





**Cornell University Library**

**Ithaca, New York**

---

**BOUGHT WITH THE INCOME OF THE  
SAGE ENDOWMENT FUND**

**THE GIFT OF**

**HENRY W. SAGE**

**1891**

Cornell University Library

**BS1151 .C69**

v.1

**New Bible commentary by bishops and othe**



3 1924 032 335 840

oIn



Cornell University  
Library

The original of this book is in  
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in  
the United States on the use of the text.

<http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924032335840>

THE  
NEW BIBLE COMMENTARY  
CRITICALLY EXAMINED.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

---

**THE PENTATEUCH AND BOOK OF JOSHUA  
CRITICALLY EXAMINED.**

- PART I. The Pentateuch Examined as an Historical Narrative. Fifth Edition, revised. 8vo. 6s.
- PART II. The Age and Authorship of the Pentateuch Considered. Third Edition, revised and enlarged. 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- PART III. The Book of Deuteronomy. Second Edition. 8vo. 8s.
- PART IV. The First Eleven Chapters of Genesis. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- PEOPLE'S EDITION of the above, complete in One Volume, price 6s.
- PART V. The Book of Genesis Analysed and Separated, and the Ages of its Writers determined. 8vo. 18s.
- PART VI. The Later Legislation of the Pentateuch. 8vo. 24s.

---

LONGMANS and CO. London.

---

**NATAL SERMONS**, First Series. Second Edition. 8vo.  
price 7s. 6d.

**NATAL SERMONS**, Second Series. 8vo. price 5s.

---

TRÜBNER and CO. London.

THE  
NEW BIBLE COMMENTARY

BY BISHOPS AND OTHER CLERGY  
OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH

CRITICALLY EXAMINED

BY THE RIGHT REV.

JOHN WILLIAM COLENZO, D.D.

BISHOP OF NATAL.

---

'We can do nothing against the Truth, but for the Truth.'—*St. Paul*, 2 Cor. xiii. 8.

'Not to exceed, and not to fall short of, facts,—not to add, and not to take away,—to state the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,—are the grand, the vital, maxims of Inductive Science, of English Law, and, let us add, of Christian Faith.'—*Quarterly Review*, on 'Essays and Reviews,' Oct. 1861, p. 369.

---

LONDON:  
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.  
1874.





THE  
NEW BIBLE COMMENTARY

BY BISHOPS AND OTHER CLERGY

OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH

CRITICALLY EXAMINED

BY THE RIGHT REV.

JOHN WILLIAM COLENSO, D.D.

BISHOP OF NATAL.

---

'We can do nothing against the Truth, but for the Truth.'—*St. Paul*, 2 Cor. xiii. 8.

'Not to exceed, and not to fall short of, facts,—not to add, and not to take away,—to state the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,—are the grand, the vital, maxims of Inductive Science, of English Law, and, let us add, of Christian Faith.'—*Quarterly Review*, on 'Essays and Reviews,' Oct. 1861, p. 369.

---

PART I.

*INTRODUCTION TO THE PENTATEUCH.*

*INTRODUCTION TO GENESIS.*

*THE BOOK OF GENESIS.*

LONDON :  
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

1871.

LONDON: PRINTED BY  
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE  
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

## P R E F A C E .

---

THIS 'New Bible Commentary' is announced as 'one in which every educated man may find an explanation of any difficulties which his own mind may suggest, as well as of any new objections raised against a particular book or passage' of the Bible, *Pref. p. iii*, and may also be 'supplied with satisfactory answers to objections resting upon misrepresentation of the Text,' *Adv. p.1*. We are informed that 'the plan of the work has been settled and the writers have been appointed under the sanction of a Committee, consisting of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of London, the Bishop of Llandaff, the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, the Bishop of Chester, &c. &c.,' and that the general EDITOR is the Rev. F. C. Cook, M.A., Canon of Exeter, who has been advised by a small Committee, consisting of the Archbishop of York and the Regius Professors of Divinity of Oxford and Cambridge, 'upon questions arising during the progress of the work.' *Adv. p.2*. We may fairly assume, therefore, until the matter is authoritatively contradicted, that this Commentary, having been, moreover, 'more than seven years' in preparation, *p.iii*, and having doubtless undergone repeated and very careful revision, has received the full approval, and must be regarded

as expressing the deliberate convictions of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England.

It would be an affectation to pretend to be ignorant that the idea of this Commentary was first suggested by the disturbance that was caused by the appearance of the first three Parts of my own work on the Pentateuch in 1862-3. The most violent denunciations were delivered against that work by some members of the Episcopal Bench in England: by others—notably by the late Archbishop of Canterbury and the present Bishop of Winchester—my books were treated with contempt, as ‘rash and feeble speculations,’ ‘puerile and trite,’ ‘in all essential points but the repetition of old and often-answered cavils against the Word of God.’ Nevertheless, as they seemed, in spite of this strong condemnation from eminent ecclesiastics, and of the hostile proceedings of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, urged on with untiring zeal by Bishop WILBERFORCE and Archdeacon DENISON, to be producing some effect upon the minds of not a few of the more intelligent Laity, the Right Hon. the Speaker of the House of Commons is understood to have suggested the idea of the present Commentary, in which, as Bishop GRAY announced to the Natal clergy in May, 1864, ‘the chief points and difficulties, which not a single writer only, but others, whether in England or on the Continent, have raised or felt, should be examined, and receive such solutions as our present knowledge and learning may enable us to give them.’

Under these circumstances, it will surprise no one to be told that I have taken a special interest in the progress of this work, have awaited with some impatience its publication which has been so long delayed,—doubtless for excellent reasons, and among others, it may be presumed, to secure a more thorough

and careful revision,—and that, having at length received from England the First Volume, which is devoted to the Pentateuch, I have read it attentively, in order to see in what way the facts which I have exhibited in my different volumes, and the conclusions which I have based upon them, would be treated by these chosen representatives of the scholarship of England. In particular, I desired to know how Bishop BROWNE, who had undertaken the responsible task of writing an ‘Introduction to the Pentateuch’ and an ‘Introduction to Genesis,’ as well as the Commentary on the Book of Genesis—who therefore comes forward as the Coryphæus of the Episcopal Bench, to give their well-considered and matured judgment upon those great questions connected with the Pentateuch, which have so violently rent the Church and distracted the minds of men in the present age—would discharge the momentous duty entrusted to him. For Bishop BROWNE was the Divinity Professor to whom, in my distress, I had turned ten years ago for counsel and sympathy, when I first began myself to realize the difficulties involved in the traditionary view, as is shown by the letter published in the Preface to my Part I, which I wrote, but did not ultimately forward to him. And, speaking in the Preface to Part IV. about the present work, then projected and in course of preparation, I said, ‘I rejoice to see in the name of Prof. HAROLD BROWNE a guarantee of the sincerity and candour with which one portion of this important work, that connected with the Pentateuch, will be undertaken.’

I have now perused the First Volume of this Commentary, and completed a very careful study of the work performed by Bishop BROWNE. And I feel it to be a religious duty which I owe to the Church of England and to mankind, as well as to myself, to give to the world the results of my examination;

and I hope, if life lasts, and my other occupations allow, to pursue the same course, book by book, with the rest of this Volume. For the present I will only say, with respect to the other portions of it, that, with the exception of the wonderful admission on p.335-6 that neither of the two copies of the Ten Commandments in E.xx and D.v, is a *correct* version of the words which were really uttered by the Divine Voice on Sinai, and written down by the Finger of God upon the Stone-Tables, and that large additions must have been made to the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Tenth Commandments, as originally given—an admission, which, followed out into its consequences, will be found to overthrow the whole traditionary notion as to the Mosaic Authorship and Divine Infallibility of the Pentateuch—this book appears to be, from beginning to end, one laboured attempt to maintain the traditionary view of the Mosaic origin of the whole Pentateuch and the infallible accuracy of its contents. By the above admission, it is true, a little of the coating has been rubbed off at one spot from one of the windows, thickly begrimed with the dust of ages, through which a single ray of light has entered—but that is all. There are a few trivial recognitions of possible interpolations, later additions, &c. But there is hardly any attempt to grapple manfully with some of the more important critical questions, which have been raised of late years by the great scholars of Europe, as well as by some in England, as Dr. DAVIDSON and Dr. KALISCH. The Editor complains of want of room, saying that ‘every volume added makes the work less accessible to those for whom it was intended.’ p.iv. And Bishop BROWNE says ‘Time will not allow of a lengthened consideration of this theory here,’ p.26; and in another place he refers briefly to Mr. QUARRY, as having ‘carefully and elaborately investi-

gated' a most important point—the linguistic differences between the Elohist and Jehovistic passages in Genesis—and as having come to a 'conclusion the very reverse' of my own, p.29: but he avoids making any such investigation himself. And yet this cannot be excused for want of room. For out of 928 pages, of which this volume consists, 250 pages—more than one-fourth—are consumed in merely reprinting in a large, luxurious type the authorised English Version with all its imperfections, defects and errors being occasionally indicated and corrected in the notes; and so 64 pages out of 206—nearly one-third of the whole space—are similarly expended in the Commentary upon Genesis. Not even has the very simple amendment been made of printing 'JEHOVAH' instead of 'the LORD,' by which, as is well known, much clearer light would be thrown on many passages. To have given in the Text an improved version, for the benefit of 'men of ordinary culture,' would have been an object worthy of such a body of labourers, and would have fairly justified so great an expenditure of space and so large an addition to the cost of the work. If, again, this Commentary had been designed for *devotional* purposes, for private or family reading, it might, of course, have been convenient to have had the comments placed under the Text. But this book is utterly unsuited for such uses. Now and then, indeed, we find a religious observation attached to a particular text. But, generally speaking, the space is occupied with notes critical, exegetical, geographical, &c., or with excursions, often abstruse enough to be of very little interest to the general reader, *e.g.* the Editor's long essay 'On Egyptian Words,' and another still longer 'On the Bearings of Egyptian History upon the Pentateuch,' the two together filling 50 pages, which can only be properly appreciated by profound Egyptologists. All

this, while it makes only more conspicuous Bishop BROWNE'S evasion of the duty of entering on such questions as the above, renders the book unfitted for the use of any but a student, who would have at his side his own copy of the Bible, and, if he had also on his shelf Dr. SMITH'S *Dictionary of the Bible*, would generally find there all the information which he will find in this Commentary, and much more full and complete.

The last remark, however, is meant to apply chiefly to the Commentary on Genesis, with which only I have had time as yet to make myself thoroughly acquainted. That I have been utterly disappointed with the result of my examination, after what had been promised and what had been said above, needs hardly to be mentioned. I have gone carefully, however, through every argument of Bishop BROWNE, which concerns the questions at issue between myself and my opponents; and I have noticed, I believe, in the following pages every single word of his which is worthy of being quoted in connection with the present controversy. The opinion which I once entertained of Bishop BROWNE'S qualifications for taking the leading part in such a work as this, has, I confess, been very considerably modified: the reader, who may take the trouble to peruse my remarks upon his comments, will be able to judge for himself on this point.\* I feel, however, that a crisis has arrived in the history of the Church of England, and that from the peculiar circum-

\* Those who cannot afford time to read through these comments may be referred especially to the notes on *Genesis* (49-56, 62, 69), or more generally—

(i) For instances of carelessness, inconsistency, and loose inaccuracy of statement, see *Introd. to Pent.*, 4.i, 28.ii, iii, iv, 29; *Introd. to Genesis*, 5, 10.iii, 12.ii, iii; *Book of Genesis*, 18, 55, 89, 91:

(ii) For instances of unsound, unscientific, extravagant, often absurd reasoning, see *Introd. to Pent.*, 17.iv, v, 20.ii, 23, 27, 28.v.; *Introd. to Genesis*, 13, 14, 22; *Book of Genesis*, 12, 49, 51-54, 62, 69, 70, 71, 109, 112, 139, 146, 151:

(iii) For instances of rash, uncritical, often puerile, judgment, defective ac-



stances of the case—from the fact that this work is in some sort put forth as a kind of challenge to myself, as also that, having been so closely engaged in the examination of the Pentateuch, I have at my command without further labour the knowledge necessary to expose at once the numerous fallacies which Bishop BROWNE has here endorsed with all the authority of the English Episcopate, to be received and taught as religious truths—a duty is laid upon me, which I cannot, if I would, evade, and my countrymen—at least those who have been interested in my writings—have a right to expect such a labour as this at my hands.

Above all, if no other reason existed for my discharging this duty, I feel bound to do so in the interests of the rising generation, and to protest against the monstrous wrong that will be done to them, if, in defiance of all the triumphs of Science in the present day, such teaching as this is to be propagated in our schools and colleges as the teaching of the Church of England, with the additional weight and impulse which must be derived from the authority of this Commentary, if its statements are allowed to be circulated without a direct and complete contradiction. It is certainly a striking and very instructive fact that in this age we see on the one hand the Roman Church maintaining with all its might the infallibility of the Man, and on the other hand the Anglican Church maintaining with like zeal the idolatry of the Book,—both from the same insane fear of the Truth which God is revealing more and more fully as the ages pass on, and both with the same

quaintance with the results of modern criticism, and evasion of well-known difficulties, see *Introd. to Pent.*, 1, 5.viii, 8.i-xix, 13,18,29,30; *Introd. to Genesis*, 1.ii, 2,4,6,ii, 11,18,20; *Book of Genesis*, 1,22,29,44,50,56,63,91,92,95,96,102,115,117, 119-123,125,126,130,134,135,138,142,144,150,153,155.

blind disregard of the fatal consequences which must inevitably follow should their views prevail—namely, the unbounded spread of infidelity and atheism, with all the attendant laxity and license, in the next generation, as it is more and more clearly seen by the multitude that their religious guides have been, after all, but ‘blind leaders of the blind,’ and teachers and taught shall fall into the ditch together. My dread of this must be my excuse if at times I have spoken of Bishop BROWNE and his criticisms with a severity which I would not otherwise use towards one whose private virtues I have always respected, but which the part he has here taken in attempting to bind more closely than ever upon the necks of Englishmen the traditionary yoke which Our Father in His Wise and Gracious Providence has loosened for us in the present age and intends us to cast off, must be held, I think, abundantly to justify.

J. W. NATAL.

BISHOPSTOWE, NATAL,  
Aug. 22, 1871.

---

\*\* Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* is quoted below as *D.B.* The different Parts of my work on the Pentateuch are quoted as (I.57), (VI.43), &c.

It may be well to mention here that—

In Part III, I have fixed the age of the *Deuteronomist*—who may possibly be Jeremiah—in the first years of king Josiah.

In Part V, I have separated the passages due to the different writers in Genesis, have determined approximately the ages of these writers, *viz.* the *Elohist* (E.) in the days of Samuel, the *Second Elohist* (E<sub>2</sub>) in the beginning of David's reign, the *Jehovist* (J.) in David's reign and the first part of Solomon's.

In Part VI (just published), I have shown that all Leviticus and large portions of Exodus, Numbers, and Joshua, with a few passages of Deuteronomy, were written after the Captivity, and I have included these under the designation of the *Later or Levitical Legislation* (L.L.); and I have further separated throughout Exodus—Joshua the portions due to the different authors, *Elohist*, *Jehovist*, *Deuteronomist*, and *Later Legislator*, giving at full length the *Original Story* of the Exodus (O.S.), as it came into the hands of the *Deuteronomist*.

# CONTENTS.



	PAGE
PREFACE . . . . .	V
INTRODUCTION TO THE PENTATEUCH . . . . .	3
INTRODUCTION TO GENESIS . . . . .	58
THE BOOK OF GENESIS . . . . .	79

HE WHO PROPAGATES A DELUSION, AND HE WHO CONNIVES AT IT WHEN ALREADY EXISTING, BOTH ALIKE TAMPER WITH TRUTH. WE MUST NEITHER LEAD NOR LEAVE MEN TO MISTAKE FALSEHOOD FOR TRUTH. NOT TO UNDECEIVE, IS TO DECEIVE. THE GIVING, OR NOT CORRECTING, FALSE REASONS FOR RIGHT CONCLUSIONS, FALSE GROUNDS FOR RIGHT BELIEF, FALSE PRINCIPLES FOR RIGHT PRACTICE—THE HOLDING FORTH, OR FOSTERING, FALSE CONSOLATIONS, FALSE ENCOURAGEMENTS, OR FALSE SANCTIONS, OR CONIVING AT THEIR BEING HELD FORTH OR BELIEVED—ARE ALL PIOUS FRAUDS. THIS SPRINGS FROM, AND IT WILL FOSTER AND INCREASE, A WANT OF VENERATION FOR TRUTH: IT IS AN AFFRONT PUT ON THE 'SPIRIT OF TRUTH.'—Archbishop WHATELY, *on Bacon's Essays*, p.10.

INTRODUCTION TO THE PENTATEUCH.

---

E. HAROLD BROWNE, D.D.

BISHOP OF ELY.



## INTRODUCTION TO THE PENTATEUCH.

---

I MUST first draw attention, as I have done elsewhere, to the extraordinary mistake which Bp. BROWNE has made on p. 6, where he writes :—

The objection (COLENSO, Pt. V. 97) that the Tabernacle (at Shiloh) could not be the tabernacle in the wilderness because it had a 'door,' 1S.ii.22, is rather singular, if we observe that *the words in Samuel on which the objection is founded*, 'the women that assembled at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation,' are literally a quotation from Ex. xxxviii. 8, 'the women assembling, which assembled at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.' Of course, the word for 'door' (דָּבָר) is as applicable to a tent-door as to a house-door, and is constantly used of the door of the tabernacle in the Pentateuch.

Now, on turning to the passage in my work to which Bp. BROWNE refers, I find that I wrote as follows :—

Of course, the fact, that the Tabernacle at Shiloh had *doors*, 1S.iii.15, &c., is sufficient to show that this could not have been the Mosaic Tabernacle.

It will be seen that Bp. BROWNE has substituted for *my* reference to 1S.iii.15, where the word דָּבָר is used in the plural, which can mean nothing but 'doors' in the ordinary sense of the word, a reference to another passage, 1S.ii.22, where a totally different word is used, which may mean (as he says) the opening of a tent. And what makes this the more remarkable is, that the Commentary on Exodus, speaking of the Tabernacle at Shiloh in Samuel's time, refers to the identical passage which I have quoted, and actually says, p. 432 :—

Its external construction was at this time somewhat changed, and doors, strictly so called, had taken the place of the entrance curtain, 1S.iii.15.

Nay, the Editor himself writes, p.247 :—

The whole was a tent, not a fixed structure, such as would naturally have been set up, and, in point of fact, was very soon set up, in Palestine; where *wooden doors*, and probably a surrounding wall, existed under the Judges of Israel.

I assume, of course, that Bp.BROWNE'S misquotation of my reference is the result of mere carelessness on his part, and not of a deliberate purpose to misrepresent my argument. But a circumstance like this—taken together with the fact that, in his *Elohistic Psalms*, p.26, he writes :—

If for 600 [thousand warriors] we might read 60, *all would be clear, every numerical difficulty worth thinking of would vanish at once—*

and then adds, on the very same page :—

60,000 would perhaps be as much too small as 600,000 seems too large . . . it is very questionable whether the difficulties would not be greater on the supposition that the numbers were much less—

is sufficient to show how little dependence can be placed on the sobriety, soundness, and carefulness of his criticisms, however positive may be his assertions, and prepares us to find the same inaccuracy and looseness of reasoning in his criticisms generally now under discussion.

Moreover, Bp.BROWNE must either have been aware of the existence of the passage (1S.iii.15) above referred to by myself and others, as showing that the Tabernacle at Shiloh had 'doors strictly so called,' or he was not. If he knew of the existence of this passage, then it would hardly have been ingenuous on his part to suppress all mention of a text which proved the truth of my general conclusion, even if through mistake or inadvertence I had quoted a wrong passage. If, however, he was not aware of so simple a fact, which must be well known to most Hebrew scholars, then he can hardly be considered competent to take the leading part, as spokesman for the Church of England, in such a work as the present,



which challenges the attention of all scholars both in England and on the Continent.

---

1. Bp. BROWNE begins by stating that 'the sacred narrative itself contains assertions of this [Mosaic] authorship [of the *whole Pentateuch*].' In proof of this, he quotes the following passages, p. 1 :—

(i) 'Write this for a memorial in the book (בְּסֵפֶר), E.xvii.14, as though there were a regular account kept in a well-known book.

*Ans.* How does it appear that this 'book' was the Pentateuch? If Moses wrote anything in 'the book,' why may not this have been a book of notes, one of the ancient records from which, as some suppose, the Pentateuch was in part composed by later writers? But the Heb. word may be pointed בְּסֵפֶר, 'in a book,' as in the E.V., *comp.* N.v.23, D.xvii.18, J.xviii.9, Is.xxx.8, and so the LXX has *εἰς βιβλίον*.

(ii) 'Moses wrote all the words of Jehovah,' E.xxiv.4.

'Jehovah said unto Moses, Write thou all these words,' E.xxxiv.27.

'Moses wrote their goings out according to their journeys,' N.xxxiii.2.

*Ans.* These passages only refer to certain documents, which later writers may have used, if they ever really existed, in composing the Pentateuch.

(iii) At the very end of the Pentateuch we read that 'Moses wrote this Law,' D.xxxi.9.

*Ans.* This refers only to the original Book of Deuteronomy, D.v-xxvi, xxviii, and is part of the fiction which ascribes this later Law to Moses.

(iv) Moses himself names *this Law* and *the Book of this Law*, as though he had written a book for his people to keep, D.xvii.18,19, xxviii.61, xxix.20,21,29, xxxi.9-11.

*Ans.* This also is part of the fiction in Deuteronomy.

Thus Bp. BROWNE'S proofs extend only to the original Book of Deuteronomy, and two or three other passages of the 'whole Pentateuch.'

2. Then Bp. BROWNE makes the following 'admissions,' p. 2 :—

(i) Moses may have dictated much, or all of it, to Joshua, or to some secretary or scribe. He may have merely superintended its writing, and stamped it with his own authority.

(ii) It may have undergone some recension in after times, as by Ezra or others. The Fathers of the Church generally believed in some such supervision. If Ezra collated MSS. and carefully edited the Books of Moses, it is not impossible that he should have admitted explanatory notes, which some think (rightly or wrongly) to betray a post-Mosaic hand.

(iii) Moses may have had 'certain documents or traditions referring to the patriarchal ages, which he incorporated into his history.'

*Ans.* (i) This might account for the style of Deuteronomy being identical with that of some parts of Joshua (VI. *App.* 47, 59, 70, 71, 73, 74), since Joshua, or some 'secretary or scribe,' might have written these passages, as well as Deuteronomy, long after the death of Moses. Yet that would not agree with Bp. BROWNE's own quotation (I.iii) from D. xxxi. 9, nor with the fact that the style of all these passages is identical with that in some parts of the Book of Kings (VII).

(ii) The Fathers ascribe to Ezra much more than a mere 'supervision' of an edition of the Pentateuch, in which he may have 'admitted some explanatory notes;' in fact, they say that he restored by Divine inspiration the whole Law, which had been burnt by the Chaldeans, and this was the tradition of the later Jews, 2(4) Esdr. xiv. 21-42. See all the passages quoted in (VI. 471-2), and our view as to the real work of Ezra (VI. 473).

(iii) This would be quite admissible, if there was any solid reason for believing that Moses wrote the Pentateuch.

3. Bp. BROWNE then proceeds to show that '*Moses could have written the Pentateuch.*'

(i) The most sceptical of modern objectors do not deny the existence of Moses, or that he was the leader of his own people out of Egypt into Canaan. Recent researches prove the early existence of writing power in Egypt. Also the Semitic nations—e.g. the Phœnicians—had a knowledge of the same art from the most ancient times, and from them the Greeks took their letters: *comp.* also the fact that Joshua took a city of the Hittites, whose ancient name was *Kirjath-sepher*, 'the city of the book,' J. xv. 15. Thus Moses *could* have written a history, first, of the ancestors of his race, if it were only from the traditions which were sure to have been preserved among them, and, secondly, of their wars and their wanderings, in which he himself had been their leader. p. 2.

*Ans.* It is probable that the Israelites left Egypt under some energetic leader, and possible that he was a man of Egyptian learning, such as 'Osarsiph, priest of Heliopolis,' in Manetho's story, (VI. 563), and therefore that he may have left written records or laws; though it by no means follows that he was 'brought up in the house of Pharaoh,' or that he was even a Hebrew by birth, or, if he was, that 'traditions of his race,' which had 'come down through Shem and Abraham to Joseph and the Israelites in

Egypt,' (when we know how traditions are modified which have passed through even two or three hands), would have been of much value as history, except in a loose general way, when transmitted through four or five centuries. We are prepared, however, to consider any distinct proof that Moses did write such records.

(ii) These wars and wanderings extended over a period of forty years, during which there must have been frequent and long intervals of comparative leisure, which would have afforded ample time, to a man of energy and diligence, to compose a long and elaborate work. *p.4.*

*Ans.* With so much 'leisure,' it is strange that Moses recorded nothing of what passed during 38 of those years (VL.ch.xiii. notes 68-70) which, says the Commentary, *p.720*, 'are almost a blank; they can hardly be said to form a portion of the history of God's people at all, for the covenant, though not cancelled, was in abeyance. A veil is accordingly thrown by Moses over this dreary interval, during which the rebellious generation was passing away.' Yet Moses, it seems, did write *some* part of the history of this interval; for the same writer tells us that N.xv-xix, containing the account of Korah's rebellion and some very important legislation, 'must apparently be referred to the long period of wandering to which the people were condemned,' *p.705*; only he adds that N.xvi 'does not necessarily rank chronologically after N.xv.' Thus Moses, it would seem, was not very careful in arranging his narrative so as to be intelligible to future generations, either during his time of 'leisure,' or after the break-up from Kadesh, when also 'the incidents are apparently not related in a strictly chronological order,' *p.719*, and no one can tell whether the 'first month' in N.xx.1 refers to the 3rd year or to the 40th, or when the history of the 40th year begins.

(iii) There can be no doubt that the Hebrews . . . by degrees grew into a powerful people, having a *code of laws and a system of worship*, markedly distinguishing and keeping them apart from the nations round about them. . . . If there be any truth at all in history and tradition, Moses their wise leader *gave them laws* and subjected them before their settlement in Canaan to a *system of training*. . . . Such a body of men would not very easily settle by conquest among people more civilized than themselves and retain *independent laws, customs, and rites*, notwithstanding all surrounding influences. Yet that this was done by the Israelites no scepticism has yet denied. Nothing short of all we read in the Pentateuch can fully explain this. *p.4.*

*Ans.* Bp.BROWNE here begs the whole question. He assumes the very point which he had to prove, *viz.* that the Israelites for centuries after their settlement in Canaan had 'laws, customs, and rites,' which, 'markedly distinguished and kept them apart from the nations round about them.' In fact, there is no sign of this in the history of the Books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings; their National Deity was YAHVE, who in the view of the people

generally was identified with 'the Baal,' the Lord of the land of Canaan, and was worshipped by them with the same 'rites' as by the tribes around them, including especially human sacrifices. And the O.S. ascribes no other 'laws' to Moses than those in E.xx.22, &c., which might be those of any other primitive people, and cannot have 'markedly distinguished' them from other nations. It is only the L.L., written after the Captivity, which gives to the religion of Israel its peculiar character, except, of course, that Divine Instruction was imparted all along, from the time of Samuel downwards, by the mouths of inspired prophets, who taught, however, without the least allusion to the 'Law of Moses.'

Upon the whole, it will be seen, that Bp.BROWNE has produced no proof whatever to show that 'Moses could have written *such a work as the Pentateuch*,' though, of course, it may be allowed that, 'if he *could*, most probably he *would* have written such a work.'

4. Bp.BROWNE'S second position is, '*That the concurrent testimony of subsequent times proves that Moses did write the books now known by his name.*' p.4.

And here, first, let the reader observe that there is not a single reference to Moses as a *lawgiver* throughout the two Books of Samuel, and none in the Books of Judges and Kings, before the 'Finding of the Book' in Josiah's time, except Ju. iii.4, 1K.ii.3, viii.9,53,56, 2K.xiv.6, xviii.6,12, xxi.8, passages which may be shown to be plainly due to D.(VII), as also that Moses is not even named by Isaiah or any prophet before the Captivity, except in Jer.xv.1, where he is ranked with Samuel, and Mic.vi.4, where he is classed, but as a *leader* only, with Aaron and Miriam. Let us now see how Bp.BROWNE makes good his assertion, that the whole subsequent history shows, not merely that the Pentateuch existed all along, but that *Moses wrote it*.

(i) This is no place to discuss the genuineness and antiquity of the Book of Joshua. We may simply observe that its testimony to the Pentateuch is such that adverse criticism has found no escape but in saying that the *author* of Joshua must also have been the *author* of the Pentateuch, or (perhaps *and*) that the Book of Joshua was a recent production of the time of the kings or of the captivity. p.5.

*Ans.* It is unfortunate that the Book of Joshua, being so closely allied to the Pentateuch, does not appear in this volume. Bp. BROWNE means, I presume, that 'adverse criticism' says that the *editor* of Joshua in its present form must also have been the *editor* of the Pentateuch: otherwise, his language would betray an incredible amount of ignorance as to the results of modern criticism. And yet—see (29) below—it is language which he systematically uses, setting up, for the purpose of knocking it down, the absurd notion that 'adverse criticism' supposes Samuel or Jeremiah to have written *the whole Pentateuch*.

With respect to the Book of Joshua, I have shown (Part VI) that it contains portions of the O.S. largely interpolated with insertions of D. and L.L. Of course, therefore, it contains allusions to other parts of the Pentateuch belonging to O.S., D., and L.L. But Bp. BROWNE'S habitual inaccuracy is shown by his saying that 'in the first chapter the very words of Deuteronomy are twice *quoted at length by Joshua*,' p.4, referring to 'J.i.13-18, where D.iii.18-20 is recited, and to J.i.3-8, where D.xi.24,25, xxxi.6-12, are recited,' but losing sight of the fact that in J.i.3-8 the words are *not* 'quoted at length by Joshua,' but are put into the mouth of Jehovah Himself, who thus addresses Joshua in a cento of scraps from three different speeches of Moses in Deuteronomy!

(ii) The Book of Judges is of a somewhat fragmentary character, describing a disordered condition of society, and the nature of its history is such as to call forth but few references to the history or the laws of Moses. The Book, however, appears in the first place to be a continuation of the history of Israel from the death of Joshua, and so thoroughly joins on to the Book of Joshua that it can hardly be explained except on the belief that the Book of Joshua was written before it. p.5.

*Ans.* It can be fully explained on the belief that the O.S. in its earliest form was written before it, and that some interpolations were made in it, as originally written, by D. and L.L., as may be clearly shown (VII). This explains the allusions to the O.S. in i.16,20,23, ii.1,10, vi.13, xi.15-27, to which Bp. BROWNE refers, and the correspondence which he observes between ii.1-23 and E.xx.5(D), xxxiv.13(D), D.vii.2,5,16, ix.18, xii.3, xvii.2; whereas his show of references to L.L. in that chapter (L.xxvi.13-17,36, N.xxxii.13, D.xxxi.16) is delusive, as well as his other statement that, in the ancient Song of Deborah, Ju.v, v.4,5, is an imitation of D.xxxiii.2, and v.8 of D.xxxii.17, as anyone will see on comparing the two pairs of passages. But it is incredible that such a state of things as is described in the Judges could have existed at all if the laws of the L.L. were already in force—*e.g.* it is incredible that Deborah's Song could have been written without the least allusion to Ark or Tabernacle, Priest or Levite, if all these institutions, so largely described in

the L.L., were in full activity, or that 'Phinehas, son of Eleazar, son of Aaron,' whose zeal and energy are so conspicuous in N.xxv.6-13, should be still high-priest, 'standing before the ark of the Covenant of Elohim in those days,' Ju.xx.27,28, and yet have allowed 'every man to do what was right in his own eyes,' xxi.25, or that Joash should have had an altar of Baal, vi.25, or that Gideon should have set up an ephod in his city, where 'all Israel went a whoring after it,' viii.27, and Jephthah have offered up his daughter as a burnt-offering to Jehovah, xi.30,31,39. Bp.BROWNE indeed says, 'In the unsettled state of the country during the reigns of most of the Judges, it is only natural to expect that there would be some departures from the strict observance of the Law.' p.6. But 'the land had rest' 40 years, iii.11, then 80 years, iii.30, again 40 years, viii.28, during the last of which peaceful periods Gideon's idolatry was practised.

It is very noticeable, however, that, whereas the Book of Joshua is so closely allied to the Pentateuch, to which, in fact, it is merely an appendix, the Book of Judges, being for the most part an independent historical narrative, which 'most of the modern critics admit to be ancient,' p.7, contains 'but few references to the history or the laws of Moses,' and certainly does not help in any way to '*prove that Moses did write the books now known by his name.*'

5. Bp.BROWNE then travels in the same jaunty fashion over the Books of Samuel; though as Moses is only mentioned in 1S.xii.6,8, 'Jehovah appointed (sent) Moses and Aaron,' without the slightest reference to Moses having *written* anything, it is difficult to understand how he can adduce these books as '*proving that Moses did write the books now known by his name.*' His quotations, however, are worthless, even as proving the existence of the Pentateuch, when the composite character of the Books of Samuel is taken into account, as well as that of the Pentateuch. But we may notice the following observations.

(i) We meet at once with Eli, the High Priest of the race of Aaron, though of the house of Ithamar, 1Ch.xxiv.3, *comp.* 2S.viii.17, 1K.ii.27. p.6.

*Ans.* How could Eli of the house of Ithamar have been High Priest, if the High-Priesthood was confined, by a Divine promise, to the house of Phinehas, that is, of Eleazar, N.xxv.13? The statement of the Chronicler is manifestly fictitious, and what Bp.BROWNE means by appealing to 2S.viii.17, 1K.ii.27, in proof of his assertion, it is impossible to see. But he goes on to say that Solomon's act in ejecting Abiathar and putting Zadok in his

place, 1K.ii.27,35, '*sustained the truth of God's promise that the High-Priesthood should remain in the family of Eleazar, N.xxv.10, &c.*'—though the succession had been interrupted for 150 years, and had not even been restored by Samuel or David!

(ii) The Tabernacle is still at Shiloh, where it was pitched by Joshua, probably somewhat more solidly fixed than it had been in the wilderness, perhaps according to the rabbinical traditions having now become 'a structure of low stone walls with the tent drawn over the top,' so that it had apparently a warder's house attached to it, where Samuel slept. The lamp burns in it according to the ordinance in E.xxvii.20,21, L.xxiv.2,3; though either that ordinance was not interpreted to mean that the light might never go out, or the carelessness, which had come on in Eli's old age and in the disordered state of Israel, had let that ordinance fall into disuse. *p.6.*

*Ans.* The ordinance in question is plain enough; but, like the law about the perpetual fire, L.vi.13, it belongs to the L.L., and was probably written with reference to the practice in the later Temple (VI.420), without considering that such a 'fire' and 'light' could not have been maintained continually in the moveable Altar and in the moveable Tabernacle. That the Tabernacle at Shiloh in which Samuel slept, with its post and doors, was not the gorgeous Tabernacle of the L.L., is sufficiently plain, and we do not need the rabbinical traditions, which are purely invented as a means of escape from this difficulty. But the fact that Samuel slept in this Tabernacle corresponds with the statement that 'Joshua, the servant of Moses, departed not out of' the original 'Tent of Meeting' in the O.S., E.xxxiii. 7-11.

(iii) The especial customs of the sacrifice alluded to in 1S.ii.13 were those prescribed in L.vi.6,7, N.xviii.8-19,25-32, D.xviii.1, &c. But the sons of Eli knew not the Lord, and so would not acknowledge the ordinance—'The sons of Eli . . . knew not the Lord nor the ordinance of the priests in reference to the people,' *p.6.*

*Ans.* Admitting the correctness of this translation, which is that of THENIUS, it is a mere assumption to suppose that the 'customs' in question were those prescribed in L.vi.6,7, &c.: the writer means the customary duties or rights of the priests, such as would exist in any worship independently of any written laws.

(iv) The Levites alone were permitted to handle the sacred vessels and to convey the ark of the Lord, 1S.vi.15. *p.6.*

*Ans.* Bp.BROWNE does not explain how Samuel, if a Levite, was allowed to minister in the Tabernacle as a young child, 1S.ii.18, iii.1, contrary to the direction in N.iv.3,23,35, or in N.viii.24, and how it came to pass that David, on his first attempt to bring up the ark to Jerusalem, did not employ the Levites at all, 1Ch.xv.2,12,13.

(v) Even verbal quotations from the Pentateuch are pointed out. The reference in 1S.ii.22 to E.xxxviii.8 has been already mentioned. The people ask them a king (1S.viii.5,6) in language which shows that they had the very words of Moses (D.xvii.14) in their minds. The words of 1S.viii.3 are evidently written with allusion to D.xvi.19. p.7.

*Ans.* The words in 1S.ii.22, 'and that they lay with the women who did service at the entrance of the Tent of Meeting,' are not found in the Vat. MS. of the LXX, and are probably an interpolation of the L.L.; as appears from the fact that nowhere else in this story is the 'House of Jehovah' at Shiloh called the 'Tent of Meeting,' the term so frequently used in the L.L., as also that there is no allusion to this particular sin of the sons of Eli, as a reason for the Divine displeasure, in v.17, or in v.29, where only their misconduct in respect of the sacrifices is mentioned.

The words of 1S.viii.3 may allude to E.xxiii.2,6-8(O.S.); and, if 1S.viii.5,6, alludes to D.xvii.14, how is it that the people do not refer to that passage, as allowing them to choose a king? It is possible, however, that D.xvii.14 may be based on 1S.viii.5 of the Older Story, whereas 1S.viii.6-22 appears to be wholly due to D. (VII).

(vi) The only inconsistencies which appear are readily explicable by the peculiar, unsettled condition of the nation in the days of Samuel and the early days of David. Especially when the ark was in captivity, and there was no longer the sacred presence of God at Shiloh, Samuel sanctioned the offering of sacrifice in other places beside the Tabernacle. But indeed the command to sacrifice only in the place to be chosen by God was not binding until that place had been chosen, viz. Mount Zion, and *the Tabernacle, to be succeeded by the Temple, had been set up there.* p.7.

*Ans.* In L.xvii.1-9 it is commanded that all slain beasts must be offered at the door of the Tabernacle, without any reference to any 'place' being chosen where Jehovah would set His Name; but, in fact, Jeremiah distinctly says that Shiloh was the place where Jehovah 'set His Name at the first.' So in J.xxii the Brazen Altar is spoken of as the only altar for burnt-offerings, without any reference to the 'place' where it was to be set up, v.19,29. And, accordingly, the Chronicler tells us that Solomon sacrificed upon the Brazen Altar at Gibeon, where the Tabernacle was, 2Ch.i.3,6, though the ark was on Mount Zion, v.4. But Bp.BROWNE says that 'the Tabernacle, to be succeeded by the Temple, had been set up' on Mount Zion, where the context—*comp.* 'beside the Tabernacle' just before—compels us to understand the *Mosaic* Tabernacle—see also (6) below—which was set up at Gibeon, not on Mount Zion.

But, supposing that Bp.BROWNE'S reasoning would account for Samuel's sacrificing at various places, it will not account for his leaving the ark itself all his life long to lie in abeyance, so that the Divine Laws in the



Pentateuch could not possibly be carried out, nor will it explain the fact of the people 'sacrificing on high places' in the very beginning of Solomon's reign, 1K.iii.2, as therefore also during the reign of David, after the bringing up of the ark to Mount Zion, *comp.* 2S.xv.12.

(vii) The difficulty, that Samuel, a Levite, but not a priest, should be said to have sacrificed, is removed if we consider how frequently it is said of others,—Joshua, Saul, David, Solomon, the people,—that they sacrificed, it being in all these cases apparently understood that a priest was present to offer the sacrifice. Samuel, as prophet and prince, blesses the sacrifice; but there is no evidence that he slew it. If he slew it, still the man who brought the offering might slay it, but he *could not sprinkle the blood on the altar.* p.7.

*Ans.* Nor could Samuel 'sprinkle the blood upon the altar' according to the L.L., if he was not a priest, though there is nothing in the O.S. to prevent it, and it is a mere assumption, contrary to the plain meaning of the Scripture, to say that Samuel offered by means of a priest in 1S.vii.9,10, ix.12,13, xvi.2-5. Did David and Solomon 'bless' the people by means of the High Priest, 2S.vi.18, 1K.viii.55, in accordance with N.vi.22-27? But Bp.BROWNE says that Samuel was 'prophet, judge, and *almost priest,*' p.7!—and he asserts that—

though he apparently makes no change in the established worship of the country, which had not widely departed from that ordained by Moses, yet he strives to bring all the ordinances both of Church and State back to conformity with the institutions of the Pentateuch—

though there is not a trace in any of his doings of adherence to the Levitical Law,—though he let the ark lie his whole life long in a private house, instead of restoring it to the Tabernacle, and therefore, as Bp.BROWNE says, was at liberty to sacrifice wherever he liked, and did so sacrifice, being only a Levite,—and though the notion of one priest 'crouching to another to be put into some office that he might eat a piece of bread,' 1S.ii.36, is abhorrent to the whole spirit and language of Deuteronomy, xviii.8, and *à fortiori* to that of the L.L., N.xviii.8-19.

(viii) After Samuel the main facts of the history and the principal laws of the Pentateuch were undoubtedly known; and there is the utmost anxiety on the part of the objectors to prove that they had not been known before. But . . . the history of Samuel is wholly inconsistent with the theory that he was a *forger*. The Pentateuch and the Mosaic system silently underlie the whole history of Samuel; but, in the midst of a general subjection to it, there are at least some apparent departures from it, which are utterly inconsistent with the belief that Samuel was its *forger.*\* p.7.

---

\* Bp.BROWNE is fond of using this language, in order (it must be presumed) to supply the force wanting in his arguments by arousing a prejudice in his reader's mind against the results of 'adverse criticism': see 'a *forger,*' p.12, 'a *forger,*

*Ans.* Bp. BROWNE here assumes, contrary to the well-known facts of the case, that Samuel is supposed by modern critics to have written the *whole Pentateuch*—see (29) below; whereas it is obvious that, if he wrote only the Elohist narrative (V.135), which contains no laws and no ‘Mosaic system’ whatever, his whole argument above falls at once to the ground. It need hardly be said that there is not a shadow of ground for the assertion that ‘after Samuel the principal laws of the Pentateuch were undoubtedly known,’ so far as regards the laws which are peculiar to D. or to L.L.

I repeat that Bp. BROWNE has not produced one single passage from the Books of Judges and Samuel to support his assertion that ‘the concurrent testimony of subsequent times proves that *Moses did write the books now known by his name.*’

6. Bp. BROWNE now proceeds to ‘the times of David and Solomon.’

It is perhaps scarcely necessary to trace minutely the references to the Pentateuch, and the observance of the Law of Moses through these reigns. The facts are the same as before—the Levitical priesthood, the *Tabernacle*, the ark, the sacrifices, all are the same. p.8.

*Ans.* Here, again, Bp. BROWNE writes as if the Mosaic Tabernacle really was ‘set up on Mount Zion, to be succeeded by the Temple,’ see (5.vi) above; otherwise the ‘ark’ was not in the Tabernacle, and no ‘sacrifices’ offered before the ark were lawful, not being offered on the Brazen Altar before the Tabernacle, as according to the L.L. they ought to have been,—

p.17, ‘any skilful *forger*,’ p.18, ‘who have been fixed on as probable *forgers* of the Pentateuch, such as Samuel or Jeremiah,’ p.18, ‘a *forger* or redactor,’ p.20, ‘piously *fraudulent*,’ p.22, ‘*gratuitous slander*,’ p.26, ‘some of the modern rationalists believe or *affect to believe*,’ p.35, ‘a *forger*,’ p.196, ‘a *forger*,’ p.227, ‘a *forger*,’ p.229, ‘*forgery*,’ p.232. He may indeed with some reason apply the term ‘forger,’ if he pleases, to those Priestly writers of the L.L., who have employed the Divine Name to sanction their own laws made for their own aggrandizement, in order to secure their own incomes and prerogatives, and to maintain the sanctity of their order above the Laity and even above the Levites, or to the Chronicler who has deliberately falsified the older history, as it lay before him in the Books of Ssmuel and Kings. But it is utterly inapplicable even to the later Deuteronomist, in his noble unselfish effort to reform the moral and religious state of his people: much more is it monstrous to use such language in speaking of the work which modern criticism ascribes to the older writers of the Pentateuch. The term might be as well applied to the works of Herodotus or Livy, which contain fictitious narratives of the primitive times related as history, and speeches ascribed to different persons which have been composed for them by the writers themselves.

'this shall be a statute for ever unto them throughout all their generations,' L.xvii.1-7, J.xxii.29. And so again he writes, 'He [Solomon] follows out the intentions of his father, and builds a Temple to succeed the old Tabernacle of the wilderness.' p.19.

No doubt, the 'Levitical priesthood' is mentioned in 2S.xv.24: but there is no distinction here between priests and Levites; the 'Levites' in 2S.xv.24 were inferior *priests*, comp. 1S.ii.36, like the priests the *doorkeepers* in 2K.xii.9, xxii.4, xxv.18, and 1K.viii.4, where mention is made of 'the priests and the Levites,' is due to L.L. (VII). But the simple fact that there were *two* chief priests, 2S.viii.17, xv.24,29,35, 1K.iv.4, is contrary to the whole spirit of the L.L.

## 7. Bp.BROWNE now proceeds to consider the Book of Psalms.

In David we have not only a king, but an author. *A large number* of the Psalms are assignable to him, either as their author or as their compiler. Now it is true that the later Psalms are much fuller of historical references to the Exodus than the earlier Psalms, the Psalms of David. But it will be found that the passing allusions, and the similarity of expressions and sentences, amounting sometimes to evident quotations, are far more abundant in the Psalms of David. It is impossible to compare the following, even in the English Version (but in the Hebrew it is much more apparent), without being convinced that David had in his mind the words or the thoughts of the author of the Pentateuch. p.8.

*Ans.* Instead of 'a large number,' the most eminent modern critics assign *very few* of the Psalms to David. Thus EWALD recognizes only *twelve* such Psalms, of which HITZIG allows only *eight* to be David's, though he adds *six* others; whereas KUENEN denies that any of the Psalms were written by David or in David's age. When, therefore, Bp.BROWNE gives a list of quotations from the Psalms, as implying the recognition of the existence of the *whole Pentateuch* in David's time, it is necessary to enquire—

- (1) whether there is any distinct allusion to the Pentateuch at all,—
- (2) whether there is reason to believe that the Psalm in question is a Psalm of David' or one of a much later age,—
- (3) whether the allusion, if there be one in a Davidic Psalm, is to the *earlier* or *later* matter of the Pentateuch; since on our view it is very reasonable to suppose that a Psalm of David's age might refer to the Elohist Narrative or to the earliest portions of the O.S. (Original or Older Story of the Exodus), which were already in existence, as we suppose, and, if so, would be notable documents, in David's time.

8. Bp.BROWNE then gives 23 quotations from 16 Psalms, which we must submit to the following discussion, premising

that he has not quoted the words of the corresponding passages, but only gives references, 'want of space' probably having prevented him from relieving his reader from a great deal of wearisome labour in endeavouring to estimate the true value of his argument.

In the following instances quoted by Bp. BROWNE it will be seen that there is no referènce at all to the Pentateuch:—

- (i) 'Jehovah is the share of my portion and of my cup ;  
Thou maintainest my lot.

The lines have fallen for me in pleasantnesses ;  
Yea, mine is a goodly inheritance.' Ps.xvi.5,6.

*comp.* 'For Jehovah's portion is His people ;  
Jacob is the lot of His inheritance.' D.xxxii.9.

*Ans.* Not only is there no sufficient resemblance in the language, but in the Psalm Jehovah is the portion of the Psalmist, in Deuteronomy Israel is the portion of Jehovah.

N.B. Ps.xvi is *Davidic* (HITZ.), *post-Davidic* (EW.), *Maccabean* (OLS.).

- (ii) 'Keep (שָׁמַר) me as the apple, daughter of the eye.' Ps.xvii.8.

*comp.* 'He preserved (שָׁמַר) him as the apple of his eye.' D.xxxii.10.

*Ans.* The expression is evidently proverbial, *comp.* Prov.vii.2, Zech.ii.8.

N.B. Ps.xvii is *Davidic* (HITZ.), *post-Dav.* (EW.), *perhaps late* (HUFF.), *Maccabean* (OLS.).

- (iii) 'I will wash my hands in innocency,  
And so will I go-round Thine altar.' Ps.xxvi.6.

*comp.* 'And Aaron and his sons shall wash their hands, &c.' E.xxx.19-21.

*Ans.* As if the practice for priests to wash their hands, when they went to officiate at the altar, could not have existed without the written law of E.xxx !

N.B. Ps.xxvi is placed by EWALD long after David: by HUFF., HITZ., OLS., its age is left undetermined.

- (iv) 'The earth is Jehovah's and its fulness,  
The world and the dwellers in it.' Ps.xxiv.1.

*comp.* 'The whole earth is mine,' E.ix.5(D).

'The heaven and the heaven of heavens are Jehovah's thy Elohim, the earth and all that is in it.' D.x.14.

*Ans.* If Ps.xxiv.1 is copied from the Pentateuch, the writer may have had before him E.ix.29(O.S.), 'the earth is Jehovah's.'

N.B. Ps.xxiv.1-6 is *Davidic* (EW.), *post-Davidic* (HITZ.), perhaps sung at the dedication of Solomon's Temple (HUFF.), *post-Exilic* (OLS.).

In the following instances, if there is any allusion to the later portions of the Pentateuch, yet the Psalm belongs to a very late age:—

(v) Ps.cxxiii.2 (Aaron's anointing), *comp.* E.xxx.25,30(L.L.).

*Ans.* But this Psalm is *late* (HUPF.), *post-Exilic* (EW.), *Maccabean* (OLS.), while HITZIG ridicules the notion of its being regarded as Davidic.

(vi) Ps.ciii.17,18, *comp.* E.xx.6(D), D.vii.9.

*Ans.* But this Psalm is *post-Exilic* (EW.), *Maccabean* (HITZ., OLS.).

(vii) Ps.lxxxvi.8, *comp.* E.xv.11(O.S.)—(viii) v.15, *comp.* E.xxxiv.6(O.S.).

*Ans.* If this Psalm had been Davidic, there would have been no difficulty in its referring to the O.S. But it is *post-Exilic* (EW., HITZ., OLS.).

(ix) Ps.xxx (Heading), *comp.* D.xx.5.

*Ans.* But whatever may be the age of the Psalm, the 'Headings' and 'Titles' are of very late date, and as Bp.BROWNE himself says, *Eloh. Ps. p.64*, 'These superscriptions are probably of no authority whatever.'

(x) Ps.i.3, *comp.* G.xxxix.3,23(O.S.).

*Ans.* Such a reference might have been made to the O.S. in a Davidic Psalm; but this Psalm was written just before the Exile (EW.), or is Maccabean (HITZ., OLS.).

In the following instances, the reference is made to the Elohistic Narrative or to the oldest portions of the O.S., and may have been made in David's time:—

(xi) Ps.viii.6–8, *comp.* G.i.26,28(E).

N.B. Ps.viii is ascribed to David by EWALD and HITZIG.

(xii) Ps.ix.12, *comp.* G.ix.5(E).

N.B. Ps.ix is *Davidic* (HITZ.), *post-Exilic* (EW.), *very late* (OLS.).

(xiii) Ps.xxxix.12, 'I am a stranger with thee and a sojourner,' *comp.* G.xxiii.4 (E), from which may have been derived L.xxv.23, which alone is quoted by Bp.BROWNE.

N.B. Ps.xxxix *belongs to the 8th century* (EW.), *to the age of Jeremiah* (HITZ.), is *Maccabean* (OLS.).

(xiv) Ps.xv.5, *comp.* E.xxii.25(O.S.), xxiii.7,8(O.S.), from which are derived D.xvi.19, L.xxv.36, quoted by Bp.BROWNE.

N.B. Ps.xv is ascribed to David by EWALD and HITZIG.

(xv) Ps.cx.4 (*Melchizedek*), *comp.* G.xiv.18, may have been written 'about the 16th or 18th year of David's reign' (V.283).

N.B. Ps.cx is *Davidic* (EW.), *late* (HUPF.), *Maccabean* (HITZ., OLS.).

(xvi) Ps.xvi.4, *comp.* E.xxiii.13.

If this latter passage belongs to the O.S., this comes under the same class as (xiv). But we assign it to D. (VI.228), *comp.* J.xxiii.7(D), 'and the name of their Elohim ye shall not mention.' If there is any imitation, D. may have followed the Psalm; but the phrase seems to have been proverbial for 'swearing,' *comp.* Hos.ii.17.

N.B. Ps.xvi is *Davidic* (HITZ.), *post-Dav.* (Ew.), *Maccabean* (OLS.).

(xvii) Ps.lxviii.7, *comp.* E.xiii.21(O.S.)—(xviii) v.8, *comp.* E.xix.16(O.S.).

There is, no doubt, distinct resemblance here, the Psalm referring to portions of the O.S. which were already in existence at the time when the ark was brought up by David, on which occasion (as we suppose) this Psalm was written (II.409), though assigned by HITZIG to the age of Jehoshaphat, by BÖRTCHER to that of Hezekiah, by VON LEMBERKE to that of Josiah, by HUFFELD to that of the Exile, by EWALD, MAURER, KÖSTER, to the time of the dedication of the Second Temple, by REUSS and KUENEN to the Syrian period, and by OLSHAUSEN to the Maccabean.

(xix) 'Let Elohim arise, let His enemies be scattered,

And let them that hate Him flee before Him.' Ps.lxviii.1.

*comp.* 'Arise, YAHVE, and let Thine enemies be scattered,

And let them that hate Thee flee before Thee.' N.x.35(O.S.).

Here there is manifestly direct copying, and, if N.x.35 formed part of the *oldest* portions of the O.S., the Psalmist on our view may very well have copied from it. But if, as I maintain with HITZIG (*Ps. II.p.70*), N.x.35 was copied from the Psalm, then N.x.35,36, may have been inserted after the bringing up of the ark to Mount Zion, the language of the Psalm used on this occasion being very naturally adapted to the movements of the ark in the wilderness, but with the remarkable change of ELOHIM to YAHVE—from which fact I have drawn an important argument as to the name YAHVE having first been made the name of the *National Deity* in Israel in the time of Saul and David (*V.App.ii.52*), though it may have been in use to some extent before that time.

The remaining instances which Bp.BROWNE produces are as follows:—

(xx) 'The chariots of Elohim are thousands on thousands;

Adonai is among them, (as at) Sinai in the sanctuary.' Ps.lxviii.17.

*comp.* 'YAHVE came from Sinai and rose-up from Seir for them;

He gave-light from Mount Paran, and came with ten thousands of saints.' D.xxxiii.2.

*Ans.* If there is any imitation here, the later writer of D.xxxiii.2 may have copied the Psalm, or followed the tradition which it represents. But

the appearance of copying vanishes altogether if the last words of D.xxxiii.2 are translated (with KNOBEL) 'from the heights of Kadesh.'

(xxi) Ps.lxviii.4,33, 'that rideth upon the heavens,' *comp.* D.xxxiii.26.

*Ans.* The language here appears to be proverbial, *comp.* Ps.xviii.10, civ.3, Hab.iii.8. But, if there is any imitation, the later writer of D.xxxiii.26 may have followed the Psalm as in (xx).

(xxii) 'sacrifice sacrifices of righteousness,' Ps.iv.5;

*comp.* 'there shall they sacrifice sacrifices of righteousness,' D.xxxiii.19.

*Ans.* The expression appears to be proverbial, *comp.* Ps.li.19.

(xxiii) 'lift-up upon us (לְעַלְּנוּ) the light of Thy face,' Ps.iv.6;

*comp.* 'YAHVE light-up His face unto thee, YAHVE lift-up upon thee (לְעַלְּנוּ) His face,' N.vi.25,26.

*Ans.* If the language of the Psalm had been copied from an old Mosaic form, supposed to be Divinely commanded, it would surely have agreed more exactly with it. It may have been the usual form with which David 'blessed' the people 'in the name of YAHVE,' 2S.vi.18, long before the L.L. was written.

N.B. Ps.iv is ascribed to David by EWALD.

9. It appears, therefore, that the whole imposing edifice, which Bp.BROWNE has erected from the 'Davidic Psalms,' tumbles to the ground. With all this show of references, he has not produced one single instance of a clear allusion to the Book of Deuteronomy or to the history or laws of the L.L. in any one probably Davidic Psalm—much less produced a particle of proof to show that 'Moses did write the books now known by his name.' The reader will better understand from the above example how utterly untrustworthy are Bp.BROWNE's lists in other similar cases.

10. Thus Bp.BROWNE next quotes from the Book of Proverbs, assuming them to be proverbs of Solomon, without taking any notice of the fact that there are five collections of Proverbs of different ages; and, though he says that 'the nature of his writings, which are mostly proverbs or apothegms does not admit of much reference to earlier works,' p.8, still, he adds, 'wherever the subject leads to it, we may trace an evident

acquaintance with the *language of Moses*, by which he means the '*language of the Pentateuch*.'

(i) Thus iii.3 appears to allude to E.xiii.9(D), D.vi.8—iii.9 to E.xxii 29(O.S.), D.xxvi.2—iii.12 to D.viii.5—iii.18 to G.ii.9(O.S.). p.8.

*Ans.* There is probably no allusion in iii.18 to G.ii.9: but the collection of Proverbs in i.7—ix was 'written about the same time as Deuteronomy,' according to KUENEN, *H.K.O.* III.p.94, and therefore may contain phrases which correspond with the style of that book.

(ii) Many other phrases in the Proverbs are borrowed directly from the Pentateuch. Thus in x.18, 'he that uttereth slander' is a Hebrew phrase of peculiar significance, occurring only here and N.xiii.32, xiv.36,37. p.8.

*Ans.* The phrase in question is הַבִּזְיָה, and the passages referred to belong to L.L. (VI.95), whereas x.18 belongs to the oldest collection of proverbs, KUEN. III.p.94. But there is nothing remarkable in the expression: הַבִּזְיָה, 'slander,' occurs in G.xxxvii.2(O.S.), as well as in later writings, Jer.xx.10, Ez.xxxvi.3; and הֵרִיץ, 'bring forth,' is used in a very similar phrase in D.xxii.14,19.

(iii) The expressions in xi.1, xx.10,23, are taken from the very words of L.xix.36, D.xxv.13. p.8.

*Ans.* xi.1, xx.10,23, also belong to the oldest collection of proverbs: but there is no such resemblance between these passages and those quoted from the Pent. as to imply imitation on either side, as appears below:—

'Balances of deceit are an abomination of YAHVE,

And a perfect stone is His delight.' xi.1.

'A stone and a stone, an ephah and an ephah,

An abomination of YAHVE are both of them.' xx.10.

'An abomination of YAHVE is a stone and a stone,

And balances of deceit are not good.' xx.23.

*comp.* 'Thou shalt not have in thy bag a stone and a stone, a great and a small.' D.xxv.13.

'Balances of righteousness, stones of righteousness, an ephah of righteousness, and a bin of righteousness, shall ye have.' L.xix.36.

(iv) The words of xi.13, xx.19, 'he that walketh being a talebearer,' are taken from L.xix.16, 'Thou shalt not walk being a talebearer.' p.8.

*Ans.* There is nothing remarkable in the expression, see Jer.vi.28, ix.4(3).

And this is all the evidence Bp.BROWNE produces from the Book of Proverbs in support of his 'second position,' *viz.* that



‘The concurrent testimony of subsequent times proves that *‘Moses did write the books now known by his name’*!

11. But, says Bp.BROWNE, ‘that which specially connects Solomon with the history of the Exodus is that he was the builder of the Temple.’ p.8. And he goes on to quote Mr. FERGUSSON’S authority (*D.B. III.p.1455*), which I have also quoted (VI.63), for the fact that the dimensions of the Mosaic Tabernacle are exactly half of those of Solomon’s Temple, as described in 1K.vi.

It is a strong proof of the reverence in which Solomon held the original pattern, that he and his architects should have so closely imitated the Tent in their erection of a stone Temple. Unless the Tent and all its accompaniments had existed and been described, the Temple of Solomon would have been almost impossible. p.9.

*Ans.* If Solomon’s Temple was copied from the Tabernacle, it is most extraordinary that not the slightest reference is made to this fact in 1K.vi, and, moreover, that in 1Ch.xxviii.19 David is made to give the pattern of the Temple and all its vessels to Solomon, *which he himself had received by direct Divine Inspiration*, without the least reference to the model he had before him in the Mosaic Tabernacle.

There are, however, some points in the description of the Temple which do not correspond with those of the Tabernacle. Thus Solomon’s Temple had two large cherubs overshadowing the ark, one on each side of it: whereas the Tabernacle had two small cherubs placed on the lid of the ark. Solomon’s Temple had folding-doors to shut off the Holy of Holies, whereas the Tabernacle, and the *Second Temple*, had a veil for that purpose. Solomon’s Temple had 10 golden candlesticks, five on each side: the Tabernacle, and the *Second Temple*, had only one: see (VI.400,402), where also the Chronicler’s mistakes are pointed out.

12. Bp.BROWNE now passes on to the history of the divided kingdom, and quotes 2Ch.xvii.9 to show that ‘the Book of the Law of the Lord’ was ‘the great text-book for teaching the people in the reign of Jehoshaphat,’ and 2Ch.xxvi.16–21 as proof that king Uzziah was stricken with leprosy for ‘venturing to offer incense contrary to the law in N.xvi.1, &c.,’ p.9—statements which are perfectly worthless as historical notices, being mere fictions of the later Chronicler, not the least hint being

given of these matters in the Books of Kings. From these latter books, however, he quotes as follows:—

(i) 2K.xviii.6 says that Hezekiah ‘kept all the commandments which the Lord commanded Moses.’ p.9.

*Ans.* This is merely a note by the author of the Books of Kings, *i.e.* according to Bp. Lord ARTHUR HERVEY (*D.B.* II.p.28), *Jeremiah* (who is identified by us with the *Deuteronomist*), and expressing his view of the pious character of Hezekiah, who acted in accordance *generally* with the Divine Will as afterwards fully expressed in Josiah’s time in the Book of Deuteronomy, *e.g.* by destroying the high-places, &c., v.4. Yet in some important respects, it is certain, Hezekiah did not act as that Law strictly enjoins, *e.g.* he did not destroy the Topheth, 2K.xxiii.10, nor the horses and chariots of the Sun at the entrance of the Temple, v.11, nor the idolatrous altars of his father Ahaz, v.12, nor Solomon’s high-places for Ashtoreth, Chemosh, and Milcom, v.13—which shows that he had not really that ‘Law’ in his hands.

(ii) 2K.xviii.4 speaks of Hezekiah’s destroying ‘the brazen serpent which Moses had made,’ and which the people worshipped. p.9.

*Ans.* As the account of the making of this serpent in N.xxi.4–9 belongs to the O.S., there is no reason why the people in Hezekiah’s time should not have revered it as a relic of the Exodus, whatever may have been its real origin (VI.487).

(iii) In 1K.xi.38 ‘Jeroboam is warned by Ahijah the Prophet that he should *keep the statutes and commandments of God,*’ evidently the well-known statutes and commandments of the Law. p.9.

*Ans.* The writer of Ahijah’s prophecy in its present form is the author of the Books of Kings (vii), that is, on our view—see (i) above—the *Deuteronomist*, who uses here his own favourite expressions in Deuteronomy.

(iv) In 1K.xii.28 Jeroboam’s words refer to the history of the Exodus. p.9.

*Ans.* They refer to E.xxxii.4 of the O.S., which on our view had long been written.

(v) The very place of Jeroboam’s worship, Bethel, was probably consecrated by the history of Jacob and the appearance of God to him there. p.9.

*Ans.* The story in G.xxxv.9, &c. (E), and G.xxviii.10, &c. (J), had long been written; but it was probably invented to account for the sanctity which already attached to the place from the oldest times, Ju.xix.18, xx.18,26, xxi.2.

(vi) In 1K.xii.32 the Feast appointed was an imitation of the Feast of Tabernacles. p.9.

*Ans.* This feast is enjoined in E.xxiii.16(O.S.) under its ancient name,

the 'Feast of Ingathering'; but it was, no doubt, kept from the oldest times without any reference to a written law.

(vii) In 1K.xii.31 'the Levites appear to have remained faithful, and hence Jeroboam is obliged to make the lowest of the people priests.' p.9.

*Ans.* For 'the lowest of the people' read 'people of all sorts,' *i.e.* from any of the ten tribes 'who were not of the sons of Levi,' these latter having been most probably set apart for the priesthood in the O.S.(VI.159). The note is by the author of the Books of Kings, *i.e.* the Deuteronomist—see (i) above—with whom Levite = Priest (III.542). If he had had the L.L. before him, he must have written 'who were not of the sons of *Aaron*.' It would have been a deadly sin to have made priests of 'the sons of Levi' generally, N.iii.10, xvi.10,40.

13. For the 'succeeding reigns' Bp.BROWNE 'points attention' to the following passages:—

(i) 1K.xxi.3, *comp.* L.xxv.23, N.xxxvi.7.

*Ans.* Supposing even that those laws of the L.L. existed in Ahab's time, there was nothing to prevent Naboth's selling or exchanging his land in the only way in which such sale or exchange could then have been thought of, *viz.* till the year of Jubilee and with the power of redemption in the interim. But there is nothing whatever to show that Naboth's refusal to sell this vineyard to Ahab proceeded from anything else than 'the independent spirit of a Jewish landholder' (*D.B.* II.p.454): *comp.* 1K.xvi.24, where Omri buys the hill Samaria from Shemer.

(ii) 1K.xxi.10, *comp.* N.xxxv.30, D.xvii.6,7, xix.15.

*Ans.* It is absurd to suppose that Jezebel's order, to set 'two men sons of Belial' to witness against Naboth, had any reference to the written law in D. or L.L., which enjoins that more than one witness should be required to prove any charge—much more a capital charge—against any man. Even among Zulus such a law might be expected to prevail, independently of the Pentateuch.

(iii) 1K.xxii.17, *comp.* N.xxvii.16,17.

*Ans.* Is it possible that Bp.BROWNE can find an allusion to the Pentateuch here?

'And he said, I saw all Israel scattered upon the hills, as sheep that have no shepherd,' 1K.xxii.17.

*comp.* 'that the congregation of Jehovah be not as sheep that have no shepherd,' N.xxvii.17.

Might not such an idea occur to anyone in a pastoral country? *comp.* Ez.xxxiv.5, Zech.x.2, Matt.ix.36.

(iv) 2K.iii.20, *comp.* E.xxix.38, &c.

*Ans.* In 2K.iii.20 we have 'in the morning at the offering of the *minchah*'; and Bp.BROWNE refers to the directions for the morning and evening sacrifice in E.xxix.38, &c., as if there could have been no sacrifices regularly offered day by day without the express prescriptions of the Mosaic Law!

But *minchah*, 'gift,' is clearly used in 2K.iii.20 for the *whole* sacrifice, as in G.iv.3,4,5, Ju.vi.18, 1S.ii.17,29, xxvi.19; whereas in the L.L. it is always used for the *meal-offering*, which accompanied the principal offering, E.xxix.41, xxx.9, xl.29, L.ii.1,3, &c. The writer of 2K.iii.20 would not have used the word in the sense in which he has used it, if he had had before him the laws of the L.L.

(v) 2K.iv.1, *comp.* L.xxv.39, &c.

*Ans.* Because a widow complains to Elisha that her creditor has come to take her two sons to be bondsmen, therefore there must be a reference to L.xxv.39, &c., which orders that no Israelite shall be made a bondservant! Why did not Elisha, then, denounce the wickedness of the creditor, instead of working a miracle to pay the debt?

(vi) 2K.vi.18, *comp.* G.xix.11.

*Ans.* 'He smote them with blindness according to the word of Elisha' must refer to the angels smiting the men of Sodom with blindness! Of course, on our view, a reference here to the O.S. would present no difficulty, —except the absurdity of supposing any such allusion.

(vii) 2K.vii.3, *comp.* L.xiii.46, N.v.3.

*Ans.* Four leprous men sit alone: therefore there must be a reference to L.xiii.46, N.v.3!

And this is *all* the evidence which Bp.BROWNE produces from the history of the divided kingdom to prove that '*Moses did write the books now known by his name*'!

14. Bp.BROWNE now proceeds to examine the prophetic books, and, in the first place, those of Isaiah.

(i) He 'distinctly names the Law, v.24, xxx.9.' p.10.

*Ans.* It is well known that תּוֹרָה, *Thora*, means properly, 'instruction, doctrine, precept, admonition,' GES., *Lex.*, 'doctrina, eruditio, institutio et paterna et divina,' FUEBST, *Conc.* Hence it is applied in the Pentateuch to the Divine Instruction as supposed to be given by Moses, first by D. (Vl.236) in E.xiii.9, xxiv.12, and Deuteronomy (*passim*), and afterwards by L.L. in E.xvi.4, though it is generally used by L.L. with reference to particular instruction by means of separate laws, L.vii.37, xi.46, &c.

Accordingly, in the parallel clause, in one of the passages quoted by Bp. BROWNE, the word is represented by 'the Word of Jehovah,' and in the other it is explained to mean prophetic instruction.

'They have cast-away the Law of Jehovah of hosts,  
And despised the Word of the Holy-One of Israel.' Is.v.24.

'This is a rebellious people, lying children,  
Children that will not hear the Law of Jehovah,  
Who say to the Seers, See not,  
And to the Prophets, Prophecy not.' Is.xxx.9,10.

*comp.* 'Hear the Word of Jehovah, rulers of Sodom!  
Give-ear to the Law of our Elohim, people of Gomorrah!' Is.i.10.

'Out of Zion shall go forth Law,  
And the Word of Jehovah out of Jerusalem.' Is.ii.3.

'Bind-up the Doctrine, seal the Law among my disciples.' Is.viii.16.

'To the Law and to the Doctrine! if they speak not according  
To this word, it is because there is no dawn in them.' Is.viii.20.

(ii) Isaiah seems to speak of it as *the Book, comp.* E.xvii.14. *p.*10.

*Ans.* See (1.i) above, and let the reader judge for himself as to the probability that Isaiah refers to the Pentateuch by 'the book' = 'the writing,' in the passage in question:—

'Jehovah hath poured-out upon you a spirit of deep sleep: He hath shut your eyes, the Prophets, and your heads, the Seers, hath He covered. And the vision of all things has become to you like the words of the (=a) sealed writing, which they give to one knowing writing, saying, "Pray read this," and he says, "I cannot; for it is sealed," and the writing is given to one who knoweth not writing, saying, "Pray read this," and he says, "I know not writing."' Is.xxix.10-12.

(iii) 'The familiarity of this great Prophet and probably of his hearers with the Pentateuch may be seen by comparing' the following passages. *p.*10.

(a) Is.i.10-14, *comp.* E.xxxiv.24, L.ii.1,16, vi.14,15, xxiii (*passim*).

*Ans.* Because Isaiah speaks of the people 'appearing before' Jehovah and keeping 'new-moons and set-feasts,' therefore he must be referring to E.xxxiv.24(D), 'when thou shalt appear before Jehovah thy Elohim thrice in the year!' Why may he not be referring to E.xxiii.17(O.S.), if the supposition of any such reference were not too absurd? How can Bp. BROWNE seriously infer from the fact of Isaiah's mentioning a multitude of sacrifices that either he or the people were acquainted with L.i.16, &c.?—not to speak of his here treating sacrifices with something like contempt.

(b) Is.ii.7, xxxi, *comp.* D.xvii.16.

*Ans.* Because Isaiah says, 'Their land is full of horses, neither is there

any end of their chariots,' and cries 'Woe to them that go-down to Egypt for help, and stay on horses, and trust in chariots because they are many, and in horsemen because they are strong,' therefore he must have had before him D.xvii.16!

(c) Is.iii.14, *comp.* E.xxii.5,26.

*Ans.* Because Isaiah says, 'Ye have eaten-up the vineyard, the spoil of the poor is in your houses,' therefore he must have been acquainted with E.xxii.5,26!—though he might have been, since it belongs to the O.S.

(d) 'And He will raise an ensign for nations from afar,

And hiss for it from the end of the earth.' Is.v.26.

*comp.* 'Jehovah shall raise against thee a nation from afar, from the end of the earth.' D.xxviii.49.

*Ans.* If there is any imitation, it is plainly D. who has copied the language of Isaiah, which is the most original.

(e) Is.xxx.16,17, *comp.* L.xxvi.8, D.xxxii.30.

*Ans.* Is.xxx.16,17. is the prototype of D.xxxii.30, which again has been imitated in L.xxvi.8 (VI.App.1.viii).

15. Bp.BROWNE then goes for help to the Prophets of Israel, having found absolutely nothing to give even a semblance of support to his assertion, that '*Moses did write the books now known by his name,*' in the writings of the Prophets of Judah.

It is, however, more important for our present purpose to pass on to the other three Prophets [Hosea, Amos, Micah], as they prophesied in Israel, and so their references will show that the Pentateuch, whether as Law or as History, was assumed as the basis of truth, even in appeals to the apostate and idolatrous kingdom of Ephraim. p.10.

*Ans.* Let it not be forgotten that Bp.BROWNE is still engaged in proving the truth of his 'second position,' that is, in showing—not merely that the whole Pentateuch existed at this time, but—'that the concurrent testimony of subsequent times proves, that *Moses did write the books now known by his name.*'

(i) Hosea and Amos distinctly name 'the Law.' p.10.

'Because thou hast rejected knowledge,

I will also reject thee from being priest to me:

Because thou hast forgotten the Law of thy Elohim,

I will also forget thy children.' Hos.iv.6.

'Because they have transgressed my covenant,

And trespassed against my Law.' Hos.viii.1.

'Because they have despised the Law of Jehovah,

And have not kept His Commandments.' Am.ii.4.

*Ans.* In all these passages the 'Law' means only the 'instruction' of Jehovah as given by His Prophets (14.i). The 'covenant' may refer to that made at Sinai, E.xxiv.3-8(O.S.), based upon the 'words of Jehovah and the judgments' in E.xx.22, &c., and supposed to have been made between Jehovah and Israel, when Israel was taken to be Jehovah's people—for which the Deuteronomist substituted afterwards a new covenant made 'in the land of Moab, beside the covenant which He made with them in Horeb.' D.xxix.1. So, too, in Hos.vi.7, below.

(ii) 'They have transgressed the covenant like Adam,' Hos.vi.7, not 'like men,' as in the Authorized Version. p.10.

*Ans.* Hosea might very well refer to the story of Adam or any other portion of the O.S. But in Ps.lxxxii.7 we have the very same phrase (אֲדָמָה), where the parallelism leaves no doubt as to its meaning—'But ye shall die *like men*, and fall like one of the princes.' And so this passage in Hosea is rendered in LXX, *Syr.*, *Arab.*, *Targ.*, *Jon.*, *Wyclif*, *Douay*, *Eng. Vers.*, and other important modern versions (IV.461-2).

(iii) Hos.xii.3,4, *comp.* G.xxv.26, xxviii.11, xxxii.24—Hos.ii.15, xi.1, *comp.* E.iv.22,23. p.10.

*Ans.* The passages referred to all belong to the O.S., to which, no doubt, the Prophet alludes.

(iv) Hos.viii.12, 'I have written for him the many things of my Law: they were reckoned a strange thing.' p.10.

*Ans.* Hosea probably refers to the 'Divine Instruction' (14.i) contained in the O.S., with which he was evidently familiar (15.iii), and especially to the 'words of Jehovah and all the judgments,' said to have been written by Moses in the 'Book of the Covenant,' E.xxiv.3-8.

(v) Am.ii.10, 'I brought you up from the land of Egypt, and led you forty years through the wilderness, to possess the land of the Amorites,' the last words being an allusion to G.xv.16. p.10.

*Ans.* Amos refers here generally to the story of the O.S.; for the '40 years,' first appearing here in the Bible, and probably adopted from the popular talk, see (VI.323).

There is no allusion in the last words to G.xv.16; see the 'Amorites' specially mentioned as the chief occupants of Canaan, in G.xlviii.22, J.v.1, vii.7, of the O.S.

(vi) Am.iii.1, 'the whole family which I brought-up from the land of Egypt.' p.10.

*Ans.* Here is only a general reference to the O.S.

(vii) Amos speaks of 'the horns of the altar,' iii.14, in allusion to E.xxvii.2, xxx.10, L.iv.7. p.10.

*Ans.* Amos is referring to Jeroboam's idolatrous altar at Bethel, which had horns, no doubt, as other ancient altars had. 'The most ancient altars were adorned with horns. Nonnus introduces Agave offering a sheep, *ἐν κερᾷ παρὰ βωμῶν*, "upon an altar beautified with horns." The figures of Roman altars upon medals are never without horns, and the altars which remain in the ruins of old Rome have the same ornament. These horns served for various uses. The victims were fastened to them. Suppliants, who fled to the altar for refuge, caught hold of the horns.' POTTER, *Grec. Ant.* (ed. Dunbar, 1832), I.p.229.

(viii) Amos speaks of the Nazarites, ii.11,12, which doubtless sprang out of the ordinance in N.vi.1—21. p.10.

*Ans.* The ordinance of N.vi 'doubtless sprang out of' the older practice, which did not agree in all points with the later law of the L.L., as appears on comparing Ju.xiii.4-6,7, with N.vi.

- (viii) 'Come to Bethel and transgress;  
 At the Gilgal multiply transgression;  
 And bring your sacrifices every morning,  
 And your tithes after three years;  
 And offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving with leaven,  
 And proclaim and publish the free-will offerings.' Am.iv.4,5.

These allusions show an intimate acquaintance with many of the Levitical Laws. One is to the continual burnt-offering, N.xxviii,—another to the tithe to be laid up at the end of three years, D.xiv.28, xxvi.13,—a third to the prohibition to burn leaven with a meat-offering, L.ii.11, and the exception made in the case of a thank-offering, L.vii.12,13,—a fourth to the free-will offering, L.xxii.18—21, D.xii.6. Indeed the accuracy of agreement in this one passage goes far to prove that the law of which Amos speaks was identical with that which we now possess. p.10.

*Ans.* See on this passage (VI.356). The meaning of the words rendered in the E.V. 'your tithes after three years' is very uncertain; and the LXX has *εἰς τὴν τριημέριον τὰ ἐπιδικατὰ ὑμῶν*, 'your tithes for the three days' feast,' the Vulg. and Targ. Jon. (Walton) *tribus diebus decimas vestras*, the Syr. and Arab. *tertio quoque die decimas vestras*. Bp. BROWNE also forgets that the 'third year's tithes' in D.xiv.28, xxvi.13, were to be eaten at home; whereas the tithes here, whatever they may have been, were eaten at a Sanctuary. Probably there was a daily morning sacrifice offered at Bethel, together with a thank-offering with leaven and free-will offerings, according to old customs which were observed before the division of the two kingdoms, and were continued after it in Jerusalem, and were subsequently defined in the L.L. But this passage makes not the least allusion to the latter, and cannot be quoted as a proof even of its existence, much less as a proof that 'Moses did write the books now known by his name.'



(ix) Mic.vii.17, 'they shall lick the dust like *the* serpent (שׂוֹפֵרֵי אֲרָבָה),' in allusion to G.iii.14. p.10.

*Ans.* There is no reason (on our view) why Micah should not have alluded to G.iii.14. But it is absurd to suppose any such allusion here, the article in Hebrew being commonly employed in 'comparisons as here, and also to denote a class of objects,' 'the serpent' = 'a serpent,' and it being a well-known notion of the ancients that serpents eat dust, Is.xv.25, *ferventi pastus arenâ*, SIL. ITAL. vii.49 (IV.203).

(x) Micah mentions the promises to Abraham and Jacob in vii.20; he alludes to the history of the Exodus and of the Book of Numbers in vi.4,5. p.10.

*Ans.* The references are only to passages of the O.S.

And now, having produced all his evidences from the older Prophets, Bp.BROWNE asks, p.10 :—

Is it possible that these Prophets, thus speaking, or the people among whom they spoke, should not have had the Books of Moses before them?

*Ans.* These Prophets had in their hands the O.S.(VI.560). But Bp.BROWNE has not produced a particle of proof from their writings to show that the five 'Books of Moses' even existed, much less that '*Moses did write the books now known by his name.*'

16. Next, coming down to Josiah's time, Bp.BROWNE says, p.10 :—

In his reign we have abundant evidences that the ordinances observed, when the Temple had been purified, were those of the Mosaic Law. The Passover was then held unto the Lord God, as it was written in the Book of the Covenant, 2K.xxiii, 'according to the word of the Lord by the hand of Moses,' 2Ch.xxxv.6. The 14th day of the first month is the day appointed, 2Ch.xxxv.1; the sacrifices are Mosaic, v.7-10; the priests assisted by the Levites kill the Passover and sprinkle the blood, v.11; the priests are the sons of Aaron, v.14; the custom of the Passover is traced from the time of Samuel to that of Josiah, v.18. p.10.

*Ans.* Except the notice in 2K.xxiii.21, that the Passover was held 'as it was written in the Book of the Covenant,' which refers, of course, to the new-found Book of Deuteronomy, xvi.1-8, all Bp.BROWNE's references are here made to the mendacious Book of Chronicles, and require no further notice.

17. Bp.BROWNE then passes on to the 'Finding of the Book' by Hilkiah in the Temple.

(i) It is unnecessary to determine here what may be meant by the 'Book of the Law,' 2K.xxii.8, or 'a book of the Law of the Lord by Moses,' 2Ch.xxxiv.14.

