



3 1761 04411 3389



Goldwin Smith.



Digitized for Microsoft Corporation
by the Internet Archive in 2008.

From University of Toronto.

May be used for non-commercial, personal, research,
or educational purposes, or any fair use.

May not be indexed in a commercial service.

THE PENTATEUCH
AND BOOK OF JOSHUA

CRITICALLY EXAMINED.

PART III.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

VILLAGE SERMONS.

Second Edition. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, 2s. 6d.

THE COLONY OF NATAL.

A Journal of Ten Weeks' Tour of Visitation among the Colonists and Zulu Kafirs of Natal. With a Map and Illustrations. Second Edition.
Fcp. 8vo. cloth, 5s.

FOUR SERMONS ON ORDINATION AND ON MISSIONS.

18mo. sewed, 1s.

A LETTER TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Upon the Proper Treatment of the case of Polygamist Converts from
Heathenism. Second Edition. 1s. 6d.

THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS

Newly Translated, and Explained from a Missionary Point of View.
Fcp. 8vo. cloth, 7s. 6d.

MACMILLAN and CO. Cambridge and London.

THE PENTATEUCH AND BOOK OF JOSHUA
CRITICALLY EXAMINED.

PART I. The Pentateuch Examined as an Historical Narrative. Fifth Edition,
revised. 8vo. cloth, 6s.

PART II. The Age and Authorship of the Pentateuch considered. Second
Edition, revised and enlarged. 8vo. cloth, 7s. 6d.

NOTES ON DR. M'CAUL'S 'EXAMINATION' OF PART I.

Price 1s.

A FRENCH PASTOR'S ESTIMATE

Of Parts I and II of Bishop COLENZO'S Work on the Pentateuch.

By the Rev. THEOPH. BOST, Pastor at Verviers.

Translated from *Le Disciple de Jésus-Christ, Revue du Protestantisme au XIX^e
Siècle.* April and May, 1863. 6d.

THE CONFESSIONS OF A MISSIONARY.

From the French of M. SCHIRER, on Part I of Bishop COLENZO'S Work.
Extracted from the *Revue des Deux Mondes.* April, 1863. (*Nearly ready.*)

LONGMAN and CO. London.

Bible
Comment. (O. 1)

THE PENTATEUCH

AND BOOK OF JOSHUA

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.

PART III.

LONDON:

LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, ROBERTS, & GREEN.

1863.

LONDON
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE

PREFACE.



IN this Third Part of my work I had intended, as I said in Part II, to ‘enter into a close examination of the book of Genesis, and seek to assign the different parts of it, with such degree of probability as the case admits of, to their respective authors.’ I had also stated that in Part III we should have to ‘consider at length’ the questions affecting the origin of the book of Deuteronomy, ‘in order to be able to detect the passages due to its author in the books of Genesis, Exodus, &c.’ I have found it necessary, however, in this Part to confine myself to the latter portion of my proposed undertaking, in order that I might do the work required more thoroughly, and place the evidence, in as clear and complete a form as possible, before the eyes of my readers. It seemed of the more importance to do this, and to confine attention for the present to this particular point, inasmuch as the evidence in this case is so very distinct and decisive, that, if I carry my readers with me here, I shall have, in effect, accomplished my main object in these criticisms, and cleared the way, at all events, for an intelligent and unbiassed examination of the whole question.

I will here state briefly the course of argument which has been followed, and the results which have been arrived at, in

the present volume. I have, as I believe, brought out into view distinctly the following facts.

(1) There are plain signs that the book of Deuteronomy was not written by the same author or authors, by whom the main portion of the rest of the Pentateuch was composed; that is to say—

(i) There is a marked difference in style and tone between the language of Deuteronomy and that of the other four books of the Pentateuch;

(ii) There are various expressions, which are habitually used in the other four books, but which are never once used by the Deuteronomist;

(iii) *There are more than thirty others, which were evidently familiar to the Deuteronomist, as he uses each of them on the average eight times in the course of the book, not one of which is used even once in the other four books;*

(iv) It cannot be believed that Moses, in the short interval of a few weeks at most, between the last act recorded in Numbers and the first in Deuteronomy, should have so completely changed—not only his style and tone, but—his very forms of expression, as these facts would imply, if we suppose him to have written the whole Pentateuch:

(v) Hence the above facts prove,—as it seems, beyond a doubt,—that, whatever portion of the other four books may be ascribed to Moses, he cannot have composed the book of Deuteronomy;

(vi) And, of course, the same holds good of any other writer or writers, who may have composed the main portion of those books.

