.

Of the agency of Ezra, in relation to the Pentateuch, as appears from history; as affirmed by tradition, and as indicated by the probabilities of the case.

The utter worthlessness of the fourth book of Esdras, as furnishing any evidence of an historical fact, having been clearly shewn, it only remains for us to inquire, what light is thrown upon the subject of our present investigation, by the productions which are, unquestionably, derived from the age to which it refers. In the book which bears his name, Ezra is introduced to our notice as a ready scribe in the law of Moses, which the Lord God of Israel had given. Certainly then we are to understand this law as existing and in writing; for in the account given in a previous chapter (iii,) of the return of the first band of exiles under Zerubbabel, more than fifty years before, it is recorded that they built the altar of the God of Israel, to offer burnt offerings thereon, as it is *written* in the law of Moses the man of God. Ezra is farther represented as leading a second colony to Jerusalem, authorized by the Persian king to establish and enforce all ordinances necessary to the well-being of his nation. Various abuses are reformed by him; and under his auspices, with the concurrence of the succeeding governor, Nehemiah, there takes place a solemn recital of the law, in the hearing and at the request of all the people. "All the people gathered themselves together as one man; and they spake unto Ezra the scribe to bring the book of the law of Moses which the Lord had commanded Israel,"—ch. viii, 1. On the 24th of the seventh month, a solemn fast is held, with confession of sin. The Levites on this occasion, in the course of their acknowledgment, make a particular recital of those incidents in the history of the Jews, connected with their deliverance from Egypt and settlement in Canaan. This circumstance furnishes proof that the Pentateuch, substantially in its present form then existed. The time taken for its deliberate reading is a corroborating consideration; and there is not the least intimation, that on this occasion, any production was

brought under view of the people, of which they were before ignorant. And here it may be a matter of curiosity to collate two passages, connected with this subject, from "Geology and the Pentateuch." In page 47, we read: "Ezra the scribe brings out the book of the law of Moses, and reads it to the assembled people. This took up from the morning until mid-day, including the time occupied by the comments and explanations of thirteen priests, besides Ezra and Nehemiah. Now, this could not have been the Pentateuch, whatever it was—a morning could not have sufficed for the purpose." Nor did it. The reading was continued for seven successive days, as we shall find our author with strange inconsistency arguing, in the extract which I shall next adduce. Page 50. In giving reasons for his belief of the Esdrine origin of the Pentateuch, the third consideration alleged is: "Because the book of the law composed or compiled by Ezra, took him seven days to read it to the people." Was there ever a more glaring contradiction? Can we have any confidence in a writer who is so utterly careless as to commit such an oversight? Or can it be possible that it was intentionally committed, with the hope that it would pass unobserved by the multitude of his readers?

The account of the solemn reading of the law, which I have above extracted from the book bearing the name of Ezra, is all that we meet with in documents, written at that time, concerning his connexion with the Pentateuch. We find elsewhere abundant recognition of its existence, but no specific account of any critical care bestowed, in correcting, editing, or arranging it. It is well known, however, that according to the traditions received by the Jews of later times, much of this nature has been ascribed to the individual who so largely shared in the work of reorganizing the Jewish polity after the captivity. Let us see what the representation of that tradition is. Let us take it from Prideaux, who is admitted by Dr. C. to be a witness of unquestioned competency. He observes in his *Connexion*, Vol. II.—"But the great work of Ezra, was his collecting together and setting forth a correct edition of the Holy Scriptures. This both Jews and Christians give him the hon-

or of, and many of the ancient fathers attribute more to him in this particular than the Jews themselves; for they hold that all the Sacred Scriptures were lost and destroyed in the Babylonish captivity, and that Ezra restored them all again by divine revelation. Thus saith Irenæus," &c. We thus perceive that the Jewish traditions extend no farther than the ascription to Ezra of a *collection* and *correct edition* of their sacred books with an illustrative observation occasionally introduced. The favorite position of Dr. C. was only maintained by certain Christian fathers, whose sole authority was the 4th book of Esdras.

But while on the subject of Jewish tradition, it is necessary to advert to what that tradition is supposed to mean, when it speaks of the law of Moses. Our author says, p. 15, "one concession I am compelled to make, that the expressions, the Law, the Law of Moses, the Law of the Lord, and the Book of the Law, are often met with throughout the Bible." He is sure they do not mean the Pentateuch, but observes, "In explaining them I know of no better authority than the universal and uniform account given of them by the Jews themselves." Again: "The references to Jewish writers and authorities by Prideaux, is laborious and ample; and from them, and from his summary of Jewish opinions, it appears that these expressions do not mean the Pentateuch, except so much as was written at Sinai by Moses himself, as we shall see, i. e. the two tables of stone; but they mean and refer to the collection made by Ezra, from the traditionary information delivered to him. All this is so plain that I shall assume it as undeniable, and consider the law, and the law of Moses, mentioned in the Old Testament, as expressions that refer, not to the law that Moses *did* write, but chiefly to the law that Moses did not write." Now it is strange that expressions occurring in books long anterior to Ezra should refer to a *collection* which *he* made from the traditionary information delivered to him; but I suppose there is here a little confusion of thought, and that it was meant to be asserted, that what is spoken of, in the historical books of the Jews, as the law of Moses, was merely that unwritten, traditionary law,

which Ezra afterwards committed to writing. Yet it is strange that the designation "book of the law," should be given to a mass of civil and religious observances, regulated by traditionary information communicated orally. But we have seen the principle of our author—now for the proof which he gives. He contents himself with referring to Prideaux's summary of Jewish opinions, and the authorities cited by him. And what do Prideaux and his authorities affirm on this subject? Absolutely nothing, I unhesitatingly and broadly assert, in the remotest degree, sustaining this principle.—The reverse is clearly established. It is utterly amazing that a writer, having any pretensions to candor or intelligence, should have so mistaken the matter himself or should have attempted thus to mislead his readers. Let us examine the passage relied on for proof. The Jews have a two-fold law, both given by Moses at Sinai; one committed to writing; the other handed down by tradition from generation to generation—both settled by the authority of Ezra; for while he published a correct edition of their sacred books, he also examined and allowed certain observances among the Jews, resting only on oral tradition. This is what Prideaux and his authorities declare. But is it said that Ezra committed this traditionary law to writing, and that to it chiefly refer the expressions, occurring in the various historical books of the Old Testament, the law, &c. *Not one word of this.* Here is the statement given.—Prid. Con. Vol. ii. 93. Charlestown ed. "As to the ancient and approved usages of the Jewish church, which had been in practice before the captivity, they had, by Joshua and Zerubbabel, with the chief elders, their contemporaries, and by others that after succeeded them, been a gathering together from their first return to Jerusalem, as they could be recovered from the ancients, &c. All these, and whatever else was pretended to be of the same nature, Ezra brought under a review; and having, after due examination, allowed such of them as were to be allowed, and settled them by his approbation and authority, they gave birth to what the Jews now call their oral law." This oral law, it is well known, was never committed to writing, until after the time of Christ.

when Rabbi Judah collected them and the Mishnah was formed. This, with the comments on it, termed Gemara, constitute the Talmud.

But again: this oral law, thus conveyed down by tradition, was the comment of which the Pentateuch was the text. I shall not cite the long accounts which according to Prideaux, the Jews give of the delivery of both these laws, by Moses, at Sinai; I would only observe, that Moses first delivered to Aaron the written law, and then the oral, which was its interpreter.—Aaron did the same to his sons; then to the seventy elders, and they to the whole congregation; that they put the text into writing, but the interpretation of it they delivered down by word of mouth to the succeeding generations. It is farther related, that many years afterwards, immediately before his death, “Moses delivered to them thirteen copies of the written law, from the *beginning of Genesis to the end of Deuteronomy*, one to each of the twelve tribes, to be kept by them throughout their generations, and the thirteenth to the Levites, to be laid up by them in the tabernacle before the Lord.” The oral law was also committed to Joshua; by him to the elders succeeding; from them extended to the prophets, from age to age, until the time of Ezra; from him, still unwritten, it passed to various individuals, successively, until the time of Rabbi Judah Hakkadosh, who wrote it in the book called Mishnah. Prid. Vol. ii. 98. Again, p. 107: “The *five books* of the law are divided into fifty-four sections. This division many of the Jews hold to be one of the constitutions of Moses at Mount Sinai.” Moreover, “the written text consisted of 613 precepts, into which they divide the law.” Surely this was more than the decalogue, or a few chapters of Deuteronomy. Can any thing then be plainer, than that the universal Jewish tradition reports Moses as having delivered in writing, at Sinai, the very books which we now have under the name of the Pentateuch. And may we trust our eyes, when, in reference to an opinion directly opposed to all this, and after an appeal for support to an authority utterly contradicting it, we read, “all this is so plain that I shall assume it as undeniable!!” Must we not admire the

promptness with which our author advances to his conclusion, when after this *formidable* array of proofs, he says, "I trust I have shewn that by the expressions, the law, &c. the Jews *do not, and never did, understand* the Pentateuch." Surely no clerical logic can be worse than this, nor can the patrons of orthodoxy furnish any rarer specimen of "impudent hardihood of assertion." Every honorable and candid man must admit, that whatever may be the true state of the case, such a mode of managing the controversy is utterly discreditable to him who uses it.

We have seen then what contemporary documents assert, respecting the agency of Ezra in relation to the sacred books of his nation; what is the tradition on this subject, be its value more or less; we have only briefly to inquire, what is dictated by probability or analogy. On this topic I shall merely cite a passage from Knapp's Theology, Vol. i. 82. He observes that at particular periods in a nation's history, learned men appear who interest themselves in its literary productions. "They take pains to preserve their text or to restore it when it has become corrupt: they shew the distinction between genuine and spurious writing; and they make collections or lists, comprising only those which are genuine. Such persons anciently appeared among the Israelites, and afterwards among the Christians. And such among the Greeks, were the grammarians of Alexandria, under the Ptolemies. They distinguished between the genuine and spurious works of Grecian literature. The books admitted into the canon they called *εγγεγραμμένοι*, and the books excluded *εκκεκριμένοι*. The excluded books were of course less used, and have since mostly perished, vide Ruhnken, *Historia Oratorum Græcorum Critica*, page 96. These remarks illustrate the origin of the collection of the Holy Scriptures."

We may reasonably conclude, therefore, that Ezra with other learned men, his coadjutors, did bestow that care in collecting and editing the literary monuments of their nation, which we know to have been exercised in other instances.

It appears then—I. That we have the fullest evidence

of the existence of the Pentateuch, immediately after the return from the captivity.

II. There is nothing in contemporary or trust-worthy documents, or tradition, asserting that it then first existed—that Ezra fabricated it.

III. It is national tradition that he collected and edited the sacred books of the Jews.

We have now to inquire—what reasons sustain the belief that the Pentateuch was not written in any intermediate age, but must be referred to Moses as its author?

SECTION V.

*Various theories respecting the origin of the Pentateuch—
Positive evidence that it is the production of Moses.*

The author of the “Connexion between Geology and the Pentateuch,” observes,* “that this book is by *universal acknowledgment*, so garbled and interpolated, as well as so utterly uncertain as to its author or compiler that it carries with it no historical credibility.” He also remarks,† “that the fact of these supposed writings of Moses having been compiled at some unknown time, *subsequently* to the captivity, is *on all hands admitted*.”

This writer assuredly uses terms of universality in a very extraordinary acceptation. If there be this entire agreement, why does he so zealously and perseveringly exert himself in sustaining his proposition? Are there no ignorant or interested supporters of orthodoxy who maintain a different opinion? Surely there are. Otherwise our antagonists, with their rare benevolence and unquestionable disinterestedness,—who, in the very spirit of martyrdom, are resolved to emancipate their fellow men from the thralldom of priestly domination,—would have a light task to accomplish. But perhaps it is meant to affirm this universal consent, respecting the spuriousness and worthlessness of this production, of those only who having the same critical acumen, and the same

* Page 18.

† Page 53.

honesty of purpose, which are possessed by our author himself, deserve to have something conceded to their opinion. But here again the assertion is, unfortunately, utterly opposed to the true state of the case. Neither among avowed Infidels, nor among the free thinking theologians of Germany, may we find this harmonious acquiescence in the theory above suggested. Rosenmüller, in his "Prolegomena in Pentateuchum," has given a full enumeration of the conjectures of those who dissent from the received hypothesis respecting the origin of this book. Some of these may be here briefly stated. Le Clerc, at one period of his life, ascribed the Pentateuch to the Israelitish priests, sent by the king of Assyria, to instruct the inhabitants whom he had transported into the conquered kingdom of the ten tribes. This was two hundred years before the return of the Jews from their captivity. Frid. Carl. Fulda thought that the Pentateuch was not *older* than the time of David. Nactigal supposed that previously to the time of Samuel, there were existing nothing but genealogical tables with few or no literary remains; that the achievements of ancient times were only commemorated in songs and on monuments; that at this period these historic odes, which had been in a great measure drawn from inscriptions on stone or brass, were in the schools of the prophets committed to writing; that in succeeding times many books were written by wise and erudite men, which contained these odes, narrations concerning ancient affairs, and a collection of laws; and that from books of this sort, brought together by the care of the learned of that age, under the direction perhaps of Jeremiah, the Pentateuch was compiled at the time of the exile. To Bertholdt it seemed probable that this book was reduced to its present form by Samuel, and deposited in the ark of the covenant; and that a copy of it, written upon Egyptian linen, was that volume of the law found by Hilkiah in the temple.—Even Volney supposes it to have been written by Hilkiah—of course not after the captivity. What then are we to think of the *agreement on all hands* that it was not more ancient than the latter period! Spinoza, Vater, De Wette, and Hasse, maintain this, but a large majori-

ty even of the opposers of the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch affirm the contrary; while the great body of theologians and biblical critics, trace it to the age of the Jewish law-giver, and to himself as the writer. It may be well also to observe, that of the authors above cited, Le Clerc and Hasse subsequently changed their opinion and wrote in favor of the genuineness of the Pentateuch. Rosenmuller likewise, a most distinguished German commentator, having originally denied, afterwards sustained this view. As to any deference which should be shown to the judgment of such renowned critics as Vater and De Wette, it should be remembered that they, as well as the advocates of more orthodox sentiments, had their preconceived opinions under the influence of which the reasonings were conducted by which they arrived at their particular conclusion. The latter, for instance, assumes it as impossible that miracles or prophesy should exist. He rests his belief of the modern origin of Genesis, upon the consideration of the miraculous events related in it, for he argues, "Such accounts can only owe their origin to *popular report*, which must have been of very long standing to have become exaggerated in the degree in which it is given in this book."[†]

We are now prepared to examine the evidence by which the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch is demonstrated. In the out-set of the investigation, however, it will be necessary to institute the inquiry—what does this document bear upon its face in relation to its age and authorship? If it do not purport to have appeared at a time coeval with the origin of the Jewish polity, and to have proceeded from the law-giver himself, it were useless for us to assert claims on its behalf which itself disavows. We are repeatedly told by the writer of the tract, to which reference has been so often made, that such is not the fact. It is denied "that any passage of the Pentateuch assigns itself generally, or any book of it specifically, to Moses." Again it is said "that Moses does not claim the Pentateuch as his

[†] "Common sense determines that such miracles are *impossible*. * * * Might not events have happened which seemed to be miraculous?—a close inspection of the narrative will negative this supposition. The result is already attained, that the narration is not contemporary, nor derived from contemporary sources."—*De Wette Ev.* § 145.

production, in any one assignable part, and that it is not ascribed to him from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelation." Yet again it is authoritatively pronounced, "Moses nowhere claims the authorship of these books, nor are the five books of Moses, nor any book among them, mentioned, or cited, or referred to, in any part of the Bible." In view of these assertions it is incumbent on us to ascertain what can be learned, with respect to the antiquity and origin of the Pentateuch from its own declarations, and from the remaining Jewish historical documents. And yet in meeting this very requisition of our antagonist himself, we are doomed to smart under his sarcastic reflections upon clerical logic. "No author is permitted to fabricate evidence in his own favor. You must establish the genuineness and authenticity of the Pentateuch before you can quote its authority for any thing contained in it." Then follows his specimen of clerical logic, which I shall not condescend to transcribe. All that I will here observe is—how unhappy is the lot of the poor theologians. If they attempt to prove from its own declarations that the book under our view claims to be written by the Hebrew legislator, they are accused of employing the absurd reasoning to which allusion has just been made; if they omit to do this, they are triumphantly told, the Pentateuch makes no pretension to be his production.

But let us advance to the proof of our principle. Moses in express words testifies, Deut. xxxi, 9–13, 22, 24–26, that this whole book was written by him from beginning to end, delivered to the elders of the people and priests, that it might be kept in the tabernacle by the side of the ark of the covenant; to be read in the hearing of all the people every seventh year at the feast of the tabernacles. And throughout the entire work, of which Deuteronomy is a part, "Moses says that he committed to writing—now particular laws—now accounts of transactions occurring. Thus in Exodus xvii, 14, the conduct of the Amalekites and the destruction destined for them in a coming age, he declares that he had by divine command written in a book, without doubt already begun, as may be gathered, says Rosenmüller, from the words being written with the article—by

which it is signified that he spake of one particular and well known book. Ex. xxiv, 4, 7. After the Israelites had received the law from Moses "he wrote all the words of Jehovah in the book of the covenant which he read to the assembled people." When to these precepts others were added, he was also commanded, Ex. xxxiv, 27, to commit them to writing. Moreover, Num. xxxiii, 1, 2, he is said, by the command of Jehovah, to have written out the journeyings of the Israelites. The book of Numbers is closed with these words: "These are the commandments and the judgments which the Lord commanded by the hand of Moses unto the children of Israel in the plains of Moab, by Jordan, near Jericho."—Lastly, in Deuteronomy, in which are contained the conclusion, the explanation and supplement of his laws, Moses in his addresses to the people, again and again speaks of "this law," and "the book of this law." Especially to be remarked is the place, Deuteronomy, xxviii, 61, where in the address in which Moses threatens the Israelites with all calamities, in case of disobedience to the divine commands, among other things there we read "Every sickness and every plague *which is not written* in the book of this law, them will the Lord bring upon thee." Whence it follows that Moses had delivered this book to the people and so had himself committed his communications to writing.