Whether it were the whole Pentateuch, or Deuteronomy only, or portions of the whole, has often been questioned. *p.11.*

*Ans.* It was judicious in Bp. BROWNE to avoid entering into this question; since, on the one hand, it is incredible that Josiah should have read in the ears of the people 'all the words of the Book of the Covenant, which was found in the House of Jehovah,' 2K.xxiii.2, if this was the whole Pentateuch, and, on the other hand, if it was only Deuteronomy, or a portion of that book, it is strange that it should be called the 'Book of the Law,' xxii.8, and the Passover be said to have been 'kept as it is written in the Book of the Covenant,' xxiii.21, that is, according to the directions in D.xvi.1-8, without any reference to the far more full prescriptions (of the L.L.) in E.xii.1-28, 43-49, N.ix.1-14.

(ii) It seems, however, pretty clear that Deuteronomy was a portion of the Book thus found. The curses referred to in 2Ch.xxxiv.24 are either those in L.xxvi or those in D.xxvii, xxviii. The effect which they produce upon the king, and his evident conviction that they concern himself especially, 2K.xxii.13, seem to point to the curses in Deuteronomy, as there only the king is threatened, D.xxviii.36, &c. *p.11.*

*Ans.* There can be little doubt that this 'Book of the Covenant' was D.v-xxvi, xxviii(VI.28).

(iii) Presently, however, Bp. BROWNE quietly assumes that this was the whole *Pentateuch*.

That, under all the circumstances of long-continued corruption and apostasy, anyone should have been able to impose such a work and such a law as the *Pentateuch* on king, priests, elders, and people, even if anyone at that time could possibly have written it, exceeds all evidence. *p.12.*

*Ans.* The incredibility is greatly reduced, if (1) the O.S., containing an older 'Book of the Covenant' between Jehovah and Israel, E.xxiv.3-8(15.i), had long been written and was known to the more learned and pious among the people as having been often referred to by the older Prophets (15.i-vi,x), and (2) if, as Bp. BROWNE assumes—see (v) below—and as seems very probable, this older 'Book of the Covenant' had been very much neglected, if not laid aside and lost sight of altogether, during the reigns of Manasseh and Amon, and (3), if the 'Book of the Covenant' found by Hilkiah did not contain the laws of the L.L., conflicting so remarkably on many points, *e.g.* the strong line drawn between Priests and Levites, with the actual practice of Josiah's time.

(iv) Moses commanded that the Book of the Law, which he had written, should be put in the side of the ark of the Covenant, and there preserved, D.xxxi.26. It is extremely probable (the language seems to imply it) that *the very autograph of Moses* was thus stored up, first in the Tabernacle, and afterwards in the Temple. We need not wonder if this treasured MS. of the Pentateuch had lasted from

Moses to Josiah, a period of only 700 years, and that in the dry climate of Palestine. *p.11.*

*Ans.* The words in D.xxxi.26 do not mean 'in the side of the ark,' which would imply that the Book was to be put *within* it, but *by the side of the ark*—as, in fact, this Commentary tells us, *p.911*, 'Rather, *by the side of the ark*. The two tables of the Decalogue were *in* the ark, 1K.viii.9; the Book of the Law was to be laid up in the Holy of Holies close by the ark of the Covenant, probably in a chest.' The same Hebrew phrase exactly is used in 1S.vi.8, where the coffer with the golden mice and emerods was to be placed 'beside' the ark. And, indeed, Bp.BROWNE himself must really suppose this: otherwise how could the book have been 'built into a wall' in Manasseh's time (v)?

But, if this precious 'autograph of Moses' was not placed inside the ark, what chance was there that it would be preserved from destruction amidst the manifold fortunes of the ark, as when it was carried to the battle-field and the Philistines took it away captive, 1S.iv.3, &c., Hophni and Phinehas, and their father Eli, being dead, and Shiloh ravaged, Jer.xxvi.6? And how strange it is that it should not have been expressly mentioned that Solomon brought up this most venerable document to the Temple, when he brought up the ark and holy vessels, 1K.viii.4!

(v) Let us next observe the long prevalence of idolatry and ungodliness in the reigns preceding that of Josiah. There is a ray of light in the reign of Hezekiah; but the darkness settles down again more thickly than ever in the reign of his son Manasseh. . . . There was, no doubt, a short season of repentance at the end of his reign, 2Ch.xxxiii.12, &c.: but his son Amon succeeded, and again did evil in the sight of the Lord, 2K.xxi.19, &c. . . . To these two evil reigns, and to a long inheritance of corruption, Josiah succeeded at eight years of age. . . . At the age of 26 (the 18th of his reign) the Book of the Law was found by Hilkiah in the Temple, 2K.xxii.3. . . . Wherever it may have been concealed, *very likely built into a wall by the priests to keep it from the hand of the spoiler* [Manasseh], it was now brought to light again by the High-Priest Hilkiah. *p.11.*

*Ans.* The story of Manasseh's repentance and return to Jerusalem considerably increases the difficulty for Bp.BROWNE. For, if Manasseh made the reforms ascribed to him in 2Ch.xxxiii.15,16, he would surely have revived the use of the Pentateuch, which his father is supposed to have piously studied till the time of his death, when Manasseh was 12 years old, *v.1*, and which the Prophets, at all events, *v.18*, would have known, and the older priests would have joyfully revealed its hiding-place—not to speak of the probability that other copies would have been made in former days, and would be existing somewhere in pious hands. And, if Manasseh had brought the Pentateuch into use again, the short reign of Amon, only two years, *v.21*, would not have sufficed to blot out all knowledge or memory of it.

But we may dismiss this story as a pure fiction of the Chronicler as baseless as the notion of Bp. BROWNE that 'Hezekiah's copy,' supposed to have been made by himself in accordance with the direction in D.xvii.18, 'had been destroyed or laid aside or forgotten,' p.12, while 'the autograph of Moses was 'very likely built into a wall by the priests'; though, even if that had been really done, it would be strange that no tradition of the fact should have remained among the older priests of Josiah's time, after the 57 years of Manasseh and Amon, so that this precious document still remained hidden till the 18th year of the reign of this pious king!

The state of things, however, during the reigns of Manasseh and Amon helps greatly to explain the fact that the 'Book of the Covenant,' when found by Hilkiah, was so readily accepted as the record of the Covenant referred to so frequently by the older Prophets as once made between Jehovah and Israel (15.i). Of course it is a mere assumption on the part of Bp. BROWNE to say that 'all the most important witnesses were satisfied that it was the *Temple Copy* of the Law.' p.12.

18. Bp. BROWNE now brings forward the 'Prophets of the Captivity.'

(i) Jeremiah began to prophesy in the 13th year of the reign of Josiah. The portion of his book from ii.1 to viii.17 is generally acknowledged to have been written before the Finding of the Book of the Law by Hilkiah. But in those chapters there are statements concerning the Law and *quotations from the Books of Moses, which show that Jeremiah was then well acquainted with the Pentateuch.* p.12.

*Ans.* How is this to be explained on Bp. BROWNE's own view that Hezekiah's autograph copy of the Pentateuch had been 'destroyed or laid aside and forgotten,' and, of course, it is implied that no other copy existed except the 'autograph of Moses,' which had been 'built into a wall by the priests' (17.v), and was only brought to light in the 18th year of Josiah, that is, as Bp. BROWNE himself says, after the prophecies in Jer.ii.1-viii.17 were written?

(ii) Thus Jeremiah refers to 'the Law' in ii.8, viii.8, and in ii.6 he alludes to D.viii.15. So ii.28 is a quotation from D.xxxii.37,38; iv.4 is a virtual quotation from D.x.16, xxx.6, and the figure used occurs nowhere else in the Scriptures; v.15,17, contains unmistakable quotations from D.xxviii.31,49. It is of less importance to multiply examples of this kind, because it is now admitted that the writings of Jeremiah are throughout impregnated with the language of Deuteronomy, insomuch that the modern critics have argued that Jeremiah must himself have been the Deuteronomist p.13.

*Ans.* Again, I repeat, how could Jeremiah have made these quotations, 'virtual' or 'unmistakeable,' from the Book of Deuteronomy, in prophecies

'generally acknowledged to have been written before the Finding of the Book of the Law by Hilkiah,' when no other copy of the Pentateuch existed in Israel ?

But the statement above italicized explains fully the phenomenon in question, which presents an insuperable difficulty on Bp. BROWNÉ's view. For we learn from Jer. xxxvi that before the 4th year of Jehoiakim—that is 23 years after he began to prophesy, and 18 after the 'Finding of the Book'—no prophecies of Jeremiah existed in writing, *comp.* v. 4, 6, 17, 18, 27, 32; since otherwise Baruch might have copied these, and would not have needed to take down a second time 'from Jeremiah's mouth all the words of the book which Jehoiakim had burned,' v. 32; only on this second occasion 'there were added to them many like words,' v. 32. Hence the prophecies in these first chapters were repeated from memory twenty years after they were originally spoken, and are strongly coloured throughout with the style of Deuteronomy, which had long been published, and which in fact had very probably been written by Jeremiah himself.

(iii) ii. 6 [? 7] also refers to N. xiv. 7, 8, L. xviii. 25–28, N. xxxv. 33, 34, all belonging to the L.L. p. 13.

*Ans.* Anyone, who will take the trouble to compare these passages, will see that there is not the least allusion in ii. 6, 7, to N. xiv. 7, 8.

In L. xviii. 25, 28, N. xxxv. 34, 'defile the land' may possibly be imitated from Jer. ii. 7<sup>b</sup>; but it is very doubtful if the use of such an expression implies imitation at all.

(iv) Ezekiel prophesied during the Captivity. Dr. McCaul has observed that in the one short passage, xxii. 7–12, there are at least twenty-nine references to, or rather quotations from, Exodus, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy. . . . In v. 26 again, where the Law is distinctly named, there are at least four more references to L. x. 10, xi. 45, xx. 25, E. xxxi. 13; xviii, xx contain references and quotations innumerable, xx being a recapitulation of all that happened in the wilderness. p. 13.

*Ans.* Of course all this agrees entirely with our view as to Ezekiel's own share in the composition of the L.L. (VI. 14). But it is very noticeable that *Ezekiel contains so many distinct references to the L.L.; whereas Jeremiah contains so many distinct references to Deuteronomy, but neither Jeremiah nor any prophetic writer before the Captivity contains a single allusion to the L.L.*

19. We need not dwell upon Bp. BROWNÉ's remarks on Ezra's doings after the return from the Captivity, since it is admitted

that the whole Pentateuch was in existence in Ezra's time pretty nearly in its present form (VI.473,481). But, when he says that—

'it is the constant Jewish tradition that Ezra collected and reduced to order all the earlier books of the O.T.,' . . . . and 'transcribed the Scriptures from the ancient Hebrew character (now known as Samaritan) into the modern Hebrew or Chaldee character' (p.13),

the reader must be reminded again that the 'Jewish tradition' ascribes to Ezra very much more than this (2.ii).

20. Bp.BROWNE then gives some account of the Samaritan Pentateuch.

In almost all particulars (dates being the principal exceptions) this Samaritan Pentateuch agrees with the Jewish Pentateuch. . . . There are but two periods in which we can suppose the Samaritans to have become possessed of this copy of the Pentateuch. Manasseh, brother of the High-Priest Jaddua, being expelled from the priesthood for marrying the daughter of Sanballat the Horonite, Neh.xiii.28, became the first High-Priest of the Samaritans and of the Temple erected on Mount Gerizim. He was joined by many priests and Levites, who like himself refused to put away their heathen wives. It is the belief of many that the so-called Samaritan Pentateuch was carried by these priests from Jerusalem to Samaria. Now they would certainly not have taken it with them, testifying as it did against their heathen marriages and schismatical worship, had they not fully believed in its genuineness and Divine authority; nor would the Samaritans have accepted it but for a like conviction on their parts. At all events, at no later period could the Hebrew Scriptures have been imposed on the dissentient Samaritans. This document, therefore, preserved in Samaria, is an independent witness, from at least the time of Ezra, to the integrity of the five Books of Moses. p.14.

*Ans.* As it is admitted that from the time of Ezra the Pentateuch has existed nearly in its present form, it is not necessary to appeal to the Samaritan Pentateuch, if belonging to that age, in support of this fact. But see (VI.474-5) for the reasons which make it probable that the Samaritans received the Pentateuch when the Temple was built on Mount Gerizim, about a century later than the time fixed by Bp.BROWNE. In fact, nothing is said in Neh.xiii.28 about anyone being 'expelled from the priesthood.' Nehemiah only says, 'I chased him from me.' And the person in question, who is not *named*, was a 'son of Joiada, son of Eliashib,' and was therefore *uncle*—not 'brother'—of Jaddua, xii.10,11. It is possible that in the next generation, *Manasseh*, a brother of Jaddua, may have married a daughter of another Sanballat, which led to his expulsion, &c., as stated above.

The variations of the Samaritan Pentateuch from the Hebrew original (besides the dates) are not a few, and many of them are given at length in (VI.478). Being made by the Samaritans themselves, with a view (apparently) of rounding off the story, they are a clear proof that the Samaritans did *not* 'fully believe in its genuineness and Divine authority'—as we might have very safely inferred from the fact that they received it at all, when it denounced severely their own practices.

(ii) Its witness may go back to a much earlier date. For many think, and that with much ground of reason, that the Pentateuch was carried to the Cuthites, who had peopled Samaria, by that Israelitish priest who was sent by Esarhaddon that he might teach them the worship of the Lord, 2K.xvii.28, Ezr.iv.2. This, if it be correct, would carry back the independent testimony of the Samaritan Pentateuch—not only to the time of Ezra but—to the reign of Manasseh the grandfather of Josiah, about B.C. 680. p.14.

*Ans.* This extravagant notion, which supposes Josiah to have reigned, with Hilkiah and Jeremiah by his side, seventeen years without a copy of the Pentateuch, while the idolatrous Samaritans had it, is at once disproved by the fact (VI.476) that the Sam. Text was plainly copied from an original written in the *Chaldee* character, that is, after the return from the Captivity, since there are frequent interchanges in the Sam. Text of ך and ך, ם and ם, ן and ן, which are similar in *modern* Hebrew (*Chaldee*), but not in Samaritan or *ancient* Hebrew.

21. We may pass over also the evidence for the reception of the Pentateuch in the times of the Greek Translators, the Apocryphal authors of the O.T., the Chaldee Paraphrasts, and the N.T. writers, which no one disputes. But when Bp. BROWNE concludes, after producing all his evidence for the truth of his 'second position,'—

We may fairly ask, whether any book, ancient or modern, has such a stream of concurrent and credible testimony in support of its claims to genuineness and authenticity (p.14)—

I can only say that Bp. BROWNE has not produced a particle of trustworthy evidence from the time of the Judges down to the Captivity, which shows even that the Five Books of the Pentateuch existed, nor has even attempted to show, by testimony however fallacious, that '*Moses did write the books*

now known by his name,'—which is what he undertook to prove.

22. Bp. BROWNE proceeds now to his 'third point,' viz. 'That the internal evidence points to Moses and to him only as the writer of the Pentateuch.'

'The author of the Pentateuch and the giver of the Levitical Law [Jehovah!] had an intimate acquaintance with Egypt, its literature, its laws and its religion.' And he mentions 'a very few' details in proof of this, e.g. the Israelites making 'crude bricks baked in the sun,' in which was 'a certain quantity of chopped straw,' the 'ark of papyrus smeared with bitumen,' in which Moses was exposed, the 'plagues of Egypt' which were 'the natural troubles of the country magnified,' &c. p.15.

*Ans.* However interesting it is to trace signs of such an 'intimate acquaintance' with Egyptian matters, it proves nothing for Bp. BROWNE'S 'third point,' when we know (1) that the L.L. was written after the Captivity, at a time when multitudes of Jews had been long living in Egypt, 2K.xxiii.33,34, xxv.26, Jer.xxiv.8, xli.17, (2) that Deuteronomy was written in the age of Josiah, when there had long been close intercourse and alliance with Egypt, 2K.vii.6, xvii.4, Hos.vii.11,16, xii.1, Is.xxx.2-7, xxxi.1-3, xxxvi.6,9, Jer.ii.18,36, xxvi.21-23, xxxvii.7, xlii.14-22, xliii, xliv.11-28, Lam.v.6, and (3) that the O.S. was written in the days of Samuel, David, and Solomon, when also there must have been a sufficiently 'intimate acquaintance' with Egypt, since not only did Jeroboam flee for refuge to the court of Pharaoh, 1K.xi.40, and Solomon bring horses and linen out of Egypt, x.28,29, but in the very beginning of his reign Solomon married Pharaoh's daughter, iii.1, which implies that David also must have been on friendly terms with the Egyptian king, *comp.* Ps.lxviii.31—if *Davidic*, as Bp. BROWNE holds with me (8.xvii-xx)—'princes shall come out of Egypt, &c.:' and Samuel in his old age made his sons Judges in Beersheba, 1S.viii.2, on the very confines of Egypt, which seems to imply the existence of some sort of intercourse with Egypt even at that time, enough to account for the general knowledge of Egyptian matters, possessed by the oldest writers of the O.S., the Elohist, in fact, making very slight mention of Egypt (29). Accordingly Mr. POOLE says, *D.B.* l.p.503:—'One Pharaoh gave his daughter in marriage to Solomon, another appears to have been the ally of Jehoram King of Israel, So made a treaty with Hoshea, Tirhakah aided Hezekiah, &c. *It is probable that during the earlier period the same friendly relations existed.*' Nay, Bp. BROWNE himself tells us, p.17, that 'Palestine was well known to the Egyptians, who repeatedly traversed it from the reign of Thothmes I.,' that is, from the time of the Exodus downwards. And, if the Elohist speaks of an Egyptian slave in Canaan, G.xvi.1,3,



it follows that in his own time such slaves were known; while, on the other hand, the Editor tells us, p.241, that 'Israelites may have been, and probably were, brought into Egypt as captives by the Pharaohs in their not unfrequent invasions of Syria'; and though he adds that 'in that position they were not likely to become acquainted with the institutions of Egypt' and were 'still less likely to have returned to their native land,' we may reasonably differ from each of these opinions. See also on this point (29) below.

23. But Bp.BROWNE goes on to make the following extraordinary statement:—

The Mosaic laws and institutions of worship are penetrated throughout by a knowledge of Egyptian customs. The connection between the cherubic figures overshadowing the mercy-seat and the Egyptian sculptures is traced in the note at the end of G.iii—the distinction of clean and unclean meats is eminently Levitical, but it is eminently Egyptian also—the Egyptian priesthood was by inheritance, so was the Levitical,—the Egyptian priests shaved their whole bodies, so the Levites were to 'shave all their flesh,' N.viii.7—the Egyptian priests had to bathe continually, so the priests and Levites had to purify themselves by bathing—the priests of Egypt wore none but linen garments, so was it with the Israelitish priests; and there is no known example of any other priesthood of antiquity clothed only in linen. The anointing of Aaron, when clothed in his priestly robes, has an exact parallel in the Egyptian sculptures,—the ceremony of the scape-goat finds a parallel in what Herodotus tells us [about the Egyptians]—the Urim and Thummim on the breastplate of the High-Priest correspond with [the fact] that the chief priest among the Egyptians, when acting the part of judge, wore round his neck an image of sapphire, which was called Truth. These are a few of the parallels, which prove an intimate acquaintance with the customs of Egypt in him who wrote the Pentateuch and *delivered the Mosaic Law.* p.15-16.

*Ans.* Bp.BROWNE's statement takes away one's breath. Most 'orthodox' persons have been in the habit of supposing that all these institutions were founded in Israel by express Divine Revelation to Moses—that *Jehovah* 'delivered the Mosaic Law'; and it is amazing to find that, in so doing, the Divine Legislator merely copied the practices which were already in vogue in connection with the Egyptian idolatries!

Of course there is no difficulty on our view in supposing that the L.L. fixed such customs in writing after the Captivity, most of which, however, may have been in use in Israel from a much earlier time, in David's Tabernacle and Solomon's Temple, and some of them very probably copied from Egypt; as also there is nothing extraordinary in the fact of the Deuteronomist being acquainted with the Egyptian practices of 'covering the

door-posts of temples and tombs with hieroglyphics,' D.xi.20, or 'erecting pillars and coating them with plaster,'\* D.xxvii.2,3, or 'inflicting the bastinado,' D.xxv.2, or letting 'the ox tread out the corn unmuzzled,' D.xxv.4, or making 'offerings for the dead,' D.xxvi.14, p.16—all which were probably familiar enough in Josiah's time in Israel.

24. Setting aside, however, these signs of a closer acquaintance with Egyptian matters, which belong to D. and L.L., there remains no more than can be reasonably explained, as quite within the reach of persons living on the confines of Egypt, and having those relations with it which have been above indicated (22). There is nothing, in fact, required, but the knowledge of a few Egyptian names of persons and places, and certain customs or peculiarities of the country which must have been more or less known to the inhabitants of neighbouring lands. It may be doubtful indeed if even these are always stated quite correctly. Thus on G.xlvii.20, Bp. BROWNE writes, p.222 :—

Diodorus [and Herodotus, II.168] represents the land as possessed only by the priests, the king, and the *warriors*, which testimony is confirmed by the sculptures. The discrepancy of this from the account in Genesis is apparent in the silence of the latter concerning the lands assigned to the warrior caste. The reservation of their lands to the priests is expressly mentioned in v.22; but nothing is said of the warriors.

And he explains the discrepancy (with KNOBEL) by supposing that—

the warrior caste did not come into possession of their twelve *aruræ* each till *after the time of Joseph*.

Again on v.26 he says, p.223, that—

the 'fifth part,' which was paid to Pharaoh for the revenues of the state and perhaps for public works of all kinds, agricultural and others, was not an ex-

---

\* Bp. BROWNE says that these pillars were coated with plaster 'to prepare for inscriptions.' But the Commentary on D.xxvii.3 says, p.893 :—'The laws were probably graven in the stone, as are for the most part the Egyptian hieroglyphics, the 'plaster' being afterwards added to protect the inscription from the weather. The 'adjusting' hand of the Editor was needed here.

orbitant impost—because ‘*the Egyptians appear to have made no difficulty in paying one-fifth of the produce of their land to Pharaoh during the years of plenty, and hence we may infer that it would not have been a burdensome rent when the system of agriculture was put on a better footing*’—

that is to say, he *assumes* the truth of one part of this story in order to prove the truth of the other!

25. Supposing, however, that in the days of the writer such an amount of tribute was actually paid in Egypt, the account here given of the origin of this custom is manifestly un-historical. If, for instance, no such law already existed, how could Pharaoh, acting on Joseph’s advice, have enforced the payment of this enormous tribute from all the land during seven years, G.xli.34,35,48,49? If Pharaoh had a right to demand this surrender of their crops, then what need had he to buy the land? Or, if they were brought in by the people of their own free-will, as a provision against the coming famine, then how can the conduct of Pharaoh and Joseph be explained in giving back to them their own stores on such hard terms—first exacting their money, then their cattle, and then their lands and themselves, xlvi.14–20, and lastly removing all the people from their homes, v.21? And is it to be believed that, when Pharaoh’s vast storehouses were full with food provided by themselves, enough to supply not only Egypt, but all neighbouring lands, for seven years—the priests only (it is supposed) being exempted from the confiscation, not the soldiers—the whole population of Egypt would have contentedly sold themselves and their children into slavery, without a struggle to recover their own? Moreover, what would causè a famine in Egypt—the low state of the Nile—would not in the least affect all other lands, as Canaan. The writer had evidently not bethought himself of this.

In short, the story is, no doubt, invented to account for the fact that the Egyptian kings, by virtue probably of their control of the Nile and of the whole system of irrigation, were

from time immemorial regarded as the landlords of Egypt and the people as their tenants.

26. Bp. BROWNE then tries to support his 'third point' by saying that 'the History and the Law of the Israelites both bear marks and tokens of their passage through the wilderness and long residence in it.' p.16.

(i) Thus the Tabernacle was a moveable Tent, with moveable vessels; the Feast of Tabernacles was observed in remembrance of their wilderness life; 'To your tents, O Israel!' was a 'cry of sedition, evidently handed down from ancient time'; the elders or chiefs of the tribes correspond with the sheyks of the desert. p.16.

*Ans.* The camp, tents, and 'Tent of Meeting' formed part of the Original Story, E.xxxiii.7-11, and no doubt the Israelites marched from Egypt through the wilderness to Canaan (VI.566). These features of the story must have been continued in the later insertions; though the L.L. has added a full description of the Mosaic Tabernacle and its vessels, and has introduced the enormous difficulties connected with its construction under the circumstances, as well as a multitude of other impossibilities, such as that of 90,000 pigeons having to be brought annually for sacrifice by women after childbirth, L.xii, and having all to be eaten by three persons (I.150-6).

The Feast of Tabernacles was the ancient Harvest-Feast (12.vi), when the people would naturally set up booths of brushwood in the open air, as they set up canvas-booths at a modern fair.

The 'cry of sedition' and the 'elders' may contain reminiscences of their former nomadic life, or even of their march through the wilderness from Egypt to Canaan.

(ii) 'Without the Camp,' Heb.xiii.13(!), was the expression applied to the very latest events of Jerusalem. In Ps.lxxx.1,2, 'Thou that dwellest between the cherubim, shine forth! Before Ephraim, Benjamin, and Manasseh, stir up Thy strength and come and help us,' we see the reflected image of the ancient march, when the ark of God went forth, the pillar of fire shining high above it, surrounded by the warrior tribes of Ephraim, Benjamin, and Manasseh. p.16.

*Ans.* Of course, Heb.xiii.13 refers to the L.L., E.xxix.14, &c.; though it seems idle to quote it in this connection.

Ps.lxxx is *post-Exilic* (EW., HITZ., OLS., KUEN.), and probably refers to the statement of the L.L. that the ark in the wilderness upon a march went immediately *before* the 'camp of Ephraim,' consisting of the tribes of Ephraim, Benjamin, and Manasseh, N.ii.17, x.21, instead of being 'surrounded' by them, as Bp. BROWNE says.

(iii) The ark was made of *shittim* or acacia-wood, 'a tree of rare growth in Syria, but the most frequent in the peninsula of Sinai.'

*Ans.* Very possibly the ancient ark was really made, in imitation of Egyptian arks (23), while the Israelites were on their way from Egypt to Canaan, and was therefore made of *shittim*-wood, D x.3 (VI.574); or perhaps they may have taken it with them from Egypt, since, according to this Commentary, p.359, this wood 'grows in Egypt in some regions at a distance from the coast.' But though there might be no difficulty in finding *shittim*-wood for this purpose even in the wilderness, it is not easy to believe that they found in the wilderness acacia-trees large enough to furnish 46 boards for the Tabernacle, each 18ft. long and 2ft. 8in. wide, E.xxvi.15, &c. (VI.411), and, we must suppose, of corresponding *thickness*,—though this last is omitted altogether, in the very precise directions of the L.L.!

(iv) The coverings of the Tabernacle were goats'-hair and ram-skin dyed red after the Arabian fashion, seal-skin from the adjoining gulfs of the Red Sea, and fine linen from the Egyptian spoils. p.16.

*Ans.* Bp.BROWNE might say that the Israelites 'borrowed' these different coverings when they 'spoiled the Egyptians,' E.xii.35,36, though he seems rather to suppose that they went to catch seals in the 'adjoining gulfs of the Red Sea.' On our view they were probably well known to the writer of the L.L., as used in Egypt in later days, when the sacred arks were carried about in processions.

(v) Bp.BROWNE finally asserts,—after quoting DEAN STANLEY as representing the Israelites in the desert 'as a nation of hunters, clambering over the smooth rocks, scaling the rugged pinnacles of Sinai, as the Arab chamois hunters of the present day, with bows and arrows instead of guns'—that the permission to eat 'the wild goat, and the roe, and the red deer, and the ibex, and the antelope, and the chamois,' in L.xi, D.xiv, *could only have arisen in a place where the animals in question abounded.* p.17.

*Ans.* This is at once set aside by the fact that they were allowed at the same time to eat 'all fishes that have fins and scales in the waters, in the seas, and in the rivers,' L.xi.9, D.xiv.9. See also the provision for Solomon's table of 'harts, roebucks, and fallow-deer,' 1K.iv.23, which surely were not obtained from the desert of Sinai, and Jonathan and Asahel compared to the gazelle in 2S.i.19, ii.18.

27. Bp.BROWNE now brings forward another argument in support of his 'third point,' *viz.* 'the language and the legislation of the Pentateuch has Canaan only in prospect.' And he quotes a series of passages as showing this, E.xii.25–27, &c. But what does this prove? Of course the main object of the

O.S. was to provide laws, *viz.* those in E.xx.22, &c. as the basis of the Covenant between Jehovah and Israel, under which they should be governed in Canaan, and the later writers have adopted the same idea.

(ii) It has been objected that the writer of the Pentateuch knew too much of the geography of Palestine for one who had never been there, and that this is an argument against its Mosaic origin. This surely cannot be a valid objection, when we remember (1) that Moses, with his knowledge of the history of Genesis and of the wanderings of the old Patriarchs, must have become familiarized with the geography of the land of these wanderings,—(2) that Palestine was well known to the Egyptians, who repeatedly traversed it from the reign of Thothmes I.,—(3) that Moses had lived for 40 years in the wilderness of Sinai feeding the flocks of Jethro, and with his active mind and deep interest in the country of his forefathers, he was sure to have enquired about, most probably even to have visited, the neighbouring plains of Palestine,—(4) that he had taken pains to ascertain all the character of the country, of its people, its cities, and its fortresses, by means of spies, and that probably for many years, as every wise general would do, when preparing to invade a hostile and powerful people. p.17.

*Ans.* I leave the above explanation to produce its due effect upon the reader's mind. Would it not have been better to say that Moses knew all this by Divine Inspiration—even so as to be able to fix the position of Mount Gerizim by referring to the Gilgal, afterwards famous but *not yet named*, D.xi.30, or else (as this Commentary asserts, p.842) by referring to some insignificant place also called 'the Gilgal,' now Jiljâlich?

(ii) Take D.xii.10. 'When ye go over Jordan, and dwell in the land which the Lord your God giveth you to inherit, and when He giveth you rest from all your enemies roundabout, so that ye dwell in safety, &c.' This passage is indeed referred to in Jo.xxiii.1, and *is spoken of there as if it had been fulfilled in the conquests of Joshua*. Yet, when we consider how partially those conquests really gave rest to Israel, how the sons of the people conditioned and, as it were, impaired their fulfilment, how long it was before their words were proved to be true indeed, it will be hardly possible to find any time when a *forg*er could have written them. For instance, could Samuel have written them with the history of the Book of Judges, a record eminently of unrest and insecurity, before his eyes, himself judging Israel, with the ark of the covenant *in the hands of the Philistines*, [for 'seven months' only, 1S.vi.1], and to be succeeded in his judgeship by the warlike and turbulent reign of Saul? Indeed the reign of Solomon is the one only reign in the whole history of Israel, in which we witness anything like an united people, with a wide dominion and *peace from the neighbouring tribes* [but see 1K.xi.14, 23–25]. That reign was 500 years after the Exodus. Would any

skilful *forger* have put words into the mouth of Moses apparently promising, immediately on the conquest of Canaan, rest and peace and security? p.17.

*Ans.* So, then, Jehovah did not 'give-rest' to Israel in Joshua's time, as Jo.xxi.44, xxii.4, xxiii.1, plainly assert, in accordance with D.xii.10, all in fact written by the same author (D). Of course, the contradiction to the actual history is obvious enough, and Bp.BROWNE evidently feels it. But probably in Josiah's time D. may have fondly hoped for such a blessed period of rest, if Israel would only now be faithful to the Law of Jehovah.

Bp.BROWNE, however, here again argues as if one single author must, according to modern critical views, have written the *whole* Pentateuch (29).

From the above it will be seen that Bp.BROWNE'S conclusion that, 'as the Pentateuch bears all the traces on its brow of Egypt and of the Desert, so also it must have had its origin before the occupation of Canaan,' p.18, has not a shadow of real foundation to rest on.

28. Bp.BROWNE, however, has one more argument to produce in support of this his 'third point.'

(i) The language of the Pentateuch is such as to suit the age and character of Moses. The language is undoubtedly archaic. There are several words and forms to be found in the Pentateuch and to be found nowhere else. p.18. And he gives in a note 'the most familiar and undoubted of these instances.'

*Ans.* The very fact that any of these archaisms are found *throughout the Pentateuch* and *not in the Book of Joshua*, of which a great part is certainly Deuteronomistic, would show that the style of the O.S. was *designedly* retained throughout, and would help to confirm our view that the correspondence in style between the L.L. and E. is due to intentional imitation by the later writer of the more ancient portions of the Pentateuch (VI.551).

(ii) Bp.BROWNE then gives the following list of archaic forms, 'to be found in the Pentateuch and to be found nowhere else.'

(a) הוּא is used for both *he* and *she*: 'everywhere else we have הוּא for *he* and הִיא for *she*.'

*Ans.* See Is.xxx.33 where הוּא stands for *she*; הִיא is used eleven times in the Pent., viz. G.xiv.2, xx.5, xxxviii.25, L.ii.15, xi.39, xiii.10,21, xvi.31, xxi.9, N.v.13,14, while הוּא stands for *she* 195 times.

(b) נָעַר is used for both *boy* and *girl*.

*Ans.* It is used for 'girl' in G.xxiv.14,16,28,55,57, xxxiv.3,12, D.xxii.15, 16,20,21,23-27,29; but we have נְעָרָה in D.xxii.19.

(c) אֵלֶּה, 'these,' is used 'constantly for אֵלֶּה, the later form.'

*Ans.* לָאֵס occurs *eight* times in the *Pent.* (G.xix.8,25, xxvi.3,4, L.xviii.27, D.iv.42, vii.22, xix.11), and also in *late* writings, 1Ch.xx.8, Ezr.v.15; whereas הָאֵס, 'the later form,' actually occurs *nine* times in the *Pent.* (G.ii.4, xxxiii.5, xliv.6, E.xxxviii.21, L.xviii.24, N.x.28, D.v.3, xxii.5, xxv.16).

(d) We have the infinitive of verbs in הַ ending in יָ instead of תָּ.

*Ans.* This occurs only in G.xxxi.28, xlvi.11, l.20, E.xviii.18, all belonging to some of the oldest Jehovistic portions of the O.S. (V.291), and therefore proves nothing as to the whole Pentateuch.

(e) So the 3rd pers. plur. præter. *constantly* ends in יָן, instead of the later form in יָ.

*Ans.* KEIL, from whom Bp.BROWNE has most probably copied the above list without proving its correctness by personal examination, says cautiously as to this peculiarity, 'not only in the *Imperf.*, but even *here and there* also in the *Perf.*,' for which Bp.BROWNE boldly writes 'constantly'! See G.xiv.24, xxxviii.22, E.xii.33, xvi.35,35, N.xiii.31, xvi.34, &c. &c. for instances of the contrary.

It will be seen that Bp.BROWNE's assertions in (a), (c), (e), are *inaccurate*. But he does not seem to perceive that this very list cuts the ground away from under him. For, even supposing that these 'archaic' forms are due to Moses, how did the '*later*' forms in (a), (b), (c), (e), find their way into the Pentateuch?

(iii) Bp.BROWNE gives also the following as 'words *peculiar* to the Pentateuch,' quoting only the words, to which I have appended the places in which they occur.

(a) אָזְנֵיב, 'green-ears,' E.xxiii.15(O.S.)—copied by D. in E.xiii.4(D), xxxiv.18(D), D.xvi.1.

(b) אֶמְתַּחַת, 'sack,' G.xlii-xliv(O.S.)

(c) בָּתָר, 'piece,' חָבַר, 'divide,'—only used by D. in G.xv.10, *comp.* Jer.xxxiv.18,19.

(d) גִּזְלָל, 'fledgeling,'—only used by D. in G.xv.9, D.xxxii.11.

(e) זָבַר, 'present,' זָבַר, 'present,' G.xxx.20(O.S.).

(f) חָרִישׁ, 'sickle,'—only used by D. in D.xvi.9, xxiii.25(26).

(g) סָבָא, 'basket,'—only used by D. in D.xxvi.2,4, xxviii.5,17.

(h) יָקוּם, 'substance,' G.vii.4,23(O.S.), also D.xi.6.

(i) רֵיטָב (for רֵיטָשׁ, 'lamb,' G.xxx.32,33,35,40(O.S.))—used also in L.L.(Li.i.10, ii.7, &c. 9 times), but L.L. has also רֵיטָשׁ (E.xii.5, xxix.38-41, &c.).

(j) מַסְוֵה, 'veil,' E.xxxiv. 33-35(O.S.).

(k) עָר (for עִיר, 'city,' N.xxi.15,28(O.S.)), D.ii.9, *comp.* Is.xv.1.\*

---

\* KEIL (I.p.xviii) gives an identically similar list—agreeing even curiously in the *order* in which the words are quoted and in יָקוּם in (h) instead of יָקוּם—except that in (k), where KEIL has עָרָר, 'stock,' which occurs only once, L.xxv.47, Bp.BROWNE substitutes עָר, which in each of the four instances he quotes is the



(l) בְּרִייתָ\* 'blood-relation,'—only used in L.L. (L.xviii.6,12,13, xx.19, xxi.2, xxv.49, N.xxvii.11).

*Ans.* Of course, we should expect that there would be some ancient words in the O.S., which might afterwards become obsolete, such as (a), (b), (e), and perhaps (j). But (c), (d), (f), (g), (l), appear to be later words, or at least to have been used in later time. For Bp.BROWNE'S purpose the whole list is evidently worthless. And it is *inaccurate*, like the former; since (c), (k), appear in other books, instead of being (as he says) 'to be found in the Pentateuch and to be found nowhere else.'

(iv) It is argued, indeed, that these are not so much archaisms as peculiarities. But it is very singular that they should pervade the Pentateuch, which has, till of late, been universally esteemed the most ancient portion of the Bible, and that they *should be unknown in the other books*, even in those connected with the writers who have been fixed on as *probable forgers of the Pentateuch, such as Samuel and Jeremiah.* p.18.

*Ans.* It will be seen that the above statements are (as usual) *inaccurate*, since the archaic forms and words (except בְּרִייתָ for בְּרִיתָ) occur chiefly in G. and D., instead of 'pervading the Pentateuch,' and (a) in (ii), and (c), (k), in (iii), are *not* 'unknown in the other books,' (c) appearing actually in *Jeremiah*, while there are no writings out of the Pentateuch 'connected with' Samuel as author, nor does anyone suppose that either Samuel or Jeremiah wrote 'the Pentateuch' (27), though each may have written portions of it, without in the least deserving to be branded as a 'forger.'

It is difficult to understand what Bp.BROWNE means by saying that 'the Pentateuch has, *till of late*, been universally esteemed the most ancient portion of the Bible,' if he is speaking of scholars, when (not to mention earlier writers) 'De Wette (1806) regards the age of David as the earliest

Proper Name of the capital of Moab, Ar or Ar-Moab, and is therefore not at all a case in point, more especially as it is used also in Is.xv.1, and עִיר is used for 'city' throughout the Pentateuch.

\* Bp.BROWNE has בְּרִייתָ, and, for a book which has been so long in preparation, and (we may suppose) has been so carefully revised, there are more errors of the press than might have been expected. I note also the following for correction in a future edition: p.2, *left*, read 20,21 for 19,20—p.6, *right*, l.33, read 25-32 for 25,32—p.8, *left*, l.5 from bottom, read xvii.8 for xvii.7—p.8, *right*, l.23, read E.xiii.9, D.vi.8, for E.xxiii.9, D.vi.1—p.8, l.31, read Prov.xi.1 for Prov.x.1—p.13, *left*, l.7, read ii.7 for ii.6—p.18, *left*, l.4 from bottom, read בְּרִיתָ? בְּרִיתָ—p.28, *right*, l.2, read xi.7 for xi.6—p.49, *right*, l.11, read *to* for *of*—p.85, *right*, l.33, read *be* for *he*—p.100, *left*, l.27, read 27 for 4—p.133, *right*, l.7 from bottom, read *generic* for *genuine*—p.135, *left*, l.5 from bottom, read *cure* for *care*—p.147, *right*, l.17 from bottom, insert *in that* before *of*—with some others of less importance.

point of time in which the composition of some passages [in the Pentateuch] might fall; earlier than this we have no reason for placing any passage of the Pentateuch; the composition of Deuteronomy he sets in the time of King Josiah, before which consequently the present form of the Pentateuch generally cannot be placed, and probably it should be placed much later.' BLEEK, *Eint. in d. A. T.* p.172.

(v.) It is argued, again, that the language of the Pentateuch, although in some few fragments apparently archaic, is for the most part too like to later Hebrew for us to believe that it came from Moses. To this it may be replied that this is really what we might expect. A language is fixed by its great, and especially by its popular, authors. . . . Moses, putting aside all question of inspiration, was a man of extraordinary powers and opportunity. . . . Such a man could not but mould the tongue of his people. . . . Everyone that knew anything of letters, must have known the books of the Pentateuch. . . . The earlier books must have been the constant study of all the writers down to the very last. p.18.

*Ans.* The most singular feature in the case is that Moses, it would seem, could not 'fix' his own language—that, after having written N.xxvi-xxxvi in a certain style, full of the peculiar phraseology of the L.L. (VI.App.28-37), he should suddenly have completely changed his style, and have written D.i-xxx without the least trace of his former style and with a perfectly new phraseology, of which not a trace appears in N.xxvi-xxxvi, though written only a few weeks previously!

The statement, that every man of letters 'must have known the books of the Pentateuch,' is contradicted at once by the fact that in all the Prophets before Jeremiah, though there are references to the O.S. (VI.569), there is not a single allusion to D. or L.L., and that in Jeremiah himself there is no sign whatever of a 'constant study,' or even of the slightest knowledge, of L.L.

(vi) Eastern languages, like Eastern manners, are slow of change; and there is certainly nothing strange in our finding that in the 1,000 years from Moses to Malachi the same tongue was spoken, and the same words intelligible. . . . It is said, on the authority of Freytag, that the inhabitants of Mecca still speak the pure language of the Koran, written 1,200 years ago. p.18.

*Ans.* The above argument is employed in (VI.553) to show that there is nothing surprising in the fact that the language of the Elohist in Genesis, writing (as we suppose) in the days of Saul, does not differ in substance from that of the Later Legislation, written six or seven centuries later, whatever may be the difference in style.

29. Lastly, Bp.BROWNE proceeds to consider the question of 'post-Mosaic authorship'; and here he shows an utter disregard

—if not indeed an utter ignorance—of the main conclusions of modern critics. Thus he constantly speaks as if they supposed that the *whole Pentateuch* must have been composed by *some one writer* or in some one age—see also (4.i, 5.viii, 27.ii, 28.iv) above.

Joshua may perhaps have been employed by Moses to assist him in his writings . . . but nothing points to Joshua as the *author of the Pentateuch*.

Samuel was a prophet and a reformer, but he is nowhere represented to us as a legislator [see 1S.x.25]. Especially it is impossible that Samuel, except by a miracle, could have written books which are so thick with indications of a knowledge of Egypt and a knowledge of Sinai. The laws of Moses bear the mark of Sinai *from end to end*. But Samuel could never have come into contact with Egypt at all; and, indeed, as far as history shows us, the Israelites from Joshua to Samuel were utterly isolated from contact with any except the Canaanites and Philistines.

David is as little likely as Samuel to have had time for *composing the Pentateuch*.

Solomon's whole organization indeed proceeds on the basis of the Pentateuch. But his own history is the clearest proof that he was not the author of the laws contained in it or the history related in it.

After the time of Solomon, the possibility of *the Pentateuch being written* becomes less and less.

It is impossible to believe that in any subsequent reign such a book as the Pentateuch . . . should have been imposed on the kingdom of Judah.

That the like should have been attempted after the return from the Captivity is even more impossible. . . . The classic simplicity of the Pentateuch could not have had its origin in the last days of the degeneracy of language and literature.

It has been shown that *from end to end* the Pentateuch and the laws of the Pentateuch have deeply imbedded in their words and thoughts ancient Egypt and ancient Sinai. A *forger* or redactor could only have exhibited such a phenomenon by devoting himself with the utmost care and attention to the study of Egyptian customs and antiquities, and to an acquaintance with the Sinaitic peninsula—and that too on the spot, in the midst of these very countries. . . . Where in the times of Samuel, Solomon, Hezekiah, Josiah, or Ezra, can we look for *such a man*?

*Ans.* We need not stop to consider the gross exaggerations contained in the statement that '*from end to end*' the Pentateuch exhibits an intimate acquaintance with ancient Egypt and ancient Sinai, such as could only have been gained by actual residence in those countries. We have already seen to what Bp. BROWNE's proofs with respect to Egypt really amount (22,23). But did no Israelite in earlier days journey through the desert of Sinai, as Elijah is said to have done, to 'Horeb the Mount of God,' 1K.xix.8, always

remembering that Serbâl, 'the most magnificent mountain of the peninsula,' which 'might have been before the actual Exodus, known as the *Mount of God* to the Amalekite Arabs and even to the Egyptians,' *D.B.* III.p.1326, was very probably in the earliest times a place for religious pilgrimage, the name being explained by some as meaning 'the palm-grove of Baal.'

Bp BROWNE's statements are again *inaccurate*, since during the time 'from Joshua to Samuel' the Israelites came into contact, not only with the *Canaanites* and *Philistines*, but with the *Syrians*, Ju.iii.8-10, *Moabites*, *Ammonites*, *Amalekites*, iii.12,13, *Midianites*, vi-viii, *Zidonians*, iii.3, x.12. And Bp.BROWNE himself speaks of Palestine as 'being well known to the *Egyptians*, who repeatedly traversed it from the reign of Thothmes I.,' p.17, while the Editor tells us 'from contemporary monuments,' p.475, that during this very period 'Palestine was traversed, Syria invaded, and the Cheta overthrown' by the Egyptians, and under Rameses XII, down to the close of the Book of Judges, 'the Egyptians retained an acknowledged pre-eminence in Syria and Mesopotamia.'

For our present purpose, however, it is immaterial whether Samuel, if we suppose him to be the Elohist, 'came into contact with Egypt' or not; since the mention of Hagar as an *Egyptian* slave, and the fact that Jacob and his sons are said to have 'gone down into Egypt,' and the Midianites to have 'sold Joseph into Egypt,' and Joseph to have 'settled his father and his brethren in the land of Rameses,' G.xlvii.11, is all which E. tells us about Egypt, and surely there is nothing here which transcended the knowledge of such a man as Samuel.

30. But Bp.BROWNE, while he here ignores the well-known conclusions of some of the most eminent modern critics, *e.g.* that Deuteronomy was written in the age of Josiah and that Leviticus and large portions of Exodus and Numbers were written after the Captivity, spends two pages out of twenty in arguing against the absurd supposition that some one individual wrote the whole Pentateuch—a supposition which no critic of the present age, at all events, has ever thought of maintaining. He has apparently left the discussion of those other most important questions to others, though they would seem properly to belong to an 'Introduction to the Pentateuch.' In point of fact, all that Bp.BROWNE says on these points, to betray even a knowledge on his part of the existence of any such 'modern critical theories,' is comprised *literally* in the following three passages:—

We have seen how Solomon in his building of the Temple followed the pattern of the Tabernacle. *The reverse process, though it has been suggested, is simply impossible.\* p.19.*

It must be borne in mind that any *man* or *succession of men* attempting to write, or even extensively to rearrange and enlarge such a book as the Pentateuch, must have set to work in the most diligent and systematic manner to do so. *p.20.*

If modern critical theories be true, we must look not for one wise head and skilful hand, that should have produced such a result; but the fabric must have grown up bit by bit. An Elohist first, then a first, second, third, fourth, or even more Jehovists, who dovetailed their respective stories and their laws of many colours one into another; making a thing of shreds and patches, which nevertheless, when compacted together, has commanded the wonder of all ages, and *every portion of which has the same archaic character (!), the same familiarity with the Egypt of early dynasties, the same air of the desert, the same apparent impress of the great master's hand.* Such a result, under the conditions of Jewish history, is inconceivable as the work of any man; but it is such as the wildest fancy cannot attribute to an indefinite and widely separated succession of many men. *p.20.*

*Ans.* Setting aside the extravagant statements in the clauses above italicized, the combined judgment of the vast majority of the most learned scholars of this age, from the most careful consideration of the contents of the Pentateuch, concludes precisely the contrary to Bp. BROWNE'S assertion, *viz.* that those contents can only be explained on the supposition that the Pentateuch is the work of writers of different ages, the first and last being probably separated by several centuries.

\* *Why* it is 'simply impossible,' Bp. BROWNE does not tell us. But he asks the following extraordinary question in a note: 'Is it conceivable that Solomon, about to build a Temple to be the glory of his nation, and for the special honour of his God, would have constructed it in fashion like a tent of the desert, in order that it might fit into the story of the desert wanderings, and the sacred tabernacle carried through the desert?'

It is very difficult to see what Bp. BROWNE means. But I suppose his argument to be that Solomon cannot be supposed to have built his Temple in order that it might be a pattern for the Tabernacle, *which he himself intended to introduce into his story of the Exodus.* If this is *not* Bp. BROWNE'S meaning, I must confess I do not know what is. But, if he really means this, I can only say that it would be simply absurd to suppose that Solomon built his Temple with any view to its being imitated by himself or by anyone else in the account of the Tabernacle. But why is it 'simply impossible' that a later writer should have taken the Temple as a model for the Tabernacle, without Solomon having had the least idea of preparing such a model?



# INTRODUCTION TO GENESIS.

---

E. HAROLD BROWNE, D.D.

BISHOP OF ELY.





## INTRODUCTION TO GENESIS.

---

### 1. Bp. BROWNE next takes in hand generally the Book of Genesis.

(i) If it be once admitted that the Pentateuch, as a whole, is due to Moses, there can be no difficulty in admitting that Genesis, the most ancient part of the Pentateuch, is due to him . . . either as *author* or *compiler*. p.21.

*Ans.* This may be admitted: but as Bp. BROWNE has brought no satisfactory evidence whatever to prove that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, it remains to be proved that he wrote the Book of Genesis.

(ii) If, however, adverse criticism has been busy in trying to dislocate all portions of the Pentateuch, to disprove its unity, and so to shake the evidence for its Mosaic origin, it has been signally busy in so dealing with Genesis. If Moses wrote the later books, he certainly wrote Genesis; and, on the other hand, if he did not write Genesis, he wrote nothing. Hence, to shake the foundation of Genesis is to destroy the whole fabric of the Pentateuch. p.21.

*Ans.* Bp. BROWNE seems incapable of supposing that 'adverse critics' may really be simply wishing to find out the fact, and may be governed in their labours by a purpose quite as honest as his own, to be the servants of the Truth. Admitting, however, as in (i), that 'if Moses wrote the later books, he most probably wrote Genesis,' yet obviously it does not at all follow that 'if he did not write Genesis, he wrote nothing.' On the contrary, BLEEK, one of the most conservative of 'adverse critics,' who maintains that the Elohist Narrative in Genesis was written in the age of Samuel, p.263, and that the Jehovistic insertions were made in the reign of David, p.271—and so far agrees very closely with our own view—considers that there are 'many laws to be found, which seem to bear evident traces of the Mosaic age, especially in Leviticus, but also in Numbers and Exodus—laws, namely, which refer to relations and circumstances which only existed while the people, as in the time of Moses, travelled about in the wilderness, and lived thickly crowded together in a camp and under tents'—and thinks that 'there is the greatest probability that these laws not only originated from Moses as to

their substantial contents, but were actually written down, in the form in which the Pentateuch delivers them to us, by Moses himself, or at all events in Mosaic times.' p.183.

BLEEK's reasoning, indeed, in support of the Mosaic origin of these passages, is no more convincing than Bp.BROWNE's in support of the Mosaic origin of the whole Pentateuch. But the fact that Bp.BROWNE can make such an assertion as the above, is another instance both of the defective character of his own critical judgment, and of the *unfairness* which marks his criticisms, when he ascribes to his adversaries, as here, an unworthy motive—a wish to 'destroy the fabric of the Pentateuch'—as a reason for their trying to 'shake the foundation of Genesis,' or when he calls to his aid his reader's prejudices by using repeatedly the word 'forger'—see *Introd. to Pent.* (5.viii)—and speaking here again, p.22, of 'the piously fraudulent labours' of the supposed writers of the Pentateuch.

2. Next, Bp.BROWNE, after mentioning ASTRUC's well-known suggestion of the distinction between the Elohist and Jehovistic passages in Genesis, goes on to ridicule the different attempts of modern criticism to solve the difficult problem of the composition of the Pentateuch.

(i) Later writers have varied this theory with every possible variation—some believing that there was one Elohist and one Jehovistic document; others that there were more than one Elohist and many Jehovists, &c. p.22.

*Ans.* Bp.BROWNE does not give his readers a hint of the fact that there is perfect unanimity—as far as I am aware—among 'adverse writers' of the present day as to the later post-Mosaic origin of Deuteronomy. Even BLEEK fixes the composition of this book 'in the period between Hezekiah and Josiah,' p.302, 'possibly under Josiah in the first years of his reign,' p.303—which last is exactly our own view (VI.24). On this point, therefore, there is already a very general—if not, as I believe, unanimous—agreement among such critics. And this point alone overthrows the whole system which Bp.BROWNE is so zealously maintaining. It is quite a secondary question whether there was one Elohist or more, whether this or that passage of Genesis should be assigned 'to the first or second Elohist, to the first, second, third, or fourth Jehovist'; and for some time to come there may well remain difference of opinion on these details, (which in the case of any other book in the world no one would ever take such pains to investigate), without in any way disturbing the above conclusion as to the later origin of Deuteronomy.

(ii) Another step has been to suggest that the different documents, often, as it is alleged, giving different versions of the same story, have been carelessly and

clumsily put together. And a step further still has been to deny that Moses could be either the Elohist, the Jehovist, or the compiler and redactor, it being evident that *the whole was a later work*, due perhaps to Samuel, perhaps to Hilkiah or Jeremiah, perhaps still later to Ezra or some survivor from the Captivity, or possibly to a collection of the labours, the *piously fraudulent* labours, of them all. *p.22.*

*Ans.* Bp. BROWNE here would seem to be unacquainted with the real state of 'adverse criticism' in respect of the Pentateuch; for I do not, of course, suppose that the above statement is merely a 'piously fraudulent labour' to throw dust in his reader's eyes. But he here again, as so frequently in the former Introduction (29), would lead him to suppose that modern critics maintain that some one person—Samuel, Hilkiah, Jeremiah, Ezra—wrote 'the whole Pentateuch,' merely throwing in, as a sort of casual conjecture of theirs, the 'possibility' that the work may be the result of the labours of different ages. Bp. BROWNE *ought* to know that the supposition in question—absurd in the light of critical knowledge now obtained by the researches of diligent enquirers—is entirely without foundation. At any rate, he is utterly misstating the views of the most eminent modern critics in ascribing such an opinion to any of them.

With respect to the 'different versions of the same story' in Genesis, we shall see how Bp. BROWNE deals with this question below—see *Genesis* (16, 18, 19, 22, 56, 115, 131, 135, 142).

3. Bp. BROWNE then mentions what he calls 'the salient points' in the arguments of such critics, *viz.* the two versions of the story of the Creation and the Deluge, one in each case Elohist, the other Jehovistic, and he adds:—

Similar phenomena are said to prevail throughout the book, and even throughout the Pentateuch; but these are the two most observable.

Then comes the well-known passage in E. vi. 3, where the Most High says to Moses that He was known to the fathers by the name of El-Shaddai, but by the name Jehovah He was not known to them. *p.22.*

*Ans.* Similar phenomena *are said* to prevail, &c. '! Bp. BROWNE cannot even admit that there are other passages in which 'similar phenomena' appear, however they may be explained. But let anyone compare G. xii. 14–20 with G. xx. 1–17 and G. xxvi. 1, 6–16, G. xxi. 22–32 with G. xxvi. 26–33, G. xxviii. 10–19 with G. xxxv. 9–15, E. xvi. 11–13 with N. xi. 31–33, E. xvi. 14, 15 with N. xi. 4–9, E. xvii. 1–7 with N. xx. 2–13.

4. In order, therefore, to repel the attacks of 'adverse criticism,' Bp. BROWNE undertakes to maintain two propositions,

the first of which is that *there is unity of plan and purpose throughout the Book of Genesis*. And, having devoted three whole columns (out of twenty) to prove the truth of this first proposition, which 'space will not allow' of his maintaining at further length, he concludes as follows, p.24 :—

This brief review of the divisions of Genesis shows that it was not a *loosely compacted structure, carelessly or clumsily thrown together by some one, who found a variety of heterogeneous materials, and determined to mass them all in one*, but that it was drawn up carefully, elaborately, and with distinct unity of purpose, whether from pre-existing documents or not, it matters comparatively little to enquire. p.24.

*Ans.* Bp.BROWNE's labour is unnecessary, as far as my own criticisms are concerned; since I do not hold the view of the character of Genesis above italicized, but believe with BLEEK, and indeed, as we shall see below (14), with Bp.BROWNE himself, that the Jehovist, whoever he may have been, wrote expressly to supplement the older Elohist Narrative, and, of course, in that case maintained the 'unity of plan and purpose throughout' which he found in that story, notwithstanding certain discrepancies and contradictions, which show that the book has not proceeded all from one mind. To what, for instance, does 'thence' refer in G.xx.1, since the passage immediately preceding, xix.30-38, refers to Lot's proceedings in the mountain near Zoar?

But even those critics who think otherwise, as HUPFELD and KUENEN, and suppose that different complete narratives have been combined by some later editor, would entirely object to Bp.BROWNE's caricature of their opinions, and would assume that the 'compiler or redactor' had a 'plan and purpose' of his own, which he carried out with care when he blended together the older documents to form the present Book of Genesis, even as Moses himself must have done according to Bp.BROWNE—see (14) below—when he combined the older Elohist matter, received from the Israelites in Egypt, with his own Jehovistic insertions.

5. Bp.BROWNE's 'second position' is, that '*the use of the names of God* [‘Elohim’ and ‘Jehovah’] *is neither arbitrary nor accidental, but consistent throughout with the Mosaic authorship and the general scope of the history.*' p.22.

We meet also with *El*, with *Eliou*, 'Most High,' occurring only in G.xiv.18 in connection with *El*, *El-Eliou*, 'God Most High,' though in the Psalms it is found with Elohim and Jehovah, and also stands alone, and *Shaddai*, 'Almighty,' in the

Pentateuch generally with *El, El-Shaddai, elsewhere standing alone.* The name Elohim . . . does not occur in the singular in the earlier books of Scripture, except in the abbreviated form of El. p.24.

*Ans.* Bp. BROWNE's statements are *inaccurate*; *El-Shaddai* occurs in Ez.x.5, and *Eloah* in D.xxxii.15,17.

6. Then Bp. BROWNE tries to account for the use of 'Elohim' in some passages and 'Jehovah' in others, by the difference in meaning of the two words.

(i) *Elohim* is 'a title rather than a name,' being 'applied to God as comprehending in Himself the fulness of all power and all the attributes which the heathen ascribe to their several divinities,' and used of Him as 'the Mighty One, the God of creation and providence'; whereas *Jehovah* is a 'Proper Name' of the God of Israel, and would be employed 'when the history of the chosen people or their ancestors is specially concerned, and the stream of the Theocracy traced down from its fountain-head.' p.24.

*Ans.* The distinction in the meaning of the two words has been fully exhibited, as above, in (II.327-9).

But this, while it might be used (as it is by Bp. BROWNE) to explain the use of Elohim in G.i, will not account for its use in other places, e.g. G.xlvi.2,3, 'And *Elohim* spake unto Israel in the visions of the night and said, "Jacob, Jacob." And he said, "Here am I." And he said, "I am *Elohim*, the Elohim of thy father,"' or in Jacob's last words to Joseph, lxviii.11,15,20,21, or, generally, for 'Elohim' being used 87 times in the Elohistic Narrative and 'Jehovah' only *once*, G.xvii.1, if this single exception be not due to a mere slip of a copyist (V.27).

(ii) The Semitic tongues very frequently repeat the noun. In consequence of this the several passages will to an European eye look as if they were strongly marked either by the title Elohim or by the name Jehovah. For instance, it is alleged that in the first account of the creation, G.i.1-ii.3, Elohim occurs thirty-five times, and that there is here no other name of God. But . . . the passage is scarcely more really marked as Elohistic by the name Elohim occurring thirty-five times than if it had occurred but once; for its having occurred once would *inevitably* lead to its continued and frequent recurrence. p.25.

*Ans.* 'Would *inevitably* lead, &c.!' Then let the reader turn to E.iii.1-18, and observe how 'Jehovah' and 'Elohim' are interchanged in v.2,4,6,7,11, 12,13, (N.B. v.4), before any special revelation of the Name, or to N.xxii, where he will find the same phenomenon in v.8,9,10,12,13,18,19,20,22 (N.R. v.8,9, v.19,20), or to G.xxx.22-24,27,30, where in five verses we have

‘Elohim’ *thrice* and ‘Jehovah’ *thrice*! In short, the table of MR. QUARRY,\* to which Bp. BROWNE appeals in a note with so much confidence as—showing how different the *virtual* occurrence of the respective names is from the apparent superficial occurrence on which so much has been built—

is a simple absurdity, when we take account of the above passages, or even of G.vii.1-16, where we have *Jehovah*, v.1,5, *Elohim*, v.9, and both *Elohim* and *Jehovah* in v.16!

No doubt, it is true that ‘Semitic tongues very frequently repeat the noun.’ But that is no reason why the noun repeated in certain passages should be *always* Elohim as a personal name,—e.g. i.1-ii.3 (35 times), vi.9-13 (4 times), ix.1-17 (6 times), xvii.3-23 (7 times), xxxv.9-15 (6 times)—and never once Jehovah, and in certain other passages should be *always* Jehovah—e.g. iv.1-16 (9 times), xviii (9 times), &c.—and never once Elohim. Such a difference in style in any other book would surely be regarded as very probably pointing to a difference in the writers of the two sets of passages. And the probability is confirmed into a certainty when we find each of these two sets of passages characterised by a peculiar phraseology, no trace of which appears in the other (V.26-36).

7. Bp. BROWNE then proceeds to consider E.vi.2,3, which is usually understood to mean that the name ‘Jehovah’ was then first revealed to Moses at the time of the Exodus, and was not known before, in which case a discrepancy would arise in the fact that this Name is put into the mouth of a number of persons in Genesis from Eve downwards, iv.1. Accordingly, Bp. BROWNE says that ‘the words of Exodus do not necessarily mean this,’ and he explains them by the following paraphrase:—

‘I manifested myself to the Patriarchs in the character of El-Shaddai, the Omnipotent God, able to fulfil that which I had promised; but as to my name (*i.e.* my character and attributes) of Jehovah, I was not made manifest to them.’ p.26.

*Ans.* It is hard to reconcile the above explanation with the fact that Jehovah Himself is represented as saying to Abraham, ‘I am Jehovah, &c.,’ G.xv.7, and that Abraham is said to have ‘believed in Jehovah,’ v.6; *comp.*

---

\* By reckoning thirty-five Elohim in G.i.1-ii.3, three in v.22-24, five in vi.9-22, four in ix.1-6, two in v.1, viii.1, ix.1-6, each set as *one*, and similarly with Jehovah, MR. QUARRY considers himself to have proved that, ‘as evidence of any predilection for either name, the case is just as if in G.i-xi Elohim had recurred singly fifteen times and Jehovah twelve times.’

also xxviii.21, xxxii.9. But even this might be granted to save the consistency of the Pentateuchal story (V.93), but for the fact that the Elohist Narrative, when extracted without the least reference to the use of Elohim, but solely by means of its style and phraseology, which differs entirely from that of the Jehovistic matter, does not once use 'Jehovah,' except in xvii.1—see (18.ii) below—while it contains 'Elohim' 87 times (V.27), and the same phenomenon is continued in Exodus, E.ii.23<sup>b</sup>–25, vi.2. This seems to show that the writer purposely forbore to use the Name Jehovah before the revelation to Moses in E.vi.2–5, and that, consequently, the words in E.vi.3 must be understood (as they usually are) to mean that, as JOSEPHUS says, *Ant.* II.xii.4, 'God declared to him His holy Name, which *had never been discovered to men before*'—notwithstanding the contradiction thus introduced (as above) into the story.

8. But one or two further remarks must be made on some observations of Bp.BROWNE in connection with this question.

(i) It follows, of course [*i.e.* from the meaning *we* assign to E.vi.2–5], that the *very first* who could possibly have written the original Elohist Narrative was Moses, the Jehovistic portions being necessarily much later than Moses. *p.*25.

*Ans.* Nothing 'follows' at all, except that the two sets of passages in Genesis are *at variance with each other*, unless it is also admitted that the Elohist matter is the older of the two, which I indeed maintain (VI. *App.*123), but which some eminent critics dispute. If, however, my view as to the meaning of the revelation in E.vi.2–5 is true, then the Elohist matter in Genesis, as Bp.BROWNE says, cannot possibly be *older* than Moses, since it shows throughout the same characteristics which we find in E.i.1–7, ii.23<sup>b</sup>–25, vi.2–5, and therefore belongs, no doubt, all to the same hand which recorded that revelation. But there is no reason why it should not be, as I maintain, of much *later* date than the time of the Exodus.

(ii) It is further argued, however, that the names compounded with the sacred name of Jah or Jehovah do not occur till the time of Samuel; hence it is added that the name could not have been known, nor E.vi.2–5 written, till the time of Samuel. And, further, it is now alleged that the name Jehovah is unknown even to the writer of the earlier Psalms, and that therefore probably David learned it late in life from its inventor Samuel. *p.*25.

*Ans.* Bp.BROWNE omits to mention that the composition of the Elohist Narrative has been fixed by BLEEK and myself in the age of Samuel, and by BÖHMER in the first seven years of David's reign, for various reasons derived from its contents, which are set forth at length in (V.90–135, VI.537, *App.* 123). If this be correct, it follows that it was most probably written either by the hand or under the direction of Samuel; and then the question arises,

What reason could Samuel have had for insisting so strongly on the revelation of this Name to Moses, or, in other words, (if we try to grasp the historical fact), *What reason could he have had for representing that the Israelites first received it at the time of the Exodus?* This question leads at once to the conjecture that they really adopted it from the tribes of Canaan, where it was in use already as the name of the Sun-God, the 'Baal' or Lord of the land—a fact which such a man as Samuel might not be willing to acknowledge, and hence he may perhaps have invented—Bp. BROWNE would say 'forged'—the account of its revelation to Moses (VI.574).

This being the case, it becomes important to examine (i) into the question of the occurrence of the name 'Jehovah' in the composition of Proper Names in Israel, and (ii) as to the use of 'Jehovah' in the earlier Psalms.

9. Bp. BROWNE then says that the 'romance of modern criticism is as remarkable as its perverse ingenuity'; and he ventures to assert that—

The wider the theory is from all that has hitherto been believed from *concurrent testimony* and *careful enquiry*, the more it finds acceptance and is hailed as a discovery. If we look a little more closely into the foundations of the theory, it will appear as baseless as other dreams. p.25.

We have seen already, *Introd. to Pent.* (4-21), what Bp. BROWNE'S 'concurrent testimony' really amounts to, and we have various specimens of his 'careful enquiry.' But this must not prevent us from soberly weighing the evidence which he produces upon the two points now before us.

'10. And first Bp. BROWNE discusses the question of Proper Names.

(i) First, as regards the names compounded with Jah, we have at all events *Jochebed*, *Joshua*, *Jonah*, *Jotham*, *Micah*, and *Jonathan*, and Mount *Moriah*, besides three named in Chronicles, *Azariah*, *Abiah*, *Ahijah*, 1Ch.ii.8,24,25, all of which at least appear to have been so compounded, and which it is a *gratuitous slander* to say were the inventions of later days. p.26.

*Ans.* Bp. BROWNE'S strong language must not prevent me from saying that I have shown that *Jochebed* is an 'invention of later days,' as it was evidently unknown to the writer of E.ii.1-10, and appears only in passages of the L.L. (E.vi.20, N.xxvi.59)—that *Joshua* belongs to the story of the Exodus, E.xvii.9, *comp.* N.xiii.16, and may therefore be explained as having been formed after the (supposed) revelation of the name to Moses, *comp.* E.xvii.15,16—that *Jonah* is nothing to the purpose, and hardly shows any



'careful enquiry' on the part of Bp. BROWNE, since, first, his name is *not* compounded with Jah, meaning simply 'a dove,' *D.B.* I.p.1120, and, secondly, if it were, yet Jonah lived 'plainly after the reign of Jehu,' *Ib.* p.1119—that no 'Mount Moriah' appears in the Pentateuch, but only 'the land of Moriah' in G.xxii.2, where, however, the name *Moriah*\* is more than doubtful (II.311-6)—that Ju.xviii.30, in which *Jonathan* appears, is clearly a later insertion, *comp.* the original notice in v.31, and belongs, in fact, to L.L. (VII)—and that the three names of the Chronicler are most probably fictitious.†

Thus of all Bp. BROWNE's names there remain only two, *Jotham* and *Micah*, to which we may add *Joash*; but neither of these three names is *certainly* compounded with Jah (II.456); and, if they are, yet they belong all to men of *Ephraim*, Ju.vi.11, ix.5, xvii.1; and it is possible that in the north of Canaan, where the name YAHVE or YAKHVE was specially in use among the Syrian and Phœnician tribes, Hebrew names may have been already compounded with this name, before it was adopted—in Samuel's time, as I suppose—as the name of the *National Deity* of Israel (VI.579).

(ii) Moreover, it by no means follows that one age should have had the fashion of a special form for the composition of names, because we find that fashion prevailing some centuries later. p.26.

---

\* In the expression in G.xxii.2, אֶל-אֲרֶץ הַמּוֹרִיָּה, the LXX has εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ὠψηλήν, (*comp.* G.xii.6, D.xi.30, אֶלֶן מוֹרֶה, 'Oak of Moreh,' τὴν δοῦν τὴν ὠψηλήν), *Aquila*, εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν καταφανῆ, *Symmachus*, εἰς τὴν γῆν τῆς ὀπτασίας, *Vulg.* in terram visionis, *Arab.* in regionem adorationis, *Onkelos*, in terram Divini cultus, *Syr.* in terram Amorrhæorum. It would seem that *Symm.* and *Vulg.* must have read מוֹרֶה, 'vision,' for מוֹרִיָּה, and possibly LXX and *Aquila* may have read the same, explaining the expression to mean that the 'land' or 'oak' was 'far-seen,' 'conspicuous,' 'lofty.' The Sam. Text has מוֹרֶה. Whatever, therefore, may be thought about the Chronicler's 'Mount Moriah,' on which the Temple was built, 2Ch.iii.1, where he plainly supposes the name derived from an 'appearance' of Jehovah to *David*, Bp. BROWNE cannot appeal to this name in G.xxii.2 as a name compounded with Jah. In fact, the land in question is identified by Mr. GROVE with the district 'in which the Oak of *Moreh* was situated,' *D.B.* II.p.422, far away from the Temple, in the neighbourhood of Mount Gerizim.

† The Chronicler gives no such names *before* the age of Jacob's *great-grand-children*, agreeing here with E.xlvi. But then he suddenly inserts a number of names compounded with Jah, in the *third* and *fourth* generations from those who went down to Egypt, *e.g.* *Azariah*, 1Ch.ii.8, *Abiah*, ii.24, *Ahijah*, ii.25, *Reaiah*, iv.2, *Rephaiah*, vii.2, *Izrahiah*, and his sons, *Obadiah*, *Joel*, *Ishiah*, v.3, *Abiah*, v.8. Yet these are the very generations just before and at the time of the *Exodus*; and not a single instance of this kind appears among the names in the Pentateuch, except *Jochebed* and *Joshua*.

*Ans.* I understand Bp. BROWNE to mean that we need not expect that in the times *before* Samuel the fashion of compounding names with Jah must have existed, where he admits apparently the greater frequency, at all events, of such names in the later age; as also HENGSTENBERG allows (quoted by me in II. p. 349) that 'names compounded with Jehovah become much more frequent from the time of Samuel.'

Bp. BROWNE's position, as above stated, of course is true. But the fact in question remains the same, that *before* Samuel we find such names very rare in the historical books, if they occur at all. This accords, at all events, with our view that the name 'Jehovah'—even if in use, especially in the northern parts of the land—was not yet recognized as the name of the *National Deity* of Israel.

(iii) Names compounded with *any* names of God are rare in the early ages, but became common in the latter. p. 26.

*Ans.* This is rather a strong assertion for one who maintains the historical character of the Pentateuch, since we have not only *sixteen* names in Genesis compounded with *El*, viz. Mahaleel, Mehujael, Eliezer, Ishmael, Israel, Kemuel, Bethuel, Adbeel, Reuel, Eliphaz, Mehetabel, Magdiel, Jemuel, Jahleel, Malchiel, Jahzeel, and not one with Jehovah, but *nine* names out of 24 in N. i. 5–15, *four* in xiii. 4–15, *seven* in xxxiv. 19–28, are compounded with *El*, and not one with Jehovah. I might fairly press this argument as against Bp. BROWNE. But, as I am not fighting for victory, but desire by 'careful enquiry' to find out the truth, I will at once admit that these last names do not belong to the Older Story, but are due to the L.L., which has perhaps merely copied the type of the Elohist in Genesis.

If we turn, however, to the historical books, we find Othniel, Ju. iii. 9, Elimelech, R. i. 2, Elkanah, Elihu, 1S. i. 1, Samuel, i. 20, Eleazar, vii. 1, Saul's grandfather, Abiel, ix. 1, David's brother, Eliab, xvi. 6, Saul's sons-in-law, Adriel, xviii. 19, and Phaltiel, 2S. iii. 15; while Samuel's firstborn son was *Jo-el* = 'Jehovah is Elohim,' 1S. viii. 2, as if Samuel was at the time of his birth bringing the name 'Jehovah' into more popular use. After this time, names with Jah become more common; though David had four sons, Elishua, Elishama, Elyadah, Eliphalet, 2S. v. 15, 16.

Moreover, names were often compounded with *other* names of God besides *El* or *Jah*: see on this point my *Baalim in Israel*, App. V. Thus omitting several which occur in the L.L. of the Pentateuch, we have Melchizedek, G. xiv. 18, (*comp.* Zadkiel, Zedekiah, Jozadak), Abida, G. xxv. 4, (*comp.* Etyada, Jehoiada), Jerubbaal, Ju. vi. 32, Abiezer, Ju. vi. 34, (*comp.* Eliezer, Joezer, Azriel, Azariah), Abimelech, Ju. viii. 31, (*comp.* Elimelech), Abinadab, 1S. vii. 1, (*comp.* Jehonadab), Abiner (Abner), 1S. xiv. 50, (*comp.* Neriah).

It is, therefore, very far from correct to say that 'names compounded with any name of God were rare in the earlier ages.'

11. Next, Bp. BROWNE proceeds to consider the question of the Psalms.

Secondly, as regards the Psalms, there is no foundation whatever for saying that the earlier Psalms are Elohistie and the later only Jehovistic. Many of the manifestly and confessedly later Psalms (as the 72nd, 82nd, 114th, &c.) are eminently Elohistie, whilst many of the earliest (as the 24th, 27th, 34th, &c.) are as eminently Jehovistic. p.26. And Bp. BROWNE adds in a note that he 'has shown this more at length in his tract called *The Pentateuch and the Elohistie Psalms*.'

*Ans.* If the reader will refer to *App. II* of my Part V, p.290-304 he will find the said 'tract' carefully criticized, and shown to be like these two 'Introductions,' inaccurate and uncritical. For the present I need only say that the mention of '*manifestly and confessedly later (i.e. post-Exilic)* Psalms' as being 'eminently Elohistie' is altogether irrelevant. We have only now to do with the '*earliest*' Psalms, wishing to see if any of these are 'eminently Jehovistic,' so as to show that the name 'Jehovah' was already freely used in a very early age. Only I will note, as I pass, that Ps.lxxii, which Bp. BROWNE quotes as 'one of the manifestly and confessedly later Psalms,' is assigned by Mr. PEROWNE to Solomon's age—possibly the beginning of it: nay, in his 'tract,' p.61, Bp. BROWNE himself admits its probable or possible Davidic origin!

Now, as to the three Psalms which Bp. BROWNE quotes above as some of the '*earliest*,' Ps.xxiv is assigned by HUPFELD, DE WETTE, HITZIG, OLSHAUSEN, to a later date than the days of David's Tabernacle,—Ps.xxvii was written, says EWALD, p.67, 'when the Temple of Solomon had long been standing,' and Mr. PEROWNE assigns it to an advanced period of David's life, during Absalom's rebellion,—Ps.xxxiv is assigned by Mr. PEROWNE to '*the time of the Exile*,' while even HENGSTENBERG regards it as written in a late period of David's life. So much for Bp. BROWNE's utterly inaccurate statement that these are among the '*earliest*' Psalms.

On the theory that the name 'Jehovah' was adopted in Samuel's time as the name of the National Deity of Israel,—being that of the ancient Lord (Baal) of the land of Canaan, which Israel now formed into a nation for the first time claimed for its own,—it would be quite possible that any of these Psalms should be 'eminently Jehovistic.'

But there is a Psalm about the age of which Bp. BROWNE and myself are thoroughly agreed, viz. Ps.lxviii, which he claims as *Davidic*, and says, *Eloh. Psalms*, p.51:—'By no possibility could the Psalm have been composed before

the events mentioned in 2S.vi, *i.e.* the bringing-up of the ark to Mount Zion, to which events I refer it. Now this Psalm uses *Elohim* 31 times, *Adonai* 7 times, *Shaddai* in v.14, and *Jehovah* (*Jah*) only 4 times: and it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that, if this Psalm was really written in the 40th year of David's life and for such an occasion as this, and yet is so 'eminently Elohistie,' the name 'Jehovah' cannot as yet have come into familiar, popular use in Israel. Moreover, as we have seen in *Introd. to Pent.* (8.xix), v.1 of this Psalm is almost identical with N.x.35, but with this remarkable difference, that in the Psalm we find 'Elohim' where we have 'Jehovah' in N.x.35. It seems improbable that a writer of David's age would have changed into 'Elohim' the 'Jehovah' of the Pentateuch, if the latter was even ancient, and impossible, if it was regarded as Mosaic and Divine. I conclude therefore that N.x.35 is of later date than the Psalm, and that the words, which were actually used for the movement of the ark to Mount Zion, were afterwards adapted very naturally by a writer of the same age to suit the movements of the ark in the wilderness—the ark brought up by David having been, in fact, the ancient ark of Israel, the very ark which the Older Story of the Exodus supposes in the wilderness, not the so-called Mosaic Ark of the L.L. (VI.53).

Such is my argument; and it appears to me that, in the absence of any single instance of a Psalm which is *certainly* older than Ps.lxviii and yet is 'eminently' Jehovistic, this argument is very strong, unless the view of those eminent critics is correct who differ from Bp.BROWNE and myself, and assign this Psalm to a time after the Captivity. I believe that the force of this reasoning will be admitted by any who are convinced that this Psalm is really Davidic, and who do not reject, as Bp.BROWNE does, all the results of 'adverse criticism' as to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. It would be still further strengthened if Ps.li and Ps.lx are also, as I think, and as Bp.BROWNE also allows (*Eloh. Ps.*), Davidic Psalms. And, even if any Psalms should be produced which are unquestionably earlier than Ps.lxviii and are yet Jehovistic, the force of the argument from this latter Psalm will not be destroyed; since the name 'Jah' or 'Jehovah' is used four times in it, and such Psalms may have been written by authors who were still more inclined to employ it. I repeat, if Ps.lxviii is really Davidic and composed for the occasion of bringing up the ark, it seems to give plain evidence that in that age the name Jehovah was not yet in full recognition as the name of the National Deity of Israel. If, on the other hand, the Davidic age of this Psalm be rejected, then I shall have lost the *additional* confirmation of my view, as to the time when 'Jehovah' began to be used as the name of the God of Israel, which might have been derived from its 'eminently Elohistie' character,—and that is all. The evidence in support of that view does not at all stand in need of such confirmation. And

Bp. BROWNE has entirely misrepresented the state of the case when he says, *Eloh. Psalms*, p. 66: 'We may thank Bp. Colenso for having rested his case so largely on the testimony of the Psalmists.'

12. Bp. BROWNE next considers the form and derivation of the name Jehovah.

(i) Some of the German writers indeed have tried to trace the name to an attempt at expressing in Hebrew letters the name of the Phœnician God IAO.\* *Time will not allow of a lengthened consideration of this theory here.* Suffice it to say that its chief support is an oracular response of the Clarian Apollo, quoted by Macrobius about 400 A.D., which has been clearly proved by Jablonsky to have originated in [? with] a Judaizing Gnostic. p. 26.

*Ans.* On the other hand LAND (*Theol. Tijdschr.*, March 1868) maintains the genuineness of this oracle, since 'after the closest examination there appears not a trace in it of later Greek or of defective versification, of anything whereby the fictitious oracles of a later age always betray themselves.' See (V. *App.* iii), where the oracle in question is quoted, as given by MOVERS with his remarks upon it: among other things, he says, 'Jablonsky's reasons are very unimportant and altogether unworthy of mention.' With the correction of *νηπευβια* for *νηπευθια* and *παύρη* for *παύρηη*, it may be translated as follows:—

'It was right that those knowing the mysteries should conceal the soul-soothing (secrets); but in deceit there is a little sense and a slight understanding. Take notice that IAO is the highest of all the gods—in winter Hades, Zeus in the beginning of spring, Helios in summer, and in the autumn tender IAO.'