(2) There are plain signs also that the writer of Deuteronomy very probably lived about the age of Josiah and Jeremiah:—

(i) There are some expressions in Deuteronomy, which are only found in Jeremiah and the latest writings of the Bible;

(ii) Almost all the peculiar words and phrases of the Deuteronomist are found also in Jeremiah;

(iii) The history, as recorded in the Second Book of Kings, makes it highly probable that the book of Deuteronomy was first brought to light in the reign of Josiah.

(3) A close examination of the contents of the book itself confirms very strongly the above conclusions:—

(i) There are distinct references to the other books of the Pentateuch as already existing;

(ii) There are numerous and palpable contradictions to the data of those books,

such as would be likely to be introduced by one writing in later days from a very different point of view;

(iii) In particular, there are remarkable modifications of some of the older laws, which cannot be conceived to have been made by *Moses*, addressing the people only a few months after those same older laws were promulgated (as is supposed) by *Jehovah Himself*;

(iv) These modifications correspond to the altered circumstances of much later times than those, in which the earlier portions of the Pentateuch (as we believe) were written;

(v) There are distinct 'signs of time,' which fix the composition of the book in an age subsequent to the Captivity of the Ten Tribes, in the days of Hezekiah;

(vi) There are special reasons for believing that it was not composed till *the early part of Josiah's reign*, at which time *Jeremiah* lived, and had been already called to the Prophetic office.

It will be seen, throughout the whole of our enquiry, that the evidence is constantly *pointing* to Jeremiah, as, *possibly*, the writer of Deuteronomy. But I must reserve for Part IV the full discussion of the arguments for, or against, this supposition. For my present purpose it is sufficient if it appears,—as I believe it will, to most readers, who will allow themselves to weigh the facts brought forward calmly and solemnly, as in the Presence of the God of Truth, and setting aside, as far as possible, all prejudgment of the case,—that Deuteronomy was very probably written by some great Prophet, in the latter times of the Jewish monarchy, *about* the early part of Josiah's reign,—a *general* conclusion, in which the greatest critics* are almost *unanimously* agreed, however they may differ in fixing the exact date of its composition. If the above point is substantiated, I repeat once more, the main object of my work is gained. The *details* of my criticisms may be confirmed or

* The reader will find the opinions of the most eminent critics on this point stated in Dr. DAVIDSON'S *Introd. to the O. T.*, i.379–385,—a work which, together with those of Dr. KALISCH on 'Genesis' and 'Exodus,' should be in the hands of every English reader, who wishes to engage himself thoroughly in the study of these questions.

rejected on further examination: but the traditional view, which regards the whole Pentateuch as written by Moses, will be shown to be untenable.

If this point be established, it will be unnecessary for me to discuss at length the numerous 'Replies' which have appeared in answer to Part I of my work. There are some, such as those by the Rev. W. H. HOARE, the Rev. W. HOUGHTON, the Rev. E. GRESWELL, A LAYMAN (*Skeffington*), and others, which, from their general fairness and their tone of courtesy and Christian feeling, demand, and have received, my respectful attention. It is obvious, however, that, *if* the arguments produced in this Part shall appear to be valid, the objections to my reasonings in Part I may, for the most part, be dismissed at once, as merely ingenious attempts, — like the 'cycles' and 'epicycles' of the old Ptolemaic system of Astronomy, — to build up a theory, which has no real foundation in fact, and which falls at last by the weight of its own cumbrous additions, and must be swept away together with them. In short, it will then be plain that the contradictions, which I have noticed, are *real* contradictions, such as might *à priori* be expected to appear in a composite work like this; and the cause of religious truth will be relieved from the necessity of inventing a variety of processes of 'reconciliation,' often in direct contradiction with one another, which scarcely, I imagine, satisfy altogether the mind of the 'reconciler,' and still less that of the general reader. Otherwise, it would be perfectly easy for me to place my finger at once upon the weak places in the arguments, generally, of each of the above writers.*

* Thus in an editorial note of the *Edinburgh Review*, No.240,p.505, 'The Layman's' work, above-mentioned, is commended as 'effectually disposing of the

And this is, in effect, the conclusion of no less an authority than Dean MILMAN, who says, in his recently published work, *Hist. of the Jews*, Pref.p.xxxii, that ‘all further enquiry has confirmed him in the view,’ which he announced ‘above thirty years ago,’ viz. —

Maintain the numbers [of the story of the Exodus] as they stand, I see no way, without one vast continuous miracle, out of the difficulties, contradictions, improbabilities, impossibilities. Reduce them, and all becomes credible, consistent, and harmonious.