The result, then, at which we have arrived by this hasty review of the contents of the document whose claims we are discussing, is, that Moses is represented as at intervals writing much; as recording not only laws but narratives of transactions, predictions of future events; directions respecting particular works, with an account of their completion—for instance the various instruments of the solemn and imposing worship which was instituted. The whole character of the book, with its expressed contents, is entirely conformed to what we observe in the Pentateuch now possessed by us. That the writer speaks of himself in the third person, need excite no surprise in one whose reading has extended so far as Cæsar's Commentaries.

But in many parts of the Old Testament, the "law of

Moses," and the law which Jehovah gave by Moses, is mentioned. In the book of Joshua,—which though it be much more recent than the age of that leader, was doubtless composed, as respects its greatest part, from documents, if not obviously contemporary, certainly very ancient,—we find it recorded, that very soon after the death of Moses, Joshua was admonished that he should read the book of the law continually.—Josh. i. 7, 8. And again, in an address to the people, ch. xxiii. 3–16, this ruler admonishes the elders of Israel, that they should do all things which were written in the book of the law of Moses; and he not only makes mention of many laws, but many occurrences are described, and promises and threats proposed in it. At a still later period of the Jewish history, David, about to die, exhorts Solomon his son to observe all the precepts "which are written in the law of Moses."—1 Kings, ii. 3. Nor does the 2d Kings, xiv. 6, admit of any question, in which Amaziah, king of Judah, is said to have spared the children of the murderers of his father, "according to what is written in the book of the law of Moses;" and to which there is subjoined the passage now read in Deut. xxiv. 16. Jehoshaphat, 2d Chron. xvii. 9, sends priests "with the book of the law of Jehovah" throughout the cities and villages to instruct the people. In the reign of Hezekiah, (2 Chron. xxx. 16–18—xxxi. 3, 4, 21,) this king causes the passover to be celebrated "as it is written in the book of the law of Jehovah." Under Josiah, (2 Chron. xxxiv. 15,) it is said that the book of the law of Jehovah, by the hand of Moses, was found in the temple.* During the captivity the book of the law of Moses is mentioned by Daniel, chap. ix. 13. References to this book after the return from Babylon, and before the time of Ezra, have been already cited in a former part of this discussion.

The above collection of passages, by which, we think, is proved the existence of the Pentateuch, in every period of the Jewish history, from the time of Moses to the era of the captivity, may suffice. Those who desire farther satisfaction may consult Jahn's Introduc-

* The supposition that this book is a forgery of Hilkiah, we shall consider elsewhere. Its being mentioned here, is a valid argument against those who ascribe the Pentateuch to Ezra, and refer it to a period subsequent to the captivity.

tion. The only mode in which the argument grounded upon them can be evaded, is that adopted by Vater, who asserts that these citations only prove that certain laws and ancient written histories existed, but not the whole Pentateuch. In this opinion, which is a mere conjecture, he is, in substance, followed by Dr. C., who peremptorily denies that the phrases "*law of Moses*," &c. mean the Pentateuch. We have already seen how "lame and impotent" was the conclusion attempted to be drawn from modern Jewish opinion, by a reference to "Prideaux and his authorities," to prove that about which they affirm not one word. As no additional reason is urged to sustain an opinion which our author again pronounces "*ex cathedra*," we can only request a candid and careful examination of the testimonials above recited, and suggest some general considerations corroborative of the position which they are intended to sustain. In what age and by what author any book was written, are facts which can only be determined by historical evidence. This evidence may be, 1st, the testimony of those who possess the means of information, and who have no inducement to mislead us. 2d. Certain marks in the work itself, as respects language, style and sentiment, which point out its age and authorship. The evidence of the former class possessed by the work in question, is most ample. It has been handed down from generation to generation as the production of him whose name it bears. Those who lived contemporaneously with its origin, and transcribed this book, together with those who in successive ages transcribed it, form a series of witnesses to its genuineness. This is a proof which we never hesitate to admit in regard to the profane authors of antiquity, and this national testimony is, in regard to the Pentateuch, particularly satisfactory. Books, at so early a period as the one at which it dates its origin, were rare, and it was less difficult to retain the recollection of the author from whom they proceeded. This recollection was preserved in the familiar instruction of fathers to their children.—Deut. xxxii. 7; Ps. lxxviii. 3–7. A whole tribe, moreover, was devoted to the services of religion, which were intimately connected with a proper

preservation of their sacred records. Nor was there any motive to induce the Hebrews to corrupt the pure tradition relative to the source whence they were derived; I mean so as to ascribe to Moses what did not belong to him. Rather might they have been tempted to *deny* that a book containing many representations discreditable to their nation had been written by their illustrious and honored legislator. And the very fact that the Jews acknowledged their ignorance of the date and authorship of several of their historical books, furnishes to us a guaranty that when they do affirm any thing on the subject, they speak from adequate information.

We find then, by a reference to the passages cited by the later writers of the Old Testament, that there was at all times a "book of the law of Jehovah, written by Moses." We perceive that the laws, the promises, and threatenings, the historical narrations referred to, are all such as we now find in the Pentateuch. Particularly is this manifest from many allusions in the Psalms and prophets, which I have omitted to cite, but which may be seen in Rosenmüller's *Prolegomena*,* and in Jahn. The "book of the law" then was the Pentateuch as appears from the ancient national testimony of the Jews. Nor do their accredited modern traditions at all oppose this conclusion, NOTWITHSTANDING the REPEATED and CONFIDENT assertions of OUR ANTAGONIST.

SECTION VI.

Positive evidence of the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, continued.

But the internal marks of genuineness exhibited by this book are not less satisfactory than the external proofs which support it. The historical, political, and geographical details respecting the most remote anti-

* An excellent abstract of his arguments with additional considerations, may be seen in an article on the Samaritan Pentateuch, originally published in the *North American Review*, April, 1826; afterwards in *Biblical Repository*, Oct. 1832, by Professor Stuart. Dr. C. speaks respectfully of it, and opposes some assertions to its arguments.

quity which it contains, especially what pertains to the history and physical character of Egypt and Arabia, are so composed as to afford a strong presumption that they were written by a man who, at an ancient age, was liberally educated in the former country. What we read respecting the Exodus of the Israelites and their journeys through the Arabian desert, is in remarkable accordance with the statements of modern travellers.—The genius and conformation of the entire work, are moreover in exact correspondence with the character and circumstances of the author. In the last of the five books, we hear the legislator addressing the people whom he had governed many years; but now advanced in life, as the more diffuse style, which all observe in Deuteronomy, proves. In this book we hear the ruler now near his end, recalling to the remembrance of his people all things which had happened to them during his government and solemnly exhorting them to obey the laws which he had by divine authority communicated to them, repealing also some, and supplying others. But Deuteronomy supposes the existence of the books which precede it, to whose matter it often refers, urging an observance of the laws contained in them, by a consideration of the events which they narrate. Again the order of composition exhibited in these books—the slight connexion sometimes existing between its several parts having their own distinct closes, shew an author not writing continuously, but with frequent interruptions, such as we know Moses to have been, oppressed with incessant engagements, and distracted by constant journeyings.

But among the internal evidences of genuineness possessed by the Pentateuch, may be mentioned that derived from its style, or the character of the language in which it is written. I am aware that reference has been made to this consideration for a purpose entirely different. It has been alledged as an argument against the antiquity of this book, that its language does not sufficiently differ from that which was common in a much more recent age. No difficulty is felt in making the admission that the Hebrew language in the ages of Moses and David, did not present the degree of diver-

sity which we observe in some other instances. This, however, is the result of a characteristic which it possesses in common with the oriental, and by which it is distinguished from the occidental dialects. The permanence which marks eastern usages in general, is also an attribute of their languages. The facts, moreover, that these so little vary during the lapse of ages, is in a considerable degree attributable to the neglect to express their vowels, the consonants alone having been originally used. Of course the *spoken* language might at different periods present a great diversity, of which no trace would be exhibited by the same language in its *written* monuments. Accordingly, as Rosenmuller remarks, the Arabic of the Koran, but slightly differs from that used in the productions of ages much more recent. The same remark is also applicable to the Syriac. But having in the fullest manner made this admission, it is still undeniable, that the language of the Pentateuch exhibits the most unquestionable evidence of antiquity, and is remarkably distinguished from that of the later books of the Old Testament. Professor Stuart, in his article on the Samaritan Pentateuch, to which I have already referred in a note, makes the following statement, which is also made by Rosenmuller. The late Professor Jahn, by betaking himself to his Hebrew Concordance, and looking the whole store of words through, to ascertain where and by whom they were used, arrived at the following result: "He collected from the Pentateuch more than two hundred words which are either not used at all in the other books; or are not used in the same sense; or have not the same form; or if employed at all, are employed but in a few instances, principally by the poets, who prefer the older diction. To this class he has added a second still larger, of words frequently used in the later writings, but seldom or never in the older.— From these classes are excluded all proper names, and in general all such as from different circumstances of ages and countries, and from the peculiarities of the writer, might be expected to be used at one time rather than another." This result attained by Jahn, Professor Stuart observes, seems to have settled the controversy on this point in Germany; Gesenius not having in his

last work ventured on the argument against the early date of the Pentateuch drawn from its language. We conclude then, that so far as the *testimony of a whole nation, the citations in subsequent writers*, numerous instances of correspondence with the characteristics of the reputed author and age in which he lived, and *the antique style of composition*, can establish the genuineness of any book, that of the Pentateuch is sustained in a manner to which we can find no parallel in literary history.

But it is alleged, with an air of triumph, that the learned and refined nations of antiquity were unacquainted alike with the Jews and their reputedly sacred books. Now, in the first place, it is an altogether unprecedented procedure, to require the testimony of *foreign* nations to the existence or authorship of any literary production. He that should demand that the genuineness of the poems of Homer, for instance, should be established by Egyptian or Phœnician testimony, and who in the absence of this, should pertinaciously reject the most ample, and universal, and unchanging testimony of the Greek nation, would certainly not deserve to be argued with; and precisely of this nature is the requisition made upon the defenders of the Hebrew Scriptures. But again, where are we to look for confirmation, either of the authorship and age of these books or of the authenticity of the incidents mentioned in them? At the dawn of profane history, in the age when certainty began to distinguish its records, there is no question respecting the existence of the Pentateuch in its present form. The litigated point is, did it exist many ages anterior to this? Jewish historical books, of posterior origin, recognize this fact. But we are called upon to sustain it by a reference to authors of foreign nations. And where shall we find them? We shall not of course be expected to look to India, or China, countries claiming great antiquity, but whose remoteness forbids the expectation of finding any reference to the national concerns, and much less to the literary productions of the Jews, in their early writers, even admitting that any existed contemporaneously with the period of which we are treating. With more reason might we turn to the Chaldean, Egyptian, and Phœ-

nician records, as likely to furnish some notices of a people, connected with these nations by consanguinity, by language, or by a long series of transactions alternately of an amicable and hostile character. But where are those records? Of Berossus, the Babylonian historian we have only a few fragments remaining preserved by Josephus and Eusebius, and he lived in the age of Alexander, a century after the time of Ezra. Manetho wrote his Egyptian history by order of Ptolemy Philadelphus, at a period no earlier than the date of the Septuagint translation of the Hebrew Scriptures. Of this history we have likewise very little remaining. In the person of Sanchoniathon, the Phœnicians furnish us with a writer of much greater reputed antiquity. But while some question the fact of his existence, the point cannot be contested that there is the greatest uncertainty respecting the time in which he lived. And the small portion of what he is supposed to have written, which remains to us, is possessed in a manner very indirect. Philo Byblos, who lived in the second century of our era, professed to translate his works into Greek. Porphyry made citations from them in his attack upon Christianity. These were adverted to with a different object by Eusebius, in whose *Preparatio Evangelica* they have come down to us. It is then most unreasonable to object that we have not the testimony of writers in neighboring nations to the existence of the Pentateuch, prior to the Babylonish captivity. We have in truth no contemporary literary productions of those nations; and if this be the fact respecting these ancient divisions of the human race, it is more remarkably so in relation to the Greeks, whose civilization, although high, and arts and learning, admirable, were yet comparatively of a recent date. Concerning them, indeed, we cannot express ourselves in terms more appropriate, than those used by Josephus in his treatise against Apion. He observes that many are so superstitiously attached to the Greeks, as to regard them as the very oracles of history, and then proceeds to remark, "we shall find nothing among them that is not novel, I mean with respect to the building of their cities, the invention of their arts and the

description of their laws; the writing of history is of very late date among them; whereas, by their own confession, the Egyptians, Chaldeans, and Phœnicians (to say nothing of ourselves) have from time to time recorded and transmitted to posterity memorials of past ages in monumental pillars and inscriptions." "Their bare pretence to the knowledge of letters is of a late date. The antiquity of which they boast goes no father back than the Phœnicians, and they value themselves on the reputation of having had Cadmus for their first master. But so far are they from being able to produce, either in their temples or public registers, any one authentic memorial of these times, that when it came to be propounded as a question, whether the use of letters was so much as known at the time of the Trojan war, it was carried in the negative. It is universally acknowledged that there is no Greek manuscript in date antecedent to the poems of Homer. Nor has it been admitted that Homer ever committed this production to writing. The prevailing opinion runs, that it passed like a kind of ballad which the people committed to memory, till in the end copies were taken from oral dictation."—*Whiston's Josephus* Vol. 4, 364. New York, 1824.

SECTION VII.

The Pentateuch not fabricated in an age subsequent to that of Moses.

A rapid sketch having been thus given of the argument by which the reference of the Pentateuch to Moses, as its author, is in our apprehension completely justified; it remains that a single consideration be urged, which respects the great difficulty, amounting under the circumstances of the case almost to an impossibility; of palming upon the Jewish nation in any age subsequent to that of their lawgiver, such a book as the one in question, provided it were a fabrication. Upon the contents of that book rested their whole political, civil.

and religious constitution. Their sacred rites, their municipal regulations, their domestic institutions, were all connected with events detailed in the history which it contains. This production purports to be the most ancient record of the nation. Let us then suppose that at any period comparatively modern, it had first made its appearance. Could the existing generation have been made to believe, that what then first came to their knowledge had existed as a sacred and highly valued production, the directory of their ceremonial worship and the measure of their moral obligations. And had such an incident occurred, would there not have been some discussion respecting it, and might we not expect to find some traces of it in their history.—But here our adversary supposes himself to have actually met our requisition, and points to the age of Josiah as the period, and to the High Priest Hilkiah as the author of the alleged forgery. I shall not pause to inquire how this hypothesis consists with the other, so zealously laboured throughout the pamphlet, which regards Ezra as the fabricator of the Pentateuch, but attempt, as briefly as may be, to meet the difficulty involved in the objection.

The circumstances of the case were briefly these. During the repairs of the temple, undertaken in the reign of Josiah, the High Priest, Hilkiah, is reported to have “found a book of the law of the Lord given by Moses.” This was by him delivered to Shaphan the scribe, who carried it to the king and read it in his presence. The king was affected in an extraordinary manner by its contents—he rent his clothes, and directed a reference to be made to some authorised interpreter of the will of Jehovah, to ascertain what should be done in view of the sins of the people, and the judgments, in consequence, impending over them. Two inferences have been drawn from this narrative by De Wette, Volney, and others. That the king and the principal ministers of religion, as well as of state, had never seen the book in question before, and that it was therefore a fabrication of Hilkiah. The former supposition may have been correct, without involving the truth of the latter. Let us then inquire what probability distinguishes the one or the

other. Now let it be observed, first, that there must have been an acquaintance with the fact that there had been a book of the law given by Moses. There is manifestly a reference to something known to have existed, but of which they had *perhaps* not recently been in possession. The case might be an analogous one to that of Cicero's treatise *De Republica*, which he was known to have composed, but which was for a time lost to the world, being recovered only about twelve years since, through the researches of the Abbe Mai.