And this oracle is explained by LAND as follows:—'IAO is the highest of all the gods, because he gives life to all, and his dwelling is heaven which spreads over all. Yet in heaven he reveals himself specially by the Sun. In winter, when the nights are longest, the god prefers to dwell in the under world as Ζεύς χθόριοις, and rules over the shades as Hades. In the spring-time, when the grain-harvest is at hand, all depends upon the weather, upon sufficient rain and sunshine; and the god is addressed as Zeus, as especially the god of heaven and of the weather. In the summer he is the scorching Helios, which burns up everything and is tempered by no cloud. Lastly, in the autumn comes the ripeness of the fig, pomegranate,

---

\* Since the Phœnician language was almost identical with the Hebrew, there would have been no great difficulty in 'expressing in Hebrew letters' a Phœnician name. Bp. BROWNE should have said that IAO was the result of an attempt at expressing in Greek letters the Phœnician (or Hebrew) name for the Deity.

and above all of the grape, with its mysterious life-awakening juice; and now is the god known as the tender IAO, the spring of all beauty, love, and life.' It is obvious how closely this corresponds to the worship of Dionysos.

But the argument for the Phœnician or Syrian origin of this name does not by any means depend upon the Clarian oracle. I must refer to (V. App.iii), where I have given at full length the proofs alleged by MOVERS in support of this view.

(ii) Bp.BROWNE then says very truly that the name JHVH is part of the verb הוה, 'to be,'—probably the 3rd pers. pres. or the same tense of the Hiphil form—'in fact, YAHVE, meaning HE IS or HE-MAKES-TO-BE (V.335).

But, if so, there can be no question that the name must have been pre-Mosaic. . . In Hebrew the verb is *always* הוה, though in Syriac and Chaldeæ it is always הוה. A name, therefore, derived from הוה and existing in ancient Hebrew must have come down from a time prior to the separation of the Hebrews from their kindred Aramæans, *i.e.* not later than the time of Abraham. . . . We must conclude then that the name Jehovah was not unknown to the Patriarchs. p. 26.

*Ans.* It may have been a very ancient name in the north of Canaan, long before the Hebrews came out of Egypt and adopted it as the name of their National Deity.

Bp.BROWNE, however, is *inaccurate* in his assertions; since the verb is not 'in Hebrew *always* הוה,' for we find הוה in G.xxvii.29, Is.xvi.4, Job xxxvii.6, Neh.vi.6, Ecc.ii.22, xi.3.

The bold inference from so defective an argument—'We *must* conclude, &c.'—is thoroughly characteristic of Bp.BROWNE as a commentator.

(iii) The theory, then, of the late invention of this sacred Name has really no foundation. That its use was very much more prevalent after the revelation to Moses in Exodus than it had been before, there can be no reasonable doubt. p.26.

*Ans.* Even Bp.BROWNE, I imagine, must suppose that the name 'Jehovah' *may* have been 'invented' somewhere, at some time, by somebody, as much as 'Elohim' or 'Zeus' or 'Dionysos;' since the Patriarchs used it—see (ii) above—before the revelation in E.vi.2-5, and there is no sign of their having received it by any special Divine communication. But, on our view, it is not necessary to suppose that it was a 'late invention:' the point is, that it was not adopted before *the national life began* in the age of Samuel as the name of the National Deity of Israel.

Bp.BROWNE, however, is *inaccurate* in his statements. Let any one look at G.iv.1-16, xi.5-9, xii.7,8, xvi.7-13, xxiv, xxv.21-23, xxix.31-35, xxxix.1-5, E.iv.1-14, and he will see that 'Jehovah' is used in the Pentateuch as freely *before* the revelation in E.vi.2-5 as after it, *e.g.* see E.xviii—but only

in *Jehovistic* passages, which strikingly contrast with the *Elohistic* passages in which they are imbedded.

13. Bp. BROWNE now suddenly makes a complete gyration in his reasoning. He had argued, first, that there were special reasons why 'Elohim' should have been used in certain passages and 'Jehovah' in others (6.i); secondly, that the *appearance* of Elohimism or Jehovism was deceptive, as the fact of either name having occurred once in any passage 'would inevitably lead to its continued and frequent recurrence,' (6.ii.)—all this tending to imply that the distinction made by 'adverse critics' between Elohistic and Jehovistic passages was without any real foundation. But now he tells us that the Elohistic passages *are* quite distinct from the Jehovistic—they are older documents which Moses copied, while the Jehovistic are his own composition!

14. The passage is so curious that I must extract it at some length:—

Let us then suppose that Moses had access to or knowledge of *oral or written traditions* concerning the Creation, which must from the nature of the case have been originally matter of revelation, the Flood, the history of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, it is most likely that he would have made these the groundwork of his history. If the name Jehovah was known to the Patriarchs, but had, as seems most likely from the first chapters of Exodus, been *latterly but little used, perhaps wholly disused, among the Israelites in Egypt*, then it is pretty certain that these *traditions or documents* would have had El, Elohim, or Elion, for the name of God, perhaps even to the exclusion of the name Jehovah. In working up these materials into a continuous history, *some of the documents would be preserved entire*, others might be so arranged and so worded as to fit them to be connecting links one with the other, while we should probably find many portions of the history in the hand of the author or compiler himself. If Moses was that author, though he would often use the name Elohim, we might naturally expect to find that he had a fondness for that sacred Name by which the Most High had declared Himself as the special Protector of His people; and hence we might look for that name in passages where another writer perhaps would not have introduced it. . . .

Now the facts of Genesis remarkably coincide with all this probability. Some portions of the narrative do indeed present what is called an Elohistic aspect, and

especially those portions which of their very nature are most likely to have existed in the *traditions current from old time* among the Israelites, *viz.* the general account of the Creation, the Flood, the covenant of Circumcision made with Abraham, and the genealogical tables. These, then, Moses appears to have adopted, *much as he found them, perhaps* perpetuating, *word for word*, in his writings *what before had been floating in unwritten record*. Yet these portions of the narrative are not loosely thrown in, but rather carefully and organically incorporated and imbedded in the whole.

For instance, in the history of the Creation, we have first in G.i.1-ii.3 that which was very probably the *ancient primeval record* of the formation of the world. It may even have been communicated to the first man in his innocence. At all events, it very probably was *the great Semitic tradition*, handed down from Noah to Shem, from Shem to Abraham, and from Abraham through Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph, to the Israelites who dwelt in Egypt. *Without interfering with the integrity of this*, the sacred author proceeds in the same chapter to add a *supplementary* history, briefly recapitulating the history of Creation, with some little addition in v.4-7, and then proceeding to the history of Paradise, the Fall, the Expulsion, and the first bitter fruits of disobedience. In the first part of this second or supplementary history, we meet with a signal phenomenon, *viz.* that from ii.4 to the end of iii. the two names of God, Jehovah and Elohim, are used continually together. There is no other instance in Scripture of this continued and repeated use of the united names. It is evident that the author, who adopted the first ancient record and stamped it with his authority, and who desired to bring his people to the worship of the great self-existent Jehovah, used this method of transition from the *ancient Elohist document* to his own more immediate narrative, in order that he might more forcibly impress upon his readers that the Elohim who created all things was also the Jehovah who had revealed himself to Moses. . .

If the basis of the history of the Flood were an ancient Elohist document, Moses appears to have interwoven it with a further narrative of his own. The one portion may be marked by the prevalence of one name, the other by that of another name of God: but the consistency of the one with the other is complete throughout. p.27,28.

*Ans.* It will be seen that Bp. BROWNE wavers so much between 'oral or written traditions,' 'traditions or documents,' 'some of the documents,' 'traditions current from old time,' 'what before had been floating in unwritten record,' 'the ancient primeval record,' 'the great Semitic tradition,' 'the ancient Elohist document,' and so, p.29, 'Elohist MSS. or traditions,' 'the more ancient documents,' that it is not easy to say what he really thinks, nor probably would he be able to say himself. He sees, no doubt, that an 'unwritten record' handed down from Adam to Noah—

'from Noah to Shem, from Shem to Abraham, and from Abraham through Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph, to the Israelites who dwelt in Egypt,' and who 'had latterly



but little used, perhaps wholly disused' the name Jehovah, though it was 'known to the Patriarchs'—

would hardly be likely to remain unaltered from the form in which Adam delivered it, in the course of 2,500 years, at least according to ordinary experience,—would, in fact, be certain to be greatly distorted, as anyone knows who has tried the modern game of tradition, by passing even a short story from one to another through the mouths of three or four persons— independently of the substitution by the Israelites in Egypt of 'Elohim' wherever Adam or any other of the antediluvian or postdiluvian Patriarchs had happened to use 'Jehovah.' On the other hand, if there were written records we should have to consider whether Adam knew the art of writing, or whether it was invented before or after the Flood, so as to allow time for the original *oral* tradition to be corrupted; and in any case it must surprise us not to find 'Jehovah' used at all in the 'ancient Elohist *document*,' if the Patriarchs used it, unless, indeed, it was copied by the Israelites in Egypt, before it reached the hands of Moses, and altered by the deliberate substitution everywhere of 'Elohim' for 'Jehovah.' But, whether oral or written traditions, Bp. BROWNE has no doubt that Moses

'would have preserved some of the documents *entire*,' and 'perpetuated word for word in his writings what before had been floating in unwritten record.'

If ever the 'perverse ingenuity' of 'modern *orthodoxy*' has been exhibited, it is surely here. The primary assumption that the Israelites in Egypt had 'little used, perhaps wholly disused,' the name Jehovah which their fathers used, is very extravagant, and based, no doubt, upon the fact that Elohim occurs in E.i.17,20,21, and that E.ii.23<sup>b</sup>-25 contains Elohim five times, which last is merely due to the circumstance that it is part of the Elohist Narrative, betraying distinctly the style of the Elohist in Genesis. But the whole theory is absurd, so that it is not worth while to contradict it further. Nor is it necessary to do more than notice the 'singular point of resemblance' which Bp. BROWNE points out with special emphasis as 'very remarkable' in G.i.26(E), 'Let us make man,' and iii.22(J), 'the man is become as one of us,' *comp.* xi.7(J.), 'Let us go down'—since on our view it presents no difficulty, and is not at all 'remarkable,' though Bp. BROWNE finds in it an allusion to the Trinity in Unity.

15. The result, however, of Bp. BROWNE's criticism is that *Moses* was the *Jehovist* who adopted the 'ancient Elohist *document*,' and 'worked up these materials into a continuous history,' 'some of the documents being preserved entire, and others so arranged and so worded, as to fit them to be connecting links one with the other;' and especially Moses inserted the second account of the Creation, and enlarged the story of the Flood,

and throughout the former, in G.ii.4-iii.24, used the compound name 'Jehovah-Elohim'—

in order that he might more forcibly impress upon his readers that the Elohim who created all things was also the Jehovah who had revealed Himself to Moses.

This last agrees so far with our view that we too hold that the Jehovist, writing in David's time, when the name Jehovah had come into popular use, used the compound name in order to show that 'Jehovah' was the same as the 'Elohim' of the older narrative, written in the age—perhaps by the hand—of Samuel, with a view to the introduction of the name as that of the National Deity of Israel.

16. Bp. BROWNE then, however, falls back again upon the notion that the use of the names 'Elohim' and 'Jehovah' does not depend upon any peculiarity in the writers, though he has just told us that the Israelites in Egypt had 'latterly but little used, perhaps wholly disused' the name Jehovah, and therefore 'it is pretty certain that these traditions or documents,' which Moses adopted from them, 'would have had El, Elohim, or Elion, for the name of God, perhaps even to the exclusion of the name Jehovah.' He now says:—

Careful observation will show that, whilst often it was a matter of indifference whether the one or the other name was introduced, yet there was no mere carelessness in the introduction. On the contrary, in most passages it is impossible to doubt that the choice of the name adopted is the happiest possible. p.28.

And he gives some instances from Genesis of such design in the use of these names. In reply to which, I need only quote the following words of Mr. PEROWNE, who maintains the Mosaic authorship of the whole Pentateuch, *D.B. II. p.775*:—

The alleged design in the use of the Divine Names will not bear a close examination. It is no doubt true that throughout the story of the Creation in i.1.-ii.3, we have Elohim, and this squares with the hypothesis. There is some plausibility also in the attempt to explain the compound use of the Divine Names in the next section by the fact that here we have the transition from the History of the Creation to the History of Redemption. . . . That after the Fall it should be Jehovah who speaks in the history of Cain and Abel is on the same principle intelligible. . . . But when we come to the history of Noah, the criticism fails us. Why, for instance, should it be said

that 'Noah found grace in the eyes of *Jehovah*,' vi.8, and that 'Noah walked with *Elohim*,' vi.9? . . . So again, how can we satisfactorily account for its being said in vi.22, 'Thus did Noah according to all that *Elohim* commanded him, so did he,' and in vii.5, 'And Noah did according to all that *Jehovah* commanded him,' while again in vii.9, *Elohim* occurs in the same phrase? The elaborate ingenuity by which HENGSTENBERG, &c., attempt to account for the specific use of the several names in these instances, is in fact its own refutation. The stern constraint of a theory could alone have suggested it.

17. It is well known, however, that the distinction made by 'adverse critics' between the Elohist and Jehovistic portions of Genesis does not depend upon the use of the Divine Name, but upon the fact that the phraseology of the Elohist passages is throughout peculiar and perfectly distinct from that of the Jehovist. Accordingly, many passages which employ 'Elohim' throughout and not 'Jehovah' are *not* assigned to the Elohist, simply because they do not exhibit his style, *e.g.* xx.1-17, xxi.9-32, xxxv.1-8, xl-xlv, xlviii.8-22, l, &c. I have exhibited fully these differences of style in (V,26,30,35,36). And when Bp.BROWNE says that:—

the Creation and the Flood most clearly exhibit the phenomena relied on by the theorists and the facts leading to a refutation of their theory, *p.*28—

he asserts what is not the true state of the case, since in other parts of Genesis, and of Exodus also, the phenomena in question are quite as clearly exhibited.

18. But Bp.BROWNE proceeds now to throw doubt on these linguistic differences, even so far as to insinuate that they may not 'exist at all':—

(i) Again, verbal peculiarities are *said* to distinguish the so-called Jehovistic from the so-called Elohist portions of the Pentateuch, so that, besides the variety in the use of the names of God, it is possible for a keen eye to disentangle the different documents by noting the phraseology peculiar to each. It will be plain that, *if even this were proved and patent*, it would still not interfere with the Mosaic origin of Genesis, so long as we admit that Moses may have used the so-called Elohist MSS. or traditions. The Elohist phraseology would then be characteristic of the more ancient documents, the Jehovistic record would belong to

Moses himself. It is, however, very clear that the peculiarities are greatly magnified, *if they exist at all.* p.29.

*Ans.* If Moses copied these 'Elohistic MSS.' 'the ancient primeval record,' 'word for word,' as Bp.BROWNE supposes (14), it would be strange indeed if its phraseology agreed precisely with his own. Bp.BROWNE avoids any discussion of the question of these linguistic differences, merely referring in a note to Mr.QUARRY as having 'carefully and elaborately investigated' the matter, and having 'arrived at a conclusion the very reverse' of my own. From the specimen which we have had in (6.ii.) above of Mr. QUARRY'S mode of reasoning, so much approved by Bp.BROWNE, I am not surprised at this. But, on the other hand, I refer confidently to my Part V. in which I have shown (V.32)—

(1) That there are 29 formulæ which occur on an average each 10 times in the Elohistic Narrative, but do not occur at all in the rest of Genesis.

(2) That there are 20 formulæ which occur on an average each 47 times in the rest of Genesis, but do not occur at all in the Elohistic Narrative.

I challenge Bp.BROWNE to contradict the above facts. And I add also the words of Mr.PEROWNE, *D.B.* II.p.776—'we find that these duplicate narratives are characterised by peculiar modes of expression, and that, generally, the Elohistic and Jehovistic sections have their own distinct and individual colouring;' and, after quoting 'certain phrases peculiar to the Elohistic passages,' he sums up as follows:—

'There is therefore, it seems, good ground for concluding that besides some smaller independent documents, traces may be discovered of two original historical works, which form the basis of the present Book of Genesis and of the earlier chapters of Exodus.'

(ii) *Sometimes* indeed the theorists discover that a passage must belong to the Elohist, for instance, because it contains Elohistic expressions. But, then, though the name Jehovah occurs in it, that name must be a later insertion, because it does not correspond with the general wording of the chapter. Thus the name Jehovah in xvii.1 is argued to be evidently out of place, because Elohim occurs everywhere else (ten times) in the chapter. Surely this is constructing a theory in despite, not in consequence, of the facts on which it ought to stand. p.29.

*Ans.* Bp.BROWNE, though he says 'sometimes'—must be perfectly well aware that G.xvii.1, is the *only* instance in which such a phenomenon occurs in the whole Elohistic Narrative. And he seems to have forgotten that he himself, after Mr.QUARRY, has been 'constructing a theory in despite of the facts,' since according to his view—see (6.ii.) above—the writer having once begun with using Jehovah should 'inevitably' have gone on repeating it throughout the section, instead of using 'Elohim' continually, with the peculiar Elohistic phraseology. The occurrence of 'Jehovah' in v.1, may be

due to a slip of the copyist from whom our present Hebrew text is derived, or, as it is found in all the ancient versions, it may even be due to the original writer, who uses the name in E.vi.2, and may—inadvertently or intentionally—have employed it here, ‘Jehovah appeared to Abraham; without the general fact being at all affected, that throughout the whole Elohist Narrative he never employs the name again, and therefore plainly supposes it unknown before the revelation in E.vi.2–5; and, accordingly, he does not make ‘Jehovah’ say to Abraham, ‘I am Jehovah,’ but ‘I am El Shaddai.’

And this is all which Bp.BROWNE has to say about the ‘verbal peculiarities which are said to distinguish’ the Elohist from the Jehovistic portions of Genesis!

19. ‘Again,’ says Bp.BROWNE, ‘Anthropomorphisms are said to characterise the Jehovist passages,’ to which he replies that ‘they are far from exclusively belonging to the Jehovistic portions.’ *p.*29.

But I have shown in (V.43) that the anthropomorphisms of the Jehovist are very numerous and of the strongest kind, Jehovah being represented as ‘making a sound as He walks,’ iii.8, ‘making coats of skins and clothing the man and woman,’ iii.21, ‘expostulating with Cain, Sarah, and Abraham,’ iv.6,7, xviii.15, 23–32, ‘eating bread and meat,’ xviii.8, &c., whereas the Elohist merely speaks of Elohim ‘remembering’ Noah, Abraham, &c. making a covenant and appointing the sign of it, and ‘going up’ from Abraham and Jacob, xvii.22, xxxv.13.

20. ‘Lastly,’ says Bp.BROWNE:—

all the indications of a more advanced civilization, such as the use of gold, jewels, earrings, musical instruments, camels, servants, &c., are assigned to the Jehovist, and are thought to mark a period later than that of Moses. *p.*29.

*Ans.* Bp.BROWNE has misstated the argument. These ‘indications’ are not ‘assigned to the Jehovist,’ but they are found to exist only in Jehovistic passages, that is, in passages distinguished, not only by the use of ‘Jehovah,’ but by the Jehovistic peculiarities of diction; whereas none of these signs of ‘advanced civilization’ occur with the Elohist. From this fact—having already abandoned, for other sufficient reasons, all notion of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch—I have inferred (V.100-1,) that the Elohist

must have lived in a primitive age such as that of Samuel, and the Jehovist amidst the more advanced civilization of a later time, (V.143).

Bp.BROWNE, as usual (27), assumes *one* authorship for the whole Book of Genesis, when he says—

It is very doubtful whether *an author* even of the time of Samuel, more than doubtful whether one in the reign of Solomon, of Josiah, or one of those who returned with Ezra from the Captivity, could have written the history of the forefathers of his race with all the truthfulness, all the simplicity, and all the accuracy of detail, to be found in the Book which is called the First Book of Moses. MOSES could have written it, for he had every conceivable qualification for writing it. *The writer of after times*, who could have produced that book, must have been himself a wonder, unsurpassed by any of those wonders which he is supposed to have devised and recorded. p.29.

21. In conclusion, Bp.BROWNE devotes a page to the difficulties arising from ‘recent discoveries of Science,’ promising more in the Commentary on Genesis :—

In the present state of our knowledge, both critical and scientific, a patient suspension of judgment on many points seems our wisest attitude . . . Modern discovery is yet in a most imperfect condition, the testimony of the rocks and of the stars but imperfectly read, whilst there is room for no small diversity of sentiment on the meaning of many of the expressions in Genesis. p.30.

*Ans.* Here we have the well-known fallacy repeated, as if there were not already a multitude of thoroughly ascertained results, both in Science and Criticism, sufficient to demolish utterly the notion of the Mosaic Authorship and Divine Infallibility of the Pentateuch! But Bp.BROWNE would have us go on believing, and teaching our children to believe, a demonstrated falsehood as a Divine Truth, until men of science and ‘adverse critics’ are perfectly agreed on all the details of their different subjects of investigation.

22. On one point, however, Bp.BROWNE seems himself to feel a difficulty :—

At present the greatest inconsistency alleged as between Genesis and Science is to be found in the question of the *Antiquity of Man* . . . It is quite possible to believe that Genesis gives us no certain data for pronouncing on the time of man’s existence on the earth. The only arguments are to be drawn from the genealogies . . . If the genealogies before and after the Flood present us only with the names of *leading and representative* men, we can then allow no small latitude to those who would extend the duration of man upon earth to more than the commonly received 6,000 years. The appearance of completeness in the genealogies is an undoubted difficulty, yet perhaps not insuperable, when we consider all that may have hap-

pened (nowhere more probably than here) in the transmission of the text from Moses to Ezra and from Ezra to the destruction of Jerusalem. p.30.

*Ans.* And Bp.BROWNE might have added 'in the transmission of' the '*ancient Elohistie document*,' in which these genealogies occur, from Adam and Noah, through 'Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and Joseph, and the Israelites in Egypt,' to Moses—see (14) above. Doubtless, the 'appearance of completeness in the genealogies,' where the age is given of each Patriarch at the birth of his (? eldest) son, as well as at his death, is a considerable 'difficulty' in the way of adopting Bp.BROWNE's view. And the appeal to 'what may have happened in the transmission of the text' is simply a desperate clutching at a straw.

It is generally supposed, however, that the account of the Flood presents quite as stupendous 'inconsistencies' with the facts of Science as the question of the Antiquity of Man. We shall see how Bp.BROWNE deals with this matter in the Commentary.





THE BOOK OF GENESIS.

---

E. HAROLD BROWNE, D.D.

BISHOP OF ELY.



## THE BOOK OF GENESIS.

### Chap. i.

1. v.1. In the first two chapters of Genesis we meet with four different verbs to express the creative work of God, viz. 1. to create (בָּרָא), 2. to make, 3. to form, 4. to build. The first is used of the creation of the universe, v.1, of the creation of the great sea-monsters, whose vastness appears to have excited special wonder (!), v.21, and of the creation of Man, the head of animated nature, in the image of God, v.27. Everywhere else we read of God's making, as from an already created substance, the firmament, the sun, the stars, the brute creation, or of His forming the beasts of the field out of the ground, or lastly, of His building up into a woman the rib which He had taken from man . . . All heathen philosophy esteemed matter to have been eternal and uncreated . . . The word בָּרָא is evidently the common word for a true and original creation. p.31.

*Ans.* Not only are the 'great sea-monsters' said to have been 'created,' but man is spoken of as 'made in the likeness of God,' i.26, v.1, comp. vi.6,7, and so in i.1, 'the heaven and the earth' are created, whereas in ii.4<sup>b</sup>, 'earth and heaven' are made; and, on the other hand, the stars are spoken of as 'created.' Is.xl.26. The word בָּרָא has evidently no such meaning as Bp. BROWNE supposes. And the passage should probably be translated (VI.550, note)—'In the beginning of Elohim's forming the Heaven and the Earth, comp. ii.4<sup>b</sup>, v.1—(and the Earth was —) when the Earth was waste and emptiness, &c.—then said Elohim, Let there be light, and there was light;' where matter is supposed to have been already in existence, and accordingly we read of both 'earth' and 'waters' in v.2.

2. v.2. Countless ages may have elapsed between what is recorded in v.1, and what is stated in v.2. Some, indeed, have insisted on the close connection of v.2 with v.1, because they are united by the word *and*: but this particle, though necessarily implying transition, does by no means necessarily imply close connection . . . The meaning of the verse before us evidently is, 'In the beginning God created the universe,' but, at the time now to be spoken of, the earth was shapeless and waste. The verb *was*, as used in this verse, implies not *succession*, but *condition* at the time in question. p.32.

*Ans.* The Hebrew construction here, with the noun before the verb, implies a *dependent* clause, parenthetically introduced as in the translation given in (1), *comp.* the same phenomena in ii.4<sup>b</sup>-7, where the apodosis of direct narrative is taken up in v.7, 'then Jehovah-Elohim formed man, &c.

3. v.2. The Targum of Onkelos and many Jewish commentators render a *mighty wind was moving*, which is favoured, though not proved, by the absence of the article. p.32.

*Ans.* The idea, contained in the usual rendering, which Bp. BROWNE adopts, *viz.* 'the Spirit of God was brooding upon the face of the waters,' is undoubtedly a grand one. But it does not seem to have been that of the Hebrew writer, who merely supposes a mighty wind howling over the desolate waste of waters:—

4. v.3. Was light created before the creation of the sun? . . . Very probably the creation of the sun is related in v.1, where under the word heaven (or heavens) may be comprehended the whole visible universe of Sun, Moon, and Stars . . . Still probably there remains a clouded atmosphere, or other obstacle to the full vision of Sun and Sky. It is not till the fourth day that these impediments are removed, and the Sun appears to the earth as the great luminary of the day, the Moon and the Stars as reigning in the night. Light may, perhaps, have been created before the Sun. Yet the statement, that on the first day not only was there light but the succession of day and night, seems to prove that the creation of the Sun was 'in the beginning,' though its visible manifestation in the firmament was not till the fourth day. p.32.

*Ans.* Certainly, the statement, that 'the evening and the morning were the first (second, third) day,' would 'seem to prove' that the sun must have been already created: otherwise, it is not easy to understand how the earth's rotation could have caused the phenomena of 'evening' and 'morning.' But then this is opposed to the plain meaning of the Scripture story; for the word 'made' is used in v.16 of the making of the sun and moon, just exactly as it is used in v.25 of the making of the beasts, cattle, and creeping things; and, if the former were 'created' in v.1, 'under the word heaven,' why not also the latter 'under the word earth'? Bp. BROWNE, however, goes on to suggest that—

the whole period of chaotic darkness may have been the first night, and the first day that period of light which immediately succeeded the darkness—

on which point see (11) below.

5. v.4. The earlier the records, the more we find in them of anthropopathic language, as the better fitted to simple understandings. p.32.

*Ans.* The anthropopathic language of the Elohist, *e.g.* 'God saw the light that it was good' in this verse, differs much in character from the grosser forms of the Jehovist (V.43).

6. v.6. In v.6 the clouds and mists are described as raised up above the firma-

ment, the firmament itself dividing between the waters of the ocean and the clouds of heaven. It is plain from this that the word rendered 'firmament' embraces the atmosphere immediately surrounding the surface of the earth, in or on the face of which also the birds are described as flying, *v.20*. In *v.14* the word is *extended* (!) further to embrace the whole region of the sky in which Sun and Moon and Stars appear. *p.33*.

*Ans.* It is plain that the Hebrew writer had no notion of the enormous distances of the heavenly bodies, but supposed them all placed in the 'firmament,' above which were stored in the clouds the treasures of rain, and on the face of which the birds flew.

7. *v.14. Let there be light*] lit. *luminaries*, light-bearers, spoken of lamps and candlesticks, *E.xxv.6, N.iv.9,16*. The narrative only tells us what Sun and Moon and Stars are in relation to the earth. When the clouds and mists are dispelled from its surface . . . then the sky is cleared up, the Sun, Moon, and Stars appear, and assume their natural functions, marking days and nights, seasons and years. *p.33*.

*Ans.* See (4) above, the Hebrew word in question is used for 'light,' not 'light-bearer,' in *Ps.xc.8*, 'in the light of Thy countenance,' *Pr.xv.30*, 'the light of the eyes.'

8. *v.16. He made the stars also*] No account is taken of the nature of the Stars, as Suns or Planets, but merely as signs in the heavens. The words in the text may be a kind of parenthesis, not assigning the special *time* of the creation of the Stars. Moreover, the word used is '*made*,' not '*created*.' *p.34*.

*Ans.* Of course, the stars *may* have been 'created' in *v.1*; but there is no sign of this in *v.14*, certainly not in the use of the word 'made,' *comp. v.25,26*, and the idea is wholly set aside for Sun, Moon, and Stars together, by the probably more correct translation of *v.1*, as given above in (1).

9. *v.26. Three times in v.27 the verb 'created' is used concerning the production of man.* For, though his bodily organization may, like that of the beasts, have been produced from already created elements (the dust of the ground, *ii.7*), yet the complex being, Man, 'of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting,' was now for the first time called into being, and so was, unlike the beasts, wholly a new creation. *p.35*.

*Ans.* Bp.BROWNE does not notice that in *v.26* we read, 'And God said, Let us *make* man in our image, after our likeness.'

10. *v.26. Let us make*] Some of the modern rationalists believe (or affect to believe) that the plural name of God, *Elohim*, was a mere relic of ancient polytheism, and that, though Moses habitually attaches a singular verb to the plural nominative, yet here the plural unconsciously escapes from the narrator's pen. The ancient Christians with one mind see in these words of God the plurality in the Divine unity. *p.35*.

*Ans.* The plural verb is used in G.xx.13, xxxv.7, E.xxxii.48, 2S.vii.23, 1K.xix.2, Ps.lviii.11,(12), and in Neh.ix.18, the plural form of E.xxxii.4,8, is changed to the singular. But, as in one of the above instances (1K.xix.21) Jezebel uses it, there seems very little foundation for this notion of the early Christians.

11. It was an ingenious conjecture of Kurtz, adopted by Hugh Miller, that the knowledge of pre-Adamite history, like the knowledge of future ages, may have been communicated to Moses, or perhaps to the first man, in prophetic vision—that so perhaps *vast geological periods* were exhibited to the eye of the inspired writer, each appearing to pass before him like so many successive days. p.36.

*Ans.* However ingenious, there is not a shadow of ground in the Bible for this conjecture. If the *first, second, &c.* day was a 'vast geological period,' then why not also the *seventh* in ii.2, E.xx.11? Besides, if there was no Sun—or none *visible*, at all events—during the third 'vast geological period,' how could the grasses, herbs, and *fruit-trees*, created in i.11,12, have grown?

12. This is the course of creation as popularly described in Genesis; and the Rocks give their testimony, at least in the general, to the same order and progress. The chief difference, if any, of the two witnesses would seem to be, that the Rocks speak of (1) marine plants, (2) marine animals, (3) land plants, (4) land animals, in their successive developments, whereas Moses speaks of (1) plants, (2) marine animals, (3) land animals—a difference not amounting to diversity. As Physiology must have been nearly, and Geology wholly, unknown to the Semitic nations of antiquity, such a general correspondence of Sacred History with Modern Science is surely more striking and important than any apparent difference in details. p.36.

*Ans.* In this Hebrew cosmogony, which agrees very closely with that of the Zendavesta (IV.164–81), the progression from grasses, plants, and trees, to animals, and from animals to man, is so natural as hardly to be called 'striking and important correspondence with Modern Science,' even were it altogether correct. But the discrepancy mentioned above—*viz.* that in the Bible *all* grasses, trees, and plants are formed before any of the marine animals—though, of no consequence in a mere human cosmogony, is fatal at once to the notion of an infallible, Divine Revelation.

13. The only important resemblance of any ancient cosmogony with the Scriptural account is to be found in the Persian or Zoroastrian; which is most naturally accounted for, first by the fact, which will be noticed hereafter, that the Persians, of all peoples, except the Hebrews, were the most likely to have retained the memory of primitive traditions, and secondly, that Zoroaster was probably brought into contact with the Hebrews, and perhaps with the prophet Daniel in the Court of Darius, and may have learned much from such association. p.36.

*Ans.* The story of the prophet Daniel at the Court of Darius is a pure fiction (VII). VON BOHLEN, quoted by me in (IV.164), says—Zoroaster ‘took the *old Magian system* as the foundation of his reform, and modified it to suit his purposes; consequently, his cosmogony is the *old Chaldean*, which very probably spread from the times of the Assyrians into Western Asia.’ This cosmogony may have been brought by the ancestors of the Hebrew race from ‘Ur of the Chaldees.’

### Chap. ii.

14. v.3. It has been argued from the silence concerning its observance by the Patriarchs that no Sabbatic ordinance was really given until the promulgation of the Law, and that this passage in Genesis is not *historical*, but *anticipatory*.

(i) This verse forms an integral part of that history of the creation, which *if there be any truth in the distinction*, is the oldest portion of the Pentateuch, the work of the Elohist, very possibly handed down from the earliest ages of the world, and taken by Moses as the very groundwork of his inspired narrative.

(ii) The history of the Patriarchs, extending over at least 2,500 years, is all contained in the Book of Genesis; and many things must have been omitted much more memorable than the fact of their resting on the Sabbath, which in their simple pastoral life would seldom have called for special notice.

(iii) There are indications even in Genesis of a division of days into weeks or hebdomades, viii.10,12, xxix.27,28.

(iv) The same hebdomadal division was known to other nations, who are not likely to have borrowed it from the Israelites after the time of the Exodus.

(v) Moreover, it appears that before the giving of the Commandments from Mount Sinai, the Israelites were acquainted with the law of the Sabbath, E.xvi.5. This has all the appearance of belonging to an acknowledged, though perhaps neglected, ordinance of Divine Service, not as if then for the first time the Sabbath were ordained and consecrated. p.37.

*Ans.* (i) No doubt, G.ii.1-3, belongs to the Elohist.

(ii) It is clear that the Sabbath was observed in early times, 2K.iv.23, Is.i.13, Hos.ii.11,(13), Am.viii.5. But in each instance, the ‘New Moon’ is put before the Sabbath, as being apparently of the greatest importance; and, in fact, it appears to have been the *first* sabbath of the month, determining the others, and was accordingly honoured with much larger sacrifices, N.xxviii.11,15, *comp.* v.9.

(iii) No doubt, the hebdomadal division of time was observed in David’s age, when these passages in Genesis were written, and in still earlier times.

(iv) The practice was a very natural one, and most probably derived by the Hebrews, as by so many other nations, from observing the principal phases of the Moon.

(v) Shortly before and after the Captivity, the Sabbath was much more strongly insisted on, Jer.xvii.21-27, Ez.xx.12,13,16,20,21,24, xxii.8,26,

xxiii.38, xlv.24. Hence in E.xvi.5, the Later Legislation lays a special stress upon it, before any Sabbath laws are given in xx.8-11, xxiii.12. See (VI.462,466-7.)

15. v.3. *which God created and made*] lit. *which God created to make*. . . The natural meaning of the words here is, that God first created the material universe, 'the heavens and the earth,' and then made, moulded, and fashioned, the new created matter into its various forms and organisms. p.37.

*Ans.* KALISCH says, Gen.p.83—*He created producing*, the infinitive being, as a complement, added after the final verb, as in the very usual phrase  $\text{וַיִּצְרָם לְאֱמֹר}$ .

16. v.4. *These are the generations, &c.*] It is apparent that the narrative proceeds in direct order from i.1 to ii.4, and that from this verse there is a return to the first formation of plants and vegetables, and to the creation of man, a kind of recapitulation, yet with *some appearance of diversity*. . . . In 1655 Is. Peyrierius wrote a book to prove that the account of the creation of man in ch. i. related to a pre-Adamite race, from which sprang a great majority of the Gentiles, whereas the account in ch. ii was of the creation of Adam, the direct ancestor of the Israelites and of the nations in some degree related to them. . . . But it seems that the whole Bible, both Old and New Testament, refers to Adam as the head of the whole human race; so that, if Pre-Adamite man existed at all, the race must probably have been extinguished before Adam was created. p.38.

*Ans.* The whole difficulty about this double Adam is explained, when we know that i.1—ii.4<sup>a</sup> is the Elohist account of the Creation, and ii.4<sup>b</sup>—25<sup>a</sup> a totally different Jehovistic account, v.4<sup>a</sup> having perhaps been removed from the *beginning* of the former, where it stands in other similar histories, v.1, vi.9, x.1, xi.10,27, xxv.12,19, xxxvi.1, xxxvii.2, and placed at the end of it, so as to form also the beginning of the second account.

17. The union of the two names Jehovah-Elohim throughout G.ii.iii, is singularly appropriate, as indicating that the 'Elohim' of the first chapter is the same as the 'Jehovah' who appears afterwards in iv, and from time to time throughout the history. p.38.

*Ans.* By the use of this compound phrase, the *Jehovist*, as we suppose, desired to indicate that his 'Jehovah' was the same as the 'Elohim' of the older writer; and the persistency, with which he uses it in ii.iii. strongly tends to confirm our view that in his time—the reign of David—the name 'Jehovah' had been newly introduced as the name of the National Deity of Israel, and had not yet been popularly adopted.

18. v.5. *Now no plant of the field was yet in the earth, &c.*]

Bp.BROWNE rightly adopts the above as the correct translation, instead of that of the E.V., 'and every plant of the field before it was in the earth,



&c.' to which he says, 'it was objected long ago, that it is opposed to i.11, God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, &c.' But he then adds—

This passage does not refer to the produce of the earth created on the third day, but to *those herbs and plants which are raised by the cultivation of man*. . . The words rendered *plant, field, grew*, never occur in the first chapter; they are *terms expressive of the produce of labour and cultivation*; so that the historian evidently means that *no cultivated land and no vegetables fit for the use of man* were yet in existence on the earth. p.39.

*Ans.* In the only other instances where  $\text{קָנִי}$ , 'plant,' occurs in the Bible, it means a *wild plant*, not 'the produce of labour and cultivation,' viz. G.xxi.15, 'she cast the child under one of the *bushes*,' Job xxx.4, 'who cut up mallows by the *bushes*,' and v.75, 'among the *bushes* they brayed.'

So  $\text{שָׂדֵה}$  'field,' is constantly used for uncultivated ground, e.g. G.xxv.27, 'Esau was a man of the *field*,' and so in xxvii.3,5, Esau goes out 'to the *field*' to hunt, *comp.* 'the *field* of Edom (Moab),' xxxii.3,(4), xxxvi.35, 'torn of beasts in the *field*,' E.xxii.31,(30), 'beast of the *field*' = wild-beast, E.xxiii.29, L.xxvi.22, D.vii.22, &c.

And  $\text{קָמַץ}$ , 'grow, is used of things sprouting of themselves without labour and cultivation;' e.g. 'thorns and thistles shall it cause-to-*sprout*,' iii.18, 'they shall *sprout* as among grass, as willows by the water-courses,' Is.xliv.4. 'He maketh the grass to *sprout* for the cattle,' Ps.civ.14, 'who maketh grass to *sprout* upon the mountains,' P.cxlvi.8.

Thus the whole of Bp.BROWNE'S argument falls to the ground, and the objection in question remains in full force, viz. that in i.12, the earth brings forth all grasses, herbs, and fruit-trees, and yet in ii.6 there is not a plant or herb in existence; which discrepancy is simply due to the fact of our having here the Jehovistic story of the Creation, differing essentially from the Elohist.

Bp.BROWNE quotes L. DE DIEU as his authority for the above statement. But he has evidently never taken the pains to verify it; he has just caught up whatever seemed to serve his purpose for the moment, without troubling himself to make any 'painful enquiry' to ascertain the real value of the argument. And in the interests of truth, I protest against such pretended criticism, of which we have had many instances already, and shall have more before we get to the end of Genesis. He does not even care to 'temper' the mortar which he 'daubs' upon the wall to hide its cracks.

19. v.5,6. *The Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, but there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground*] It is objected here also that the first chapter speaks of the earth as enveloped in waters and vapours, and that there could therefore have been no lack of rain and moisture. The inconsistency is again more apparent than real. In the first place, the mist

or vapour or cloud, here mentioned as watering the ground, may perhaps tally well with that watery condition of the atmosphere of which we read in ch. i. But, next, the purpose of ch. ii. is to give an account not of the Creation or adaptation of the whole earth, but of the preparation of a special chosen spot for the early abode of man. That spot may have been in a region where little or no rain fell, and which derived all its moisture from vapours or dews. It may not have been wholly without vegetation, but it was not a cultivated field; no herbs, or shrubs, or fruit-trees fitted for man's use grew there; no rain was wont to fall there (as some render it, 'not even a mist went up to water the ground,' or more probably) 'yet there went up a mist and watered the whole face of the ground.' p.39.

*Ans.* Where do we read in ch.i. a single word about any 'watery condition of the atmosphere'? And does not Bp.BROWNE say (7) that on the fourth day 'the sky was cleared up' and 'the clouds and mists were dismissed from its surface,' so that the sun, moon, and stars appeared? Then, secondly, as to this site of Paradise, where 'little or no rain fell' and 'only a mist went up,' not only have geographers failed to point out any such a region, but it is not easy to see how *four rivers* could have flowed out of such a district, two of them identified by Bp.BROWNE himself as the Tigris and Euphrates, p.39, without any rain.

20. v.7. *And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground*] It is probably not intended that the language should be philosophically accurate; but it clearly expresses that man's bodily substance was composed of earthly elements. p.39.

*Ans.* The Hebrew writer clearly means what he says, *viz.*, 'the dust of the ground,' having no other idea of the composition of the human frame than what he had gathered from its *appearing* after death to be resolved again into dust, *comp.* Ecc.xii.7, Job xxxiv.15.

21. The identification of Gihon with the Nile (Joseph.) is utterly untenable. . . . It is impossible, setting aside all questions of inspiration, that one so familiar with Egypt as the writer of Genesis should have conceived of the Nile as connected with the Tigris and Euphrates. p.40.

*Ans.* KALISCH notes, *Gen.p.94*—'The LXX render Shichor, which is the Nile, in Jer.ii.18, by Gihon. JOSEPHUS observes distinctly, *Ant.* I.i.3, that the Gihon flows through Egypt, and is that river which the Greeks call Nile. . . . The Arabians also include the Nile among the rivers of Eden, and the Ethiopians call it *Gejôn* or *Gewôn*. PAUSANIAS, II.5, maintains in like manner the identity of the Euphrates and the Nile.' VON BOHLEN observes, II.p.34—'The representation of KOSMAS [about A.D. 550] strikingly shows how fabulous was the view of the ancients. He imagines the earth to be an oblong, with a mountain inhabited by gods in the north: the sea flows round it on all four sides, and *beyond* the sea, towards the East, lies

the Paradise in India. The intervening sea was caused by the Flood, and was crossed by Noah. Under this sea the Euphrates and Tigris continue their course [from Eden], and appear again in the Western world. Here is Gihon, the Ganges, *which afterwards becomes the Nile in Egypt*, in a manner somewhat similar to what Alexander imagined respecting the Indus. Pison, on the contrary, is the Indus, emptying itself into the Persian Gulf.' See other striking instances of similar confusion and ignorance in geographical matters in KALISCH, *Gen.* p.95, down as late as the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries of the Christian era.

But, if JOSEPHUS, PAUSANIAS, and KOSMAS, could make such mistakes about the Nile, with their advanced geographical knowledge, why should not the writer in Genesis have done so 1,000 years previously?

Moreover, how could these rivers or their *beds* have existed at all on the very first day of the creation, and without any rain?

22. v.19. The account of the formation of the brute animals here does not, as some have supposed, necessarily imply that they were created *after* Adam. But it is introductory to the bringing them one by one to Adam, that he may name them. . . . In order to mature his mental powers, and to teach him the use of language, the animals are brought to him that he might name them. p.42.

*Ans.* There is no ground for doubting that the writer does mean that the animals were created after the man. But, admitting that the words do not 'necessarily' mean this, how could all 'cattle, birds, and beasts of the field,' from all countries, hot and cold, have been brought to Adam in Paradise? And where was the *woman* all this time, who is 'created' in i.27 at the same time with the man 'in the image of God,' and evidently after the same manner, not 'built up out of his rib,' as in ii.22? Bp. BROWNE takes no notice whatever of this discrepancy.

23. v.23. *Woman, because she was taken out of man*] Heb. '*Ishsha*, because she was taken out of *Ish*.' Hence many have argued that Hebrew must have been the primitive language. The same, of course, is inferred from other names, as Eve, Cain, Abel, &c., all having appropriate significance in Hebrew. The argument is inconclusive, because it is quite possible to translate names from one language into another, and to retain the meaning which those names had in their original tongue. p.43.

*Ans.* That is to say, it being the constant habit of the Jehovist, as in this passage, to derive Hebrew names, and indeed names not Hebrew, from Hebrew roots, and, where he does not actually derive, to allude to such derivations (V. An. 3. iv), Bp. BROWNE supposes that analogous pairs of words may have existed in the 'primitive language,' which either Moses himself, or the Israelites in Egypt from whom he received these 'traditions or documents,' must have replaced, by corresponding Hebrew forms, having just

the same relation to each other as the originals—at least in the first *ten* chapters of Genesis, since, according to KEIL and Bp. BROWNE, *p.53*, the Hebrew language did not exist until the time of the dispersion of Babel! It is difficult to conceive a more extravagant supposition. It is plain that on Bp. BROWNE'S notion of the infallible historical truth of the story of the Creation, it must be concluded that Hebrew was the language of Paradise, so that Adam 'called his wife's name Eve (הַבַּיִת), because she was the mother of all living (חַי),' *iii.20*.

### Chap. iii.

24. *v.1*. The reason why Satan took the form of a beast remarkable for its subtlety may have been, that so Eve might be the less upon her guard. New as she was to all creation, she may not have been surprised at speech in an animal which apparently possessed almost human sagacity. *p.44*.

*Ans.* Though it is said here that 'the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field,' yet what signs of 'almost human sagacity' has anyone observed in the serpent, that Eve should be so discerning?

25. *v.8*. The whole of this history of the Creation and the Fall is full of these anthropomorphic representations. *p.45*.

*Ans.* But the anthropomorphisms of the Jehovist are far more crude and coarse than those of the Elohist—see (5) above. What comparison is there between the representations of God saying, 'Let us make man, &c.' *i.26*, 'seeing all He had created that it was very good,' *i.31*, and 'resting from His work,' *ii.2*, and those in *ii.8*, 'planting a garden for Adam,' *ii.19*, 'bringing the animals to Adam to name them,' *ii.22*, 'building-up the rib into a woman,' *iii.8*, 'walking in the garden in the cool of the day,' *iii.21*, 'making coats of skin for Adam and Eve,' and in *xviii.8* even 'eating' bread and meat?

26. *v.14*. The most natural interpretation of the curse might indicate that the serpent underwent some change of form. It would, however, be quite consistent with the narrative, even in its most literal acceptance, to understand that it merely implied continued and perpetual degradation coupled with a truceless war against mankind. *p.45*.

*Ans.* But do serpents wage a more 'truceless war against mankind' than they do against their ordinary victims?—though, no doubt, a mortal hatred does exist, for very natural reasons, almost everywhere between the human race and the serpent tribe; and so most people have a dislike for *scorpions, spiders, earwigs, &c.* There is no reason to suppose that any change has passed upon the form or habits of the serpent, or that it eats dust, as the Hebrew writer supposed it to do after the curse: *comp. Is.lxv.25*, 'dust shall be the serpent's meat,' *Mic.vii.17*, 'they shall lick the dust like the serpent.'

27. *v.17.* The whole earth partakes of the punishment, which the sin of man, its head and destined ruler, has called down. Instead of the blessed soil of Paradise, Adam and his offspring have to till the ground now condemned to bear thorns and thistles, and this is not to end, until the man returns to the earth from which he was taken. *p.46.*

*Ans.* Were there no thorns or thistles, as well as fruits and flowers, in the geological ages, before man lived upon the earth? And is not labour a blessed thing for man, the very means of drawing out and strengthening his powers? What true man would wish, if he could, to live the idle listless, unmeaning life which Bp. BROWNE supposes to have been man's lot in 'the blessed soil of Paradise'? 'Jesus said, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.'

28. The traditions of all, especially Eastern nations have more or less resemblance to the record of *G.i-iii.* This is, according to some, to be explained by mere similarity in all early mythology. According to others, it results from the Hebrew histories borrowing the myths of neighbouring countries. . . . The nearest resemblance, however, is traceable between the Biblical record and the teaching of the *Zendavesta.* As there is a likeness in the history of Creation and in the description of Paradise, so there is a special similarity in the account of the Fall. According to the doctrine of Zoroaster, the first human beings, created by Ormuzd, the good principle, lived in a state of innocence in a happy garden with a tree which gave them life and immortality. But Ahriman, the evil principle, assuming the form of a serpent, offered them the fruit of a tree which he had himself created; they ate and became subject to evil and to a continual contest between light and darkness, between the good motions of Ormuzd and the evil suggestions of Ahriman. . . . Hartmann, Von Bohlen, and other mythical interpreters have imagined that the Mosaic account was really borrowed from the Zoroastrian—a theory which could only be established by proving that the early chapters of Genesis were not written till after the Babylonish Captivity; for it was then that the Jews first came into close contact with the Persians, and might have borrowed some of their superstitions. *p.48.*

*Ans.* See some of these myths exhibited more fully in (*IV.225, &c.*). No doubt there is a strong resemblance between the Persian and Hebrew myths, enough to show that they have had a common origin. But there are also important differences, which are pointed out by TUCH, *Gen. p.44, &c.* (translated in HEYWOOD'S *Von Bohlen, II.p.69, &c.*), *e.g.* in the *Zendavesta* the serpent is the evil principle itself, in Genesis it is a natural serpent, *iii.1,14*; 'in the former it is sinful and fatal to eat of the proffered fruits, because they are the production of Ahriman, in the Hebrew the tree of knowledge is from God, and the sin consists in man's following his own will, and doing what is displeasing to God.' And he concludes—'Hence it must be clear that the Hebrew myth differs internally and fundamentally from the Persian—that in the former the pure conception of the unity of

Jehovah is developed, while in the latter the dualism of a good and an evil principle is prominently brought forward.' He then observes that allusions to the myth appear only in Pr.iii.18, xi.30, xiii.12, xv.4, but that the first decided reference is in Wisd.ii.23,24, and adds—'This late revival of the myth may be explained from the acquaintance obtained by the Israelites with the Parsee religion during the exile; and the Persian influence is here shown in the interpretation of the serpent as Satan. . . . Thus the old Hebrew form of the myth is brought nearer to the Parsee; but the former account cannot be derived from the latter on account of the fundamental difference between the two myths: although such a derivation has been adopted by HARTMANN, VON BOHLEN, &c., and the later origin of the Hebrew myth has been consequently inferred by these writers. But, if this be the case, why does not Satan, whom the *later* form of the Hebrew religion admitted, 1Ch.xxi.1, appear already as an actor in this part of Genesis? Upon the whole, it must be allowed that there is a very near connection between these Hebrew and Persian myths, and that *both of them proceeded from one original legend*, which had spread in different forms throughout the ancient East.'

Our own view agrees with that of TUCH and Bp.BROWNE, p.49, that 'the real contact-point between the legends of the Zendavesta and the Jewish history must be found in the days of the early Patriarchs' of the Hebrew people, who brought them from the original cradle of their race (13); though we do not think it necessary to believe (with Bp.BROWNE) (i) that this 'great Semitic tradition' was 'delivered direct from *Shem* to Abraham, from Abraham to Jacob, from Jacob to Joseph, and incorporated under Divine guidance by Moses in his history'—'much as he found it, word for word'—(ii) that '*Japhet* may have given the very same account of [?] to] his own posterity,' and (iii) that 'the Hebrews retained the *Semitic* tradition pure and uncorrupted, through their adherence to the worship of the true God [though they had 'latterly but little used, perhaps wholly disused,' the name *Jehovah*, p.27], whilst the Persians had the *Japhetic* tradition, though corrupted by dualism,'—upon which three assumptions, says Bp.BROWNE—

the resemblance between their respective accounts would be in every way natural, and the *real historical basis* of them both—[the naming of all the animals! the woman made out of the rib! the talking serpent! the Lord God walking in the cool of the day! the cherubs placed at the east of the garden, with a flaming sword, which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life!]*—would be the simplest (!) solution of the difficulty.*

After all, it would seem that Bp.BROWNE himself may have some misgivings about this 'real historical basis,' since he concludes as follows:—

It may only be necessary to add that this reasoning will not be affected, even if we should concur with those who argue that the history of the Fall is a true history, *though veiled under allegorical imagery . . .* that the description given of this in Genesis is *not literal, but emblematical and mystical.* p.49.

29. v.24. In this passage the cherubim appear to be *living beings*, angels of God, fulfilling the will of God.

Then Bp.BROWNE devotes three pages to the discussion of the appearance of these cherubs, for which see *D.B.* I.p.301, &c.; where the account is also illustrated by engravings; but one or two of Bp.BROWNE'S remarks may be noticed.

The cherubim on the mercy-seat in the Tabernacle appear to have been exactly imitated by Solomon in the Temple, *unless they were the very cherubim of the Tabernacle removed to the Temple.* Their height is said to have been 10 cubits, and their wings touched the walls on either side, 1K.vi.27. p.50.

*Ans.* The mercy-seat was to be  $2\frac{1}{2}$  cubits long and  $1\frac{1}{2}$  cubit broad, E.xxv. 17. Who would ever have thought of placing on the two ends of such a small surface, v.19, two cherubs 10 cubits high!—and with their wings, each 5 cubits long, meeting in the middle, 1K.vi.24,27! But we are distinctly told that Solomon '*made two cherubs of olive-wood,*' 1K.vi.23, whereas in E.xxxvii.7 the cherubs are made of *gold.*

30. Bp.BROWNE then mentions Mr.LAYARD'S discovery in Nineveh of 'gigantic winged bulls with human heads, winged lions and human figures with hawk or eagle heads, corresponding so nearly with the winged Cherubim of the visions of Ezekiel and St. John,' p.51, and he very justly says that—

St. John nearly repeats the imagery in Ezekiel, and that Ezekiel saw these visions by the river Chebar, and there he and his people would, no doubt, have become familiarized with the gigantic winged guardians of the temples and palaces in Babylonia and Assyria. It is highly probable that the difference between the cherubim in Ezekiel's vision (repeated with certain variations in St. John's) and the cherubim in the Tabernacle and the Temple resulted in part from this.

And he also observes as follows :—

Nothing connects Moses with Assyria or the Assyrian sculptures. . . . Far more likely is it that some Egyptian type should have been followed; and we find in the Egyptian sculptures, and in the 18th dynasty, which was probably the dynasty of the Exodus, examples of a shrine or ark wonderfully calculated to remind us of the ark of the Covenant made by Moses. It is carried by persons of the sacerdotal race, by staves, as the Levites carried the ark. In the centre is the symbol of the Deity, and two winged human figures spread out their wings around

and over it. [See one such figured, *D.B. I.p.304*, also *p.106.*] . . . *It is very doubtful whether, notwithstanding this apparent similarity, there is any relation between these figures and the cherubim of the Tabernacle. . . .* To Moses, on the other hand, but still on the same principle, God had dictated the carving of figures like those which he had seen in Egypt, figures emblematical of guardianship, and of the reverence of those who wait constantly upon God, but which had never been objects of idolatrous worship. *p.51.*

*Ans.* Thus on the very same page Bp.BROWNE (in the passages above italicized) contradicts himself. But these figures, if not themselves worshipped, had been constantly used in 'idolatrous worship' in Egypt, and would therefore have strongly tempted the Israelites to fall back into idolatry. The fact is that Solomon's cherubim were made *first*, copied, very probably, from an Egyptian or else Phœnician model; and from these in later days the smaller cherubs of the (supposed) Mosaic Ark were imitated.

31. But after all, Bp.BROWNE does not tell us plainly what he himself thinks the cherubs in iii.24, which 'appear to be living beings' (29), really were; though indirectly he allows his own view to *shimmer* faintly through a mist of words as follows:—

The cherubim and the flaming sword at the east gate of Paradise to *them*, [*i.e.* 'those who believe the cherubim in the Tabernacle to have been like those seen by Ezekiel,' which Bp.BROWNE does *not* (30)] mean only that the way back to Eden and to the tree of life was closed by such natural hindrances as the Author of nature saw fit to interpose. *It is not impossible that, even if the cherubim of the Tabernacle were not composite creatures, but simply winged human figures, much the same may have been meant.* There are, doubtless, hosts of spiritual beings that surround the throne of God and do His will: but all things serve Him. He maketh the winds His angels and a flame of fire His ministers. The stern, mechanical, turning everyway of the sword of flame *perhaps points to this*; and the sacred writer may possibly have signified under the symbols of angelic beings the great ministering powers of nature. *p.52.*

#### Chap. iv.

32. *v.1.* The use of the name Jehovah is significant, though *we cannot think that Eve already knew this name of God, which was first revealed to man at a later period of his history*, and which is of Hebrew origin, whereas that language probably did not exist until the time of the dispersion at Babel. Yet, doubtless, the historian expresses the true meaning of Eve's speech which she spoke, inspired by that help which had been graciously given her of God. *p.53.*

*Ans.* Bp.BROWNE quotes the above from KEIL, in such a way as to adopt KEIL's view as his own—that is, he supposes that the name 'Jehovah' was



not yet revealed to man \* (that the Hebrew language 'probably did not exist until the time of the dispersion of Babel'), and that the paronomasia which exists in the *Hebrew*, 'she bare Cain (*Kain*), and she said I have gotten (*Kanah*) a man,' existed also in the 'primitive language' of Paradise. But when was the name 'Jehovah' revealed, if it was not revealed in E.vi.2-5? And as Bp.BROWNE will not allow this—see *Introd. to Genesis* (7)—and yet insists that the name was known before the Exodus, —see *Ibid.* (12.ii)—did one of the Patriarchs *invent* it or *adopt* it from the tribes of Canaan?

33. v.2. It is not said that Abel was so named by Eve herself, as Cain had been. Hence it is possible that the name Abel (*breath, vapour, vanity, nothingness*) was that by which he became known after his life had passed away like a breath or a vapour. p.53.

*Ans.* That is, according to Bp.BROWNE, he was not really known in his lifetime by the Hebrew name *Abel*, or by any corresponding name in the language of Paradise!—the difficulty being, of course, that this name means 'vanity' and manifestly alludes to his vanishing life, and therefore could hardly have been given him at his birth. On our view it is not historical, but was merely invented for this mythical story.

34. v.2. The rationalist view coincides with the heathen, that a state of nature was pure barbarism, and that man gradually emerged from it into nomadic, then into agricultural, and finally into civilized life. In contradistinction to this, the account of Genesis represents man as placed by his Maker in a state of very simple civilization. Adam in Paradise was to 'dress and to keep the garden.' His sons must have learned from him the knowledge which he had thus acquired. It is not likely to have been extensive knowledge, probably the very simplest possible, but still sufficient to rescue them from a state of pure barbarism and from the necessity of living by the chase. p.53.

And then, after quoting Sir CHARLES LYELL as saying that 'had the original stock of mankind been really endowed with superior intellectual

\* On p.28, where Bp.BROWNE tries to explain the use of 'Jehovah' in iv.1, which 'would inevitably lead to its continued and frequent recurrence' in the rest of the chapter, he says—'When we come to ch.iv and to Eve's exclamation, when she hoped that her firstborn should be the ancestor of the promised seed, *the words ascribed to her connect her hope with Jehovah*, Him whom the Israelites learned to look on as their covenant God, &c.' Then either she did know and use the name Jehovah, which Bp.BROWNE denies, or she did not know that name, and then the words which 'connect this hope of Eve with Jehovah' are *falsely* 'ascribed to her' by Moses, who, according to Bp.BROWNE, p.29, must be the *Jehovistic* writer in Genesis.

power, and with inspired knowledge, and had possessed the same improvable nature as their posterity, the point of advancement which they would have realised ere this would have been immeasurably higher, and, instead of rude pottery and flint weapons we should in that case have found works like those of Phidias and Praxiteles,' Bp. BROWNE replies as follows:—

Scripture does not represent the first man as endowed with superior intellectual power, and with *inspired knowledge*. All that we learn is, that Adam was placed in Eden to till it, that his *power of speech* was exercised by having to name the brute creation, that he had a simple command given him, and afterwards a special promise. p.59.

*Ans.* Bp. BROWNE forgets that he has supposed that 'the great Semitic tradition'—the 'ancient primeval record of the formation of the world'—'may even have been communicated to the first man in his innocence,' p.27, and that it must have required the exercise of some powers of *thought* and *observation*, as well as of 'speech,' to name all the beasts and birds of all countries hot and cold, when they were brought to him, 'in order to mature his mental powers and to teach him the use of language.' p.42. And his civilization must have progressed very rapidly, since we find his son Cain building a city, iv.17, and in the seventh generation men invented musical instruments and wrought in copper and iron, v.21,22.

35. But Bp. BROWNE says, 'This is really not opposed, but confirmed, by the records of Geology':—

Ethnologists distinguish a flint age, a bronze age, and an iron age, as having existed in ancient Europe; during the first of which only flint instruments, during the second bronze, during the third iron instruments, appear to have been in use. p.59.

And he quotes again Sir CHARLES LYELL as saying, 'We must remember that as yet we have no distinct geological evidence that the appearance of what are called the *inferior races* of mankind has always preceded in chronological order that of the higher races'—where, however, he is speaking of *races*, not of *difference in civilization*; thus the Chinese race had been in possession of advanced arts for centuries before Europeans of higher race acquired them. But then, he says—

In the valley of the Ohio there are hundreds of mounds containing pottery, ornamental sculpture, articles in silver and copper, and stone-weapons, with skulls of a Mexican type. Above these have grown a succession of forests, in which the Red Indians for centuries may have housed and hunted. p.59.

*Ans.* What does this prove except that 'in those very ancient days there must have been a civilization of which all traces have vanished,' p.59, preceded, perhaps, by many centuries of barbarism? Who supposes that the

remains at Nineveh or Babylon indicate the state of civilization at the very *beginnings* of the Assyrian or Babylonian power—that no ruder ages had preceded? But, indeed, Bp. BROWNE himself says that the Deluge ‘must have reduced mankind to almost *original simplicity and rudeness*,’ p.68. And when he concludes—

So, in fact, the argument from Geology is really coincident with the testimony of Scripture, and of *universal* primitive tradition, *viz.*, that man in his original condition was not a helpless savage, but had at least the rudiments of civilization and intelligence. p.59—

it is obvious that his ‘argument from Geology’ proves only the great antiquity of the advanced civilization of the human race in the Ohio valleys; while his statement as to the ‘universal primitive tradition’ hardly agrees with the well-known lines quoted by Sir CHARLES LYELL, *Ant. of Man*, p.379—

Quam prorepserunt primis animalia terris,  
Mutum et turpe pecus, glandem atque cubilia propter,  
Unguibus et pugnis, dein fustibus, atque ita porro  
Pugnabant armis, quæ post fabricaverat usus ;  
Donec verba, quibus voces sensusque notarent,  
Nominaque, invenerent : dehinc abistere bello,  
Oppida cœperunt munire, et ponere leges.—HOR. *Sat.* l.iii.99–105.

36. v.3. The word here used [for ‘offering,’ מִנְחָה] *always* signifies an *unbloody* oblation. It is frequently translated a ‘meat-offering.’ Its nature is defined in L.xi.1, &c. p.53.

*Ans.* But we read in v.4, ‘Jehovah had respect unto Abel and to his offering,’ where Abel’s was a ‘bloody oblation.’ In fact, מִנְחָה, lit. ‘gift,’ seems to be frequently used in older writings for the whole sacrifice, 1S.ii. 17,29, xxvi.19, 1K.xviii.29,36, 2K.iii.20; though in the L.L. it is restricted to the ‘meat-offering’ or rather ‘meal-offering.’

37. v.14. *everyone that findeth me shall slay me*] Most commentators rightly understand that his fear was from the vengeance of his own kindred. It is observed by Kurtz that, according to hints gathered from G.iv.25 the murder of Abel probably took place just before the birth of Seth, *i.e.* 130 years after the creation of man, G.v.3. We need not suppose that Cain, Abel, and Seth were the only sons of Adam. Indeed, from G.v.4, we infer that there were others. Cain, Abel, and Seth are mentioned for obvious reasons: Abel, for his piety and early death; Cain, for his wickedness, and the worldly wisdom of his posterity; Seth, because he was the ancestor of the Promised Seed. There may, then, in 130 years, have grown up a very considerable number of children and grandchildren to Adam and Eve. p.55.

*Ans.* G.v.4 manifestly refers to children born *after* the birth of Seth, who,

(like the others in G.v. and G.xi) is plainly given as his father's eldest son, the Elohist document, in fact, knowing nothing of Cain and Abel. The only persons, therefore, whom Cain might fear, would be Abel's children or grandchildren and his own, or rather, since he was to be a 'fugitive and vagabond' in a distant land, they would only be the members of his own family.

38. v.17. *buildd a city*] Rather, *began to build a city*, lit. *was building a city*. It is not necessary to suppose that the city was built immediately on the birth of Enoch. It may have been built when Cain had lived many years, and was surrounded by children and grandchildren. The word *city* is, of course, not to be interpreted by modern ideas. A village of rude huts, which was distinguished from the booths or tents of the nomads, would satisfy all the conditions of the text. p.56.

*Ans.* This is said, of course, to meet the objection—similar to that in (37)—that there were no other inhabitants of the 'land of Nod' but Cain and his family. But the text says '*he was building a city*' at the birth of his son, 'and he called it after his son's name Enoch.' If the writer had meant that it was built many years after the birth of Enoch, he would have written 'and he built a city.'

39. v.19. *Lamech took unto him two wives*] Here we have the first example of polygamy; which, though afterwards tolerated, had its rise among the sons of Cain, and is evidently mentioned for reprobation. p.56.

*Ans.* There is not the least indication in the text either that polygamy 'had its rise among the sons of Cain' or that it 'is mentioned for reprobation.'

40. v.22. Previously to this time, all weapons for defence or instruments of husbandry may have been of flint, or wood, or bone. Uncivilized nations at the present time have weapons made of flint, wood, bone, sharks' teeth, &c. Where nations have lost the usages of more civilised life, they seem to have fallen back on a flint age, then to have invented bronze weapons (in the case of South America weapons of gold), and, lastly, to have discovered the use of iron. . . . That the most ancient inhabitants of Europe were ignorant of the use of metal, as indicated by the discovery of flint weapons in the gravel, can be no proof that they were unknown to the early descendants of Adam. If the colonists of Australia were for the next 1,000 years to be separated from all connection with the rest of the world, it is quite possible that they might utterly lose many of the arts of civilized life; and perhaps, if there were a deficiency of coal or lime or native metals, even the use of metallic instruments. p.57.

*Ans.* Doubtless, they could not make 'metallic instruments,' if they had no 'native metals' and were cut off 'from all connection with the rest of the world.' But the supposition is absurd. Where was ever a people so situ-

ated, that anything can be inferred from such an example? Bp. BROWNE says that Tubal-Cain, &c. were descendants of Cain, and the *Sethites* did not enjoy the 'social and political advancement' nor the progress in 'art' of the *Cainites*. Still Noah must have had considerable skill in ship-building to construct a huge vessel like the ark, whose 'proportions' or rather whose 'dimensions' ( $525\text{ft.} \times 87\frac{1}{2}\text{ft.} \times 52\frac{1}{2}\text{ft.}$ ) 'are not very different from the Great Eastern' ( $680\text{ft.} \times 83\text{ft.} \times 58\text{ft.}$ ), p.68, with its multitudinous 'nests' or 'different compartments fitted for the habitation of men and animals,' p.67, and even having its 'window' glazed with 'some transparent substance,' which 'may easily have been known to the antediluvians, who had made the progress in the arts described in iv.21,22,' though, 'perhaps, the invention was lost after the Deluge.' p.68. But Bp. BROWNE may reply that Noah may have employed *Cainites* to build it.

41. v.25. *Seth*] i.e. *Foundation*, from the word signifying to *place*, rendered here, 'appointed.' p.58.

*Ans.* This, according to Bp. BROWNE (32), was not his *real* name; but that had just the same relation to the corresponding verb in the 'primitive language,' which *Sheth* has to *Shith* in Hebrew.

42. v.26. *Then began men to call upon the name of the Lord*] Then began *he* to call on the name of the LORD. . . . There is nothing to connect the verb with Enos as its nominative rather than with Seth. . . . The sacred narrative has all along used the name Jehovah; and, whether we believe it to have been known from earlier times, or to have been revealed first to Moses, there is nothing whatever to connect its revelation and acknowledgment with the birth of Enos. p.58.

*Ans.* Bp. BROWNE's correction of the E.V. is erroneous. The literal translation is 'Then it was begun (שָׁתַּחֲוֶה) &c.' = 'Then men began &c.' Bp. BROWNE holds that the name 'Jehovah' was *not* 'revealed first to Moses,' but 'was known from earlier times' (32), though he nowhere tells us when or how it became known, whether by *revelation* or *invention* or *imitation*. Probably, the Jehovistic writer only means here that in that age men began to *worship* the Deity, without 'placing emphasis on the special name Jehovah.'

## Chap. v.

43. Bp. BROWNE derives the names of Enos, Cainan, Mahalaleel, Jared, Enoch, Methuselah, as the writer in Genesis does Noah, v.29, from *Hebrew* roots, p.60. But it must be remembered that these, according to Bp. BROWNE (32), were not their *real* names; though these last were similarly related to corresponding roots in the primitive language, all which, both names and roots, were carefully reproduced in Hebrew, in the 'traditions or documents' which Moses received from the Israelites in Egypt, *Introd. to Genesis* (14).

44. *v.29. which the LORD hath cursed*] This occurs in a chapter which modern critics call Elohistic. Therefore they consider this an interpolation. The truer inference would be that the Elohistic theory is unfounded. p.61.

*Ans.* Bp. BROWNE writes as one very little acquainted with the results of modern criticism. Otherwise, he would not have allowed himself to write 'Therefore—i.e. because "Jehovah" here occurs in an Elohistic chapter—they consider this an interpolation.' It so happens that this single verse contains (beside the name Jehovah) the following distinct signs of the Jehovist:—

(i) 'over our work and over the pain of our hands': *comp.* the work and pain laid upon Adam in iii.17-19, to which this clearly alludes.

(ii) עֵצְבוֹן, 'pain,' as in iii.16,16,17—*nowhere else in the Bible.*

(iii) 'the ground which Jehovah cursed': *comp.* 'cursec is the ground for thy sake,' iii.17.

(iv) the derivation of Noah (נֹחַ) from נַחַם, 'comfort,' like those of 'Adam,' ii.7, 'Ishshah,' ii.23, 'Eve,' iii.20, 'Cain,' iv.1, 'Nod,' iv.16, 'Seth,' iv.25, and generally throughout the *Jehovistic* story (V.*An.*3.iv, xvi, 5.iii. 55.xii). See also (V.*An.*11), where it is shown at full length that v.29 is a Jehovistic interpolation. The Elohist probably wrote in v.28 'and begat Noah, as in the other instances; for which the Jehovist inserted 'and begat a son. and called his name Noah, saying &c.'

45. Bp. BROWNE then devotes some space to show that the disagreement between the Hebrew, Samaritan, and Septuagint, in respect of the *ages* of the antediluvians in this chapter, 'does not affect the general integrity of the text,' even though, as he allows—

There appears something like *design* in the alterations which must have taken place, the results being frequently made to tally, whilst the constituents of these results disagree. p.62.

This is readily allowed. But then Bp. BROWNE adds—

Though we believe in the *Divine guidance and inspiration* of the *original writer*, we have no right to expect that a miraculous power should have so watched over the transmission of the records as to have preserved them from all possible errors of transcription; though a special Providence may have guarded them from such loss or mutilation as would have weakened their testimony to Divine and spiritual Truth.

*Ans.* Why should 'Divine guidance and inspiration' be claimed for the 'original writer' of these 'records,'—that is, according to Bp. BROWNE for some unknown writer of the 'ancient Elohistic document,' p.28, which Moses received from the Israelites in Egypt? But, in any case, it seems that 'Divine guidance and inspiration,' on Bp. BROWNE'S view, does not imply *infallibility* in the present record, except in respect of what 'would have weakened the testimony to Divine and spiritual Truth.' And this, too,

is readily allowed. But then comes the question, What *is* Divine and spiritual *Truth*? And who or what is to be the judge of it, but the spirit of a living man under the leading of the Spirit of God?

46. As to the prodigious *longevity* of the antediluvians, Bp. BROWNE says that 'some eminent physiologists (as BUFFON) have thought this not impossible, —that 'the traditions of ancient nations, as Greeks, Babylonians, Egyptians, Hindoos, and others, point to the great longevity of the early inhabitants of the world,' and, if the Scripture account is true, the others 'would be sure to preserve some traces of the truth,'—and that 'this is a more probable explanation of the fact' than that different nations should have separately 'stumbled upon the same fabulous histories.' p.62.

*Ans.* Many nations also have traditions as to the *gigantic size* of the first men, whereas the records in the Rocks tell us nothing of this. Perhaps 'Greeks, Babylonians, Egyptians, and Hindoos' may all have derived their legends from one and the same ancient myth, far back in the primeval time.

47. Supposing, however, that physiology should ultimately decide that the extreme longevity of the Patriarchs was not possible, without a continued miracle, we should only be driven to the principle already conceded, that *numbers* and *dates*, especially in genealogical tables, are liable in the course of transcription to become obscured and exaggerated. p.62.

*Ans.* It should be remembered that there is no *essential* difference between the Heb., Sam., and Sept. as to the ages of the antediluvians, the average being 847 years, 793 years, 844 years respectively.

48. Bp. BROWNE then expends two pages in replying to the arguments—Geological, Historical, Linguistic, Ethnological—for the Antiquity of Man, which I leave to the consideration of Men of Science, having already said all that I need say on this point in Part IV, and being mainly occupied at present with questions which concern the Mosaic Authorship and Historical Credibility of the Pentateuch. By means of Bp. BROWNE's elastic 'principle' (47) as to the uncertainty of 'numbers and dates,' something, no doubt, may be done (49) towards diminishing the difficulties arising from Sir CHARLES LYELL's demonstrations as to the Antiquity of Man, to which, says Bp. BROWNE, 'several of the most distinguished geologists in England demur,' though he does not name them, or state whether they demur *substantially* or only to *parts* of Sir CHARLES LYELL's conclusions. But, unfortunately, the *beasts* and *reptiles* were made on the same day with Man, i.24–31, and the birds and fishes the day before, i.20–23, or, according to ii.19, the birds and beasts were made apparently *after* Adam. Now the Antiquity of the Animal Creation is carried back by *all* Geologists, as far as I am aware, to almost infinite ages, until the mind stands aghast at the notion almost of Eternal Time.

49. There is one important objection made to the genealogies in G.v. and G.xi., *viz.* that each gives a catalogue of but ten generations; *which looks as if neither were historical.* A probable solution of this difficulty would seem to be, that the genealogies neither were, nor were intended to be, *complete.* Like other genealogies or pedigrees, sacred and profane, they omitted certain links, and perhaps only recorded and handed down to posterity those ancestors of the race who, for some reason or other, were more than the rest deserving of remembrance. This solution would be entirely satisfactory, if it were not for the appearance of chronological completeness which both the genealogies exhibit in their present form, the age of the patriarch at the birth of his son and successor, and the number of years which he lived after that birth, being given in every case. If, therefore, the above explanation be adopted, it would almost be necessary to add that in the course of transmission and transcription *a greater appearance of completeness had been given to the catalogues than had existed in the original record.* Such hypotheses are never to be too lightly adopted; but they are *far more probable than those of the modern critical school, which reject the historical truth of the earlier books of the Bible.* The genealogies of our Lord in the Gospels have undoubtedly some links omitted, and yet are reduced to a form of great completeness. This is a strong argument for believing that the genealogies in Genesis may have been treated in the same manner. We may observe that this supposition, *viz.* that some links are omitted, will allow a much greater antiquity to the race of man than may at first appear on the face of the text of Scripture. In fact, if it be correct, the time which it would allow is *almost unlimited.* p.64.

*Ans.* Certainly, by supposing thousands of generations 'omitted' here and tens of thousands there, Bp. BROWNE may make these genealogies cover an 'almost unlimited time,' enough even to include the animal remains in the Laurentian strata; though why the remains of other kinds of animals are not found in these strata, if all were created in two successive days, does not appear. But, on this supposition, what insignificant persons these antediluvians must have been, that only one man should be worth naming in a thousand generations! Bp. BROWNE, however, is not wanting in boldness of assertion, when he says that the above conjecture, made in the very teeth of 'the appearance of chronological completeness which both the genealogies exhibit in their present form,' and supported by the assumption that this 'appearance of completeness' had been given to the record 'in the course of transmission and transcription,' by what we should almost venture to designate as a deliberate 'forgery,' (if we might use Bp. BROWNE's favourite expression without incurring the charge of a 'gratuitous slander,' p.26), is 'far more probable than the view of modern critics, which regards the genealogies in G.v, xi, as unhistorical.'

### Chap. vi.

50. v.3. *yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years]* The normal dura-



tion of human life did not become from this time 120 years; and the whole context shows that the judgment impending was that of the Flood, and that it was a respite from that which is here promised, that time might be given for Noah's preaching and man's repentance. The only argument that can even appear to have weight against this interpretation is that of Tuch, repeated by Bp. Colenso, viz. that Noah was 500 years old (v.32) when this saying is ascribed to the Almighty, and that he was 600 years old (vii.6) when the Flood came. Hence there were but 100 years, not 120, given as a respite. But *there is really no ground whatever* for asserting that all which is related in vi. took place after Noah was 500 years old. What is said in v.32 is that Noah was 500 years old when his three sons were born. The Deluge may have been threatened long before this. p.66.

*Ans.* The Deluge is first 'threatened' in vi.13-21, and in v.18 we read 'thou and *thy sons* and thy wife and *thy sons' wives* with thee,' meaning surely the 'three sons' as in vii.7,13, viii.16,18; so that, when the Deluge was threatened, Noah's three sons were already born, and therefore Noah was at least 500 years old, in direct contradiction to Bp. BROWNE,—whose assertion that 'there is really no ground whatever' for my statement is, to say the least, somewhat hasty. The fact is, that vi.1-4 is a Jehovistic or possibly even later insertion, and has nothing to do with the ages in the Elohist Narrative.

51. It is mentioned in the German commentators that Peter Jansen, in 1609, built a vessel of the same proportions as the ark, though smaller, viz. 120ft. x 20 ft. x 12ft. It was found most convenient for stowage, *containing one-third more freight than ordinary vessels of the same tonnage*, though it was unsuited for making way quickly through the water.

John Temporarius, quoted by Heidegger, made a curious calculation, according to which the ark would have afforded abundant room for *all the animals then known*, and food for their voyage. Tiele also, in his Commentary, calculates that there was room for 7,000 distinct species. p.68.

*Ans.* Is it possible that such solemn nonsense can be penned in this age, by a Bishop of the Church of England, for a Commentary intended to 'make the latest information accessible to a man of ordinary culture,' and 'enable him to find an explanation of any difficulties which his own mind might suggest, as well as of any new objections, &c.' *Pref.*? Of course, a mere tub, like Peter Jansen's, having the same breadth throughout from top to bottom, would hold more than an ordinary vessel of the same tonnage properly shaped. But did 'JOHN TEMPORARIUS' calculate in what state the *carriion* would be—taken on board for a twelvemonth's supply for vultures, &c.—at the end of a day or two, or even of the fresh meat which must have been provided for lions, tigers, leopards, eagles, owls, kites, and hawks? Where did the chameleons get their flies, the woodpeckers their grubs, the

night-hawks their moths? How could snipes and woodcocks, that feed on worms and insects at the bottom of sedgy brooks, or humming-birds that seek the honey of flowers, have lived in the ark? How was this huge 'Great Eastern' drained and its 'nests' cleaned day by day? But these and similar questions have been asked before (IV.282, &c.), and Bp. BROWNE takes not the slightest notice of such difficulties, except to suggest, p.69, that— if the ark was to hold, not only birds and quadrupeds, but insects and reptiles, possibly *eggs* or *larvæ* may have been preserved!

This, no doubt, gets over the difficulty of pairs of spiders and ladybirds, ants and bees, moths and butterflies, and 'creeping things' generally, vi.20, vii.14,21,23, viii.17, marching or flying deliberately up to be taken into the ark. But we have now to imagine Noah and his family going about the country searching for 'eggs' and 'larvæ,' and storing and preserving for twelve months the proper supplies of vegetable food for these multitudinous grubs and caterpillars, not to speak of the business of changing their food daily, well-known to amateur keepers of silkworms!

52. It really needs an apology to the common-sense of my readers for putting before them in plain words such considerations as these. But I am compelled to enter into these absurd details by the contents of this Commentary, put forth under the sanction of the Archbishops and Bishops of England. A few years ago there were many who ridiculed the notion of such things being seriously believed in these days, and who condemned my own exposure of such absurdities as utterly unnecessary amidst the light and knowledge of the present age. But here we have this Commentary, set on foot by the Speaker of the House of Commons, and expressing, or supposed very naturally to express, the very mind of the English Episcopate, propounding gravely these childish 'explanations' to satisfy the doubts of devout and earnest enquirers, and Bp. BROWNE, as one of the most learned members of that body, as the very Coryphæus of the scholarship of England, bringing the English Church into contempt throughout the world by these ineptitudes. There is something very solemn and impressive in the grand old myth, with the ark and its human and brute inhabitants floating alone upon the waste of waters over a dead and buried world. It is only such writers as these, with their attempts to justify and render credible the details of the story, who make the whole ridiculous.