A *reduction* of the numbers will make, no doubt, an Exodus possible and, as I have said elsewhere, perfectly conceivable. But, as is shown in (190-9), no reduction will make the story of *the* Exodus, as recorded in the Pentateuch, consistent and possible. One set of difficulties may be got rid of in this way, but only to introduce another equally formidable.

greater part of Dr. COLENSO’s objections.’ It is sufficient to say that one of my principal difficulties is ‘effectually disposed of.’ p.31, by assuming that Jacob went down to Egypt with ‘a thousand or more’ followers, who were all reckoned as his children, and as the progenitors of the two or three millions, who came out of Egypt,—and this, although we read. D.x.22, ‘thy fathers went down into Egypt with *threescore and ten* persons’—and although it is equally plain that ten asses, G.xlii.26.27, could scarcely have brought up corn enough from Egypt to support a thousand servants, besides Jacob’s own children and grandchildren, for twelve months in a time of famine. So another series of overwhelming difficulties is ‘disposed of,’ p.152-3, by assuming that ‘the Priests formed originally *five* households, of which Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, Eleazar, and Ithamar, were the heads,’—that each of these five families consisted of about *forty* souls, including ‘a considerable number of *servants*, married and unmarried,’ p.68, and that *all* the males of proper age among these 200 souls, servants and all, were reckoned as ‘sons of Aaron,’ or ‘Priests’!! Let any reader turn to L.viii,ix,x, upon this point—especially x.12.16. On p.61, again, ‘another objection which Bishop COLENSO urges with great force, and which, if established, would be fatal to the entire argument,’ is ‘disposed of’ by the assertion that the ‘firstborns’ of *man* were *not* to be ‘openers of the womb,’ though it is distinctly laid down in E.xiii.2, ‘Sanctify unto me all the firstborn, whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, among man and among beast, it is mine.’ In short, the book, though ably and pleasantly written, will be found to be full of fallacies, such as those above instanced.

But, if it be really true, as the Bishop of OXFORD has said, that ‘much harm has been done among the young by my book,’ and that ‘it is doing an amount of evil which it is difficult to estimate,’—and if it be also true, as the same Prelate has written, that my arguments are ‘but the repetition of old and often-answered cavils,’—it would surely be most desirable,—rather, I should say, it would be felt to be imperatively necessary,—for the Bishops, who condemn me, to put forth a ‘Reply,’ such as to themselves appeared to be sufficient and satisfactory,—such as might be guaranteed in their name by the authority of the Primate. If this were done, I should be bound by the sense of honour, as well as compelled by the love of truth, to consider seriously the arguments adduced in such a document. I should justly be condemned and disgraced, in the presence of my fellow-countrymen, if I did not do this, and either admit that I am wrong, or point out the defective reasonings of the ‘Reply.’

As, however, Dr. M’CAUL’S ‘Examination’ has been commended by the *Quarterly Reviewer*, No. 226, at p.425, as having ‘effectually torn my book to pieces,’ and at p.446, as ‘the most complete of all the [Replies] which have appeared,’—as, further, it has been adopted by the Christian Knowledge Society and thus will be issued with some sort of Church authority,—I have thought right to make a few ‘Notes’ upon it (see *Advi.*), which will enable the general reader to appreciate its true value; and I suppose that the Christian Knowledge Society will deem it right to request Dr. M’CAUL to correct some, at least, of his more conspicuous errors, *e.g.* 43,44,50,51,53,65,66, &c., before they circulate the work as the only answer which the traditionary party in the Church can give to my criticisms.