The only difficulty then, in the instance now in question, is the conceiving how a book of such a character should have been so completely lost, even among those whom we should most reasonably expect to possess it. In the reign of Jehoshaphat, between two and three hundred years previously, it existed, according to the testimony of the very same writer who records its discovery by Hilki'ah. This pious king is represented, 2 Chron. xvii, 8-9, as commissioning certain princes, Levites and priests, "who taught in Judah, and had the *book of the law of the Lord* with them, and went about through all the cities of Judah and taught the people." Had this book then entirely disappeared in the age of Josiah, or was there something merely in the particular copy found, which produced so deep an impression upon the mind of the young king? Was it the autograph of Moses, the very copy which he was directed to lay up beside the ark of the covenant? Did this circumstance, in connection with the high degree of national guilt which had been incurred, and of the perilous condition of the kingdom, give to such menaces of divine judgments, as are contained in Deuteronomy, an import far more alarming? A degree of probability is attached to this supposition by a view of the phraseology of the passage in Chronicles—"Hilki'ah found a book of the law of the Lord *by the hand* of Moses"—so it is in Hebrew, as indicated by a note in the margin of our bible, although the translation in the text is "given by Moses"

But it *may have been* that copies of the law had become exceedingly scarce, especially in the vicinity of the court, and among those who had been exposed to its influence during the preceding reigns. Manasseh, one

of the worst sovereigns who had ever occupied the throne of David, had during fifty-five years labored to efface the knowledge of the true religion and to introduce an idolatrous worship. Amon, his son, pursued a similar course. Josiah succeeded to the kingdom when but a child, and early exhibited the best dispositions; and it was in the eighteenth year of his reign and the twenty-sixth of his age, at the beginning of the reformation which he undertook, that a copy of the law was found in the temple. The Rabbins say that Ahaz, Manasseh and Amon endeavored to destroy all the copies of the law, and that this was only saved by having been buried under a paving stone. This may or may not have been the case. We can, however, scarcely doubt that in the remoter parts of the kingdom, and among the more pious portion of the people, there were other copies secured and cherished, ready to be brought to light at a more auspicious era. But let us admit that the volume discovered by the High Priest, was the only one of the kind existing in the kingdom of Judah, the question arises, was there any thing in the circumstances of the case, to justify the suspicion, or sustain by adequate proof, the fact that Hilkiah fabricated the work which he professed to have found. Our author thinks that there was. He supposes that Hilkiah had enlisted his pupil, the young king, in support of the Jewish priests against the priests of Baal, and as the Jews knew nothing of the law of Moses, something of the kind was necessary as a system of religious ceremonies. He composed a book of the law, and pretended to have found it, after binding the workmen to secrecy. Now observe a glaring inconsistency in this passage itself: He refers to the existence of Jewish priests, and yet supposes that they had no system of religious ceremonies, until one was constructed for them on the present occasion. Again, this supposition is directly opposed to his own admission, page 26 of his pamphlet. In reply to the argument that the laws of the Jews, appealed to throughout the Old Testament, are the same as those contained in the Pentateuch, he answers, "granted; they are a part of the oral law recited to the people." Here then is an acknowledgment that their laws and observances were,

by means of tradition, known to the Jews through every period of their history. There was therefore no occasion for the High Priest to fabricate them, although he might commit them to writing. But to our main question—As already observed, we know from the testimony of the same writer, who records the discovery of the book of the law, that a document bearing that name had been employed for the instruction of the people, several hundred years previously. We are also apprised, from numerous passages in the historical and prophetic writings of the Jews, that this book had been at various periods well known, and recognized as the production of Moses. And it does not appear that Josiah was at all surprised at the finding of such a book, but simply was appalled at a portion of its contents, which may have been unknown to him, while he possessed a general acquaintance with its religious system and code of laws. The matter then to be determined is—was this ancient document the one produced by the High Priest, or did he in the room of it substitute something of his own. The latter supposition is utterly incredible. We have already considered the strong evidence which sustains the belief that the Samaritan Pentateuch existed, independently of that possessed by the Jews, at a period long anterior to the one now under view; and this seems an insuperable objection to the hypothesis I am combating. But could Hilkiah have written in a style so antique? Had he ever affected the use of archaisms, the occasional occurrence of words belonging to the language of a more modern age, would have betrayed him.* He could not, moreover, have possessed the qualifications manifestly necessary for writing such a book as the Pentateuch. He had not the requisite knowledge of Egypt, as respects its manners and institutions and physical character. He could not have been so well acquainted with Arabia and its localities. And upon the supposition that from pre-existing materials, he compiled the book which he palmed upon the Jewish nation as the work of Moses, the following objections present themselves, as observed by Jahn: “1st, He would not have

* The alledged anachronisms which may be regarded as something of this nature will be presently considered.

arranged them in the manner of a diary, following the order of time, so as to introduce, now a law, then a historical fact, and then again a law. 2nd, He would not have repeated some laws as often as they were published; or 3rd, he would have omitted in the former parts of the work, the laws which are altered in Deuteronomy; nor would he, (4th,) after having previously given a minute description of the tabernacle, and of all its parts and utensils, have repeated that minute description when he recorded its completion." These considerations, which induce us to reject the opinion that the "book of the law" was either fabricated or re-written by Hilki'ah, are equally conclusive against the supposition of its being forged or re-modelled by any other writer who lived in an age subsequent to that of Moses. Whatever conjectures may be formed, or whatever possibilities imagined, we have no hesitation in appealing to enlightened and candid inquirers, to determine, whether the greatest improbability is not attached to them; and whether the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch is not sustained by as high a degree of evidence, as, under the circumstances of the case, could be expected or desired. It is the height of absurdity to require, in literary discussions of this kind, the same quality and amount of proof as is demanded to substantiate recent transactions in ordinary courts of justice. But there are many grave objections made to the proposition which I have been endeavoring to maintain, which call for a patient examination in order to their satisfactory solution. The attempt to furnish this will be made in some succeeding sections.

SECTION VIII.

First objection to the genuineness of the Pentateuch—Alleged anachronisms.

When there are found in any book, evident allusions to the circumstances of a later age, when, for instance, places are designated by names different from those

originally borne; when institutions, the growth of times more modern are mentioned; or when acquaintance is implied with arts not known to the supposed author, there is so far a presumption furnished against the genuineness of that book. Yet it is a presumption more or less violent, which may be neutralized or overthrown by other manifest considerations. These parts may be shewn to be excrescences on the original work; their origin may be clearly accounted for, or if not, they may in general be referred to that liability to glosses and interpolations to which all works derived from a very remote period are subject. Concerning the anachronisms alleged to exist in the Pentateuch, there has been, at various times, much discussion. Our author has entered into the subject largely and repeatedly. He represents the case in the instance under view, as one of the most aggravated kind; the interpolations and text being undistinguishably blended, so that no confidence whatever can be reposed in such a book. A most unfair coloring is also given to the whole controversy, by the representation, that his antagonists assume, without any proof, that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, and then, with an equal want of evidence, regard every thing occurring in it incompatible with this hypothesis, as the consequence of interpolation. Whereas the true state of the case is this:—Here is a book possessing very strong proofs of genuineness—such evidence as we cannot resist. Occasionally there is something occurring, which could not have been written by the supposed author. What is the conclusion which we are bound to adopt?—that the whole work is spurious? Certainly not. The entire genius and confirmation of the production prove the reverse. What remains? We determine that in some way or other these passages have been introduced into the original text. Now, in obviating the difficulties of the objector, it is necessary to inquire—what is the character and amount of these anachronisms which are so much spoken of? Are they intentional corruptions? Are they so incapable of being distinguished from the original text as to cast a suspicion over the whole work?

In respect to the inquiry, concerning the number of

alleged anachronisms, we shall find, that admitting them to the full extent, they are not considerable; and if we take away those which are doubtful, or which can be shown not to belong to this class, they are still less worthy of note. It was not left for the enemies of Revelation to detect these. The Rabbins had, at an early period, distinguished eighteen instances of what they supposed to be additions to the text, posterior to the age of Moses. Christian writers had also referred to the same subject. It is believed, however, that many of these passages, do not necessarily involve the supposition of a more recent origin, than that of the body of the work. Let us consider a few of them. In Gen. xii. 6, it is said that when Abraham first entered Palestine "the Canaanite was then in the land." This is supposed to mean that the original inhabitants had not yet been expelled by the Israelites, and of course to imply that the writer of the passage lived at a time when this had been done. But neither is this interpretation, nor this inference unquestionable. It is well known that Palestine was not the first seat of the Canaanites, that they came from Arabia, and that all which the sacred writer meant to indicate, was that even at that early period this migration had taken place—they were *then* in the land.

The next passage which we may consider in Gen. xxii. 14. "as it is said to this day, in the mount of the Lord, it shall be seen." Mount Moriah, which is here meant, was not so denominated, until the building of the temple, several hundred years afterwards—it is therefore supposed that this expression could not have been used by Moses, but by some writer long subsequently to his age. But respecting this passage we need experience no difficulty. It is susceptible of an interpretation, and, indeed, according to the just principles of interpretation, requires it, which is entirely consistent with the fact of its genuineness. With no view to the present exigency, there have been several translations given of what is confessedly a different passage. Houbigant and others had rendered it "In monte, Deus videbitur"—In the mount God shall be seen—supposing it to be a prophetic annunciation of the future coming of the Messiah—another version accepted by Rosenmuller, is—"In

monte, Dei providebitur, curabitur, prospicietur." In the Mount it will be provided for, cared for, or looked to by God. According to an observation of Jerome, it passed into a proverb among the Hebrews, if at any time they were placed in distressing circumstances, and hoped to be delivered by the divine interposition,—they said "In the Mount, God will provide; as He had compassion on Abraham, He will pity us." We thus perceive that the phrase, "Mount of the Lord," which creates the whole difficulty, does not appear in the passage.

Another passage usually cited in the discussion in which we are now engaged is Gen. xxxvi. 31. "These are the kings that reigned in Edom, before there reigned any kings over the children of Israel." It is supposed that in two points of view this implies an age posterior to Moses. 1. It argues that there *were* kings reigning over the children of Israel when this statement was made. 2. It is not to be conceived that in the space of between two and three hundred years which intervened between Esau and Moses, there could have lived 14 dukes or phylarchs—then eight kings and afterwards eleven dukes. In reply to this C. B. Michaelis observes that the expression, "before there reigned any king over the children of Israel," is not at all incompatible with the age of Moses and the circumstances of his people at that time. For both he and they were apprized by the promises long since made to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, that kings would at a future period reign over the chosen people of Jehovah—Gen. xvii. 5—xxvi. 3—xxxv. 11.

As regards the second objection, it is replied—that it is affirmed upon insufficient grounds that the Idumæans had three forms of government, at several times existing among them; that their dukes were the heads or princes of families, not existing successively but contemporaneously; that they and the kings lived simultaneously, as appears from Num. xx. 14, compared with Ex. xv. 15, in the latter it being said that Moses sent ambassadors to the *Kings* of Edom, in the former the dukes of the same country being represented as in consternation at the approach of the Israelites. Besides in forming our judgment respecting the catalogue of the Idumæ-

an kings, it will be important to consider that they did not exist, according to hereditary succession, but were elevated to power either by election or violence. Among the kings enumerated we do not find one who had a son as his successor. Nor were foreigners excluded from the succession, as is apparent from the different cities and countries mentioned in the table of those who successively bore the regal title. These cities and countries must have been the places of their birth, inasmuch as it is extremely improbable that eight rulers, in immediate succession, should each have chosen a different metropolis for his kingdom. In a monarchy then, such as the one just described, we might expect shorter reigns and a more rapid succession of those who held the supreme power, than under one differently constituted; and since dukes and kings appear to have existed together, it is easily conceivable that eight of the latter might have lived in the space of time allotted to them.* This interpretation of his father, the younger and more celebrated Michaelis has adopted.

But again the expression occurring Ex. xvi. 36, "now an omer is the tenth part of an epha," is supposed to furnish unequivocal evidence of a modern age, inasmuch as it is not customary to define measures while still in use. To this, however, Le Clerc forcibly replies—it does not appear that the Hebrews ever used any measures, while in Palestine, different from their original ones, so that it might become necessary to define these, nor can it be shewn that an epha was any better known than an omer. Yet Moses who founded the Jewish commonwealth, inserted here and there, the fit occasions being given, something respecting their measures, lest at a future period they should be changed.

I shall particularly consider no other passage, although many more, which are usually regarded as additions to the text, might be satisfactorily explained. What has already been done, is sufficient to shew that the number of texts calculated to produce difficulty, inconsiderable upon the largest enumeration, may be much reduced. Of the portions of the Pentateuch really belonging to a subsequent age, we may reckon as the most important,

* The average of the reigns of the Roman Emperors, was ten years.

being by far the most extensive, the last chapter of Deuteronomy. Others consist in the substitution, on a few occasions, of the modern name of a place for one more ancient. Some are of such a character as the following: Ex. xvi, 35:—"And the children of Israel eat manna forty years." This term had not expired at the death of Moses; it is therefore concluded that he could not have written it. This inference is, however, by no means inevitable. He might have recorded it, immediately before his death, when the period indicated was so near its expiration as to justify the expression. But we have no occasion to insist on this consideration.

Now the appeal is confidently made to every man of candor and reflection, whether a very few passages of this kind occurring in an ancient book, furnish any evidence against its genuineness, or show it to be so corrupted as to be undeserving of any regard; or whether these interpolations are so undistinguishably blended with the text as to cast a suspicion over the whole work. It is quite easy to conceive, how these passages might have been introduced, without the least censure being attached to the author of them, or the least uncertainty being produced as to the genuineness of the residue of the work. The last chapter of Deuteronomy might very well have been added by any successor of the Hebrew law-giver, who wished to complete the account of his eventful life. The substitution of a few modern for the ancient names of places, or an explanatory remark, from being a marginal gloss, might readily pass into the text, perhaps with some distinguishing mark, which through the negligence of scribes was afterwards omitted. Or, according to the much ridiculed theory, these additions might have originated in the Esdrine edition of the Scriptures, and been intended for their illustration.

There is a large class of passages, to which I have as yet made no reference, which Dr. C. following De Wette, regards as anachronisms. Every instance of a prophetic declaration is so esteemed. For example, predictions made respecting the future condition of the Israelites to which the event corresponded, are supposed to furnish, in themselves, evidence that they were not delivered until after that event. Now were we to

meet, in any narrative of facts, a notice of occurrences as then taking place, which belonged to a later period, we should regard as highly absurd a solution of the difficulty thus presented, by the supposition of an insight into futurity. But very different from this is the case of a man, who professing to possess the spirit of prophecy, makes a reference to the events of a coming age, as yet future, but destined certainly to occur. When an illustrious individual, such as the dying patriarch Jacob, or Moses himself, when his end was approaching, undertakes to foretel the future destiny of his children or people, is the fact that the prediction made corresponded to their actual subsequent condition, conclusive proof that such prediction was fabricated after the event? Should we not rather inquire whether it were within the competency of human sagacity to have foreseen what occurred, or whether there might not have been some fortunate, although accidental coincidence. If neither of these suppositions were admissible, would it not be incumbent upon us to consider whether the Supreme Being may not have lifted up the veil covering futurity for the consolation of a good man, or for the confirmation of a great system of moral and religious truth, designed, in the first place, to benefit a whole nation, and eventually all mankind.

Our author speaks with contempt of Professor Stuart's remark, that such portions of the Pentateuch as those last referred to, cannot with propriety be denied to have been written by Moses, since no one can prove that he did not possess a prophetic spirit. And yet the remark is perfectly just. This is the very question upon which we are at issue. The unbeliever has no right to *assume* that his theory is correct; although it is competent for him to advance reasons in its favor. The Jewish system professes to be of divine origin. Its claim is to be substantiated by the miracles wrought in attestation of it, or by the predictions proceeding from those who taught it. Whether such miracles were wrought, or such predictions made, is a suitable subject of inquiry. The evidence offered may be thoroughly sifted by the skeptic, but surely it outrages all propriety, to take it for granted that prophecy is impossible, and

then to assume, with no respect to other considerations, and even in defiance of the strongest proof, that all predictions occurring in any book are either interpolations or conclusive evidence of the spuriousness of the entire work. This view of the subject is correct under any circumstances. But surely it will not be denied that there is some peculiarity attached to the Jewish system and sacred books, which might induce the expectation, that traces of divine power and knowledge should be there recognized which are not seen elsewhere. In their own character, in the degree and nature of the evidence which sustains them, and in the religious and moral system which they teach, they are surely widely removed from all competition on the part of works, reputedly sacred, existing in any other nation. Besides, Judaism is intimately connected with a more perfect and extensively diffused modification of religious belief, prevailing over the only enlightened part of the earth, and supported by the most ample proof, which can be brought more immediately under our view, being blended with the transactions of a more recent age. If to the decision of Christianity any authority is to be conceded, a divine origin must be ascribed to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and the occurrence of prophetic passages in them may reasonably be expected.

The result then of the observations proposed in the present section may be thus stated:

1. The reference of the Pentateuch to Moses as its author is sustained by the most convincing evidence.

2. Of various passages, supposed to be inconsistent with this theory, many are susceptible of an explanation entirely satisfactory.

3. Of those which remain, none are to be regarded as intentional corruptions, nor do they attach any uncertainty to the text in general. They are either to be accounted for upon the supposition of the accidental transfer of a marginal note into the body of the work; or to be referred to some subsequent authorized writer, whose object has been either to complete what was deficient or illustrate what is obscure.

4. It is a manifest begging of the question to regard as interpolations the numerous *prophetic passages* which are found in these writings.

SECTION IX.

Second objection to the genuineness of the Pentateuch.—
Passages incompatible with the actual circumstances of
the reputed author.—Deut. i. 1. Meaning of the He-
brew word עבר, (eber,) and the Greek Περαιν. (Peran.)