53. v.16. *a window shalt thou make to the ark, and in a cubit shalt thou finish it above*] Much has been said against the historical truth of a narrative which could assign but one window of a cubit long to so vast a ship. It is quite possible that it may have been a *window-course* (Ges.), running for a cubit long under the top or deck of the ark, lighting the whole *upper story*, very similar to the clerestory of churches. . . . It seems not impossible that some transparent substance was

used. This may easily have been known to the antediluvians, who had made the progress in arts described in iv.21,22. Perhaps the invention was lost after the Deluge, an event which must have reduced mankind to almost original simplicity and rudeness. It is by no means clear that these windows were all in the roof or deck. They may have been in the gunwales, *i.e.* on the higher part of the sides of the vessel, like the portholes of a modern ship of war. And, if they were covered with a transparent substance, it is quite possible that they may not have been confined to the *upper story* of the ship, as the word 'above' does not necessarily mean on the upper part of the vessel, but may mean the top of the window-course.

*the door of the ark*] There was naturally but one opening beside the window-course, through which all the inhabitants of the ark were to be let into it. p.68.

*Ans.* Whatever may be meant by 'above,' yet Bp.BROWNE will hardly maintain that one single 'window-course,' one cubit =  $1\frac{3}{4}$  ft. high, lighted sufficiently the *three* decks of this ship  $52\frac{1}{2}$  ft. high! Moreover, he says himself, p.72, that 'the window,' which was 'opened,' viii.6, means merely 'the opening,' being 'quite a different word' from that used for the 'window-course' in vi.16; and he adds—

The Authorised Version would suggest the idea that Noah was commanded to make a *window*; whereas the original expresses the fact that Noah was commanded to make a window-course or light-system, and that now he opens the window or casement in the ark which he had made on purpose to open. p.72.

One only 'window or casement made to open' for these three stories, stuffed with beasts and birds, and with all kinds of animal and vegetable food, and even this apparently not opened till the end of nine months, viii.6! If even the creatures had *light*, it is clear that they had no *air*; for the one *door*, says Bp.BROWNE—

which could not have been secured with pitch or bitumen by Noah, was by some providential or supernatural agency secured and made water-tight. p.71.

54. v.19. *two of every sort shalt thou bring into the ark*] Of course, if we will admit nothing out of the ordinary course of nature, we shall be unable to receive the Mosaic history of the Deluge. Yet, even on natural principles we may in some measure explain Noah's power over the beasts. When a terrible catastrophe is closely impending, there is often a presentiment of it in the brute creation. Under the pressure of great danger, or great suffering, the wildest animals will, at times, become perfectly tame and tractable. Most likely, too, *Noah and his family would choose pairs of very young animals, just old enough* to feed themselves, as being the most tractable, and as requiring less room than those full-grown. If the ark was to hold, not only birds and quadrupeds, but insects and reptiles. possibly eggs or larvæ may have been preserved. p.68.

*Ans.* It is not more surprising that Bp.BROWNE should have written the above than that the EDITOR should have printed it—at least without remou-

strance. Bp. BROWNE now supposes, not that the beasts and birds and 'creeping-things' came of their own accord, under a Divine impulse, as 'orthodox' persons have generally supposed, and as, in fact, the text plainly implies, vii.9,15, but that 'Noah and his family chose pairs of very young animals,' and had therefore at their command litters of young lions, leopards, &c. and broods of young birds of all kinds!—not to speak of the 'eggs and larvæ' of 'all creeping-things of the earth after their kinds,' which latter (*viz.* 'insects and reptiles') were also to be taken according to vi.20, vii.8, &c.

### Chap. vii.

55. v.1. The preceding chapter accounts for a period of 120 years. At the beginning of that period, God had declared His Will to destroy mankind by a flood, unless they profited by the time still given them for repentance. Noah is ordered to prepare an ark, the building of which may have occupied the greater part of this season of respite. He is told *at the very first* that he and his sons are to go into the ark, &c. In the present chapter we reach the end of the 120 years. p.69.

*Ans.* How could Noah have been 'told *at the very first* that he and his sons are to go into the ark,' with 'his wife and his sons' wives,' vi.18, *if his sons were not yet born*, as Bp. BROWNE suggests—

What is said in v.32 is that Noah was 500 years old when his three sons were born. The Deluge may have been threatened *long before this*. p.66. (?)

The Elohist story appears to suppose an interval of 100 years after these sons were born, *comp.* v.32, vii.6,11, during some portion of which the ark was in preparation.

56. v.2. *of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee by sevens, the male and his female*] There is no inconsistency between this verse and vi.20 [or vii.9,15], 'two of every sort.' The command here is but an amplification of the former injunction, which had probably been given 120 years before. In the first instance, it was said that Noah's family should be preserved, together with a pair of every kind of beast—in the second, that whilst the *general* rule should be the saving of a single pair, yet, in the case of the few clean beasts, there should be preserved not one pair only but seven. p.69.

*Ans.* The *birds* were also to be taken 'two of every sort' in vi.20; whereas in vii.3 they are to be taken 'by sevens, the male and the female,' the *unclean* birds as well as the clean. Bp. BROWNE says that the insertion in the Sam., Sept., and Syr., which corrects this discrepancy,—

must have been a very ancient reading, but it appears to have arisen from a gloss or commentary having crept into the text. *It probably gives the true sense of the passage.* p.69.

The fact is, that vii.1-5 belongs to the *Jehovist*, as appears not merely from the use of the name 'Jehovah,' but from other indubitable signs (V.*An.*22), while vi.20, vii.9,15, belong to the *Elohistic*.

57. v.4. *Yet seven days*] Noah is allowed yet seven days more for gathering all safely into the place of refuge before the Flood sets in. p.69.

*Ans.* Noah is called to 'come into the ark,' v.1, and in v.7 he actually enters, and then 'after seven days' the Flood begins, v.10; so that he was in the ark with all his animals 'seven days' before the rain.

But vii.4,10, are interpolations of the *Jehovist*.

58. Bp.BROWNE agrees with our own view (V.*An.*24) that 'the boundary line between clean and unclean animals is marked by nature,' and that—

it is not impossible that the distinction even of the names, 'clean and unclean' had been fully established by custom long before it was recognized and ratified by the Law. p.69,—

so that such expressions may very well have been used by the *Jehovist* in this passage before the L.L. was written.

Bp.BROWNE also agrees with us (IV.67, VI.504) that the Flood began at 'the beginning of the wintry and rainy season,' *i.e.* in *November*, which in older times was reckoned as the 'second' month, vii.11, so that the 'seventh' month, viii.4, when 'the ark rested' was 'Abib,' reckoned in later days as the 'first' month.

Bp.BROWNE further agrees with us that the writer of the *Elohistic Narrative* must have been acquainted with the length of the year, whether we reckon five months of 30 days (= 150 days, vii.24, viii.3) from vii.11 to viii.4, which—

makes the Noachic year a year of 360 days, corresponding with the old Egyptian year, unless any intercalation of five days was made use of, p.70,—

or twelve (lunar) months (= 355 days) + 10 days = 365 days, from vii.11 to viii.14, an exact solar year (VI. *App.*123,17). Bp.BROWNE adds—'It is certain that the Egyptians used solar time long before the date of the *Exodus*,' and, if so, then long before the age of Samuel, when the Israelites may have already learned from their more advanced neighbours this mode of reckoning time.

59. v.12,17. With regard to the forty days' rain, it seems pretty certain that these were not additional to, but part of, the 160 days of the prevalence of the Flood. p.70.

*Ans.* The 'seven days' in v.4,10, and the 'forty days' rain' in v.12,17, as well as the 'forty days' of waiting in viii.6, and the 'seven days' in viii.10, 12, are all due to the *Jehovist*, and interpolated into the Original Story.

60. v.17,18,19. In these verses the frequent repetition of the same thought in almost the same words has been supposed by Astruc and others to evidence the work of different hands. p.71.

*Ans.* See (V.*An.*32), where v.18<sup>a</sup>, 19<sup>b</sup>, is assigned to E., and v.17,18<sup>b</sup>,19<sup>a</sup>, to J., on other grounds than mere 'repetition of the same thought.'

### Chap. viii.

61. v.7. It has been supposed that there were carcasses of men and beasts floating on the water, that from them the raven found a place to light upon, and also food; and hence, though it returned from time to time and rested on the ark, it never again sought an entrance into it. p.72.

*Ans.* It may be questioned if 'carcasses of men and beasts' would be found floating at the end of *nine months*.

62. v.11. *an olive leaf*] Theophrastus and Pliny are cited as saying that the olive grew under water in the Red Sea, and bore berries there. Whether this be so or not, it is *probable that the olive may live more healthily under a flood than most other trees*. It is eminently hardy, and will grow in a favourable soil without care or culture. The following passage illustrates the extraordinary powers of adaptation to circumstances possessed by some plants. 'The formation of sprouts gives the plant the means of attaching itself to the most varied conditions, of persisting through periods of continued cold and heat, damp or drought, according as the climate may produce, and guarding against death in all cases of frustrated seed-development. Thus *Littorella lacustris*, which never flowers under water, maintains and increases itself by lateral runners, year after year, at the bottom of the lakes of the Black Forest, and only comes into flower when the water retreats in the driest years, which scarcely occurs oftener than once in ten.' p.73.

*Ans.* What has this plant's peculiarity of being able to live under water to do with the *olive*? And is it not certain that almost all trees, plants, and grasses would die if submerged for nine months—so that when Noah and the animals came out of the ark two months afterwards there would have been nothing (without a new creation) for the *herbivorous* animals to eat? The *carnivorous* animals, no doubt, might turn to devouring their fellow-creatures, saved together with themselves in the ark. But then if the two cats ate the two mice, the spiders the flies, the hawks the sparrows, &c., how would these different extinguished races be propagated 'after their kind'?

63. v.14. Bp. BROWNE takes no notice of the fact that 'Noah removed' the 'covering of the ark,' v.13, 'on the first day of the first month;' whereas it was not until 'the 27th day of the second month,' v.14, that he was commanded to go out of it. What became of the *birds* all this while? Did none of these fly away, when 'the face of the ground was dry,' v.13? Or,

were they all in the *lower* stories, so that they could not get out for nearly two months, till they went out with Noah and the rest, v.19?

64. v.20. Some of the German commentators see in the account of this sacrifice a late interpolation derived from the Mosaic or Levitical customs of sacrifice. Delitzsch justly observes that in most of the traditions of the Deluge external to the Israelites a sacrifice forms part of the legend. The *pretence*, therefore, that in the Biblical narrative this was an afterthought of a Jehovist interpolator, must be gratuitous. p.73.

*Ans.* viii.20-22 may be due to the Jehovist, as it is clearly shown to be (V.An.45), without this sacrifice being 'derived from Mosaic or Levitical customs.' If the distinction of 'clean and unclean' animals existed independently of the Law, as Bp.BROWNE says (58), doubtless 'clean' animals only were used for sacrifices in the age of the Jehovist, centuries before the L.L. was written; and, accordingly, he provides seven pairs of clean beasts and birds in vii.2,3, with a view to the sacrifice in viii.20.

65. v.21. *a sweet savour*] lit. 'the savour of satisfaction or delectation,' the word *Nichoach*, 'satisfaction,' having a reference to *Noach*, 'rest.' p.73.

*Ans.* Even supposing that in the 'primitive language' Noah's real name had the same relation to the words for 'rest' and 'comfort' as in Hebrew, *Noach* has to *Nuakh* and *Nikham*, v.29, yet it is strange that it should have a *third* similar relation to the representative of *Nichoach*.

66. v.21. In vi.5 it is written that God's anger was moved 'because every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.' Here, on the contrary, it is said that 'the Lord said in His heart, I will not curse the ground any more for man's sake, for the imagination of his heart is evil from his youth.' The Germans discover an inconsistency between the words of the *Elohists* in vi.5 and those of the *Jehovist* here. p.73.

*Ans.* To what 'Germans' does Bp.BROWNE refer, as assigning vi.5 to the *Elohists*? It is certain that it belongs to the *Jehovist* (V.An.13); and, in fact, though the E.V. has 'God' in this verse, by which perhaps Bp.BROWNE was beguiled into the notion that it must be regarded as an *Elohistic* passage, yet the *Heb.*, *Sam.*, *Syr.*, *Arab.*, have 'Jehovah,' and the LXX Κύριος ὁ Θεός.

67. That in all parts of the world, among races the most remote and dissimilar, there should prevail a belief that, after Man was created on the earth, all men but one family were destroyed by a Deluge, is intelligible only on the supposition that some such event actually did occur—an event simply, graphically and *accurately* (!) related in the Book of Genesis, but variously distorted and *disguised* in the legends of the heathen world. p.75.

*Ans.* Whether the existence of such stories may really be due to the occurrence of some actual inundation in the original seat of the human

race, of which a reminiscence may have been handed down in the myth of the Flood, as that of huge primeval saurians may perhaps have been preserved in the *dragons* of so many ancient legends;—or whether the discovery of bones—sometimes of large size—of extinct animals on mountain summits may have generated the belief in a Flood, together with the belief in the existence of giants which has come down in diverging channels from the earliest times, it being remembered that, among the grand results of Comparative Philology, as stated by Prof. MAX MÜLLER, and quoted by Bp. BROWNE, p. 83, ‘nothing necessitates the admission of different beginnings for either the material or the formal elements of the Turanian, Semitic, or Aryan branches of speech,’ nor consequently of different beginnings for the corresponding races;—or whether the matter must be left unexplained—the value of the story in Genesis as an historical narrative has been shown to be utterly worthless (51, &c).

68. Was the Deluge Universal? . . . The most literal interpretation of the language . . . would lead to the conviction that it must have been universal. Yet it is certain that many, who accept implicitly the historical truth of the narrative, believe the inundation to have been partial. . . It may be well to consider the nature of the narrative, and the common use of language among the Hebrews. And, if we do so carefully, we shall surely be led to conclude that the Deluge is described as from the point of view of an eye-witness. . . Even if we are right in esteeming all as a simply direct revelation, it may be that the revelation was given in prophetic vision, and that Moses wrote not merely what he had heard, but also, and rather, *what he had seen*. But we may remember, too, that the custom of Scripture is to refer historical records to the evidence of *eye-witnesses*. . . Now just so is the Deluge described in Genesis. It is pictured as it would have presented itself to the eyes of Noah and his family. [How could it have been described otherwise than as a *picture*, presenting itself to the eyes of Noah or someone else?] Moreover, on the principle just mentioned, it is in the highest degree probable that the description is really that which was given by one of such eye-witnesses. It would have been very strange if no such description had been given and preserved. *Shem would almost certainly have related it, over and over again, to his children and grandchildren*. They would have treasured it up in their memories, and handed it on. As has been so notoriously the case among later nations, the very words of the original narrative would be carefully recorded from father to son, whether in writing or by oral tradition; and so, *in all probability, we have in Genesis the very syllables in which the Patriarch Shem described to the ancestors of Abraham that which he himself had seen, and in which he had borne so great a part*. [What? ‘the very syllables in which the Patriarch Shem described &c.’! Was, then, the primeval language *Hebrew* after all (32)?] . . . One of the eight human beings saved in the ark relates all that he saw. He mentions first God’s warning to Noah, and denunciation of judgment on mankind. He describes the building and proportions of the ark, &c. &c. p.76.



*Ans.* But he does not say a word that may help us to understand how the animals lived without light and air, or how many of them got their supplies of animal food, carrion or fresh meat, in the ark,—how food and water were daily supplied, the cribs cleansed, &c.—how the birds were kept from flying away, when the ark was without a covering for the last two months—how immediately after the Flood the cattle lived without grass, the birds without seeds and flowers, all vegetation having been destroyed—how the pairs were replaced, which the beasts and birds of prey devoured, as soon as they came out of the ark, which—

had probably been young and tame in the ark, but were now adult or adolescent, and returning to their own wild natures. *p.78.*

69. At length not only did the ark float, but the highest hills disappeared . . . the very words are 'All the high hills under the whole heaven were covered.' Where the ark was at this time, or where Noah and his family had been dwelling before, we cannot tell. The country may have been mountainous, and so, in order to hide the hills from view, the waters must have been very deep; or *it may have been a plain country*, as many think the region round about Babylon, with few hills in sight, and those not of great altitude, in which case but a moderate depth of water would have sufficed to cover all the highest hills under the whole canopy of heaven. *The inhabitants of the ark probably tried the depth of the Deluge by a plumb-line (!)*—[how did they know when they were exactly over the 'highest hills' ?]—an invention surely not unknown to those who had acquired the art of working in brass and iron, and they found the depth of 15 cubits (27 ft.), vii.20. Then 'all flesh, all that was on the dry land, died.' . . . At length on a specified day the ark rests. It is found that it had stranded near to some of the hills in a generally plain country, perhaps to the south of Armenia, perhaps in the north of Palestine, perhaps somewhere in Persia, or in India, or elsewhere [This refers to BR. BROWN'S view as to the meaning of the 'mountains of Ararat']. . . From first to last, the description is just that which Shem or Noah would have given of all that he had himself seen.

If this be the true explanation of the narrative, we may then more readily see how the question of the universality of the Deluge stands. The words used may certainly mean that the Deluge was universal. . . Yet, if only the inhabited world was inundated, and all its inhabitants destroyed, the effect would have been the same to Noah, and would most likely have been described in the same words. The purpose of God was to sweep away the sinful race of Adam. That purpose would have been effected by a Deluge, which covered the whole of that portion of the globe which may be called the cradle of the human race. The words of the narrative are perhaps no stronger than would have been naturally used to describe such a catastrophe. The most striking is the passage 'All the high hills under the whole heaven,' vii.19. But this is no more than such expressions as 'the whole heaven,' D.ii.25, 'all countries,' G.xli.57, and *comp.* 1K.xviii.10. When the ancients speak of the whole world, they mean at most the whole world as known

to the ancients; when they speak of the whole heaven, they mean the whole visible canopy or expanse of the sky; and so, when they speak of the earth, the land, the dry ground, they mean at times very limited portions indeed of the earth's surface. The strictest interpretation of the record, according to the habit of speech among Semitic nations, will allow us to understand that a Deluge prevailed, extensive enough to destroy all the living race of man, and to cover with water the whole visible face of nature. *p.77.*

*Ans.* But vi.7,17,19, vii.4,15,21-23, viii.21, ix.11,15—in addition to vii.19, quoted by Bp.BROWNE, and even more decisively—make it impossible to doubt that the writer meant the Deluge to be *universal*—‘all flesh wherein is the breath of life,’ vi.17, ‘every living thing of all flesh,’ vi.19, ‘every living substance that I have made,’ vii.4, ‘two and two of all flesh wherein is the breath of life,’ vii.15, &c.

Moreover, if the Deluge was to be partial only, what was the use of a miraculous preservation of all beasts, birds, and creeping things within that area, when ‘the now desolated continent’ could easily have been ‘replenished’ from outside it, and when, moreover, the *birds*, at all events, and many of the other animals, might have easily escaped out of the reach of such an inundation, when only—

that portion of the earth, perhaps as yet a *very small portion*, into which mankind had spread, was overwhelmed by water. *p.77. (?)*

Lastly, a partial Deluge, such as to cover ‘the highest hills,’ within sight of Noah must have speedily found its level over the whole earth by the laws of gravitation, unless outside those lower hills there was a *complete* circular range of higher hills, like the crater of a lunar volcano.

Thus the notion that the Deluge described in Genesis was a partial Deluge is (1) *unscriptural*, (2) *unnecessary* and *useless*, as regards the animals, (3) *unscientific* and *absurd*, without a further supposition of a higher circular rim for the inundated region, for which there is no basis whatever in fact. And what is the meaning of ‘all the foundations of the *great deep* being broken up,’ if there was only a limited inundation in an *inland* district?

Bp.BROWNE says that ‘the seas and rivers burst their *boundaries*,’ *p.71*, apparently through the access of rain-water; but it seems plain that this is not what the writer intended; he imagines water-springs bursting underneath the sea.

70. Bp.BROWNE, however, does not seem to be quite sure of his ground, and proceeds to argue as to the possibility of the Flood being universal:—

It is said the loose scoræ on the mountains of Auvergne and Languedoc must have been swept away by an universal flood. It is, however, quite conceivable, even if the Deluge extended to those regions and to the tops of those hills, that the

*gradual* rise and subsidence of the waters may have left there remains of volcanic action, *which are not so light as has been asserted*, almost untouched. p.77.

*Ans.* The Bible tells us that 'all the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and *the windows of heaven were opened*,' vii.11, which surely implies that 'the clouds poured down rain,' p.71, in torrents. As to Bp.BROWNE'S assertion that the scorixæ in question 'are not so light as has been asserted,' we have the statement of Mr.SCOPE, who has visited these volcanoes and described them at length in his *Volcanos of Central France*, to the following effect, p.206—'The undisturbed condition of the volcanic cones, consisting of *loose scorixæ and ashes, which actually let the foot sink ankle-deep in them*, forbids the possibility of supposing any great wave or debacle to have passed over the country since the production of these cones;' see also p.97,207, LYELL'S *Antiquity of Man*, p.192, HUGH MILLER, *Testimony of the Rocks*, p.341-2, KALISCH, *Gen.* p.208.

71. Lastly, Bp.BROWNE, to obviate the difficulty of accounting for the reception of all animals, from hot countries and cold, into the ark, of their living in it for more than a year and their redistribution to their present abodes, returns once more to his notion of a partial Deluge:—

Is it conceivable that all should have been gathered from their original habitats into the ark of Noah, and have been afterwards redistributed to their respective homes? The difficulty, however, vanishes entirely if the sacred narrative relates only a submersion of the human race and of its then dwelling-place, *a sense of that narrative, which exact criticism shows to be possible, perhaps even the most probable*, irrespective of all questions of Natural Science. p.77.

*Ans.* This is mere bold assertion: we have seen (69) that the 'sense,' which implies a partial Deluge, is unscriptural, unmeaning, and impossible, and therefore the difficulty in question remains in full force.

72. The *cavils* against the single window, the proportions of the ark, &c., have been considered in their respective places. The *peculiar unfairness* of the objections urged is to be found, not so much in the objections themselves, as in the insisting at the same time on an interpretation of the Scripture narrative, on principles which would not be applied to any other history whatever. Not only are we required to expound ancient and Eastern phraseology with the cold exactness applicable only to the tongues of Northern Europe, but moreover to adhere to all the interpretations of past uncritical ages, to believe that *there was but a single window in the ark*, that the ark stranded on the top of a mountain, within sight of which it very probably never sailed, that the waters of the Flood rose three or even five miles above the sea-level, and other prodigies, which the sacred text, even in its most natural significance, nowhere either asserts or implies. p.78.

*Ans.* Bp.BROWNE'S reproaches are wholly unfounded as regards my own criticisms. I am perfectly willing to allow for 'ancient and Eastern phrase-

ology'; but I cannot doubt that when the Bible says 'every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground,' and 'only Noah remained, and what was with him in the ark,' vii.23, it means that the Flood was universal. I can suppose that there was a 'window-course'; but even that could not light all the cabins of a huge three-decker, and Bp. BROWNE allows apparently that there was only one 'opening' for air for all these animals, and only one 'door,' which was 'secured and made water-tight.' I have no doubt that the text really means that the ark stranded on the top of Ararat; but the difficulties of the story remain insuperable, if the waters rose only 15 cubits above 'all the low hills' in sight of Noah. If the story is a myth, all these objections vanish at once. But Bp. BROWNE compels us to enquire into all the details of the story, as we should into those of any other history, when he speaks of Noah taking 'eggs and larvæ' into the ark.

### Chap. ix.

73. v.3. *Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you*] In the primal blessing, i.28-30, there had been mention of man's supremacy and power over the inferior animals. It has been a question whether there had been a permission of animal food or not. The almost universal opinion of the ancients was that only vegetable food was then permitted . . . an interpretation which seems to do less violence to the text. It cannot, however, be said that from the first there was a *prohibition* of animal food. From very early times we find sheep and cattle kept at least for milk and wool, and slain for sacrifice, iv.2,20. Whether then it had been conceded, or not, from the first, it is likely that those who fed and sacrificed sheep, like Abel, who kept cattle like Jabal, or who handled instruments of bronze and iron, like Tubal-Cain, would in the course of time have learned the use of animal food. If so, we may consider the words of this verse as a concession to the infirmities or the necessities of mankind, coupled with restrictions, which may have been called for by the savage practices of the antediluvians. p.78.

*Ans.* The Elohist, apparently, now for the first time supposes the use of animal food. Bp. BROWNE's difficulty arises from the insertion of the Jehovistic matter in iv.2,20, which presumes the keeping of sheep and cattle 'at least for milk and wool' and sacrifices, from the earliest times.

74. v.4. *flesh with the life thereof, the blood thereof*] We need not look for any scientific explanation of the connection between life and blood, here or in the subsequent legal enactments. The ancients, no doubt, generally believed the blood to be the seat of the life. But it is also literally true that the shedding of blood is equivalent to the destruction of life; and so in these early injunctions the God of mercy taught the value not only of human, but of all animal being. p.79.

*Ans.* We have merely here signs of a superstition shared by the Hebrews with 'the ancients generally,' which forbade the eating of blood, 1S xiv.32;

L. iii.17, &c. If this had been really a Divine command to Noah, it would be binding on the whole human race at this moment, being addressed to Noah as the second father of mankind.

75. v.10. *from all that go out of the ark to every beast of the earth*] An idiomatic expression, signifying that the covenant shall extend not only to those that go out of the ark, but also to every beast of the earth. Not only those preserved in thy ark, but all other animals are to be interested in this promise. From which we can hardly fail to infer that the destruction of the lower animals was confined to a certain district, and not general throughout the earth. p.79.

*Ans.* Instead of 'unto every *beast* of the earth,' the Hebrew should most probably be translated (KALISCH) 'unto every living-being (הַיָּיִת) of the earth'; *comp.* v.16, 'the everlasting covenant between Elohim and every *living creature* (הַיָּיִת שֶׁבְּהַמָּיִם) of all flesh that is upon the earth,' where (i) 'every living creature' includes Noah himself and all human beings as well as animals, *comp.* 'all flesh,' v.17, and (ii) the covenant is made with all that shall hereafter be born.

76. v.13. *I do set my bow in the cloud*] lit. 'I have set my bow.' . . . It appears at first sight as if the words of the sacred record implied that this was the first rainbow ever seen on earth. But it would be doing no violence to the text to believe that the rainbow had been already a familiar sight, but that it was newly constituted the sign or token of a covenant. p.80.

*Ans.* From the repetitions in v.14, 'the bow shall be seen in the cloud,' v.16, 'the bow shall be in the cloud,' it seems plain that the writer supposes the bow to have been seen for the first time when the Deluge was over, and Noah, &c. came out of the ark, viii.18,19, which was immediately followed by ix.1-17 in the Elohist Narrative. Bp. BROWNE'S modification of the E. V. is no improvement.

77. v.22. The great difficulty in this history is, that Ham appears to have sinned, and Canaan is cursed. . . . It has been thought that Noah's prophecy extended to all the posterity of Ham, but that only that portion which affected Canaan was preserved by Moses, in order to animate the Israelites in their wars against the Canaanites. p.81.

*Ans.* This passage (as we suppose) was written 'in the latter part of David's reign' (V.291), when perhaps the idea was already entertained of enacting 'bond-service' from the Canaanites remaining in the land, as Solomon actually did, 1K.ix.20,21, and the Gibeonites may perhaps even have 'served' at David's Tabernacle, J.ix.23,27, 2S.xxi.1-9, *comp.* 1S.xxii. 18,19.

78. v.27. *God shall enlarge Japheth*] There is a paronomasia on the name Japheth, which probably signifies 'enlarged.' The Hebrew word 'shall enlarge.'

is, neglecting the vowel-points, letter for letter the same as the word Japheth. p.81.

*Ans.* We must suppose, according to Bp. BROWNE (32) that Japheth's real name in the 'primitive language' had a similar relation to the word in that language meaning 'enlarge,' and that this whole prophecy, in fact, has been translated out of that language into Hebrew, and so ingeniously, as to retain the paronomasia, which, while 'so common in Hebrew poetry,' p.84, must it seems, have been equally common in the 'primitive language.'

### Chap. x.

79. It is quite possible that even the very earliest Patriarchs, as Shem, Ham, and Japheth, Canaan and the like, may have been known in after ages by names which adhered to them through events in their history or places where they had fixed themselves. Thus Shem may have been the man of *name*, the most renowned of Noah's sons, Ham the man who settled in the *warm regions* of Africa, Japheth the father of the *fair* people of Europe, or perhaps the man whose descendants *spread abroad* more widely than the rest. Canaan again may have been the dweller in *low* lands, while Aram may have derived a title from having chosen the *high* lands for his home. This theory, if true, would not interfere with the historical character of this chapter—*especially if we consider that Hebrew may not have been the primitive tongue, in which case all these names must either have been translations of the original names, or names by which the bearers had become known to posterity.* p.83.

*Ans.* This chapter, no doubt, gives the best geographical knowledge to which the writer had attained in the age in which it was written—as we suppose, (except v.8-12), the beginning of Solomon's reign (V.291).

80. The name Tartessus is identical with Tarshish, the *t* being constantly substituted by the Syriac for the Hebrew sibilant, *comp.* Bashan = *Batanæa*, Zor = *Tyre*, &c.

The Spanish were among the most famous of the Phœnician colonies, and were especially rich in metal; of which colonies Tartessus was the most illustrious. . . . Two passages in Chronicles (2Ch.ix.21, xx.36) seem irreconcilable with this, and induced St. Jerome and after him Bechart and others to suppose that there must have been another Tarshish in the Indian Ocean, which could be approached by the Red Sea—an opinion now generally rejected. p.85.

*Ans.* Bp. BROWNE does not explain the matter more fully. But as he himself appears to join in the 'general rejection' of this view, it should be understood that in so doing he fixes upon the Chronicler an absurd mistake, betraying also gross ignorance. For the Chronicler is copying from the Book of Kings, 1K.x.22, xxii.48,(49) : but where the older writer speaks of *Tarshish-ships*, meaning (see Bp. BROWNE, p.85) 'large ships' for trading purposes (just as we say *Indiamen*), the Chronicler changes the expression,

and speaks of these ships as made to 'go to Tarshish,' introducing thereby in the latter passage the absurdity of representing Jehoshaphat as building ships at Ezion-geber on the Red Sea with a view of their going to Spain!

81. Some passages in the Old Testament seem to require that we should place *Cush* in Asia, as . . . E.ii.16,21, compared with N.xii.1; in the latter of which Zipporah is called a Cushite, whilst in the former she is said to be a daughter of the priest of Midian. This connects Cush with Midian, which was in Arabia Felix, near the Red Sea. *p.86.*

*Ans.* On the other hand, the Commentary on N.xii.1 says—'This can hardly be Zipporah, who was not an Ethiopian, but a Midianite. And even if we regard the term Cushite as one which Miriam applied to the wife of Moses in contempt, it is highly improbable that Miriam could now have brought up in reproach a marriage which Moses had contracted *half a century previously*, and before his special call by God.

82. The fact that the Canaanites appear to have spoken a Semitic tongue has been alleged as a reason why they should not have been of Hamitic descent. . . . In the earliest days the Hamites and Shemites were near neighbours; there may have sprung from them a mixed race, which spread toward Tyre and Sidon, and dispossessed, partly also intermingled with, a Semitic race originally inhabiting the region of Palestine and Phœnicia. As Abraham and his descendants appear to have changed their native Aramæan for the Hebrew of Palestine, so very probably the Hamitic Canaanites, long mingled with Semitic races, acquired the language of the children of Shem. *p.87.*

*Ans.* The language of the Canaanites—at all events, of the Phœnicians—being almost identical with Hebrew, and that of 'the other inhabitants of Canaan being Semitic,' *p.91*, the Hebrews must have learned to use the speech of Canaan after their settlement in it, or else they must have been cognate with the Phœnicians, as they confessedly were with the Edomites, Moabites, and Ammonites.

83. *v.8.* Nimrod is here separated from the other sons of Cush, perhaps because of his great fame and mighty prowess. *p.88.*

*Ans.* He is separated only because *x.8-12* is a Deuteronomistic interpolation (*V.66*).

84. The language of the inscriptions discovered in these ruins (*Nineveh*) appears to be an ancient Semitic dialect. This is not inconsistent with the foundation of the city by a descendant of [the Hamitic] Nimrod; for the indigenous race was no doubt derived from the colonization [of the district *Asshur*] by *Asshur*, the son of Shem, *v.22*, and the adoption of the Semitic language has parallels in the cases of *Babylon* and *Canaan*. *p.90.*

*Ans.* The supposed 'parallels' are assumptions made by *Bp. BROWNÉ* himself in support of his own theory. But there are several other dis-

crepancies in the accounts of G.x, which show some uncertainty in the traditions, reports, or theories, on which the writer relied, as well as other points, on which he is at variance with the ethnological science of the present day. Thus Havilah is *Hamite*, v.7, but *Shemite*, v.29—Sheba and Dedan are *Hamites*, v.7, but appear as *Shemites*, xxv.3, *comp.* Sheba, x.28; and, if it be said that there may have been two Shebas, two Dedans, and two Havilahs, yet Tarshish (Tartessus) and Kittim (Cyprus) are known to have been *Phœnician* (*Hamite*) settlements (as Bp. BROWNE allows for Tarshish, p.85), and yet they are classed among the *Japhethites*, v.4, and the Phœnicians are placed among the *Hamites*, though their tongue was *Semitic*: see (IV.368). Bp. BROWNE, however, says—

It has been thought that in these, as in other instances, the Shemite and Hamite races intermarried, and that there consequently arose a certain confusion in their names, or that very probably they adopted names from those with whom they were thus connected. p.153.

85. Many of the names in these genealogies are significant, and were probably given to their bearers late in life, or even historically, after their deaths. p.93.

*Ans.* Thus we have '*Peleg*, for in his days the earth was divided (*palag*),' v.25: but then this was not his real name, says Bp. BROWNE, in the '*primitive language*.'

N.B. The writer of G.x gives us no account whatever of the origin of the negro races of Africa, or the *red* Indians, or the *yellow* Malays.

### Chap. xi.

86. v.1. *the whole earth was of one language.*] The general opinion of the Jews and ancient Christians was that this language was Hebrew. The names of the most ancient places and persons mentioned in Scripture being Hebrew seems to countenance this belief. p.95.

*Ans.* Here, then, Bp. BROWNE drops the notion of the '*primitive language*' not being Hebrew, on which he has hitherto laid so much stress (32,79).

87. v.9. *Babel*] From *Babal*, 'to confound,' contracted from *Balbal*, 'confusion.' . . . Eichhorn suggested that the name originally was *Bab-Bel*, 'the gate or court of Bel,' i.e. Baal or Belus. So Rosenmüller, Gesenius, and others have thought it might be *Bab-Il*, 'the Gate of God.' These derivations are really much less likely than that given by Moses. p.97.

*Ans.* Bp. BROWNE's fellow-Commentator, Prof. RAWLINSON, says, *D.B.* I.p.149—'The name is connected in Genesis with the Hebrew root  $\text{לבל}$ , *confundere*, "because the Lord did there confound the language of all the earth," G.xi.9. But the native etymology is *Bab-Il*, "the gate of the god Il," or perhaps more simply "the gate of God"; and this was, no doubt, the



*original intention* of the appellation as given by Nimrod, though the other sense came to be attached to it after the confusion of tongues.'

88. v.10. We have here the *third* genealogical table. The first was given in ch.v from Adam to Noah, the second in ch.x, the genealogy of the three sons of Noah, *the descendants of Shem being traced down as far as Peleg*. Now we have the line of Shem farther carried down to Abraham. . . . In ch.x no account is given of the length of the generations or of the duration of life; but here in ch.xi, as before in ch.v, both these are supplied. p.97.

*Ans.* This is only the *second* genealogy of the *Elohist*, the continuation of that in ch.v. It is obvious that the Jehovistic passage, x.22-25, is of a totally different character. If this were the *third*, it would surely begin with Peleg, not with Shem.

89. v.28. *Ur of the Chaldees*] Mentioned *only here*. p.98.

*Ans.* Inaccurate: it is mentioned in v.31, xv.7, also Neh.ix.7.

90. v.32. *two hundred and five years*] The Sam. Pent. has here 145, which Bochart and others consider the right number. St. Stephen (Acts vii.4) says the migration of Abram into Canaan was *after his father's death*: but from v.26 it seems as if Terah was only 70 when Abram was born, and by xii.4 we find that Abram was 75 when he left Haran. This, according to the Sam., would appear to be the very year of his father's death. It is certain that the Sam. Text cannot have been tampered with by any Christian hand to bring it into conformity with St. Stephen's statement, and it may very likely have preserved the true reading. It is possible, however, that Terah may have been really 130 years old when Abram was born; for, though it is said in v.26 that Terah lived 70 years and begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran, yet it does not follow that Abram was the *eldest* son, having been named first as being the heir of the promises and the subject of the future history. p.99.

*Ans.* Whether Abram was the eldest son or not, there can be no doubt that v.26 means that Abram, Nahor, and Haran were all born when Terah was 70 years old, (as Shem, Ham, and Japheth, when Noah was 500 years old, v.32), and cannot possibly intend to say that Abram was born 60 years afterwards, 'when his father was 130 years old.' The Sam. Text has been in many places corrected (VI.477-8) to obviate difficulties or supply deficiencies in the Hebrew Text. Very probably, as Terah started 'to go into the *land of Canaan*,' v.31, there seemed an incongruity in Abram's being specially summoned to go thither, as in xii.1, while his father was still alive, and his death was therefore placed 75 years after Abram's birth, so as to agree with xii.4<sup>b</sup>. But xii.1-4<sup>a</sup> is a Jehovistic insertion: the Elohist in v.4<sup>b</sup> makes Abram *of his own accord* carry out the migration which his father had begun, and during the lifetime of his father, who 'came unto Haran and dwelt there,' xi.31.

## Chap. xii.

91. v.1. *The call was evidently from the birthplace of Abram, Ur of the Chaldees; and not only Abram, but his father and other of his family seem at first to have obeyed the call; for Terah took Abram and Lot and Sarai, and 'they went forth from Ur of the Chaldees to go into the land of Canaan,' xi.31. The land is here called by the Almighty 'the land that I will show thee;' but Moses in xi.31 calls it 'the land of Canaan,' the destination of Abram being known to Moses, though it was not at the time of his call known to Abram himself. p.99.*

*Ans.* Bp.BROWNE has applied force to the language of the Bible. It is plain that in xi.31, there is no indication of any Divine call; it is simply Terah, who takes his children with him to go to Canaan, but stops on the way in Haran. The discrepancy in question has entirely arisen from the Jehovistic insertion in xii.1-4\*.

Moreover, it appears from xxiv.4,7, 'my country and my kindred,' that J. does not mean in xii.1 *Ur of the Chaldees*, as Bp.BROWNE supposes, but the place in Haran where his father lived, called in xxiv.10, 'the city of Nahor.' But the most extraordinary thing is that Bp.BROWNE himself writes as follows, on xv.7, p.114:—

*I am the Lord that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees]* In xi.31 Terah is represented as having left Ur of the Chaldees and settled in Haran with Abram, Sarai, and Lot; whilst in xii.1 Abram is represented as having been called by the Lord to go out of Haran, v.4. These different statements are thought to be inconsistent with each other, and referable to three different hands. *Whether there was a distinct command to Abram to leave Ur does not appear. The Lord by His Providence may have led him and his father out of Ur to Haran, with the design of leading him farther onward, and afterwards by special revelation have called him to leave Haran and to go to Canaan.*

Thus, first, Bp.BROWNE forces the meaning of the Scripture, and then he contradicts his previous statement.

92. v.3. *in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed]* Rashi, Clericus, Knobel, and some others interpret the words to mean that Abram should be so blessed in his family that all families of the earth should wish for like blessings, comp. xlviii.20, 'In thee shall Israel bless, saying, God make thee as Ephraim and as Manasseh.' The words, however, can *with no shew of reason* be rendered otherwise than as rendered in the E.V., following the LXX and *Vulg.* p.100.

*Ans.* This is another of Bp.BROWNE's bold assertions, the rashness of which shakes all confidence in his criticisms. It may be a question whether the rendering of the E.V. is the best or not; but to say that 'the words can *with no show of reason* be rendered otherwise' is simply absurd. First, we have in xlviii.20 (as above), the identical phrase, '(in =) by thee shall Israel bless &c.' where there cannot be a doubt as to its meaning, 'by the

use of thy name or example.' Secondly, in xxii.18, xxvi.4, the Hithpael form of the verb is used, '(in) by thy seed shall all nations of the earth *bless-themselves*,' *comp.* Ps.lxxii.17, 'and men shall bless-themselves (in) by it.' Thirdly, in xii.3, xviii.18, xxviii.14, the phrase is 'by *thee*,'—not 'by *thy seed*,' supposed to refer to the Messiah. Lastly, in xii.2, 'thou shalt be a blessing' implies that the name or example of Abram should be used as a form of blessing; just as one accursed of God should be 'as a curse and as an oath among his people,' N.v.21, *comp.* Is.lxv.15, 'Ye shall leave *your name* for a curse unto my chosen,' and especially Jer.xxix.22, 'And of them shall be taken up a curse, saying, Jehovah make thee like Zedekiah, and like Ahab, whom the King of Babylon roasted in the fire.'

93. v.6. *the plain of Moreh*] Rather 'the oak (or terebinth) of Moreh.' . . . Nothing is known as to the meaning of the word *Moreh*; it may have probably been the name of a man, a prince of the land, or owner of the property. p.101.

*Ans.* Bp.BROWNE might have mentioned the fact that some critics (as KNOBEL) have a very definite idea as to the probable meaning of 'Moreh.' The word occurs in Is.ix.15,(14), Hab.ii.18, in the sense of *prophetical teacher*—'the prophet *teacher* of lies,' *comp.* also Is.xxx.20; so that this 'oak of Moreh,' *near Shechem*, may mean the 'Prophet's Oak,' and is not improbably identical with the 'Wizard's Oak,' *near Shechem*, mentioned in Ju.ix.37, under which, as a sacred place, Jacob also is said to have buried the idols and amulets of his party, G.xxxv.4, and Joshua to have erected a *great stone*, J.xxiv.26, which explains the expression, 'oak of the pillar' in Ju.ix.6.

94. v.6. *the Canaanite was then in the land*] The original settlement of the sons of Canaan *seems* to have been in the South, near the Red Sea. A Semitic race *probably* occupied the regions of Palestine and Phœnicia. A colony of the Canaanites, afterwards spreading northwards, partly dispossessed and partly mingled with the ancient Shemite inhabitants, and adopted their language. The historian therefore most appropriately relates that, at the time of the emigration of Abram and his followers, the Canaanite was already in possession of the land. The conjecture, therefore, that these words were written by a later hand than that of Moses, after the ancient Canaanite inhabitants had been expelled, is altogether beside the mark. p.101.

*Ans.* By means of a series of gratuitous assumptions invented to account for the awkward fact that the Phœnicians (*Hamites*) spoke a language almost identical with the Hebrew (82), Bp.BROWNE explains away the obvious meaning of v.6, which is that Canaanites then—in Abram's time—were living as masters of the land, as they had done all along, and not friendly Hebrews, as at present—a note which an historian in David's time might

very well have written, but not Moses, in whose time the Canaanites still lived in Canaan.

And so writes Mr. PEROWNE, *D.B.* II. p.776:—

‘When, for instance, it is said (G.xii.6, *comp.* xiii.7), ‘And the Canaanite was then in the land,’ the obvious meaning of such a remark seems to be that the state of things was different in the time of the writer—that now the Canaanite was there no longer; and the conclusion is that the words must have been written after the occupation of the land by the Israelites. In any other book, as Vaihinger justly remarks, we should certainly draw this inference.’

### Chap. xiii.

95. v.18. *Hebron*] called *Arba* or *Kirjath-Arba*, xxiii.2, xxxv.27, Ju.i.10, till after the death of Moses, when Caleb took the city, and changed its name to Hebron. It has been thought therefore that the words here, ‘which is Hebron,’ must have been inserted by a later hand than that of Moses. It is more probable that Hebron was the *original* name, changed to Kirjath-Arba during the sojourn of the descendants of Jacob in the land of Egypt, and restored by Caleb at the conquest of Palestine. . . . The cave of Machpelah still is there, surrounded by a mosque, in which lie probably the dust of Abraham and Isaac, and perhaps the embalmed body, the mummy, of Jacob, brought up in solemn state from Egypt, i.13. p.106.

*Ans.* The phrase ‘which is in Hebron’ plainly points to a later hand. Bp. BROWNE’s assumption, in order to account for it otherwise, is very artificial and perfectly gratuitous, more especially when we see that there is not the least reference to the restoration of an *older* name in Jo.xiv.15, xv.13, Ju.i.10.

### Chap. xiv.

96. v.1. The occurrence of the name ‘Jehovah’ in [this chapter] is inconsistent with the theory, which assigns the use of that name only to the later portions of the Book of Genesis. p.106.

*Ans.* Bp. BROWNE does not seem to understand the theory which he so summarily condemns. I have shown (V.282-3), that this chapter was probably written ‘about the *sixteenth* or *eighteenth* year of David’s reign,’ when there was no reason (on our view) why the writer should not have used the name ‘Jehovah.’

97. v. 14. Bp. BROWNE quotes Dr. KALISCH as holding this Dan to be the same as Dan-Jaan, 2S.xxiv.6, and *different* from the northern Dan, formerly Laish, which did not receive the name of Dan till long after the death of Moses, and so could not be mentioned by Moses here. p.109.

*Ans.* KALISCH did assume this many years ago, *Gen.* (1858), p.358, in order to avoid ‘a glaring anachronism.’ And so did KURTZ in Vol.I. of

his *History of the Old Covenant*; but afterwards he wrote, III.p.522—'In I.p.216 I adopted HENGSTENBERG's explanation, that the Dan of G.xiv.14. and D.xxxiv.1. was the same as the Dan-Jaan of 2S.xxiv.6, and denoted a very different place from the ancient Laish. But a closer examination has convinced me that *the very same Dan* is alluded to in the Pentateuch and 2 Samuel as in Jo.xix.47 and Ju.xviii.29.

98. v.18. *Melchizedek*] Was he of the Canaanitish race or Semitic? On x.6 [see (82)] some explanation is given of the fact that the Canaanites spoke a Semitic tongue. The name and titles of Melchizedek are Semitic, but this proves nothing. He dwelt among Canaanites; but there had probably been Semitic inhabitants of the land before the immigration of the Canaanites; and so Melchizedek, who was a worshipper of the true God, may have been one of the original Shemitic stock. There were, however, worshippers of the true God, besides the Israelites, retaining patriarchal truth, as Job and Balaam, and so it is not certain that Melchizedek was a descendant of Shem. p.110.

*Ans.* There is no ground whatever for supposing that 'there had probably been Semitic inhabitants of the land before the immigration of the Canaanites.' The name and title '*Melchizedek, King of Salem*, seem to be identical with '*Adonizedek, King of Jerusalem*,' Jo.x.1, one name meaning 'King of righteousness,' the other 'Lord of righteousness;' and this last is represented as a *Canaanite* king. And, in fact, Bp.BROWNE seems to incline to the opinion that Melchizedek was *not* of Shemitic descent, since he speaks of his designation, 'the priest of El-Elion,' v.18, as being used 'in connection with the worship of an ancient people, perhaps not related by blood to the chosen race.' p.111.

99. v.18. *king of Salem*] Josephus, Onkelos, and all the Targums understand Jerusalem, which is called Salem in Ps.lxxvi.2, and this is pretty certainly the true interpretation. . . . Probably *Salem was the oldest*, Jebus the next, and Jerusalem the more modern name of the same city. p.111.

*Ans.* 'Salem' was probably the name given to Jebus by David, after his conquest of it in the eighth year of his reign, 2S.v.6-9, when he had settled down in peace and prosperity, v.10—'Jerusalem' = 'dwelling of peace' (GES.) being the full form. In that case it may very well have been used here by a writer in the seventeenth or eighteenth year of David's reign, though not by Moses.

## Chap. xv.

100. v.1 This is the first time that the expression, so frequent afterwards, 'the word of the Lord,' occurs in the Bible. p.112.

*Ans.* Bp.BROWNE should have said, 'This is the *only* time that this phrase occurs in the Pentateuch,' which fact tends to show that this passage most probably does *not* belong to J., since he introduces frequently Divine

Revelations, vii.1, xii.1,7, xxvi.2, &c., but never uses this formula. The same argument, however, does not equally apply against D., since no similar instance of Divine Revelation occurs in Deuteronomy.

Further, this phrase does not occur in any of the prophecies of Isaiah, (though once in the *history*, Is.xxxviii.4), or in those of any prophet *before* Jeremiah, (though it appears in the introductory formulæ, Hos.i.1, Joel i.1, Jon.i.1, iii.1, Mic.i.1, Zeph.i.1, inserted by some later Editor.) But *Jeremiah* uses it repeatedly, i.4,11,13, ii.1, xiii.3,8, xvi.1, xviii.5, &c.

See (V.An.79) for the proofs that this chapter is due to the Deuteronomist, whom we identify with Jeremiah. This agrees with Bp.BROWNE'S note on *Adonai-Jehovah*. v.2,8.

The same combination occurs again in the Pentateuch only in D.iii.24, ix.26. p.113.

101. In the promise to Noah the *rainbow* had been the sign given from on high. . . . Now to Abram the still brighter and more enduring token is the starry firmament. p.113.

As the rainbow probably did not first appear after the Flood, but was then made the token of the Noachic covenant; as the stars of heaven were made the sign of the earlier covenant with Abraham; &c. p.121.

*Ans.* The two cases of the 'rainbow' and the 'stars' are quite different: it is not said, 'I do set my stars in the sky,' as it is said of the rainbow repeatedly (76), implying that it appeared then for the first time.

102. v.9. The *essence* of the true Hebrew sacrifice was in the *slaying* of the victim, for the very word זָבַח (*zabach*, 'sacrifice') signifies 'slaying.' p.114.

*Ans.* It might just as well be said, 'the very word אָבַח, viii.20, xxii.2,3, &c., means 'going-up' of the fumes of the *burnt* offering. But, in reply to this extraordinary assertion, I need only quote the words of this Commentary, p.355—'Moses was on this occasion performing the office of a priest (the family of Aaron not being yet consecrated), and he employed young men whose strength and skill qualified them to *slaughter* and *prepare* the sacrifices. *The Law did not regard these acts as necessarily belonging to the priests.*'

103. v.15. *and thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace*] A similar expression occurs in xxv.8, xxxv.29, xlix.33. p.115.

*Ans.* This statement might mislead a reader to suppose that there is such similarity in these different passages as implies or suggests identity of authorship. But here D. says, 'go to thy fathers in peace,' whereas in all the other passages we have the Elohist phrase, 'was gathered to his people.'

## Chap. xvi.

104. v.1. *now Sarai &c.*] The recapitulatory character of this verse is consistent with the general style of the Book of Genesis. p.116.

*Ans.* The 'recapitulation' in question, arises from the Jehovist having inserted at an unsuitable place, xi.30, 'and Sarai was barren, she had no child,' which fact the Elohist states here in its proper place—the hand of J. in xi.30. being clearly shown by עקרה, 'barren,' xxv.21, xxix. 31, and other indications (V.*An.*58(v.)).

## Chap. xvii.

105. v.1. The title or character 'El-Shaddai' . . . is noted as occurring in those passages which the German critics call Elohist. In this very verse, however, we read it in immediate juxtaposition with the name 'Jehovah.' p.119.

*Ans.* Bp.BROWNE does not mention that this is the *only* instance where 'Jehovah' occurs in the whole Elohist Narrative previously to E.vi.2-5.

106. v.2. *I will make my covenant*] The word for 'make' is different from that used in xv.18. There God is said to have 'cut' a covenant with Abram by sacrifice. . . . Here he says, 'I will give my covenant between me and thee.' p.119.

*Ans.* E. always says either 'give a covenant,' ix.12, xvii.2, or 'establish a covenant,' vi.18, ix.9,11,17, xvii.7,19,21, E.vi.4—never 'cut a covenant,' which is used by D. in xv.18, and by J. in xxi.27,32, xxvi.28, xxxi.44.

107. v.25. *Ishmael his son was thirteen years old*] The Arabs have in consequence always circumcised their sons at the age of thirteen. p.121.

*Ans.* On our view the writer is merely trying to account for the actual practice of the Arabs as existing in his time.

108. Bp.BROWNE's note, p.121-2, on the question whether circumcision was already 'in use among the Egyptians and other African tribes,' before the time of Abraham, contains nothing worthy of special notice. He leaves the matter undecided. See *D.B.* I.p.330, and (V.129,130), where I have said, 'If this section was written in the days of Samuel, we are reminded that the expression 'uncircumcised' is only used in the history with reference to the *Philistines*, and then only in the days of Samson, Ju.xiv.3, xv.18, and *Saul*, 1S.xiv.6, xvii.26,36, xxxi.4, 2S.i.20.

## Chap. xviii.

109. v.2. *three men*] It appears from the comparison of these passages, and indeed from the whole narrative, that of the three men who appeared to Abraham two were angels and one was Jehovah Himself. p.123.

v.13. *the Lord said*] Here the speaker is distinctly called Jehovah; and it

seems much more reasonable to believe that there was a Theophania of the Son of God, than that a created angel was personating God and speaking in His Name. p.124.

That spiritual visitants, though in human form, should eat, has been a puzzle to many commentators. . . . If the angele had assumed human bodies, though but for a time, there would have been nothing strange in their eating. In any case, *the food may have been consumed, miraculously or not*; and the eating of it was a proof that the visit of the angels to Abraham was no mere vision, but a true manifestation of heavenly beings. p.124.

*Ans.* If the angels and Jehovah Himself 'assumed human bodies, though but for a time,' and 'washed their feet,' and 'rested under a tree,' and chatted familiarly with Abraham and Sarah, there would be no difficulty in supposing that they also ate the bread and meat which Abraham set before them, and partook of Lot's 'feast' or 'sumptuous repast,' p.126. Such things as these, however,—with Sarah 'laughing,' having 'scarcely recognized the Divinity of the speaker,' p.124, whom, in fact, 'she took for a traveller,' p.135, 'nor perhaps realised the truth of the promise before made [by another writer, xvii.15-19] to Abraham,' p. 124, and 'Lot, like Abraham, only seeing in the angels two men, travellers, apparently wearied by the way,' p. 126, but afterwards 'perhaps even having some suspicion of the sacred character of his guests,' p.127, though 'there is no evidence that he thought either of them to be the Most High,' p.128—however natural in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, are seriously perplexing to thinking men in the Bible, supposed to contain throughout veracious history, and even represented as Divinely infallible.

### Chap. xix.

110. 4 v. The Canaanitish nations in general, and the cities of the plain especially, were addicted to those deadly sins so strictly forbidden to the Israelites. p.127.

*Ans.* Such vices were evidently practised by not a few among the Israelites, *comp.* Ju.xix.22-27, 1K.xiv.24, xv.12, and even in a very late age, *comp.* D.xxiii.17,18, 2K.xxiii.7, L.xx.13,15,16, *comp.* also the 'consecrated' harlot in G.xxxviii.21; and this story was probably written with a view of checking these abominations.

111. v.30-38. De Wette and his followers, Rosenmüller, Tuch, Knobel, &c. speak of this narrative as if it had arisen from the national hatred of the Israelites to the Moabites and Ammonites. But the Pentateuch by no means shows such national hatred, D.ii.9,19: and the Book of Ruth gives the history of a Moabitess who was ancestress of David himself. It was not till the Moabites had seduced the Israelites to idolatry and impurity, N.xxv.1, and had acted in an unfriendly manner towards them, hiring Balaam to curse them, that they were excluded from the congregation of the Lord for ever, D.xxiii.3,4. p.131.



*Ans.* The 'national hatred' in question certainly existed in David's time, 2S.viii.2, x, xi.1, xii.26-31, during which G.xix.30-38 was probably written, though not long before David had very friendly relations both with Moab, 1S.xxii.3,4, and with Ammon, 2S.x.2, which is quite consistent with the story of his Moabite descent. In the Deuteronomist's time, the feeling between Israel and the Ammonites and Moabites was usually hostile, 2K.xxiv.2, but not always, Jer.xxvii, xl.11 (VI.34-7).

112. Both ancient and modern writers assert that *nothing animal or vegetable lives in this [the Salt] Sea*. No wonder, then, that the Salt Sea should have been called the Dead Sea. . . . *Even its shores, incrustated with salt, present the appearance of utter desolation.* p.131.

It is quite conceivable that the terrible catastrophe recorded in Genesis, *traces of which are visible throughout the whole region*, may have produced even the *deep depression* of the bed of the Dead Sea. p.132.

At all events, it is *very probable that the Southern division of the lake may have been formed at a comparatively recent date*. . . . The *general belief* at present that that portion only of the Sea can have been of recent formation &c. p.132.

And Bp.BROWNE speaks of the 'somewhat uncertain position' on which Mr.GROVE's 'arguments rest,' viz. 'that no part of the Dead Sea can be of recent formation, notwithstanding the terrible catastrophes all around it, to which not only Scripture but tradition and *the present appearance of the whole country bear testimony.*' p.132.

*Ans.* Bp.BROWNE has undertaken in this Commentary to 'make the latest information accessible to men of ordinary culture;' and it is monstrous that, so long after the publication (1863) of Mr.GROVE's elaborate description of the Salt Sea in *D.B.* III.1173, &c., most carefully written, with appeal to the highest authorities for all his statements, assertions like the above should be hazarded in such a work as this, by one who has evidently only the most superficial knowledge of the subject. I shall content myself with quoting, in opposition to Bp.BROWNE's 'latest information for men of ordinary culture,' the following facts from Mr.GROVE's article, to which I refer the reader for full details:—

'It has long been supposed that no life whatever existed in the lake. But recent facts show that *some inferior organizations can and do find a home even in these salt and acrid waters*. . . . The ducks, seen diving by Poole, must surely have been in search of some form of life, either animal or vegetable,' p.1183<sup>d</sup>.

'The 'Dead Sea,' says a recent traveller, 'did not strike me with that sense of desolation and dreariness, which, I suppose it ought. I thought it a pretty, smiling lake—a nice ripple on its surface.' 'Nothing of gloom and desolation,' says another traveller, '*even the shore was richly studded with bright yellow flowers, growing to the edge of the rippling waters,* p.1184.

'The evidence of the spot is sufficient to show that *no material change has taken place in the upper and deeper portion of the lake for a period long anterior to the time of Abraham. In the lower portion—the lagoon and the plain below it—if any change has occurred, it appears to have been rather one of reclamation than of submersion—the gradual silting up of the district by the torrents which discharge their contents into it,*' p.1186.

'The very few competent geologists, who have visited the spot . . . concur in stating that *no certain indications exist, in or about the lake, of volcanic action within the historical or human period, no volcanic craters, no coulées of lava traceable to any vent. The igneous rocks described as lava are more probably basalt of great antiquity; the bitumen of the lake has nothing necessarily to do with volcanic action. The scorched calcined look of the rocks in the immediate neighbourhood, of which so many travellers have spoken as an evident token of the conflagration of the cities, is due to natural causes—to the gradual action of the atmosphere on the constituents of the stone,*' p.1187.

'The destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah may have been by volcanic action; but it may be safely asserted that *no traces of it have yet been discovered, and that, whatever it was, it can have had no connexion with that far vaster and far more ancient event, which opened the great valley of the Jordan and the Dead Sea, and at some subsequent time, cut it off from communication with the Red Sea, by forcing up between them the tract of the Wady Arabah,*' p.1187.

### Chap. xx.

113. *v.1. from thence*] *i.e.* from Mamre, where he had received the heavenly visitors, and whence he had beheld the smoke from the conflagration of the cities of the plain. p.132.

*Ans.* But the passage immediately preceding, *viz.* xix.30-38, relates the birth of Moab and Ammon. The words 'from thence,' as here inserted, point plainly to a difference of authorship.

114. *v.2.* The age at which Sarah must have been at this time, some 23 or 24 years older than when Pharaoh took her into his house, xii.15, creates a considerable difficulty here. We may remember that Sarah after this became a mother,—that, though too old for child-bearing under normal conditions, she had had her youth renewed since the visit of the angels, when it was promised that she should have a son. p.133.

*Ans.* The difficulty arises, not only from Sarah being 90 years old, and from its being the *second* time in Abraham's history that such a thing occurred, so that he 'can scarcely be acquitted either of some disingenuousness or of endangering his wife's honour and chastity, in order to save his own

life,' p.133, but from the circumstance that Sarah is now actually pregnant with the son so graciously promised, xviii.10,14, for whom they had waited so long. The *second* difficulty, however, arising from the *repetition* of this incident, is removed altogether, when it is seen that this story in xx.1-17, is due to the *Second Elohist*, and that in xii.10-20, to the *Jehovist*, this latter having been written at a later date, and having probably been meant to have been substituted for the former, so as to diminish considerably, at all events, the *first* difficulty, and get rid of the *last*, though by some accident both stories have been retained (V.294).

115. v.2. The assertion of modern critics that this is merely another version of xii.10-20, the work of the *Elohist*, whilst that was by the *Jehovist*, is ably combated by Keil. He observes that the name 'Elohim' indicates the true relation of God to Abimelech, but that in v.18 'Jehovah,' the covenant God of Abraham, interposes to save him. p.133.

*Ans.* The original story in xx. ends with v.17, the writer having used 'Elohim' throughout, in Abraham's mouth, v.11,13, *comp.* v.17, as well as in reference to Abimelech, v.3,6, and v.18, being manifestly a Jehovistic addition. Yet the writer of v.1-17, is not 'the Elohist,' as Bp. BROWNE supposes, and KEIL is too well-informed to make such a mistake; he speaks of this passage as being merely 'Elohistic,' that is, containing 'Elohim' frequently, but not as being 'the work of the Elohist.' The writer in question is known to critics as the 'Second Elohist,' whose style differs entirely from that of the 'Elohist,' and, in fact, corresponds so nearly with that of the Jehovist, that the question has arisen whether he may not, possibly, be identical with the latter, but writing in an earlier time (V.72,74,84).

116. v.7. *he is a Prophet*] An objection has been made to the antiquity of the Pentateuch from the statement in 1S.ix.9, that he that is now called a Prophet was beforetime called a Seer. Hence it is argued that the Pentateuch, which always uses the word Prophet, cannot be of the great antiquity assigned to it. The difficulty is only on the surface. 'Prophet' was the genuine [*sic*, ? generic] name applied to all who declared God's will, who foretold the future, or even to great religious teachers. 'Seer' had a more restricted sense, and was appropriated to those only who were favoured with visions from heaven. . . The application of the title 'Seer' to Samuel, who had visions specially vouchsafed to him, was very appropriate. But after his time, though the name was sometimes employed to designate the inspired teachers of mankind, the older and more comprehensive title of 'Prophet' again came into common use, not only for teachers of religion generally, but also for the most favoured of God's servants. p.133.

*Ans.* Had Moses, then, no 'visions?' Might he not have been called a 'Seer' just as correctly as Samuel is called a 'Prophet,' 1S.iii.20? Plainly, 1S.ix.9, means, as Dean Stanley says, see *D.B.* II. p.928, that *Roeh* (Seer)

was 'the oldest description of the prophetic office, superseded by *Nabi*, (Prophet) shortly after Samuel's time, when *Nabi* first came into use.' If so, the passages of the Pentateuch where *Nabi* is used, G.xx.7, E.vii.1, N.xi.29, xii.6, D.xiii.1,3,5, xviii.15,18,20,22, xxxiv.10, may have been written in the days of Samuel or David or afterwards, but cannot be of *Mosaic* origin.

117. v.18. Keil has observed that the various names of the Most High are used very significantly in these last two verses. The care [*sic*, ? cure] of Abimelech and his wives belonged to the Deity (*Elohim*). Abraham directed his intercession not to *Elohim*, an indefinite and unknown God, but to *ha-Elohim*, 'the' true 'God.' And it was 'Jehovah,' the covenant God, who interposed for Abraham, and preserved the mother of the Promised Seed. p.135.

*Ans.* Bp.BROWNE has here adopted a subtle distinction of KEIL, for which there is not a shadow of real foundation: see v.6, where *ha-Elohim* speaks 'in a dream' to Abimelech, as does *Elohim* in v.3, while *Elohim* interferes for Abraham in v.13, as does *Jehovah* in v.18.

### Chap. xxi.

118. v.1. In xvii.16 God promised that He would give Abraham a son by Sarah his wife. . . . What God (*Elohim*) then promised, here the Lord (*Jehovah*) fulfils. p.135.

*Ans.* The Jehovist, in the verse, *might*, no doubt, refer to xvii.16,(E). But why may he not be referring to the Jehovistic passage, xviii.10,14?

119. v.2. *at the set time of which God had spoken to him*] The 'set time' was fixed, xvii.21, xviii.10,14. Modern critics see in xvii and in this ch.xxi an Elohist portion of the history of Abraham, and in xviii a Jehovistic portion. Yet this present chapter seems clearly to point back both to xvii and xviii; and in its first verse it uses twice the name 'Jehovah,' whilst in v.2,3, it has constantly the name 'Elohim,' until we come to v.33, when both names are conjoined. p.135.

*Ans.* As before (115), Bp.BROWNE does not understand the criticism (of Hupfield), which he here condemns. No one supposes that 'this present chapter,' though it uses constantly the name 'Elohim,' belongs to the Elohist. At the most, v.2-5, belongs to E.; v.1. is a mere Jehovistic link, to join the passage on to what precedes; v.8-20,22-27<sup>a</sup>,32, belongs to the Second Elohist (V.78), whose style is altogether different from that of E.; and v.6,7,21,27<sup>b</sup>-31,33,34, belongs to J., as is fully shown in (V.*An.*116,120, 126,128). There is not the slightest reference throughout to xviii.

120. v.17. *the angel of God*] Nowhere else in Genesis does this name occur. Elsewhere it is always 'the angel of the Lord.' We meet with it again in E.xiv. 19. The identification of the *Malach Elohim* with *Elohim* here, v.17,19,20, is

exactly like the identification of the *Malach Jehovah* with *Jehovah* in other passages—a clear proof that there is not that difference between the Elohist and Jehovistic passages in the Pentateuch, of which so much has been written. p.137.

*Ans.* It is a 'clear proof' that Bp. BROWNE has really no proper acquaintance with the criticism of the Pentateuch—at least, not enough to justify him in challenging the critics of Europe in this Commentary. This passage is *not* due to the Elohist, between whose style and that of the Jehovist there is an essential difference; but it belongs (as probably does E.xiv.19) to the Second Elohist, whose style agrees very closely with that of the Jehovist; and the fact noticed by Bp. BROWNE tends to confirm my view that the Second Elohist is only perhaps the Jehovist in an earlier stage of his literary activity.

### Chap. xxii.

121. v.2. *Moriakh*] The meaning of the name seems clearly to be *Mori-jah*, 'the vision' or 'the manifested of Jehovah.' To this root it is evidently referred by *Symm., Vu'g.*, 'the land of vision,' *Aq.* 'the conspicuous land,' LXX. 'the lofty land.' p.140.

*Ans.* It is 'evidently' *not* referred to the above root by the translators in question, since not one of them takes notice of 'Jehovah': see *Introd. to Genesis* (10).

122. v.22. *Chesed*] Jerome supposes the Chasdim (or Chaldæans) to have derived their name from him, to which conjecture the occurrence of the Chasdim also in the Book of Job gives some colour. If, indeed, 'Ur of the Chaldees' was so called when Abraham dwelt there, xi.31, this would be an anachronism. But, very probably, it may have been known as Ur of the Chaldees when Moses wrote, and so designated by him, though the Chaldees or Chasdim may not have been in existence in the days of Abraham. p.144.

*Ans.* Bp. BROWNE seems to have forgotten that in xv.7 the Almighty says 'I am Jehovah that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees.' This is another instance of the loose character of Bp. BROWNE'S critical reasoning.

### Chap. xxiii.

123. v.2. *Kirjath-Arba*, *the same is Hebron in the land of Canaan*] The supposition that the name Hebron was not given till the time of Joshua, and that the use of it in Genesis indicates a later hand, is *contradicted by the natural force of these words*. They appear plainly to have been written by some one *not then living in the land of Canaan*. Hebron was apparently the original name, which was changed to Kirjath-Arba, and restored again by Caleb, J.xiv.15. p.145.

*Ans.* How the supposition in question 'is contradicted by the natural force of these words' does not appear. See J.xxi.2, xxii.9, 'Shiloh that is

in the land of Canaan,' xxii.10, 'the regions of the Jordan that are in the land of Canaan,' where similar expressions are used by persons 'then living in the land of Canaan': see also (95) above.

Chap. xxiv.

124. v.2. *put, I pray thee, thy hand under my thigh*] A form of adjuration mentioned only here and of [sic] Jacob, xlvi.29. Various conjectures have been made by Jews (Joseph. *Ant.* I.16, Hieron. *Qu. in Gen.*, Ambrose. *De Abrahamo* I.6, Eliezer in Pirke, c. 39), and by the Fathers (Ambrose, *De Abrahamo*, I.9, Hieron. *ubi supra*, August. *De C. D.* xvi.33); but nothing is known with certainty of the signification of the action. p.147.

*Ans.* It is to be hoped that the 'men of ordinary culture,' for whom this Commentary is intended, will be duly grateful for the 'information' which is thus 'made accessible' to them with a great display of learning. It is all that they will get from Bp. BROWNE, except the further intimation that—

Aben-Ezra supposes that it was a form of oath prevalent in patriarchal times, but only taken by inferiors, &c.

Nevertheless, the 'form of adjuration' in question is perfectly well understood by scholars: see *D.B.* II.p.588,2.

125. v.14. The word here used for *damsel* (נַעֲרָה) is of common gender, signifying a child or young person of either sex. This is a peculiarity of the Pentateuch. In all the later books the distinction of gender is observed, the feminine affix (ה) being used when a girl is intended. It is important to notice this here—first, as showing the antiquity of the Pentateuch generally; secondly, as showing that this chapter, which is markedly Jehovistic, is also of marked antiquity. Those who *accuse* the so-called Jehovistic chapters of being modern (of the date of Samuel, for instance) ground their arguments on a minute criticism of the difference of the words used by the Elohist and the Jehovist writers respectively. It is, however, here very apparent that the word child, נַעֲרָה, had not, in the time of the writer of this most Jehovistic history, been distinguished in the singular number into masculine and feminine, נַעֲרָה and נַעֲרָה, *boy* and *girl*. p.149.

*Ans.* See *Introd. to the Pent.* (28 ii<sup>b</sup>), for the reply to the above. No doubt this chapter is 'of marked antiquity,' i.e. not half a century later than the oldest parts of the Pentateuch, i.e. the Elohist matter, which we suppose to be the oldest portion of the Bible, except perhaps some passages in Judges. But *how is it that we find נַעֲרָה in D.xxii.19, if this was written by Moses, at a time when the word 'had not been distinguished in the singular number into masculine and feminine'?*

126. v.62. In xxv.11 we find that, after Abraham's death, Isaac took up his residence at Lahai-roi, to which we find [here] that he had been on a visit, when Rebekah arrived, where perhaps he had already been pasturing his flocks and

herds. All this is in the strictest harmony; though the German critics discover the hand of the Elohist in xxiii, and in the earlier verses of xxv, and that of the Jehovist throughout xxiv. *p.* 152.

*Ans.* xxiii, xxv.7-11<sup>a</sup>, belongs to E. (*V.An.*139,147)—but not ‘the earlier verses of xxv,’—and xxiv. xxv.1-6, 11<sup>b</sup>, to J. (*V.An.*141,146,148). According to E, Isaac lived at Hebron, xxxv.27, as Abraham did; J. has produced the ‘harmony’ in question by inserting Lahai-roi in xxiv.62, and xxv.11<sup>b</sup>.

### Chap. xxv.

127. *v.*19. According to the uniform plan of the author, there is a brief recapitulation, in order to make the section complete. In this case it is very brief, consisting of *v.*19<sup>b</sup> and *v.*20. *p.*154.

*Ans.* *v.*20. is not a ‘recapitulation,’ but the original Elohist datum, upon which J. has based the story of Isaac’s marriage with Rebekah in xxiv.

128. *v.*20. *the Syrian (Aramæan) of Padan-Aram*] There is no reasonable foundation for the belief that *Padan-Aram* was the old name used by the so-called Elohist, *Aram-Naharaim* being the name which had been adopted by the later Jehovist. *p.*154.

*Ans.* The ‘foundation’ for such a belief is the simple fact, that *Padan* or *Padan-Aram* is *always* used by E., xxv.20, xxviii.2,5,6,7, xxxi.18, xxxv.9,26, xlvi.15, xlviii.7; whereas J. uses *Padan-Aram*, xxxiii.18, but also *Aram-Naharaim*, xxiv.10, all which is very natural if *Padan-Aram* was the older name, and the Jehovist lived almost in the same age as the Elohist.

129. *v.*30. Esau was born with red hair and colour. His frantic demand for red pottage and selling his birthright to gain it, may have conspired with his hair and complexion to stamp the name *Edom* (or Red) upon him. *p.*156.

*Ans.* Mr. PORTER more reasonably says, *D.B.* I.*p.*488—‘Probably the *physical aspect* [of Esau’s land] may have had something to do with this. The *ruddy* hue of the mountain-range given to Esau would at once suggest the word *Edom*.’

### Chap. xxvi.

130. *v.*4. The pronoun here rendered *these* is one of those ancient forms peculiar to the Pentateuch (*ha-el*): in the later books it would be *ha-eleh*. *p.*158.

*Ans.* Bp. BROWNE does not seem to have noticed that the *later* form occurs *nine* times in the Pentateuch, and the older only *eight* times, see *Introd. to Pent.* (28.i.c.), which latter, moreover, we do find used ‘in the later books,’ *viz.*, 1Ch.xx.8, Ezr.v.15.

131. *v.*7. *she is my sister*] Isaac acted on this occasion just as Abraham had

done in Egypt and in Philistia. Probably, too, he called Rebekah his sister because she was his cousin, and the deep importance of strict truthfulness had not been fully unfolded to the patriarchs in their twilight state of faith. The difference in the details of this story and the events in the life of Abraham is too marked to allow it to be thought that this is only a repetition of the histories in xii and xx. p.158.

*Ans.* It is incredible that an event so very similar to that which happened *twice* in the life of Abraham should have happened also in that of Isaac, as also that 'Abraham gave the name of Beersheba to this well long before, and under similar circumstances,' though Bp BROWNE says that 'there is no inconsistency in this':—

the well dug by Abraham, and secured to him by oath, had been covered and lost; it is found by Isaac's servants just after the covenant made between him and Abimelech; *the whole series of events recalls to Isaac's mind the original name, and that which gave rise to the name*, and so he restores, not the well only, but the name also. p.160.

But Isaac's servants had *dug* this well, v.25,32, just as they had dug the other wells, v.19,21,22; and he had already, previously to this, 'dug again' his father's wells, and restored their old names, v.18. See (V.An.168-170) for an explanation of this phenomenon.

In (V.294, An.174) I have suggested that J. intended to cancel the older story in xx, about Abraham's conduct at the court of Abimelech, as placed too late in Abraham's life (114), and to substitute for it the account in xii.10-20 of his conduct at the court of Pharaoh, by which Abimelech is now at his disposal for a similar story in Isaac's life, which, together with the story about the well at Beersheba, xxvi.26-33, substituted for xxi.22-32, adds another feature or two to Isaac's colourless life as originally sketched by E.

Even if we admit that the 'Abimelech' of xxvi.26 may be a son of the 'Abimelech' in xxi.22, who lived about 80 years earlier—for Bp. BROWNE says—

It is not impossible, when men lived to 180, that the same king may still have been reigning over the Philistines. p.157—

so that Abimelech 'may have been, like Pharaoh, a title rather than a name,' yet it is strange that 'Phichol' should have been 'chief captain of his host' on each occasion. But Bp. BROWNE explains the name 'Phichol' to mean '*the mouth of all, i.e. commanding all,*' which 'sounds like the title of the *commander-in-chief* or the *grand-vizier,*' p.157, of which the latter sense—would seem the more probable, if it had not been said that Phichol was the *chief captain of the army.* p.159.

132. v.29. We have here twice, v.28,29, the sacred name Jehovah used by the



king of Gerar. This does not, however, indicate that the writer of this portion of the history had so-called Jehovistic tendencies. . . Abraham had dwelt some time at Gerar. . . Abraham was known as a worshipper of Jehovah, and was seen to be blessed and prospered by his God. . . Abimelech does not profess himself a worshipper of the Lord, but looks on the Lord as the God of Abraham, and sees that Abraham's son Isaac is 'now the blessed of the Lord.' p.159.

*Ans.* In (V.An.171) I have shown that xxvi.19-33 contains a large number of Jehovistic peculiarities, and belongs undoubtedly to J., and not to E. Bp.BROWNE argues as if the two writers were distinguished only by their use of Elohim or Jehovah.

### Chap. xxvii.

133. v.1. Bp.BROWNE, after showing that 'Isaac was 137, Esau and Jacob being 77, at this time'—see (V.184)—proceeds as follows:—

If this calculation be true, Isaac had still 43 years to live [instead of being near his death, v.1,2,4,7,10,41], his quiet life having been extended to an unusual length. There is, however, great risk of numerical calculations from various causes being inexact. The last chapter had brought us down only to the hundredth year of Isaac's life, Esau being then but 40. And in some respects an earlier date seems more accordant with the tenor of the subsequent history, it being hardly probable that Jacob should have been 77 when he fled to Laban and served seven years for his wife, and then another seven years for his second wife—even at a period when human life was still extended so far beyond that of future generations. p.161.

*Ans.* I have shown (V.An.183) that there is no incongruity in the original Elohist Narrative, and that it is the Jehovistic insertions, especially the notice in xli.46, which bring confusion into the story.

134. v.23. *God*] lit. *the God*, i.e. that God just named, the God of thy father, viz. Jehovah. It does not indicate (Keil) 'the personal God,' nor is it (as some would have it) a Jehovistic formula. The article is perfectly natural as referring to Jacob's words, v.20. p.163.

*Ans.* I know not who 'would have it' that *הָאֱלֹהִים* (*ha-Elohim*) is 'a Jehovistic formula,' since the *Elohist* uses it repeatedly, v.22,24, vi.9,11, xvii.18, E.ii.23<sup>b</sup>. It is true, however, that in all these passages the form occurs *after a preposition*, and not as the subject of the verb, as in xxii.1,9, xxvii.28, xxxv.7. It seems very extravagant to suppose any reference in v.28 to v.20, especially with 'Jehovah' interposed in v.27.

### Chap. xxviii.

135. v.21. The fulfilment of this vow is related in xxxv.15, where God again appears to Jacob on his return from Padan-Aram, and Jacob *restores* the pillar which he had before set up, and again solemnly gives it the name of Beth-el, 'the house of God.' p.167.

*Ans.* In this way Bp. BROWNE tries to get over the difficulty that in the *Elohistic* passage, xxxv.9-15, we have *Elohim* appearing to Jacob—not 'Jehovah,' as in this *Jehovistic* account, v.13—and Jacob erecting a pillar at the place, pouring oil upon it, and calling it Beth-el, just exactly as here—N.B.—without the slightest allusion to the fact of his having ever done so before. But in xxxv.14 there is no indication whatever of his 'restoring the pillar which he had before set up;' and nothing but 'the stern constraint of a theory' could have forced such a meaning into the simple words, 'And Jacob set-up a pillar in the place where He spake with him, a pillar of stone, and he poured upon it a drink-offering, and poured oil upon it.'

### Chap. xxix. xxx.

### Chap. xxxi.

136. v.47. It appears that at this time Jacob spoke *Hebrew*, whilst his uncle Laban spoke *Syriac*. We can only account for this by supposing either that the family of Nahor originally spoke Syriac, and that Abraham and his descendants learned Hebrew in Canaan, where evidently the Hebrew language was indigenous when he first went there, having probably been acquired by the Hamitic Canaanites from an earlier Shemitic race, or else, which is not otherwise supported, that the ancestors of Laban, having left the early seat of the family, had unlearned their original Hebrew, and acquired the Syriac dialect of Padan-Aram. p.176.

*Ans.* Probably there was a well-known cairn of stones on this spot, which had the two names in question, by whomsoever given. The notion of an 'earlier Shemitic race' in 'Canaan, from whom 'the Hamitic Canaanites,' e.g. the Phœnicians, learnt Hebrew, is a mere fancy of Bp. BROWNE. The fact is, most probably, that there was a closer relation between the Hebrews and Canaanites than the former were willing in after days to allow—the Phœnician language, at all events, being almost identical with the Hebrew.

137. v.53. There is a very marked unity of purpose throughout this chapter in the use of the names of the Most High, utterly inconsistent with the modern notion of a diversity of authors, according to some not fewer than four, in the different portions of the same chapter. p.177.

*Ans.* In (V.An.221) the *whole* of this chapter is assigned to the Jehovist, except v.18, which certainly belongs to E., though it does not contain 'Elohim.'

138. According to the common calculation, Judah and his sons, Er and Onan, must have been quite children when they married, whereas the assigning *forty* instead of *twenty* years to the sojourn of Jacob in Padan-Aram will allow time for them to have grown up, though even so their marriages must have been for that

time unusually early. The common calculation . . . *must surely require some correction*, even allowing for the length of patriarchal lives on the one side, and for the early age of eastern marriages on the other. p.178.