Dr. M'CAUL has thought it necessary in several passages of his book to speak with contempt of my knowledge of Hebrew. How far he is qualified by his own mastery of the language to pass such censure upon others, I leave my readers to infer from some of the above 'Notes,' *e.g.* 1,6,14,23,28*,55. I do not profess to have the profound knowledge of the Hebrew language possessed by Dr. DAVIDSON or Dr. KALISCH. Nor, indeed, is such scholarship needed for my purposes, as I have very rarely occasion to enter upon nice textual and verbal criticism, and, when I have, I am glad to fall back upon the learned works of our own countrymen above named, or of the great Hebraists of the Continent, such as EWALD, HITZIG, HUPFELD, and KNOBEL. But having begun the study of Hebrew as a schoolboy, and continued it at intervals from that time to this, during a space of thirty-five years, I have sufficient confidence in my acquaintance with the language, to be satisfied, that I am not likely to fall into any serious error,*

* I have already corrected *two* errata in my work, one in each Part, neither of them of any consequence to the argument, and both arising from inadvertence on my part, in following the translation of the E.V., without referring to the original. In Part I, p.24, I have commented on KURTZ's expression 'little ones,' which is that also of the E.V., in G.xlvi.5, without noticing that in the original the word used here is not *kētanim*, but *taph*, which is derived, indeed, from a verb meaning to 'trip, mince, &c. in walking,' and, therefore, means *properly* 'little children,' but is also used for 'women and children' or 'family,' generally, or for 'children' of all ages, as in the text in question. Again in Part II, p.344, I have quoted the name *Eli*, as compounded with *EL*, forgetting at the moment that in the original it is עֲלִי, *Heli*, not אֱלִי, *Eli*.

Dr. M'CAUL, indeed, has suggested, in two or three places, corrections, as he considers, of the rendering of the English Version, which rendering I have generally adopted without alteration, whenever it was not necessary for me to translate with more strict accuracy; as *e.g.* in comparing the similarity of expression in two passages, which may be strong in the Hebrew, but may not be so apparent in the E.V., from the fact of our translators having used not unfrequently different English words or phrases, to express the same Hebrew expression. But I see no sufficient reason in these instances for abandoning the usual translation.

and certainly, I trust, not into errors so considerable as those into which Dr. M'CAUL'S zeal has betrayed him. Dr. M'CAUL, however, has adopted this mode of argument, and very many have been found only too ready to take up and swell the cry, by some of whom attempts, it seems, have been made to determine the Hebrew scholar, who is assumed to have been the principal writer of my Second Part. One party in the Church has fixed upon Dr. DAVIDSON; and, when he has disclaimed having any part in my work, the opposite party has indicted the Rev. J. P. GELL, as having had 'complicity' with my critical labours, and having, in fact, composed a great portion of Part II.

In justice to Mr. GELL I think it right to state the real facts of the case. For the criticisms of every kind in each of my three Parts, I am in my own person wholly responsible; such as they are, whether good or bad, they are my own,—except, of course, what I owe to the published works of the great modern Biblical critics. Nevertheless, having found by experience, in the case of Part I, that my work would be subjected to a very hostile—not to say, ungenerous—criticism, which would spare no blemish, and extend no mercy to the most trivial fault, would convert into a crime any little inadvertence of expression, and speak even of a misprint as a 'blunder,' I have submitted the revised proofs of the last two Parts to the further revision of some of my friends, and, among others, to that of Mr. GELL, with the request that they would notice any defects, which might have escaped my own attention, without committing themselves in any way to my conclusions.*

* I take this opportunity of expressing my thanks especially to THOMAS SCOTT, Esq., of Ramsgate, for the great labour which he has kindly bestowed in verifying the numerous references of Parts II and III.

Scarcely any 'Reply' has been made, as yet, to the more important critical arguments adduced in the latter portion of my Second Part. Bishop OLLIVANT has, indeed, addressed to his clergy a 'Second Letter' with reference to it. But, though formerly a Professor of Hebrew literature,—and, as I believe, the only English Bishop, who has distinguished himself in such studies,—he distinctly says, *p.26*,—

The task of examining *seriatim* the Bishop's minute criticisms *I must leave to others.*

On one point, however, of these 'minute criticisms' Bishop OLLIVANT does furnish a reply, and the reader will find it quoted in (543), and will be able to judge for himself how far it is satisfactory.