The prosecution of a simple philological inquiry, would not seem to furnish any occasion, or present much inducement, to indulge in vituperation against one's adversaries. Yet is this reasonable expectation disappointed in the instance of our author, whose advanced age, long subjection to the softening influences of literary cultivation, and abundant professions of being actuated solely by the love of truth and a regard to the happiness of mankind, would seem to authorize the hope, that he would form a candid and just, if not a liberal and generous estimate of the character and motives of his opponents. The critical discussion in which we are now about to follow him, is closed, on his part, with a long and virulent invective, to which there are too many parallels throughout the work upon which I am commenting. The "clerical profession is denounced as one that renders impartial examination a crime, and which requires those who adopt it, to insist on as true, what no man, who is a searcher for truth alone, can possibly accept as truth." "It is said to be disgusting to observe the virulence of clerical reproaches made against those whom they are pleased to denominate "infidels." These latter persons are represented as "braving the reproaches of the interested, the lamentations of the hypocrite, and the fierce bigotry of the ignorant dupe of an interested clergy." We who are "hired," and paid, and salaried witnesses in favor of the cause by which we get our living, are admonished to recollect "that the day has passed by when infidels and infidelity may be made with impunity the hated subjects of clerical abuse." "The clerical craft is in danger and the members of the church militant will do well to hasten to the rescue, better armed than they have hitherto been." "The glove is thrown down before them, let those who choose take it up." A defiance given quite

in the forms of the ancient institution of chivalry! Pity it were that more of knightly honor and courtesy had not been shewn in the management of the combat! The gauntlet has for a considerable time lain untouched, and doubtless the accomplished cavalier, armed at all points for the conflict, has feared that, through the recreancy of his adversaries, no farther opportunity would be furnished for the exhibition of his prowess. This delay has arisen from considerations very different from any apprehension of the issue of the test being unfavorable. Many there are who in the cause of truth, and clad in its impenetrable panoply, are ready to meet at any time and on any field their boastful assailant. We rejoice that the number of those in the christian ranks who are competent to do this, in an effective manner, is daily increasing. Yet we regard with surprise and pity the insinuation that revelation has ever wanted adequate defenders. We triumphantly refer to days that have gone by, and challenge a comparison in point of profound and various learning, and the powers of a masterly and convincing argumentation, between them and their adversaries. That the petulance of our author has not been sooner rebuked, and his arguments earlier met, is to be attributed to the fact that his pamphlet has not attracted the attention which he expected, and which from considerations apart from its intrinsic merits, it should have received. From its title it was supposed to relate merely to the geological exceptions taken against the Mosaic record. These, so far as any considerations drawn from a science so largely hypothetical, are deserving of attention, it was thought might with propriety be referred to those friends of revelation, whose pursuits particularly qualified them for this investigation. And in reference to those, to whom the character of the production in question became better known, it is to be observed, that in general they deemed it unnecessary to renew a discussion which in their apprehension had been terminated in a manner satisfactory to the public mind. In this opinion it is thought they erred. It is not enough that the enemy has been once met and vanquished, the battle must be renewed in every age. As old objections are revived they must

be again answered. As new modifications of erroneous opinions appear, they must be exposed and refuted. In the absence of a worthier champion, the writer of these essays has not hesitated to accept the defiance. He is willing to attempt the succor of the beleaguered citadel, imperfectly armed although he may be. In spite of the strong temptation to a contrary course, he is not conscious that he has in any degree indulged in personal invective, when he should alone feel concerned to controvert the arguments of his opponent. He has been solicitous to ascertain and vindicate truth, and not to render odious either an individual or a class.

Let us then return from this digression, and consider the objections to the genuineness of the Pentateuch, founded on passages occurring in it, incompatible with the actual circumstances or known sentiments of the reputed author. The first which I shall examine occurs Deut. i. 1. "These are the words that Moses spake unto all Israel *on this side* Jordan in the wilderness." To this version Dr. Cooper takes exception, asserts that it should be translated *beyond, on the other side* Jordan, and concludes that the author of Deuteronomy must have lived on the west of this river, and that he could not therefore have been Moses who died eastward of it.

Now the question to be determined is, what is the proper rendering of בעבר. (be-eber.) It will be readily conceded that the term is often *susceptible* of the interpretation which it is wished to attach to it as its *sole* and *exclusive* signification. But does it not sometimes, unquestionably, mean *on this side*, and is there not therefore some general idea involved in the term, which authorizes its employment in this diversified manner? This cannot be denied. Our author himself refers to two passages Deut. iii. 8, and Gen. i. 10 and 11, where the word in question must be translated *on this side*; but he *assumes* that in these instances it is manifestly *misapplied*, remarking that in a book so full of mistakes and interpolations, this may well be. Surely this is a summary mode of getting rid of a critical difficulty. The signification of words is determined by the usage of good writers—here are two cases in which a partic-

ular meaning is necessarily attached to a term—that meaning, however, is opposed to what *seems* to be indicated by other passages from the same writer. Should we not attempt an explanation of the matter upon some other principle than the assumption of a corruption in one class of our texts. Is it not unlikely that in a production of moderate length, two instances of a precisely similar mistake, in *writing* a simple and well known term, should occur? But we have not merely this degree of improbability to contend against. There are many *other passages* not at all alluded to by Dr. Cooper, where the original term must be rendered on this side. To these I would solicit the reader's particular attention. There is no question that the book of Joshua was written after the conquest of Canaan, and of course by one living west of Jordan. In the xii. ch. 7 v. of this book, we find the following passage: "These are the kings of the country which Joshua and the children of Israel smote *on this side* (עַבְרָה,) Jordan on the west." Again, Joshua xxii. 7, it is said "Now to the one half of the tribe of Manasseh, Moses had given possession in Bashan;" but unto the other half thereof gave Joshua among their brethren, *on this side* (עַבְרָה,) Jordan westward. As connected with this we may cite a remarkable passage in Num. xxxii. 19. The two tribes and a half, who had received their lot in the region which had been conquered east of Jordan, expressed their determination to assist their brethren in the conquest of the remaining part of the promised land, and then to return to their own possession—"For we will not inherit with them on *yonder side* of Jordan, or forward, because our inheritance is fallen to us *on this side* Jordan eastward." Here we have the same word in the original, differently rendered in the several parts of the same sentence. Other passages I shall not cite in full, but make a simple reference to them: Josh. v. 1.—1 Chron. xxvi. 30.—Josh. i. 15.—1 Kings iv. 24. Let the reader examine them for himself, and he will be convinced that the term in question does mean *on this side*, not once or twice, but very commonly. But we are told, that in many instances, it has a meaning directly opposite, and some ill-timed pleasantry is indulged in on the occasion: "This

is truly a most convenient word, it means white ; it means black ; it signifies neither white nor black, but any color you please." It will be well for our author to defer his jesting until he has accounted for the passages above cited, and has replied to the considerations which I shall here subjoin.

Is he not then aware of an instance analagous to this, in the Latin word *sacer*, which at once means—sacred, holy, divine, and—cursed, detestable, horrible. "Auri sacra fames."—*Virgil*. "Intestabilis et sacer esto."—*Horace*. "Ego sum malus, ego sum sacer, scelestus."—*Plautus*. Has not his Hebrew erudition made him acquainted with the usage respecting the word בָּרַךְ, (*Barak*,) which, according to Gesenius, means, 1. To bless. 2. To greet, or salute, 3. To take leave, renounce, revile. 1 Kings xxi. 10. "Thou hast reviled God and the King." Job i. 5.—ii. 5. Perhaps also the term נָכַר (*nakar*) has escaped the accuracy of his research, which according to the same lexicographers signifies not only to *understand* but to mistake : not merely to be known, but to let oneself be unknown ; to dissemble. In illustration of this peculiarity Gesenius refers to the inseparable German prepositions *ent* and *ver*, which in composition sometimes express a negation or antithesis, sometimes not.

I trust then that the diverse significations ascribed to עָרַךְ will not seem so completely absurd or so entirely without parallel, as they are represented to be. But, as has already been suggested, there is, in reference to all such words as those above cited, some primary meaning, from which all other acceptations, however apparently unconnected, naturally flow. This is clearly and beautifully apparent with respect to the term בָּרַךְ. (*Barak*.) No two things seem more opposite than to bless and revile or curse, and yet the transition from one meaning to the other is easily traced. 1. It means to bless. 2. To greet or salute, because on such occasions persons speak well to each other ; and in primitive times invoked a blessing. 3. To take leave, depart, because the same salutations were usual then, as took place at meeting. From parting amicably, the transition is easy to a simple *separation*, then to one involving

a *renunciation* of all friendly intercourse, accompanied even by reproaches.

Let us now inquire what is the leading idea expressed by עבר (eber.) The radical עבר (abar) which is a verb, means according to Gesenius—1. To pass on. 2. To go or pass through. 3. To pass by. 4. To pass over. 5. To overflow, spoken of water, &c. Here we find the notion of *passage* entirely the predominant one. This is the fact also, with respect to the various explanations quoted by Dr. C. from Davies' Celtic Researches. Is it then absurd to conclude with Pagnini, Arias, Montanus, Huet, and others, that the fundamental idea of the derivative word is "in transitu?" This idea is of course expanded and modified as we have seen to be the fact in reference to certain other words before mentioned. The statement of Rosemuller seems to be entirely correct. Scholia in Deut. chap. i. 1, עבר which properly denotes transitum, trajectum—passage—thence it is used to denote all that tract which is washed by a river or which is divided by water flowing in the midst of it, whether this tract be on the one side or the other." In other words, it denotes in its greatest amplitude of signification the valley of any stream—and the expression עבר הירדן may well be rendered *at, near*, or in the valley of Jordan. It does not occur to me that there is any passage in which the original word is rendered *beyond*, where it will not be equally well expressed by the explanation given above. And what is very remarkable, we find this word often conjoined, with some other phrase which more definitely fixes its signification. This is to be observed in the passage already cited from Numbers xxxii. 19, where in the different parts of the same sentence, this term has a different sense, indicated by an adjunct expression. "For we will not inherit with them on *yonder side* of Jordan, *forward*," that is *westward*—the Israelites being advancing in that direction "because our inheritance is fallen to us on *this side* Jordan, eastward." Another exemplification of our principle is furnished by Deut. iv. 47, 49. Two kings of the Amorites are mentioned as being "on *this side* Jordan towards the *sun rising*," and we have also reference made "to all the plain

on *this side* Jordan, *eastward*." Again, in Joshua xii. 27, the inheritance of the tribe of Gad is spoken of by the writer as on the other side of Jordan *eastward*.

Instances might be multiplied were it necessary.—These may serve to show that the term under discussion, is not, in the sense which we attach to it, so utterly vague as it is represented to be. I have hitherto made no reference to the decision of any lexicographer respecting the meaning of the derivative word, *עבר*, because it is more satisfactory to appeal *at once* to that authority, by which all their opinions must be sustained—the usage prevailing in the Hebrew writings. Yet it may be well to state that Gesenius who assigns to our term, *beyond*, as its leading signification, gives as his second definition—"that which is on this side," adding the strange remark "as if used by one living on the other side." He refers to 1 Kings, iv. 24, in illustration. Yet it is impossible to conceive what this text furnishes in support of the limitation attached to his explanation. He also takes no notice of the numerous passages resembling the one which he cites, many of which I have on the present occasion quoted.

He gives us his third definition—"side quarter generally;" referring to 1 Samuel, xiv. 40—"on one side, on the other side;" to Ex. xxviii. 26, "which is on the side *עבר* of the ephod inward;" and to Exodus xxxii. 15,—*"the tables were written on both their sides, on the one side and the other were they written."*

It appears then to the writer that we have an exceedingly strong case made out, in favor of the signification which we attach to the word under view. And in reviewing the evidence by which our conclusion is supported, it is amazing to reflect on the contemptuous terms in which it is spoken of by our adversary. Let us hear, however, what he has to allege.

He pleads the universal assent of the Jews, ancient and modern, that *עבר* means exclusively beyond. After observing the *total want of correctness*, which marks Dr. C's statements respecting the *Jewish traditions*, which he professes to derive from Prideaux and his authorities, the reader will feel little inclination to repose confidence in any similar, sweeping and unsupported assertion.

Nor will the opinion of Dr. C's. teacher, although he may have been a pupil of the celebrated Vater, be entitled to any weight when contradicted by the numerous instances which I have adduced of the *usus loquendi* of the ancient Hebrew writers.

But it is said that the ancient versions, with the exception of the Syriac, translate Deut. i. 1, "beyond Jordan." What are these versions? The Samaritan is spoken of, but in such terms, as to leave it doubtful whether it is regarded as a version or not. What is *properly* called the Samaritan Pentateuch is merely a document in the Hebrew language, expressed in the ancient Phœnician character—of course we have no translation of the disputed word, but the term itself differently written.

The Chaldee, Septuagint, Syriac, Arabic, and Vulgate are the principal versions mentioned. The Vulgate may render the word in question, *trans*, and yet it may be a misconception of Jerome—who although one of the greatest proficient in Hebrew among the early fathers, cannot be placed in competition with the author of the old Syriac version, who spoke a cognate dialect, and whose interpretation is different. *If* the Chaldee Targum and Arabic, do translate as they are asserted to do, it may be that the terms which they employ are marked by the same peculiarity of signification, which distinguishes the Hebrew word. I am inclined to suspect this, by the consideration that this is demonstrably the case with regard to the Septuagint, which is cited as sustaining the view of our adversary. Πέραν, according to classical usage, certainly means "beyond;" but what is its signification according to that peculiar modification of the Greek language, which appears in the version of the Seventy, and in the writings of the New Testament? The citation of a few passages will settle this point beyond all possibility of dispute. Let us then examine in the Septuagint a fact already cited from the Hebrew. Numbers xxxii. 19—it was seen that the word עָבַר in the former and latter parts of the same verse, had a different meaning attached to it, in consequence of the connexion in which it stood. The case is precisely the same with respect to the Greek word Πέραν. "For we will not inherit with them ἀπὸ τοῦ πέραν Ἰορδάνου καὶ περσεῖνα, for we have

received our inheritance *ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ἐν ἀνατολαῖς.* Here we find the original word whose meaning we are discussing, alike used to denote the regions *west* and *east* of Jordan—in the one instance connected with the term *ἐπέκεινα*, *beyond*, in the other with the phrase *ἐν ἀνατολαῖς*—towards the east—on this side.

But there is another passage equally decisive of the point in controversy; the quotation from Isaiah, which occurs in Matthew iv. 15, “The land of Zebulon and the land of Nephthalim, by the way of the sea, *περὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου*, Galilee of the nations.” Here we perceive that a tract of country which every one knows is on the *same side* of the river with Jerusalem, where Isaiah lived, is designated by him as *περὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου*—our translators omitting to consider how the Hebrew idiom had affected in many instances the signification of terms in the Greek language, have rendered this passage “beyond Jordan.” Many critics have since noted the incorrectness of this version. Campbell, whose accurate learning and great candor none will question, translates thus: “on the Jordan,” remarking that both the Hebrew and Greek words signify indifferently “on this side” and on “the other side”—and that they should be rendered in general terms, unless limited by such expressions *κατ’ ἀνατολὰ* or *κατὰ θαλάσσης*. Kuinoel also observes in his note on Matthew iv. 15, that *περὶ* should be understood as meaning “ad, juxta, prope.” And again, in John i. 28, adds that *περὶ* answers to the Hebrew *רַב* and not only signifies *trans* but *juxta*, *prope*, *cis*, sustaining his opinion by a reference to Vorstius de Hebraism, N. T. and Bielii, Thes. sub. v. *περὶ*, ed. Schleusneri. Parkhurst, also, in his Greek Lexicon gives as one of the significations of *peran*, about, near. And yet Dr. Cooper cites this writer to prove that the corresponding Hebrew word always means *beyond*, *over*; and annexes the taunting observation, “I hope the orthodox will not object to Parkhurst.” I might go on and make many other citations both from the Septuagint and the New Testament, in confirmation of our principle. To the general reader, however, it would be tedious, and to those particularly qualified to judge in the controversy, it cannot be necessary.

The result then at which we have arrived with a degree of certainty, equal to that attainable in any literary investigation, is—I. That, both the Hebrew term and that by which it is rendered in the Septuagint, are used to express the nearer or farther side of a river indifferently.

II. Their inherent indeterminateness of signification is shewn by the fact that in numerous instances they are associated with phrases which limit them—"on the side of Jordan eastward—on the side of Jordan westward."

III. These, therefore, according to the definitions of Kuinoel and Rosenmuller, not only mean at, on, near, but with considerable latitude, express the whole region or valley washed by a stream in its course.

Our version of Deut. i. 1, is therefore correct, and the passage furnishes no argument against the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch.

SECTION X.

Objection to its genuineness derived from the occurrence of passages incompatible with the known sentiments of Moses.

In sustaining any abstract truth, or in vindicating the accuracy of any historical record, it is often necessary to bestow much attention in obviating the difficulties which are supposed to be attached to the subject. It matters not what force of reasoning or amount of evidence be brought to bear upon the point in question, a single objection suggested is sometimes sufficient to suspend our belief or prevent it altogether. Hence it arises that the most laborious portion of the duty devolving upon the apologist for Revelation, is the replying to the numerous cavils presented by its adversaries. Nor is the importance of this duty less remarkable than its difficulty. In supporting truth, we are bound to present it in as clear a light as possible, and to answer all reasonable objections. Yet is this task far more difficult

of accomplishment than the office assumed by our antagonist. It requires neither learning nor ingenuity to make exceptions to the history or the doctrines of the Bible; nor is there any intelligence, patience, or industry, necessary on the part of the community, in order to its comprehension of them. Unfortunately, however, for the interest of truth, the case is otherwise when a reply is to be made to these exceptions. Profound research is often requisite to expose the inaccuracy of an assertion recklessly made, or to render intelligible a circumstance which belonging to a remote age and a very different state of society, is naturally productive of some perplexity; and the mind which would understand the elucidation which is given, must be something more than the indolent recipient of some brief remark thrown out in conversation, or some brilliant, although fallacious sentiment, occurring in the fugitive productions of the day.