*Ans.* I have shown (I.20) that the difficulty in question amounts to this, that Judah had by one wife separately three sons, who had all reached maturity, when Judah begot two twins, one of whom had also children born to him, and all before Judah was *forty-two* years old. Bp.BROWNE justly says that this 'must surely require some correction.' And he does correct it by adopting, as 'a far more probable chronology than that commonly acquiesced in,' the suggestion that, after Jacob had served Laban fourteen years for his two wives, he then 'had for twenty years taken care of his cattle, not as a servant, but as a neighbour and friend,' and only after these *thirty-four* years 'at last for six years more he served for wages,' so working for Laban forty years altogether. This would allow him to go to Padan-Aram at the age of 57 (instead of 77). But Isaac is represented as at this time already aged and nearly blind, and approaching his hour of death, xxvii.1,2,4,7, and Esau says, 'the days of mourning for my father are at hand,' v.41; whereas (according to Bp.BROWNE'S view) he had only reached the age of 117 years, having yet 63 more to live, xxxv.28, and being twenty years younger than Ishmael at his death, xxv.17, which evacuates the force of Bp.BROWNE'S own remark—

It is not improbable that the thought of his brother's death at this age (137) put Isaac in mind of his own end. p.160.

This notion, however, of Bp.BROWNE is based merely upon the assumption that the 'twenty years' in xxxi.38 are different from the 'twenty years' in v.41, for which there is not a shadow of foundation, as anyone may see who will compare the two passages:—

'These twenty years am I with thee; thy ewes and thy she-goats have not aborted, and the rams of thy flock have I not eaten,' v.38;

'These twenty years have I had in thy house; I served thee fourteen years for thy two daughters, and six years for thy cattle,' v.41.

### Chap. xxxiii.

139. v.22. The name Jabbok is either derived from *bakak*, 'to pour forth, to gush forth,' or from *abak*, 'to wrestle,' from the wrestling of Jacob there. p.180.

*Ans.* Most probably the name is derived from  $\text{בבב}$ , 'to pour out;' but it suggested to J. the idea of Jacob's wrestling ( $\text{בבב}$ ), in which there may be also an allusion to the name 'Jacob' ( $\text{בבב}$ , 'he trips up'). But Bp.BROWNE says—

The custom prevailing among the Jews to this day of abstaining religiously from eating this sinew—the *nervus ischiadicus*, which is one of the largest in the body,

and extends down the thigh and leg to the ankle—seems a *lasting monument of the historical truth of this wonderful event in the life of Jacob!* p.182.

Why may not this practice, like the *lex leviratus*, or law of marriage with a brother's widow, 'rest on some traditional custom,' p.198?

Chap. xxxiii.

Chap. xxxiv.

140. v.1. If Jacob's sojourn in Padan-Aram was forty years long, and not twenty only, it is quite possible that Dinah may have been some years older than Joseph, who was *seventeen* at the beginning of the history related in xxxvii, *i.e.* probably a year or two after the events related in this present chapter. In any case, therefore, she was not less than *fifteen* years old at this time, supposing her to have been no older than Joseph; so that the objection urged by Tuch and others that at this time she was but *six* or *seven* years old cannot be maintained. p.184.

*Ans.* There is not the least ground for Bp. BROWNE'S notion that 'Jacob's sojourn in Padan-Aram was forty years long' (138); nor, consequently, could Dinah have been 'some years older than Joseph,' since she was the seventh child of Leah born within seven years, xxx.21, and Joseph was born at the end of the seventh year (*i.e.* the fourteenth year of Jacob's stay with Laban), xxx.25, xxxi.41. Nor is there any reason for saying that the events in xxxvii took place 'probably about a year or two after the events' in xxxiv. On the contrary, we are told that Jacob left Padan-Aram 'to go to his father Isaac,' xxxi.18; and it is unreasonable to suppose that after so long an absence he would linger *some years* at Succoth or Shechem, xxxiii 17-20. Thus Dinah, who was *six* years old when Jacob left Padan-Aram, would not be much older when the events occurred in xxxiv.

141. v.7. *he had wrought folly in Israel, which thing ought not to be done*] The words of this verse seem to have become proverbial; they are almost repeated in 2S.xiii.12. But this is no reason for supposing that the words of this present verse should be ascribed to a later hand than that of Moses. p.185.

*Ans.* It is very possible that the story of the violation of Jacob's daughter, Dinah, by the prince Shechem, and the terrible revenge which Dinah's own brothers took upon him and his people may have been written by the Jehovist in David's age with a special reference to the violation of David's daughter Tamar by the prince Amnon, and the terrible revenge which Tamar's own brother Absalom took upon him, 2S.xiii.

Chap. xxxv.

142. v.9. *God appeared unto Jacob again, when he came out of Padan-Aram*] He was now at Bethel, the place from which he may be considered to have set out for Padan-Aram. . . Accordingly, God appears to him here once more, promises him

again, and more emphatically, protection, blessing, inheritance, confirms the name Israel to him, a name given by the angel at the ford of the brook Jabbok, but now fixed and ratified. . . Accordingly, Jacob . . . rears again a stone-pillar as he had done forty [twenty] years before, and again solemnly names the place Bethel. p.187.

*Ans.* Bp. BROWNE now says 'rears again a stone pillar as he had done 40 years before,' whereas on p.167 he says, 'restores the pillar which he had before set up' (135). But his whole explanation is a deliberate attempt to force the true meaning of the passage into agreement with his own traditional views.

We have here an Elohist passage, xxxv.9-15, indicated by the plainest signs (V. An. 251)—(how is it that 'Jehovah' does not once appear here?)—in which Jacob's name was for the first time changed to Israel, v.10—'thy name is Jacob; thy name shall not be called any more Jacob, but Israel shall be thy name; and he called his name Israel'—and in which Jacob for the first time sets up a pillar, and 'he called the name of the place where God spake with him, Bethel,' v.15. In xxviii.10-22, xxxii. 24-32, we have Jehovistic versions of these two incidents, with a totally different phraseology.

No doubt, in v.9 the word 'again' is perplexing, as the Elohist has recorded no previous revelation to Jacob. Nor has he recorded any revelation at all to Isaac: this is, in fact, the second revelation to the patriarchs in the Elohist Narrative; and the writer may merely mean to say that, as God had appeared once before to Abram by the name El-Shaddai, when he changed his name to Abraham, xvii, so He appeared again to Jacob on this occasion by the same name, El-Shaddai, and changed his name to Israel. Otherwise, the word 'again' may have been interpolated with reference to the previous Jehovistic revelation in xxviii.10-22.

143. v.20. *unto this day*] i.e. till Moses wrote. It was worthy of notice that the pillar [on Rachel's grave] still stood after the land had been so long inhabited by unfriendly tribes. p.188.

*Ans.* Bp. BROWNE supposes Moses to have ascertained this fact by careful enquiry or even by making personal visits to the land of Canaan, while he fed the flocks of Jethro in the wilderness of Sinai, p.17—respecting which see *Introd. to Pent.* (27.1).

But Bp. BROWNE does not point out that Moses must have been very badly informed, if he inserted the words in v.19<sup>b</sup>, 'that is Bethlehem.' For in the historical passage, 1S.x.2, Rachel's sepulchre is placed near Ramah, north of Jerusalem, instead of near Bethlehem, south of Jerusalem. Accordingly, TRENIUS, *Sam.* p.39, concludes that there must have been a place Ephrath, 'near Bethel, right on the border between Benjamin and Ephraim, which was known as the place of Rachel's sepulchre, and is referred to in

1S.x.2.' In (V.*An.*258.N.B., 330.N.B.) the clause 'that is Bethlehem' in xxxv.19, xlviii.7, has been marked as a note by a later hand, which indeed is self-evident in xlviii.7, since no original writer would have put such a clause into the mouth of Jacob under such circumstances. Also xxxv.16<sup>b</sup>-18,20<sup>b</sup>, belongs to J. (V.*An.*259), and v.16<sup>a</sup>,19<sup>a</sup>,20<sup>a</sup>, is due to E., who only tells us that Rachel died—from what cause is not mentioned, nothing being said by E. either here or in xlviii.3-7 about the birth of *Benjamin*, whom he reckons, in fact, as born with the rest in Padan-Aram, xxxv.24,26—and that she was buried on the way from Bethel to Ephrath, and near the latter place, which was obviously not far from Bethel, *comp.* 1S.x.3, in which passage the 'Oak of *Tabor*' is, no doubt, the same as the 'Oak of *Deborah*,' G.xxxv.8, which was 'under Bethel.'

144. v.26. *these are the sons of Jacob, which were born to him in Padan-Aram]* *i.e.* except Benjamin, whose birth has just been recorded in Canaan, v.18. p.188.

Bp.BROWNE uses here the Gordian method of cutting a knot. The Elohist tells us plainly that *all* Jacob's sons—Benjamin included and mentioned by name, v.24—were born in Padan-Aram. But this is at variance with the Jehovistic account of the birth of Benjamin in Canaan, v.16<sup>b</sup>-18; and so Bp.BROWNE 'excepts' Benjamin, to get rid of the contradiction!

145. v.27. *Jacob came unto Isaac his father]* Whether this was just before Isaac's death, or whether Jacob spent some time at Mamre with his father, we do not read. If this were only just before his death, it is very probable that Jacob had visited him from time to time before. p.188.

*Ans.* The Elohist knows nothing of the delays interposed by the Jehovist in xxxiii, xxxiv. He makes Jacob start from Padan-Aram 'to go to Isaac his father,' xxxi.18, brings him to Bethel, xxxv.9-15, starts him from Bethel, when Rachel dies, and is buried at Ephrath, v.16<sup>a</sup>,19<sup>a</sup>,20<sup>a</sup>, gives a list of Jacob's twelve sons who 'were born to him in Padan-Aram,' v.22<sup>b</sup>-26, and so brings him to 'Isaac his father unto Mamre,' v.27.

### Chap. xxxvi.

146. v.31. *and these are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom before there reigned any king over the children of Israel]* These words have led many to suppose that this and the following verses were a late interpolation, as, it is thought, they must have been written after kings [rather, *one* king at least] had reigned in Israel. Spinoza argued from them that it was clearer than midday that the whole *Pentateuch* was written centuries after the time of *Moses*—a most illogical conclusion, for the utmost that could be inferred would be that these verses were taken from 1Ch.i.43-54, and, having been inserted in the margin of a very ancient MS. of Genesis, had crept into the text.

There is, however, nothing inconsistent with the Mosaic origin of the whole pas-

sage. . . The words in the original are 'before the reigning of a king to the sons of Israel,' and might be rendered 'whilst *as yet* the children of Israel *have* no king,' there being nothing in the words expressive of a past tense, or indicating that before the writing of the sentence a king had reigned in Israel. p.191.

*Ans.* Bp. BROWNE does great injustice to SPINOZA, who does not draw any such conclusion from this single passage. He cites a number of instances scattered throughout the Pentateuch, some quoted by ABEN-EZRA, others by himself. And after examining them one by one, he says, '*From the whole of this it is as clear as noonday light that the Pentateuch was not written by Moses, &c.*'—*Tract. Theol. Pol.* (TRÜBNER), p.175. Bp. BROWNE's suggestion that G.xxxvi.31, &c. has been merely copied from ICh.i.43-54, is extravagant—more especially as in Genesis we do not find 'and Hadad died,' as in ICh.i.51, a fact which seems to imply that Hadad, whose family relations appear to have been well known to the writer, G.xxxvi.39, was *still living*, as he may have been in Samuel's time, since we have Hadad, perhaps his son or grandson, a fugitive under David, and returning to raise a revolt at the beginning of Solomon's reign, 1K.xi.14-22.

The insertion by *Moses* of the words in question, explained as they are by Bp. BROWNE, would be simply unmeaning and absurd. He writes, however, very boldly—

He (Hadad) probably was living when Moses wrote, as no mention is made of his death, *an argument for the Mosaic origin of this chapter*; for Hadad could hardly have been living after the time of the kings of Israel, to which period those, who from v.31, consider it to be an interpolation, would assign this genealogy, or perhaps the whole chapter. p.192.

But the text says, 'these kings reigned in Edom before there reigned any *king* in Israel.' Why may not Hadad have been reigning at the time when Saul was chosen the first king in Israel?

### Chap. xxxvii.

147. v.3. *the son of his old age*] It is not impossible that the greater part of this narrative may have been chronologically *before the birth of Benjamin*, and the death of Rachel, related in xxxv.18. p.194.

*Ans.* This is quite inconsistent with Joseph's display of great affection for Benjamin, xlv.14, whom he had never seen. How did he know that their 'younger brother' was his own mother's son, xliii.29? According to the Elohist, Benjamin was born in Padan-Aram; and I have shown (V.An.280) that only v.2, belongs to E., *viz.* 'These are the generations of Jacob: Joseph, a son of seventeen years, was tending with his brothers among the flocks, and he was a lad with the sons of Bilhah and with the sons of Zilpah his father's wives,' together with, perhaps, v.28<sup>a</sup>, 'and there passed-over Midianites, merchants,' and v.36, 'and the Midianites sold him

into Egypt to Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh, captain of the guard'—these Midianites having merely kidnapped or *stolen* Joseph, xl.15, not *bought* him from his brethren. But, even as the story now stands, with the Jehovistic insertion in xxxv.18, it is impossible to suppose that *eleven* years at least had passed between Jacob's leaving Padan-Aram 'to go unto Isaac his father,' xxxi.13, and his 'coming unto Isaac his father,' xxxv.27, which must be supposed if Joseph was now *seventeen* years old, xxxvii.2, having been only *six* years old when Jacob left Padan-Aram, xxx.25, xxxi.41, and if, as Bp. BROWNE 'thinks not impossible,' Benjamin was not yet born, which he was before Jacob came to his father, xxxv.18,27.

148. v.25. *they sat down to eat bread*] In this heartless meal Reuben can have taken no part. It appears from v.29 that he must have left his brethren, perhaps for the very purpose of seeking means to rescue Joseph. The simplicity and truthfulness of the narrative are all the more apparent by the indifference of the writer to the question how and why it was that Reuben was absent at this point of the history. A *forgery* would have been likely to tell all about it, and make it all plain. Yet, strangely enough, this very artlessness has been made an argument against the historical truth of the narrative, as being clumsily arranged and inconsistent in these details. p.196.

*Ans.* In (V.An.283) I have expressly argued *against* the idea of the omission in question implying here a difference in authorship. But this judgment, if correct, does not in any way help to prove the 'historical truth of the narrative.'

### Chap. xxxviii.

149. v.1. *and it came to pass at that time*] It is by no means certain that this note of time is to be immediately connected with the events in the last chapter. The strict chronological sequence in these *Toledoth* is not always followed. p.197.

*Ans.* The original Elohist Narrative appears to have been written in 'strict chronological sequence'; but the order of events is frequently disturbed by the insertion of Jehovistic passages.

### Chap. xxxix.

150. v.2. The variety in the use of the Divine names in the history of Joseph is very observable. The name *Jehovah* occurs only where the narrator is speaking in his own person, until we come to xlix.18, where Jacob uses it in the midst of his blessing on Dan. In all other speeches in the history we have *Elohim*, sometimes *ha-Elohim* with the article, and sometimes *El* or *ha-El*. The reason of this is generally apparent. The whole history, though given by an inspired writer to whom the name *Jehovah* was familiar, concerns the history of Joseph and his kindred in contact with a heathen people. It is therefore on all accounts natural that the general name *Elohim*, and not the specially revealed name '*Jehovah*,' should be



used in dialogue. Even the narrative, as in xlvi, is most naturally carried on in a so-called Elohist form, *the name Elohim being of common use to both Hebrews and Egyptians.* p.200.

*Ans.* Bp. BROWNE can hardly mean to say that 'Elohim' was an Egyptian word; and, if not, it is not easy to see why the Egyptians should have 'used' it at all. Moreover, why does Joseph always use 'Elohim,' never 'Jehovah,' in making himself known to his brethren, xlv.5,7,8,9, when he stood all alone with them, v.1? Why, again, have we only 'Elohim' in the Divine revelation to Israel, xlvi.2,3, and in Jacob's last words to Joseph, xlviii.3,9, 11,15,20,21?

But Bp. BROWNE seems to have lost sight of the fact that, on his view, Moses received this history by oral or written tradition, from the Israelites who dwelt in Egypt, and who 'had latterly but little used, perhaps wholly disused,' the name 'Jehovah,' *Introd. to Genesis* (14)—so that the frequent repetition of 'Jehovah' in xxxviii.7,7,10, xxxix.2,3,3,5,5,21,23,23, requires at least some explanation.

I have shown (V.291) that only parts of xlvi-xlix are due to E.; whereas considerable portions of xl-xlii, xlv, are due to E<sub>2</sub>, who wrote probably in the latter part of Saul's reign, and never uses 'Jehovah' while almost all the rest of G.xxxvii-1 was written in the second decade of David's reign, when Jehovah was not yet freely used, except xxxviii, xxxix, xl.1,3<sup>b</sup>,5<sup>b</sup>, xlv. 12<sup>b</sup>, written in the latter part of David's reign, which fact explains the frequent use in these passages of the name Jehovah.

Chap. xl. xli. xlii.

Chap. xliii.

151. v.11. All these fruits may have grown in the land of Canaan, though the corn-harvest may have utterly failed. Thus also we may account for the fact that the small supply, which could be carried from Egypt by ten asses, sufficed for a time to supply Jacob's household. There was a grievous famine; but still all the fruits of the earth had not failed. Corn was needed; but life can be supported, especially in a warm climate, with but a moderate amount of the more solid kinds of food. p.210.

*Ans.* There had been already one year's 'sore famine,' xli.57, and Jacob's sons had been obliged to go to Egypt for corn; so that they had no store in hand from former years. The next year again 'the famine was sore in the land,' and 'they had eaten up the corn which they had brought out of Egypt,' xliii.2; and, with great distress of mind, Jacob yields to Judah's entreaty to let Benjamin go with them, 'that we may live and not die, both we and thou and also our little-ones,' xliii.8. If ten sacks of eorn, in addition to the fruits of the earth, would supply for twelve mouths the

wants of eleven families, the famine can hardly have been so very 'sore' in Canaan—more especially, if, as Bp. BROWNE says—

some hundreds of dependents accompanied Jacob in his descent into Egypt, and settled with him in Goshen. p.215.

If these 'dependents' could manage to live without corn, why could not Jacob and his sons? Or how can it be supposed that the writer would represent Jacob as doing such violence to his feelings by letting Benjamin go, and Judah urging him to it, for the purpose of saving the lives of their families, if it was only that they might have the luxury of a cake of corn-bread now and then, which 'some hundreds of dependents' had done without?

Chap. xlv. xlv.

Chap. xlvi.

152. v.7. *his daughters and his sons' daughters*] only one daughter is named, and one granddaughter. This verse implies that there were more. p. 217.

*Ans.* Bp. BROWNE makes no remark on v.23, 'and the sons of Dan, Hushim,' where the writer reckons only *one* son of Dan, though he says 'sons,' and so he clearly means to reckon only *one* daughter of Jacob, and *one* granddaughter, though he uses the plural number, as is common in Hebrew genealogies, comp. 1Ch.ii.7,8,31, &c.

153. v. 12. Bp. BROWNE meets the objection as to the impossibility of the birth of Hezron and Hamul before Jacob's descent into Egypt, stated above in (138), by making three assumptions, viz. (i), that xxxviii. may not follow chronologically after xxxvii,—(ii) that Jacob served Laban *gratis* for twenty years, besides the twenty years usually reckoned to him,—

(iii) that the names in this catalogue may have comprised, not only those that were actually of the company which went down into Egypt, but also all the grandchildren or great-grandchildren of Jacob born before Jacob's death.

*Ans.* Bp. BROWNE merely repeats the usual fallacies, which I have exposed fully in (L.22-30), and I need not here repeat my arguments. I may say however, that (i) is utterly irrelevant, since it does not matter when the events in xxxviii took place, the question being merely, whether Hezron and Hamul could possibly have been born under the circumstances, their *grandmother* being the widow of Judah's sons, and Judah himself only forty-two years old, when Jacob went down to Egypt—that for (ii) there is not a shadow of foundation (138)—and that (iii) directly contradicts the plain letter and meaning of xlvi.7,8,26 27.

It seems plain that v.12<sup>b</sup> was inserted at the time when xxxviii was intro-

duced into the story, the Elohist having reckoned Er and Onan among the 70 who went down with Jacob (V.*An.*316).

154. *v.21. the sons of Benjamin*] These are ten in number. According to N.xxvi.40, two of them, Naaman and Ard, were *grandsons* of Benjamin. According to the common chronology, Benjamin was only 23 at the coming into Egypt,—an age at which he could hardly have had ten sons, or eight sons and two grandsons, even if he had two wives and some of the children had been twins. The considerations alluded to at *v.12*, however, will allow us to calculate that Benjamin was 32 at the going-down to Egypt, and therefore 49 at the death of Jacob, by which age he might easily have been the father of ten sons. *p.218.*

*Ans.* According to E., Benjamin was born in Padan-Aram, xxxv.24,26, though he does not mention at what time he was born during Jacob's stay there. But, even according to J.xxxv.18, Benjamin was born on the way from Padan-Aram, and therefore was only about six or seven years younger than Joseph, xxx.25, xxxi.41; and, as Joseph was now 39, *comp.* xli.46,54,56, xliii.1, Benjamin must have been about '32 at the going down to Egypt,' and might very well have had ten sons by one or more wives, without any of Bp.BROWNE's fallacious 'considerations' (153)—though it is true that his age and paternity are hardly consistent with his being called 'a child of Jacob's old age, a little one,' xliv.20 (J.).

#### Chap. xlvii.

155. *v.12. according to their families*] lit. *to the mouth of their children*; meaning very probably 'even to the food for their children.' *p.221.*

*Ans.* It is a common Heb. idiom, meaning 'according to,' without the least reference to 'food,' see N.ix.17, Hos.x.12, Jer.xxix.10, and *comp.* L.xxv.52, xxvii.8,18, N.vi.21, Mal.ii.9.

#### Chap. xlviii.

#### Chap. xlix.

156. *v.7. I will divide them in Jacob and scatter them in Israel*] This was most literally fulfilled; for, when Canaan was conquered, on the second numbering under Moses, the tribe of Simeon had become the weakest of all the tribes, N.xxvi.14; in Moses' Blessing (D.xxxiii) it is entirely passed over; and in the assignment of territory it was merely mingled or scattered among the tribe of Judah, having certain cities assigned it within the limits of Judah's possession, Jo.xix.1-9; whilst the Levites had no separate inheritance, but merely a number of cities to dwell in, scattered throughout the possessions of their brethren, Jo.xxi.1-40. With regard to the latter, though by being made dependent on the tithes and also on the liberality of their countrymen, they were punished, yet in process of time the curse was turned into a blessing. Of this transformation of

the curse into a blessing there is not the slightest intimation in Jacob's address; and in this we have a strong proof of its genuineness. *After this honourable change in the time of Moses* (due in great part to the faithfulness of Moses himself and of the Levites with him), it would never have occurred to the *forger* of a prophecy to cast such a reproach and to foretell such a judgment on the forefather of the Levites. In fact, how different is the blessing pronounced by Moses himself upon the tribe of Levi in D.xxxiii.8, &c. p.227.

*Ans.* The *Levites* numbered only 23,000, N.xxvi.62, when the Simeonites numbered 22,200, v.14, immediately before the blessing pronounced on Levi in D.xxxiii. But Bp.BROWNE quietly *assumes* that such an 'honourable change' in the fortunes of Levi, *did* really take place 'in the time of Moses,' according to all the statements of the Pentateuch; and so he reasons on in a vicious circle. I have shown that the Levitical cities are entirely a later fiction (VI.App.36,69), as are also the extraordinary privileges and prerogatives secured to the tribe of Levi in the numerous ordinances of the L.L.—the only distinction which they enjoyed in the Original Story of the Exodus being that of the *whole tribe* having been set apart for priestly offices, without any line of demarcation being drawn between Priests and Levites, or any notion of surpassing dignity being attached to their offices, so that in Deuteronomy the Levites might all be Priests, and are constantly classed with the poor and needy, the orphan and the widow, and the stranger.

Supposing, however, this Blessing of Jacob to have been written in the reign of David, its language with respect to Simeon and Levi would be thoroughly explained by the condition of the two tribes at that time—Simeon being practically absorbed in the tribe of Judah, and the Levites being probably in a very low condition, more especially when the sanctuaries at Shiloh and Nob had been successively destroyed, until the erection of the Tabernacle on Mount Sion in the fourteenth year of David's reign, about two years before which event we have fixed the composition of this Blessing (V.280). In the much later days, when the Blessing of Moses was written, the Levites filled a much more prominent position, as Priests, and probably Judges, in Judah, *e.g.* Hilkiah in Josiah's time, and are addressed in corresponding terms (VI.131-6).

157. v.10, Bp.BROWNE translates this verse as follows—

The Sceptre (either of royal or perhaps only of tribal authority) shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver (senator or scribe) from before him, until Shiloh (*i.e.* either 'the Prince of Peace' or 'he whose right it is') shall come, and to him shall the nations be obedient—

And he 'confidently holds that the above paraphrase conveys the true sense of the passage.' He admits that 'after the Babylonish Captivity, the

royalty was not in the House of Judah; but then, he says, 'the prophecy is not express as to the possession of absolute royalty,' and so he passes off under a cloud of words:—

Israel never ceased to be a nation, and Judah never ceased to be a tribe with at least a tribal sceptre and lawgivers or expositors of the Law, Sanhedrim or Senators, and with a general pre-eminence in the land [? during the Captivity], nor was there a foreign ruler of the people till at least the time of Herod the Great [? Antiochus Epiphanes], just before the birth of the Saviour; and even the Herods, though of Idumæan extraction, were *considered* (!) as exercising a *native* sovereignty in Judah, ['the sceptre shall not depart from Judah, &c.'], which did not quite pass away till a Roman procurator was sent thither after the reign of Archelaus, the son of Herod the Great; and at that very time the Shiloh came, the Prince of Peace, to whom of right the kingdom belonged. p.228.

*Ans.* The attempt of Bp. BROWNE to prove that the triumphant supremacy of Judah, as predicted in this passage, was maintained till the coming of Christ, breaks down entirely, if we consider only the times of the Captivity. As KALISCH says, *in loc.*, 'As the empire of Judah ceased in the sixth century before the Christian era, and the tribe of Judah never afterwards obtained a permanent or brilliant political position, or received government over other branches of the Hebrews, and was, in the time of the Maccabees, subordinate to leaders from the tribe of Levi, this part of the prophecy cannot possibly refer, as commonly understood, to the Messiah.'

Moreover, the above translation is—if not forbidden, yet at least—rendered highly improbable by the *parallelism*, which requires or recommends the following translation:—

'The sceptre shall not depart from Judah,  
Nor the rod from between his feet,  
Until he come to Shiloh (= a place of rest),  
And to him be the obedience of peoples.'

This Blessing, as we suppose (V.280), was written about the twelfth year of David's reign, shortly before he had 'come to Shiloh,' *i.e.* 'rest,' like Joshua in the O.S. of the Pentateuch, then just written or under the writer's hands, when he set up the Tabernacle on Mount Zion, as Joshua set it up at Shiloh, Jo.xviii.1, having 'the land subdued before him'—at a time when he was still exposed to dangers, or harassed by difficulties from within his realm or from without. The expression, 'the obedience of peoples,' may be understood as applying only to the tribes of Israel, *comp.* v.16, xxviii.3; or it may be understood of the subjugation of the nations roundabout, as Edom, Moab, and Ammon, and the distinct reference to David's victories seems to make the last meaning most probable. He was

to go on 'conquering and to conquer,' until his hand should be on the neck of every foe—

' Until he come to Shiloh,  
And to him be the obedience of peoples.'

It will be seen how mistaken is the remark of Bp. BROWNE that—

Whether it were a prophecy by Jacob or, as many who adopt this theory [of modern critics] will have it, a *forgery* of after date, nothing could be less pertinent than the sense to be elicited from the words 'till he come to Shiloh.'

And it is very noticeable that the very same expression is used to describe the state of Israel under *David*, just after he had set up the Tabernacle on Mount Zion, 2S.vi.17,—'Jehovah had given-rest to him roundabout,' 2S.vii.1, as is used to describe the state of Israel under Joshua, just after he had set up the Tabernacle at Shiloh, Jo.xviii.1—'Jehovah had given-rest to them roundabout,' Jo.xxi.44, *comp.* xxii.4.

See (V.188-199), where the fallacies of HENGSTENBERG, reproduced by Bp. BROWNE on p.228,232-3, are answered. As usual, Bp. BROWNE undertakes to assert, that, 'notwithstanding the authority of EICHHORN, BLEEK, HITZIG, TUCH, EWALD, DELITZSCH, KALISCH, &c.'—*i.e.* notwithstanding a consensus of many of the most eminent scholars of the age—the rendering 'until he come to Shiloh' is '*utterly impossible*,' p.232. But Bp. BROWNE might have included in the above list the name of KURTZ, one of his most useful allies on other occasions; whilst both KURTZ and HENGSTENBERG reject as utterly untenable, the rendering 'he to whom it belongs' or, 'he whose right it is,'—which, says Bp. BROWNE, with a certain reading, 'we may safely adopt.' p.233.

158. v.13. *Zebulun shall dwell at the haven of the sea*] The language here used, though in all material points fulfilled in the subsequent history, is just what would not have been written by a *forgery* in after times. Zebulun had not properly a maritime territory: yet its possession reached very nearly to both seas. It was far from the city of Zidon; and yet, as approximating very closely to the land of the Syrians, might well be said to have its border by or towards Zidon. p.229.

*Ans.* Very probably in David's time, when this Blessing was written, it was fully expected—at least by the enthusiastic writer—that the territories of Zebulun would be extended to the sea, and that the Lion of Judah would even lay his paw upon the Zidonian borders, which are reckoned as part of the inheritance of Israel in Jo.xiii.6.

### Chap. I.

159. v.10. *beyond Jordan*] *i.e.* to the west of Jordan. Moses wrote before the Israelites had taken possession of the land of Israel, and therefore whilst they

were on the east of Jordan. This accords with what we hear of the site of Goren-Atad and Abel-Mizraim; for Jerome identifies it with Beth-Hoglah, which lay between the Jordan and Jericho, the ruins of which are probably still to be seen (see *D.B.* I.p.200). p.235.

*Ans.* Bp.BROWNE should have also referred his readers to *D.B.* I.p.3, (ABEL-MIZRAIM) and p.133 (ATAD), where they will find that JEROME not only 'identifies it with Beth-Hoglah,' but also describes it as '*trans-Jordanem*,' so that one of the two statements must be incorrect. Accordingly, on p.133, Mr.GROVE seems to speak of the site as '*west of the Jordan*,' but on p.3 he says distinctly, 'It was beyond (עֲבָרָה, = on the east of) Jordan, though placed by JEROME at Beth-Hoglah, near the river on its *west* bank.' There can be no doubt that the place in question did lie on the *east* bank, perhaps opposite to Beth-Hoglah; for from v.13, it is plain that the funeral procession had not yet entered the land of Canaan, and Moses would hardly have spoken of a place as '*beyond the Jordan*,' v.10,11, if he merely meant to say that it was in the '*land of Canaan*,' as in v.13.

The simple fact is, that we have here a sign of the later age in which this passage was written, the writer living in Canaan, and speaking of this place inadvertently as '*beyond*,' = east of the Jordan.

160. Finally, throughout this Commentary, Bp.BROWNE takes no notice whatever of the fact that the Elohist narrative may be extracted from the Book of Genesis, almost entire, as a continuous story without a single break as far as xxviii.9, that is, for 224 verses, as is actually done in Part V; so that, as Mr.NEALE says (VI. *App.*123, 2.)—

Whatever may be the truth concerning the origin of the different narratives constituting the present Book of Genesis, two facts are certain:—

(i) That it contains *but one set of passages*, in which anything like a continuous story of the antediluvian and patriarchal ages can be traced:

(ii) That it *does* contain *such a set* of passages, distinguished by marked peculiarities of language, which, when all the other passages (where these peculiarities do not occur) are struck out, may be read continuously, without the addition or omission of a single word, except in two or three cases, where very large additions to the original story appear to have been made, and some portions of it to have been struck out.

All the other parts of Genesis, though often forming continuous narratives of considerable length, require this Original Story as the thread to hold them together, and cannot be combined into independent histories complete in themselves, without arbitrary additions or transpositions.

LONDON: PRINTED BY  
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE  
AND PARLIAMENT STREET



THE  
NEW BIBLE COMMENTARY  
CRITICALLY EXAMINED.

LONDON : PRINTED BY  
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE  
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

THE  
NEW BIBLE COMMENTARY

BY BISHOPS AND OTHER CLERGY  
OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH

CRITICALLY EXAMINED

BY THE RIGHT REV.

JOHN WILLIAM COLENSO, D.D.

BISHOP OF NATAL.

---

'We can do nothing against the Truth, but for the Truth.'—*St. Paul*, 2 Cor. xiii. 8.

'Not to exceed, and not to fall short of, facts,—not to add, and not to take away,—to state the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,—are the grand, the vital, maxims of Inductive Science, of English Law, and, let us add, of Christian Faith.'—*Quarterly Review*, on 'Essays and Reviews,' Oct. 1861, p. 369.

---

PART II.

INTRODUCTION TO EXODUS.  
THE BOOK OF EXODUS.

LONDON:  
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.  
1872.



## PREFACE.



IN presenting another instalment of my examination of the 'Bishops' Commentary,' I can only say that, with one very important exception, of which I will speak presently, this second portion of the great work, by which the reputation of the English Church was to be maintained in the face of all Europe, is merely, like the first, a laboured attempt throughout to maintain the foregone conclusions of traditionary theologians, with scarcely a sign of a desire to weigh seriously the arguments of the most distinguished modern critics, and hardly even a notice of some of their most important conclusions.\*

\* Those who cannot afford time to read through the following criticisms, may be referred especially to the Commentary on Exodus (27,33,41), or, more generally,—

(i) For instances of inaccuracy, see *Intr.* 3,13, *Ex.* 2,3,7,11,46,47,54,78,104 ;

(ii) For instances of fallacious, sometimes absurd, reasoning and evasion of difficulties, see *Intr.* 8,9,10,14,22,23, *Ex.* 1,25–28,30,33,34,36,41,44,49,51,55,56,60,61, 63–68,75,76,96,102,108 ;

(iii) For instances of uncritical judgment and a defective knowledge of the results of Modern Criticism, see *Intr.* 2,11, *Ex.* 9,11,19,20,50,57,72,73,75,81,107.

The above occur in Canon Cook's contributions to this Part of the Commentary.

MR. CLARK'S notes are of a different character, and are distinguished throughout by accuracy of statement and fair argument *from his own point of view*, which, however, shuts out to a very great extent the latest results of Modern Criticism. But anyone, who wishes to see how untenable is his position, may be referred to *Ex.* 116,117,121–126,131,135,137–141,146–148,150,152,153,161,165,167,174,176, 179,183,184,192,198,199,202,203,205.

Nevertheless, the further I have advanced in the study of this book, the more strongly I feel that its publication should be hailed with thankfulness by all sincere lovers of the Truth. I am not speaking merely of the opportunity which is thus given for drawing attention to the evasions, absurdities, and contradictions, into which most writers will be betrayed, who try to make credible as an historical narrative what is certainly not history, and probably by its original authors was never meant to be regarded as such. But we are enabled now to test in the most satisfactory manner the correctness of our own conclusions, by comparing them at every point with those of able adversaries—at least, with those of clergymen of note and reputation, who come before us as the chosen representatives of the highest form of traditionary scholarship in England. The benefit of thus being able, as it were, to compare notes throughout the Pentateuch, not with anonymous adventurers in the field of Biblical Criticism, but with scholars of name, though obvious to anyone, can only, however, be fully appreciated by those who, like myself, have carefully examined my own results with the additional light thrown upon them by the remarks in this Commentary, and in no single instance, as yet, have found reason to modify them, much less to abandon them as unsound and untenable.

The Introduction to Exodus and the Commentary on Ex.i–xix have been written by the Rev. Canon COOK, the Editor; the Commentary on Ex.xx–xl by the Rev. S. CLARK. With respect to the former I can only say *Amicus Plato, &c.* I must not allow private feelings of friendship and esteem to prevent my discharging on this occasion what I regard as a public duty, and exhibiting as plainly as I can the fallacious character of

his criticisms. The struggle in which we are engaged is, as I have said in my former Preface, an internecine conflict. Upon the success or the failure of this Commentary—upon its being allowed to impose on the great majority of English readers a mass of fallacies, assertions, and assumptions, in the place of solid reasoning and sound criticism, or its being exposed from the first in its proper character and neutralised in its effects by the juxtaposition of the truth—it depends very much, as I conceive, whether the reign of traditionary falsehood shall or shall not be brought to an end within the Church of England in the present generation,—whether educational efforts shall or shall not be any longer cramped and enthralled under the slavish yoke of ignorance and superstition,—whether missionaries in heathen lands shall or shall not for the time to come continue to give their converts stones instead of bread, and to pour down their eager throats the poisonous doses with which they have hitherto been too commonly drugged, and which must assuredly result in the next generation in numberless cases, here as elsewhere, in incurable, hereditary scepticism and unbelief.

Like the former Commentary and Introductions, so these eschew almost entirely any very close contact with the questions connected with the peculiar phraseology which, according to modern critics, is found to characterize the different writers of the Pentateuch, as fully set forth in my Part VI. Canon Cook, indeed, displays a great amount of *Egyptian* learning, devoting many pages, *p.*476–492, besides remarks in the notes, to the discussion of Hebrew words for which he finds Egyptian roots, and he quotes also, now and then, an *Arabic* word, *p.*305,310. All this erudition must be rather beyond the calibre of ‘men of ordinary culture,’ ‘laymen as well as pro-

fessed divines,' 'who have had no special preparation for such studies,' however much it may be appreciated by a very limited number of scholars devoted to Egyptological pursuits. But, if room could be found for these researches, surely there might have been inserted essays or appendices bearing upon the questions of Hebrew phraseology above referred to, which occupy so conspicuous a place in the criticism of the Pentateuch—more especially as so much space in this work is expended in merely reprinting the authorized English Version, with all its defects—without even the substitution of 'Jehovah' for 'the LORD,' for want of which, as the Editor admits, the meaning of the sacred writer in certain passages 'is much obscured,' *p.*263—the text alone filling, in fact, more than fifty pages out of the whole number (185) devoted to the Commentary on Exodus. The only instance of the kind is given by Canon COOK in a note on *p.*244, and this is most ungainly in form and inaccurate in substance, as is fully shown below (*Intr. to Ex.* 13). But neither Canon COOK nor Mr. CLARK betrays throughout this Commentary any sign even of acquaintance with the important conclusions, to which some of the most eminent scholars of the present day—*e.g.* REUSS, GRAF, KUENEN, NÖLDEKE, KALISCH—have been led as to the later origin of the Levitical Legislation of the Pentateuch.

The Introduction and Commentary on Exodus, however, is creditably distinguished from the former portions of this work, not only by the learning and research displayed in some passages, especially the very elaborate and very able remarks of Mr. CLARK upon the Tabernacle and its appurtenances, but also by an almost total absence of the use of those opprobrious weapons which were so freely employed by Bp. BROWNE, so that, just as the Elohist



or Jehovist is marked by a peculiar phraseology, in like manner the expression 'forger' or 'forgery' may be regarded as a characteristic of his contributions (*Intr. to Pent.* 5.viii), while 'archaic' and 'Egyptian' characterize those of Canon Cook. Mr. CLARK, indeed, does speak of 'the *cavils* of objectors,' p.354, who are '*captiously* looking at dissevered fragments of the letter,' p.408, forgetting that what from *his* point of view may seem to be captious cavilling, and might be fairly so called if it formed the sole reason for objecting to the traditionary views as to the authorship and authority of the Pentateuch, loses that character entirely when those views have been already discarded upon other abundantly sufficient grounds, and the writer is merely pointing out additional indications—*nuances*, as it were—all tending in the same direction. And, perhaps, not the least noticeable of these is the fact that Mr. CLARK himself finds it expedient to represent as the enforcement of 'traditional rules' and 'patriarchal maxims' what is recorded in Exodus as an express communication from the mouth of Jehovah Himself to Moses, and to speak of 'the *Mosaic Legislation*,' where the Bible implies a direct *Divine Revelation* (*Ex.*121–3,131,135). Canon Cook also once insinuates a charge of 'disingenuousness' against his opponents, p.246, and so he speaks in his advertisement of 'supplying satisfactory answers to objections resting upon *misrepresentations* of the text'; though such expressions come with rather a bad grace from one who deals with the text as Canon Cook himself does in some places (*Ex.*27,33,41, &c.). But otherwise this Commentary is free from such blemishes; and the faults and defects which attach to it are merely those which arise from the fact that the writers have evidently sat down to their work under

strong prepossessions, and have gone through with it from beginning to end without having been able, except in one instance, to throw off the control of these powerful prejudices.

*Except in one instance*—for one most remarkable exception there is to the above statement, *viz.* the course adopted by Mr. CLARK, it must be presumed with the deliberate approval of the Editor, and also of the Standing Committee of advice, with reference to the Ten Commandments (*Ex.112*). It will certainly be new to most congregations of the Church of England to be told that these Commands which they have had read out in their hearing from Sunday to Sunday as the words ‘which God spake’ in the ears of Moses and all Israel, amidst thunders and lightnings, on the flaming Mount, are now declared *not* to have been thus uttered in either of the two forms in which they appear in the Pentateuch (*E.xx, D.v*). It may be doubted if one Churchman in a thousand—even in our Universities—has ever as yet heard this fact recognized or stated plainly from the pulpit by his Minister. It is to be presumed, however, that this result of Modern Criticism, at all events, as now avouched in this Commentary under the sanction of the Archbishops and Bishops of England, will no longer be kept a secret from young people when catechized, or from the people at large—that no clergyman of intelligence will read these words any longer as the Divine Words actually uttered ‘with a loud voice’ on Sinai, without relieving his character—nay, his conscience—from the charge of ‘speaking lies in the name of the Lord,’ by explaining to his flock from time to time the real truth with respect to the Decalogue. If this is done, I venture to predict that before long a great deal more will have to be admitted, as facts established by the Modern Criticism of the

Pentateuch, whatever uncertainty may still exist on other points, and that the Laity of the English Church will demand that ‘the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth’ shall be stated, which as we have been told (*Quart. Rev.* Oct. 1861, p.369) is ‘the grand, the vital maxim of Christian Faith,’ and will insist upon it that the windows of our National Church—if it is to retain any longer that honoured title—long thickly coated with the grime of ages, from one little corner of which the dust has been here rubbed off to their very great surprise, shall be thoroughly cleansed, and the doors thrown wide open, that all devout truth-seekers and truth-speakers may enter joyfully in, and light and air penetrate freely into every part of the building.

J. W. NATAL.

BISHOPSTOWE, NATAL :

Oct. 1871.

---

\* \* \* Dr. Smith’s *Dictionary of the Bible* is quoted below as *D.B.* The different Parts of my work on the Pentateuch are quoted as (I.57), (VI.43), &c.

It may be well to mention here that—

In Part III, I have fixed the age of the *Deuteronomist*—who may possibly be Jeremiah—in the first years of king Josiah.

In Part V, I have separated the passages due to the different writers in Genesis, have determined approximately the ages of these writers, *viz.* the *Elohist* (E.) in the days of Samuel, the *Second Elohist* (E<sub>2</sub>) in the beginning of David’s reign, the *Jehovist* (J.) in David’s reign and the first part of Solomon’s.

In Part VI (just published), I have shown that all Leviticus and large portions of Exodus, Numbers, and Joshua, with a few passages of Deuteronomy, were written after the Captivity, and I have included these under the designation of the *Later or Levitical Legislation* (L.L.); and I have further separated throughout Exodus—Joshua the portions due to the different authors, *Elohist*, *Jehovist*, *Deuteronomist*, and *Later Legislator*, giving at full length the *Original Story* of the Exodus (O.S.), as it came into the hands of the *Deuteronomist*.



# CONTENTS.



	PAGE
PREFACE . . . . .	V
INTRODUCTION TO EXODUS . . . . .	3
THE BOOK OF EXODUS . . . . .	29

HE WHO PROPAGATES A DELUSION, AND HE WHO CONNIVES AT IT WHEN ALREADY EXISTING, BOTH ALIKE TAMPER WITH TRUTH. WE MUST NEITHER LEAD NOR LEAVE MEN TO MISTAKE FALSEHOOD FOR TRUTH. NOT TO UNDECEIVE, IS TO DECEIVE. THE GIVING, OR NOT CORRECTING, FALSE REASONS FOR RIGHT CONCLUSIONS, FALSE GROUNDS FOR RIGHT BELIEF, FALSE PRINCIPLES FOR RIGHT PRACTICE—THE HOLDING FORTH, OR FOSTERING, FALSE CONSOLATIONS, FALSE ENCOURAGEMENTS, OR FALSE SANCTIONS, OR CONNIVING AT THEIR BEING HELD FORTH OR BELIEVED—ARE ALL PIOUS FRAUDS. THIS SPRINGS FROM, AND IT WILL FOSTER AND INCREASE, A WANT OF VENERATION FOR TRUTH: IT IS AN AFFRONT PUT ON THE 'SPIRIT OF TRUTH,'—Archbishop WHATELY, *on Bacon's Essays*, p.10.

INTRODUCTION TO EXODUS.

---

REV. CANON COOK, M.A.





## INTRODUCTION TO EXODUS.

---

1. CANON COOK begins by stating that ‘the Book of Exodus consists of two distinct portions,’ *viz.* the ‘historical portion,’ ch.i–xix, and the ‘giving of the law and the institutions which completed the organization of the people, &c.,’ ch.xx–xl, and he says:—

These two portions are unlike in style and structure. . . . But their mutual bearings and independence are evident, and leave no doubt as to the substantial unity of the Book. The historical portion owes all its significance and interest to the promulgation of God’s will in the law. The institutions of the law could not, humanly speaking, have been established or permanently maintained but for the deliverance which the historical portion records. *p.*237.

*Ans.* Rather, as Canon COOK says, *p.*239, ‘the promulgation of the law is described in xix,xx’; while the history appears again in xxiv,xxxii–xxxiv. But the great bulk of his second portion, *viz.* xxv–xxxi,xxxv–xl, containing the directions for building the Tabernacle, &c., differs entirely in style from the other ‘legislative’ matter, and is closely related to the L.L. in Leviticus, Numbers, and Joshua.

It is, of course, a mere assumption, directly contradicted by the historical facts recorded in the books of Samuel and Kings, that the institutions in these chapters ever were ‘established or permanently maintained,’ or that the Mosaic Ark and Tabernacle ever really existed.

2. Canon COOK assumes (with Bp.BROWNE), in complete disregard of the most certain results of modern criticism, that Exodus, as well as Genesis, is the work throughout of ‘one author.’

The narrative, indeed, is so closely connected with that of Genesis as to show not only that *it was written by the same author*, but that it formed part of one general plan. *p.*237.

The Book of Exodus could not have been *written by any man* who had not passed many years in Egypt, and who had not also a thorough knowledge, such as could only be acquired by personal observation, of the Sinaitic Peninsula. But it is improbable that *any Israelite* between the time of Moses and Jeremiah could have possessed either of these qualifications. p.240.

It is *the production of one mind, written by one man.* p.244.

*Ans.* The most important instances of correspondence both with Egypt and Sinai appear in passages of D. or L.L., written in or after the days of Jeremiah, e.g., the notices in D.i.1,2, the list of Stations in N.xxxiii, the signs of a knowledge of Egyptian art in E.xxv, &c., xxxv, &c.

### 3. Canon Cook goes on to say :—

Still it [the Book of Exodus] is a distinct section ; the first events which it relates are separated from the last chapter in Genesis by a considerable interval, and it presents the people of Israel under totally different circumstances. Its termination is marked with equal distinctness, *winding up with the completion of the Tabernacle.* p.237.

*Ans.* Most of the directions in E.xxv, &c., no doubt, are carried out in this Book, so that it has the *appearance* of 'winding up with the completion of the Tabernacle.' Yet those for the anointing of the Tabernacle and its vessels, as well as for the consecration of Aaron and his sons, xxix, xxx.22-30, xl.12-15, are first executed in L.viii ; though, previously to this, shewbread is 'set in order before Jehovah' upon the golden table, xl.23, incense burnt upon the golden altar, v.27, and the 'burnt-offering and meal-offering' offered upon the brazen altar, v.29, when at that time there was no priest, and neither the table nor either altar was consecrated, and no laws of sacrifice had yet been given, and actually the instructions for the shewbread first appear in L.xxiv.5-9!

All this, of course, is intelligible when we know that the whole account is a mere fiction of the L.L. But it is inconsistent with the notion that we have here an authentic history, composed by the principal actor in it or under his direction.

### 4. Canon Cook then says :—

The Book is divided into many smaller sections . . . of different lengths . . . probably written on separate parchments or papyri. . . . This is a point of importance, accounting to a great extent for apparent breaks in the narrative and for repetitions which have been attributed to the carelessness of the compiler. p.237.

*Ans.* This will hardly account for the repetition in L.xxiv.1-3 of the identical words in E.xxvii.20,21, about the oil for the golden candlestick, or in E.xiii.6,7, of the command about the Feast of Mazzoth, which had been

already *much more fully* given in xii.14-20. Or, since Canon Cook says:—

E.xii was evidently intended to be read as a separate lesson, and may possibly have been rewritten or revised for that purpose towards the close of the life of Moses, p.239—

it will not explain the fact that in xxxiv.10-26 we find repeated, often in identical words (VI.253), a few only of the laws which were solemnly uttered a few weeks previously by the Divine Voice on Sinai, as the basis of the Covenant between Jehovah and Israel (VI.231).

5. Canon Cook then, speaking of the Song of Moses, E.xv, says:—

The length and structure of this great hymn have been represented as proofs of a later origin. p.239.

And he quotes the instances of 'Egyptian poems of the age of Moses or much earlier,' which are twice as long, adding:—

We have also exact information as to the time which it would take to write out such a hymn. An Egyptian scribe, writing with the greatest care, with rubrical headings, &c., would have done it in half a day: a few hours would suffice in the simpler characters used by the Semitic races. This comparison leaves no doubt as to the possibility of such a hymn being written by Moses, who was trained in the schools of Egypt, and *no one denies his genius.* p.239.

*Ans.* There is no proof even of the existence of the *traditional* Moses, much less of his 'genius'—more especially when we know that Deuteronomy was written just before the Captivity, and the Levitical Legislation during or after it, leaving very little testimony from the more ancient parts of the Pentateuch, whatever may be their historical value, to the acts or abilities of Moses.

Most probably, the Israelites marched out of Egypt under the guidance of some eminent leader (VI.563), and he may have had poetical genius, such as this hymn displays. If there were reasonable ground for believing that the rest of the narrative is historically true, no critic would 'represent the length and structure of this great hymn as proofs' of its not being Mosaic, nor, as far as I am aware, has anyone objected that Moses or his scribe could not have found time enough to 'write it out.'

6. Canon Cook concludes his 'general view of the structure of the Book' as follows:—

That the several portions are distinct, forming complete subdivisions may not be admitted without misgiving, but this fact is best accounted for by the

circumstances under which the work must have been composed, if Moses was its author. It was the form in which a man engaged in such an undertaking would naturally present at intervals an account of each series of transactions, and in which such an account would be best adapted for the instruction of the people. The combination of all the documents into a complete treatise might naturally occupy the period of comparative leisure towards the end of his life, and, while it involved some few additions and explanations, would be effected without any substantial change. *p.239.*

*Ans.* Not only 'towards the end of his life,' but during the whole 38 years, one would suppose, after leaving Sinai, Moses must have had plenty of 'comparative leisure,' for arranging his notes and filling up and retouching his narrative, since the Israelites made only 40 rests in the wilderness, N.xxxiii, and therefore must have stayed on the average about a year at each Station. But, however this may be, it is strange that Moses, when 'combining all the documents into a complete treatise' for the instruction of all future ages, should not have avoided the incongruities noticed above in (3), as well as those referred to in (*Intr. to Pent.* 3.ii). No critic, as far as I am aware, objects to the mere existence of 'distinct portions' and 'complete subdivisions' in the Book of Exodus, as proofs against its Mosaic origin. What is urged is the fact that some of its statements disagree with others (*e.g.* ii.21,22, iv.20,25, with vii.7; x.29 with xi.4-8; xi.4 with xii.3,6; xix.22,24, 'the priests that come-near to Jehovah,' with xxiv.5), and that the existence in those early days of the 'institutions' in xxv, &c., is disproved by the whole later history of Israel.

7. Canon Cook then falls back upon the support of Bp.BROWNE, and says:—

The *principal* arguments for the Mosaic authorship have been stated in the Introduction to the Pentateuch. *p.239.*

These 'principal arguments,' adduced by Bp.BROWNE in support of his second position, *viz.* that 'the concurrent testimony of subsequent times proves that Moses did write the books now known by his name,' have been considered fully in (*Intr. to Pent.* 4-21), and have been shown to be utterly worthless. But Canon Cook goes on to say:—

Many objections apply especially to this Book; and some of the most convincing evidences are supplied by its contents. This might be expected. On the one hand, the question of authorship is inseparably bound up with that of the miraculous character of many transactions which are recorded. Critics, who reject miracles as simply incredible under any circumstances, have ever felt that the

narrative before us could scarcely have been written by a man in the position and with the character of Moses, and could not certainly have been addressed to eye-witnesses or contemporaries of the events which it relates. It is a foregone conclusion with writers of this school. On the other hand, *a narrative of the personal history of Moses, of the circumstances under which the greatest work in the world's annals was accomplished, if it be authentic and veracious, must abound in internal coincidences and evidences sufficient to convince any inquirer not shut up to the opposite theory.* p.239.

*Ans.* As we are not of the number of those who 'reject miracles as simply incredible under any circumstances' (I.10), we coincide entirely with the words above italicised, and only require that proof shall be given, that the story in Exodus does so 'abound in internal coincidences and evidences sufficient to convince' any reasonable person that it is an 'authentic and veracious' narrative, in order to admit both 'the supernatural character of the transactions' and 'the authorship of Moses.'

8. We turn, then, to the evidence which Canon Cook produces on this point.

One argument is drawn from the representation of the personal character and qualifications of Moses. In its most important features it is such as could *never* have been produced by a writer collecting the traditional reminiscences or legends of a later age—not such even as might have been drawn by a younger contemporary. *To posterity*, to Israelites of his own time, *Moses was simply the greatest of men*: but it is evident that the writer of this Book was unconscious of the personal greatness of the chief actor. He was indeed thoroughly aware of the greatness of his mission, and consequently of the greatness of the position which was recognized at last by the Egyptians, xi.3. But, as to his personal qualifications, the points which strike him most forcibly are the deficiencies of natural gifts and powers, and the defects of character, which he is scrupulously careful to record, together with the rebukes and penalties which they brought upon him and the obstacles which they opposed to his work. . . . Such a representation is perfectly intelligible as proceeding from Moses himself. But what in him was humility would have been obtuseness in an annalist, such as is never found in the accounts of other great men, nor in the notices of Moses in later books.\* . . . The only rational account of the matter is, that we have Moses' own history of himself and of his work. p.240.

---

\* Canon Cook notes here:—'See especially the three last verses of Deuteronomy (xxxiv.10–12), added either by a younger contemporary of Moses or at a later time by a reviser.' We have seen (VI.130) that v.10 belongs to the O.S. and v.11,12, to D.; but nothing whatever is said here about the character or genius of Moses; only mention is made of the 'signs and wonders which Jehovah sent him to do in the land of Egypt, &c.'

*Ans.* 'To posterity, Moses was simply the greatest of men.' Then how is it that Moses is not even named by any of the prophets before the Captivity, except Micah, who puts him in the same line exactly with Aaron and Miriam, vi.4, and Jeremiah, who couples him in like manner with Samuel, xi.1? The 'Law of Moses' is just mentioned in Mal.iv.4, Dan.ix.11,13; and he is once named, and then without the least commendation of his genius or character, by the later Isaiah, lxiii.11,12. When we remember that nothing is told us about 38 years of the 40 supposed to be spent in the wilderness, and that large portions of the history as well as of the legislation belong to the L.L., the writer of the O.S. can hardly be properly called an 'annalist.' But the character of Moses, as exhibited in the O.S., is (on our view) not derived from 'traditional reminiscences or legends of a later age,' but is simply due to the imagination of the writer; just as we have at least two Abrahams in Genesis, one dignified, brave, and noble-minded, the other timorous, cowardly, and contemptible (V.51-53).

We read, however, in N.xii.3, 'Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth'; and it is very improbable that such words were written by Moses about himself. But the Commentary says:—

When we regard them as uttered by Moses, not *proprio motu*, but under the direction of the Holy Spirit which was upon him, they exhibit a certain objectivity which is a witness at once to their genuineness and also to their inspiration! p.693.

But would Moses have written 'the *man* Moses,' N. xii.3, *comp.* E.xi.3? Or, if he had occasion to speak of himself as 'meek,' would he have called himself 'the meekest of all men upon the face of the earth'?

9. Canon Cook's second argument, which, he says, 'is even less open to objection, since it rests not on subjective impressions, but on external facts,' is the knowledge of Egypt and Sinai which is exhibited by the writer of Exodus.

The Book of Exodus could not have been written by any man who had not passed many years in Egypt, and who had not also a thorough knowledge, such as could only be acquired by personal observation, of the Sinaitic Peninsula. But it is improbable that any Israelite between the time of Moses and Jeremiah could have possessed *either* of these qualifications [? Jeroboam, 1K.xi.40]: it is not credible, or even *possible* (!), that any should have combined both. Israelites may have been, and probably were, brought into Egypt as captives by the Pharaohs in their not unfrequent invasions of Syria. But in that position they were not likely to become acquainted with the institutions of Egypt [why not? *comp.* G.xxxix.1-6,

xl.3,4]—still less likely is it that any should have returned to their native land— [why?] Again, no Israelite, for centuries after the occupation of Palestine, is likely to have penetrated into the Sinaitic Peninsula, occupied as it was by hostile tribes; while it is *certain* (!) that none could have had any motive or opportunity for traversing the route from Egypt to Horeb, with which no one doubts the writer of the Pentateuch was personally familiar. . . . We have no probable alternative but to admit that the narrative in its substance came from Moses or from a contemporary. p.241.

*Ans.* Here we have a series of bold assertions and assumptions without a particle of proof. See (*Intr. to Pent.* 22,23) for a reply to the whole argument. If we set aside the later insertions, made in or after the time of Jeremiah, the acquaintance with Egypt and the wilderness exhibited in the Pentateuch, to which Canon Cook refers, *e.g.* the knowledge of a few names of persons and places, the mention of 'brickmaking' and of the ark of bulrushes coated with bitumen, and of the usual plagues of the country, here intensified into miracles, &c., is no more than might be expected to have been possessed by any intelligent person living in the adjoining district of Canaan in the days of David and Solomon, since Canon Cook himself says :—

It is possible that David may have adopted the Egyptian system [in respect of his troops], being on friendly terms with the contemporary dynasty, which gave a queen to Israel. p.307.

Or even in the days of Samuel, when Samuel's sons were judges in Beersheba on the confines of Egypt, IS.viii.2, since Canon Cook says :—

The power of the Pharaohs extended far beyond the frontier, especially on the road to Palestine. p.282.

Moreover, why may such a person not have made enquiries, with a view (suppose) to writing this very narrative, from some *Egyptian* slave as Hagar or the one captured by David, 1S.xxx.11,13, at the very time when, as we believe, the O.S. of the Exodus was in process of composition, *comp.* also 2S.xxiii.21, or from some *Israelitish* slave, who had escaped from Egypt through the wilderness to Canaan, or from some pilgrim who had visited for religious purposes Horeb, the 'Mount of God,' which had been famous as a consecrated place \* from the earliest times (*Intr. to Pent.* 27),—or even made the pilgrimage himself?

---

\* Canon Cook says :—'It is assumed that the spot was previously held sacred. For this there is no ancient authority; though it has been lately shown that the whole Peninsula was regarded by the Egyptians as specially consecrated to the gods from a very early time.' p.261. See also below (*Ex.*13).'

10. Canon Cook then devotes three pages—one-fourth of the whole Introduction—to prove, what no one doubts, that the plagues have a ‘strongly marked and indeed unmistakable local colouring.’

The plagues are each and all Egyptian, and the modes by which the people’s wants are supplied in the Sinaitic Peninsula recall to our minds the natural conditions of such a journey in such a country. *p.241.*

They were supernatural in their greatness, in their concentration upon one period, . . . . in their being, as it were, so disciplined to a will. . . . This being clearly laid down, it is most desirable to notice that the phenomena that are put to this use are such as mark the country where this great history is laid. *p.243.*

And he considers that, between the different plagues—

the delay occasioned by Pharaoh’s repeated refusals to listen to the commands afforded ample time for preparation—

the interval between the first summons to Pharaoh in v.1 and the last plague in xii.29 being, as he conjectures, about twelve months, during which they received several permissions to depart, and were thus ‘put in an attitude of expectation,’ and ‘formal instructions for preparation were of course given by Moses’ after the seventh plague, x.8–11, ‘between one and two months before the Exodus’ :—

In fact, on each occasion, when Pharaoh relented for a season, immediate orders would, of course, be issued by Moses to the heads of the people, who were thus repeatedly brought into a state of more or less complete organization for the final movement. *p.290.*

Nay, the very fact that they were dispersed throughout the land of Egypt to ‘gather stubble instead of straw,’ v.12, was ‘the first and most important step in their training for a migratory life in the desert.’ *p.241.* And he concludes :—

We have thus throughout the characteristics of local colouring, of adaptation to the circumstances of the Israelites, and of repeated announcements\*

---

\* Canon Cook observes that three of the plagues, the third in each group of three, occur without any previous warning. In the O.S., however, there were only seven preparatory plagues (VI.208), the last of which (*darkness*) occurs without warning, and seems to have been followed in this respect by the L.L., which has inserted the other two (*mosquitoes* and *boils*) in like manner without warning.



followed by repeated postponements, which enabled and indeed compelled the Israelites to complete that organization of their nation, without which their departure might have been, as it has been often represented, a mere disorderly flight p.243.

But then he observes on these plagues:—

They are such as no later writer living in Palestine could have invented for Egypt. p.241.

No Jewish writer, who had lived in Palestine alone, could have imagined a narrative so Egyptian in its marks. . . . we shall look in vain for anyone other than Moses himself, who possessed this qualification for writing under Divine Guidance the history of the emancipation of the Israelites. p.243.

*Ans.* Canon Cook here begs the whole question. Why might not a writer of the age of David, who was 'on friendly terms with the contemporary dynasty' in Egypt and 'perhaps may have adopted the Egyptian [military] system,' p.307, have known—if not from common hearsay information, yet at least from conversation and enquiry, or even from a personal visitation—these peculiarities of Egypt, which on his own view were frequent, well-known occurrences in a milder form, 'such as mark the country where this great history is laid'?

11. Canon Cook then notices 'a point of subordinate, but practical importance' in connection with the above.

The two facts, that between all the miracles there is an intimate connection, and that each and all are shown to be nearly allied to analogous phenomena recorded in ancient and modern accounts of Egypt, leave no place for interpolations of any considerable extent—*none certainly for the introduction of any single visitation.* In the commentaries of some scholars, to whose learning and ability the student of Holy Scripture is deeply indebted, some of the accounts are attributed to the Elohist, others to the Jehovistic, writer. . . . but the characteristics here pointed out are common to all the plagues, and they are conclusive. In fact, *no one plague could be omitted without dislocating the whole narrative, and breaking the order distinctly intimated, though nowhere formally stated by the writer . . .* and the narrative which records them, remarkable as it is for artlessness and simplicity, is certainly not one which could have been concocted from documents of different ages, constructed on different principles, and full of internal discrepancies and contradictions. It is the production of one mind, written by one man, and by one who had alone witnessed all the events which it records. p.244.

*Ans.* By reference to the Original Story, as given at length in (VI.ch.xii), it will be seen that *two* plagues, interpolated by the L.L., have been omitted, 'without dislocating the whole narrative, &c.' In (VI.208) the peculiarities which mark the miracles of the O.S. and those of the L.L. are plainly exhibited;

and in (VI.197,200-1,204-5) are pointed out certain 'discrepancies and contradictions,' caused by insertions of this later hand.

Canon COOK, however, shows no sign of acquaintance (any more than Bp. BROWNE) with the evidence which has been produced of late in proof of the existence of this Later Legislation by eminent critics, *e.g.* REUSS, KUENEN, KALISCH, NÖLDEKE, and especially GRAF, whose work has marked an epoch in the criticism of the Pentateuch.

12. Canon COOK then gives a list of words, to which 'the attention of scholars is specially called.' But he gives it in so uninviting a form that I venture to say that no one of his ordinary readers, even with a taste for critical examination, will be tempted to study it closely and estimate its real value. If one page of the space consumed in proving what nobody doubts (10) or in suggesting Egyptian roots for Hebrew words, *p.*476-492, had been expended in giving a clear table of these words, with a list of the passages in which they occur, and a statement of the reasoning founded upon them, there would have been something worthy, at least, of the 'attention of scholars,' which this confused heap in its present form, with scarcely a word to indicate its supposed bearing upon the controversy in hand, most certainly is not. It will be understood, therefore, that the Hebrew below, and the arrangement, are not Canon COOK's, but our own. He merely notes (1) those words which 'are found only in this book and marked *á.λ.*,' (2) those occurring 'in the Pentateuch and later Psalms taken directly from it, marked *P.*,' or, as he says on *p.*488, 'occurring, if at all elsewhere, *only* in the Psalms of later date, which recapitulate the history,' (3) those 'marked *E.*,' which 'have Egyptian equivalents, and are derived from roots either common to Egyptian and Hebrew, or found only in Egyptian.' And all that he says, by way of assisting the student to understand the object for which the list is given, is literally as follows:—

It is to be observed that these words occur indiscriminately in the so-called Jehovistic and Elohistie passages. The list may be extended. *p.*244.

13. However, I have made it a duty to go laboriously through the whole list; and the reader shall be enabled without much trouble to form a judgment as to its true value.

And, first, I am bound to say that it is by no means creditable to the character of this work, put forth with so much pretension, and after so many years of preparation and revision, that even this list—the solitary specimen which Canon Cook gives—abounds with errors and inaccuracies, like those which I have had already occasion to notice in (*Intr. to Pent.* 26.iii,note).

Thus of the 47 words quoted, *two* are marked P., instead of א.ל. (*viz.* a.vii,viii), and *four* are marked א.ל., instead of P. (*viz.* b.iii,v,vi,ix)—*four* others are marked א.ל. (*viz.* c.i-iv), and *two* are marked P. (*viz.* c.v,vi), which do occur *elsewhere* in the Bible, contrary to Canon Cook's statement,—besides *one* (c.vii), marked P., which he admits not strictly to belong to P., and *one* (c.viii), marked א.ל., which is doubtful, and *one* (c.ix), marked א.ל., which does not exist at all.

Further, in l.7 for iii read iii.2,—in l.8 for 3 read 11,—in l.13 for x read ix,—in l.18 for xiv read xiv.9,—in l.20 *dele*? \*

\* Again, Canon Cook says that שָׂרָץ, 'swarm,' is found 'in Pentateuch *only*, except in Ps.cv,' p.488; but see Ez.xlvii.9.

So שָׁמַיִם, 'heaven,' E.xii.15,19, 'occurs *only* in this chapter,' p.491; but see E.xiii.7, L.ii.11, D.xvi.4.

And אֲנָם, 'pool,' E.vii.19, viii.5(1), is 'found in Isaiah, but *uncommon*,' p.489; whereas it occurs in Is.xiv.23, xix.10, xxxv.7, xli.18, xlii.15, Jer.li.32, Ps.cvii.35,cxiv.8.

And תִּנּוֹר, 'oven,' is 'not uncommon, but *occurs more frequently in the Pentateuch than elsewhere*,' p.489; whereas it occurs *six* times in the Pentateuch, G.xv.17, E.viii.3, L.ii.4, vii.9, xi.35, xxvi.26, and *nine* times elsewhere, Neh.iii.11, xii.38, Ps.xxi.9(10), Is.xxxi.9, Lam.v.10, Hos.vii.4,6,7, Mal.iv.1(iii.19).

And בָּחַר, 'cut off,' 'in this sense occurs once in Zechariah, *otherwise only here*, E.ix.15, and in Job iv.7, xv.28, xxii.20,' p.490; but see E.xxiii.23, 1K.xiii.34, 2Ch.xxxii.21, Ps.lxxxiii.4(5).

And פָּרָה is found 'nineteen [read *eighteen*] times in the Pentateuch, *eleven* [read *ten*] times elsewhere.' p.488.

And תִּבְנֵן, 'straw,' is '*common* in the Pentateuch, rare elsewhere,' p.489; whereas it occurs in only two passages of the Pentateuch, G.xxiv.25,32, and E.v.7-18, which this Commentary (*Intr. to Gen.* 6) would reckon as only *two* separate instances, and it occurs in five other distinct passages, Ju.xix.19, 1K.iv.28(v.8), Is.xi.7, lxxv.25, Jer.xxiii.28.

And חֻמֵּץ, 'leavened dough,' 'does not occur in the same sense out of the Pentateuch, unless it be Am.iv.5, when [?where] it seems *rather* to mean 'spoil,' p.491. Yet Canon Cook, as Editor, allows Bp.BROWNE to build a special argument upon

Making the above *twenty* corrections, we have at last the following lists :—

(a) *Words which occur only in Exodus.*

(i) עֲרֵי מַסִּים, 'taskmasters,' E.i.11.

N.B. There is nothing remarkable here, since the two words occur separately in all parts of the Bible. Possibly there may be an allusion, after the Jehovist's style (V. *An.* 3.iv, xvi, 5.iii, 55.xii), to the name Rameses (רַעַמְסֵס), which occurs in the same verse.

(ii) בָּבֵעַל, 'bolloed,' E.ix.31.

(iii) אֶפְיִלֹת, 'immature,' E.ix.32.

(iv) עָפָה, 'ashes,' E.ix.8,10.

(v) אֲבַעְבַּעַת, 'blains,' E.ix.9,10.

(vi) מִשְׁקוֹף, 'lintel,' E.xii.7,22,23.

(vii) עֹמֶר, 'omer,' E.xvi.16,18,22,32,33,36.

(viii) צִנְצָנָה, 'pot,' E.xvi.33.

(b) *Words which occur only in the Pentateuch and later Psalms referring to it.*

(i) תַּבָּה, 'ark,' E.ii.3,5.

N.B. This word is 'only used of the ark of Noah and of the cradle of Moses.' p.489.

(ii) סִגְה, 'bush,' E.iii.2,3,4.

N.B. This word is only used of 'a thorny shrub common in that district.' p.261.

(iii) עֲרָב, 'swarms of flies,' ['cockroaches'], E.viii.21, [22,24,29,31].

(iv) בְּרִיָּשׁ, 'furnace,' E.ix.8,10, [xix.18].

(v) מִכְסָּה, 'number,' E.xii.4, [L.xxvii.23].

(vi) עֲרַבִּים, 'two-evenings,' E.xii.6, [xvi.12, xxix.39,41, xxx.8, L.xxiii.5, N.ix.3,5, 11, xxviii.4].

(vii) צִפְרָדְעִים, 'frogs,' E.viii.2, [3-9,11-13].

(viii) מוֹקֻפֹּת, 'frontlets,' E.xiii.16, [D.vi.8, xi.18].

(ix) שְׁאֵר, 'leaven,' E.xii.15,19, [xiii.7, L.ii.11, D.xvi.4].

N.B. It will be seen (VI.272) that in (a) i,ii,iii, occur only in passages of the O.S., and iv,v,vi,vii,viii, only in passages of the L.L., instead of 'occurring indiscriminately in the so-called Jehovistic and Elohist passages.'

So in (b) i,ii,iii, occur only in O.S., and iv,v,vi, only in L.L.; in (vii) E.viii.2-4, 8,9,11-13, belongs to O.S., and v.5-7 to L.L., which necessarily uses the word for 'frogs' already employed; (viii) belongs wholly to D., and (ix) to D. and L.L.

this word as meaning 'leaven' in Am.iv.5 (*Intr. to Pent.* 15.viii), without the least hint of what he himself considers to be the more probable meaning in this passage!

Of course, it is not at all surprising that words should have been used in an ancient writing of David's age, which may have become obsolete in later days, and that some new words should appear in D. and L.L., which were not employed in the older document.

(c) *Words quoted by Canon Cook as found only in Exodus or the Pentateuch, but which, in point of fact, occur elsewhere.*

- (i) אֲבָנִים, 'stools,' E.i.16, *comp.* Jer.xviii.3.  
(ii) לְטִיִּם, 'enchantments,' ['secret arts'], *comp.* לֵט, 'secret,' R.iii.7, 1S.xviii.22, xxiv.4(5).  
(iii) אֶנְוֵהוּ, 'I will make-him-to-dwell,' E.xv.2, *comp.* Hab.ii.5.  
(iv) קָפָא, 'be congealed,' E.xv.8, *comp.* Zeph.i.12, Job x.10.  
(v) שְׂרָץ, 'swarm,' E.i.7, *comp.* Ez.xlvii.9.  
(vi) מִשָּׂה, 'draw-out,' E.ii.10, *comp.* 2S.xxii.17 = Ps.xviii.16(17).  
(vii) רְהִטִּים, 'troughs,' E.ii.16, *comp.* Cant.i.17, vii.5(6).  
(viii) בֶּן, 'mosquito,' E.viii.16,17,18, *comp.* Is.li.6.  
(ix) 'heaped-up,' referred to E.xv.7, but not found there.

(d) *Words referred by Canon Cook to Egyptian roots.*

- (a) i-v, vii, viii; (b) i-iv, vii, ix; (c) ii, iv-vi, viii.  
(i) פָּרָה, 'be fruitful,' E.i.7, *comp.* Is.xi.1.  
(ii) 'Pithom' and 'Rameses,' E.i.11.  
(iii) גִּמְא, 'bulrushes,' E.ii.3, *comp.* Is.xviii.2.  
(iv) זָפַת, 'pitch,' E.ii.3, *comp.* Is.xxxiv.9.  
(v) סִיף, 'flags,' E.ii.3, *comp.* Is.xix.6.  
(vi) שֵׁפַת הַיָּאֵר, 'lip of the river'; for 'lip,' *comp.* Is.vi.5, 'river,' *comp.* Is.vii.18.  
(vii) רָחַץ, 'wash,' E.ii.5, *comp.* Is.i.16.  
(viii) תָּבֵן, 'straw,' E.v.7, *comp.* Is.xi.7.  
(ix) קִישׁ, 'stubble,' E.v.12, *comp.* Is.v.24.  
(x) מְבַשְּׂפִים, 'sorcerers,' E.vii.11, *comp.* Mal.iii.5.  
(xi) חֲרָטְמִים, 'magicians,' E.vii.11, *comp.* Dan.i.20.  
(xii) שִׁחִין, 'boil,' E.ix.9, *comp.* Is.xxxviii.21.  
(xiii) פָּרַח, 'breaking-forth,' E.ix.9, *comp.* Ez.xiii.20.  
(xiv) בִּשְׂתָה, 'flax,' E.ix.31, *comp.* Is.xlii.3.

\* On p.483 Canon Cook observes:—'The word used by Moses [in E.ii.10] may, of course, be Semitic; although it must be observed that it occurs only in this passage, and in one other which is evidently taken from it, Ps.xviii.17. But at any rate it is so exceedingly rare that we can best account for its selection by Moses by the supposition that it came exceedingly near to, or exactly represented, the Egyptian.' p.483.

*Ans.* There is no reason for supposing that Ps.xviii.17 is 'taken from' E.ii.10, or contains any allusion to it.

- (xv) פִּסְמֶת, 'spelt,' E.ix.32, *comp.* Is.xxviii.25.  
 (xvi) פֶּסַח, 'passover,' E.xii.11, *comp.* 2K.xxiii.21.  
 (xvii) סוּד, 'horse,' E.xiv.9, *comp.* 2S.xv.1.  
 (xviii) גְּזָה, 'triumph,' E.xv.1, *comp.* Is.ii.12.  
 (xix) תִּבְרֵל, 'timbrel,' E.xv.20, *comp.* 1S.x.5.  
 (xx) קִיר, 'pot,' E.xvi.3, *comp.* 1K.vii.45.  
 (xxi) מָן, 'manna,' E.xvi.15.

N.B. In (xxi) the name 'man' seems to be referred by the writer in E.xvi.15 to the Aramaic *man*, 'what (is it)?,' and not to an Egyptian root: see below (*Ex.*86).

14. It will be seen that (a), (b), (c), give no indication of any remarkable peculiarity of diction in Exodus. And with respect to the words in (d), for which Canon Cook assumes to have found Egyptian roots, p.488, &c., many of the supposed derivations appear to be exceedingly doubtful. But, if they were all approved by Egyptian and Hebrew scholars, yet, as every one of these words (except, of course, ii and xxi) occurs in other later Hebrew writings, they would only prove that either there was a much closer relation between the Egyptian (*Hamitic*) and Hebrew (*Semitic*) tongues than is commonly supposed, or else that the Israelites during their long sojourn in Egypt adopted a number of Egyptian words, which subsequently became embodied in their own language; as Zulu refugees in Natal use now habitually *hashi* for 'horse,' *mali* for 'money,' *elepa* for 'help,' &c., derived from the English in the course of a few years' intercourse, and would, no doubt, continue to use them if they returned to Zululand. In short, they might then serve to confirm our own view (VI.561), that the Hebrews had lived formerly in Egypt; but they would do nothing more. They would not prove that the Pentateuch was written by Moses, or even by one who had himself lived some years in Egypt. The case would, of course, have been different if a number of *common* words, unquestionably of Egyptian origin—not merely the names of well-known cities, as Pithom and Rameses (*d.*ii), or of the river Nile (*d.*vi), or of an Egyptian ark (*b.*i)—had been used *only* in Exodus or the Pentateuch.

It is therefore a mere fallacy when Canon Cook concludes :—

Enough has been said to show that Moses habitually uses words which existed in Egyptian, and for the most part cannot be shown to have a true Semitic etymology. p.491.

15. Canon Cook then proceeds to speak of ‘the portion of the Book which follows the account of the departure from Egypt.’

It has never occurred to any traveller, who has traversed the route from Suez to Sinai or from Sinai to Palestine, to doubt that the chapters of Exodus which touch that ground were written by one to whom the localities were known from personal observation. It is not merely that the length of each division of the journey, the numerous halting-places, are distinctly marked ; for, although such notices *could not possibly have been invented*, or procured at any later period by a dweller in Palestine, the fact might be accounted for by the supposition gratuitously made, but hard to be rebutted, that some ancient records of the journey had been preserved by written or oral tradition. But the chapters which belong either to the early sojourn of Moses, or to the wanderings of the Israelites, are *pervaded* by a peculiar tone, a local colouring, an atmosphere, so to speak, of the desert. p.244.

*Ans.* Probably there are few—if any—of these ‘travellers who have traversed the route from Suez to Sinai, &c.,’ who did not start with the assumption that the story of the wanderings, and the list of stations in N.xxxiii were to some extent historically true, derived either from legendary report or perhaps even—especially the latter—from very ancient written records. Now, however, it appears (VI.App.34) that N.xxxiii is a pure fiction of the L.L., as are also several notices in the account of the wanderings in Exodus. At the time when the L.L. or D.i.1,2, was written, doubtless the Sinaitic Peninsula was well known. But even in the earlier days when the O.S. was composed, Horeh, ‘the Mount of God,’ and the wilderness generally may have been sufficiently known (9) to an Israelitish writer, to enable him to give to his narrative the ‘local colouring’ in question: though it is easy to exaggerate the depth of that colouring and the extent of the older writer’s acquaintance with life in the desert. For instance, Canon Cook speaks of the ‘chapters which belong to the early sojourn of Moses’ being ‘*pervaded* by a peculiar tone, an atmosphere, so to speak, of the desert.’ But when we turn to those chapters, *viz.* ii.15–iv.20, the only sign of an acquaintance with the wilderness is found in a few expressions in iii.1–4,12, *viz.* the ‘back of the desert,’ the ‘Mount of God,’ the ‘*seneh*’ bush ; for the story in ii.15–22 has no more relation to desert life than that recorded in G.xxix.2–14 which it greatly resembles.

16. Canon Cook then undertakes to prove that the 'wilderness' of Sinai was after all not such a very bad place to live in at the time of the Exodus.

Facts can be adduced which confirm, and indeed go far beyond, the conjectures of travellers who have pointed out that the supply of water and the general fertility of the district must have been very different before the process of denudation, which has been going on for ages and is now in active progress, had commenced. We have now proofs from inscriptions, coeval with the pyramids, both in Egypt and in the Peninsula, that under the Pharaohs of the third to the eighteenth dynasty, ages before Moses and up to his time, the whole district was occupied by a population whose resources and numbers must have been considerable, since they were able to resist the forces of the Egyptians who sent large armies in repeated, but unsuccessful, attempts to subjugate the Peninsula. Their principal object, however, was effected, since they established permanent settlements at Sarbet el Khadim and at Mughara, to work the copper-mines. . . . It is well known that the early Egyptian kings were careful to provide for the security and sustentation of the caravans and bodies of troops, by which the communications with settlements under such circumstances were carried on; and every spot where the modern traveller still finds water on the route was, doubtless, then the object of special attention. The vegetation which even now protects the well of Moses, from which the dwellers at Suez obtain a supply of brackish water, *must have been then far more luxuriant*; and the 70 palm-trees, which Moses found at Elim, *doubtless sheltered fountains from which streams, far more copious than those which now water the wady, flowed over the adjoining district*. Where the superficial water was insufficient, it was customary in that early age to dig wells of whatever depth might be needed; and every tree, now recklessly destroyed, was the object of special care and even superstitious reverence. p.245.