The Rev. W. H. HOARE has also undertaken to make a reply to my reasonings in Part II. But he, too, says, *p.127*,—

The only omission of which I shall be conscious is, the not having gone into the critical history [?' discussion'] of the Psalms, the Book of Judges, and the Books of Samuel. As it would not help my argument to have done so, and as these are points which turn purely on criticism. *I must leave them to others.**

* Mr. HOARE does, however, make a few remarks on one or two of the chief points in my criticism.

(i) He considers, *p.119*, that 'Aaron or Eleazar may fairly contest with Samuel the honours of the Elohists, and Moses with 'the promising young men of Samuel's time' the honours of the Jehovists;' and with manly sincerity he admits also as follows:—1. 'The general idea of dividing the documents in the manner that has been indicated, [*i. e.* into *Elohistic* and *Jehovistic* portions,] has, I believe, been shown to be based on more than mere critical conjecture, [*i. e.* (I presume) on *certain evidence*:] while the particular application of it, which I have ventured to suggest, [*viz.* that *Aaron* was the Elohists, and *Moses* the Jehovists,] has the additional advantage that it maintains, intact and inviolate, the canonical authority of Holy Scripture.' The *Quarterly Reviewer*, *p.444*, characteristically 'regrets that Mr. HOARE, whose answer to the First Part of Bishop COLTENSO's book is very able, has yielded to the clamour (!) about the Elohists and Jehovists, and suggests that the former might mean Aaron and the latter Moses.'—regrets, in short, that Mr. HOARE has felt, and has had the courage to acknowledge, the power of the Truth, so far as to admit the existence of more than one author.

I need hardly say that the critical discussion of the Psalms,* &c., which fills the latter half of my second volume, is that portion of my book, as far as it has yet been published, which appears to me of most importance, and with respect to which I have said in my Preface to Part II, *p.viii*, and now repeat, with express reference also to the matter here laid before the reader in Part III,—

It was, perhaps, my knowledge of the overwhelming amount and weight of this evidence, and of much more of the same kind to be produced hereafter, which led me to express myself in the First Part with an assured confidence in the certainty of my conclusions, which some of my Reviewers have condemned, as scarcely warranted, in their opinion, by the premisses, even if they were admitted to be true.

Up to the present time none of my Episcopal Brethren, who

(ii) He thinks, *p.129-132*, that the names, Judah, Japheth, Jobab,—nay, Sarah (!), Shelah (!), Shiloh (!),—are all compounded with the name Jehovah,—a suggestion which I must leave to the judgments of Hebrew scholars, my own conclusion being that Mr. HOARE has (like the ‘Two Working Men’ also, in their ‘Answer’ to Part II) fallen amidst Rabbinical subtleties, which may manage to detect such names, where a scholar, like HENGSTENBERG, with all his zeal, is unable to find them (483).

(iii) Mr. HOARE asks, *p.102*, why I do not quote Is.lxiii.10-12, as a passage written ‘before the Captivity,’ in which Moses is named? I answer, Because the above passage was written by the ‘later Isaiah,’ who lived *after* the Captivity, as is plain from the language in v.18, ‘The people of Thy holiness have *possessed it but a little while*; our adversaries have *trodden down Thy Sanctuary*.’

* Since this Preface was in type, Prof. HAROLD BROWNE’S ‘*Five Lectures*’ have appeared, upon ‘*The Pentateuch and the Elohistic Psalms*.’ I find nothing in these ‘Lectures’ requiring me to modify any of my previous conclusions. Prof. BROWNE’S treatment of the Psalms is too *general* and *superficial* to meet the requirements of the case. He *asserts*, on general grounds, that certain Psalms are David’s; but he does not go through a searching, minute examination of them, so as to *prove* that they are, most probably, David’s Psalms, or Psalms of the Davidic age. And, until he does this, his arguments can have no weight against the conclusions to be drawn from such Psalms as Ps.li. Ps.lx, and, especially, Ps.lxviii, which I have *proved*, as I believe,—the last and most important, at all events,—to be, in all probability, David’s. I shall be ready to abandon at once any part of my constructive theory, as soon as it is plainly shown that my criticism is unsound.

have condemned me, except Bishop OLLIVANT, have taken any notice of these criticisms, except that some have pronounced them, generally, as 'rash and feeble,' 'unfounded, false, and childish.' *

I said in my last preface, *p.*xvii :—

I am naturally anxious to see what the Bishops and Doctors of the Church of England will say upon the subject of my book, and how they will act in the present emergency.