It is manifest, therefore, that the advocate of grave and important truths contends under the greatest disadvantages; yet difficult as it is to obtain adequate attention to the considerations which we may suggest, in consequence of the aversion to intellectual labor so common among men—the effort must be made. In the course of the investigation which we have been pursuing, I trust that something of this duty has been satisfactorily accomplished. I am now to attempt its entire fulfilment.

The next objection to be met is—that the Pentateuch contains sentiments and regulations irreconcilable with the known opinions and purposes of the Hebrew lawgiver. It is therefore inferred that he cannot be the author of this book. In support of this view, Deut. xvii. 14—20, has been cited, where reference is made to the future appointment of a king, directions given respecting his election, and restrictions imposed upon his conduct. Moses, it is asserted, established a theocracy; he never contemplated the existence of a regal government among the Hebrews, and when at a period long subsequent, a request was made on the part of the people, to the prophet Samuel, to ordain a king over them who might lead them forth to battle, it was regarded by

the Almighty as equivalent to a rejection of his authority. These are the suggestions of Ilgen, in which De Wette has followed him. I do not, however, conceive that any importance is to be attached to such considerations. Undoubtedly, according to the original organization of the Israelitish commonweath, it might with propriety of speech be termed a theocratic establishment, inasmuch as their laws proceeded directly from God, were expounded by the priests and Levites, as holy persons, and executed by the judges as divine vicegerents; to which we may add that in difficult cases relating to government and war, Jehovah was consulted by Urim and Thummim, or made known his will by the prophets, his authorized ministers. It is equally evident, that Moses desired this constitution to be a permanent one, because he deemed it most advantageous to the people for whom he felt interested. But is there any thing irreconcilable with these views in the passage before us? Does the writer direct or even approve a change in the form of government originally established among the Hebrews? By no means. He simply declares, "When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and shall possess it, and shall dwell therein, and shalt say, *I will set a king over me*, like as all the nations that are about me; thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom the *Lord thy God shall choose*," &c. He merely anticipates what will be their future wishes. This might have been the result of natural sagacity, even without the prophetic insight into futurity which we suppose him to have possessed. "He well understood the temper of the orientals whose propensity to kingly government was also remarked by the Greeks and Romans in later times. The example of all their neighbors, the idea of a nation being more respectable with a king at their head, the corruption of morals which gradually crept into the priestly order, the desire or the necessity of being always prepared for war—these and other causes may have induced the Hebrews earnestly to desire a king." *Michaelis' Com. on the Laws of Moses, Art. liv. Sec. 1, page 1.* In prospect of this state of things, Moses allows of the existence of a form of government somewhat modified, but

attaches to it such restrictions as would in a great measure obviate the evils incident to its establishment. "In this," continues the philosophical writer above quoted, "his judicious conduct merits commendation, since he thus avoided the error into which other legislators both ancient and modern, have fallen, in wishing to prescribe for their nation a form of government never to be changed. For even the best constitution of a state may become in a manner antiquated and enfeebled by abuses that are too strong for the laws, in which case it is expedient to alter it, and to convert, for instance, into a monarchy, a free republic, where the people have become lawless, or certain citizens too powerful or ambitious.—History confirms the observation, and the government which has in itself no inherent power of changing its form, will sooner or later experience a revolution, notwithstanding, with this difference only, that it will not be effected peaceably, but by force."

The next objection which demands our attention is derived from a class of passages, which are conceived to represent the Almighty as visible, and which cannot therefore have proceeded from Moses who taught the spirituality of the divine nature. We scarcely deem this imagined difficulty worthy of a passing notice, although much importance seems to be attached to it.—Several texts are cited such as Exodus xxxiii. 11—where it is said that the Lord spake unto Moses, face to face, as a man speaketh to his friend. It is astonishing that any one who pays attention to the context, or who is at all acquainted with the genius of the Hebrew language, and the modes of expression common among all nations in the early stages of their existence, should understand the author as here ascribing to the Deity, a corporeal form. In a passage immediately succeeding the one under view, it is declared no man can see God's face and live. We cannot suppose that any writer, however blundering, could within so short a space, have fallen into so palpable a contradiction. The truth is, that the expression, "the Lord spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh to his friend," is merely a figurative representation of the high regard in which the Almighty held his minister, and the direct communication which

he maintained with him. The tropical significations of the word *face*, are exceedingly numerous. I need only refer to Gesenius, where the instances are noted, and shall merely cite a single passage from the very chapter which is supposed to present the difficulty which I am called upon to obviate. In our version God is represented as saying. "My presence shall go with you"—meaning that he would by his power attend and protect the Israelites. A literal translation would be—"my face shall go with you." While on this topic, it may be well to suggest a general remark in relation to the anthropomorphical and anthropopathical representations occurring in the Bible—that is expressions ascribing human form or passions to the Deity. No candid man of intelligence can fall into any misconception on this subject. We find it exceedingly difficult under any circumstances to conceive of God in his pure spirituality, much less to speak of his operations consistently with this character. Much more difficult then, and even impossible was it to hold communication in respect to these things with a people as a whole, rude and uncultivated, and having in their language no words for the expression of abstract or spiritual ideas. Much therefore, as Moses and the sacred writers succeeding him insisted upon the immensity and invisibility of Jehovah—greatly as they censured any attempt to give a corporeal representation of him—even although it were taken from man—the possessor of intelligence which assimilated him to the Divinity, and constituted him Lord of this lower world; still were they compelled to fall into an apparent inconsistency in their language. It was necessary to employ terms drawn from the objects of sense, using them however, in a metaphorical signification. To denote the commandments of God, they spoke of his *mouth*—in speaking of his knowledge of the actions of men, they referred to his *eyes* and *ears*—his *hand* was the expression of this power, and his *heart* the indication of his dispositions and feelings.

Still more frivolous than the objection which I have just discussed, is another respecting the imagined inconsistency between the prohibition to worship images, and the direction to form the brazen serpent in order to

an emblematic use of it. It was sufficiently strange that the weak minds of a former age, should have supposed the second commandment to forbid the execution of any work of statuary, even without the purpose of employing it as the instrument of an idolatrous worship. It is utterly amazing that such a notion should have entered the brain of an enlightened philosopher of the nineteenth century. In connexion with this objection, our author animadverts on the supposed inconsistency between the curious and costly works accomplished by the Israelites in the desert, and the state of destitution, relieved only by miraculous supplies, which marked their wanderings. This was a favorite theme with Voltaire, who asserted that the quantity of gold employed in the fabrication of the golden calf alone, must have far exceeded the resources of the people. This and various other exceptions of that ingenious and lively, but superficial and dishonest writer have been well answered in a volume entitled "Letters of certain Jews to Mons. Voltaire"—a work written with great spirit and talent, distinguished by much urbanity, and enriched with many valuable illustrations of the Old Testament Scriptures. It may, however, on the present occasion, be only necessary to observe, that all the employment of the precious metals in the formation of these works, which required moreover the agency of ingenious artists, took place within one year after the departure from Egypt, when the resources of the Hebrews are represented as being most ample, and when having just emerged from a country marked by a high degree of civilization, they doubtless had with them artizans of every kind and of the most consummate skill.

We may now advance to the next difficulty proposed, grounded on Numbers xii. 3: "Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth." It is thought that such an observation respecting himself is entirely alien from the dignity and modesty inseparable from our conception of the character of the Jewish law-giver. The passage has attracted the attention of biblical critics as well as that of infidels. Eichhorn regards it as an addition to the text subsequently made. In this view, Rosenmuller coin-

cides, alleging that the connexion is perfect and even more natural without the third verse. He insists, in addition, upon the consideration that the phrase, "*the man Moses*," is without example in the Pentateuch. We might safely concede this point, in accordance with the principle laid down in a former essay. Such a reflection might well have been put down as a marginal note by one who was struck with the consideration of the forbearance evinced by the distinguished minister of Jehovah. Through the negligence of some copyists it might have passed into the text. All this may be supposed, without there being attached to us the censure involved in the following remark of Dr. Cooper: "If Moses wrote these books such passages are interpolations, but it is strange logic to assume that they are interpolations for the sole purpose of making Moses the author." How uncandid is this insinuation. We do not act, as in this passage we are charged with doing. We have various, independent, and satisfactory proofs that Moses wrote the Pentateuch; we merely find it necessary, as in relation to all the most accredited works of antiquity, to make some critical emendations, and sometimes to reject a passage which is manifestly spurious. That the text which we have been considering is of such a character, is, however, by no means universally conceded. Dr. Adam Clarke thinks that all difficulties will be obviated by a correct understanding of the meaning of the passage. His suggestions are valuable, and although nothing can be more ridiculous or unauthorized, than the varying the translation of any passage in the Scriptures which becomes the object of misconception, it is equally unreasonable to persist in a false rendering which is productive of serious embarrassment either in the conception of truth itself, or in the vindication of it from the charges made by its adversaries. "I think," observes the learned writer just referred to, "that the word rendered meek has not been rightly understood, מַלֵּךְ (*anav*) which we translate meek comes from מָנָה (*anah*,) to act upon, humble, depress, afflict, and is translated so in many parts of the Old Testament, and in this sense should be understood here." "Now the man Moses was depressed or afflicted more than any man of that land—

borne down by the weight of the cares devolving on him, and afflicted by the perverseness and rebellions of the people confided to his charge." The reader may, in addition to what is here suggested, consider Gesenius' illustration of the meaning of the word in question.

Of the objections belonging to that class to which this number has been devoted, there remains but one to be considered. It is drawn from the occurrence of the plural word Elohim to express the Deity. This is supposed to imply polytheistic notions inconsistent with the Mosaic doctrine concerning the unity of the divine nature. By one in the slightest degree imbued with a knowledge of the Hebrew language, such a difficulty could never, in good faith, have been suggested. As, however, our author's acquaintance with this language, may not be more perfect than that which Voltaire possessed of the Greek,* and as the confident assertion of so *profound* a scholar, will, at all events sway the opinions of multitudes, it is incumbent on us to exhibit its fallacy. We have then no difficulty in allowing that the form of the word Elohim is plural, and that it is sometimes necessary to translate it accordingly. Why then do we often render it in the singular, and how does it appear that its use by the Jewish writers does not involve the belief in many Gods? By attending to a principal of construction belonging to the Hebrew language, recognized by all grammarians and lexicographers. In Gesenius' Lexicon, under the word Elohim, we find the following description:—"As a pluralis excellentiæ God in the singular. It is sometimes construed (contrary to the general rule concerning the pluralis excellentiæ) with plural adjectives ex: gr: 1 Sam. iv. 8—xvii. 26; but the verb is almost constantly in the *singular*, as in Gen. i. 1. The exceptions are Gen. xx. 13; xxxi. 53; 2 Sam. xvii. 23; Ps. lviii. 12." The same principle is laid down in the Hebrew Grammar, essentially that of Gesenius, which Professor Stuart has published. Some farther illustration of the doctrine is added, which I do not think it necessary to quote. Rosenmuller on Gen. i. 1, observes, "The plural Elohim is customarily used to

* For some curious and amusing instances of ignorance in relation to the simplest elements of the Greek language, drawn from the works of this most superficial writer of universal pretensions, see 'Jew's Letters,' pages 463, 464.

express God. In poetic style, and in the later books of the Old Testament, the singular is found. Otherwise the Old Testament writers use the plural Elohim, but *construed* like the singular, concerning the one true God. For according to the peculiarity of the Hebrew tongue the plural, as well masculine as feminine, is employed concerning one thing great and excellent in its kind."

As I am not aware that any Hebrew scholar has ever impugned the accuracy of the above representation, I do not think it necessary to advance any thing more in its support. It will be sufficient to add a remark on Dr. Cooper's reference to Parkhurst and Dr. A. Clark, to illustrate one or two exceptions to the general rule established in the citations which I have made. The reference alluded to is in these words:—"That Elohim is in the plural, and that it is joined with plural adjectives, verbs and pronouns, Dr. A. Clark, after Parkhurst's Lex. has collected abundant instances in his note on Gen. i. 1." Now it may be inquired whether Parkhurst and Dr. Clark meant to assert that Elohim was *uniformly* or even *generally* used in connexion with plural adjectives, pronouns and verbs. We shall perceive in the sequel what was the opinion of the latter; and as respects the former, the very purpose which he meant to accomplish by his citations would be frustrated by the establishment of such a principle. He proceeds upon the admitted doctrine that the plural designation Elohim is used to denote the one true God, a main proof of which is, that it is subject to the construction of a word in the singular; i. e. it has joined to it singular verbs, pronouns and adjectives. Hence he infers, fancifully, as is thought by many orthodox theologians, that a proof is thus furnished of a Trinity in Unity. He endeavours to corroborate his argument by shewing that this plural denomination of Deity, although manifestly referring to the true God, who is one, and construed as a singular, is nevertheless not unfrequently connected with plural verbs, &c. What were Dr. Clark's views will appear from his note on Gen. xx, 13. "Here the word Elohim is used with a *plural* verb, which is very *unusual* in the Hebrew language, as *this* plural noun is generally joined with verbs in the singular number." The passage upon which this observa-

tion occurs is one of the few exceptions to the rule which holds good, generally, respecting all the attributive parts of speech, and almost universally in relation to verbs. Rosenmuller's remark is that these exceptions usually occur when respect is had rather to the plural form than to the signification of the word.—That in this very text where the plural form obtains, both in the subject and predicate of the proposition, the discourse is concerning the *one* true God, is manifest by a reference to a parallel passage. In this place Abraham says, when Elohim caused me to wander (verb in plural form) from my father's house, that I said, &c. His allusion is to what is narrated Gen. xii. "Now the Lord (*Jehovah*) had said unto Abram, get thee out from thy country," &c. It is thus demonstrated that the word Elohim, even when construed with a plural verb, is used to designate that one God who was known to the Israelites by his proper name Jehovah. Other instances where plural adjectives are joined to the word in question, when there can be no doubt that the true God is spoken of, are furnished Ps. lviii, 12. Joshua xxiv. 19. It is time however, to close this discussion, with which I shall terminate the present section.

SECTION XI.

Objections particularly referring to the Book of Genesis.

"From the last verse of Genesis, to the end of the Revelation, there is no reference made to the book of Genesis or its contents." Such a remark proceeding from any other writer than the author of the "Connexion between Geology and the Pentateuch," would greatly surprise us.—It, however, perfectly corresponds to many assertions with which we meet in that production. The total absence of truth which distinguishes it, I need not attempt to prove, so far as my concern is with those who are at all acquainted with the Bible, either in its earlier or its later portions. Yet to those less informed on the subject, the inquiry may be addressed—how could the

succeeding books be at all understood without the history contained in this introductory one? How would the Israelites have known any thing respecting the God of their fathers ; He who is ever called the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and whose promises, repeatedly made to these patriarchs, are so frequently referred to? And how could they have known any thing in relation to their migration into Egypt, and the events which there occurred?

It must be manifest then, to every one who will reflect on the subject, that the book in question is absolutely indispensable to the completeness of the historical records of the Jews.

To this book however, apart from its imagined want of connexion with those which succeed, our author takes the strongest exceptions. There are several reasons which he suggests, against its reception as a genuine production.

1. It is composed of various independent documents. I am at a loss to conceive what bearing upon the subject this consideration can have. Dr. Cooper furnishes a full account of the several theories which have been offered respecting the sources whence Moses derived his materials for writing the history contained in Genesis. He seems to think that the admission of the correctness of these theories which agree in the essential fact, that pre-existing documents were used, and differ only in respect to the number of them, is equivalent to an abandonment of the position that the first book of the Pentateuch is a Mosaic production. Absurd imagination! Such an assumption is entirely inconsequential. Does he not know that the orthodox Vitringa first suggested the opinion under view in his *Observationes Sacrae Lib. 1, civ. s 23, p. 36, Franeq. 1712*, long before it was fully developed by Astruc, A. D. 1753, and modified by Eichhorn and Ilgen? Is he not aware that many have since adopted it, who never for a moment questioned the authority of Genesis, as proceeding from Moses? Such is especially the fact in reference to Jahn and Rosenmuller among the biblical critics, and Knapp among the Theologians ; who have however shewn the impotence of the attempts to ascertain the precise number of documents used, or to define

accurately their beginnings or endings—and wherein consists the incompatibility of this theory with the views which we advocate? There are only three sources from which we can suppose Moses to have derived his materials. He must have received them directly from the Deity by inspiration, or derived them from oral traditions, or possessed some ancient written memorials of the human race. Admit the latter supposition to be true either wholly or partially, and how does it derogate from the character of Genesis? Still its accuracy is vouched for by Moses, able, as he is allowed on all hands to have been, to judge respecting the trust-worthiness of any ancient documents, and qualified according to our apprehension to give them the sanction of an inspired prophet.

But it is alleged that these documents are conflicting, exceptionable in themselves, or manifestly derived from another people long subsequent to the age of Moses.—There is supposed to be a contrariety between the two accounts of the creation of man, contained in the first and second chapters of Genesis, which are regarded as being two of these documents. The plain state of the case is—that in the former chapter there is a brief mention of the formation of man in the general account of the work of the six days. In the latter the subject is resumed, and some details of the transaction are given entirely consistent with the mere succinct statement previously furnished.

But in the one narrative the designation given to the Creator is Elohim; in the other it is Jehovah Elohim. And what does this prove? that there were separate accounts in the hands of Moses, which he had derived from his forefathers? Let this be allowed, and what does the adversary gain? Who supposes that it at all detracts from the value of an historical work, that in its compilation two distinct, although harmonious authorities have been used—the one going more into detail than the other? And these documents are not confusedly thrown together, or barely compiled by one who assumed no responsibility in regard to them. Moses often blends them intimately, as is the case in Gen. vi. 5, 6; “And God (Elohim,) saw that the wickedness of man

was great on the earth, and it repented the Lord (Jehovah,) that He had made man."