*Ans.* See (I.83-90) for full replies to all such fallacies as the above. The fact, that a considerable British army was routed and massacred almost to a man by the rude mountaineers of Affghanistan, does not help to prove that that wild district is capable of supporting a large—much less an immense—population, with innumerable flocks and herds. The Pharaohs, of course, provided for the 'security and sustentation' of their *mining slaves* as well as of the 'caravans and bodies of troops.' And whatever change may have passed over the Peninsula from the days of the Exodus, through the 'cutting down without remorse of shrubs and trees,' it is enough that the Pentateuch speaks of it always as a desert land, 'a waste howling wilderness,' D.xxxii.10, 'a great and terrible wilderness, wherein were fiery serpents and scorpions and drought, where there was no water,' D.viii.15, and that Jeremiah describes it as 'a land of deserts and pits, a land of drought and of the shadow of death, a land that no man passed through, and where no man dwelt,' Jer.ii.6. If we suppose the last passage



to contain a poetical exaggeration of the horrors of the wilderness, yet the former must be accepted by Canon Cook as the deliberate statements of Moses himself, the result of the impression made by his own actual experience.

17. In fact, Canon Cook himself lays stress on the general agreement of the account in the Pentateuch with the facts recorded by modern travellers, most probably in strict accordance with the experience of older pilgrims, who have found, he says—absence of water where no sources now exist—abundance of water where fountains are still found—tracts, occupying the same time in the journey, in which food would not be found—and in some districts a natural production similar to manna, most abundant in rainy seasons, such as several notices show the season of the Exodus to have been—[but the Israelites lived on manna for forty years together, E.xvi.35, J.v.12]—the presence of nomad hordes, &c. *p.246.*

But, when he inserts, as also observed by travellers, ‘indications of a far more copious supply [of water] in former ages,’ we must ask what is meant by ‘former ages’—whether far-distant geological ages or the more recent times, when this desert is described—as Canon Cook supposes, by Moses himself—as ‘a waste howling wilderness, &c.’? Surely such words imply that the very same ‘state of utter aridity and barrenness’ existed in earlier times as that to which, says Canon Cook, the whole district will be reduced ere long—

if the devastation, which began ages ago, and has in fact continued without cessation, goes on at the present rate of increase. *p.246.*

But even now, we are told, ‘there is no mistaking the enormous amount of rain which must fall on the desert and run off uselessly into the sea; in February all the wadys had evidently had strong torrents down and all across them from hillside to hillside.’ *D.B. III.p.1753.* And yet the present state of the desert of the Tih may be gathered from SEETZEN’S account of ‘the view from the highest ridge of the lower mountain-line,’ *Ib.p.1750*:—‘On all sides the most frightful wilderness extended out of sight in every direction, without tree, shrub, or speck of

green.' Even were it true that 'the resources of the desert, under a careful economy of nature's bounty, *might* be, to its present means of subsistence, as that winter torrent's volume to that summer streamlet's slender thread,' *Ib.*, yet there is not the least sign that such 'economy' was applied in the days of Moses, or that the desert was then anything else than a 'howling wilderness.' It is therefore a mere assumption when Canon Cook says that—

the aspect of the whole country, when it was first visited by Christian pilgrims who have left us accounts of their journeyings, *must have differed greatly from that which it presented to the Israelites, when under the guidance of Moses they found pasturage for their flocks and herds.* p.246.

18. But Canon Cook says:—

When Niebuhr visited the country at the beginning of last century, large supplies of vegetable produce were exported regularly to Egypt, showing that the original fertility was not even then exhausted—which supplies have now ceased. p.246.

But he does not tell us from what part of the Peninsula such supplies were exported, nor whether they were at all likely to satisfy, year after year, the wants of two millions of people and two millions of sheep and oxen, in a district where 'the whole permanent population' amounts now to about 5,000 (I.85.iv); and he himself tells us that—

at present neither oxen nor horses are kept in the Peninsula, which does not supply fodder for them, under ordinary circumstances. It was, however, more fertile (?) in the time of Moses. p.260.

Canon Cook, however, waxes very bold and says:—

The only wonder is that so much remains as to satisfy a careful enquiry of the possibility of the events recorded in the Exodus. p.246.

Whereas Dean STANLEY, who has laboured as much as anyone by 'careful enquiry' to reduce within the bounds of credibility the 'possibility' in question, concludes his arguments by saying (I.85.xiii):—

'It must be confessed that none of these changes solve the difficulty, though they may mitigate its force. But they, at least, help to meet it; and they must under any circumstances

be borne in mind, to modify the image which we form to ourselves of what must have always been—as it is even thus early described to be—‘a great and terrible wilderness.’

19. Canon Cook then proceeds to say :—

It is easy to assert that any single notice may have been retained by oral tradition or preserved for ages in scanty documents, such as were formerly supposed to be alone likely or possible to have been produced in the time of Moses. And such is the course generally adopted when any coincidence is pointed out too clear to be explained away—a course which, were it applied to any secular history, *would be condemned as disingenuous* or uncritical, making it, in fact, impossible to establish the authenticity of any ancient writing. But, in addition to the positive arguments thus adduced, a negative argument, at least equally conclusive, demands attention. No history or composition in existence, which is known to have been written long after the events which it describes, is without internal indications which conclusively prove its latter origin. . . . Even when *anachronisms and errors of detail* are avoided . . . the *genuine touch of antiquity* is invariably and inevitably absent. Whether we look at the general tone of this narrative, the style equally remarkable for artlessness and power, or at the innumerable *points of contact with external facts capable of exact determination*, we are impressed by the weight of this internal evidence, supported as it has been shown to be by the unbroken and unvarying tradition of the nation to whom the narrative was addressed, and by whom it was held too sacred not to be preserved from wilful mutilation or interpolation. *p. 246.*

*Ans.* With the evidence in Part VI. before us, we do not suppose that any ‘single notice’ in the Pentateuch ‘may have been retained in oral tradition or preserved for ages in scanty documents.’ The whole story of the Exodus is (on our view) a fiction, based only on the fact of a former migration out of Egypt into Canaan, and perhaps some vague traditional reminiscences of hardships experienced upon the journey, assisted by conjecture as to what *must* have been endured under such circumstances. That part of the narrative, which we suppose to have been written in the time of Samuel, shows, as might be expected, some signs of a rude and primitive age. But it is simply a daring assertion, in disregard and defiance of well-known facts, to say that the Pentateuch was ‘held too sacred’ by the Jewish nation ‘not to be preserved from wilful mutilation or interpolation,’ when we find so many variations from the Hebrew in the Samaritan text (VI.478). As to the ‘anachronisms and errors of detail,’ which have been observed in the story of the Exodus, we shall see how Canon Cook deals with such questions, one by one, as they arise (*Ex.27, 41, &c.*). To mention no other ‘points of contact with external facts capable of exact determination,’ the fact of the existence of the Mosaic

Tabernacle and Ark, as also that of any distinction being made before the Captivity between the Priests, the sons of Aaron, and the Levites, are effectually disproved by the later history (VI.415-6,453-4). And more than one half of the present Pentateuch consists of 'interpolations' made shortly before, or during, or after, the Captivity (VI.273).

20. Then Canon Cook produces an argument 'which many readers may feel to be even less open to objection,' *viz.* one 'drawn from the account of the Tabernacle.' p.247.

In form, structure, and materials, the Tabernacle belongs altogether to the wilderness. The wood used in the structure is found there in abundance—[see *Intr. to Pent.* 24.iii]. . . . The whole was a tent, not a fixed structure, such as would naturally have been set up, and in point of fact was very soon set up in Palestine; where wooden doors, and probably a surrounding wall, existed under the Judges of Israel. The skins and other native materials belong equally to the locality. One material, which entered largely into the construction, the skin of the Tachash, was in all probability derived from the Red Sea; *with the exception of one reference in Ez.xvi.10, no traces of its use are found at a later period or in any other district.* The metals, bronze, silver, and gold, were those which the Israelites knew and doubtless brought with them from Egypt; nor is it probable that they possessed equal resources for a long time after their settlement in Palestine. . . . There are exceedingly few indications of any such arts among the Israelites during the period from the occupation of Palestine to the accession of Solomon; the ephod of Micah [and Gideon's ephod, Ju.viii.26,27] and the teraphim in David's bed being scarcely noticeable exceptions. It is improbable that any portion of the decorations of the Tabernacle could have been produced, even had the rich materials been forthcoming; and it is to be noted, as a fact of very special importance in this enquiry, that when Solomon in the height of his prosperity, with the resources of a vast empire at his disposal, erected the Temple, which was to replace the Tabernacle, he was compelled to seek the aid of foreigners, and to bring Tyrian artists to accomplish the work which Bezaleel had produced, when his native genius, trained in the school of Egypt, was developed by the Spirit of God. p. 247.

*Ans.* It is obvious how strongly every word of the above confirms our conclusion in (VI), that the so-called Mosaic Tabernacle is purely a work of the writer's imagination, and never really existed, the whole account of its construction in E.xxv, &c., being part of the L.L. written during or after the Captivity, and really based upon the Temple and its institutions. It is certainly a very significant fact that the only other writer in the Bible, who mentions Tachash skins, is Ezekiel, to whose hand we probably owe some portions of the L.L. (VI.7): they may, in fact, have been adopted as outer coverings for the Tabernacle, E.xxvi.14, and Ark, N.iv.6, from the actual practice in Egypt.

21. But it is strange to find Canon Cook saying—like Bp. BROWNE before him (*Intr. to Pent.* 23)—that not only ‘the names of many of the materials and implements,’ but ‘the furniture and accessories of the Tabernacle—the dress and ornaments of the priests—are shown to have been Egyptian;’\*—though the Book of Exodus represents them as specially revealed by Jehovah Himself to Moses, who was to be careful to make them ‘after their pattern which was shown him in the Mount’—‘according to all that I show thee, the pattern of the Tabernacle and the pattern of all the instruments thereof, even so shall ye make it,’ E.xxv.9,40, xxvi.30, xxvii.8. It may be said, of course, that Uri, whom Jehovah ‘filled with the Spirit of God in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship, to devise cunning works, to work in gold and in silver and in brass, and in cutting of stones to set them, and in carving of timber, to work in all manner of workmanship,’ E.xxxi.3–5, and Aholiab and all the others in whose hearts Jehovah ‘put wisdom,’ v.6, had only thus intensified by a Divine gift the skill which they had already acquired in a natural way in Egypt. And accordingly Canon Cook writes:—

It is certain that the arts, required for the construction of the Tabernacle and for all its accessories, were precisely those for which the Egyptians had been remarkable for ages; such as artizans, who had lived under the influence of Egyptian civilization, would naturally have learned. p.247.

---

\* It is curious that while Bishop BROWNE and Canon Cook lay so much stress on the resemblance between the ‘materials and implements,’ ‘furniture and accessories,’ of the Tabernacle and the ‘dress and ornaments of the priests,’ as being Egyptian, the former observing that ‘the laws and institutions of worship are *penetrated throughout* by a knowledge of Egyptian customs,’ and quoting ‘a few of the parallels which prove an intimate acquaintance with the customs of Egypt’ (*Intr. to Pent.* 23), Mr. CLARK says that ‘it should be always kept in view that such resemblances to foreign patterns are *extremely superficial*. . . . On the whole, it seems wonderful that there is so little in the Sanctuary to remind us of any foreign association.’ p.464.

Yet surely the curtains embroidered with cherubim, E.xxvi.1, the cherubs, xxv.18-20, &c., must have been included among the things 'shown in pattern in the Mount.' And how can it be believed that the Divine wisdom would have revealed to Moses a whole series of 'patterns,' in order merely to *remind* him of objects with which he was already familiar as used in the idolatrous worship of Egypt, and to help him to repeat and perpetuate them? Yet this is what Canon Cook maintains:—

The rich embroidery of the hangings, the carving of the cherubic forms, the ornamentation of the capitals, the naturalistic character of the embellishments, were all things with which the Israelites had been familiar in Egypt, but which for ages after their settlement in Palestine, in which the traces of Canaanitish culture had been destroyed as savouring of idolatry, and where the people were carefully separated from the contagious influences of other nations on a par with Egypt, must have died out, if not from their remembrance, yet from all practical application. p.247.

22. But Canon Cook has yet 'another argument, which has not hitherto received due attention,' viz. 'the peculiar way in which the history of the erection of the Tabernacle is recorded.'

Two separate accounts are given. In the first Moses relates the instructions which he received; in the second he describes the accomplishment of the work. Nothing would be less in accordance with the natural order of a history written at a later period than this double account. It has been represented as an argument for a double authorship, as though two sets of documents had been carelessly or superstitiously adopted by a compiler. It is, however, fully accounted for by the obvious hypothesis, adopted throughout this part of the Commentary, that each part of the narrative was written at the time, and on the occasion, to which it immediately refers. When Moses received these instructions he wrote a full account of them for the information of the people. This was on all accounts probable and necessary: among other obvious reasons it was necessary, in order that the people might learn exactly what amount of materials and what amount of work would be required of them. When again he had executed his task it was equally proper . . . that he should give a formal account of every detail in its execution—a *proof*, to such as might call for proof, that all their precious offerings had been devoted to the purpose, and, what was of far more importance, that the Divine instructions had been completely and literally obeyed. p.248.

*Ans.* The idea of Moses having to produce his accounts to be audited for the satisfaction of such of the Israelitish contributors as may have 'called for proof that all their precious offerings had been devoted to the purpose,'

is certainly a novel one. Would not the existence of the Tabernacle, Ark, &c., have been a sufficient proof of this? Or may it have been thought expedient to guard against a suspicion in the minds of any that Moses had, perhaps, appropriated some of them to his own uses? No doubt, it is stated that so much gold and silver and brass was used for certain purposes, E.xxxviii.24-31. But where is any account rendered of the 'blue and purple and scarlet and fine linen,' xxxv.23, received and expended, or of the *silver* freely contributed in v.24?—for the silver accounted for in xxxviii.25-28 was the produce of a compulsory tax laid on rich and poor alike, xxx.11-15. The notion that xxxv, &c., was inserted to satisfy the Israelites that 'the Divine instructions had been completely and literally obeyed,' is at once set aside by the existence of the incongruities noted above in (3). When we observe, however, the tedious repetitions in other passages—notably in N.vii—there is no difficulty in believing that E.xxxv, &c., which repeats almost verbally the language of E.xxv, &c., may be by the same hand. POPPER, however, has drawn attention to certain phenomena which make it probable that E.xxxv-xxxix and L.viii-x were added afterwards, and E.xxxvi.8-xxxviii.20 at a still later time than the rest.

23. Lastly, Canon COOK makes a few remarks on the Chronology of the Exodus, adopting 430 years for the duration of the sojourn in Egypt, as in E.xii.40, with the assumption of 'the omission of several links in the genealogies,' and of 480 years from the Exodus to the building of the Temple, as in 1K.vi.1—which last datum his fellow-commentator, Bp. Lord A. HERVEY, says 'is manifestly erroneous,' and 'is, in fact, abandoned by almost all chronologists, whatever school they belong to.' *D.B.* II.p.22. On our view both these dates are unhistorical, and are due to the L.L., the former having been obtained by doubling 215, the number of years from Abram's call to the descent into Egypt, (G.xii.4, xxi.5, xxv.26, xlvi.9), and the latter being simply  $12 \times 40$ . By adopting, however, 430 years for the sojourn in Egypt, Canon COOK fancies that he has got rid of a considerable difficulty.

It is especially important with reference to the number of the Israelites, which amounted to 600,000 males at the time of the Exodus. Such an increase of a patriarchal family within 215 years . . . presents great, if not insuperable, diffi-

culties, which are removed if we accept the statement of Moses in the sense attached to it by most commentators. It needs no elaborate calculation to show that, in a period extending over more than four centuries, a family which counted 70 males with their households, probably amounting to many hundreds, occupying the most fertile district in Egypt, under circumstances most favourable to rapid and continuous increase specially recorded in this Book, should become a mighty nation. *p.*249.

*Ans.* Canon Cook takes no notice *here* of the fact that the Israelites are represented as having come out of Egypt in the *fourth* generation after the descent—*comp.* Levi, Kohath, Amram, Moses, E.vi.16–20—by which the sojourn in Egypt is of necessity restricted to 215 years,\* and the difficulty of accounting for their numbers at the time of the Exodus is enormously increased (I.122,125–7). We shall see how he deals with this matter below (*Ex.*27,56). There is not a shadow of ground for the assertion that Jacob's family 'counted 70 males with their households, probably amounting to many hundreds.' The Scripture reckons '70 souls out of the loins of Jacob,' G.xlvi.27, E.i.5, D.x.22, including two *females*, G.xlvi.15,17. And the impossibility of reckoning 'many hundreds' of dependents is shown by the simple fact that *ten ass-loads* of corn are represented as sufficing for the wants of the whole family. If his hundreds of dependents could do without corn, then surely Jacob and his children could have done the same. In that case Judah would not surely have spoken of the necessity of going down a second time to Egypt to buy corn 'that we may *live and not die*, both we and thou and also our little-ones,' G.xliii.8 (N.B. no mention of 'dependents'), nor would Jacob have risked the loss of his darling Benjamin for the purpose of obtaining a mere unnecessary luxury (*Gen.*151).

---

\* If Kohath was only an *infant* at the descent into Egypt, G.xlvi.11, and begat Amram *at the very end of his life*, at the age of 133, E.vi.18, and so Amram begat Moses at the age of 137, E.vi.20, and Moses was 80 years old at the Exodus, E.vii.7, still this would only account for  $133 + 137 + 80 = 350$  years, instead of 430.



## THE BOOK OF EXODUS.

---

Ex. I--XIX, REV. CANON COOK, M.A.

Ex. XX--XL, REV. S. CLARK, M.A.



## THE BOOK OF EXODUS.



Chap.i.1-7,13(E.), 8-12,14-22(O.S.).

1. *v.1. every man and his household.*] It may be inferred from various notices that the total number of dependents was considerable, a point of importance in its bearings upon the history of the Exodus. See G.xiii.6, xiv.14, from which we learn that Abram had 318 trained servants born in his house. The daughters are not mentioned, nor are the names of their husbands given; it is more likely that they were married to their near relations or to dependents than to heathens; and in that case they with their families would form part of the patriarchal households. *p.250.*

*Ans.* From (*Intr.23*)—*comp.* (*Gen.151*)—it is plain that the narrative does not suppose any considerable number of dependents in the family of Jacob. If there were, why is Joseph sent out *alone* to find his brethren, G.xxxvii.13, &c. ? and why have his brethren to load and unload each his own ass, xlii.26,27 ? But, in any case, such dependents are not reckoned among the '70 souls out of Jacob's loins' in G.xlvi.27, all of whom are his sons or *their* sons or grandsons, except himself and one daughter and one granddaughter, whose names are given; from which number of 70 souls, we are told, sprang the whole host of Israel 'as the stars of heaven for multitude.' D.x.22.

2. *v.13. with rigour.*] The word [בְּפָרֶךְ] is repeated in *v.14*, but *does not occur elsewhere.* *p.252.*

*Ans.* It occurs in L.xxv.43,46,53, Ez.xxxiv.4.

3. *v.16. upon the stools.*] The Hebrew means literally 'two stones.' The meaning is doubtful, as *the expression does not occur elsewhere.* *p.252.*

Like many other words it belongs to the age of Moses. *p.253.*

*Ans.* It occurs in Jer.xviii.3.

4. *v.21. made them houses.*] *i.e.* they married Hebrews and became mothers in Israel. The expression is proverbial. See 2S.vii.11,27. *p.253.*

*Ans.* There is not the slightest ground for saying that the midwives, whom Canon Cook supposes to have been Egyptians, *p.252*, 'married

*Hebrews*, and became mothers in Israel.' The writer merely means to say that they were rewarded for their piety, by having large families.

Chap.ii.1-23<sup>a</sup>(O.S.), 23<sup>b</sup>-25(E.).

5. v.1. *a man of the house of Levi.*] The marriage of Amram and Jochebed took place so long after the immigration of the Israelites, that it seems scarcely possible that Amram should have been the grandson and Jochebed the daughter of Levi. The idiom, which calls even a remote descendant the son or daughter, is common to the Old and New Testament; and this passage may be understood to mean that both parents of Moses were of the house and lineage of Levi. p.254.

*Ans.* Whatever may have been the meaning of the O.S. in this passage, E.vi.16-18 represents Amram as the grandson of Levi, and Jochebed as his 'father's sister,' v.20, that is, the 'daughter of Levi.' We are not obliged to maintain that this statement, which 'seems scarcely possible,' is historically true.

6. v.2. *bare a son.*] Not her firstborn; Aaron and Miriam were older than Moses. In this part of the Book the object of the writer is simply to narrate the events which led to the Exodus, and, as usual, he omits to notice what had no direct bearing upon that object. It is remarkable that any critic, conversant with the style of the sacred writers, should have drawn from this omission an argument against the accuracy or veracity of the writer. p.254.

*Ans.* The language of v.1,2, seems to imply that in the writer's view Moses was the *first* child of this mother, *comp.* G.xxxviii.2, Hos.i.3. According to L.L., however, Aaron was *older* than Moses, E.vii.7; and since the O.S. speaks of Aaron as 'brother of Moses,' iv.14, and of Miriam as 'sister of Aaron,' E.xv.20, it is possible that the original writer regarded Aaron and Miriam as children of the same father as Moses, but by a different mother. Assuming Miriam to be the 'sister' in ii.4,7, she would have been, of course, older than Moses, and, being then a girl, would have been even older than Aaron, according to vii.7(L.L.).

7. v.3. The word which is rendered 'river' (רִיב) is not used in the Bible of any river out of Egypt, except *once* by Daniel, xii.5. p.254.

*Ans.* See 2K.xix.24 = Is.xxxvii.25, Job xxviii.10, Is.xxiii.10, xxxiii.21, Dan.xii.6,7.

8. v.21. Moses tells us nothing of what he may have learned from his father-in-law; but he *must* have found in him a man conversant with the traditions of the family of Abraham; nor is there any improbability in the supposition that, as hereditary priest, *Reuel may have had written documents concerning their common ancestors.* p.257.

*Ans.* In this way, probably, Canon Cook would partly explain the fact

that Moses (on his view) has so much to say about Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the Book of Genesis.

9. *v.23. their cry came up unto God.*] This statement, taken in connection with the two following verses, proves that the Israelites retained their faith in the God of their Fathers. The Divine Name God, Elohim, is chosen because it was that which the Israelites *must* have used in their cry for help—that under which the covenant had been ratified with the Patriarchs. *p.258.*

*Ans.* 'The covenant had been ratified with the Patriarchs' under the name El-Shaddai, G.xvii.1, xxxv.11, E.vi.3—not simply El or Elohim. If the Patriarchs knew and used the name 'Jehovah' (*Intr. to Gen. 12.iii*), why *must* the Israelites have used 'Elohim' here?

But *v.23<sup>b</sup>-25* is due to the Elohist (*VI.App.79*), and thus we account for the frequent use in it of the name 'Elohim.'

10. *v.24.* The accumulation of so-called anthropomorphic terms in this passage is remarkable. God *heard, remembered, looked upon,* and *knew* them. *p.258.*

*Ans.* These anthropomorphic expressions of the Elohist are very different in character from the coarser forms of the Jehovist—see (*Gen.5,25*).

### Chap.iii.1-22(O.S.), except *v.1* 'to Horeb'(D.).

11. *v.1.* Hitherto the narrative has been studiously brief, stating only what was necessary to be known as preparatory to those events [which immediately preceded the Exodus]. But from this point Moses dwells minutely on the details. . . . This chapter is attributed by some writers to the Jehovist; by others it is broken up into fragments, in order to meet the obvious objection that the name Elohim is found in it *seventeen* times, that of Jehovah *six* times only. But the internal evidence of unity is irresistible; and the fact that both the Divine names occur far more frequently than in the preceding chapters is sufficiently accounted for by our having here a record of the personal intervention of the Lord God. *p.260.*

*Ans.* It is difficult to see how the narrative in *i.15-21*, or that in *ii.1-10*, or in *ii.11-15*, or in *ii.16-22*, can be said to be 'studiously brief.' Canon COOK, however, seems to think, like Bp.BROWNE (*Gen.115,119*), that the Elohist and Jehovistic passages are only distinguished by reference to the more frequent use of the name Elohim or Jehovah. But this chapter is shown to be Jehovistic by its phraseology throughout, which is entirely distinct from that of the Elohist (*VI.App.80*); though the writer here, from the frequent use of Elohim, may be the Jehovist at an early stage of his literary activity (*V.305*).

But Canon COOK's statement is *inaccurate*. Elohim occurs in this chapter 21 times (not 17 times), and Jehovah 7 times, (not 6 times). Moreover, 13 of the Elohim occur as *appellatives*, e.g. 'Elohim of your fathers,' &c.,

where Jehovah could not be used: there remain only 8 Elohim used personally, and 7 Jehovahs.

Doubtless the Divine name in one form or other is more frequently used in this section, by reason of the 'personal intervention' of the Deity, than in ii.1-22, where it is not required at all. But in ii.23<sup>b</sup>-25 we have Elohim as a personal name occurring five times.

12. *v.1. the Mountain of God, even to Horeb.*] More exactly *to the Mountain of God, towards Horeb*: the meaning is that Moses came to the Mountain of God, *i.e.* Sinai, on his way towards Horeb. The name Horeb appears to belong to the northern part of the Sinaitic range. . . . An argument is drawn from the expression 'Mountain of God' against the Mosaic authorship. But Moses, who appears to have written, or to have revised, this Book towards the end of his life, may naturally have given this name by anticipation, with reference to the manifestation of God. *p.261.*

*Ans.* The word, הַרְבֵּה 'to Horeb,' is inserted apparently, to explain the phrase used in the O.S., 'Mount of God,' by which this mountain was known as having been a sacred spot from the earliest times (*Intr. to Ex. 9, Intr. to Pent. 27*), and inserted most probably by D., who never uses 'Sinai,' and is the only writer in the Pentateuch who uses 'Horeb,' D.i.2,6,19, iv.10,15, v.2, ix.8, xviii.16, xxix.1, and E.iii.1(D.), xvii.6(D.), xxxiii.6(D.)—see (VI. *App.80*, iv.N.B.).

13. *v.5. the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.*] This passage is almost conclusive against the assumption that the place was previously a sanctuary. Moses knew nothing of its holiness after some forty years spent on the Peninsula. *p.261.*

*Ans.* It is obvious that the above argument begs the whole question, by assuming the historical accuracy of this narrative.

14. *v.6.* Our Saviour adduces this passage as a proof that the doctrine of the resurrection was taught in the Old Testament, and He calls this book the Book of Moses (see marg.)—two points to be borne in mind by readers of the Pentateuch. *p.261.*

*Ans.* Canon Cook writes 'see marg.?' but in the margin he only quotes Matt.xxii.32, which says not a word about Moses. In Mark xii.26, however, we find 'have ye not read in the Book of Moses?' But, if the reference had been to the 'Book of Ruth' or the 'Book of Job,' or the 'Book of Judges,' would that prove that the book in question was written by Ruth, or Job, or Judges?

15. *v.13. what is his name.*] The meaning of this question is evidently—*By which name shall I tell them the promise is confirmed?* Each name of the Deity represented some aspect or manifestation of His attributes. El, Elohim, or Shaddai, would speak of majesty or might; either would probably have sufficed for

Moses; but he would not use any one of them without God's special permission. What he needed was not a new name, but direction to use that Name which would bear in itself a pledge of accomplishment. p.263.

*Ans.* This is merely special pleading. It is evident that Moses does not ask 'by which' of the names of God he should say the Divine promise was confirmed, El-Shaddai or Jehovah. He simply asks what is the name of the 'Elohim of their fathers,' and, instead of being told at once in reply the name 'Jehovah,' he receives first a derivation of the name, v. 14<sup>a</sup>, next a transitional form of it, viz. EHYE or EHVE, v.14<sup>b</sup>, and then the full name, YAHVE, v.15,16,18. The whole appears to be an amplification of the original brief Elohist notice in vi.2,3.

16. v.14. *I am that I am.*] To Moses and the Israelites this was an explanation of the name Jehovah, which had been known from the beginning, but of which probably the meaning, certainly the full import, was not comprehended. The word 'I AM' in Hebrew is equivalent in meaning to Jehovah, and differs from it very slightly in form. This is much obscured by our substitution of LORD for Jehovah. The name, which Moses was thus commissioned to use, was at once new and old—old in its connection with previous revelations, new in its full interpretation, and in its bearing upon the covenant of which Moses was the destined Mediator. p.263.

*Ans.* The above explanation, which is that of Bp.BROWNE, has been shown to be untenable (*Intr. to Gen. 7*). It is clear that the Elohist, by suppressing the use of the name Jehovah till he comes to the announcement in E.vi.2,3, intends that to be the first revelation of the name, though this is contradicted by the later insertions in Genesis.

Of course, Canon Cook must be aware that it is not strictly accurate to say that 'the word I AM in Hebrew is equivalent to Jehovah,' and so again, on v.15, 'the words I AM and Jehovah being equivalent,' when he should have written 'He Is.' But, since he admits that 'much obscurity' is caused 'by our substitution of LORD for Jehovah,' it is to be regretted that he did not, as Editor, insist upon 'Jehovah' being everywhere printed, instead of Lord, in the text.

17. v.15. the *LORD God.*] In this passage it is of great importance to keep the Divine name 'Jehovah God of your Fathers, &c.' . . . This enables us to omit the article before 'God,' which is not in the Hebrew, and may be misunderstood, as though distinguishing Jehovah from other gods. p.263.

*Ans.* Canon Cook leaves his readers to suppose that we might expect to find an article before 'God' in the Hebrew, in such a phrase as 'the God of your fathers,' if it were intended to distinguish Jehovah from other gods; whereas it is contrary to the usage of the Hebrew language to use the article in such a case (*GES. Gr.* 198.ii), *comp.* Ju.vi.10, x.6, &c. It is plain

that 'Jehovah the Elohim of Israel' is here 'distinguished from other gods,' the tutelary deities of other nations, as in many other places, *comp.* E.xv.11, xviii.11, Ju.xi.21,23,24. And so Canon COOK himself observes on E.xv.11, 'Who is like unto thee, Jehovah, among the gods?'—

The translation is quite correct and justified by other unmistakable passages, *e.g.* Ps.lxxxvi.8, 'Among the gods there is none like unto Thee.' p.312.

### Chap.iv.1-31(O.S.).

18. v.13. *and he said.*] The reluctance of Moses is a point of great moment. It had a permanent effect, for it caused the transfer of a most important part of his work to his brother; and its record supplies a *strong evidence of the Mosaic authorship* of this portion, attributed by KNOBEL to the so-called Jehovist. Like every other circumstance in the narrative, it is in accordance with the inner law of man's spiritual development, and specially with the character of Moses. But under the circumstances it indicates a weakness of faith, such as no late writer would have attributed to the greatest of the descendants of Abraham. p.266.

*Ans.* The above is an instance of what Canon COOK regards as '*strong evidence of Mosaic authorship.*'

19. v.13. *send . . . by the hand.*] The Hebrew phrase is curt, so to speak, and ungracious, lit. *send, I pray, by hand, thou wilt send, i.e.* by whomsoever thou wilt—an expression which has scarcely a precedent, and which may serve to illustrate Moses's own account of his heavy and awkward utterance. p.266.

*Ans.* There is nothing extraordinary in the construction; we have merely the not uncommon omission of the relative (GES. *Gr.* 121-3); for a similar instance see Hos.i.2, '*the beginning* (of that which) *Jehovah spake.*'

20. *an ass.*] Lit. *the ass*, which, according to Hebrew idiom, means that he set them upon asses, not upon one ass, which would imply that they both were infants. This is the first notice of other sons [read 'another son'] besides Gershom. p.267.

*Ans.* Canon COOK gives no other instance of the 'Hebrew idiom' to which he refers. KNOBEL, *Ex.* p.37, observing that the writer mentions only one son in ii.22, iv.25, reads בְּנֵי, 'his son,' in v.20, instead of בָּנָי, 'his sons,' which latter may have arisen from the notice in xviii.3,4, by reading בָּנָי, which stands elsewhere for בָּנָי, D.ii.33, xxxiii.9, Dan.xi.10, 1S.xxx.6. Possibly the second son may have been supposed in the O.S. to have been born during the journey, *e.g.* at this resting-place, and circumcised soon after his birth, G.xvii.12.

However this may be, Canon COOK takes no notice of the incongruity that Moses was 'grown,' ii.11, 'forty years old,' Acts vii.23, when he fled to Midian, and can hardly be supposed to have waited forty years before he married Zipporah, E.ii.21; and yet he is now *eighty* years old, vii.7, and has,



at least, one son apparently an infant, and at all events very young, iv.25. The real explanation of this is, that vii.7, is an insertion of the L.L. (VI.198-9).

### Chap.v.1-23(O.S.).

21. v.2. *I know not Jehovah.*] This may mean either that Pharaoh had not heard of Jehovah or that he did not recognize Him as God. The former is possible; for, though the name was ancient, it was apparently less used by the Israelites than other designations of God. p.269.

*Ans.* See (16) above.

22. v.23. The earnestness of this remonstrance, and even its approach to irreverence, are quite in keeping with other notices of Moses' naturally impetuous character. But such a speech would *certainly* not have been put into his mouth by a later writer. p.271.

*Ans.* It is utterly incredible that, after the miracles wrought for his conviction in iv.1-7, Moses should have remonstrated with the Divine Being as in iv.10,13, or in v.22,23; such speeches must 'certainly have been put into his mouth by a later writer.'

### Chap.vi.1,9(O.S.), 2-5(E.), 6-8,10-30(L.L.).

23. v.2. *I am Jehovah.*] The meaning seems to be this. 'I am Jehovah, and I appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as El-Shaddai, but as to my name Jehovah I was not made known to them.' In other words, the full import of that name was not disclosed to them. On the one hand, it is scarcely possible to doubt, and it is in fact admitted by most critics, that the sacred name Jehovah was known from very early times. On the other hand, the revelation on Mount Sinai clearly states that the derivation and full meaning of the name were then first declared. p.272.

*Ans.* Is it conceivable that the Hebrews should require to have the 'derivation' of the name revealed to them, when, as Bp. BROWNE says, p.26, it is simply the third person present of the substantive verb? But see (*Intr. to Pent.* 7) for the full reply to the above.

24. v.9. *they hearkened not.*] The contrast between the reception of this communication and that recorded in iv.31 is dwelt upon by some critics as indicating different authors; but it is distinctly accounted for by the change of circumstances. p.273.

*Ans.* We have assigned both the passages in question to the O.S. (VI.272).

25. v.13. With this verse begins a new section of the history; and, as in the Book of Genesis, 'there is in every such case a brief repetition of so much of the previous

account as is needed to make it an intelligible narrative in itself—a peculiarity which extends to the lesser subdivisions also.' QUARRY 'On Genesis.' p.273.

*Ans.* How can the repetition in v.14,15, from G.xlvi, be of the slightest use to make this story of the Exodus 'an intelligible narrative in itself'? Or how can the statements in v.17,19,21,22,24, have contributed to this end? Canon Cook indeed says:—

Moses mentions in the first place the families of the elder brothers of Levi, in order to show the *exact* position of his own tribe and family. p.273.

But surely the fact that Levi was the third son of Jacob could hardly have needed to be stated to the Israelites—much less to be impressed on their attention by mentioning the names of the four families of Reuben and the six families of Simeon. The whole passage is plainly interpolated for the simple purpose of giving a full account of the chief *Levite* families; and v.14–30 is shown by the clearest evidence to belong to the L.L. (VI.App. 86).

26. v.14. *these be the heads.*] We have in the following verses, not a complete genealogy, but a summary account of the family of the two brothers. It has been objected to as out of place, interrupting the narrative, and therefore probably an interpolation. But the reason is clear why Moses should have recorded his own genealogy and that of his brother, when they were about to execute a duty of the highest importance which had been imposed upon them. Just then it was right and natural to state, for the satisfaction of Hebrew readers, to whom genealogical questions were always interesting, the descent and position of the designated leaders of the nation. p.273.

*Ans.* But what have v.14,15,17,19,21,22,24, to do with the genealogy of Moses and Aaron? And how is it that the four sons and even the grandson of *Aaron* are mentioned, with Aaron's wife and her descent, while nothing is said about the sons of Moses, Gershom, and Eliezer, (of whom Eliezer has not yet even been named,) or his grandsons Shebuel, and Rehabiah, 1Ch.xiii.16,17? Obviously, the family of Aaron the *priest* was a matter of greater interest to the writer of the L.L. than that of Moses, 'the greatest of the descendants of Abraham.' p.266.

27. v.20. *Amram.*] This can scarcely be the same person who is mentioned in v.18 (!), but *his descendant and representative in the generation immediately preceding that of Moses.* The intervening links are omitted, as is the rule (?) where they are not needed for some special purpose, and do not bear upon the history. Between the death of Amram and the birth of Moses there was an interval which can scarcely be brought within the limits assigned by any system of chronology to the sojourn in Egypt. Thus TIELE quoted by KEIL: 'According to N.iii.27, &c., in the time of Moses the Kohathites were divided into four branches, that of Amram, Izhan, Hebron, and Uzziel; their number amounted to 8,600 males; of

these the Amramites were about one fourth, *i.e.* more than 2,000 males. This would be impossible were Amram the son of Kohath identical with Amram the father of Moses. We must therefore admit an omission of several links between the two.' Thus in the genealogy of Ezra (Ezr.vii.3, *comp.* 1Ch.vi.7-9) five descents are omitted between Azariah the son of Meraioth and Azariah the son of Johanan and several between Ezra himself and Seraiah, who was put to death by Nebuchadnezzar 150 years before the time of Ezra. *p.*274.

*Ans.* I request the special attention of my readers to the manner in which Canon Cook here consents to tamper with the plain meaning of the Scripture, in order to support traditionary views. Will any unprejudiced person believe that the 'Amram' in *v.*20 is not the same as the 'Amram' in *v.*18? Are not then 'Izhar,' *v.*21, and 'Uzziel,' *v.*22, the same as 'Izhar' and 'Uzziel,' Amram's brothers, in *v.*18? Or will Canon Cook maintain that 'Amram' in N.xxvi.59 is not the same 'Amram' as in *v.*58, whom 'Kohath begat,' as in E.vi.18?

In Ezr.vii.3 there are no such data as there are here, plainly showing that no links are supposed to be omitted, *viz.* 'the years of the life of Levi, 137 years,' *v.*16, 'of Kohath, 133 years,' *v.*18, 'of Amram, 137 years,' *v.*20.

28. *v.*20. *Jochebed.*] Here named for the first time, and, as might be expected (!), not in the general narrative, but in a genealogical statement. The name means 'the glory of Jehovah,' one clear instance of the usage of the sacred name before the Exodus. *p.*274.

*Ans.* How can Canon Cook say that Moses' mother 'might be expected' to be named for the first time, not in the story, but in a genealogy, when obviously the proper place for naming both 'Amram' and 'Jochebed' would have been in ii.1, if the writer of the O.S. had known these names? But they are both later inventions, occurring only in the L.L., Amram in E.vi.18,20, N.iii.19, xxvi.58,59, *comp.* iii.27, Jochebed in E.vi.20, N.xxvi.59—by which simple fact is explained the occurrence of 'Jehovah' in the composition of the latter name apparently 'before the Exodus.'

29. *v.*25. *Putiel.*] This name is remarkable, being compounded of Puti or Poti, in Egyptian 'devoted to,' and El, the Hebrew name of God. *p.*274.

*Ans.* It is strange to find a *hybrid* name like this, partly Egyptian and partly Hebrew. But the name belongs to the L.L., and is, no doubt, fictitious as that of the father-in-law of Phinehas.

30. *v.*28. This and the following verses belong to the next chapter. They mark distinctly the beginning of a subdivision of the narrative, and, according to the general rule in the Pentateuch, begin with a brief recapitulation. Moses once more, like other sacred writers, dwells strongly upon his personal deficiencies and faults of character—an all but certain indication of autobiography in the case of great and heroic personages. *p.*275.

*Ans.* v.28-30 is merely due to the L.L., taking up again the thread of the story, after the interpolation in v.14-27, and repeating almost verbally v.10-12 (VI.196).

Chap.vii.1-13,19,20<sup>a</sup>,22(L.L.), 14-18,20<sup>b</sup>,21,23-25(O.S.).

31. v.1. It is admitted *by critics* that the deliverance of the Israelites must have been the result of heavy calamities inflicted upon the Egyptians, who certainly would never have submitted to so great a loss had they been in a state to prevent it. . . A succession of such plagues as are described in Exodus must therefore be assumed, and is in fact accepted *by critics*, as *the only* conceivable cause of the result. p.275.

*Ans.* Canon COOK does not name the 'critics' to whom he refers. But certainly KUENEN, one of the leading critics of the day, has no idea of 'a succession of such plagues' being 'the only conceivable cause' of the Exodus of the Israelites from Egypt (VI.564).

32. v.9. *thy rod.*] Apparently the rod before described, which Moses on this occasion gives to Aaron as his representative. p.276.

*Ans.* In the O.S. it is always *Moses* who casts down *his* staff, iv.3,4, *comp.* v.17,20, and so in vii.15,17, ix.22,23, x.12,13, *comp.* v.21,22. In the L.L. it is always *Aaron* who acts with *his* staff, viii.5,6,16,17, as here, the L.L. evidently desiring to throw additional dignity about the person of Aaron, *comp.* N.xvii.8,10, xx.8,9 (VI.282, note 17).

33. v.17. It is well known that before the rise the water of the Nile is green and unfit to drink. About the 25th of June it becomes clear, and then yellow, and gradually reddish like ochre. This effect has been generally attributed to the red earth brought down from Sennaar; but Ehrenberg proves that it is owing to the presence of microscopic cryptogams and infusoria. The depth of the colour varies in different years; when it is very deep, the water has an offensive smell. Late travellers say that at such seasons the broad turbid tide has a striking resemblance to a river of blood. The supernatural character of the visitation was attested by the suddenness of the change, by its immediate connection with the words and act of Moses, and by its effects. It killed the fishes, and made the water unfit for use, neither of which results follows the annual discoloration. p.277.

*Ans.* As before (27), Canon Cook explains away the clear language of the Scripture; but he has hardly a right to complain of 'objections resting upon *misrepresentation* of the Text.' If the writer is supposed to be writing mere *poetry*, and describing imaginary plagues, it might be said that perhaps he only meant to speak of the waters being changed to a *blood-red colour*, as the moon in an eclipse, Joel ii.31, Acts ii.20, Rev.vi.12. But, if he is writing plain historical prose, then surely he means to say what he says, that the waters of the river were turned to *blood*, v.17,19,20,21, *comp.* Ps.lxxviii.44, iv.29; see (34).

34. *v.21. the fish that was in the river died.*] The expression may not necessarily mean 'all the fish'; but a great mortality is of course implied.

*v.22. and the magicians of Egypt did so.*] From this it must be inferred that the plague, though general, was not universal. In numberless instances the Hebrew terms which imply universality must be understood in a limited sense.

*v.24. digged roundabout the river.*] This statement corroborates the explanation given above (33). The discoloured water would be purified by a natural filtration. *p.278.*

*Ans.* It is clear that the Scripture writer means to say that *all* the fish in the river died, *v.18,21, Ps.cv.29*, and therefore also all the *frogs* in the 'streams, sluits, tanks, and reservoirs,' *v.19*, so that a difficulty arises as to the next plague.

Canon COOK's second assumption, to account for the magicians finding water on which to make their experiments, is equally inadmissible in the present instance—the fact being, however, that the O.S. speaks only of the *River* being smitten, so that the magicians might have obtained water from other sources, whereas the L.L. has interpolated the notice about the 'streams, &c.,' *vii.19,20<sup>a</sup>, viii.3*, and so has caused the incongruity in question (VI.200–2).

If the water could be 'purified by a natural filtration'—that is, if it was only discoloured with 'cryptogams and infusoria,' not changed into 'blood,'—why might not the Egyptians have 'filtered' the water in their tanks and reservoirs?

35. *v.22.* The names of the two principal magicians, Jannes and Jambres, who 'withstood Moses,' are preserved (!) by St. Paul, *2Tim.iii.8. p.279.*

*Ans.* The names are evidently derived in *2Tim.iii.8* from mere Jewish tradition, as is the story of 'Michael the archangel contending with the devil about the body of Moses, &c.,' *Jude 9*, or 'Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesying, &c.,' *Jude 14.*

### Chap.viii.1–4,8–15<sup>a</sup>,20–32(O.S.), 5–7,15<sup>b</sup>–19(L.L.).

36. *v.9. glory over me.*] The expression is rather obscure, but it is supposed . . . to mean, 'have honour over me,' *i.e.* have the honour or advantage over me, directing me when I shall entreat God for thee and thy servants, &c. . . . *It is obvious that such an expression would not have been attributed to Moses by a later writer. p.280.*

*Ans.* Canon COOK does not explain *why* a later writer could not have put a courtly phrase into the mouth of Moses, especially if he was one who lived in the Court of David, for this passage belongs to the O.S. (VI.272).

37. *v.16.* It is observed by Hebrew commentators that the nine plagues are divided into three groups. Distinct warnings are given of the first two plagues in

each group; the third in each is inflicted without any previous notice, the third, *lice*, the sixth, *boils*, the ninth, *darkness*. p.281.

*Ans.* The remark is true; but of these nine plagues seven only belong to the O.S., of which the last comes without warning; and the L.L. in those of *lice* (? mosquitoes) and *boils* (VI.208), has apparently imitated the form of this seventh plague already existing in the story.

#### Chap.ix.1-7,13-34(O.S.), 8-12,35(L.L.).

38. v.3. *the camels.*] These animals are only twice mentioned, here and in G.xii.16, in connection with Egypt. In this passage the enumeration of cattle is *studiously complete*. It is shown in the Appendix that, though camels *are never represented on the monuments*, they were known to the Egyptians, and were probably used on the frontier bordering on the desert. p.283.

*Ans.* If 'the enumeration of cattle is studiously complete,' would not 'goats' also be named, as in 1S.xxv.2, and 'mules,' as in 1K.x.25, xviii.5, Zech.xiv.15? But it is plain that 'camels' are here inadvertently mentioned, as common property of the *Egyptians*, by a writer living in Palestine.

#### Chap.x.1-29(O.S.).

39. v.4. The locust is less common in Egypt than in many eastern countries; yet it is well known, and dreaded as the most terrible of scourges. . . . They come *generally* from the *western* deserts, but sometimes from the east and the south-east. p.287.

*Ans.* Here also, most probably, the writer living in *Palestine*, where 'locusts are observed to come *invariably* from *the east*,' (KITTO, *Phys. Hist. of Palestine*, p.ccccxix), speaks inadvertently of these locusts being brought to Egypt by an east-wind, v.13, and carried off by a west-wind, v.19, into the Red Sea.

40. v.14. *went up.*] The expression is exact and graphic; at a distance the locusts appear hanging, as it were, like a heavy cloud *over* the land; as they approach they seem to *rise*, and they fill the atmosphere *overhead* on their arrival. p.288.

*Ans.* Canon Cook's criticism is here unsound: the writer in using this word had no intention of saying that the locusts *rose* like a cloud overhead, *comp.* E.viii.4,6, Ju.vi.3,5, &c.

41. v.19. *west wind.*] Lit. '*sea wind*,' which in Palestine, of course, is from the west; but in this passage it may, and probably does, denote a wind blowing from the sea on the *north-west* of Egypt. A direct westerly wind would come from the Libyan desert, and be far less effectual than one rushing transversely over the whole surface of lower Egypt (which was doubtless the main centre of the visitation), and driving the locusts into the Red Sea. p.289.

*Ans.* In fact a west wind in Egypt, 'coming from the western desert,' would be more likely to *bring* the locusts (39) than to carry them away. Canon COOK does not give any other instance of a 'sea-wind' in the Bible meaning anything else than a *west* wind. The writer was evidently living in Palestine, and, wishing to throw the locusts into the Red Sea, he has introduced inadvertently a *sea-wind*, *i.e.* a *west-wind*, to carry off the locusts which had been brought by an *east-wind*, according to the usual experience in Palestine (39). Moreover, in Egypt, a 'sea-wind' from the Mediterranean might be *north* or *north-east*, as well as north-west, or might be *east*, coming from the Red Sea. Who is it, again, that is guilty of 'misrepresenting Scripture' (27,33)?

Chap.xi.1-8(O.S.), 9,10(L.L.).

42. v.1. *the Lord said*], or *the Lord had said*. Commentators generally agree that the first three verses of this chapter are parenthetical. The most probable account of their insertion in this place appears to be that, before Moses relates the last warning given to Pharaoh, he feels it right to recall to his readers' minds the revelation and command which had been previously given to him by the Lord. Thus Aben-Ezra, who proposes the rendering 'had said,' which is adopted by ROSENMÜLLER, KEIL, KALISCH, RANKE, SMITH (*Pentateuch*, p.557-560), who *completely disposes of the objections of German and English critics*. p.290.

v.4. *and Moses said*.] The following words must be read in immediate connection with the last verse of the preceding chapter. It is not there stated that Moses left the presence of Pharaoh. This passage tells us what took place after his declaration that this would be his last interview. p.291.

*Ans.* In (VI.204) I assigned x.28,29, to L.L.; but on further consideration I see that these verses belong to the O.S.\*

The above explanation, therefore, is probably correct, in spite of the awkward parenthesis, xi.1-3; *comp.*, however, a similar one in J.iv.1<sup>b</sup>-3 (VI. 166, note). Certainly 'it is not stated that Moses left the presence of Pharaoh,' and xi.4 may be 'read in connection with x.29,' xi.1,2, referring to the commands formerly given, iv.22,23, iii.21,22, which Moses may be supposed to call to mind, when ordered to see Pharaoh's face no more, and so is able at once to denounce the final judgment in v.4-8, and 'goes out from Pharaoh in heat of anger.'

43. v.3. *Moreover the man Moses was very great*.] No objection would have been taken to this statement, had it been found in any other book (!). . . . The

---

\* (i) v.28, 'take heed to thyself,' *comp.* G.xxiv.6, xxxi.24,29, E.xix.12, xxiii.21, common also in D., not used in L.L.

(ii) v.28,29, 'see my (thy) face no more,' G.xliv.23, *comp.* 'see thy face,' G.xxxi. 2,5, xxxii.20, xxxiii.10, xliii.3,5, xliv.26, xlvi.30, E.xxxiii.20, not in D. or L.L.

(iii) v.29, 'so hast thou spoken,' *comp.* E.vi.9.

reasons above assigned appear sufficient to account for the introduction of these verses, which undoubtedly interrupt the narrative. But there would be no objection in point of principle to the supposition that they may have been inserted either by Moses at a later period, when he probably put together and revised the detached portions of the books, or by one of his younger contemporaries, &c. p.290.

*Ans.* I have referred to 'SMITH (*Pentateuch*, p.557-560),' referred to above (42), and nowhere can I find a trace of such a discussion as Canon COOK mentions, and I am quite at a loss to know what his reference means. In *D.B.* II, the article on 'The Pentateuch' extends through p.768-784, and the only allusion I can find to the passage before us is on p.773, where Mr. PEROWNE argues with us against Canon COOK (*Intr. to Ex.* 8) as follows:— '*Is it probable* that Moses wrote the words in E.xi.3, 'Moreover the man Moses was very great, &c.,' or those in N.xii 3, 'Now the man Moses was very meek, &c.?' And so in I.p.596 all Mr. PEROWNE says on this passage is, that 'the apparent confusion in E.xi.1-3 may be explained by regarding these verses as parenthetical,' having observed just before that 'the remark in xi.3 leads to the conclusion, that a writer later than Moses made use of materials left by the great legislator in a somewhat fragmentary form.'

But, as soon as it is seen that x.28,29, where Moses says to Pharaoh, 'I will see thy face no more,' belongs to L.L. (VI.272), the whole difficulty vanishes, and there is no longer any necessity for regarding xi.1-3 as 'parenthetical,' as our translation of the O.S. shows (VI.ch.xii).

44. v.4. *about midnight.*] This marks the hour, but not the day, on which the visitation would take place. There may have been, and probably was, an interval of some days, during which preparations might be made both for the celebration of the Passover and the departure of the Israelites. In the meantime Egypt remained under the shadow of the menace. p.291.

*Ans.* It is very plain that the O.S. meant this visitation to take place that very night, *comp.* xii.29, and the translation in (VI.ch.xii). Nor would anyone have thought of suggesting a different meaning, except for the fact that there *must* have been—not 'may have been and probably was'—an interval of some days, for the preparations for the Passover, xii.3,6, if this had formed part of the O.S., instead of being part of the L.L., and the whole had been real history.

Chap.xii.1-28,40-51(L.L.), 29-39(O.S.).

45. v.1. *in the land of Egypt.*] It seems evident that this verse, and consequently the rest of the chapter, was written *some time after the Exodus*, probably when Moses put together the portions of the Book towards the end of his life.

*Ans.* No doubt, the phrase 'in the land of Egypt' could hardly have



been written by Moses while in Egypt. But v.1-13,14-28,40-51, belongs to the L.L., whereas v.29-39 continues the O.S. after xi.1-8 (VI.272). See the translation in (VI.ch.xii).

46. v.4. The Hebrew root כָּסַם [count, number], with its derivatives, does not occur in any book but the Pentateuch, and with one exception, N.xxxi, only in connection with this special transaction, nor is it found in any of the Semitic languages. *It is evidently archaic, unknown to later Hebrews except from this Book.* p.301.

*Ans.* It occurs only in very late passages of the L.L., viz. כָּסַם, E.xii.4, מָכַס, N.xxxi.28,38,39,40,41, מְכַסָּה, E.xii.4, L.xxvii.23; and in Chaldee we find several cognate words (CASTELL. *Lex. Hept.* s.v. כָּסַם), e.g. כְּסָא, כְּסָה, feria stativa, tempus statum, quod in numeratum anni diem semper recurrit. BUXT. *Lex. Chald.* s.v. כָּסַם.

47. v.8. *bitter herbs.*] The word occurs only here and in N.ix.11, in reference to herbs. p.294.

*Ans.* It occurs also in Lam.iii.15, evidently in the same sense.

48. v.9. *sodden with water*] or *sodden*, omitting 'water,' which is added in Hebrew because the word in that language may be used either of roasting (as in 2Ch.xxxv.13, or boiling. p.294.

*Ans.* There is no instance in which the word in question (בָּשַׁל) is used *by itself* in the sense of 'roasting,' though in one passage it is used with בָּשַׁל, 'with fire,' in this sense: in all other passages it means 'boil,' and so it plainly does in D.xvi.7, in contradiction to the passage now before us (VI.360).

49. v.9. The lamb was slain and the blood sprinkled by the head of each family. No separate priesthood as yet existed in Israel. . . . When the priesthood was instituted, the slaying of the lamb still devolved on the heads of families, though *the blood was* sprinkled on the altar by the priests, an act which essentially belonged to their office. p.294.

*Ans.* Supposing only the *adult males* partook, say 750,000, since the warriors alone were 603,550—as the strict law of the Karaites prescribed, p.292,—and that twenty persons on the average partook of each lamb, since 'Josephus says, not less than ten attend this sacrifice, and twenty are generally assembled,' p. 292,—there would have been sprinkled at the altar at the *second* Passover, N.ix.5, the blood of 37,500 lambs by *three* priests, (Aaron, Eleazar, Ithamar, L.x.6), in the time 'between the two evenings,' E.xii.6, *i.e.*—

the time from afternoon or early eventide, until sunset—this would allow about two hours and a half for slaying and preparing all the lambs, p.293—

in other words, according to Canon Cook, each priest would have had to

sprinkle the blood at the rate of 83 lambs a minute, for two hours and a half incessantly!

50. *v.11.* The word *Passover* renders as nearly as possible the true meaning of the original, of which the primary sense is generally held to be 'pass rapidly,' like a bird with outstretched wings; but it undoubtedly includes the idea of sparing. See *GES. Thes. s.v.* It is a word which occurs very seldom in other books, twice in 1K.xviii, *viz. v.21*, where it is rendered 'halt,' and seems to mean 'waver,' flitting like a bird from branch to branch, and *v.26*, where our A.V. has in the margin 'leaped up and down.' A passage in Isaiah, xxxi.5, is of more importance, since it combines the two great ideas involved in the word,— 'As birds flying, so will the Lord of hosts defend Jerusalem, defending also He will deliver it, and *passing over* He will preserve it.' . . . It is remarkable that the word is not found in other Semitic languages, except in passages derived from the Hebrew Bible, *p.295.*

*Ans.* The word פָּסַח, *pasach*, means simply *prætermovere, transilire, præterire*, FÜRST. *Conc.*, 'to pass over,' *GES. Lex.*, who adds 'Hence תַּפְסָח (passage), *Thapsacus*, proper name of a city, situated at a celebrated passage over the Euphrates'; so that the word must have existed in, at least, one 'other Semitic language.' And it appears to correspond closely with עָבַר, 'pass by,' or 'pass over,' whence מִעֲבָרָה מִעֲבָרָה, 'a passage or ford of a river,' G.xxxii.23, Ju.iii.28, xii.5,6; and observe how curiously פָּסַח and עָבַר are interchanged in E.xii.13,23 (VI.368). There is no idea of 'sparing' necessarily involved in the phrase פָּסַח עָלַי, 'pass-over by,' E.xii.13,23,27, (*comp. עָבַר עָלַי*, 1K.ix.8, 2K.iv.9, Ez.xvi.6,8), though, of course, in the present instance such an idea is implied by the context. In 1K.xviii.21, Is.xxxi.5, פָּסַח, appears to mean merely 'pass-over,' and in 1K.xviii.26 the Pihel form may, perhaps, have the same meaning intensified, 'they passed-over repeatedly by the altar,' *i.e.* danced to and fro, and at any rate does not 'include the idea of sparing.' From this it appears that there is no foundation for Canon Cook's distinction:—

The word rendered 'pass through' (עָבַר) is wholly distinct from that which means 'pass over' (פָּסַח). The 'passing through' was *in judgment*, the 'passing over' in *mercy*. *p.295.*

*Ans.* See especially Am.vii.8, viii.2.

51. *v.12. against all the gods of Egypt.]* The meaning of this and of the corresponding passage, N.xxxiii.4, is undoubtedly that the visitation reached the gods of Egypt. . . . The true explanation in this case is that, in smiting the firstborn of all *living beings*, man and beast, God smote the objects of Egyptian worship. It is not merely that the bull, and cow, and goat, and ram, and cat were worshipped in the principal cities of Egypt as representatives, or, so to speak, incarnations of their deities, but that the worship of beasts was universal. Every nome, every

town, had its sacred animal, including the lowest forms of animal life—the frog the beetle, being especial objects of reverence, as representing the primeval deities of nature. In fact, not a single deity of Egypt was unrepresented by some beast. This explanation . . . forces itself upon our minds in proportion to our closer and more accurate knowledge of Egyptian superstitions. It would not, however, have occurred to an Israelite living in Palestine. *p.295.*

*Ans.* Canon Cook's explanation is forced and unnatural, and is at once contradicted by the fact that only the firstborn of 'cattle'—בְּהֵמָה, 'tame cattle,' as bullock, goat, sheep, &c., not cats, dogs, frogs, beetles, &c.—were destroyed among the Egyptians, *v.12,29*, and therefore all the firstlings of such cattle were to be sacrificed among the Israelites, *xiii.15, N.iii.13, comp. v.41,45.* The meaning is plainly that Jehovah, the God of Israel, would exhibit His power over the idols of Egypt by desolating the land supposed to be under their protection, *comp. E.xviii.11, Is.xix.1, Jer.xliii.12, xlvi.25.*

52. *v.15–20.* These verses appear from *v.17* to have been given to Moses *after the departure from Egypt*, but are inserted here in their proper place, in connection with the history. *p.295.*

*Ans.* No doubt, *v.17* was written after the Exodus: for the whole passage belongs to the L.L., written after the Captivity (VI.272).

53. *v.15. seven days.]* The period of seven days does not settle the question as to the previous observance of the week, since this command may have been first given after the institution of the Sabbath; but it adds considerable weight to the argument in its favour. *p.297.*

*Ans.* The sabbath was, no doubt, observed from the earliest times, from its connection with the principal phases of the moon (VI.462,466), and without any reference to a Divine command.

54. *v.21. Then Moses called.]* In *v.21–28* Moses records the directions which, in obedience to the command, he gave at the time to the people. This method of composition occurs frequently in the Pentateuch: it involves, of course, some repetition, from which no very ancient writer would shrink; but it *would scarcely have been adopted by a compiler.* Moses is *ever careful* to record first the commands which he receives and afterwards the way in which he executed them. *p.297.*

*Ans.* See *vii.16–18, viii.1–4,20–23, ix.13–19*, for instances of 'commands,' where Moses is not 'careful to record the way in which he executed them,' and *x.3–6, xi.4–8*, for instances of Moses executing 'commands' which he does not record. It is curious that in the Samaritan Pentateuch the very repetitions have been interpolated in a later age which are needed to bear out Canon Cook's rash and inaccurate assertion (VI.478).

55. *v.37. 600,000.]* This includes all the males who could march. The total number of Israelites should therefore be calculated not from the men above twenty

years old, but from the males above twelve or fourteen, and would therefore amount to somewhat more than two millions. This is not an excessive population for Goshen, nor does it exceed a reasonable estimate of the increase of the Israelites, including their numerous dependents. *p.*299.

*Ans.* It is difficult to see what Canon COOK means by saying that this number (600,000) 'includes all the males who could march,'—meaning, apparently, 'not the men above twenty years old,' but 'the males above twelve or fourteen, when we are distinctly told, shortly afterwards, that the number of the males 'above twenty,' 'all that were able to go forth to war in Israel,' was 603,550, E.xxxviii.26, N.i.45,46.

As Canon COOK does not himself attempt to satisfy his readers that 'this number 'does not exceed a reasonable estimate of the increase of the Israelites,' but only refers them to PAYNE SMITH'S *Bampton Lectures*, I need only refer to (L.ch.xvi-xix) of my work, where it is shown that such increase, under the conditions specified, is utterly impossible. It will be enough to mention two of the impossibilities involved in the idea of such an increase, (1) that Kohath's *four* sons, E.vi.18, must have had between them 2750 grandsons, from thirty to fifty years old, at the time of the Exodus, and about as many granddaughters, whereas one of them, Amram, had only six, *viz.* the four sons of Aaron, E.xxviii.1 (supposing Nadab and Abihu to be still living, L.x.2) and the two sons of Moses, E.xviii.3,4,—(2) that Kohath's contemporary, Hushim, G.xlvi.23, must have had 62,700 male great-grandchildren above twenty years old, N.i.39, and as many females.

There is no ground whatever for the assumption that Jacob and his sons had 'numerous dependents,' or, if they had, that these are reckoned here as Israelites—see (1) above.

56. *v.*40. If the Hebrew text be taken as it stands, it fixes the duration [of the sojourning in Egypt] to 430 years; and this is accepted by the majority of critics of all schools. It agrees substantially with G.xv.13,14: the expressions here used apply to Egypt, and not to Canaan, in which the Patriarchs were certainly not made to serve. The additional statement in *v.*16 of the same chapter, 'in the fourth generation they shall come hither again,' presents some difficulty. It is, however, probably identical in sense with the preceding one, referring to the time during which the people would serve in a strange land. The term 'generation' is understood by GSENIUS and other Hebrew scholars to be equivalent to a century. *p.*301.

*Ans.* G.xv is a Deuteronomistic insertion (V.77-79), except *v.*13, 'four hundred years,' which seems to have been interpolated by the L.L., as a round number, with reference to the datum 'four hundred and thirty years' in E.xii.40. The passage, as originally written, would then run thus:—'Know of a surety, that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and they shall serve them, and they shall afflict them; . . . and in

the fourth generation they shall return hither; for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full'—where 'the fourth generation' has now its proper meaning, as implied in every one of the genealogies given in the Pentateuch, *e.g.* Zarah (G.xlvi.12)—Zabdi—Carmi—Achan, J.vii.18, Pallu (G.xlvi.9)—Eliab—Dathan and Abiram, N.xvi.1 (VI.100, note), Kohath (G.xlvi.11)—Amram—Aaron—Eleazar, E.vi.16–23. In fact, since Joseph was only 39 years old at the descent into Egypt, G.xli.46,53, xlv.11, and died at the age of 110, G.l.22, the Israelites must have lived in all possible comfort in Egypt for at least 70 years—perhaps for 100 or 120 years, E.i.6–8, and so were not 'slaves' and 'afflicted' during a large portion of the 'sojourn in Egypt,' any more than they were in Canaan. In fact, it would seem from E.i.8,15, ii.1–3, that the oppression began *not long* before the birth of Moses, so that, as he was 80 years old at the Exodus, vii.7, it did not last altogether more than 100 or 120 years, instead of 430. And so writes Canon Cook in another place:—

The interval probably extended over 100 years. This coincides very closely with the period required by the Scriptural narrative: some years elapsed before the birth of Moses, 80 years between his birth and the Exodus. *p.* 455.

D. only says that they were oppressed, but does not define the duration of the oppression; only 'in the fourth generation' from their going down to Egypt they should return to Canaan.

It is quite possible that the L.L. may have written originally in xii.40, as Canon Cook supposes, 'the sojourning which they dwelt in Egypt was 430 years,'—by mere inadvertence, not perceiving the incongruities which would thus be introduced into the story—and that the Samaritan copyists and Greek translators felt the difficulties in question, and inserted the words 'in the land of Canaan' in order to obviate them. St. Paul adopts this latter view as correct, Gal.iii.17; but Canon Cook observes:—

The period accepted generally by the Jews in his time sufficed for his purpose; and a discussion upon a point which did not affect his argument would have been out of place. *p.* 302.

However this may be, those difficulties undoubtedly exist, and Canon Cook refers to some of them, *e.g.* the fact that Moses was grandson of Kohath, Levi's son, who went down with Jacob to Egypt, nay, was grandson of Levi himself, through his mother Jochebed, and 'it is clear,' he says, 'that a space of 430 years could not be accounted for in this way,' *p.* 301; and he adds, 'the difficulty appears to be insuperable, even on the hypothesis' of only 215 years in Egypt, since then—

it is necessary to assume that Levi was 95 years old when Jochebed was born, and that Jochebed was 85 years old when she became mother of Moses: this is said

by a commentator of great weight not to be improbable, but it involves two miracles, for which there is no authority in Scripture. p.301.

He quotes also the impossible number of Kohathites as in (55)—see also (27)—and concludes:—

Whether the longer or shorter period be adopted, it is equally necessary either to assume a succession of miracles, or to admit that *an indefinite number of links in the genealogies are omitted*—a fact for which we have positive evidence in the most important of all genealogies, that of our Lord, and in that of Ezra, which therefore there can be no irreverence in assuming in a case where it clears up every difficulty in the narrative. p.302.

Unfortunately for Canon Cook's assertion, it does not 'clear up' the difficulty of supposing that the Amram, Izhar, and Uzziel in E.vi.18 are different persons, separated by 'an indefinite number' of generations from the Amram, Izhar, and Uzziel of v.20-22(27).

Finally, Canon Cook remarks:—

*It may be possible* to reconcile the number of the Israelites at the time of the Exodus with the shorter period. But it certainly is *far more probable* if we accept without any reserve the statement of Moses in this passage, made as it is in the most formal and precise terms, with the express purpose of fixing the length of the sojourn permanently upon the national mind. p.302.

*Ans.* It is simply impossible to reconcile the number in question, *and at the same time the other statements of the narrative*, either with the longer or with the shorter period; and Canon Cook does not attempt to do so; he merely passes off under a cloud of words, as above.

57. v.43. *and the Lord said.*] The following passage, from this verse to v.16 of the next chapter, contains additional instructions regarding the Passover. Such instructions were needed when the Israelites were joined by the 'mixed multitudes' of strangers, and they were probably given at Succoth, on the morning following the departure from Rameses. *The antiquity of this section is admitted by critics of all schools (!)*. p.300.

*Ans.* It is clear that Canon Cook cannot be well acquainted with the results of modern critical enquiry. The section v.43-51 is assigned to the L.L. by GRAF, KUENEN, NÖLDEKE, &c., and is shown to belong to it in (VI.App.94).

In any case it would be strange that these directions should have been given amidst the confusion and excitement of the Exodus itself, when they were not needed for another twelve months, N.ix.1-5, on which occasion some additional directions are given, v.6-14.

Chap.xiii.1,2,17-22(O.S.), 3-16(D.).

58. v.1. The instructions in the first part of this chapter are not necessarily connected with the rest of the narrative; and there may have been special reasons

for adding some of them, together with the grounds for their observance, when the people were preparing for the invasion of Palestine. This might have been before the beginning of their long wandering in the wilderness of Tih, at the same time when Moses sent the spies to explore Canaan. Whether written later or not, this section contains much which must have been orally given at the first celebration of the Passover. p.302.

*Ans.* It is very plain that v.6,7, cannot have been written *after* the full directions for the Feast of Mazzoth in xii.14–20 had been already written. In (VI.209, *App.*96) it is shown that v.1,2, belongs to the O.S. and v.3–16 to D.

59. v.2. In lieu of the firstborn of men the Levites were devoted to the temple services. The consecration of all firstborn is admitted to be peculiar to the Hebrews; nor can any satisfactory reason for such a law be assigned by those who refuse to accept the Scriptural statement, which they admit to be explicit. KNOBEL refutes the theories of other writers. p.302.

*Ans.* Canon Cook might have added that 'in lieu of the firstborn of cattle,' 'instead of all the firstlings among the cattle of the children of Israel,' v.41, the 'Levite cattle' were taken for Jehovah, N.iii.45, and yet the firstlings also are claimed for the priests, N.xviii.15–18—which shows the un-historical character of the narrative.

It is true, KNOBEL says that 'the law of the dedication of the firstborn is peculiar to the Hebrews,' *Ex.* p.128, upon which, most probably, Canon Cook has based his assertion 'the consecration of all firstborn is admitted to be peculiar to the Hebrews.' But, when he goes on to assure his readers that 'KNOBEL refutes the theories of other writers,' it is necessary to observe that this is literally *all* which KNOBEL says by way of such refutation—'Why the firstborns should be a sin-offering (BAUR) is not apparent: see *contra* SCHOLL. Also the assumption (GEORGE), that the offering of the firstborns belongs to the Passover festival, is without foundation.'

It is certain, however, that the custom of passing-over (הַעֲבִיר), *i.e.* 'sacrificing,' firstborns of men, as well as cattle, was common among the Canaanites and neighbouring nations, from whom, perhaps the Israelites adopted it, Ez.xx.26, and these offerings were probably made at the spring-festival, and hence may have been derived its name of *pesach*, 'pass-over,' from פָּסַח = עָבַר (50): see this subject fully considered in (VI.367–374). It is to be regretted that the marginal reading in v.12, *viz.* 'cause to pass over,' is not employed in the text, though Canon Cook observes:—

The sense is correctly expressed in the text, 'thou shalt *set apart*,' which follows the Old Versions, and is preferable to the marginal rendering, which suggests a reference to the word 'Passover.' p.303.

60. v.9. They were to keep all the facts of the Passover constantly in mind,

and, 'referring to a custom prevalent ages before Moses in Egypt, to have them present, as though they were inscribed on papyrus or parchment, fastened on the wrists or on the face between the eyes. It is improbable that Moses should have adopted that custom, which was scarcely separable from the Egyptian superstition of amulets; but modern Israelites generally allege this precept as a justification for the use of phylacteries. p.303.

*Ans.* No doubt, the language in v.9,16, is used by D. metaphorically, as in D.vi.8, xi.18. But in N.xv.37-40 'fringes' are ordered by Jehovah to be made 'in the borders of their garments' for a similar purpose; and it is difficult to see why Moses should have hesitated to adopt this custom, if so many others (*Intr. to Ex.* 21) were adopted under like Divine authority, which 'were scarcely separable from the Egyptian superstitions.'

61. v.13. *an ass.*] Possibly the only unclean animal domesticated among the Israelites at the time of the Exodus. . . The mention of the ass only would scarcely have occurred to an Israelite of a later age. p.303.

*Ans.* Inasmuch as 'horses and camels' are mentioned familiarly among the cattle of the Egyptians in E.ix.3, there would be no reason, if the narrative were historical, why these animals also should not have been 'domesticated among the Israelites at the time of the Exodus.' But, in point of fact, the 'ass' was the only—or at least the chief—animal of this kind used among the Hebrews down to the time of Solomon, as appears from 1S.viii.16, xii.3, xxv.18,20, 2S.xvi.1,2, xvii.23, xix.26, 1K.ii.40, *comp.* E.xxi.33, xxii.4,9,10, xxiii.4,5,12, written in the age of Saul or David. In the time of D., no doubt, horses were not uncommon, D.xvii.16; but they were most probably only possessed by the wealthy or used for purposes of war.\* The beast for the common people was still the ass, *comp.* Is.i.3, xxxii.20, Jer.xxii.19, Zech.ix.9, 2Ch.xxviii.15; and they were always far more plentiful than horses, Neh.vii.68,69 (6720 asses, 736 horses), xiii.15, and thus are taken as the type of unclean domestic animals in this passage, *comp.* E.xx.17(D.), D.v.14,21, xxii.3,4,10, xxviii.31.

62. v.17-19. These verses do not appear to be a continuation of the narrative, which is resumed at v.20. It is not improbable that some short time was passed at Succoth, and that Moses then gave final injunctions touching the celebration of the Passover, and received general instructions as to the ultimate direction of the journey. p.304.

*Ans.* These verses form part of the O.S., and continue the narrative from v.1,2, except that the original directions for the Feast of Mazzoth appear to have been struck out and replaced by those in v.3-10 from the hand of

---

\* Canon Cook says that 'the Egyptian word for horse, which corresponds exactly to the Hebrew, always designates the swift, high-bred horses used for the war-cars of nobles.' p.311.



D., who has also in v.11-16 expanded the brief command in v.2 (VI.ch.xii, note 15).

It is most 'improbable' that, in the bustle of the Exodus, Moses should have 'given final injunctions' at Succoth about the *next year's* Passover.

63. v.17. *the way of the land of the Philistines.*] The occupancy of southern Palestine by the Philistines, at a much earlier period than is assigned by any critics to the Exodus, is attested by the narrative in G.xxvi.1. p.304.

*Ans.* Canon Cook's reasoning here is fallacious. How can the fact in question be 'attested' by G.xxvi.1, if that passage was written not earlier than the time of David, as almost all modern critics maintain?

64. v.18. *harnessed.*] The objection (grounded on the rendering in our version), that the Israelites were not likely to have been armed, is *unreasonable*. There is not the least indication that they were disarmed by the Egyptians; and, as occupying a frontier district frequently assailed by the nomads of the desert, they would of necessity be accustomed to the use of arms. The fear expressed by Pharaoh (i.10), that they might at any time join the invaders and fight against Egypt, was the avowed and doubtless the true motive for the crafty measures by which he hoped to subdue their spirit and prevent their increase. p.304.

*Ans.* It is 'unreasonable' to suppose that when Pharaoh 'hoped to subdue their spirit,' and 'made their lives bitter with hard bondage,' and ordered all their male children to be drowned, for fear that they 'might at any time join the invaders and fight against Egypt,' he yet allowed them to be armed—nay, to get 'accustomed to the use of arms'! Truly this is a bold assertion.

65. v.18. The promptitude with which so vast a multitude was marshalled and led forth justifies admiration, but is not marvellous, nor without parallels in ancient and modern history (see Introduction). p.305.

*Ans.* I suppose that Canon Cook intended to give such 'parallels in ancient and modern history' in the 'Introduction'; but I can find no trace of any, and I venture to doubt if any such can be produced, where a population of two or three millions, nearly as large as that of London, men, women, and children of all ages,—

the encampment of the great host of Israel extending over many miles, p.307,— were 'marshalled and led forth,' in the middle of the night, in perfect order, whatever previous arrangements may have been made to facilitate the movement. Yet Canon Cook can boldly write the above with the details of the Franco-Prussian War fresh in his memory, and full knowledge of the difficulties attending the movement even of a disciplined army of two or three hundred thousand full-grown men, without women and children!

66. v.20. *Succoth.*] Succoth may very probably have been the head-quarters of the Hebrews in Goshen. The name in Hebrew indicates an assemblage of booths or moveable huts, *such as were probably used by the Israelites, ever mindful of their condition as sojourners in a strange land.* p.304.

The name Succoth may have been given by the Israelites; but the same or a similar word occurs in Egyptian in connection with the district. Thus we find an officer of state in possession of a domain called Sechet or Sochet, in the time of Chufu. That domain was certainly in Lower Egypt, and probably at no great distance from Memphis. p.299.

*Ans.* However this may be, as to the origin of the name Succoth, it seems the height of absurdity to suppose that the Israelites lived—Canon Cook supposes, for 430 years!—in booths or huts, as being ‘ever mindful of their condition as sojourners in a strange land.’ What, then, were the ‘houses,’ with ‘lintel’ and ‘side-posts,’ in xii.22,23,27?

#### Chap.xiv.1-7,9-31(O.S.), 8(L.L.).

67. v.11. *because there were no graves in Egypt, hast thou taken us away to die in the wilderness?*] This bitter taunt was probably suggested by the vast extent of cemeteries in Egypt, which might not improperly be called the land of tombs. *It would scarcely have been imagined by one who had not dwelt there.* p.308.

*Ans.* The argument here seems little short of puerile.

68. v.22. *were a wall unto them.*] The waters *served the purpose of an intrenchment and wall*; the people could not be attacked on either flank during the transit; to the north was the water covering the whole district; to the south was the Red Sea. For the idiom *comp.* Nah.iii.8.

*Ans.* It is plain from J.iii.13,16, where the waters of the Jordan ‘stand upon an heap’ on the side up the stream, while the people cross on dry ground in the midst of the river, that the above is *not* the meaning of the passage before us, where the waters of the Red Sea are driven apart by the violent wind so as to form a wall on each side of the crossing host, *comp.* ‘the floods stood upright as a heap,’ xv.8, and are not supposed merely to act *metaphorically* as a wall, by being stretched out as a broad expanse of shallow water, and so keeping off the Egyptians. See (74) below.

69. v.23. *the Egyptians pursued.*] The Egyptians might be aware that under ordinary circumstances there would be abundant time for the passage of the chariots and cavalry, of which the force chiefly consisted. p.309.

*Ans.* The writer seems merely to mean that the Egyptians followed on heedlessly, assuming that, where the Israelites had gone safely, they might go also.

70. v.26. *that the waters may come.*] A sudden cessation of the wind at sunrise coinciding with a spring-tide (it was full moon) would *immediately* convert the low

flat sand-banks first into a quicksand, and then into a mass of waters, *in a time far less than would suffice for the escape of a single chariot*, or horseman loaded with heavy corselet. p.309.

*Ans.* The above rationalistic attempt to explain the way in which this miracle was wrought not only contradicts the obvious meaning of the story (75), but does not even bring it within the bounds of credibility as a *natural* occurrence, that the waters returned so suddenly over 'the low flat sandbanks,' when the wind dropped, that 'not so much as one' of the Egyptians escaped:—

The statement is explicit, all the chariots and horsemen and that portion of the infantry which followed them into the bed of the sea. p.309.

### Chap.xv.1-25<sup>a</sup>,27(O.S.), 25<sup>b</sup>,26(D.).

71. v.1. This magnificent hymn is said to have been sung by Moses and the people, an expression which evidently points to him as its author. That it was written at the time is an assertion expressly made in the text, and it is supported by the strongest internal evidence. The style is admitted, even by critics who question its genuineness, to be archaic, both in the language, which is equally remarkable for grandeur and severe simplicity, and in the general structure, which, though rhythmical and systematic, differs materially from later compositions, in which the divisions are more numerous and the arrangement more elaborate. *The subject-matter and the leading thoughts are such as belong to the time and the occasion*; unlike the imitations in the later Psalms, *the Song abounds in allusions to incidents passing under the eye of the composer*; it has every mark of freshness and originality. The only objections are founded on the prophetic portion, v. 15-17. But, if ever there was a crisis calculated to elicit the spirit of prophecy, it was that of the Exodus, if ever a man fitted to express that spirit, it was Moses. Even *objectors* admit that the invasion of Palestine was contemplated by Moses. If so, what more natural than that after *the great catastrophe, which they accept as an historical fact*, he should anticipate the terror of the nations through whose territories the Israelites would pass, and whose destruction was an inevitable condition of their success? p.310.

*Ans.* Canon Cook, certainly, might not unreasonably expect that 'objectors,' who 'accept this great catastrophe as an historical fact,' should not dispute the Mosaic authorship of this Song. In (VI. *App* 99) it is shown that this Song belongs to the Jehovist in David's age, which explains its 'archaic' character, 'severe simplicity,' &c. It seems to have been composed upon the *thema* of Miriam's Song in v.21, which is quoted in its first words (VI.210). Canon Cook says:—

All the words which describe the fall of the mailed warriors of Egypt are such as one who actually witnessed their overthrow would naturally employ. . . . They

must have sunk at once like a stone, *v.5*, or, as we read in *v.10*, like lumps of lead. Touches like these come naturally from an eye-witness. *p.311*.

But surely there is no reason why 'Lays of Ancient Israel' should not have been written, whose 'subject-matter and leading thoughts are such as belong to the time and the occasion,' and 'abounding in allusions to incidents passing under the *mind's* eye of the composer,' without any need for our supposing that Pharaoh's chosen captains 'may have been for the most part personally known' to him, *p.311*. If the Song had been shown to be Mosaic, we might admit its prophetic character in those expressions of *v.15-17*, which now help us to determine the age of its composition 'in the age of David' (VI.491).

72. *v.2*. The form of the word 'song' in Hebrew is archaic. *p.311*.

*Ans.* There is nothing 'archaic' in the form of the word זִמְרָה: KALISCH, *Ex. p.263*, quotes several words of the same form, and adds, 'All these words are *poetical*, and the corresponding forms in ה are used in prose.'

73. *v.6. is become glorious.*] The translation is correct, but inadequately represents the force and beauty (!) of the Hebrew word, which is archaic in form and usage. *p.311*.