By the way, I would remark upon a considerable oversight of Dr. Cooper, in referring to Eichhorn's classification of texts. They who read the works of this writer, must have often wondered at his studious display of Scriptural erudition, and at his commendable zeal in enforcing upon them an actual and careful examination of the texts which he cites: "I request," he in the present instance observes, "the reader to take his Bible and peruse the account of the creation by the *Gods* (Elohim,) in the following order, Gen. vi. 12, 13, &c. &c. and the Jehovah narration. Gen. vi. 5. 7." &c.

Alas! he has imposed upon the reader a difficult—an impracticable task. How can we read what is not written? When the entire discourse is of the wickedness of the human race, leading to the desolation of our globe by an universal deluge—how may we find two separate accounts of the creation of man? Surely it becomes the writer to examine the texts which he cites, and to ascertain their subject, before he refers the reader to them for his satisfaction, in relation to a particular hypothesis. The strong hold, however, in which the adversary entrenches himself is the plural termination of the word Elohim. But after the full discussion of this topic in the last number, I do not deem it necessary to add a single remark.

The fallacy thus being shewn, of any conclusion detrimental to the authority of Genesis, drawn from the fact that Moses used pre-existing documents, and the assertion that these are conflicting, satisfactorily refuted; we are prepared to meet the exceptions to these original sources of information independently considered. The Elohim document is said to be a Chaldee tradition added to a Jewish one, and the assertion is, that the production which they constitute, did not exist until after the transportation to Babylon. And what are the reasons for this belief? An attempt is made to exhibit a formidable array of them, by a double enumeration of one, and by the fabrication of others which involve the inference of the actual from the possible.

The first proof, so called, that the book of Genesis

had its origin during the captivity, is that Elohim is plural. So fond of this argument is our author, that in addition to his former reference to it he has twice mentioned it in the single paragraph which we have now under view. For an exhibition of the insufficiency of this consideration, the reader must again be referred to the discussion gone into, on a former occasion. I may, however, suggest one additional remark. Greatly as the Jews were prone to idolatry, prior to the chastisement inflicted by their long and mournful captivity; after this period, they never gave the slightest indication of a similar propensity. Any respect paid to the gods of other nations, any thing derogatory from the honor of Jehovah, they appear to have regarded with extreme abhorrence. Now let it be admitted that they had adopted or compiled any historical document, at that time, is it credible that they would have tolerated in such document, any thing which recognized a multiplicity of Gods?

But the word El is not Hebrew but Chaldee. This is a remark for which our author is indebted to Voltaire; although, by a singular neglect, this lively writer is not mentioned in the general list of authorities which is furnished. Perhaps it was thought that a more imposing display of learning was made by a reference to Hobbes, and Spinoza, and Father Simon.

"These puppies of Jews," writes the courteous Frenchman, "are of so late a date that they had not a word in their language to signify God, the name El was originally Chaldean."—*Phil. Dict.*

What if it were so? Was not Abraham a native of Ur of the Chaldees? Did not Isaac his son, obtain a wife from Mesopotamia? Is it forgotten that the wives of Jacob were Chaldean, and that the Patriarch himself spent many years of his life in the "land of the children of the East?" Is it then surprising that a designation of the Deity derived from this oriental dialect, should have been in use among the descendants of these individuals? Moreover, Hebrew and Chaldee are languages now nearly resembling each other, they are both branches of one original stock, and of course varied from each other less at a former and remote period than they do

at present. This being considered, who can doubt that they had not a few, but many words in common? We have as authority for this, Mons. Voltaire, who in singular contradiction to what is above quoted from him says, "This word *El* signified God among the first Phœnicians," (who spake Hebrew.)—*Phil. Dict. Art Phæn.* The position therefore in reference to this word which is attempted to be maintained, we perceive to be utterly untenable.

But the traditions contained in Genesis, are farther said to be Chaldean, because they agree with the Phœnician and Chaldean writers, as cited by Josephus, Alexander, Polyhistor, and Eusebius from Berosus." Chaldee, *because* they agree with the *Phœnician* writers! Why not Phœnician rather? And if the Phœnician and Chaldean writers, independent authorities, concur in a particular representation, in which they are also sustained by the Hebrew records, why should not these latter be considered a separate and additional witness? But two other of our adversary's reasons remain to be considered—the one that Ezra, educated at Babylon, would derive all his knowledge from Chaldean writers; the other, that the Jews of that period would be conversant with the literature and traditional cosmogony of the country in which they lived. I would here simply repeat a suggestion already made, that this involves an argument from the possible to the actual. It is a mere begging of the question. It is saying nothing more, than that *if* Moses *did not* write Genesis, Ezra or some other Jew *might* have done it, during the exile.

It seems then that the imposing array of objections brought up against us, is so much diminished, that but two require to be seriously met. These are—that *El* is a Chaldean word, and that the cosmogony, or account of the origin of created things contained in Genesis, is Chaldean. A sufficient refutation of the argument founded upon them it is thought, has been furnished by the observations already made. The latter of the considerations above mentioned, may perhaps deserve some additional attention. It is admitted that the traditions preserved by Berosus, do greatly resemble the narration which Genesis presents.—This observation also applies in a degree even

more remarkable to the fragmentary records of the Egyptians and Phœnicians, as they are exhibited in Diodorus, Siculus and Sanconiathon. A similar correspondence may be traced in the accounts of the origin of things existing among the ancient Persians. To the Hindoos and Chinese, it is not deemed necessary, at present, to make any reference. Now it is not probable that from any one of these nations, all the rest borrowed their cosmogonies. The obvious conclusion is that they were derived from some common and more ancient source, and that they were founded on transactions really taking place.

But the other document assumed as one of the originals of Genesis, in which the term Jehovah is used, is also denounced as suspicious. To support this proscription a reference is made to the following passage, Ex. vi. 3: "And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty: but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them."

The difficulty connected with this passage is, that in many parts of the preceding history the name Jehovah occurs. Yet here it is supposed to be declared that this name was not previously applied to the Deity. The inference is, that the book of Genesis, containing this history must have been written after Exodus, and is contradictory to it. The only and the entirely satisfactory solution of the difficulty presented is, that the text cited does not prove the name Jehovah to have been entirely unknown to the ancestors of Moses. Various writers use different methods of establishing this conclusion.

We premise to a statement of some of these, the general consideration that there can be no real inconsistency between the passage in question and the numerous texts in Genesis, where Jehovah is employed as a well known divine appellation. If it were so, would not they, who according to the gratuitous supposition of our adversary, at a late period foisted the book of Genesis into the collection of the Jewish historical records, have avoided an inconsistency so glaring, by new modelling the spurious production which they are assumed to have borrowed, or expunging the single passage which seemed to create any embarrassment? Upon the supposition

we have made, principle could have presented no obstacle to such a proceeding—interest and common sense would have imperatively enjoined it. But to return—some understand the phraseology of the text, Ex. vi. 3, as employed not in an absolute but comparative sense. God was not so much known to the patriarchs by the designation of Jehovah, as by that of El Shaddai—God Almighty. Others think that in the present instance the word *only* is to be understood as supplied—that He was not only known to them by the name Jehovah, but by that of El Shaddai. Such, according to Dr. Gill, was the view of Saadai Gaon, a Jewish Rabbi, head of a School at Sora, near Babylon, author of an Arabic translation of the Old Testament, &c. who flourished A. D. 930. This interpretation is supported by a reference to Gen. xxxii. 28: “Thou shalt no more be called Jacob, but Israel,” where the meaning necessarily is: “Thou shalt no more be called Jacob *only*—but Israel likewise.”

Some again propose to read the passage interrogatively: “By my name Jehovah, was I not known?” An affirmative answer being supplied.

The explanation most generally approved, however, is that furnished in the following paraphrase. To your ancestors, I have shewn myself to be the Almighty, but as a God, faithful, unchangeable, (the idea involved in the term Jehovah,) and fulfilling the promises which I gave them concerning the occupation of the land of Caanan—they have not known—*had no experience* of me. He does not intend that the name itself was unheard of by the ancestors of Moses—but that they had not seen brought to pass what was signified by that name—as among the sacred writers “to be called,” is sometimes the same as “to be,” so here the name is denied to one, who has not yet exhibited the character, or exercised the influence involved in it. See the subject more fully developed in Rosenmuller.

I must not, however, omit to mention, that an elaborate investigation has been made of this subject in a late number of the Biblical Repository, by an American writer, who has proposed a new, and as he thinks, more satisfactory interpretation.—Not, however, regarding it as preferable to the one above stated, I shall content

myself with referring to the article itself.—*Bib. Rep. No. xii. Art. 4.*

In connexion with the topic now under discussion, and with a view to deprive the Jews of all originality whatever in their religious system, it has been asserted that even the name Jehovah—the most remarkable appellative of the God whom they worshipped—was derived from the Phœnicians and Egyptians. The existence of such an opinion, furnishes a remarkable exemplification of the facility with which error is transmitted from one writer to many succeeding ones—who are content to receive, without examination, the assertions of those who have gone before them. No principle seems to have been generally recognized as a more certain truth than that the name Jehovah, or, *Iaw*, was known to the nations above mentioned. Yet Professor Tholuck of Halle, has shewn to a perfect demonstration the total fallacy of this supposition.—*Bib. Rep. No. xiii. 3.*

He traces the general prevalence of this opinion to Schiller's Essay on the Mission of Moses, the leading ideas of which are derived from the book of Brother Decius, or the Hebrew mysteries by the celebrated Reinhold. The latter individual who speaks of the Egyptian origin of the name Jehovah, as a well known fact, introduces as a guaranty, Voltaire, who says: "The most sacred name among the Egyptians was the same which the Hebrews afterwards adopted in their language, viz: I-ha-ho. This was pronounced in various ways, and Clemens Alexandrinus assures us, in his Stromata, that no one might enter the temple of Serapis, who did not bear on his breast or forehead the name I-ha-ho or Jao, which denotes the eternal God."

"What a remarkable fact of antiquity," observes Tholuck; but—if it could only be found in Clement; I have never succeeded in finding it." This able writer whom I have just quoted, proceeds to investigate the *grounds* of the opinion, the *history* of which he had just given. He sets out with the statement that not one single ancient writer affirms that God was called *Iaw* by the Egyptians; and he establishes this statement beyond all dispute, by an examination of the few passages usually cited on the subject. The first is Diodorus Siculus i. 94.

where the author speaking of the Egyptians incidentally makes the observation: "It is related that among the Hebrews, Moses professed to have received his law from the God Jao." The whole paragraph in the original may be seen in the *Biblical Repository*, No xiii. page 95. No one can avoid sympathizing in the astonishment expressed by Tholuck, that any author should have quoted this as sustaining the belief of the *Egyptian origin* of the word in question, nor avoid concurring in the supposition that there was some unaccountable slip of the memory in the writer who first cited the passage, and that the error once committed, has been successively propagated by those who adopted the quotation without verifying it. In addition to the passage from Diodorus, only two testimonies of antiquity have been brought forward to shew that the name Jehovah or Jao, existed beyond the limits of the Mosaic institutions; the one from Macrobius, proving, it is thought, the employment of this name in the Grecian mysteries—the other in Porphyry, shewing its existence among the Phœnicians. Macrobius flourished in the first part of the fifth century of the Christian era, under Theodosius the younger. The passage in his writings above referred to, consists of verses ascribed to Apollo Clarius. According to Tholuck, Jablonsky, in his *Pantheon Egyptiacum*, has clearly shewn that these verses belong to a Judaizing Gnostic. Besides, does the knowledge of the name Jao among the Greeks, or Egyptians, or Orientals of Western Asia, in the second or third century of our era, prove that it originated among them, and not rather that it was derived from the Jews then universally dispersed?

"We know from Jamblichus, that the syncretic theosophists of that age were accustomed to adopt foreign names of God, and employ them in their incantations."
—*Tholuck*.

The passage from Porphyry is professedly derived from Sanchoniathon, and is preserved by two of the fathers of the church, Eusebius and Theodoret. It, however, fails entirely in answering the end for which it is cited. Porphyry simply says, "Sanconiathon gave a true account of the Jewish history, and this because he received his accounts from a priest of *Ieuu*—*Jeuo*."

There are two other data which are supposed to furnish proof of the hypothesis which I am opposing, one of which is an inscription on the temple of Isis at Sais, transmitted by Plutarch, but of which no mention is made by Herodotus, or Diodorus, or Strabo. For an exposure of the insufficiency of these testimonials, the reader must, however, be referred to the article of Tholuck, where entire satisfaction may be obtained.

The present section has already reached and undue length, and we have yet before us a class of objections, which, if I mistake not, our author regards as particularly forcible. The next section will contain an examination of their validity.

SECTION XII.

Objection to its genuineness, derived from the alleged fact, that Moses was unacquainted with Hebrew, the Egyptian being his vernacular language.

To the class of objections discussed in the last section, belong the suggestion, "that Moses was never out of Egypt, except so far as the land of Moab," and the consecutive inquiry, "What could induce him to place Paradise upon the Euphrates? And what could he know of Pison and Gihon, and Hiddekel?" Prior, therefore, to the consideration of the difficulty, stated at the head of the present essay, it will be necessary to inquire how far the Hebrew lawgiver was qualified by his attainments in geographical knowledge, at least, for communicating the information contained in the book of Genesis. It is thought that the above stated questions although capiously proposed, will, in their solution, lead to the adoption of views entirely at variance with the result at which the author of them hoped to arrive. For where, in the whole range of history may we find an individual in whom so many qualifications for writing the production in question, meet, as in Moses—descended from Chaldean ancestors—nurtured at the court of Pharaoh, and instructed in all the learning of the Egyptians—having,

doubtless, intercourse with the Phœnician merchants, whose pursuits led them to all parts of the world, then accessible to commercial enterprise, and who in fine, spent eighty years of his life in Arabia—during forty of which as a private individual, his acquaintance must have been extensive with the Nomadic tribes who ranged from Egypt to the Euphrates, and who throughout the forty years succeeding, as the leader of the Israelites, had extensive dealings, peaceful as well as warlike, with various surrounding nations. Surely, it is alone necessary to direct the reader's attention to the facts thus hastily enumerated, to produce in him a feeling of surprise that any one should for a moment have questioned the entire competency of Moses, to furnish all the geographical and historical details which are contained in the early Hebrew writings—and when the question recurs, "What could induce Moses to place Paradise upon the Euphrates?" we have only to answer, that *there* was the first seat of the human race, and that with this fact the historian had ample means of becoming acquainted.

But let us now advance to the consideration of the objection, "that Moses and the Israelites did not, and could not write, or read, or speak Hebrew, which was the language of the Phœnicians and Canaanites, until after the invasion and peaceable settlement of the promised land." What then is the proof of this startling assertion? It is said "that Chaldee was Abraham's native language and that Hebrew was the language of the Canaanites which Abraham and his posterity learnt by travelling among them." Who doubts this? And yet our author, prodigal of testimony where none is wanted, cites in support of it, Dr. Rees, and his authorities quoted under the head Hebrew character in the Encyclopedia—which authorities are Le Clerc, and Joseph Scaliger, and Walton, and Selden.

I have said, who questions the statement above made? I know of no other but Dr. Cooper himself, who leans on it for support, and yet who professes to disbelieve it in part. He admits that Abraham acquired the Hebrew language, but "*naturally infers* that he would not teach it to his descendants, from his great reluctance to permit Isaac to marry in Canaan."—However *natural* may

be this inference, it appears to be not only entirely without proof, but opposed by the learned authorities which are above quoted, and conclusively shewn to be false by a passage in the patriarchal history. Respect is had to Genesis xxxi. 46, 47, where at the parting of Jacob, and his father-in-law Laban, a pile of stones was erected as a memorial of a covenant into which they had entered. "Laban called it Jegar-sahaduthy, but Jacob called it Galeed." Their languages were therefore different—Laban spoke Chaldee, but Jacob, the grandson of Abraham, and the progenitor of the Israelites, who at the close of his life, with his family, made Egypt his permanent residence, spoke a different dialect which was Hebrew. It appears then to be incontrovertible that not only did Abraham, according to the admission of our antagonist, acquire a knowledge of Hebrew, but that this also became the language of his descendants. And all this occurred by a process the easiest imaginable—Hebrew and Chaldee, now cognate dialects, nearly resembling each other, originally presented still less diversity than is at present manifest. For according to the opinions of almost all critics, there was originally but one language in that section of Asia, which includes the region of the Euphrates, Syria, Palestine and Arabia. The original identity of the languages subsequently prevalent throughout this part of the world, is proved, not merely by their having many words in common but by their whole genius and structure. It is generally supposed that a full exhibition of this primitive speech is furnished by no one of those derived from it; and that these latter have by their respective deviations from it, assumed their specific character. Many, however, do assert that the Hebrew itself is that primeval tongue which gave rise according to Gesenius:—I. To the Aramean, spoken in Syria, Mesopotamia, and Babylon, and which includes the West Aramean or Syriac, and the East Aramean or Chaldee; II. To the Hebrew spoken in Palestine and Phœnicia, from which the Punic is descended; and III. To the Arabic, with which the Ethiopic is nearly allied. The claims of the Hebrew to this prerogative are well stated in an article of the *Biblical Repertory*—Princeton, Vol. II. No. 2, p. 320, on the Antiquity, History, &c. of the Hebrew language.

But to recur to the course of our argument, there is no doubt that the Israelites carried the Hebrew language with them to Egypt—the contrary opinion is not only totally without evidence, but in direct opposition to it. The question then is—did they lose it during their continuance in that country? Our opponent thinks that they did. He asserts that they adopted the Egyptian language and that they did not acquire that of Canaan until after the entire conquest of the promised land, perhaps in the reign of Solomon. Truly, we may adopt the remark of our author with some slight variation: “The hardihood of assertion exhibited by the patrons of heterodoxy is absolutely amazing.” To sustain the fact which Dr. Cooper *assumes*, there is not the least shew of evidence in the Jewish records themselves, nor the testimony of a single author, nor, as far as my information extends, the corroborating *opinion* of any modern writer. This is the first instance in which I have not been able to trace Dr. Cooper’s reasonings and objections to some source beyond himself, and regarding this as a specimen of his inventive powers, there is no reason to apprehend that the cause of revelation is placed in greater peril by the assaults of this new champion, than it has frequently been in days past. In the absence then of any shadow of *proof*, how is it attempted to shew that the Israelites lost their language in Egypt? Simply by a reference to an analogous instance in which a similar result is supposed to have taken place. I allude to the Babylonish captivity. Now admitting for the present, that the Jews did totally lose their language during the seventy years transportation, it would not follow that their ancestors had lost it during their abode in Egypt, even for a period still longer. The cases are marked by strong features of discrimination. The Jews when carried beyond the Euphrates, were much dispersed—their communication with each other, in consequence, much obstructed—and there was nothing in their political or civil condition which tended to perpetuate their language. But how different were the circumstances of their ancestors, at a former period, even when most depressed by Egyptian servitude; they had gone down to Egypt as

the kindred of an highly distinguished favorite and minister of the king of the country.—There had been assigned to them a distinct portion of the land as their peculiar and exclusive possession. This had been the result of the provident management of Joseph himself, who was anxious to preserve his family from the corrupting influence of Egyptian customs and superstitions. He had directed his brethren to announce themselves to Pharaoh, as shepherds, with the avowed object of obtaining for them, a place of abode, of which they would be the exclusive occupants, inasmuch as “every shepherd is an abomination to the Egyptians.”—Gen. xlvi. 34.

Occupying, therefore, the land of Goshen, admirably suited to their pastoral occupations, and for more than a hundred years distinguished by the royal favor, it is not surprising that “the children of Israel were fruitful and increased abundantly, and multiplied, and waxed exceedingly mighty, and the land was filled with them.—Ex. i. 7. Under these circumstances no one can suppose that they lost their language, nor was this effect to be anticipated, when a reverse was experienced by them and the munificence of former kings was followed by the oppression of their successor.—Still the Hebrews remained in a body—They were not slaves occupying a station of domestic servitude—they were the disfranchised subjects of a despotic monarch—in lieu of a heavy pecuniary tribute, severe and continued labors were exacted from them. But out of this condition grew neither the necessity nor the inducement to adopt the language of their oppressors, no necessity, inasmuch as the daily intercourse of life could be maintained in the Hebrew—no inducement for they could not admire nor wish to imitate a speech which had then become the vehicle only of arbitrary mandates or stern reproaches.

That they should therefore have relinquished the use of their own language in order to the adoption of that of Egypt, is an assumption as utterly improbable as it is altogether destitute of evidence. But in case this had been done, how would the dialect of Canaan, ever have come into use among the Isrealites. If according to

our author, they refused to adopt it, while they were yet a single family of wandering shepherds, sustaining amicable relations, and having daily intercourse with the inhabitants of the land, is it to be supposed that they would do this—when as a conquering nation they entered Palestine—when they were the executors of the divine judgments upon a devoted people, and when they were forbidden to retain, even as slaves, those whom the Almighty Ruler of nations had adjudged to death for their crimes? And although a portion of this condemned race, was under the arrangements of Providence, permitted to occupy, for several generations, a part of their original territory, and occasionally to harass, and even sometimes subjugate the Israelites, yet in all this, there was nothing which could induce the latter to substitute for their own language that of a rival and most odious people.

But in the considerations presented above, I have admitted a fact, upon which alone rests even the semblance of an argument offered by our adversary. I have conceded the point, that the Jews did lose their language during the Babylonian captivity. Had this been really the case, the alleged result would have been greatly facilitated by the striking similarity of the Chaldee and Hebrew dialect.

But the fact thus admitted, is by no means unquestionable. It is, on the contrary, extremely improbable that the Jews after their restoration to their own land, spoke only the Chaldee. This opinion which has been very generally entertained is supported principally by the passage in Nehemiah viii. 8, where an account is given of the solemn recital of the law under the direction of Ezra—"So they read in the book of the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading." But this statement which is supposed to refer to a translation of the law from Hebrew into Chaldee, made by the Levites in the course of their reading, may well be understood of such an interpretation or illustration of the sacred text, as is now given by Christian teachers in their ordinary ministrations. In confirmation of this view, we may add, that the prophets, after the captivity, addressed the people in

Hebrew, and that Nehemiah xiii. 24, speaks of those who by their marriage with the daughters of Ashdod, brought up their children to speak partly the language of Ashdod, and partly that of the Jews. Doubtless, during their residence in a foreign land, many of the Jews either acquired its language in full, or adopted a mixed dialect. The effect thus begun to be produced was continued and increased by the ascendancy of the Syrian monarchy under the Seleucidæ, and the final result, after several ages, was the establishment of the Syro-Chaldaic—a mixture of the East and West Aramean as the vernacular language of Palestine. But this process was one which went on very gradually, for in the time of the Maccabees, we find inscriptions on coins, which prove that the use of the Hebrew was not then abandoned.

It appears that even the single analogous instance upon which Dr. C. grounds his opinion, that the Hebrews lost their language in Egypt, is a very dubious one—and that of any other proof, his assertion is entirely destitute. We must, therefore, regard his objection, that Moses speaking in Egyptian, could not have written a book in Hebrew, as completely overthrown.

SECTION XIII.

Alleged impossibility of such a work having been produced in the age of Moses, derived from a consideration of the characters then used in writing and the substances upon which they were impressed.

It was a favorite object with the philosopher of Ferney, in his numerous diatribes against the Jews and their religion, to establish the principle above stated. He asserts “that in the time of Moses, Hieroglyphic writing only was in use, and that the art of engraving upon polished stone, upon brick, upon lead and upon wood, was the only method of writing, and that the Egyptians and Chaldeans wrote in no other way.” It was therefore Mons. Voltaire’s opinion that nations em-

ployed more difficult processes in the earlier than in the later period of their existence, although he has elsewhere observed that "before Hieroglyphics, men *painted* their conceptions in a clumsy manner." The use of colors then, by his own shewing, being known, it would have been much easier to have traced figures by their means upon cloth, or other light substances than to have engraven them upon stone and metal. But we shall pass by this consideration at present, and remark, that he seems at a subsequent period to have learned that the Jews employed at least one more facile method of representing their ideas—i. e. by tracing characters in soft plaister with which stones were covered, Of this discovery, our author upon whom the mantle of the patriarch of French literature seems to have fallen, has availed himself, and with singular ingratitude, in adopting and appropriating it, has flatly contradicted the opinion maintained by his instructor—that engraving upon polished stone, &c., was in use among the Egyptians. For he peremptorily denies that Moses, who came out of Egypt, and whose circumstances there had been such as to forbid the supposition that he was not acquainted with its arts, knew any other, or better mode of writing than the tracing of characters in soft plaister spread over stone.

There seems, moreover, to be a want of entire coincidence of sentiment between these two great men on another subject. The one asserts that Hieroglyphic writing *only*, was in use in the time of Moses—the other seems to leave the matter in doubt, although afterwards, with no great consistency, he affirms, in reference to the particular instance of the Jewish historian, that "he did not write one line of phonetic Egyptian." I shall cite in full what he says on this subject with a view to the addition of some critical remarks. On page 36, of *Geol. and Pent.* we meet the following passage: "in what *language* Moses wrote, whether in the Hieratic or phonetic Hieroglyphics of the Egyptians, *in which we are to presume he was instructed*, is no where said." In this passage I would note two things—One is a new and surprising use of the word *language*, where the appropriate term would have been *character*. We do not

speak of the hieratic or hieroglyphic language—but of the hieratic or hieroglyphic character, or mode of representing ideas by one set of sensible images rather than another.—Intending to express the fact that our Hebrew scriptures are written in the Chaldee *character* or *letters* we would not say they were written in the Chaldee *language*. This, however, may have been an oversight committed in the haste of composition—but there cannot be given the same excuse for the error which is the subject of my second remark.

There is displayed in the passage upon which I am commenting, an utter confusion of ideas in reference to the modes of writing in use, among the Egyptians. We have here a phonetic, hieroglyphic *language* of this people, distinguished from a hieratic, hieroglyphic language. What a total incongruity and absurdity there is in these expressions, will appear from some observations which I shall subjoin to the next quotation. At page 57 of his pamphlet, Dr. C. again says, “whether Moses wrote in the hieratic, the demotic, or the phonetic character, or in what form of hieroglyphic, or whether he used the *ta prota stoicheia*, described in the *Stromata* of Clemens Alexandrinus, I shall not stop to inquire.” Here is dust thrown into the eyes of the unlearned, he does not intend to investigate the subject, but thinks it well to excite the admiration of the wondering multitude by the display of an acquaintance with all the intricacies of the ancient Egyptian learning. Unfortunately, however, there are almost as many errors as there are words in the sentence above cited. In the first place he distinguishes the *phonetic*—from the *hieratic* and *demotic character*, whereas the former is only a particular *class* of *signs*, common to the *different kinds of writing* expressed by the two last mentioned terms. *Phonetic* is opposed, not to *hieratic* or *demotic*, but to *ideographic*—a *phonetic* character, is one expressing *sound*, such as the *letters* of our alphabet, which do not present *ideas* but *words*: Whereas an ideographic character is expressive of the *object itself*, and does not merely enter into the composition of a word by which it is designated. Again, the clause, “or in what form of hieroglyphics,” either implies that the hieratic, de-

motie and phonetic were distinct *species* of *hieroglyphic writing*, of which there were other kinds, or that this hieroglyphic writing was something entirely different from the modes of representing ideas denoted by the terms first mentioned. Now the hieratic and demotic, were not *subdivisions* of *hieroglyphic* writing, but they were two independent kinds of *writing in general*, in use among the Egyptians, of which the hieroglyphic was a *third* and *collateral* one. To make this entirely clear let the following remarks be attended to. The most definite information respecting the written character of the ancient Egyptians, is derived from a passage of Clements Alexandrinus in his *Stromata*, Lib. v, Tom. ii. p. 657. With this concur substantially the brief statements of Herodotus and Diodorus. The information given by Clement, was however never rendered perfectly intelligible until the recent discoveries of Champollion, with which it presents a remarkable correspondence. M. Letronne in a letter to Champollion, published in the *Precis du Systeme Hieroglyphique*, has given a translation of this celebrated passage of the Christian father, with a comment illustrating it. See an *Essay on the hieroglyphic system of Mons. Champollion* by J. G. Greppo, p. 26.

There are, says Clement, three kinds of Egyptian letters. 1. The epistolographic, 2. The hieratic, 3. The hieroglyphic. Herodotus and Diodorus furnish but two classes—the demotic or popular, and the hieretic or sacred. It appears that they grouped together under one denomination the two last divisions of Clement.

All the three kinds of writing mentioned by him have been recognized upon the monuments by Champollion—on the famous Rosetta stone, however, the term enchorial, national or belonging to the country, was used to express what Clement calls *epistolographic* and the Greek historians *demotic*. “The *demotic* writing was the most flowing and simple of the three, and employed chiefly *phonetic* or alphabetic sounds. The *hieratic*, less simple than the *demotic*, differs from the *hieroglyphic* in the delineation of its characters, which are a kind of reduction, or rather the tachygraphy, (the short hand) of the hieroglyphic signs to which they correspond.—

It employs much fewer *ideographic* signs than the *hieroglyphic*, but more than the *demotic* or popular writing. But in their *phonetic* parts, these three writings form (so to speak) but one, their only difference consisting in the differently formed signs which they employ;" Greppo's Essay, p. 28, 29.

With this explanation of the Egyptian system of writing, the reader may at once perceive how extremely inaccurate and confused are the terms in which Dr. C. refers to it. Nor is his allusion to the *ta prota stoicheia* of Clement at all more happy—he speaks of these as a certain class of written characters totally distinct from hieroglyphics, whereas they constitute *one* of the *two kinds of signs* employed in the hieroglyphic method.—“This writing, i. e. the hieroglyphic, says Clement, is of two kinds; one of these the *cyriologic* employs the *primitive alphabetic letters*; the other is symbolic. Such is M. Letronne's translation in which it is to be observed that he renders *πρωτων στοιχειων*, the *primitive alphabetic letters*. For an illustration of the correctness of this version, see Greppo's Essay, p. 30. This passage then merely confirms the statement already made, that in the hieroglyphic writing some of the signs were *symbolic* or *ideographic*, i. e. expressive of ideas, while others were *phonetic*, i. e. representatives of sound—in other words alphabetic characters. Such then is the *accuracy* of our author's learning; I shall now exhibit a rare specimen of his logic. After having in the first extract from his pamphlet which is given above, admitted that Moses was instructed in the several kinds of writing employed by the Egyptians, and after having in the second, declined inquiring which of these varieties was used by him, he advances the assertion, the incorrectness of which shall be shewn in the sequel, that “no man ever yet saw an Egyptian book, or part of a book, or any other historical record beyond an inscription of mere names, 'till the settlement of the Greeks at Alexandria, under the Ptolemies and the introduction of Christianity among the Copts.” By the way, this joining together two distinct events, three or four hundred years apart, to indicate the era of a particular transaction is somewhat extraordinary. Let this pass, however, while

we attend to the chain of our author's reasoning. "Moses therefore did not write one line of *phonetic* Egyptian, and whether he wrote any thing in any form of hieroglyphic, we know not." Here Dr. C. again uses the term *phonetic* instead of *demotic* to express the popular and most simple form of writing, and still seems uninformed that many of the hieroglyphic signs (Cham-pollion says the greatest number) were *phonetic*. But we proceed with our citation. "Upon these points his whole history is silent; no wonder! What account *could* Moses give of them? Did he write in Hebrew? No.—Hebrew like Samaritan is Phœnician," &c. *Admirable demonstration!* Moses did *not* write Hebrew, but Egyptian—and *therefore* he could give no account whether he wrote any thing in the phonetic [understand demotic] or hieroglyphic character of the Egyptians. After having by so *unexceptionable* a process reached this *irrefutable* conclusion, he rambles off with citations from Bochart and Petit and Walton, to prove that the Hebrew is identical with the Phœnician. To this statement, which no one ever dreamed of contesting, he adds the remark, "A man must be sadly ignorant of literary discussions who doubts this at this day." What an air of condescending superiority is here assumed in reference to the imagined ignorance of his opponents. With what beautiful propriety may they retort the observation. A man must be sadly ignorant of the discoveries of the last ten years, to say nothing of the investigations of the learned, for the last fifteen hundred, who exhibits such a total want of correct acquaintance with the system of writing employed by one of the most renowned nations of antiquity. But the merits of the question under consideration are distinct from the inquiry, how far Dr. Cooper is qualified to sustain the office which he assumes to himself of being an instructor in universal science. The objections which he has proposed may be valid, however superficial his acquaintance with related topics. Yet it is not foreign from the object had in view in these essays, to estimate the acquirements and expose the errors of one, whom many regard, as in an eminent manner, their guide, philosopher, and friend—and to whom this community in gen-

eral have been too much accustomed to defer on all points involving profound literary research. Opinions often attain extended currency, through the imagined superiority in intellectual power or scientific attainment of him who promulgates them. It is hoped that henceforth no man will regard the decisions of Dr. C. as conclusive upon any subject, literary, or scientific, or moral, where there is requisite for its comprehension, either deep learning or candid investigation.

We return to the subjects proposed, and inquire whether there is any reason to doubt concerning the production of the Pentateuch in the age, during which it purports to have appeared, derived from the consideration that the art of writing was not then in use. There can exist in the mind of a well informed man no difficulty on this subject. There are the most satisfactory grounds for concluding that the invention of letters took place in an age long anterior to that of Moses. We shall omit the consideration of those pictured representations by which we may suppose men originally communicated their ideas; and in regard to alphabetic writing, it may be observed that all the early writers attribute the invention to a very remote age, and to some country of the East. Cadmus, according to their report, introduced letters from Phœnicia into Greece, B. C. 1519—a little after the death of Moses. Anticlides, an ancient Greek historian, as quoted by Pliny, vii. 57, asserts and attempts to prove that letters were invented in Egypt 15 years before Phoroneaus, 409 years after the deluge, and in the 117th of Abraham. Epigenes informs us that observations made on the heavenly bodies for 720 years at Babylon, were written down on baked tiles. Pliny, from these statements draws the conclusion that the use of letters, as he expresses it, must have been eternal, i. e. very ancient. Jahn's *Biblical Archæology*, Sect. 85. That Cadmus first introduced letters into Greece, rests upon the statement of Herodotus, L. V. 58, who, however, expresses himself with an air of doubt, using the limitation, "as it appears to me." He is contradicted by Diodorus Siculus, V. 57, 74, who states that many generations before Cadmus, the Greeks were in possession

of written characters and used them for public monuments. Pausanias I. 43, makes mention of an inscription which he had read at Megara, the date of which was 1678 years before our era, which was therefore anterior to Cadmus, and consequently Pelasgic. See *Anthon's Lempriere, Art. Pelasgi. Mitford's Greece, C. ii. Sec. 3, p. 118, 125. Beloe's Herodotus, v. 58. Note by translator. I might here make a quotation from Voltaire, who asserts that 800 years before Moses, there were books written by the help of the alphabet. See letters of certain Jews, ect. p. 68. The authorities however, given above, can derive no additional weight from the opinion of an author who did not hesitate to express the most opposite conclusions, when by this means, he could effect a favorite purpose. In truth we might well dispense with all the information which has been recited above, inasmuch as there are now actually existing specimens of alphabetic writing, which have come down to us from an age prior to that in which we suppose the Pentateuch to have appeared. I allude to the manuscripts which have been deciphered by Champollion, as well as to the monumental inscriptions which he has enabled us to read. These, however, will again be brought up for our consideration, while examining the objection that "Moses could not have written the Pentateuch, because in his age the materials were not such as would have enabled him to produce so extended a work." It is proposed to meet this imagined difficulty in the next section.