*Ans.* The verb (אָרַךְ) occurs twice (*Niph.*) in this passage, *v.6,11*, and once (*Hiph.*) in the later Isaiah, Is.xlii.21: there is not the least sign of its being 'archaic': see the corresponding noun (אָרָךְ) in Zech.xi.13, Mic.ii.8, and אָרַךְ in Zech.xi.3, Ez.xvii.8.

74. *v.8. And with the wind of Thy nostrils the waters were piled; the floods stood as a heap, the depths were congealed in the heart of the sea.*] This description has been strangely misrepresented, as though it were irreconcilable with the preceding narrative. It differs from that as lyric poetry differs in its imagery from prose; and, as inspired poetry, it brings us into contact with the hidden and effectual causes of the natural phenomena which it still distinctly recognizes. The blast of God's nostrils corresponds to the natural agency, the east wind, *xiv.21*, which drove the waters back. On each side the Psalmist describes what he must actually have seen—on the north the waters rising high, overhanging the sands, but kept back by the strong wind, on the south lying in massive rollers, kept down by the same agency, in the heart or deep bed of the Red Sea. *p.312*.

*Ans.* This description is only 'irreconcilable' with Canon COOK's own rationalistic explanation of the miracle (68). The writer evidently means to say that the waters were 'piled' by the effect of the wind; they stood up 'congealed' or hardened so as to form 'walls,' *xiv.29*, in the very middle of the sea.

75. *v.8. as an heap.*] The LXX render this 'as a wall.' The Hebrew word probably means 'a dam.' It corresponds to wall, *xiv.22*.

*Ans.* The Hebrew word (הַיָּבֵשׁ) means simply 'heap'—see 'heap' of grain, Is.xvii.11, and so we read in Ps.xxxiii.7, 'He gathereth the waters of the sea together as an heap, He layeth up the depth in store-houses.' The word is only used elsewhere in Ps.lxxviii.13 with reference to this passage in Exodus, and in J.iii.13,16, with reference to the waters of the Jordan 'rising up and standing upon an heap.' This last passage distinctly contradicts Canon Cook's rationalistic explanation of this miracle (68), as having been caused by the 'sudden cessation of the wind at sunrise,' when the spring-tide immediately overflowed 'the treacherous sandbanks,' p.312, over which the Israelites had passed just before, as the Bible says, 'on dry ground through the midst of the sea,' xiv.16,21,22,29. A 'quicksand,' just drained, would have been something very different from 'dry ground,' and very wearisome for the people to march on, which clearly is not what the Text intends. It is plain that the writer supposes the Egyptians to be overwhelmed just exactly as they would have been if they had followed the Israelites into the dry bed of the Jordan, and the piled-up waters had come down suddenly upon them.

76. v.10. *Thou didst blow with Thy wind.*] It is important to observe that Moses here states distinctly the natural agency by which the destruction was effected. In the direct narrative (xiv.28) we read only 'the waters returned'; here we are told that it was because the wind blew. A sudden change in the direction of the wind would bring back at once the masses of water heaped up on the north. If the tide rose at the same time, the waters of the Red Sea would meet and overwhelm the host: but this is not said, and the Egyptians, who were close observers of natural phenomena, would probably have been aware of the danger of attempting the passage *had flood-time been near at hand*. One cause is assigned, and it suffices for the effect. p.312.

*Ans.* Canon Cook has just assumed that there was a 'spring-tide' at the very time when the Egyptians were crossing (70), which helped to produce the catastrophe. No doubt, the writer's language here, 'Thou didst blow with Thy wind, &c.,' supplies another feature to the narrative in xiv.27,28, which would hardly have omitted this 'wind,' if relating *true*, and not imaginary, history. Nor, indeed, is it quite clear what the writer here supposes; since a strong *west* wind would have divided the sea quite as well as a strong *east* wind, and a strong *north* or *south* wind would not have helped to bring down upon the Egyptians *both* the 'walls' of water.

77. v.13. *Thou hast guided them in Thy strength to Thy holy habitation.*] Two objections are made to this as indicating a later origin—(i) the use of the past tense; but Moses naturally and correctly speaks of the guidance as already begun; God had redeemed the Israelites, and placed them in the way towards Canaan—(ii) the words 'Thy holy habitation' are supposed to refer to the temple at

Jerusalem. It would not, however, be an unsuitable designation for Palestine regarded as the land of promise, &c. It is clear that no Hebrew writing before the time of Solomon would have introduced a reference to the temple. p.313.

*Ans.* We assign this Song to a writer of David's age (VI.491): the expression 'holy habitation' may allude to the tabernacle on Mount Zion, but most probably refers to the land of Israel.

78. v.14. *the inhabitants of Palestina.*] In Hebrew *Pelasheth*, i.e. the country of the Philistines. . . . It is obvious that the order of thoughts would have been very different had the Song been composed at a later period; since in fact *Philistia was the last district occupied by the Israelites.* p.313.

*Ans.* It is curious that in 2S.viii.1 the very *first* notice in the list of David's conquests is 'David smote the Philistines and subdued them.'

79. v.16. *till Thy people pass-over, Jehovah, till the people pass-over, which Thou hast purchased.*] An objection is taken by some critics to the expression 'pass-over' as applying specially to the passage over Jordan. The prophecy was doubtless then fulfilled; but *that event could not have been in the mind of Moses, since he expected that the entrance would be by the southern frontier*; and the term which he uses would be equally applicable to any passing over the physical barriers of Canaan. Had, indeed, the Song been composed after that passage, it is scarcely possible that some allusion would not have been made to the resemblance between the two miracles. p.313.

*Ans.* It is obvious that the above expressions in the Song agree thoroughly with the view that it was subsequently inserted, having been written in the age of David, upon the *thema* in v.21, by one who had before him the O.S. of the Exodus, including the account of the passage of the Jordan, and had perhaps taken a part in writing that narrative. Why should any more definite 'allusion' have been made to 'the resemblance between the two miracles'?

80. v.17. *in the mountain of Thine inheritance.*] The expressions in this verse, especially the word 'Sanctuary,' are in favour of the explanation given in the latter part of the note on v.13, viz. that Moses had Mount Moriah in his mind, whether in remembrance of Abraham's offering, or as the result of an immediate inspiration. But some critics consider that Palestine is meant. p.314.

*Ans.* Either Palestine is meant, 'that goodly mountain,' D.iii.25, or an actual mountain on which Jehovah had prepared for Himself a Sanctuary, i.e. Mount Zion, whither the Ark had been brought when this Song was written in David's time, 2S.vi (VI.491).

81. v.19. *For the horse, &c.*] This verse does not belong to the hymn, but marks the transition from it to the narrative. Writers, who attribute different portions of the book to various authors, consider that it belongs to the original

composition. It is, however, obviously a summary statement of the cause and subject-matter of the preceding hymn and, as such, assumes its existence. p.314.

*Ans.* The Song manifestly ends with v.18, and v.19 only 'belongs to the original composition' in the sense of its having been appended to it by its author to explain the 'cause and subject-matter' of his poem, which manifestly formed no part of the Original Narrative.

82. v.20. and *Miriam.*] The men are represented as singing the hymn in chorus, under the guidance of Moses. At each interval Miriam and the women sang the refrain, marking the time with the timbrel, and with the measured rhythmical movements always associated with solemn festivities. p.314.

*Ans.* It is not said in v.21 that '*Miriam and the other women* answered them (the *men*),' but that '*Miriam answered them (the other women),*' מִרְיָם לְיָהוָה for יְהוָה לְיָהוָה, as in i.21, G.xxxi.9, xxxii.16, xli.23. It is plain that v.20,21, contained the original notice, for which the Song was afterwards substituted.

83. v.20. *the prophetess.*] Miriam is called a prophetess, evidently (N.xii.2) because she and Aaron had received Divine communications. . . . She is called the sister of Aaron, most probably to indicate her special position, as coordinate not with Moses the leader of the nation, but with his chief aid and instrument. It is evident, however, that this designation, most natural in the mouth of Moses, who would be careful to record the names of his brother and sister on such an occasion, was not likely to have been applied to Miriam by a later writer. p.314.

*Ans.* The expression 'prophetess' is probably used of Miriam in this passage very much in the same sense as that in which it is used in 1S.x.5, 10-12, xix.20,24, where it seems to imply *psalmists* or *choristers*, who were supposed to compose or chant under Divine inspiration, comp. 1Ch.xxv.1,2,3. Perhaps Miriam was regarded in the O.S. as sister of Aaron, but only half-sister of Moses, who is clearly meant to be the first child of his mother in E.ii.1,2, whereas Miriam—if the 'sister' in v.4,7—was already a young girl (6).

### Chap.xvi.1<sup>a</sup>(O.S.), 1<sup>b</sup>-36(L.L.).

84. v 2. *murmured.*] The want of food was first felt after six weeks from the time of the departure from Egypt. We have no notice previously of any deficiency of bread. p.316.

*Ans.* Yet how did these two or three millions of people get supplies of bread during these six weeks?—for they could not have carried them from Egypt. Moreover, '33 geographical miles' of their march, before they came to this 'wilderness of Sin,' lay through a region which Canon Cook thus describes :—

The whole district is a tract of sand or rough gravel, the wadys are depressions in the desert, with only a few scattered herbs and shrubs, withered and parched by drought; the road afterwards continues through hills of limestone equally destitute of vegetation, some exhibiting an abundance of crystallized sulphate of lime. p.315.

During these six weeks, at all events, they had no 'supernatural supply,' in addition to the 'milk, cheese, and limited supply of flesh,' p.320, which they derived from their flocks and herds—how supported does not appear. Yet says Canon Cook:—

Without such a supply the vast host of the Israelites could not have subsisted for a considerable time in *any* part of the Peninsula. p.316.

85. v.13. *the dew lay round.*] There are many indications that *the season was unusually humid*, natural agencies concurring with supernatural interpositions. Manna is found in abundance in wet seasons; in dry seasons it ceases altogether. p.318.

*Ans.* Canon Cook gives no reference to these 'many indications that the season was unusually humid.' But the Israelites were fed with manna for forty years, E.xvi.35.

86. v.15. *it is manna.*] This rendering is disputed. The Old Versions concur in rendering the phrase, 'What is this?' But oriental scholars are generally agreed that this explanation is not borne out by *ancient* usage, and that the Israelites said, 'This is *man*.' The word 'man' they explain by reference to the Arabic, in which it means 'gift.' The Egyptian language seems to afford the true solution. p.318.

𐤎 is the Chaldaic form for מַה, 'what?'; but there is no vestige of the use in the *ancient* language. p.321.

*Ans.* This passage belongs to the L.L. (VI.App.101), which might very well use an Aramæan form to explain the origin of the name 'manna.' The O.S. in N.xi.4-9 does not attempt to explain the origin of the name. KALISCH, KEIL, and probably other 'oriental scholars,' agree in adopting the rendering 'What is this?', in accordance with all the Ancient Versions.

87. v.16. *an omer.*] The word 'omer,' in this sense, occurs in no other passage. It was probably not used at a later period, belonging, like many other words, to the time of Moses. It is found in old Egyptian, but with the meaning 'storehouse.' p.318.

*Ans.* Probably 'omer' was an ancient word, which the writer (L.L.) here uses, but, as it was obsolete in his time, takes care to explain in v.36. It would be possible, of course, for one, who ascribed this chapter to Moses, to hold that v.36 must have been inserted by a *later* hand. But it is surely extravagant to argue, as (Canon Cook says) it has been argued,—



that Moses, as a legislator, would be careful to define what was probably a *new* measure, p.320,—

when he might just as well have used throughout the name of an *old* measure in speaking to the Israelites. And, in fact, Canon Cook himself maintains that 'omer' was an Egyptian word, and therefore it must have been well known to them in Egypt.

88. v.18. *had nothing over.*] The result is undoubtedly represented as miraculous. The Jewish interpreters understand by this statement that, whatever quantity each person had gathered, when he measured it in his tent, he found that he had just as many omers as he needed for the consumption of his family: and this is probably the true meaning. p.318.

*Ans.* Thus Canon Cook supposes a meaningless miracle to be wrought—apparently daily (except on sabbaths) for the whole forty years. At all events, it is difficult to see how this particular miracle can have 'formed some part, so to speak, of an educational process.' p.320.

89. v.22. From this passage and from v.5 it is inferred that the seventh day was previously known to the people as a day separate from all others; and, if so, it must have been observed as an ancient and primeval institution. No other account of the command (given without any special explanation), or of the conduct of the people who collected the manna, is satisfactory. It is at the same time evident that Moses took this opportunity of enforcing a strict and more solemn observance of the day. p.319.

v.25. *eat that to-day.*] The practical observance of the Sabbath was thus formally instituted before the giving of the law. The people were to abstain from the ordinary work of everyday life; they were not to collect food nor, as it would seem, even to prepare it as on other days. p.319.

v.27. *there went out some of the people.*] This was an act of wilful disobedience. It is remarkable, being the first violation of the express command, that it was not visited by a signal chastisement: the rest and peace of the 'Holy Sabbath' were not disturbed by a manifestation of wrath. p.319.

*Ans.* The whole is perfectly intelligible when we know that this section, v.2-36, is a later insertion of the L.L. (VI.211-2).

90. v.32. *fill an omer.*] This was probably done at the end of the first week. But the order to Aaron may have been repeated when the tabernacle was fitted up with its appurtenances. p.320.

*Ans.* The L.L. inadvertently makes Moses in v.33 direct Aaron, as if he were High-Priest, to lay up a pot of manna 'before the Lord,' *i.e.* before the Ark in the Tabernacle, N.xvii.7,9, when as yet not a word has been said about Ark, Tabernacle, or Priesthood.

91. v.35. *did eat manna forty years.*] This does not necessarily imply that the Israelites were fed exclusively on manna, or that the supply was continuous during

forty years, but that, whenever it might be needed, owing to the total or partial failure of other food, it was given until they entered the promised land. They had numerous flocks and herds which were not slaughtered (N.xi.22), but which gave them milk, cheese, and, of course, a limited supply of flesh. Nor is there any reason to suppose that during a considerable part of that time they may not have cultivated some spots of fertile ground in the wilderness. We may assume, as in most cases of miracle, that the supernatural supply was commensurate with their actual necessity. Moses gives a complete history of manna till the end of his own life. The manna was not withheld, in fact, until the Israelites had passed the Jordan. Moses writes as a historian, not as a prophet. What he knew as a fact was, that it lasted till he penned this passage. A later writer would have been more specific. *p.* 320.

*Ans.* It may be doubted if the O.S. meant the Israelites to be supported chiefly, if not wholly, on manna in the wilderness. It speaks of it only twice, N.xi.6-9, xxi.5, and says nothing about their feeding on it for forty years, finding it every day (except sabbaths) in prodigious quantities, from *four to six millions* of pounds *daily*, whereas the present whole *yearly* produce is from *five to seven hundred* pounds—all which is due to L.L. (VI.ch.xiii. note 43).

But, however this may be, the notice in *v.* 35 could hardly have been written by Moses: it clearly implies that the Israelites had *ceased* to eat manna at the time when it was written, which was not till after the death of Moses, J.v.12, between which verse and this there is no substantial difference.

92. *v.* 35. The manna of the Peninsula of Sinai is the sweet juice of the Tarfa, a species of tamarisk [see VI.ch.xiii, note 43]. The resemblance in colour, shape, taste, and in the time and place of the appearance, is exact. The name is also that now given to the product, well known as its Arabic designation. . . . The differences, however, are equally unmistakable.

(i) The manna of Exodus was not found under the tamarisk tree, but on the surface of the wilderness, after the disappearance of the morning dew.

(ii) The quantity which was gathered *in a single day* far exceeded [ten thousand times (91)] the *annual* produce at present, and probably at the time of Moses.

(iii) The supply ceased on the Sabbath-day.

(iv) The properties differed from common manna; it could be ground, baked, and in other respects treated like meal.

(v) It was found after leaving the district where it is now produced, until the Israelites reached the land of Canaan. . . .

The local colouring is unmistakable. We may not attempt to give an explanation how the change was effected: to such a question we have but to answer that we know nothing. One thing certain is that, *if Moses wrote this narrative*, it is impossible that he could be deceived, and equally impossible that he could have

deceived contemporaries and eyewitnesses. As for ourselves, we must be content to bear the reproach that we are satisfied with a reference to the Almightyness of Jehovah, in which alone faith finds any explanation of the mystery of the universe. p.321.

*Ans.* Some of the above-named differences arise probably from imperfect acquaintance on the part of the writer with the manna of the Peninsula. But, 'if Moses did *not* write this narrative,' we are relieved from the necessity of submitting our faith to such a tremendous stress as on Canon Cook's view would be necessary.

Chap.xvii.1-13,15,16(O.S.), except, v.6, 'in Horeb,' 14(D.).

93. v.7. The names [Massah, Meribah] were retained from this time, nor are Rephidim and *Kadesh mentioned by later writers*; they belong to the time of Moses. p.322.

*Ans.* The 'waters of Meribah-Kadesh' are mentioned in Ez.xlvii.19, xlviii.28, evidently with reference to the story in N.xx.2-13(L.L.).

94. v.8. *Then came Amalek.*] It may be conjectured that reports of the marvellous supply of water may have reached the natives and accelerated their movements. p.323.

*Ans.* The writer of the O.S. in David's time may very reasonably have imagined an attack by the Amalekites on Israel, more especially when we consider the hostility of Samuel towards them (arising probably from motives of policy), which is evinced by the narrative in 1S.xv. But the conjecture that they had heard of the miraculous supply of water, which would show that the Israelites were under the protection of a powerful Deity, is hardly sagacious.

95. v.9. *Joshua.*] His original name was Hosea; but Moses calls him by the full name, which was first given him about forty years afterwards, as that by which he was to be known to succeeding generations. From this it may perhaps be inferred that this portion of Exodus was *written or revised towards the end of the sojourn in the wilderness*. A later writer, mindful of the change of name, would probably have avoided the appearance of an anachronism. p.323.

*Ans.* Canon Cook's somewhat extravagant theory is set aside by the fact that N.xiii.16, D.xxxii.44, where 'Hosea' is mentioned, belong to the L.L. (VI.93,129). The Jehovist names him throughout 'Joshua,' and might have done so, even if the name 'Jehovah' had not been already revealed in E.vi.2-5, since he supposes it known from the earliest times.

96. v.9. The hill, on which Moses stood during the combat, KNOBEL supposed to be the height now called Fera, on the north of the plain Er-Rahah: on its top is a level track with good pasturage and plantations. The conjecture may

show the vivid impression of reality made by the narrative upon a critic who believes this very portion to be a product of a later age. *p.323.*

*Ans.* The above remark 'may show' on how very slight foundations Canon Cook is content to rest his belief in the historical 'reality' of the story of the Exodus.

97. *v.14. in a book.]* It should be rendered '*in the book.*' The plain and obvious meaning is, that the account of the battle and of the command to destroy the Amalekites was to be recorded in the book, which contained the history of God's dealings with His people. In this explanation nearly all critics are agreed. See *Intr. to Pent. p.324.*

*Ans.* See (*Intr. to Pent. li*) for the reply to the above, and *comp. N.v.23, D.xvii.18, J.xviii.9, 1S.x.25, Is.xxx.8, Jer.xxxii.10, Job xix.23,* for similar expressions. So the LXX has here  $\epsilon\nu\ \beta\iota\beta\lambda\iota\omicron\nu$ , reading  $\beta\epsilon\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\tau$ , 'in a book,' not  $\beta\epsilon\tau\epsilon\tau$ , 'in the book.'

98. *v.14.* The work was not actually completed until the reign of Hezekiah, when 500 of the tribe of Simeon 'smote the rest of the Amalekites that were escaped,' and retained possession of Mount Seir, when the book of Chronicles was written, 1Ch.iv.43. This is a point to be especially noticed. True prophecy deals often with the remote future, regardless of delays in its fulfilment. But certainly no one writing at a later time, while the Amalekites still existed as a nation, would have invented the prediction. *p.324.*

*Ans.* There is no prediction in the O.S., only a declaration that Jehovah—*i.e.* Israel in Jehovah's name—would have perpetual war with Amalek, *v.16*, which might have been written very well in David's time, when the Israelites still had war with the Amalekites, 2S.viii.12. In the time of D. they no longer 'existed as a nation,' and therefore the writer might well 'have invented the prediction' in *v.14, comp. D.xxv.17-19,* and see (VL388) for an explanation of the probable connection of this passage with the preceding context in *v.13-16.*

See also (V.*App.i.11-18*), where it is shown that 1Ch.iv.39-43 probably refers to a migration of the Simeonites during the reign of David, *comp. v.31,* and that the 'remnant of the Amalekites who escaped,' and who were slain by the 500 Simeonites, were the 400 Amalekites who 'escaped' from David's pursuit after the sack of Ziklag, 1S.xxx.17.

99. *v.16. because the Lord hath sworn.]* This rendering is incorrect; but the Hebrew is obscure, and the true meaning is very doubtful. As the Hebrew text now stands, the literal interpretation is 'for hand on throne of Jah,' which may mean 'because his hand (*i.e.* the hand of Amalek) is against the throne of God, therefore, &c. ;' and this on the whole seems to be the most satisfactory explanation. It expresses a certain fact, and keeps most closely to the Hebrew. The word rendered throne occurs in the exact form in no other passage; but it may be

an *archaic* form of the very common word from which it differs but slightly (כס for כסס), and which is found in the Samaritan.

An alteration, slight in form, but considerable in meaning, has been proposed with much confidence, *viz. nes* (נס), 'standard,' for *kes* (כס), thus connecting the name of the altar with the sentence. But conjectural emendations are not to be adopted without necessity; and the obvious *a priori* probability of such a reading makes it improbable that one so far more difficult should have been substituted for it. One of the surest canons of criticism militates against its reception. The text as it stands was undoubtedly that which was alone known to the Targumists, the Samaritan, Syriac, Latin, and Arabic translators. The LXX appear to have had a different reading, *ἐν χειρὶ κρυφαίᾳ πολεμεῖ*.

*Ans.* The LXX rendering implies some uncertainty in the reading. Probably כס, rejected by Canon Cook, but approved by KNOBEL, and many other eminent commentators, is the true reading—Moses built an altar and called its name *Jehovah-Nissi* (Jehovah is my banner), and said, The hand on the banner of Jah! War for Jehovah with Amalek from generation to generation!

#### Chap. xviii. 1–27 (O.S.).

100. v. 11. *Greater than all gods.*] This does not prove that Jethro recognized the existence or power of other Deities, for the expression is not uncommon in the mouth of Hebrew monotheists. . . . It simply indicates a conviction of the incomprehensible might and majesty of Jehovah. p. 326.

*Ans.* The writer in David's age, no doubt, recognized the existence of the tutelary deities of other nations, as well as of Jehovah the God of Israel, who was 'greater than all gods' (17).

101. v. 13. In the following passage the change in the organization of the people . . . is attributed entirely to the counsel of Jethro. This is important for several reasons. *It is certain that no late writer would have invented such a story,* and most improbable that tradition would have long preserved the memory of a transaction which to Israelites might naturally seem derogatory to their legislator. Nothing, however, can be more characteristic of Moses, who combines on all occasions distrust of himself and singular openness to impressions with the wisdom and sound judgment which chooses the best course when pointed out. p. 326.

*Ans.* Canon Cook's mere assertion, 'it is certain, &c.,' advanced without a reason, can only be as distinctly contradicted. In D. i. 9, &c., Moses speaks of himself as having *of his own accord* proposed this organization to the people, and carried it out on their approval, 'leaving the selection of the persons' to them. p. 327. In the passage before us, he does it by Jethro's advice, without consulting the people. Of course, it is possible to 'reconcile' the two accounts, by supposing corresponding *omissions* in both cases.

But it is not so easy to explain why Moses confounds together in Di.9-18 the two accounts in E.xviii, and N.xi, as exhibited fully in (VI.325).

102. v.13. *From the morning unto the evening.*] It may be assumed as at least probable that numerous cases of difficulty arose out of the division of the spoil of the Amalekites (!).

*Ans.* One would have supposed that a single magistrate for a population as large as that of LONDON would be likely to find plenty of work on his hands, without having recourse to so farfetched a supposition.

103. v.15. *to inquire of God.*] The decisions of Moses were doubtless accepted by the people as oracles. There is no reason to suppose that he consulted, or that the people expected him to consult, the Lord by Urim and Thummim, which are first mentioned in xxviii.30. p.326.

*Ans.* Probably the writer in David's age supposed Moses to consult, not the 'Urim and Thummim' of xxviii.30, but some kindred object, e.g. a symbolical figure, fixed in a portable ephod, comp. 1S.xxi.9, xxiii.6,9, xxx.7 (VI.408).

104. v.21. With the usual care observed by Moses in relating the words of pious Gentiles, Jethro is represented as using the general expression God, not the revealed name Jehovah. p.327.

*Ans.* Yet, strangely enough, Jethro uses 'Jehovah' in v.10,11, and Moses uses 'Elohim' in v.15,16, and the historian (Moses also, according to Canon Cook), uses 'Elohim' in v.1,12,12.

According to our view, this section was written by the Jehovist in an earlier stage of his literary activity, when he began to use 'Jehovah' more freely, but still employed 'Elohim' frequently (VI.308-9).

105. v.23. *and all this people shall also go to their place in peace.*] 'To their place,' i.e. to Canaan, which is thus recognized by Jethro as the appointed and true home of Israel. p.327.

*Ans.* The meaning seems to be merely that they should go home from the tribunals to their tents, and not wait about wearily day after day for their causes to be heard.

Chap.xix.1,20-25(L.L.), 2,3<sup>a</sup>,9<sup>a</sup>,10-19(O.S.), 3<sup>b</sup>-8,9<sup>b</sup>(D.).

106. v.3. *house of Jacob.*] This expression does not occur elsewhere in the Pentateuch. It has a peculiar fitness here, referring doubtless to the special promises made to the Patriarch. p.328.

*Ans.* It would be very strange if Moses used the expression here, and never used it again. But v.3<sup>b</sup>-8 is a Deuteronomistic insertion (VI.App. 105), and see Jer.ii.4, v.20, comp. D xxxii.9, it being remembered that we regard the Deuteronomist as very possibly identical with Jeremiah.

107. v.13. *when the trumpet soundeth, they shall come up to the mount.*] When the trumpet sounded, those who were *especially called* might ascend. p.329.

• *Ans.* Clearly it is meant that the *people* should draw near, in order, no doubt, to hear the words of God; and, accordingly, when the trumpet sounds, Moses brings them near, v.17; but, at hearing the 'voice' of God, v.19, *i.e.* the terrible thundering, they 'removed and stood afar off,' xx. 18,21, and desired that Moses might act as mediator, v.19.

108. v.22. *the priests also.*] The Levitical priesthood was not yet instituted, but sacrifices had hitherto been offered by persons who were recognized as having right or authority. According to the very probable account of Rabbinical writers, these were the firstborn or heads of families, until they were superseded by the Aaronic priesthood. p.330.

*Ans.* v.20-25 is an interpolation of the L.L. (VI.216), which inadvertently speaks here of 'the priests that *come-near unto Jehovah,*' before there were any priests, *comp.* E.xxiv.5, using a formula peculiar to the L.L., Ez.xliv.13, *comp.* E.xxviii.43, xxx.20, L.vii.35, x.3, xxi.17,21,23, N.iv.19, xvi.5, Ez.xl.46, xlii.13, xliii.19, xliv.15,16, xlv.4.

#### Chap.xx.1-17(D.), 18-26(O.S.).

109. v.1. The account of the delivery of the Ten Commandments in xix and xx.18-21 is in accordance with their importance as the recognized basis of the Covenant between Jehovah and His ancient people. p.330.

*Ans.* Mr.CLARK has not perceived that the narrative passes from xix.19 to xx.18, omitting the 'Ten Commandments' altogether, which were introduced by D., as we suppose, instead of the laws in xx.22, &c., which were really the original 'basis of the Covenant' between Jehovah and Israel in the O.S., xxiv.3-8, but in D.'s time had become for the most part antiquated (VL217,232). And, in fact, Mr.CLARK himself says:—

The context seems to make it clear that we may identify this series (xv.22, &c.) with what was written by Moses in the book called the *Book of the Covenant*, and read by him in the audience of the people, xxiv.4,7, p.343—see also (121) below.

110. v.8. *Remember the sabbath-day.*] These words have been taken to refer to the observance of the sabbath-day as an old usage dating back to the Patriarchs, or even to the creation of the world. There is, however, no distinct evidence that the sabbath, as a formal ordinance, was recognized before the time of Moses. The expressions of Nehemiah (ix.14), of Ezekiel (xx.10,11,12), and perhaps of Moses himself (D.v.15), may be taken to intimate that the observance was regarded as originating in the Law given on Mount Sinai. The most ancient testimonies favour this view. It is now generally admitted that the attempts to trace the observance in heathen antiquity have failed. It has been alleged that the word '*remember*' may be reasonably explained in one of two ways without adopting the

inference that has been mentioned; it may either be used in the sense of *keep in mind* what is here enjoined for the first time, or it may refer back to what is related in xvi. where the sabbath-day is first noticed in giving the law for collecting the manna. p.332.

*Ans.* If Mr. CLARK only means that no one has been able to 'trace the observance in heathen antiquity' of a sabbath law like that in the Fourth Commandment, he is no doubt right. But it is also certain that the observance of a week of seven days was common to almost all the great nations of antiquity. Thus KALISCH says, *Ex.* p.449:—'The division of the week into seven days was known and adopted by the most different nations, as the Assyrians, Arabs, Indians, (Chinese, Peruvians, but not the Persians), and many African and American tribes, which never came into intercourse with the Israelites, and later by the Greeks and Romans, who followed the Egyptians. We must therefore recognize therein, not an exclusively theocratical, but a general astronomical arrangement, which offered itself to the simplest planetary observation of every people.' In short, the observance evidently arose at first from noticing the chief phases of the Moon; which conclusion is further confirmed by the fact that the Peruvians not only divide the lunar month into halves and quarters by the Moon's phases, but they have also a period of *nine* days, the approximate *third* part of a lunation, thus showing the common origin of both. So the Romans had their *ninth* day of the month, which was a holiday—a 'day of rest'—even for slaves, *comp.* E.xxiii.12. And CLEMENS ALEX., *Strom.* v.256, quotes HESIOD as saying:—

Πρῶτον ἔφη τετράς τε καὶ ἔβδομον ἱερὸν ἡμᾶρ,  
First, the *first* day, the *fourth* day, and the *seventh*,  
Is sacred:—

and he produces in the same place various passages from Homer and Callimachus, which show that the seventh day was held sacred in 'heathen antiquity' (IV.171).

Accordingly, the day of the New Moon was distinguished, as the first and chief holiday or 'sabbath' of the month, with special sacrifices (VI.431,462), as of more importance than ordinary sabbaths. And this, no doubt, was a very ancient custom among the Hebrews, so that the O.S. gives the first sabbath law, enjoining rest for the ox and the ass, the slave and the hireling, in E.xxiii.12. Upon this law, the more precise command in xx.8-11 is based, 'Remember, &c.,' which assumes the sabbath to be already well known; and it is obvious that the brief direction in xxiii.12 could not have been written, if xx.8-11 had been already proclaimed by the Divine Voice on Sinai.

Now that it appears that these Commandments are from the hand of D.



the meaning of 'Remember,' with reference to a primeval custom, existing long before his time in Israel, is self-evident, and we need no forced explanations of it as above. But the phrase in question is a favourite one with D., D xxiv.9, xxv.17, E.xiii.3(D.), J.i.13(D.), *comp.* D.ix.7,27, xxxii.7, E.xxxii.13(D.), and occurs nowhere else in the Pentateuch.

111. v.17. There is a curious interpolation in the Samaritan Text following the Tenth Commandment. The Israelites are commanded to set up on Mount Gerizim two great plastered stones with the words of the Law inscribed on them, to build there an Altar, and to sacrifice upon it Burnt-Offerings and Peace-Offerings. The passage is evidently made up from D.xxvii.2-7, with some expressions from D.xi.30, Gerizim being substituted for Ebal. p.334.

*Ans.* See (III.758, &c.) for reasons in support of KENNICOTT'S view that the Samaritan Text may contain the *true* copy of the original MS.

112. What actually were the Words of Jehovah that were engraven on the Tables of Stone? We have two distinct statements, one in E.xx.1-17, and one in D.v.6-21, apparently of equal authority, but differing from each other in several weighty particulars. Each is said, with reiterated emphasis, to contain the words that were actually spoken by the Lord, and written by Him upon the stones.

The variations which are of most importance are in the Commandments which we commonly call the Fourth, the Fifth, and the Tenth. The two copies of these are here placed side by side. [See (VI.App.108)].

It has been generally assumed that the whole of one or other of these copies was written on the Tables. Most commentators have supposed that the original document is in Exodus, and that the author of Deuteronomy wrote from memory, with variations suggested at the time. Others have conceived that Deuteronomy must furnish the more correct form, since the Tables must have been in actual existence when the book was written. But neither of these views can be fairly reconciled with the statements in Exodus and Deuteronomy, to which reference has been made. If either copy, as a whole, represents what was written on the Tables, it is obvious that the other cannot do so.

A conjecture which seems to deserve respect has been put forth by EWALD. He supposes that the original Commandments were all in the same terse and simple form of expression as appears (both in Exodus and Deuteronomy) in the First, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth, such as would be most suitable for recollection, and that the passages in each copy, in which the most important variations are found, were comments added when the books were written. It is not necessary to involve this theory with any question as to the authorship of the Books, or with any doubt as to the comments being the words of God given by Moses as much as the Commandments, strictly so called, that were written on the Tables. In reference to the most important of the differences, that relating to the reason for the observance of the sabbath-day, the thoughts are in no degree discordant, and each sets forth what is entirely worthy of, and consistent with, the Divine Law. Slighter

verbal or literal variations, with no important difference of meaning (such as *keep* for *remember*) may perhaps be ascribed to copyists.

It may be supposed that the Ten Words of Jehovah, with the prefatory sentence, were to this effect, assuming that each Table contained Five Commandments.

I am Jehovah thy God who have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.

## FIRST TABLE.

## SECOND TABLE.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| (i) <i>Thou shalt have no other God before me.</i>                    | (vi) <i>Thou shalt not kill.</i>               |
| (ii) <i>Thou shalt not make to thee any graven image.</i>             | (vii) <i>Thou shalt not commit adultery.</i>   |
| (iii) <i>Thou shalt not take the name of Jehovah thy God in vain.</i> | (viii) <i>Thou shalt not steal.</i>            |
| (iv) <i>Thou shalt remember the sabbath-day, to keep it holy.</i>     | (ix) <i>Thou shalt not bear false witness.</i> |
| (v) <i>Thou shalt honour thy father and thy mother.</i>               | (x) <i>Thou shalt not covet. p.335-7.</i>      |

*Ans.* The above must be regarded as expressing the *present* views of the Episcopal Bench in England, represented by their authorized exponents in this Commentary, on one of the most important portions of the Pentateuch—in fact, the very key-stone of the whole story of the Exodus according to traditionary views, ‘the recognized basis of the Covenant between Jehovah and His ancient people.’ p.330. It will be seen that this ‘New Bible Commentary’ deliberately admits that *neither* version of the Ten Commandments, as they appear in the Bible, gives the genuine ‘Ten Words’ uttered by the Almighty on Sinai; although in E.xx.I we read, ‘God spake all these words,’ and in D.v.22, ‘*These words* Jehovah spake . . . and He added no more, and He wrote them on two Tables of Stone, and delivered them unto me.’ And it further supposes that in the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 10th Commandments, large interpolations must subsequently have been made, apparently by Moses ‘when the Books were written, which were thus added to the words really spoken by Jehovah “unto all the Assembly, in the Mount, out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice.”’ Yet even now the abridged Fourth Commandment, though consisting only of a few words, differs in Exodus and Deuteronomy, being in the one ‘*Remember* the sabbath-day to sanctify it,’ and in the other ‘*Keep* the sabbath-day to sanctify it.’ But this variation, says the Commentary, ‘may perhaps be ascribed to *copyists*,’—who could not even copy correctly these few most sacred words, supposed to have been uttered by Jehovah Himself on Sinai, and which might therefore be expected to have been engraven in the hearts and memories of all pious persons in Israel! Further, in order that even these abridged ‘Ten Words’

may all conform to the same type, as shown in the First, Second, Third, Sixth, &c., Commandments, the original language of the Fourth and Fifth must have been also modified—(?) by ‘copyists’—into ‘Thou shalt remember,’ ‘Thou shalt honour,’ instead of the imperative ‘Remember,’ ‘Honour.’

It need hardly be said that the above straightforward recognition of one indisputable result of the critical examination of the Pentateuch strikes at the root of the whole Pentateuchal story as an historical narrative. For when the ‘keystone’ is taken away, what becomes of the arch? If the ‘Ten Commandments’ in the Pentateuch are not genuine and historically true, what is? Doubtless, before such an admission can have been allowed to be published in this Commentary, the Committee appointed to advise with the Editor, ‘upon questions arising during the progress of the work,’ will have been consulted. But I venture to think that it is far more ‘dangerous,’ far more fatal to the cultivation of an intelligent and reverent faith in the Bible, to assert that Moses wrote the Decalogue, but wrote twice over, each time in different words, what he knew to be untrue, than to say that the Decalogue, as critical examination plainly shows (VI. *App.*107) is, in each of its forms, the work of D. in a far later age.

113. What is assumed, on the theory here stated, to be the *comment* on both the First and Second Commandments, ‘For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, &c.’ occurs in a somewhat different and more diffuse form in E.xxxiv.6,7. Does not a comparison of the two passages tend to confirm the supposition that the words are not a part of the *original* Ten Commandments, but that they were quoted here in a condensed form by *Moses*, as bearing on the two Commandments, when the book of Exodus was put together? p.336.

*Ans.* In (VI.244–6) it is shown that the language in E.xxxiv.6,7, of the O.S., *comp.* N.xiv.18(O.S.), has been imitated by several later writers, *e.g.* Joel ii.13, Nah.i.3, Jon.iv.2, *comp.* Ps.lxxxvi.15, ciii.8, cxi.4, cxii.4, cxvi.5, cxlv.8, 2Ch.xxx.9, Neh.ix.17, and no doubt by D. (? Jeremiah) in E.xx.5,6, *comp.* Jer.xxv.29, xxx.11, xlvi.28, xlix.12.

114. The name most frequently used by Moses for the Decalogue (הַעֲדוּת) signifies something strongly affirmed, literally, *something spoken again and again*; it is therefore properly rendered in our version ‘The Testimony.’ Taking this in connection with the prohibitory form of the Commandments, the name must have been understood as the testimony of Jehovah against the tendency to transgress in those to whom the document was addressed. p.338.

*Ans.* The above falls to the ground when it is seen that the word is used by the O.S. in xxxi.18, xxxii.15, of the ‘Tables of the Testimony,’ where the laws engraven on the Tables are those of xx.22, &c., ‘the basis of the Covenant between Jehovah and Israel,’ xxiv.3–8. It seems rather to mean

the specification of the terms of that Covenant, which Israel had promised to observe, and which would be a standing testimony against them in case of disobedience.

115. The relation in which the condemning strictness of the Law stood to the forgiving mercy of Jehovah was distinctly shown in the symbolism of the Sanctuary. When the Tables of the Law were deposited in the Ark of the Covenant, they were covered by the Mercy-seat, which, in accordance with its name, was the sign of the Divine lovingkindness. The cherubim, which were on the Mercy-seat, appear to have figured the highest condition of created intelligence in the act of humble adoration and service, and so to have expressed the condition on which were obtained forgiveness, deliverance from the letter that killeth, and communion with Jehovah. *p.*339.

*Ans.* All such observations as the above fall to the ground when the later origin of the L.L. is recognized, and the fact that the Mosaic Ark, with the Mercy-seat, cherubim, &c., existed only in imagination.

116. *v.*18-21. The people had realized the terrors of the voice of Jehovah in the utterances of the Ten Words of the Testimony, and they feared for their lives. Though Moses encouraged them, they were permitted to withdraw and to stand afar off, at their tent-doors, *D.v.*30. It would appear, according to *E.xix.*24, that Aaron on this occasion accompanied Moses in drawing near to the thick darkness. *p.*334.

*Ans.* Not a word is said or implied about the people having heard the 'Ten Words': only they 'saw the thunderings and the lightnings, and the noise of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking,' *v.*18, referring evidently to *xix.*18,19.

Nor is anything said in *D.v.*30 about the people 'standing at their tent-doors': the words are simply, 'Go, say to them, return ye to your tents,' where *D.* has clearly departed from the meaning of *E.xx.*18,21, 'the people stood afar off.'

Nor is there the least sign that 'Aaron accompanied Moses in drawing near to the thick darkness,' in which case he, too, would have heard all the commands in *xx.*22, &c., and *xxiv.*1 would have been unmeaning. But *xix.*20-25 is an interpolation of the L.L., introducing 'priests which come near to Jehovah,' *v.*22,24, before there were any (108), and seeking to dignify Aaron by the command in *v.*24, which, however, is nowhere carried out (*VI.*216).

117. The term *Holy Convocation*, which belongs to the sabbath-day in common with certain other festival days, would seem to imply that there was a meeting together of the people for a religious purpose, *L.xxiii.*2,3. From the mode in which the commands to keep the sabbath-day and to reverence the Sanctuary are associated, it may be inferred with probability that there was such a meeting in the Court of

the-Sanctuary, L.xix.30, Ez.xxiii.38. At later periods, in places remote from the Temple, we know that it was a custom to resort on this day to public teachers, and to hear the reading of the O.T., with addresses of exposition and exhortation in the Synagogues. It is not unreasonable to suppose that some usage of this kind may have been observed at the Sanctuary itself from the first institution of the Sabbath. There may be references to such a custom in L.x.11, D.xxxiii.10.

Such are the particulars that can be gathered out of the Scriptures as to the mode of observing the sabbath-day. In the time of the Legislator an entire rest from the work of daily life was to reign throughout the camp. And it may be conjectured that *the people assembled before the Altar at the hours of Morning and Evening Sacrifices for prayer and contemplation, and to listen to the reading of portions of the Divine Law, perhaps from the lips of Moses himself.* p.340.

*Ans.* It will be seen that all Mr. CLARK'S references are to passages belonging to the L.L., except D.xxxiii.10, which belongs to the age of Jeremiah (VI.135). There is not a particle of evidence to show that in the days of David or Samuel, the sabbath was observed in the way above supposed—much less that the people ‘assembled before the Altar at the hours of Morning and Evening Sacrifices for prayer and contemplation,’ and to listen to portions of the Law ‘from the lips of Moses himself.’

118. The notices of the sabbath-day in the Prophets are most frequently accompanied by complaint or warning respecting its neglect and desecration, Is.lvi.2-6, lviii.13, Jer.xvii.21,27, Ez.xx.13,16,20, Am.viii.5, &c. But in the time of Isaiah (i.13) a parade of observing it had become a cloak for hypocrisy. p.340.

*Ans.* The above notices are all from later prophets, just before or after the Captivity, except Am.viii.5, which puts the ‘New Moon’ before the sabbath, *comp.* 1S.xx 5, 2K.iv.23, Is.i.13,14, Hos.ii.11 (VI.462).

119. The Law of the Sabbath was the expression of a universal Truth. Hence the Commandment bears its meaning for all mankind. The day which we observe, in accordance with ecclesiastical usage, holds another place in the week, and its connection with the Creation of the world has thus been put into the background. But the meaning of the Lord's day cannot be separated from the great meaning of the Sabbath. . . . On this ground, then, there is reason enough why the Fourth, as well as the other Commandments, should be addressed to Christian congregations, and should hold its place in our Service. p.342.

*Ans.* But let the people be duly informed of the real nature of these Commandments, that they are not Divine utterances which ‘God spake unto Moses,’ but merely the best summary of the ‘Faith and Duty’ of a pious Israelite, which the Deuteronomist—a prophet of Josiah's age, such as Jeremiah—could frame. Let them be taught also that there appears to be a Divine Ordinance for the rest of one day in seven, as indicated by the Moon's phases, just as the Sun indicates by its rising and setting when ‘man should go forth unto his work and to his labour until the evening.’ Exp-

rience teaches us our need of a due proportion of *sleep*; and nature informs all men everywhere that night is the proper time for taking such refreshment; and though this Natural and therefore Divine Law may be broken when duty, or convenience, or even pleasure requires it, and we are left to our own judgment in the matter, not slavishly bound to obey this command,—the night being made for man, not man for the night,—yet experience shows us that habitual neglect of this kindly precept will be attended with evil—sometimes with fatal—consequences to health of body and mind. Just so experience teaches us, more especially in civilized countries, that body and mind require to be relieved and refreshed from time to time, not merely by sleep, but by *rest*, by dropping for a season the occupations which habitually engross our thoughts and require our energies, and relaxing the tension which day after day acts as a painful strain upon the system. And Nature, by the Moon's changes, guides all men everywhere to keep one day in seven as a holiday or day of rest. The observance of this law, not only for religious exercises, but for family and friendly intercourse and bodily or mental recreation, such as shall string the nerves afresh for the next week's duties, is laid upon us by a Divine Ordinance as benevolent as that which bids us sleep at night. Habitual neglect of this injunction, to take these regular holidays which all may enjoy together, as a relief for the wear and tear of civilized life, will generally be found, as in the other instance, to be attended with injurious effects upon health and mental vigour. Yet this law, like the other, is the kindly instruction of a gracious Father. We are not bound, as slaves, to a rigid observance of it. We may break it, if need be, at the call of duty, or for convenience, or even for pleasure, if only we regard the rights of others in this respect as well as our own. 'The sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath.'

120. Not only did the original ground of the weekly sabbath connect it with all true worship, but it formed an organized system including the sabbatical year and the jubilee year. Besides this, the recurrence of the sabbatical number in the cycle of yearly festivals is so frequent and distinct as plainly to indicate a set purpose. . . . It is evident that the number 'Seven' was the Divinely appointed symbol, repeated again and again in the public services, suggesting the connection between the entire range of the Ceremonial Law and the consecrated seventh day. . . . The ritual of the sabbath-day, in spite of the superlative sanctity of the day, was not, like that of other festivals, distinguished by offerings or rites of a peculiar kind, but only by a doubling of the common daily sacrifices. It was thus not so much cut off from the week as marked out as *the Day of Days*, and so symbolized the sanctification of the daily life of the people. p.342.

*Ans.* The sabbatical year belongs to the O.S. (E.xxiii.11), the jubilee year to the L.L. (L.xxv.8-17); but there is no sign that the latter was ever observed or the former before the Captivity (VI.22.xi). No doubt,

the number 'Seven,' when once observed to be connected with the Moon's changes, was regarded as having a special sanctity. But the 'Ceremonial Law' belongs wholly to the L.L. The New Moon was not 'distinguished by rites of a peculiar kind'; but it was marked, apparently as the first sabbath of the month, of more sacred character than ordinary sabbaths, by a far larger sacrifice, N.xxviii.11-15, *comp.* v.9,10.

121. v.22. Adopting the conclusion as by far the most probable one, that the Book of the Covenant included from xx.22 to xxiii.33, it is evident that the document cannot be regarded as a *strictly systematic whole*. Portions of it were probably *traditional rules*, handed down from the Patriarchs, and retained by the Israelites in Egypt. Probable traces of pre-Mosaic antiquity may be seen in xx.24-26, xxi.6, xxiii.19, &c. Some of the laws relate to habits of fixed abode, not (at least if taken in their strict form) to such a mode of life as that of the Israelites in their march through the wilderness, xxii.5,6,29, xxiii.10,11; some, especially those relating to slavery, would seem to have been *modifications of ancient usages*, xxi.20,21. These more or less *ancient maxims* may have been associated with *notes of such decisions* on cases of difference as had been up to that time pronounced by Moses and the judges whom he had appointed by the advice of Jethro.

*In whatever way these laws may have originated*, as they are here brought together, they are clearly *enforced by Jehovah* as conditions of conduct for the covenanted people. The adoption of Patriarchal maxims accords with the spirit of the *Mosaic legislation*, as expressed in the Fifth Commandment (!). p.343.

*Ans.* Let it be well observed that these laws, which Mr. CLARK speaks of as not forming 'a strictly systematic whole,' as being some of them 'traditional rules,' 'Patriarchal maxims,' and others 'notes of decisions pronounced by Moses and the judges,' 'enforced by Jehovah' as part of 'the Mosaic legislation,' were according to xx.22 *spoken* by Jehovah to Moses as part of a *Divine* Legislation, and, if such, might be expected to be Divinely perfect, infallibly just and right, instead of being in more than one instance, e.g. xxi.4,7,21, iniquitous and inhuman.

The peculiarities, noticed by Mr. CLARK, are, of course, explained as soon as it is seen that this 'Book of the Covenant' belongs most probably to the age of Saul, and very possibly corresponded to the 'custom of the kingdom' or common law, which Samuel 'spoke to the people and wrote in a book,' when Saul was made king, 1S.x.25, just as Moses 'came and told the people' all these words, and 'wrote' them in a 'book,' E.xxiv.3,4,7 (VI. 493-506).

122. v.23. *Assuming this to be an old formula*, its meaning is brought out more comprehensively in the Second Commandment, and is strengthened by the fact declared in v.22, that Jehovah had now spoken from Heaven. p.343.

*Ans.* It is obvious that this 'old formula,' quoted (N.B.) by Jehovah (!),

is quite out of place, if already in *v.4-6* its meaning had been 'brought out *more comprehensively*' by the Divine utterance on Sinai.

123. *v.24-26*. These must have been *old and accepted rules* for the building of altars; and they are not inconsistent with directions for the construction of the Altar of the Court of the Tabernacle, *xxvii.1-8*. There is no good reason to doubt that they were observed in 'the Brazen Altar,' as it is called, although no reference is made to them in connection with it. That Altar, according to the directions that are given, must indeed have been rather *an altar case*, with a mass of earth or stone within, when it was put to use. *p.343*.

*Ans.* But what need was there at all for constructing and carrying about in the wilderness such a huge wooden case, *9ft.* long, *9ft.* broad, and *5½ft.* high, all covered with bronze, when Jehovah had already only just before sanctioned 'an old and accepted rule'—rather had Himself laid down the law, had not merely *permitted*, but *commanded*—that every altar should be built of earth or stone, *v.24,25*? See (VI.401). This law, however, corresponds well with the state of things in the age of Samuel and Saul (VI.494), when (as we suppose) this section was written.

### Chap. xxi. 1-36 (O.S.).

124. *v.3*. If a married man became a bondman, his rights with regard to his wife were respected. But, if a single bondman accepted at the hand of his master a bondwoman as his wife, the master does not lose his claim to the woman at the expiration of the husband's term of service. *Such wives, it may be presumed, were always foreign slaves.* *p.344*.

*Ans.* Why should it be 'presumed' that 'such wives were always foreign slaves,' when in *v.7* it is allowed that any *Hebrew* may 'sell his daughter' into slavery? It is blasphemous to suppose that such laws as these were ever sanctioned by the Divine Being—much less authoritatively uttered by the Voice of Jehovah, as 'the basis of the Covenant between Himself and His people.'

125. *v.5,6*. But if the bondman loved his wife so as to be unwilling to give her up, or if he was strongly enough attached to his master's service, he might, by submitting to a certain ceremony, prolong his term 'for ever'—that is, most probably, till the next Jubilee, when every Hebrew was set free. *p.344*.

*Ans.* The idea of the 'Jubilee' belongs wholly to the L.L. (VI.439-442); the O.S. knows nothing about it, and, no doubt, means here that the man should continue a slave to the end of his life. Mr. CLARK evades the proper sense of the phrase 'for ever,' in order to avoid the manifest contradiction to L.xxv.39-41. On his view, that it means only the interval before the next Jubilee, 'for ever' might mean only a few months or even days.



126. v.6. A man might, in accordance with existing custom, sell his daughter to another man *with a view to her becoming an inferior wife or concubine*. In this case, she was not to 'go out,' like the bondman; that is, she was not to be dismissed at the end of the sixth year. But women, who were bound in any other way, would appear to have been under the same conditions as bondmen: see D.xv. 17. p.344.

*Ans.* v.7 says not a word about a girl being sold to 'become an inferior wife or concubine,' but merely says, 'if a man sell his daughter to be a *female-slave*' (אִמָּה, see Ges. *Lex.*), comp. G.xxx.3, E.ii.5, xx.10,17, where there can be no doubt as to the word meaning 'slave,' as it clearly does in the rest of this very chapter, v.20,26,27,32; the girl would be a slave for all uses, including, of course, that of being treated as a concubine, if the master pleased, by himself or by his son, v.8,9. The O.S., therefore, allowed the *male* Hebrew slave to 'go out' after six years' service, but distinctly forbids this in the case of a Hebrew *female*, who might have been sold into slavery by her own father! And this is supposed by Mr. CLARK to be an 'existing custom,' 'enforced' by express Divine authority!

The more tender-hearted Deuteronomist lays down the same law of manumission for all Hebrew slaves, whether male or female, D.xv.12-17.

127. v.8. The latter sentence of the verse appears to signify that, although he was not forced to keep literal faith with the woman by *making her his concubine*, he was not permitted to sell her to a foreigner. Even in the case of a foreign captive, who had been accepted as a concubine, and had displeased her master, she could not be sold as a slave, but was entitled to her freedom, D.xxi.14. p.344.

*Ans.* The phrase 'seeing he hath dealt faithlessly by her' seems to correspond to that in D.xxi.14, 'because thou hast humbled her,' and to imply the case of the man's no longer wishing to *keep* the girl as a concubine, having already used her as such: in that case he might sell her back to her friends or to another Hebrew master, but not to a foreigner—which seems to imply that under other circumstances he might 'make merchandise' of her to a foreigner. The word אָרַךְ, 'appoint,' E.V. 'betroth,' is only used in this sense here and in v.9, 'if he have appointed her to his son, he shall deal with her after the manner of daughters,' where also the word seems rather to mean 'assign' as a concubine, implying that the son had already used her as such. The Deuteronomist gives freedom to a heathen captive who has been similarly 'humbled' and rejected, xxi.10-14.

128. v.11. *if he do not these three unto her.*] Most commentators refer these three things to the food, raiment, and duty of marriage, mentioned in v.10. But KNOBEL and others prefer the interpretation of most of the Rabbinitists, which seems on the whole best to suit the context, that the words express a choice of one of three things, in which case their sense is, *if he do neither of these three things*. The man was to give the woman, whom he had purchased from her father, her

freedom unless (i) he caused her to be redeemed by a Hebrew master, or (ii) gave her to his son and treated her as a daughter, *v.9*, or (iii), in the event of his taking another wife, *v.10*, unless he allowed her to retain her place and privileges. *p.345*.

*Ans.* Mr. CLARK'S view is surely erroneous. How could it be known whether the girl would or would not be redeemed? How long a time would be allowed the master to make his 'choice of one of these three things'? The writer plainly means to say that, if the master takes another concubine, he must not defraud the first of her triple right to food, clothes, and concubitus: if he fails in any one of these three points, she has only to go to the judges and prove his neglect of her, and she shall 'go out free without money.'

129. *v.13,14*. There was no place of safety for the guilty murderer, not even the Altar of Jehovah. . . . But for one who killed a man 'at unawares,' that is, without intending to do it, the Law afterwards appointed places of refuge, *N.xxxv. 6-34, D.iv.41-43, xix.2-10, J.xx.2-9*. It is very probable that there was some provision answering to the Cities of Refuge, *that may have been based on old usage, in the Camp in the wilderness. p.345*.

*Ans.* The single place in *v.13*, which Jehovah would appoint, refers most probably to some one particular place of refuge, 'based upon old usage,' such as the altar in David's Tabernacle, *1K.i.50,51,53, ii.28,29*, and such as may have been in existence or at least contemplated at the time when this section was written (*VI.496*).

130. *v.20*. The Jewish authorities appear to be right in referring this law, like those in *v.26,27,32*, to foreign slaves, see *L.xxv.44-46*. All Hebrew bondmen were treated, in regard to life and limb, like freemen, and the Law would take this for granted. *p.345*.

*Ans.* There is no reason for supposing that the slaves in the above passages are merely foreign slaves. The later law of the *L.L.*, to which Mr. CLARK refers, distinctly forbids that there should be any Hebrew 'bondmen' at all; whereas the *O.S.* as distinctly recognizes the existence of such Hebrew slaves, even for the whole life long, *E.xxi.2-6*, and the laws in *v.20,21*, &c., no doubt, are meant to apply to these especially.

131. *v.21*. The master was permitted to retain the power of chastizing his alien (?) slave with a rod; but the indulgence of unbridled temper was so far kept in check by his incurring punishment if the slave died under his hand. If, however, the slave survived the chastigation a day or two, it was assumed that the offence of the master was not so heinous, and he did not become amenable to the law, because *the loss of the slave who by old custom [? by Divine authority] was recognized as his property*, was accounted under the circumstances as a punishment. It is not said how the master was to be treated in the event of the immediate death of the slave. The protection here afforded to the life of a

slave may seem to us but a slight one. But it is the very earliest trace of such protection in legislation [Jehovah's!], and it stands in strong and favourable contrast with the old laws of Greece, Rome, and other nations. The same may be said of *v.26,27,32*. These regulations were most likely as much as was feasible at the time, to mitigate the cruelty of ancient practice; they were as much as the hardness of the hearts of the people would bear. *Matt.xix.8. p.346.*

*Ans.* If these laws had been merely *Mosaic* laws, *i.e.* adopted or originated by Moses and ascribed by him to the Deity, but not actually spoken or revealed by Jehovah to Moses, as the text declares, *E.xx.22*, and the traditionary view supposes, they might possibly be regarded as 'standing in strong and favourable contrast with the old laws of Greece, Rome, &c.,' and as 'mitigating the cruelty of ancient practice.' But these laws allow the slaveholder to flog *ad libitum* even unto death, provided the slave 'continues a day or two' and does not die on the spot under the lash, in which case the murderer is to be punished, assuredly, with 'some secondary punishment,' *p.346*, 'for he is his money,' not with death, as for the murder of a freeman, *v.12*, and secures to him also his hold upon the wife and children of a manumitted slave, if the wife also was one of his slaves. And Mr. CLARK says:—

In whatever way these laws may have *originated*, they are clearly *enforced by Jehovah*, as conditions of conduct for the covenanted people. *p.343.*

Surely, to say that the Divine Being ever sanctioned or 'enforced,' much less originated, such laws, whether for Hebrew slaves or for 'aliens'—that for the Great God, 'the Father of the spirits of all flesh,' this was 'as much as was feasible at the time'—that He could not do more in the cause of humanity 'because of the hardness of heart' of the chosen people—is simply to blaspheme the Holy Name of our Father in Heaven. Even the text appealed to, *Matt.xix.8*, says, '*Moses*, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives.'

### Chap.xxii.1–31(O.S.).

132. *v.1*. The thief, when he had proved his persistency in crime by adding to his theft the slaughter or sale of the animal, was to restore four times its value in the case of a sheep, *comp. 2S.xii.6. p.347.*

*Ans.* If these laws were written (as we suppose) in the days, perhaps even by the hand of Samuel, we can understand why David said of the rich man, who had taken by force and killed the poor man's lamb, 'he shall restore the lamb *fourfold*.'

133. *v.13*. When an animal was killed by a wild beast, the keeper had to produce the mangled carcase, not only in proof of the fact, but to show that he had, by his vigilance and courage, deprived the wild beast of his prey. *p.348.*

*Ans.* The mangled carcase was to be produced, no doubt, 'in proof of the fact': the latter reason above assigned seems very fanciful.

134. v.18. This is the earliest denunciation of witchcraft in the Law. p.349.

*Ans.* If these laws were written in the age of Samuel, it is easy to understand why Saul, who was not a very religious man, and had personally no decided aversion to witchcraft, 1S.xxviii.7, &c., had yet 'cut off out of the land' all kinds of witchcraft, v.3,9.

135. v.20. This was probably *an old formula*, the sense of which, on its ethical side, is comprised in the First and Second Commandments. p.349.

*Ans.* *Jehovah* here adopts 'an old formula'!—see (122).

136. v.29. *the firstborn of thy children shalt thou give unto me.*] The specific law relating to the firstborn of living creatures was brought out in a strong light in connection with the deliverance from Egypt. p.349.

*Ans.* The language here used with reference to the firstborns of men, 'thou shalt give unto me,' is identically the same as that used with reference to the firstlings of oxen and sheep in v.30, and these last were undoubtedly sacrificed. When we take into account the story of Abraham's Sacrifice in G.xxii, and of Jephthah's in Ju.xi.30-40, both told without a word of censure of the act, in the one case intended and in the other accomplished, and then consider that of these two narratives the latter was probably written in the same age as the laws before us, and the former perhaps in the age immediately following, it is difficult to resist the suspicion that the writer of this command may have really contemplated the sacrifice of firstborns, and recognized it as a standing practice in Israel, though a somewhat later writer, without actually going to the length of condemning, disapproved of the practice, and desired to check and help to suppress it altogether by the story in G.xxii, commending the zeal which impelled to the sacrifice of the human firstborn, but approving, as on Divine authority, the substitution of a lamb. In fact, this passage and E.xiii.1,2, may be those which Jeremiah had in view, when he asseverates again and again so earnestly, 'which I commanded (them) not (nor spake it), neither came it upon my heart,' vii.31, xix.5, xxxii.35, as if the people were urging some (supposed) Divine direction, which enjoined the immolation of their firstborns; while Ezekiel more distinctly seems to refer to the existence of some such passages in the older laws, when he says, 'Wherefore I also—I gave them statutes not good, and judgments whereby they should not live, and I defiled them in their gifts, in their *making-to-pass-over all that openeth the womb* [*comp.* E.xiii.2]. . . . For, in your offering your gifts, in *making your children to pass-over in the fire*, ye defile yourselves with all your idols unto this day,' xx.25,26,31: see (VI.367-374).

Chap.xxiii.1-12,14,15<sup>ndef</sup>,16-18,20,21(O.S.), 13,15<sup>bc</sup>,19,22-33 (D.).

137. v.11. *thou shalt let it rest and lie still.*] Some understand this expression to relate to the crops, not to the land, so as to mean *thou shalt leave them* (i.e. the crops) *and give them up to the poor, &c.* The words, if they stood by themselves, might bear this interpretation, as well as that given in our version; and neither interpretation is opposed to L.xxv.2-5, where it is said that the land was to remain untilled. But it has been presumed without the least authority that the writer of Leviticus made a mistake, and that the original law, as it is here given, was not intended to prevent the land from being tilled as usual, but only to forbid that the crops should be harvested by the proprietor, in order that the poor might gather for themselves.

It has also been objected that this original law could not have been written by Moses in the wilderness, where, of course, it could not have been observed, and that the difficulty occurred to the writer of Leviticus, and induced him to prefix the words 'when ye come into the land which I give you.' But surely this difficulty, if we admit it to have a real existence, would have been avoided by anyone writing a clever fictitious narrative, with a view to deceive his own or later ages. It seems easier and more reasonable to regard Moses as having legislated and written with the deep conviction ever in his mind that the promise of the possession of the land made to Abraham was sure of fulfilment. p.351.

*Ans.* L.xxv.2-5 says—not only that 'the land was to remain untilled,' but—that *the vines were to be left unpruned*; and surely no legislator in his senses would have prescribed this, by which both the owners and the poor would be injured. It is plain that the later writer of L.xxv has mistaken the meaning of the original command, which bids only that the same shall be done with the vineyard and oliveyard as with the land—that is, that the crops shall not be gathered by the owner, but left to be gathered by all who would—himself and his family, it may be supposed, being included, see L.xxv.6; the land, however, being cultivated and the trees pruned as usual. What possible good, indeed, could have resulted from enforcing a whole year's idleness upon the rural population alone, while all others would be following their usual employments?

If there were no other reasons for affirming that these laws are not Mosaic than the fact that they do not always apply to life in the wilderness, of course, Mr. CLARK's reasoning above on this point would be valid, more especially as the O.S. did not contemplate a forty years' wandering (VI. ch xiii, note <sup>es</sup>). But, with our present knowledge of the composition of this narrative, such passages confirm the view that these laws were written in the land of Canaan, and at a time when the people were more thoroughly agricultural than in the later days of David (VI.493).

These laws were perhaps not written by the same hand which penned the main portion of the 'clever fictitious narrative' of the Exodus, but in a somewhat earlier age.

138. *v.14.* This is the first mention of the three Great Yearly Festivals. . . The whole three are spoken of as if they were familiarly known to the people. The points that are especially enjoined are, that every male Israelite should attend them at the Sanctuary, and that he should take with him an offering for Jehovah. . . . That the latter condition belonged to all the Feasts, though it is here stated only in regard to the Passover, cannot be doubted. *p.351.*

*Ans.* The 'Feast of Mazzoth' is here 'spoken of as familiarly known to the people,' just as the other two ancient Feasts, which hardly agrees with the representation that it had only just been instituted and only once celebrated. All three were probably agricultural festivals, handed down from a very early time.

It is clear that the clause at the end of *v.15*, 'and none shall appear before me empty,' is out of its proper place, since it breaks the connection between the verb 'thou shalt keep' at the beginning of *v.15* and the two accusatives depending on it in *v.16*, 'and the Feast of Harvest, and the Feast of Ingathering'; besides which, where it now stands in the *third* person, it follows awkwardly a number of verbs in the *second* person. This clause manifestly belongs to the end of *v.17*, and applies, as Mr. CLARK says, to all the three Feasts (VI.225).

139. *v.16. in the end of the year.]* The year here spoken of must have been the civil or agrarian year, which began after harvest, when the ground was prepared for sowing. The sacred year began in Spring with the month Abib or Nisan. *p.352.*

*Ans.* It would be strange that the legislator, while enjoining the performance of a 'sacred' duty (the observance of the three Festivals, with sacrifices and offerings), does not refer to the 'sacred year,' if that year already existed. But E.xii.2, which makes Abib the first month of the year, is part of the L.L., and accordingly in L.xxiii.34, N.xxix.12, the 'seventh month' is expressly named for the Feast in question. In the age of Samuel the year ended and began as here, 'after harvest.'

140. *v.16. when thou hast gathered]* rather, *when thou gatherest in.* The Hebrew does not imply that the gathering in was to be completed before the Feast was held. In some years the harvest must have fallen later than in others. It was perhaps rarely completed before *the time appointed for the Feast.* And hence the fitness of the expression, 'which is in the end of the year.' *p.352.*

*Ans.* The 'time appointed for the Feast' is fixed by the L.L., *viz.* 'the fifteenth day of the seventh month,' L.xxiii.34, N.xxix.12. The older law in E.xxiii.16 appoints no particular time, but only says generally, 'at thy

gathering, &c.']; and so D.xvi.13 says only 'after that thou hast gathered in thy corn and thy wine.'

141. v.18. *the fat of my sacrifice*] strictly, *the fat of my Feast*. In the parallel passage, xxxiv.25, what appears to be the equivalent expression is 'the sacrifice of the Feast of the Passover.' It has been inferred with great probability that the *fat of my Feast* means not literally the fat of the paschal lamb, but the *best part* of the Feast, that is, *the paschal lamb itself*. This explanation best accords with xii.10, where there is no mention of the fat. If we take the words in their mere literal sense, they must refer to the fat of sacrifices in general, which, when the ritual of sacrifices was arranged, was burnt upon the altar by the priests. p.352.

*Ans.* There may be here a special reference to the sacrifice of the Pesach—not to the 'paschal lamb,' for E.xii.10 belongs to the L.L., but—to the sacrifice 'of the flock and of the herd,' D.xvi.2, which was specially offered on the first evening of the Feast of Mazzeth, v.6. But the rule to burn the fat at once existed, no doubt, in the earliest times, 1S.ii.16, and see (VI. ch.xii, note<sup>28</sup>). The idea that 'the fat of the Feast' means the paschal lamb, as the 'best part' of the Feast, seems in any case far-fetched and extravagant.

142. v.19. *The first of the firstfruits of thy land thou shalt bring into the House of Jehovah thy Elohim.*] As the preceding precept appears to refer to the Passover, so it is likely that this refers to the Pentecost, as especially to the offering of what are called in v.16 'the firstfruits of thy labours,' i.e. the two wave-loaves described L.xxiii.17. They are called in Leviticus 'the firstfruits unto the Lord;' and it is reasonable that they should here be designated 'the chief of the firstfruits.' If, with KEIL and others, we suppose the present to relate to the offering of firstfruits in general, the command is no more than a repetition of xxii.29. p.352.

*Ans.* KEIL's view appears to be correct, though these 'first of the firstfruits' may have been offered at the 'Feast of Harvest,' xxiii.16, in the earliest times, without any reference to the law about the 'wave-loaves' in the L.L. But the 'repetition' in question arises from the fact that this command is very probably a Deuteronomistic interpolation (VI.224).

143. *Thou shalt not see the a kid in its mother's milk.*] This precept is repeated xxxiv.26, D.xiv.21. There has been much discussion as to its meaning. St. Augustine and some more recent commentators have given up the explanation of it in despair. . . . It has been brought into connection with the prohibitions to slaughter a cow and a calf, or a ewe and her lamb, on the same day, L.xxii.28, and to take a bird along with her young in the nest, D.xxii.6. It is thus understood as a protest against cruelty and outraging the order of nature. p.352.

*Ans.* The above explanation, which Mr. CLARK mentions with others, seems to be correct. E.xxxiv.26 is due to D. (VI.248), as well as D.xiv.21; and the precept agrees thoroughly with the spirit of D., who perhaps, in accordance with his habitual tenderheartedness, has here enforced by a

written command what was already the actual practice of his time (VI.224,357).

144. v.20-33. These verses appear to form the conclusion of the Book of the Covenant. . . . Compare xxxiv.10-17, where similar promises and warnings are prefixed to the shorter Compendium of Law which was written down after the renewal of the Tables. p.353.

*Ans.* xxiii.22-33 and xxxiv.9-27 are both Deuteronomistic insertions (VI.229,248).

145. v.23. *I will cut them off.*] It has been too absolutely taken for granted that it was the Divine Will that the inhabitants of Canaan should be utterly exterminated. We know that, as a matter of fact, great numbers of the Canaanite families lived on and intermarried with the Israelites—see Ju.i,ii, with such cases as those of the Sidonians, of Araunah, of Uriah, of the family of Rahab, &c. The national existence of the Canaanites was indeed to be utterly destroyed, every trace of their idolatries was to be blotted out, no social intercourse was to be held with them while they served other gods, nor were alliances of any kind to be formed with them. These commands are emphatically repeated and expanded in D.vii, xii.1-4,29-31. They were often broken by the Israelites, who had to suffer for their transgression, N.xxxiii.55, Ju.ii.3. But it is alike contrary to the spirit of the Divine Law, and to the facts bearing on the subject scattered in the history, to suppose that any obstacle was put in the way of well-disposed individuals of the denounced nations, who left their sins and were willing to join the service of Jehovah. p.353.

*Ans.* What says D.xx.16,17,—‘Of the cities of these people, which the Lord thy God doth give thee for thine inheritance, *thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth*, but thou shalt utterly destroy them, the Hittites, and the Amorites, the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites’? And why was it more ‘contrary to the spirit of the Divine Law’ to order the utter destruction of all these, than to command the massacre of 80,000 Midianite women and 32,000 boys, N.xxxi (VI.464)? But these injunctions of D. and L.L., however bloodthirsty in appearance, only existed on paper, and express the feeling of abhorrence, which prevailed in a later day, against the idolatrous practices of the Israelites themselves (III.883-6, VI.602-4). There is no Divine command in the O.S. for the extermination of the Canaanites, though in various places it is assumed that they were utterly destroyed (VI.ch.xiv, notes <sup>137,145,148</sup>). And, in point of fact, they were not by any means exterminated, as we find Solomon making bondmen of the remnant of the ‘Amorites, Hittites, Perizzites, Hivites, and Jebusites,’ ‘their children that were left after them in the land, whom the children of Israel were not able utterly to destroy,’ IK.ix.20,21.



146. v.31. In v.23 the limits of the land of Canaan, strictly so called, are indicated: to this, when the Israelites were about to take possession of it, were added the regions of Gilead and Bashan on the left side of the Jordan. . . . But in this verse the utmost extent of Hebrew dominion, as it existed in the time of David and Solomon, is set forth. . . . HENGSTENBERG thinks that these broad descriptions of the Land are to be taken as rhetorical, and not as the strict terms of the promise. He considers this to be the right way of meeting those who reject the genuineness of the narrative on the ground of the improbability that Moses should have foretold the extent of the conquests of David and Solomon. But the *cavils* of such objectors may be met more simply and effectively by urging that, if Moses was acquainted with the geography of the region (which can hardly be called in question), he might certainly have foreseen that the Hebrew power, when it became very strong in the land of Canaan, could not fail to exercise domination over all the country from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean and the Red Sea. p.354.

*Ans.* The objection in question is not a 'cavil.' But the whole difficulty is explained when we know that v.22-33 is a later Deuteronomistic insertion (VI.229).

### Chap.xxiv.1-11,13-15,18(O.S.), 12(D.), 16,17(L.L.).

147. v.1,2. It is not easy to trace the proper connection of these two verses as they stand here. EWALD, with great probability, thinks that their right place is between v.8 and v.9 of this chapter. It has been suggested that they may relate to what was said to Moses immediately after the utterance of the Ten Commandments. If they are here placed in due order of time, the direction to Moses contained in them was delivered on the Mount, xx.21, but its fulfilment was deferred till after he had come down from the Mount and done all that is recorded in v.3-8. p.355.

v.3,4. The narrative in these verses seems naturally to follow the end of the preceding chapter. p.355.

*Ans.* The passage is easily explained when we remove the two interpolations, viz. xx.1-17 (the Ten Commandments), due to D., and xix.21-25, due to L.L., where Moses is summoned to come up into the Mount, v.20, and is instantly sent down again with a command to come up with Aaron, v.24. In xx.21, Moses is still standing, as in xix.17-19, at the foot of the Mount, and, after receiving the laws of the Covenant, is here commanded to 'come up with Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy elders,' v.1; but they were to go only 'a short distance up the Mountain,' p.356, and Moses alone is to 'draw near to Jehovah,' v.2, while the people are still to 'worship afar-off.' And so Moses goes to the people, of course with this message, which is carried out in v.9, as soon as he had sworn them to the Covenant on the basis of these laws, v.3-8.

148. v.5. *And he sent young men of the children of Israel, and they offered burnt-offerings and sacrificed sacrifices, peace-offerings to Jehovah, bullocks.*] Moses was on this occasion performing the office of a priest (the family of Aaron not being

yet consecrated), and he employed young men whose strength and skill qualified them to slaughter and prepare the sacrifices. The Law did not regard these acts as necessarily belonging to the priests; and it is probable that they were regarded in the same way in earlier times, when the sacerdotal character belonged especially to the firstborn sons. p.355.

*Ans.* But the text says that these young men 'offered burnt-offerings (וַיַּעֲלֶה עֹלֹת)', the identical phrase which is used for the act of the priest, L.xiv.20; and, though it is used also for the act of the person who *brings the sacrifice*, L.xvii.8, this does not apply in the present instance. It is plain, therefore, that these youths discharged the duties of priests; and yet, according to xix.22,24, there were at this time present 'priests who came near to Jehovah'! This last, however, belongs to the L.L.: the O.S. in the passage before us knows nothing about such priests, or about any special sanctity attaching as yet to the priestly office.

149. v.8. The Book of the Covenant was then read, and after that the blood in the basins was 'cast upon the people.' It was cast either upon the elders or those who stood foremost, or upon the twelve pillars representing the Twelve Tribes, as the first half had been cast upon the altar which witnessed the presence of Jehovah. p.356.

*Ans.* Why, then, is it not plainly said that it was cast upon the 'elders' or the 'pillars'—as assuredly it would have been said, if this had been an *historical* narrative?

150. v.9. It would appear that Moses, Aaron with his two sons, and seventy of the elders, went a short distance up the Mountain to eat the meal of the Covenant, *comp.* G.xxxi.43-47, which must have consisted of the flesh of the peace-offerings. Joshua is not named here, but he accompanied Moses as his servant.

As they ate the sacrificial feast, the presence of Jehovah was manifested to them with special distinctness. . . . It is idle to speculate on the mode of this revelation. That no visible form was presented to their bodily eyes we are expressly informed, D.iv.12.

The pure blue of the heaven above them lent its influence to help the inner sense to realise the vision which no mortal eye could behold. p.356.

*Ans.* There is no intimation in the text that this was a sacrificial feast, in which case the meat would have had to be carried from the place of sacrifice some distance up the Mount. But, however this may be, the O.S. clearly means that a visible form of some kind was 'presented to their bodily eyes,' whatever may have been the view of the later Deuteronomist.

As to Joshua, the writer seems to have lost sight of him at times; for though so much is said about Moses fasting forty days and nights, xxxiv.28, D.ix.9,18, he takes no account (nor does Mr. CLARK) of the fact that Joshua must have fasted also, v.13,14,18, xxxii.17(152).

151. *v.12. tables of stone and a law and commandments.*] EWALD takes the words to mean the Ten Commandments, and 'other sacred books of the Law.' But it is more probable that the Ten Commandments alone are spoken of, and that the meaning is, the Tables of Stone *with the Law, even the Commandment.* p.357.

*Ans. v.12* is a Deuteronomistic interpolation (VI.236), and, no doubt, refers to the Ten Commandments alone, which D. supposes to have been written on the Tables, D.iv.13, v.22, though this was not the meaning of the O.S., which makes Jehovah write upon the Tables 'the words of the Covenant,' xxxiv.28, *i.e.* the laws in xx.22, &c., *comp.* xxiv.3-8—the clause at the end of xxxiv.28, 'the Ten Words,' being an explanatory addition by D. or L.L. (VI.257.iv).

152. *v.15. Moses went up.*] Moses appears to have left Joshua, and gone up alone into the cloud. p.357.

*Ans.* This does not 'appear' from the text, since Moses says to the elders in *v.14*, 'Tarry ye here for us, until we come again to you,' and Joshua seems to follow him as a sort of shadow (150), even when not named. At all events, Joshua is supposed not to have returned with Aaron to the camp, xxxii.17, during the absence of Moses, and therefore must have fasted the 'forty days and forty nights' as well as Moses.

#### Chap.xxv.1-40(L.L.).

153. *v.3. gold, and silver, and brass.*] The supply of these metals possessed by the Israelites at this time probably included what they had inherited from their forefathers, what they had obtained from the Egyptians, and what may have been found among the spoils of the Amalekites. But, with their abundant flocks and herds, it can hardly be doubted that they had carried on important traffic with the trading caravans that traversed the wilderness, some of which, most likely, in the earliest times, were furnished with silver, with the gold of Ophir (or gold of Sheba, as it seems to have been indifferently called), and with the bronze of Phœnicia and Egypt. p.359.

*Ans.* They could hardly have had much time as yet for this 'important traffic,' for only a few months had passed since they left Egypt. But there is not the least sign of such 'traffic' in the O.S., nor even in the L.L., to which belongs the whole account of the construction of the Tabernacle, Ark, &c., and of the abundant supply of all kinds of precious materials among the Israelites. On the contrary, it is plain that no opportunities for carrying on such traffic are supposed in the narrative. If they could have purchased 'gold, silver, and bronze, blue, and purple, and scarlet, fine linen and goats' hair, rams' skins and seal skins,' *v.3-5*, what is the meaning of the statement in D.viii.4, 'Thy raiment waxed not old upon thee these forty years,' or that in D.xxix.5, 'And I have led you forty years in the wilder-

ness; *your clothes are not waxen old upon you, and thy shoe is not waxen old upon thy foot* ?

154. *v.4. fine linen.*] The word *shesh*, which is here used, is Egyptian. It is rendered by the LXX βύσσος, which must be allied to *butz*, the name of the 'fine linen' of Syria in *Ez.xxvii.16*. . . . The linen cloth of Persia is mentioned, *Esth.i.6*, by its Persian name *karpas*. . . . The occurrence of these three native names, *shesh*, *butz*, and *karpas*, for the same article produced in three different countries, in strict consistency with the narratives in which they occur, is worthy of remark. *p.358*.

*Ans.* It would be more 'worthy of remark' if Ezekiel did not use also *shesh*, *xvi.10,13, xxvii.7*, as well as *butz*, *xxvii.16*. Surely the Hebrews might use an Egyptian name for an Egyptian product without having lived in Egypt, as well as *meshi* for 'silk,' *Ez.xvi.10*, 'which Fürst thinks may be of Chinese derivation,' *p.359*, without having lived in China.

155. *v.9. according to all that I shew thee.*] The Tabernacle and all that pertained to it were to be in strict accordance with the ideas revealed by the Lord to Moses. Nothing in the way of form or decoration was to be left to the taste or judgment of the artificers. . . . The revelation to the mind of Moses was, without doubt, such as to suggest the exact appearance of the work to be produced. But there is no need to adopt the materialistic notion of some of the rabbinites, that a Tabernacle in the heavens was set forth before the bodily eyes of the Legislator. *p.360*.

*Ans.* Whatever may be the exact meaning of the 'pattern' shown in the Mount, it is strange that 'the ideas revealed by the Lord to Moses' corresponded so very closely with the practices of the idolatrous Egyptians (*Intr. to Pent. 23, Intr. to Ex. 21*).

156. *v.10.* The Ark is uniformly designated in Exodus 'the Ark of the Testimony,' *xxv.22, xxvi.34, xxx.6,26, xxxi.7, xl.3*; it is so called also *N.iv.5, vii.89, J.iv.16*; it is called simply 'the Testimony,' *E.xvi.34, xxvii.21, L.xvi.13, xxiv.3, N.xvii.10*. But in *N.x.33* it is named 'the Ark of the Covenant,' and this is its most frequent name in Deuteronomy and the other books of the O.T. In some places it is named 'the Ark of the Lord,' 'the Ark of God,' 'the Ark of the Strength of the Lord,' and 'the Holy Ark.' *p.360*.