* The original work of Lempriere, remodelled, greatly extended and vastly improved. The edition of 1833 (the third in quick succession) contains many articles of great interest, involving much research, and presenting the most important results of the critical labors of the profoundest scholars of Modern Germany. In its present form, although doubtless susceptible of much improvement, it is indeed a *Bibliotheca Classica*.

SECTION XIV.

Did there exist in the age of Moses any suitable material, upon which the Pentateuch might have been written?

“The Egyptian priests, told all their chronological lies to Herodotus, but they proved them from no book.” Thus writes our courteous and candid, and accurately informed author, whose enmity to the priestly order loses no opportunity of displaying itself and whose amazing sagacity enables him to determine, in the absence of all evidence, what took place in a remote country more than two thousand years ago. Upon what authority rests the assertion, that the Egyptian priests did not confirm their statements by a reference to any written documents? Does Herodotus declare this? Certainly not. He rather gives us to understand the contrary, when in his *Euterpe*, s. 145, he says “the Egyptians profess always to have computed the years and kept written accounts of them with the greatest accuracy.” Surely this pretension could not have been supported in reference to ancient transactions, of which the historian is speaking, if they had not been able to exhibit any written documents even of a more modern date. Does the assumption then, which we are considering, rest upon the fact that there are now in existence, no Egyptian writings derived from a remote period? Were it even so, would it be at all surprising, that in a country over which the tide of conquest has repeatedly rolled, and in which the sway of barbarians has for many ages prevailed, there should have taken place a destruction of all the productions of a learned antiquity? Concerning Heliopolis, whose inhabitants are termed by Herodotus the most ingenious of the Egyptians, where Plato studied philosophy and Eudoxus astronomy, Savary remarks “a barbarous Persian has overthrown her temples, a fanatic Arab burned her books, and one solitary obelisk overlooking her ruins, says to passengers, this once was Heliopolis.” But the fame of Egypt is not supported alone by the testimony of ancient historians, who visited it when just declining from its high and palmy state, and recorded the results of their own ob-

servations and inquiries; while its "old magnificence is attested by its architectural remains, and the specimens which exist of its proficiency in the arts, useful and ornamental; there is abundant evidence of the acquaintance with letters which distinguished its people, furnished by the inscriptions which cover its temples and palaces, as well as the rolls of papyrus, which have been brought to light by the ardent spirit of modern discovery. Many most interesting memorials of the latter kind have been made known to us by the indefatigable Frenchman, who has created a new era in the study of Egyptian antiquities. "In the rich collection of Mr. Sallier at Aix, a roll of papyrus has recently been discovered which has aroused the curiosity of all the learned of Europe. The manuscript which is in the *demotic* character is a history of the campaigns of Rhamses the great." It gives a circumstantial account of his conquest, of the force and composition of his army, and it was written in the 9th year of his reign." Champollion, *Bulletin, des Sciences Historiques* tom, x. p. 200, cited by Greppo, p. 177. This great King who was the Sesostris of Herodotus, the Sesoosis of Diodorus, the Sethos of Manetho, and the Rhamses of the monuments, lived about 1500 years before Christ, near the period of the Exodus. In reference to this subject, and in confirmation of what the modern decipherers of Egyptian inscriptions have read, the reader may consult the remarkable passage of Tacitus, Lib. ii. Sec. 60, *Annals*.

We may thus judge of the degree of information possessed by a writer, who asserts, "no man ever yet saw a line of phonetic Egyptian." It is also apparent that papyrus was in use as a writing material, at a much earlier period than has been generally supposed. But of this fact we have a yet more striking confirmation.—The burial vaults of the ancient Egyptians, their necropoleis, as they are termed, among many other relicts of past ages have furnished numerous manuscripts on papyrus. "Some filled with hieroglyphics and adorned with paintings of the divinities of Amenti or Egyptian hell, and with mystic scenes of the passage of souls, are only repetitions more or less complete of a kind of funeral ritual. Other manuscripts are traced usually in

hieratic writing. They present various *kinds of acts* promulgated by Egyptian monarchs, and they bear the *names and dates* of the reigns of these monarchs. To this class belong a series of papyrus fragments, which for a long time remained unnoticed in the Turin Museums, but which have now been recognized by Champollion! An immense number of acts are there found, which belong for the most part to the eighteenth dynasty, and of which none are later than the nineteenth. But the most remarkable of all, contains an *act* of the fifth year of the reign of Thouthmosis III, the 5th king of the eighteenth dynasty, who governed Egypt two hundred years before the time when Moses wrote the Pentateuch."—Essay on the Hieroglyphic system, see p. 165. Here then I might let the controversy rest; one fact is worth a thousand theories and assumptions, and of that we are in possession. We *have* a manuscript, written on papyrus, long anterior to Moses; he might then have used the same material. But before dismissing the subject, it may be well to add a remark or two, illustrative of the merits of the question, independently of the decisive fact just stated. We shall thus perceive that with no reference to facts disclosed by modern investigation, the assertion that the only mode of writing practised in the age of Moses, was engraving upon stone or metal, or the tracing of characters upon soft plaster, spread over the former substance, is rash and unauthorized. The notion entertained by some, that papyrus was not in use before the foundation of Alexandria, rests on the assertion of Varro. But Pliny observes, "many striking examples are found which contradict the opinion of Varro concerning charts."—Caylus, according to Guilandin, cites also many similar passages from the ancients: see Diss. sur le papyrus in Tom. xxvi. Memoirs of Academy of Inscriptions. But even had the papyrus not been known thus early—there can be no question that many other materials for writing would have been used before stone or metal, which manifestly require, of all others, the most skill and labor. Every one must assent to the correctness of the following remark of the Count de Caylus. "It is clear that as soon as writing was found

out, it was laid on every thing which could receive it. The substances have varied according to times and countries. It may, however, be affirmed that the most common substances and the lightest for carriage claim the preference in a thing so necessary." Accordingly we find on linen envelopes of the mummies, many of which are not less than 4000 years old, painted inscriptions. Moreover, Pliny states that the Egyptians used the palm leaf for writing, previously to the employment of papyrus. This was so abundant in Palestine that the whole country was called Φοινίκη from Φοινίξ a palm tree.*—

But passing from the general question, respecting the materials for writing used by other nations, let us take a view of the subject, so far as the Hebrews are concerned, and guided alone by their historical records. Our adversary has attempted to prove by these very records, that Moses knew of no other or better way of writing than by tracing characters upon plaster which had been spread over stone. A reference is made to Deuteronomy xxvii. 2, 3, "and it shall be on the day when ye shall pass over Jordan unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, that thou shalt set thee up great stones and plaster them with plaster, and thou shalt write upon them all the words of this law," &c. Let us be sure that we understand this passage. Is it then certain that the plaster was spread over the surface of the stones, and while in a soft state, made to receive certain characters? In opposition to this view, we might refer to the passage in Josh. viii. 30, 32, where an account is given of the execution of this command of Moses. No mention whatever, is made of plaster—it is simply said, "and he wrote *there upon the stones* a copy of the law." "Plastering the stones with plaster," may then have been done with some other view than to fit them for receiving an inscription. It will be remembered that these stones were designed to form an altar. It was customary to erect, as memorials of particular events, and as altars, where offerings to God were to be made, piles of stone rudely put togeth-

* I am aware that different derivations have been given by Bochart and L'Abbe Mignot.

er. Moses may, therefore, in the passage under view, be understood as directing the Hebrews to bestow more than ordinary pains in the construction of their altar, instead of piling the stones loosely together, they were required to "cement them with cement," for thus we may render plaster them with plaster. According to another opinion the writing was to be in *relievo*, and the spaces between the letters were filled up with mortar. Inscriptions in the East were frequently executed in this way. Dr. Clarke mentions, as in his possession, a large slab of basalt, on which there is an inscription in Persian, Arabic, and Tamul; in the two former, the letters are all raised—the Tamul is indented.

Michaelis supposes that Moses commanded that his laws should be cut in the stones themselves, and then coated with a thick crust of lime, that the engraving might continue for many ages secure from all injuries from the weather and atmosphere, and then when by the decay of the covering it should, after hundreds or thousands of years, first come to light, serve to shew to the latest posterity whether they had suffered any change. An instance somewhat analogous to this, is presented in the case of Sostratus, architect of the famous tower of Pharos, near Alexandria, who while he cut the name of the then King of Egypt in the outer coat of lime, took care to engrave his own name secretly in the stone below, in order that it might come to light in after times, when the plaster with the King's name should have fallen off. For a full and beautiful developement of this theory, see Smith's Michaelis, vol. 1, 357. Art. 69, Sec. 1. Let us however grant that the proper meaning of the passage is, that Moses did direct the inscription to be traced in the plaster with which the stones were covered. We then inquire into the reason of this direction. Did it arise from his ignorance of any other or better mode of perpetuating his law? We have satisfactory evidence that it was not. The art of engraving upon stone and metal was well known and practised at that period. I shall not cite the instance of the tables of the law prepared at Sinai, lest our author should assume without evidence, that they too were covered with plaster. I would refer to the direction

given in Ex. xxviii. 9, 11, "and thou shalt take two *onyx stones* and *grave* on them the names of the children of Israel—with the work of an engraver in stone, like the engraving upon a signet," &c. Again, Ex. xxxix, 30, "And they made the plate of the holy crown of pure gold, and wrote upon it, a writing like to the engraving of a signet, Holiness to the Lord." Who then can doubt that the Hebrews in the age of Moses understood the art of engraving on metal and wood.—That suitable materials for committing to writing more extended works were also in use, is implied in many passages. Let it not be objected that these testimonies are from a book, the authority of which is not acknowledged by our adversaries. *It is to be remembered*, that we are not now considering the general historical question respecting the ancient materials for writing—but that we are rebutting the assertion, that *from the Pentateuch itself, appears* that no other mode of writing was known than the tracing of characters upon soft plaster. In this view of the subject, the evidence against the assertion amounts to perfect demonstration. Were we then unable to assign any reason why Moses chose this particular mode of preserving any portion of his law, it would avail the adversary nothing. Yet we may suggest an explanation of the subject, furnished by the context and in accordance with the ideas developed in other passages. With the direction to build an altar, on the stones of which certain promises and threats were to be inscribed, there is joined the prohibition "thou shalt not lift up any iron tool thereon." In the account which is given in Joshua, of the execution of this command, it is recorded that an altar was built of whole stones over which no man hath lifted any iron.—And in Ex. xx. 25, we read the general declaration, "and if thou wilt make me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone, for if thou lift up any tool upon it thou hast polluted it." We thus perceive a very manifest reason why an inscription on an altar was not *engraved*, which would have required the use of an iron tool, but traced in soft plaster, which might be done with a wooden instrument. In reference to the farther inquiry, respecting the intention of the general law above re-

cited, we may accept the solution offered by the learned Spencer DeLegibus.—Hebræorum Ritualibus, Lib. ii. c. vi. Sec. 1., “that stones unwrought and retaining their original and entire form, are endowed with a certain native purity, and therefore remarkably correspondent to the sanctity of an altar.” He adds that in the earlier ages it passed into a law that most symbols and instruments of divine worship should be rude and destitute of ornament.

I must here terminate the protracted consideration which we have given to the various difficulties which are supposed to attend the belief that the Pentateuch proceeded from the hand of Moses. An *attempt* has at least been made to answer the objections, which Dr. Cooper declares to have been hitherto unanswered.—What degree of success has attended the effort, an intelligent community will determine.

SECTION XV.

Of all the objections to the genuineness of the Pentateuch, advanced in the pamphlet which has given occasion for the present remarks, it is believed that no one of any importance has escaped our consideration. There is indeed one assertion made, to which I have not yet adverted, which furnishes a striking example of what cannot be regarded as any other than wilful misrepresentation. It is said that at the dedication of the temple by Solomon, “*search was made for the ancient documents and records of the national religion* ; but there was nothing found in the ark, save the two tables of the law which Moses put there at Horeb.” Now the latter fact is announced both in the book of Kings and that of Chronicles, but in vain may we look for any confirmation of the former. “Search was made for the ancient documents and records of the national religion !”

Where this is mentioned, I confess, I have been unable to discover. Here it may not be inappropriate to remark, that it was not *in the ark* that the book of the law might be expected to be found. It was not directed to

be deposited within this receptacle, but to be laid up *beside it*.

I would now repeat the remark, that I am not aware of having omitted to consider any objection proposed in our author's pamphlet, although it has been through close attention and diligent and repeated perusal of it that I have been enabled to throw into any order, the undigested mass of his reasons and exceptions.

In the outset of this investigation, it was proposed to examine the question respecting the authenticity, as well as that relating to the genuineness of the Pentateuch.—For the present, at least, this must be omitted. The writer has found the subject grow under his hands, and he fears that he has already exhausted the public attention, even if he has been so fortunate as to gain it. There are several additional inducements to abstain from the farther prosecution of the subject. A reference to the arguments which prove the *authenticity* of the early biblical records, is not uncommon in the religious publications of the day, and in consequence, information on this point is pretty generally diffused. Again, it is the question concerning the genuineness of the Pentateuch, which is principally and almost exclusively discussed by Dr. Cooper. Indeed this is the only point, on which, ostensibly, controversy exists, although throughout his work there are many indirect attacks upon facts recorded and the system of religion taught in the Bible.

To meet and repel the various exceptions to the subject matter of our sacred records, which are scattered throughout his tract, would require space equal to that which I have already occupied.

As respects, however, the connexion between Geology and the Pentateuch, and the consistency of the records of revelation with the appearances of nature, that which furnishes to Dr. C. the title of his pamphlet, but which occupies a very small portion of it—it is sufficient that I refer the reader to an interesting essay of Professor Silliman, in the edition of Bakewell's Geology, issued in 1833. It is not the syllabus of his lectures, appended to a former edition of this work, but a distinct treatise, in which, without naming Dr. C. or at all

adverting to his uncourteous attack, he meets all the Geological difficulties of the latter.

But although our researches have stopped short of their final result, we have attained a point of elevation whence we can clearly perceive the conclusion of our progress. Many important principles have been settled, many facts authenticated; the way is cleared up for our further advance. Enough has been accomplished, to shew that the Pentateuch was written by Moses, and promulgated in the very age of its production. So far then as the credibility of an historian is established, by his being contemporary with the transactions which he describes, and thus able to obtain an acquaintance with them—we may confide in the Jewish records. An important consideration, auxiliary to this, is furnished by the fact of the historian's connexion with the events which he describes. That he was well informed, no one can doubt; that his narration is true, we have this guaranty, that it was addressed to eye and ear witnesses, who would have lost all respect for a leader who endeavored to palm upon them fables for truth, who would relate a series of prodigies, as having come under their own observation, when no such things had occurred. For although national vanity might connive at false representations, designed to advance the glory of the Jewish people, or to exhibit them as the peculiar favorites of heaven; it would most assuredly have been outraged by an account of their disgraceful conduct in numerous instances. We may then regard the established fact, that the Pentateuch was written for contemporaries and addressed to them as carrying with it a strong proof of the authenticity of the record.

In connexion with the truth of the history contained in the five books of Moses, it would be interesting to consider the question of the divine authority of the system of religion taught in them; which would be established by a view of the miracles wrought in attestation of it; the accurate prediction of events to occur in a remotely succeeding age, and by its sublime Theology and pure morality, to which we shall in vain seek a parallel in the instance of any other nation, however re-

nowned for its antiquity, its arts, or its literary and scientific cultivation.

But there are topics which however attractive, I do not think it advisable to introduce at the close of what has been a protracted, and I fear tedious discussion. Such it has necessarily been. The adversary has occupied a wide field. Many of his objections, although frivolous, could not be satisfactorily answered within a moderate space; others rendered necessary investigations, in which the public generally will, it is probable feel little interest. The whole inquiry may be neglected by many who will be influenced by various reasons. Some feeling already satisfied with respect to the conclusion meant to be established, will not care to examine the process by which it is reached; others will shrink from the intellectual effort requisite for the comprehension of an argument, necessarily treating of recondite matters, while many, not wishing to be convinced of the truth of religion, fondly cling to pre-conceived opinions.

But whatever attention his argument may excite, or whatever estimate may be made of its merits, the writer possesses the satisfaction of knowing, that his object has been to sustain what he deems important truth, that he has used no disingenuous arts of controversy, and advanced no statement which he did not believe to be true.

So far as the discussion has assumed a personal aspect, he is conscious of never having, without necessity, used a harsh expression; although he regrets that a concern for the interests of truth and a wish to guard against the evil influence exerted by a great name, has compelled him in a few instances to abandon that tone of courtesy which would otherwise have been preserved toward his antagonist, on account of his elevated station and advanced age, as well as in accordance with the ordinary proprieties of social intercourse.