*Ans.* The phrase 'Ark of the Testimony' is used *only* in L.L., except perhaps in *J.iv.16*, on which last point see (*VI.App.51.xx*); and the very fact that this favourite expression is never employed in 'Deuteronomy and the other books of the O.T.,' is a convincing proof of the later origin of the L.L. The phrase 'Ark of the Covenant' is that used by the O.S., which is copied by D. (*VI.85-6*).

157. *v.10.* Taking the cubit at 18 inches (see on *G.vi.15*), the Ark of the Covenant was a box *3ft. 9in.* long, *2ft. 3in.* wide, and *2ft. 3in.* deep. *p.360*.

*Ans.* The note on G.vi.15 says 'reckoning the cubit at 21 inches,' and adds, 'the length of the cubit is doubtful, as there appear to have been two or three different measures so called.' The usual estimate is 1.824ft. = 22in. according to which the Ark would be 4ft. 6in. long, and 2ft. 9in. wide and deep.

158. v.10. of *shittim wood*.] It is well observed that, if the Ark, which appears to have been preserved till the destruction of Jerusalem, 2Ch.xxxv.3, Jer.iii.16, had originated in Palestine, it would not have been made of shittim wood, the wood of the Wilderness, but either of oak, the best wood of the Holy Land, or of cedar, which took the place of shittim wood in the construction of the Temple. p.360.

*Ans.* The above argument assumes that the Ark in 2Ch.xxxv.3, Jer.iii.16, was made of shittim wood, of which no sign appears in those passages; nor does the O.S., in speaking of the Ark, or any other passage not in the Pentateuch, state of what wood it was made. It is most probable, however, that it really was made of shittim wood—either in the wilderness during the journey (VI.574) or in Egypt before the Exodus, since this wood 'grows in Egypt in some regions at a distance from the coast.' p.359. For the Deuteronomist, apparently quoting in D.x.1,2, the literal commands of E. xxxiv.1,2, inserts the clause, 'and make thee an ark of wood,' which probably existed originally in E.xxxiv.1, but must have been struck out when the directions to make the Ark in E.xxv, &c., were interpolated, and then he makes Moses say in D.x.3, 'and I made an ark of *shittim wood*,' thus indicating the wood of which the ark existing in his time (Jer.iii.16) was made (VI.46-51).

159. v.15. They are also called the Tables of the Covenant, E.xxxiv.28, D.ix. 9,11,15, as the Ark is called the Ark of the Covenant. The meaning of the latter name admits of no doubt; the Ten Commandments contained 'the word of the Covenant' between Jehovah and His people, E.xxxiv.28, D.iv.13. p.361.

*Ans.* The expression, 'He wrote upon the tables the words of the Covenant,' in E xxxiv.28 belongs to the O.S., and corresponds to 'the book of the Covenant,' xxiv.7, 'all the words of Jehovah,' v.4, 'the Covenant which Jehovah hath made with you concerning all these words,' v.8, referring to the laws in xx.22, &c., and altogether excluding the Ten Commandments. It is D. who inserts these, and supposes the Covenant to be based upon them.

160. v.23. The Shewbread Table, the Golden Altar, and the Golden Candlestick, were renewed by Solomon for the Temple. Of the Candlestick ten copies were then made. From the omission of them among the spoils carried home from Babylon, Ezr.i.9-11, we may infer that the Table and the Golden Altar with a single Candlestick were remade by Zerubbabel, 1Macc.i.21,22, and again by the Maccabees, 1Macc.iv.49. There cannot, therefore, be a doubt that the Table and the Candle-

stick figured on the Arch [of Titus] are those of the Maccabæan times. . . . It is, however, most likely that the restorations were made as nearly as possible after the ancient models. *p.361*.

*Ans.* In Solomon's Temple there were *ten* golden candlesticks, five on the right and five on the left. The *single* seven-branched candlestick of the L.L., E.xxv.31, &c., xxxvii.17, &c., N.viii.2, was most probably imitated from what the writer had before him in the *Second* Temple, 1Macc.i.21, *comp.* Zech.iv.2, which was carried off by Antiochus; another golden candlestick, perhaps a copy of this, was made by Judas Maccabæus, 1Macc.iv.49,50, and is that which appears upon the Arch of Titus. So, too, the Chronicler, having before his mind's eye the single candlestick of his own time, speaks inadvertently of 'the candlestick of gold with *its* lamps' in Solomon's Temple, 2Ch.xiii.11, in spite of 2Ch.iv.7, which is merely copied from 1K.vii.49, and gives the correct number. On the other hand, the Chronicler provides *ten* golden tables, as well as ten candlesticks, for Solomon's Temple, 2Ch.iv.8, 19, 1Ch.xxviii.16, though in 2Ch.xiii.11, xxix.18, he speaks only of one, as in 1K.vii.48 (VI.402).

161. *v.30.* The Shewbread Table was placed in the Holy Place on the *north* side, xxvi.35. Directions for preparing the shewbread are given in L.xxiv.5-9. *p.364*.

*Ans.* The unhistorical character of the narrative appears from the fact that it is nowhere ordered in what direction the Tabernacle itself should be placed (164), without which a number of commands are unmeaning, *e.g.* xxvi.18,35, &c. (VI.399)—as also from the fact that Moses sets the shewbread in order upon the table, xl.23, before any directions have been given for preparing it. L.xxiv.5-9.

162. *v.39.* *a talent of pure gold.*] Amongst the discrepant estimates of the weight of the Hebrew talent, the one that appears to be received most generally would make it about 94*lbs.* *p.366*.

*Ans.* Thus, according to the present Mint price of pure gold, the candlestick alone contained 5,000*l.* worth of gold!

### Chap.xxvi.1-37(L.L.).

163. *v.15.* *and thou shalt make boards for the tabernacle of shittim wood.*] The shittah tree has been said to be too small to produce boards of the size here described. It has been conjectured that each board was jointed up of several pieces. But Mr. TRISTRAM regards this conjecture as needless, and states that there are acacia-trees near Engedi which would produce boards four feet in width. If there are no trees so large in the Peninsula of Sinai at this time, liberal allowance may be made for the diminished capabilities of the region for the production of timber. *p.372*.

*Ans.* These boards were to be 10 cubits (18*ft.*) long, and 1½ cubit (2*ft.*)

8in.) wide, v.16—it is not mentioned how thick. Of course, by making sufficiently 'liberal allowance for the diminished capabilities of the region for the production of timber,' we may easily obtain in the wilderness of Sinai whatever the text requires. But in D.viii.15 it is called 'a great and terrible wilderness.'

164. v.18. *the south side southward.*] The Hebrew phrase, which also occurs xxvii.9, xxxvi.23, xxxviii.9, is relieved from pleonasm if it is rendered *the south side on the right*. As the entrance of the Tabernacle was at its east end, the south side, to a person entering it, would be on the *left* hand. But we learn from JOSEPHUS, (*Ant.*VIII.iii.6) that it was usual in speaking of the Temple to identify the south with the *right* hand and the north with the left hand, the entrance being regarded as the face of the structure and the west end as its back. p.372.

*Ans.* There is no direction anywhere that the Tabernacle was to be placed east and west; but the writer, no doubt, assumes this from what he had before his eyes in the position of the Second Temple.

165. v.31. The veil of the *first* Temple was in like manner adorned with cherubim. p.373.

*Ans.* It is plain that 'the first Temple' had *no veil at all*, but folding-doors, 1K.vi.31,32, vii.50, and that the Chronicler has inadvertently introduced into Solomon's Temple (2Ch.iii.14) the veil which he had before his eyes in the *second* Temple, *comp.* Matt.xxvii.51, Heb.vi.19, and which the L.L. has assumed for the Tabernacle (VI.400).

166. The veil which separated the Most Holy Place from the Holy Place was suspended from golden hooks attached to four pillars. . . . But *the position of these pillars is not mentioned in Exodus*. It is indeed said that the veil was hung 'under the taches.' Now the taches of the tabernacle cloth *must have been 15 cubits from the back of the Mishkan* [or whole building]. . . . But according to Philo, Josephus, and all tradition, supported by every consideration of probability, *the veil was 10 cubits—not 15—from the back*, and the Holy of Holies was a cubical chamber of corresponding measurement. *The statement that the veil was hung 'under the taches' remains unexplained.* p.375.

According to this view [Mr.FERGUSON'S, *D.B. Art. Temple*, adopted by Mr. CLARK] the five pillars at the entrance of the Tent (E.xxvi.37) *were graduated*, as they would naturally be at the entrance of any large tent of the best form, the tallest one being in the middle *to support one end of a ridge-pole*. It has been already observed that the descriptions in Exodus appear to pass over all particulars of the construction, except those which formed visible features in the fabric. On this ground we may be allowed to suppose that there was not only a ridge-pole, but a *series of pillars at the back of the Tent, corresponding in height with those at the front*. Such a ridge-pole, which *must have been sixty feet in length*, would have required support; and this *might have been afforded by light rafters resting on the top of the boards*, or, as is more in accordance with the usage of tent architecture,

by a plain pole in the middle of the structure. . . . There must also have been a back-cloth suspended from the pillars at the back. p.377.

Above the tent-cloth of goats' hair was spread the covering of red rams' skins. Mr. FERGUSSON conceives that the covering of *tachash* [seal or dugong] skins above this *did not cover the whole roof*, but served only as a 'coping or ridge-piece' to protect the crest of the roof. p.377.

The hangings were attached to the pillars by the silver hooks; but the length of the space between the pillars—they were  $7\frac{1}{2}$  ft. apart, p.381—would render it most probable that they were also in some way fastened to these rods. p.380.

The position of the Tabernacle in the Court *could hardly have been* in the middle, as Josephus imagined. *It is most probable* that its place was, as Philo conceived, equidistant from the W., N., and S. walls of the Court, so as to leave between it and the entrance of the Court a suitable space for the Brazen Altar and the Laver. p.381.

There has been a difficulty raised regarding the number and distribution of the pillars of the Court. KNOBEL, taking up the notion of Philo and some other interpreters, supposes that the number was 56, each corner pillar being reckoned both as one for the side and one for the end. KEIL, who contends for 60 as the number, has not made the matter much clearer by his mode of explanation. . . . *If we may suppose the numbers, referring to each side of the enclosure, to have belonged to the spaces between the pillars rather than to the pillars themselves, the statements become clear.* p.381.

*Ans.* The numerous omissions—and in one place *inaccuracy*—indicated by the italics in the above quotations from Mr. FERGUSSON's ingenious explanation, are inconsistent with the notion of a correct and perfect *Divine Revelation*, and must be felt to qualify to some extent the words of Mr. FERGUSSON with reference to this account in Exodus, as quoted by Mr. CLARK, p.379:—

It seems to me clear that it must have been written by some one who had seen the Tabernacle standing: no one could have worked it out in such detail without ocular demonstration of the way in which the parts would fit together.

### Chap.xxvii.1-21(L.L.).

167. v.8. *hollow with boards.*] It was a hollow casing, formed of stout acacia planks covered with plates of bronze,  $7\frac{1}{2}$  ft. 6 in. in length and width, and 4 ft. 6 in. in height. Jewish, as well as Christian, authorities have supposed that, when it was fixed for use, it was filled up with earth or rough stones. If we connect this suggestion with the *old rule* regarding the Altar of earth and the Altar of stone given in xx.24,25, the woodwork might in fact be regarded merely as the *case* of the Altar on which the victims were actually burned. The shelf round the sides, v.5, was required as a stage for the priests, to enable them to carry on their work conveniently on the top of the Altar. Hence it is said of Aaron that he



*came down* from the Altar, L.ix.22. According to rabbinical tradition, there was a slope of earth banked up for the priest to ascend to the stage, E.xx.26.

The Altar of Solomon's Temple is described in 2Ch.iv.1. It was 20 cubits in length and breadth, and 10 cubits in height; so that it was unlike the Altar of the Tabernacle, not only in its magnitude, but in its proportions. p.380.

*Ans.* The 'old rules' in E.xx.24-26, which are here contradicted both by the altar being constructed of wood plated with bronze, instead of being made of earth or 'built' of unbewn stones, 'no tool being lifted up upon it,' and also by its being so high— $5\frac{1}{2}$ ft. high and 9ft. square, reckoning the cubit as 1.824 ft.—that the priests must mount up to it in some way, which is expressly forbidden in xx.26—were, according to the story, *Divine* ordinances, which had only been just before delivered, and included among the laws which were made the basis of the covenant between Jehovah and Israel, xxiv.3-8. But those laws belong to the O.S., and were written in an age when elaborate constructions of wood and bronze were not thought of in Israel, and when the priests were not supposed to wear 'linen breeches,' xxviii.42. Why should this clumsy 'case' have been carried about in the wilderness, if they must after all fill it with earth and stone, and therefore might have built a temporary altar of earth and stone anywhere? The 'rabbinical tradition' is only invented to save the consistency of the Pentateuchal story.

The Chronicler has, no doubt, merely guessed at the size of Solomon's altar, and made it 18ft. high and 36ft. long and wide!—evidently an enormous exaggeration.

168. v.20,21. It is not quite easy to see the reason of the insertion of these verses in this place. The passage, with unimportant verbal alterations, is repeated L.xxiv.2,3, where it is connected in a natural manner with the rules for the supplying and ordering of the shewbread. p.382.

*Ans.* It was probably interpolated here by some one who saw that otherwise Moses is made to light the lamps in E.xi.25 before any order had been given for a supply of oil 'to cause the lamp to burn always.'

169. v.21. *the tabernacle of the congregation*] more literally, *the Tent of Meeting*; this is the first occurrence of this designation of the Tabernacle. p.382.

*Ans.* It is adopted from the language of the O.S. in xxxiii.7.

### Chap.xxviii.1-43(L.L.).

170. v.1. Moses is now commanded to commit all that pertains to the Offerings made to the Lord in the Sanctuary to the exclusive charge of the members of a single family, who were to hold their office from generation to generation. p.382.

*Ans.* The O.S. knows nothing about the setting apart of Aaron and his sons for the priesthood; nor is Aaron anywhere mentioned as a priest till after the Captivity—not even by Jeremiah or Ezekiel, both priests—except in the interpolated Ju.xx.28\*(L.L.). But it is probable that the O.S. did set apart the *Levites* generally as priests, in a passage which was of necessity expunged, when this passage of the L.L. was inserted (VI.157–9).

171. v.1. Nadab and Abihu, the two elder sons of Aaron, had accompanied their father and the 70 elders, when they went a part of the way with Moses up the mountain (xxiv.1,9). Soon after their consecration they were destroyed for ‘offering strange fire before the Lord,’ L.x.1,2. Eleazar and Ithamar are here mentioned for the first time, except in the genealogy, vi.23. Eleazar succeeded his father in the high-priesthood, and was himself succeeded by his son Phinehas (Ju.xx.28). But Eli, the next high-priest named in the history, was of the line of Ithamar. The representatives of both families held office at once in the time of David, 1Ch.xxiv.1–3, 2 S.viii.17. p.383.

*Ans.* The O.S. mentions two sons of Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, just as it mentions two sons of Moses, Gershon and Eliezer, xviii.3,4; but it knows nothing whatever about Eleazar and Ithamar, who belong entirely to the L.L. Ju.xx.28<sup>a</sup> (where Phinehas is mentioned) is also an interpolation of the L.L. (VII). The notion of Eli belonging to the line of Ithamar, and Zadok to that of Eleazar, and of ‘the representatives of both families holding office in the time of David,’ is a mere fiction of the Chronicler. 2S.viii.17 proves nothing.

172. v.3. The following points in this *divinely ordained* investiture of the Priests of Jehovah seem to be worthy of special notice in our own day:—

(i) There was nothing left to individual taste or fancy; every point was authoritatively laid down in minute detail.

(ii) The High-Priest, when performing his highest and holiest functions, was attired in a plain white dress, L.xvi.4.

(iii) The only garments worn by the other priests ‘for glory and for beauty,’ v.40, when they were engaged in the service of both the Golden Altar and the Brazen Altar (L.vi.10), were also white, with the exception of the girdle, v.40.

(iv) There were no changes in the dresses of the priests at the three Great Festivals, nor any periodical change whatever, except when the High-Priest, on the Day of Atonement, put off his robes of office for the dress of white linen. p.383.

*Ans.* However comely the surplice may be, as a dress for the officiating minister ‘in our own day,’ it is impossible to regard it as ‘divinely ordained,’ when we know that these prescriptions are all fictitious, the product of a very late age. In whatever time the custom of the priests wearing ‘a plain white dress’ originated, it was probably copied from the practice of the Egyptian priesthood (*Intr. to Pent.* 23). And so Mr. CLARK notes:—

The ancient Egyptian priests, like the Hebrew priests, wore nothing but white linen garments in the performance of their duties. p.390.

173. v.30. *put in the breastplate of judgment the Urim and the Thummim.*] It is not questioned that this rendering fairly represents the original words; and it most naturally follows that the Urim and the Thummim (whatever they were) were *put into* the bag that was formed by the doubling of the *Chosen* ['breastplate,' rather 'breast-piece'] as the Tables of the Law were *put into* the Ark, the same verb and preposition being used in each case, xxv.16. Most critics are in favour of this view. But it cannot be denied that the words may also mean *upon the Breastplate* [Breast-piece].

*The Urim and Thummim.*] These were probably some well-known means for casting lots, which from this time forward were kept in the bag of the *Chosen*. p.388.

From the definite article being prefixed to each of the names, from their not being described in any way, and from their not being mentioned in the record of the construction of the Breastplate, xxxix.21, it seems most likely that they were something previously existing and familiarly known. p.391.

There is no instance on record of their being consulted after the time of David. They were certainly not in use after the Captivity; and it seems to have become a proverb in reference to a question of inextricable difficulty, that it should not be solved 'till there stood up a priest with Urim and Thummim,' Ez.ii.63, Neh.vii.65. p.391.

It has been suggested on very probable ground that the Teraphim may have been employed as an unauthorized substitute for the Urim and Thummim (see Ju.xvii.5, xviii.14,17,20, 1S.xv.28, Hos.iii.4, 2K.xxiii.24, Ez.xxi.21, Zech.x.2). Now we know that the Teraphim belonged to patriarchal times, to the Semitic race, and to regions remote from Egypt. Is not the supposition as easy that the Urim and Thummim took the place of what must have been familiarly known to the Patriarchs, and which appear, in a renewal of the old degraded form, to have been in later times confounded with them, as that they were adopted from the Egyptians? p.392.

No attempted explanation seems to be more in accordance with such analogy as the history of the Israelites affords, or more free from objection, than that the Urim and Thummim were some means of casting lots. . It seems worthy of remark that the Urim and the Thummim appear to have fallen into disuse as the prophetic office became more distinct and important in and after the reign of David. p.393.

*Ans.* See (VI.403-8), where it is shown that the 'Urim and Thummim' were probably identical with 'teraphim,' being small images fixed in the Sacred Ephod which was used in some way for purposes of divination, or, perhaps, as Mr. CLARK says, 'kept in the bag of the breast-piece.' As the writer does not attempt to describe their form or material, it is probable that he was unable to do so—that he only knew of the Urim and Thummim

as having been in use in ancient times, as 'something previously existing and familiarly known' down to the days of David, without having any very clear idea as to their nature.

Chap.xxix.1-46(L.L.).

Chap.xxx.1-38(L.L.).

174. v.12. *when thou takest the sum of the children of Israel.*] The silver must have been contributed at this time, along with the other materials, since it was used in the Tabernacle, which was completed on the first day of the *first* month of the second year after coming out of Egypt, xl.17. But the command to take the complete census of the nation appears not to have been given until the first day of the *second* month of that year N.i.1. On comparing the words of E.xxx.12 with those of N.i.1-3, we may perhaps infer that the first passage relates to a mere *counting* of the adult Israelites at the time when the money was taken from each, and that what the latter passage enjoins was a formal *enrolment* of them according to their genealogies and their order of military service. p.397.

*Ans.* Mr.CLARK has not mentioned that this 'counting' must have taken place *more than six months* before the 'enrolment' in N.i, and yet the number of adult males is exactly the same on each occasion, E.xxxviii.26, N.ii.32 (I.47). It is plain that the whole account is unhistorical.

175. v.18. *a laver of brass.*] The bronze for the Laver and its foot was supplied from the bronze mirrors of the women 'who assembled at the door of the tabernacle.' p.398.

The women were most probably devout women who loved the public service of religion. p.423.

*Ans.* Of course, the phrase may be supposed to refer to the older 'Tent of Meeting' in xxxiii.7. But most probably the writer has used the expression here inadvertently, forgetting that the 'Mosaic Tabernacle,' as described in the L.L., was not yet in existence, xl.17 (VI.411).

176. v.23. *take thou also unto thee principal spices, &c.*] *Myrrh* is a gum which comes from the stem of a low thorny tree, that grows in *Arabia Felix and Eastern Africa*. It is probable that *Cinnamon* was imported from *India* in very early times by the people of *Ophir*, and that it was brought with other spices from the south part of *Arabia* by the trading caravans that visited *Egypt* and *Syria*.

*Sweet Calamus* . . . was probably what is now known in *India* as the *Lemon Grass*.

*Cassia* is the inner bark of an *Indian tree*. p.399.

*Ans.* As the Israelites could not have plundered these spices from the *Amalekites*, xvii, nor purchased them in the wilderness, where they could not even buy clothes or leather for shoes, D.viii.4, xxix.5, the traditionary view

must suppose that they 'asked' them from the Egyptians, though spices are not alluded to in iii.22, xi.2, xii.35, and the spices here were contributed only by the *rulers*, xxxv.28, instead of, as in that case we might expect, more generally by the people. It is much more easy to understand that a writer of a late age, when such spices were common and were probably in actual use for the composition of the 'holy anointing oil' in the Second Temple, has here inadvertently made Jehovah command the instant production of these foreign spices in large quantities, viz. 15½lbs. of myrrh, 15½lbs. of cassia, 7lbs. 14oz. of cinnamon, and 7lbs. 14oz. of calamus, p.399, as well as of the aromatic ingredients required for the incense in v.34, as to which Mr.CLARK says:—

It seems by no means unlikely that the *stacte* here mentioned was the gum known as Benzoin or Gum Benjamin, which is an important ingredient in the incense now used in churches and mosques, and is the produce of a tree that grows in *Java* and *Sumatra*; *galbanum* is imported from *India*, *Persia*, and *Africa*; *frankincense* was most likely imported from *India*. p.401.

177. v.33. The Holy Oil was not even to be used for the anointing of a king, 1K.i.39. p.400.

*Ans.* It was probably not even known in the age of David.

### Chap.xxxi.1-17(L.L.), 18(O.S.).

178. v.2. There seems sufficient reason to identify Hur, the grandfather of Bezaleel, with the Hur who assisted Aaron in supporting the hands of Moses during the battle with Amalek at Rephidim, xvii.10, and who was associated with Aaron in the charge of the people while Moses was on the mountain, xxiv.14. Josephus says that he was the husband of Miriam. It is true probable that Bezaleel was related to Moses. p.402.

*Ans.* It is very possible that the Hur in xvii.10, xxiv.14, was supposed to be brother-in-law of Moses as Aaron was his brother or half-brother (6). But Mr.CLARK does not give the 'sufficient reason' for identifying the grandfather of Bezaleel with this Hur of the O.S. In fact, 1Ch.ii.18-20 gives the genealogy Hezron—Caleb—Ephrath—*Hur*—*Uri*—*Bezaleel*, where the last three are the same as here, and Bezaleel would be in the *fifth* generation from those who went down with Jacob, instead of the *fourth*, as the main body of adult Israelites (56), which would imply that he was a *young* man when called to the work of the Tabernacle. No dependence, however, can be placed on the Chronicler's genealogies, and Bezaleel belongs wholly to the L.L.

179. v.12-17. In the Fourth Commandment the injunction to observe the Seventh Day is addressed to the conscience of the people; in this place the object

is to declare an infraction of the Commandment to be a capital offence. . . . From the repetition of the substance of these verses in the beginning of ch.xxxv it seems likely that the penal edict was specially introduced as a caution in reference to the construction of the Tabernacle, lest the people, in their zeal to carry on the work, should be tempted to break the divine Law for the observance of the Day (!). In this chapter, the edict immediately follows the series of directions given to Moses on Sinai for the work: in xxxv Moses utters it before he repeats any of the directions to the people.

*cut off from among his people.*] This is distinctly assigned as a reason why the offender should, or might, be put to death. . . . He, who was 'cut off from the people,' had by his offence put himself out of the terms of the Covenant and was an outlaw. On such, and on such alone, when the offence was one which affected the well-being of the nation, as it was in this case, death could be inflicted by the public authority. p.404.

*Ans.* Happily we are not obliged to believe that the severe laws of the L.L., which order that a man shall be 'rooted-out (cut-off) from his people' for a multitude of offences (VI.602), were Divine ordinances, or were ever really meant to be carried out, so that (*e.g.*) anyone who happened to touch a dead mouse, lizard, mole, or snail, would be 'unclean until the evening.' L.xi.31, and would be liable to death under certain circumstances, vii.21. They are merely indications of the zeal with which in later days the *priests* sought to enforce a punctilious observance of the ceremonial law, by the enunciation of terrible penalties, represented as enjoined by Jehovah in the wilderness for such offences, though now they had neither the power, nor (it may be hoped) the desire, to inflict them.

### Chap.xxxii.1-6,15-33,35(O.S.), 7-14,34(D.).

180. v.1. The exact coherence of the narrative of all that immediately relates to the construction of the Sanctuary, if we pass on immediately from ch.xxxi to ch.xxxv, might suggest the probability that these three chapters originally formed a distinct composition. This suggestion is in some degree strengthened, if we take account of some part of the subject-matter of ch.xxxiv. But this need not involve the question of the Mosaic authorship of the three chapters. The main incidents recorded in them follow in due order of time, and are therefore in their proper place as regards historical sequence. p.404.

*Ans.* xxv.1-xxx.17 belongs to the L.L.; xxxii followed in the O.S. after xxxi.18, and this after xxiv.1-11,13-15,18, all in historical sequence (VI.272). Mr.CLARK's admissions above tend to confirm the correctness of our view.

181. v.4. The Israelites must have been familiar with the ox-worship of the Egyptians. . . . It seems most likely that the idolatrous tendency of the people had been contracted from the Egyptians, but that it was qualified by what they

still retained of the truths revealed to their forefathers. In *v.5* Aaron appears to speak of the calf as if it was a representative of Jehovah, 'To-morrow is a feast to Jehovah.' They did not, it should be noticed, worship a *living* Mnevis or Apis, having a proper name, but only the golden type of the animal. The mystical notions connected with the ox by the Egyptian priests may have possessed their minds, and, when expressed in this modified and less gross manner, may have been applied to the Lord, who had really delivered them out of the hand of the Egyptians. Their sin, then, lay, not in their adopting another god, but in their pretending to worship a visible symbol of Him whom no symbol could represent. The close connection between the calves of Jeroboam and this calf is shown by the repetition of the formula, 'which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt,' 1K.xii.28. *p.403.*

*Ans.* It seems most probable that this molten calf and those of Jeroboam are not in any way to be connected with the Egyptian worship of a *living* animal, but point to the worship of *ΥΑΗΥΕ* as the Sun-God, the Baal of Canaan, under the form of a steer or heifer. Thus Mr. WESTCOTT (*D.B. I. p.243-4*) rejects the notion of an Egyptian origin for the Israelitish calf-worship, observing that 'it was extremely unlikely that they would so soon adopt a Deity whom they had so recently seen humiliated by the judgments of Moses'—that 'there was only *one* Apis, whereas Jeroboam erected *two* calves'—and that 'the prophets of Israel, though sanctioning the calf-worship, still regarded themselves, and were regarded, as *prophets of Jehovah*, 1K.xxii.6, &c.' If this narrative was written (as we suppose) in David's time, it would imply that in that age the prophetic writer desired to abolish the practice of this idolatry, as well as that of human sacrifices (59).

182. *v.14. And the Lord repented of the evil which He thought to do unto His people.*] This states the fact that was not revealed to Moses till after his second intercession, when he had come down from the Mountain and witnessed the sin of the people, *v.30-34.*

Moses was tried in a two-fold manner. The trial was at first based on the divine communication made to him in the Mount respecting the apostasy of the people: on this occasion he rejects the offer of glory for himself and intercedes for the nation; the exercise was a purely spiritual one, apart from visible fact, and no answer is given to his intercession. But, in the second case, stirred up as he was by the facts actually before his eyes, after he had unflinchingly carried out the judgment of God upon the persons of the obstinate idolaters, he not only again intercedes for the nation, but declares himself ready to sacrifice his own salvation for them, *v.22.*

If the wonderful narrative in this passage should appear to any thoughtful reader incoherent or obscure, let him read it again and again, and apply to it the key of his own spiritual experience. On another occasion in the history, when the

people had rebelled on account of the report of the ten spies, the trial of Moses' faithfulness was repeated in a very similar manner, N.xiv.11-23. *p.*406.

*Ans.* In N.xiv, *v.*2-10 belongs to L.L., *v.*11-25 to O.S. (VI.97); and so here, *v.*1-6,15-33, belongs to O.S., but *v.*7-14,34, to D.(VI.239), the two writers being in each instance plainly distinguished by their phraseology. It seems clear that in *v.*15-19, *comp. v.*31, Moses and Joshua know nothing of the idolatry going on in the Camp, as notified to Moses in *v.*8; but Mr.CLARK supposes that Moses knew, but had not told Joshua!—

Moses does not tell Joshua of the divine communication that had been made to him respecting the apostasy of the people, but only corrects his impression by calling his attention to the kind of noise which they are making.

And as to the breaking of the Tables in *v.*19, which seems to imply that Moses then first became suddenly aware of what they were doing, Mr. CLARK says:—

Though Moses had been prepared by the revelation on the Mount, his righteous indignation was stirred up beyond control, when the abomination was before his eyes.

Had Joshua been 'fasting,' as well as Moses, all this time?

183. *v.*20. We need not suppose that each incident is here placed in strict order of time. What is related in this verse must have occupied some time, and may have followed the rebuke of Aaron. Moses appears to have thrown the calf into the fire to destroy its form and then to have *pounded* or *filed* the metal to powder, which he cast into the brook. He then made the Israelites drink of the water of the brook. . . . It seems idle to speculate on the means by which the comminution of the gold was effected. *p.*407.

*Ans.* It is by no means 'idle,' if our object is to determine whether this narrative is historically true or not. Metallic gold might have been 'pounded' into a thin plate, but surely not into fine powder; and it would have taken a long time to 'file' the calf into powder. But the very fact that the principal actor on this occasion, writing an account of his own doings, does not relate them 'in strict order of time,' and does not mention at all Jehovah's anger against Aaron and his own intercession for him, D.ix.20, shows that this is not history.

184. *v.*26-29. The tribe of Levi, Moses' own tribe, now distinguished itself by immediately returning to its allegiance and obeying the call to fight on the side of Jehovah. We need not doubt that the 3,000 who were slain were those who persisted in resisting Moses: we may perhaps conjecture that they were such as contumaciously refused to drink of the water of the brook. The spirit of the narrative forbids us to conceive that the act of the Levites was anything like an indiscriminate massacre. An amnesty had first been offered to all in the words, 'Who is on the Lord's side?' Those who were forward to draw the sword were



directed not to spare their closest relations or friends; but this must plainly have been with an understood qualification as regards the conduct of those who were to be slain. Had it not been so, they who were on the Lord's side would have had to destroy each other. We need not stumble at the bold simple way in which the statement is made. The Bible does not deign to apologise for itself; and hence at times it affords occasion to gainsayers, who shut their eyes to the spirit, while they are *captiously* looking at dis severed fragments of the letter. p.408.

*Ans.* It seems plain that the Text does mean that the Levites were to commit—and did commit—an 'indiscriminate massacre' on all whom they came across, in going from one side of the Camp to the other, v.27. And what is there in this so discordant with the 'spirit' of the Pentateuch, when we find 88,000 Midianite women and 32,000 boys of all ages, including infants, butchered by order of Moses in cool blood, N.xxxi (VI.464)?

185. v.29. *consecrate yourselves to-day to the Lord.*] Our version gives the most probable meaning of the Hebrew (L.viii.22,27), and is supported by the best authority. The Levites were to prove themselves in a special way the servants of Jehovah, in anticipation of their formal consecration as ministers of the Sanctuary, by manifesting a self-sacrificing zeal in carrying out the divine command, even upon their nearest relatives. p.408.

*Ans.* See (VI.157-9), where it is shown that in the O.S. there probably existed in connection with this passage some short account of the whole tribe of Levi having been set apart for the priesthood, which has been of necessity removed to make way for the more complex system of the L.L., with its distinction of 'Priests' and 'Levites.'

186. v.34. *in the day when I visit I will visit their sin upon them.*] This has been supposed to refer to the sentence that was pronounced on the generation of Israelites then living, when they murmured on account of the report of the ten spies that they should not enter the land, N.xiv. On that occasion they were charged with having tempted God 'these ten times,' v.22. But though the Lord visited the sin upon those who rebelled, yet He 'repented of the evil which He thought to do unto His people.' He chastized the individuals, but did not take His blessing from the nation. p.409.

*Ans.* See (VI.239), where it is shown that v.34 is a Deuteronomistic insertion, inconsistent with v.35, and anticipating xxxiii.1.

### Chap.xxxiii.1,2,7-23(O.S.), 3-6(D.).

187. v.1. It had been conceded to Moses that the nation should not be destroyed, and that he should lead them on towards the place of which the Lord had spoken. But the favour was not to be awarded according to the terms of the original promise in xxiii.20-23. The Covenant on which the promise was based had been broken by the people. Jehovah now therefore declared that though His Angel

people had rebelled on account of the report of the ten spies, the trial of Moses' faithfulness was repeated in a very similar manner, N.xiv.11-23. *p.*406.

*Ans.* In N.xiv, *v.*2-10 belongs to L.L., *v.*11-25 to O.S. (VI.97); and so here, *v.*1-6,15-33, belongs to O.S., but *v.*7-14,34, to D.(VI.239), the two writers being in each instance plainly distinguished by their phraseology. It seems clear that in *v.*15-19, *comp. v.*31, Moses and Joshua know nothing of the idolatry going on in the Camp, as notified to Moses in *v.*8; but Mr. CLARK supposes that Moses knew, but had not told Joshua! —

Moses does not tell Joshua of the divine communication that had been made to him respecting the apostasy of the people, but only corrects his impression by calling his attention to the kind of noise which they are making.

And as to the breaking of the Tables in *v.*19, which seems to imply that Moses then first became suddenly aware of what they were doing, Mr. CLARK says:—

Though Moses had been prepared by the revelation on the Mount, his righteous indignation was stirred up beyond control, when the abomination was before his eyes.

Had Joshua been 'fasting,' as well as Moses, all this time?

183. *v.*20. We need not suppose that each incident is here placed in strict order of time. What is related in this verse must have occupied some time, and may have followed the rebuke of Aaron. Moses appears to have thrown the calf into the fire to destroy its form and then to have *pounded* or *filed* the metal to powder, which he cast into the brook. He then made the Israelites drink of the water of the brook. . . . It seems idle to speculate on the means by which the comminution of the gold was effected. *p.*407.

*Ans.* It is by no means 'idle,' if our object is to determine whether this narrative is historically true or not. Metallic gold might have been 'pounded' into a thin plate, but surely not into fine powder; and it would have taken a long time to 'file' the calf into powder. But the very fact that the principal actor on this occasion, writing an account of his own doings, does not relate them 'in strict order of time,' and does not mention at all Jehovah's anger against Aaron and his own intercession for him, D.ix.20, shows that this is not history.

184. *v.*26-29. The tribe of Levi, Moses' own tribe, now distinguished itself by immediately returning to its allegiance and obeying the call to fight on the side of Jehovah. We need not doubt that the 3,000 who were slain were those who persisted in resisting Moses: we may perhaps conjecture that they were such as contumaciously refused to drink of the water of the brook. The spirit of the narrative forbids us to conceive that the act of the Levites was anything like an indiscriminate massacre. An amnesty had first been offered to all in the words, 'Who is on the Lord's side?' Those who were forward to draw the sword were

directed not to spare their closest relations or friends; but this must plainly have been with an understood qualification as regards the conduct of those who were to be slain. Had it not been so, they who were on the Lord's side would have had to destroy each other. We need not stumble at the bold simple way in which the statement is made. The Bible does not deign to apologise for itself; and hence at times it affords occasion to gainsayers, who shut their eyes to the spirit, while they are *captiously* looking at dis severed fragments of the letter. p.408.

*Ans.* It seems plain that the Text does mean that the Levites were to commit—and did commit—an 'indiscriminate massacre' on all whom they came across, in going from one side of the Camp to the other, v.27. And what is there in this so discordant with the 'spirit' of the Pentateuch, when we find 88,000 Midianite women and 32,000 boys of all ages, including infants, butchered by order of Moses in cool blood, N.xxxi (VI.464)?

185. v.29. *consecrate yourselves to-day to the Lord.*] Our version gives the most probable meaning of the Hebrew (L.viii.22,27), and is supported by the best authority. The Levites were to prove themselves in a special way the servants of Jehovah, in anticipation of their formal consecration as ministers of the Sanctuary, by manifesting a self-sacrificing zeal in carrying out the divine command, even upon their nearest relatives. p.408.

*Ans.* See (VI.157-9), where it is shown that in the O.S. there probably existed in connection with this passage some short account of the whole tribe of Levi having been set apart for the priesthood, which has been of necessity removed to make way for the more complex system of the L.L., with its distinction of 'Priests' and 'Levites.'

186. v.34. *in the day when I visit I will visit their sin upon them.*] This has been supposed to refer to the sentence that was pronounced on the generation of Israelites then living, when they murmured on account of the report of the ten spies that they should not enter the land, N.xiv. On that occasion they were charged with having tempted God 'these ten times,' v.22. But though the Lord visited the sin upon those who rebelled, yet He 'repented of the evil which He thought to do unto His people.' He chastized the individuals, but did not take His blessing from the nation. p.409.

*Ans.* See (VI.239), where it is shown that v.34 is a Deuteronomistic insertion, inconsistent with v.35, and anticipating xxxiii.1.

### Chap.xxxiii.1,2,7-23(O.S.), 3-6(D.).

187. v.1. It had been conceded to Moses that the nation should not be destroyed, and that he should lead them on towards the place of which the Lord had spoken. But the favour was not to be awarded according to the terms of the original promise in xxiii.20-23. The Covenant on which the promise was based had been broken by the people. Jehovah now therefore declared that though His Angel

people had rebelled on account of the report of the ten spies, the trial of Moses' faithfulness was repeated in a very similar manner, N.xiv.11-23. *p.406.*

*Ans.* In N.xiv, v.2-10 belongs to L.L., v.11-25 to O.S. (VI.97); and so here, v.1-6,15-33, belongs to O.S., but v.7-14,34, to D.(VI.239), the two writers being in each instance plainly distinguished by their phraseology. It seems clear that in v.15-19, *comp.* v.31, Moses and Joshua know nothing of the idolatry going on in the Camp, as notified to Moses in v.8; but Mr. CLARK supposes that Moses knew, but had not told Joshua! —

Moses does not tell Joshua of the divine communication that had been made to him respecting the apostasy of the people, but only corrects his impression by calling his attention to the kind of noise which they are making.

And as to the breaking of the Tables in v.19, which seems to imply that Moses then first became suddenly aware of what they were doing, Mr. CLARK says:—

Though Moses had been prepared by the revelation on the Mount, his righteous indignation was stirred up beyond control, when the abomination was before his eyes.

Had Joshua been 'fasting,' as well as Moses, all this time?

183. v.20. We need not suppose that each incident is here placed in strict order of time. What is related in this verse must have occupied some time, and may have followed the rebuke of Aaron. Moses appears to have thrown the calf into the fire to destroy its form and then to have *pounded* or *filed* the metal to powder, which he cast into the brook. He then made the Israelites drink of the water of the brook. . . . It seems idle to speculate on the means by which the comminution of the gold was effected. *p.407.*

*Ans.* It is by no means 'idle,' if our object is to determine whether this narrative is historically true or not. Metallic gold might have been 'pounded' into a thin plate, but surely not into fine powder; and it would have taken a long time to 'file' the calf into powder. But the very fact that the principal actor on this occasion, writing an account of his own doings, does not relate them 'in strict order of time,' and does not mention at all Jehovah's anger against Aaron and his own intercession for him, D.ix.20, shows that this is not history.

184. v.26-29. The tribe of Levi, Moses' own tribe, now distinguished itself by immediately returning to its allegiance and obeying the call to fight on the side of Jehovah. We need not doubt that the 3,000 who were slain were those who persisted in resisting Moses: we may perhaps conjecture that they were such as contumaciously refused to drink of the water of the brook. The spirit of the narrative forbids us to conceive that the act of the Levites was anything like an indiscriminate massacre. An amnesty had first been offered to all in the words, 'Who is on the Lord's side?' Those who were forward to draw the sword were

directed not to spare their closest relations or friends; but this must plainly have been with an understood qualification as regards the conduct of those who were to be slain. Had it not been so, they who were on the Lord's side would have had to destroy each other. We need not stumble at the bold simple way in which the statement is made. The Bible does not deign to apologise for itself; and hence at times it affords occasion to gainsayers, who shut their eyes to the spirit, while they are *captiously* looking at dis severed fragments of the letter. p.408.

*Ans.* It seems plain that the Text does mean that the Levites were to commit—and did commit—an 'indiscriminate massacre' on all whom they came across, in going from one side of the Camp to the other, v.27. And what is there in this so discordant with the 'spirit' of the Pentateuch, when we find 88,000 Midianite women and 32,000 boys of all ages, including infants, butchered by order of Moses in cool blood, N.xxxi (VI.464)?

185. v.29. *consecrate yourselves to-day to the Lord.*] Our version gives the most probable meaning of the Hebrew (L.viii.22,27), and is supported by the best authority. The Levites were to prove themselves in a special way the servants of Jehovah, in anticipation of their formal consecration as ministers of the Sanctuary, by manifesting a self-sacrificing zeal in carrying out the divine command, even upon their nearest relatives. p.408.

*Ans.* See (VI.157-9), where it is shown that in the O.S. there probably existed in connection with this passage some short account of the whole tribe of Levi having been set apart for the priesthood, which has been of necessity removed to make way for the more complex system of the L.L., with its distinction of 'Priests' and 'Levites.'

186. v.34. *in the day when I visit I will visit their sin upon them.*] This has been supposed to refer to the sentence that was pronounced on the generation of Israelites then living, when they murmured on account of the report of the ten spies that they should not enter the land, N.xiv. On that occasion they were charged with having tempted God 'these ten times,' v.22. But though the Lord visited the sin upon those who rebelled, yet He 'repented of the evil which He thought to do unto His people.' He chastized the individuals, but did not take His blessing from the nation. p.409.

*Ans.* See (VI.239), where it is shown that v.34 is a Deuteronomistic insertion, inconsistent with v.35, and anticipating xxxiii.1.

### Chap.xxxiii.1,2,7-23(O.S.), 3-6(D.).

187. v.1. It had been conceded to Moses that the nation should not be destroyed, and that he should lead them on towards the place of which the Lord had spoken. But the favour was not to be awarded according to the terms of the original promise in xxiii.20-23. The Covenant on which the promise was based had been broken by the people. Jehovah now therefore declared that though His Angel

should go before Moses (xxxii.34) and should drive out the heathen from the land, He would withhold His own favouring presence, lest He should 'consume them in the way,' xxxiii.2,3.

*Ans.* See (VI.241), where it is shown that v.3-6 belongs to D., so that in the O.S. we have no longer the repetition in v.2, 'I will send an Angel before thee,' of the promise immediately preceding in xxxii.34, which belongs to D. (186), nor the contradiction in v.3, 'I will *not* go up in the midst of thee,' of that in v.14, 'My presence shall go, and I will give thee rest,' which Mr. CLARK explains as a change of the Divine purpose in answer to the prayer of Moses:—

Here he again intercedes with persevering fervour until he obtains the answer in v.14.

But the promise of 'the Angel' in v.2, *comp.* 'Mine Angel,' xxxii.34, is the same exactly as 'the original promise in xxiii.20-23,' and implies the Divine Presence, *comp.* xiii.21, xiv.19, as to which Mr. CLARK is evidently perplexed, and writes:—

According to the Targums it was the *shekinah* that was to be withheld. HENSTENBERG supposes that the Angel promised in xxiii.20-23 was 'the Angel of Jehovah,' *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, the Second Person of the Trinity, in whom Jehovah was essentially present, . . . but that the Angel here mentioned was an *ordinary* Angel, one commissioned for this service out of the heavenly host. It should, however, be noted that this Angel is expressly spoken of as 'the Angel of Jehovah' in xxxii. 34. But in whatever way we understand the mention of the Angel in this passage as compared with xxiii.20, &c., p.409.

And when Mr. CLARK says further—

The answer is at last given in a still clearer and more gracious form, 'I will do this thing also that thou hast spoken,' v.17, p.409—

it is plain that this is said in reply to the request of Moses in v.13, 'Shew me now Thy way that I may know Thee,' explained more fully in v.18, 'shew me Thy glory,'—in other words, it is said in reply to Moses' desire that Jehovah would reveal Himself to him, which revelation accordingly takes place in xxxiii.19-xxxiv.8.

188. v.7. *the tabernacle.*] The original word signifies *the tent*, . . . a tent appointed for this temporary purpose by Moses, very probably the one in which he was accustomed to dwell. . . . This is by far the most satisfactory interpretation.

This tent was to be a place for meeting with Jehovah, like the Tabernacle which was about to be constructed. But, in order that the people might feel that they had forfeited the Divine Presence, the *Tent of Meeting* was placed 'afar off from the Camp,' and the Mediator and his faithful servant Joshua were alone admitted to it. p.410.

*Ans.* This was the original 'Tent of Meeting,' the *only* one known to the O.S., and referred to again in N.xi.24-30, xii.4,5, D.xxxi.14,15. It may have

been the tent of Moses (VI.56); but it was set up—not 'afar off,' but—'a little way off' from the camp (VI.cb.xii, note <sup>85</sup>)—*comp.* G.xxi.16, E.ii.4, and all, who desired, 'went out to it,' v.7, and there is no sign that they were not admitted into it. The splendid 'Tabernacle' of the L.L., with all its appurtenances, has been substituted for this more simple one of the O.S., and has borrowed its name 'Tent of Meeting' (VI.54-61).

189. v.9. The cloudy pillar 'came down and stood at the entrance of the Tent and talked with Moses:' the *cloudy pillar* is the proper nominative to the verb *talked*, xiii.21, xix.9, xxiv.16, xl.35. p.411.

*Ans.* Surely not: the nominative is 'the Lord' understood, as in the E.V., *comp.* N.xi.25, xii.5.

Chap.xxxiv.1-8,28-32(O.S.), except v.28, 'the Ten Words,' 33-35(L.L.), 9-27(D.).

190. v.1. *the words that were in the first tables which thou brakest.*] These were 'the words of the Covenant, the Ten Commandments,' v.28; see D.iv.13, ix.10,11, x.1,4, and especially D.v.6-22. These passages would seem to leave no room for doubt that what we recognize as the Ten Commandments were inscribed on the second as well as the first pair of Tables. But GÖTTE, in one of his early works, started the notion that what was written on these Tables was the string of precepts, which may be reckoned as *ten*, in v.12-26. . . . HIRTIG has taken a similar view. HENOSTENBERG and KURTZ have answered HIRTIG at length. EWALD holds that the Tables mentioned in this verse contained the original Ten Commandments, but that the Tables spoken of in v.28 were distinct ones, on which Moses engraved this string of precepts. But this seems an utterly gratuitous supposition. p.413.

*Ans.* See (VI.249-251), where it is shown that neither the 'Ten Commandments' nor the 'string of precepts' in v.12-26 were engraven on the Tables, but the original 'words of the Covenant' in the O.S., *viz.* E.xx.22, &c., *comp.* xxiv.3-8; and see (VI.ch.xii, note <sup>81</sup>), where it is shown that such stone-tables as KEIL supposes those of Moses to have been, would have easily held all these words, after the manner of the Phœnician Sacrificial Stone-Tables of Marseilles.

191. v.9. Moses had been assured of the pardon of the people and the perfect restoration of the Covenant, xxxiii.14,17: he had just had revealed to him, in a most distinguished manner, the riches of the Divine forgiveness. Yet now, in the earnest travail of his spirit, he supplicates for a repetition of the promise, adding the emphatic petition, that Jehovah would take Israel for His own inheritance. This yearning struggle after assurance is like the often-repeated utterance of the heart, when it receives a blessing beyond its hopes, 'Can this be real?' These words of Moses wonderfully commend themselves to the experience of the prayerful spirits of all ages. p.413.

*Ans.* The whole is explained when we know that v.9-27 is merely a later Deuteronomistic insertion (VI.243).

192. v.12-27. The precepts contained in these verses are, for the most part, identical in substance with some of those which follow the Ten Commandments, and are recorded in the 'Book of the Covenant,' xx-xxiii, see xxiv.7. Such a selection of precepts in this place, connected with the account of the restored Covenant and the new Tables, may tend to support the probability that chapters xxxii-xxxiv originally formed a distinct composition. p.414.

*Ans.* See (VI.253-4), where it is shown that in v.10-26 the Deuteronomist has repeated the most important portions—for his own time at least—of the identical 'words of Jehovah' and 'judgments,' upon the basis of which the Covenant was made in xxiv.3-8. He has apparently *condensed* the older passage, xx.22, &c., including his own words in xiii.12,13, but omitting the prescriptions belonging to ordinary civil life, many of which had in his later time become obsolete, and retaining only the commands more expressly connected with religion. It is obvious that it is impossible to suppose that *Jehovah* repeated here to Moses word for word the identical language of xxiii.15 in v.18—of xiii.12,13, in v.19,20<sup>a</sup>—of xxiii.15<sup>b</sup> in v.20<sup>b</sup>—of xxiii.12 in v.21—of xxiii.16,17, in v.22,23—of xxiii.18,19, in v.25,26—within three months after the first solemn utterance, but omitting all the *runder* laws of xx.22, &c.

193. v.13. *ye shall cut down their asheras.*] According to the most probable derivation of the name, the *asherah* represented something that was upright, which was fixed or planted in the ground; it was formed of wood, and, when destroyed, it was cut down and burned; that it could not be a 'grove' appears from an *asherah* having been set up 'under every green tree' in Judah, 1K.xiv.23, and in Israel, 2K.xvii.10, and from a carved image of the *asherah* having been set up in the Temple by Manasseh, 2K.xxi.7, which was brought out by Josiah and burnt and stamped to powder, 2K.xxiii.6. It has been inferred that *Asherah* was another name for Astarte. This opinion might seem to be countenanced by the LXX in 2Ch.xv.16 (where the Vulgate has *simulacrum Priapi*) and by the Vulgate in Ju.iii.7.

On the whole the most probable result of the enquiry seems to be that, while Astarte was the personal name of the goddess, the *asherah* was a symbol of her, probably in some one of her characters, wrought in wood in some conventional form. p.416.

*Ans.* The *asherah* was in all probability a *phallus* (*simulacrum Priapi*), which was set up beside the altar of the Sun-God (*Yahve*), D.xvi.21, as a symbol of his life-giving power—such as is even now very commonly found, in some modified form, set up in villages in India.

194. v.24. *neither shall any man desire thy land, when thou shalt go up to appear before the Lord thy God thrice in the year.*] This is the only place in which the



promise is given to encourage such as might fear the consequences of obeying the Divine Law in attending to their religious duties. p.415.

*Ans.* The O.S. in xxiii.17 contemplates the people celebrating the three Feasts at the different Sanctuaries, without going far from their own homes. But D. wishes them all to go up to Jerusalem, the 'place which Jehovah had chosen,' and which in his day, when the kingdom was reduced to the territory of Judah, was more practicable than in the times of David and Solomon. Hence he provides this promise of security from their enemies, when they leave their homes for this purpose (VI.260-6).

195. v.27. *write thou.*] Moses is here commanded to make a record in his own writing of the preceding precepts. The 'Book of the Covenant' was written in like manner, xxiv.4,7. p.415.

*Ans.* Most probably, this abstract of the 'words of the Covenant' in xx.22, &c., was meant to supersede that more ancient string of precepts, and therefore Moses is to write these, as he wrote the former. And it is very possible that D. intended to cancel xx.22, &c., altogether (VI.257).

196. v.28. *he wrote.*] According to Hebrew usage, the name of Jehovah *may* be the subject of the verb; that it must be so, is evident from v.1. p.415.

*Ans.* v.28 follows v.8 in the O.S., and we also suppose Jehovah to be subject of the verb 'he wrote.' But the words written were meant to be the same words as 'were in the first tables,' the 'words of the Covenant,' viz. those in xx.22, &c., the phrase 'the Ten Words' at the end of xxxiv.28 being an insertion by way of interpretation, due probably to L.L. (VI.257.iv).

197. v.34. *Moses went in*] i.e. to the Tent of Meeting. p.416.

*Ans.* But 'Moses went in before Jehovah to speak with Him,' which shows that v.33-35 belongs to the L.L., *comp.* N.vii.89: in the O.S. the pillar of the cloud stands *at the entrance of the Tent*, and there Jehovah stands while He speaks with Moses, E.xxxiii.9, N.xii.5, D.xxxi.15 (VI.248).

Chap.xxxv-xxxvii(L.L.).

Chap.xxxviii.1-31(L.L.).

198. v.24. A question is raised as to the meaning of the term 'a shekel of the Sanctuary.' The rabbinites speak of a common shekel of half the weight of the shekel of the Sanctuary. But there is no sufficient reason to suppose that such a distinction existed in ancient times. And the Shekel of the Sanctuary (or the *Holy Shekel*) would seem to denote no more than an exact shekel 'after the king's weight,' 2S.xiv.26, 'current money of the merchant,' G.xxiii.16. p.425.

*Ans.* Of course, the fact that a 'holy Shekel' is here mentioned before the

Tabernacle was in existence, is fatal to the notion of the Mosaic origin of this passage, if the phrase be understood in its obvious sense. But the 'Holy Shekel' is here named inadvertently by the Later Legislator, in whose æc different shekels were in existence.

199. v.26. In the reign of Joash, a collection similar to the one here mentioned, apparently at the same rate of capitation, was made for the repairs of the Temple, 2Ch.xxiv.9. The tax of later times, called *didrachma*, Matt.xvii.27, which has often been connected with this passage of Exodus, . . . was not, like this one and that of Joash, a collection for a special occasion, but a yearly tax for the support of the Temple, of a whole shekel. p.425.

*Ans.* The story of the Chronicler, about the collection of this capitation tax in the time of Joash, is manifestly fictitious: the history in the Book of Kings knows nothing about it. In Neh.x.32 the people agree to lay upon themselves a yearly tribute of a *third* of a shekel, for supplying the expenses of public worship, in connection with which fact, no doubt, the idea originated in a later day (VI.409) of collecting the *half*-shekel in E.xxx.11-16, xxxviii.26, of the L.L., which is referred to in 2Ch.xxiv.6,9; for the Jews would hardly have laid upon themselves the tax of a *third* of a shekel, if they had had before them a (supposed) Divine ordinance enjoining the payment of *half*-a-shekel, though only, it is true, on one occasion. Accordingly, the Temple-tax was half-a-shekel in our Saviour's time, the *didrachmon* of Matt.xvii.27 being the *half*-shekel, not 'a whole shekel,' as Mr. CLARK says. So Col. LEAKE says, quoted in *D.B.* II.p.409:—'It appears that the half-shekel of ransom had, in the time of our Saviour, been converted into the payment of a didrachm to the Temple; and two of these didrachms formed a stater of the Jewish currency. This stater was evidently the extant "Shekel Israel," which was a tetradrachmon of the Ptolemaic scale.'

200. v.26. There must have been, in addition to the sum of the half-shekels [paid as a capitation tax], the free-will offerings of silver, xxxv.24, of which no reckoning is here made. They may perhaps have been amongst what was returned to the donors as being more than enough, xxxvi.7. p.425.

*Ans.* But the people were only 'restrained from bringing more,' xxxvi.7: nothing is said about returning to them *all the silver* which they had brought. Probably the notion of the capitation-tax in xxx.11-16 was inserted at a later time into the story, which originally contemplated *only* freewill offerings; and xxxviii.21-31 must have been added at the same time (VI.409).

201. v.24-29. According to the estimate of the shekel which has here been adopted, the weight of the metals mentioned in this chapter would be nearly as follows in avoirdupois weight:—

Gold, 1 ton	4 cwt.	2 qrs.	13 lbs.
Silver, 4 tons	4 cwt.	2 qrs.	20 lbs.
Bronze, 2 tons	19 cwt.	2 qrs.	11 lbs.

The value of the gold, if pure, in our money would be 175,075*l.* 13*s.*, and of the silver 38,034*l.* 15*s.* 10*d.* The quantities of the precious metals *come quite within the limits of probability*, if we consider the condition of the Israelites when they left Egypt, and the object for which the collection was made. There is no reasonable ground to call in question the substantial accuracy of the statements of Strabo and Diodorus, regarding the great stores of gold collected by the Arab tribes near the Ælanitic Gulf; and they were probably still more abundant at this time when the tribes must have come into frequent contact with the Israelites. *There may be no trace of native gold in those regions at present*; but the entire exhaustion of natural supplies of the precious metals is too familiarly known to need more than a bare notice in this place. *p.*426.

*Ans.* The Israelites could not have had much commercial intercourse with the Arab tribes in the wilderness of Sinai during the short time since they left Egypt, and they were not even able to buy clothing or leather during the whole forty years of the wanderings, D.viii.4, xxix.5. Consequently they must have 'asked' this enormous quantity of gold and silver from the Egyptians, except what they may have plundered from the Amalekites, E.xvii.

Chap.xxxix.1-43(L.L.).

Chap.xl.1-38(L.L.).

202. *v.*4. *the things that are to be set in order.*] The directions given in L.xxiv. 5-9 are here presupposed, and must have been issued before this chapter was written. *p.*429.

*Ans.* This is one sign, among a multitude of others, of the unhistorical character of the whole narrative.

203. *v.*20. *and he took and put the testimony into the ark*] *i.e.* the Tables of stone with the Ten Commandments engraved on them. Nothing else is said to have been in the Ark. These were found there by themselves in the time of Solomon, 1K.viii.9. The Pot of Manna was 'laid up before the Testimony,' E.xvi. 34; Aaron's rod was also placed 'before the Testimony,' N.xvii.10. Most interpreters hold that the Pot of Manna and Aaron's rod were placed between the Ark and the Vail. It is, however, said in Heb.ix.4 that the Ark contained 'the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the Covenant.'

It is very probable that the pot and the rod were not at first placed within it, but in front of it, and had been put into the Ark before it was taken by the

Philistines, but that *they were not sent back with the Ark and Tables*, 1S.iv.11, vi.11. p.430.

*Ans.* The last suggestion (italicized), considering the superstitious terrors of the Philistines, is utterly incredible. But the 'pot' and the 'rod' belong to the L.L., and never really existed, Heb.ix.4 only repeating a Jewish tradition, like 2Tim.iii.8, Jude ix.14. The Ark in Solomon's time probably contained the Tables with the 'words of the Covenant' in E.xx.22, &c., for which D. substitutes the 'Ten Commandments' (VI.249-251).

204. v.31. Aaron and his two sons, having had the Divine call, took part in the service of the Sanctuary as soon as the work was completed. But Moses took part with them, and most likely took the lead, until they were consecrated and invested (L.viii). and publicly set apart for the office. p.431.

*Ans.* There is nothing whatever in v.31 to show *necessarily* that Aaron and his sons 'took part in the service of the Sanctuary' before they were consecrated: the words may be fairly explained as meaning that this was the laver in which they washed their hands and feet as soon as they began to officiate and ever afterwards. Yet it is very *probable* that the L.L. has here made an anachronism.

205. The Tabernacle, after it had accompanied the Israelites in their wanderings in the wilderness. was most probably first set up in the Holy Land at Gilgal, J.iv. 19, v.10, ix.6, x.6,43. But, before the death of Joshua, it was erected at Shiloh, J.xviii.1, xix.51. Here it remained as the national Sanctuary throughout the time of the Judges, J.xviii.8, xxi.2, xxii.9, Ju.xviii.31, xxi.19, 1S.i.3, iv.3. But its external construction was at this time somewhat changed, and *doors*, strictly so called, had taken the place of the entrance curtain, 1S.iii.15: hence it seems to have been sometimes called *the Temple*, 1S.i.9, iii.3, the name by which the structure of Solomon was afterwards commonly known. After the time of Eli it was removed to Nob in the canton of Benjamin, not far from Jerusalem, 1S.xxi.1-9. From thence in the time of David it was removed to Gibeon, 1Ch.xvi.39, xxi.29, 2Ch.i.3, 1K.iii.4, ix.2. It was brought from Gibeon to Jerusalem by Solomon, 1K.viii.4. After this it disappears in the narrative of Scripture. p.431.

*Ans.* Mr. CLARK produces here a number of fallacies. How the 'Mosaic Tabernacle' could have had 'doors strictly so called' instead of 'the entrance curtain,' it is impossible to conceive, even if it were credible that a building, erected by Moses after express Divine directions, according to an actual pattern shown him in the Mount, could have ever been 'changed' by sacrilegious hands to such an extent. Would no mention have been made of its silver sockets, and golden rings, and gilded boards, and bars and pillars, E.xxvi.19,21,25,29,32,37, among the treasures carried off in the days of Rehoboam, 1K.xiv.26, Asa, xv.18, Joash, 2K.xii.18, Hezekiah, xviii.16?

But there is no real ground for supposing that the Sanctuary at Shiloh was the 'Mosaic Tabernacle.' It is called the 'House of Jehovah,' 1S.i.7,24, and the 'Temple of Jehovah,' i.9, iii.3, as being probably a somewhat imposing edifice, and it had 'doors,' iii.15, and 'door-posts,' i.9. In ii.22<sup>b</sup>, it is true, it is called 'Tent of Meeting': but this clause is evidently an interpolation of the L.L. (*Intr. to Pent.* 5.v), since no allusion is made to this particular sin of the sons of Eli—that 'they lay with the women who assembled at the entrance of the Tent of Meeting,' *comp.* E.xxxviii.8—either in v.17 or in v.29. This 'House of Elohim' at Shiloh may have been very ancient, set up soon after the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan; but there is not the least indication that it was a *tent* at all. In Ju.xviii.31, xxi.19, there is reference to Shiloh as a *Sanctuary*, and nothing more. There is no sign in 1S.xxi.1-9 that the 'Mosaic Tabernacle' ever stood at Nob; and the Chronicler's statements, that it once stood at Gibeon, are all fictitious, invented to account for Solomon's sacrificing at Gibeon, 1K.iii.4, ix.2, where nothing is said about the 'Tabernacle.' 1K.viii.4 is manifestly an interpolation by the L.L. (VII.32). If the Ark was on Mount Zion and the Tabernacle at Gibeon, how could they have been brought up together to the Temple?

In short, there is no trace of the 'Mosaic Tabernacle' in the real history after the notice of the L.L. in J.xxii.19. On our view the 'Tent of Meeting,' which Joshua sets up at Shiloh in J.xviii.1, was the rude tent of the O.S. in E.xxxiii.7. It is possible, of course, that such a tent, which they had used for sacred purposes in the wilderness, really was set up at Shiloh, and that the 'Temple' or 'House of Jehovah' in Eli's time was erected on the site of it.

206. In accordance with its dignity as the most sacred object in the Sanctuary, the original Ark of the Covenant constructed by Moses was preserved and *transferred from the Tabernacle to the Temple*. The Golden Altar, the Candlestick, and the Shewbread Table were renewed by Solomon. They were subsequently renewed by Zerubbabel, and lastly by the Maccabees. But the Ark was preserved in the Temple until Jerusalem was taken by the forces of Nebuchadnezzar, Jer.iii.16. It was never replaced in the Second Temple. *p.*432.

*Ans.* It is singular that Mr. CLARK like Bp. BROWNE (*Intr. to Pent.* 5.vi.6) speaks of the Ark being 'transferred from the Tabernacle to the Temple,' where the context implies the *Mosaic* Tabernacle; whereas the Ark had been lying for many years in a private house, 1S.vii.1,2, until it was brought up by David to the tent which he had built for it on Mount Zion, 2S.vi.17, from which it was 'transferred to the Temple.' According to the fictitious account of the Chronicler, the 'Mosaic Tabernacle' was all the while in existence, and David actually left this splendid structure, the divinely-ordered receptacle for the Ark, standing together with the Brazen Altar at

Gibeon, 1Ch.xvi.39,40, xxi.29, 2Ch.i.3, while he himself had pitched a tent for the Ark at Jerusalem, 1Ch.xv.1, 2Ch.i.4 (VI.412-6)!

It is probable, however, that this 'ark' really had been carried through the wilderness. See (VI.53), where it is shown that in E.xxxiv the O.S. most probably contained commands corresponding to those which appear to be quoted from it in D.x.1-5, viz. in v.1, 'and make thee an ark of wood,' in v.2, 'and thou shalt place them in the ark,' in v.4, 'and Moses made an ark of shittim-wood,' in v.28, 'and Jehovah gave them unto Moses; and Moses turned and came down from the Mount, and put the tables in the ark which he had made, as Jehovah commanded him' (VI.90)—all which must of necessity have been struck out when the account of the Ark in the L.L. was inserted. This ancient Ark was, no doubt, lost or destroyed at the Captivity and never replaced.

The Altar of Incense and Shewbread Table, which were provided by Solomon for his Temple, 1K.vii.48,49, were provided also in the Second Temple, 1Macc.i.21,22, and, when carried off by Antiochus Epiphanes, were renewed by the Maccabees, 1Macc.iv.49. But in place of the *ten* Golden Candlesticks of Solomon only *one* existed in the Second Temple, 1Macc.i.21, and one again was renewed by the Maccabees, 1Macc.iv.49. The L.L. has evidently copied these institutions of the Second Temple in its arrangements for the Tabernacle.

207. The Ark of the Covenant has been most generally likened to the arks, or moveable shrines, which are represented on Egyptian monuments. The Egyptian arks were carried in a similar manner by poles resting on men's shoulders; and some of them had on the cover two winged figures not unlike what we conceive the golden Cherubim to have been. Thus far the similarity is striking. But there were points of great dissimilarity. Between the winged figures on the Egyptian arks there was placed the material symbol of a deity; and the arks themselves were carried about in religious processions, so as to make a show in the eyes of the people. We know not what they contained. As regards the Ark of the Covenant, the absence of any symbol of God was one of its great characteristics. It was never carried in a ceremonial procession: when it was moved from one place to another, it was closely packed up, concealed from the eyes even of the Levites who bore it. When the Tabernacle was pitched, the Ark was never exhibited, but was kept in solemn darkness. Rest, it is evident, was its appointed condition. It was occasionally moved out of its place in the Holy of Holies, but only as long as the nation was without a settled capital, and had something of the character of an army on its march. During this period it accompanied the army on several occasions. But it had been foretold that the time should come when the Sanctuary was to be fixed, and, when this was fulfilled, we are told that 'the Ark had rest.' It was never again moved till the capture of Jerusalem by the forces of Nebuchadnezzar. p.434.

*Ans* Most probably the real ark of the O.S., that which existed in the days of Eli, David, and Jeremiah, was copied from the Egyptian arks, and made either while the Israelites were in Egypt, or during their march through the wilderness (VI.574). 'We know not what it contained' *at first*, any more than we know what the Egyptian arks contained; for the account of the Stone Tables, with the 'words of the Covenant,' having been put into it, belongs to the age of David, and may represent what was actually done at the time when David brought up the ark to Mount Zion, which would agree very well with our view that the 'Book of the Covenant' in E.xx.22, &c., may exhibit the system which Samuel carried out as judge, or may even correspond to the 'manner of the kingdom,' which Samuel 'told the people' when Saul was made king, 'and wrote it in a book and laid it up before the Lord,' 1S.x.25. Before this time, it is quite possible that the ark may have contained some symbol of the Deity, on which account Samuel let it lie neglected all his life in the house of Abinadab, 1S.vii.1,2; and accordingly the Philistines identify the Deity with the ark in 1S.iv.7, as indeed the 'ark of Jehovah' is in various passages used as a synonym for 'Jehovah,' *comp.* N.x.35,36, J.iv.13, vi.7,8, 2S.vi.5,14,16,21. That the Hebrew ark in ancient times *was* carried about in religious processions is clearly indicated by N.x.33-36, xiv.44, J.iii.6, vi.6, &c., 1S.iv.3, &c., 2S.xi.11. The notion of its being 'closely packed up,' when carried, and never seen, even by the Levites, but 'kept in solemn darkness,' belongs entirely to the L.L., and represents the morbid religious feeling of a later age, when the ark no longer existed. No doubt, it was seen by all when brought up by David, 2S.vi.

208. The Editor has a note, *p.*435-442, correcting an 'opinion which formerly appeared to the writer to be sustained by the strongest evidence,' and which 'identified *Jebel Musa* with the peak of Sinai.' He now comes to the conclusion, upon the authority of eminent military surveyors, that—

*Jebel Musa*, the loftiest and grandest summit of the group, may have been included in the tremendous manifestations of Divine power, but the announcement of the Law must have taken place elsewhere, *p.*441;—

and he pronounces (with Dean STANLEY) for *Ras Sufsafeh*, on the northern extremity of the Sinaitic group, stating that Sir HENRY JAMES concurs with the military surveyors in the opinion that—

No spot in the world can be pointed out which combines in a more remarkable manner the conditions of a commanding height and of a plain in every part of which the sights and sounds described in Exodus would reach an assembled multitude of more than two million souls. *p.*442.

*Ans.* Whether the height and plain in question would really satisfy the conditions of the case, with Moses going up and down, and the two millions

of people not merely assembling in the plain, but being able to 'stand afar off' in it, E.xx.21, is of no real consequence in the present discussion. It is plain that the writer knew *something*—perhaps even by personal observation—of the wilderness of Sinai: and, if by Mount Sinai he meant Ras Sufsafeh, he probably took into account the plain Er Rahah in front of it, as capable of holding a large body of people. But it is quite as likely that he was altogether indifferent to any such considerations—that he did not trouble himself about Moses' climbing powers or the possibility of the people being able to '*stand at the nether part of the Mount,*' xix.17, before they removed to a distance, xx.18,21, and that he meant Jebel Musa to be the Mount of the Law, in accordance with the description of WELLSTED as quoted by Canon Cook, p.440:—

Mount Sinai itself and the hills which compose the district in its immediate vicinity, rise in sharp, isolated conical peaks. From their steep and shattered sides huge masses have been splintered, leaving fissures rather than valleys between their remaining portions. . . . No forests, lakes, or falls of water break the silence and monotony of the scene. All has the appearance of a vast and desolate wilderness, either grey or darkly brown or wholly black. Few, who stand on the summit of Mount Sinai, and gaze from its fearful height upon the dreary wilderness below, will fail to be impressed with the fitness of the whole scene for the sublime and awful dispensation, which an almost universal tradition declares to have been revealed there.

Similar remarks apply to Canon Cook's discussion of the *route* which was probably taken by the Israelites from the Red Sea to Sinai. The writer of the O.S. knew something about that route, and did not trouble himself as to the possibility of two millions of people, with their two millions of flocks and herds, making their way along it. But the list of Stations in N.xxxiii belongs to the L.L. (VI.App.34).

209. Canon Cook then follows with an elaborate Essay, p.443-475, 'On the Bearings of Egyptian History on the Pentateuch,' in which he gives his reasons for rejecting the conclusion of 'BRUGSCH and many distinguished scholars,' that the Exodus took place under the fourth king of the 19th dynasty, Menephtha, son of Rameses II. Miamun (VI.565), and fixes it long previously in the reign of Tothmosis II., the fifth prince of the 18th dynasty. The arguments produced can only be properly appreciated by profound Egyptologists, as they depend to a great extent on the interpretation of manuscripts and inscriptions, 'uncertain dates' and 'doubtful calculations,' p.452; and this learned Essay would certainly have been better adapted for the pages of a scientific journal than for those of a popular Commentary.



This point, however, is of no consequence whatever in the criticism of the Pentateuch, since the questions as to the historical character of the narrative and its Mosaic origin are altogether independent of the age when the Exodus really took place.

We may note, however, one or two of Canon Cook's statements in this part of his work, which have some bearing upon matters discussed in my work on the Pentateuch.

210. Thus Canon Cook admits, contrary to the popular notion, that no distinct signs of the residence of the Israelites in Egypt have been as yet detected on any of the Egyptian monuments:—

No direct or distinct notice of the events preceding the Exodus or following the occupation of Palestine by the Israelites is found on Egyptian monuments. *p.461.*

At Abd el Kurna, in the temple before mentioned, there is a well-known picture of such captives employed in making bricks. It is an admirable illustration of the labours of the Israelites, whom it was formerly supposed to represent. The inscription, however, states that they are 'captives taken by his Majesty to build the temple of his Father Ammon.' *p.458.*

211. Again, the last and most powerful Shepherd King was Apophis or Apepi, and it has been very generally thought that this was the king by whom Joseph was received—with which view, however, Canon Cook entirely disagrees. But he says:—

No fact about Apophis is more certain than that he repudiated the national religion. The testimony of the Papyrus Sallier is clear and explicit:—'The king Apepi adopted Sutech as his God, he did not serve any God which was in the whole land.' Sutech or Set, in later ages the representative of the evil principle Typhon, is identified and was certainly confounded with Baal of the Phœnicians. Sutech is identified with Baal in numerous inscriptions, and is represented specially as the chief deity of the Cheta [Hittites], masters of northern Syria under the 19th dynasty. The only monument in which the name of Apophis is found calls him 'the beloved of Sutech'—an appellation borne by the first Shepherd King and probably common to all the dynasty. If we accept the probable tradition of Porphyry that Aahmes I. suppressed human sacrifices offered under the Shepherd Kings of Heliopolis, the form of worship must have been Typhonian, and in all probability of Phœnician origin. *p.449.*

It is obvious that the circumstance that the deity adopted by these nomads was identified with the Phœnician Sun-God and worshipped with human sacrifices, corresponds singularly with the fact that the Hebrew

tribes, who were probably akin to the Hyksos (VI.564,568), adopted a similar deity and a similar worship (VI.574,578).

212. Further, Canon Cook maintains that long after the Exodus there were multitudes of Hebrew captives in Egypt, who had been carried off during different invasions of Palestine by the Egyptians as prisoners of war.

We should, of course, expect to find among the numerous prisoners of war brought back by Rameses some Israelites, if, as we have assumed, they were then dwelling, though not dominant, in the land. *p.465.*

We should expect that a large number of captives would be employed in the works, &c., among the captives brought into Egypt at the end of the Syrian campaign, Israelites would naturally be looked for. . . There was a grim irony, quite in keeping with Egyptian character, in reducing Israelites to servitude on the scene of their forefathers' oppression. *p.466.*

Now, that Israelites were actually employed then and there, has been, though not really proved, yet shown to be so probable that nearly all Egyptian scholars accept it as a fact. M. Chabas first called attention to the circumstance that the Egyptian word 'Aperu' corresponds very closely to 'Hebrews,' the name by which the Israelites were perhaps best known to foreigners. . . Still the question remains whether these Hebrews were in the condition described in Exodus, inhabitants of the district in which they were employed, or prisoners of war. The former alternative is generally assumed: a close examination of the original documents seems decidedly to point to the latter. *p.466.*

Then, after quoting from some older documents, he concludes:—

The other documents complete the argument. Aperu were employed in considerable numbers in reigns which *all admit to be posterior to the Exodus.* We find a body of 2,083 Aperu residing upon a domain of Rameses III., under the command of officers of rank called *Marinas*: from the signs attached to these names it is evident that they were not subjects but captives. Here, again, the inference is natural that they were brought by Rameses III. on his return from a campaign in Syria. Another notice is found under Rameses IV.: 800 Aperu were employed in the quarries of Hamamat, accompanied, as in all the cases where they are mentioned, by an armed force, generally a detachment of mercenaries. *p.467.*

Upon which we may observe that, assuming the presence of so many Hebrew captives in Egypt, during the age of 'the events recorded in the Book of Judges after the time of Deborah and Barak,' *p.475,* and therefore not long before the time of Samuel (VI.572), it is not difficult to explain the existence, among the Hebrews of that age, of a considerable acquaintance with Egyptian names and words, manners and customs, from this source alone, through the escape of such captives to their own land, their

manumission, or their redemption. It surely would be idle to suppose that no such captives or their children or grandchildren ever returned to their own land, even under the powerful reign of David, who was 'on friendly terms with the contemporary dynasty' in Egypt, 'which gave a queen to Israel,' p.307. It can scarcely be doubted that in David's time, if not before, there must have been sufficiently free intercourse between Israel and Egypt, to account for such knowledge of Egyptian matters as we find in the O.S. of the Pentateuch. As the Patriarchs are supposed to have done of old, G.xii.10, xxvi.1, xlii.1, &c., so probably in all ages inhabitants of Canaan went down to Egypt occasionally, *e.g.* to buy corn in years of dearth.

213. Lastly, Canon Cook has another Essay, p.476-492, 'On Egyptian Words in the Pentateuch,' as learned and abstruse as the former, the real value of which, however, as in the former case, can be properly appreciated only by a very few profound Egyptologists. His argument, however, is stated by himself as follows:—

It is highly improbable that any Hebrew born and brought up in Palestine, within the period extending from the Exodus to the accession of Solomon, would have had the knowledge of the Egyptian language, which will thus be shown to have been possessed by the writer. It is certain that no author would have given the words without explanation, or even indication, of their meaning, had he not known that his readers would be equally familiar with them. p.476.

In that part of the narrative which deals specially with Egyptian matters, words are constantly used which are either of Egyptian origin or common to Hebrew and Egyptian. p.484.

It would be very difficult to resist the impression that this verse (E.ii.3) was written by a man equally familiar with both languages, or, on the other hand, to admit the possibility that coincidences coming so near together were purely accidental, as they must have been in the mouth of a Palestinian Jew. p.485.

*Ans.* From (212) it appears that a certain number of Egyptian names and phrases may very well have been familiarly known to a Hebrew in David's time—*e.g.* a few names of persons, Pharaoh, Potiphar, Potipherah, Zaphnath-Paaneah, Asenath, or a few names of well-known places, On, Pithom, Rameses, or some names of things specially Egyptian, as *yeor*, 'the River,' *achu*, 'reeds,' or the cry *abrech*, 'bow the knee,' or whatever it may mean, in G.xli.43. With respect to the numerous other Egyptian derivations which Canon Cook finds for Hebrew words, they seem to one, who is no professed Egyptologist, many of them, very fanciful and doubtful. But, whatever be the meaning of 'Asenath,' the name of the daughter of the priest of On whom Joseph married, G.xli.45, it is surely erroneous when Canon Cook writes:—

It is natural to refer the idolatry of the Ephraimites to this origin. Mnevis, the black bull, was worshipped at On as a local deity, the living representative of the God Tm, the unseen principle and first cause of all existence. p.480.

The Ephraimites did not worship a 'black bull' nor a *living* animal. And their calf-worship, 1K.xii.28, may be much more naturally explained by supposing that they followed the example of the tribes of Canaan, and worshipped JAHVE, the Sun-God, the Lord of the land, under the form of a calf or heifer (181).

214. If, however, all Canon Cook's derivations were approved, yet, as most of these occur in later Hebrew writers (*Intr. to Ex.* 13), it would only follow that the Hebrews were more closely related to the Egyptians than is generally supposed, or else that, while living in Egypt, they had adopted many Egyptian words, which afterwards became permanently words of the Hebrew language; they would not help in any way to prove that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. Rather, the mention of the 'land of Rameses' in G.xlvii.11 might be explained, no doubt, as a later interpolation, or as used by a prolepsis for the land which was afterwards called by that name, when Rameses was built, E.i.11; but it really indicates a writer of David's age, using familiarly the name of a city well known in his time. On Canon Cook's view, indeed, Moses could not possibly have used it, either in G.xlvii.11 or in E.i.11, xii.37, with reference to the famous city built by Rameses II. Miamun, as to which he says it is 'a certain fact' that—

Rameses II. gave his own name to a fortress of considerable extent in the district [of Rameses], as well as to others in different parts of Egypt, p.486—

because on his view the Exodus occurred long previously to the time of this king (209). Accordingly he says—'Rameses may well have been the *old* name of the district,' which may have been 'very naturally given to the capital of the district.' And he concludes as follows:—

One argument of great weight remains to be considered. The city of Rameses Miamun, with its parks, lakes, and the whole adjoining district, was the centre of a great Egyptian population, a place of festivities; whereas, at the time described in the Pentateuch, the two fortresses built by the Israelites were in the district which they occupied, and of which there is no indication whatever that they were dispossessed. In the time of Rameses it was a rich, fertile, and beautiful district, described as the abode of happiness, where all alike, rich and poor, lived in peace and plenty. But in the time of Moses it was the abode of a suffering race, resounding not with the jubilant shouts of Egyptians, but with the groans and execrations of an oppressed population. A stronger contrast can scarcely be drawn than that of the state of the district at the Exodus and that which it presented under Rameses II. and his successors. p.487.

But Canon Cook himself says :—

*very much cattle.*] This is an important fact, as showing that the oppression of the Israelites had not extended to confiscation of their property. *p.299.*

And, if they were able to 'borrow' from their Egyptian neighbours in a few hours  $1\frac{1}{4}$  ton of gold and  $4\frac{1}{4}$  tons of silver, besides precious clothes and jewels, here is a sign that their masters at any rate were 'living in peace and plenty' in Rameses itself.