Since then I have been answered, and, I confess, in a way which has disappointed my expectations. For opposition and censure I had prepared myself,—for being misjudged even by many good men, whom I esteem, and for being misrepresented by others, who care only for the triumph of a popular opinion, and not for the truth. I knew from the first that these were the only conditions, on which such a work as this could be conducted, coming, as it does, in direct antagonism with many strong and dear prepossessions, and not a few deep-rooted prejudices. But I had confidence in the power of Truth that it would in the end prevail; and that confidence has been sufficiently justified. To the many correspondents, lay and clerical, who from all parts of the country have written to cheer me with their sympathy, and strengthen me in the resolve to carry on and, if God will, complete my labour, I would here express my heartfelt thanks. It is a source of great comfort to know that so many earnest and devout minds are watching with deep interest the conflict, and

* In the single short letter of one of my Episcopal Brethren, forbidding me to minister in his diocese, the following expressions appear, applied either to myself or my work:—'unfounded,' 'false,' 'childish,' 'heretical,' 'blasphemous,' 'abominable,' 'unhappy,' 'blind,' 'daring,' 'ignorant self-sufficiency,' 'instrument of Satan,' 'poor Bishop COLENSO.'

rejoicing in the progress and triumph of the Truth. Great service also has been rendered to the cause of 'free enquiry' by that portion of the Public Press, which, often without expressing agreement with my views, has yet insisted on a *fair field* being allowed for the discussion of these important questions, and for *time* being given to test the truth of my arguments.

But I have, I confess, been disappointed in the course which has been adopted by the great body of my Episcopal Brethren. I had no reason to suppose that I should receive from *all* of them expressions of sympathy, or encouraging help in my work; from *some* I could only expect condemnation; and, while dissenting from their judgment, I should yet have respected the religious feelings, however (as it seemed to me) mistaken, which to their own minds justified their censures. But I did not imagine that so many of the Bishops of England, with the Bishop of OXFORD at their head, would have absolutely ignored the existence of such a science as Biblical criticism, and its undoubted and undeniable results, in its application to the earlier Hebrew Scriptures. I believed that there were men of science and scholars among them, who, being acquainted generally with these results, would be aware of their reality and importance, and who would feel it to be impossible, in this age of enquiry, any longer to bar out their admission, as facts to be taken account of, like any other facts of science, by the more intelligent minds of the Church of England. I had hoped that their influence would have prevailed to check the hasty judgment of others, less informed than themselves on these matters; and that, if my Episcopal Brethren, generally, did not think it expedient to hold out to me a brotherly right

hand of fellowship,—if they condemned me as going too far in my conclusions, or as reasoning too confidently on insufficient premisses,—they would, at least, have recognised that my arguments were not altogether without some real foundation, and ought to be judged upon their merits,—ought to be considered, and, if need be, checked and corrected, not merely thrown aside with contemptuous language, as unfounded and ridiculous. I could not have believed, for instance, that the Bishop of OXFORD would have ventured to say that my ‘speculations, so rash and feeble in themselves,’ are—

‘in all essential points but the repetition of old and often-answered cavils against the Word of God;’—

and still less that His Grace, the Primate of all England, would have pronounced with the high authority of his office, that my objections ‘are for the most part puerile and trite,’—

‘so puerile, that an intelligent youth, who read his Bible with care, could draw the fitting answers from the Bible itself,—so trite, that they have been again and again refuted, two hundred years ago by Archbishop USHER, one of the most learned analysts of this or of any country, more recently by Bishop WATSON and others.

It is hardly necessary for me to repeat what the Public Press has already said in reply to such assertions as the above, *viz.* that many of the criticisms in these volumes have *never* been answered, and that the writings of Archbishop USHER and Bishop WATSON will throw no light whatever upon the most important questions which are here discussed. As well might we refer to books of the last century for a refutation of the objections, which are raised to the historical truth of some portions of the book of Genesis, by recent discoveries in geological science. But, on behalf of those, who regard the Bible with a true reverence, as a Divinely-given Teacher, which God in His Providence has ‘caused to be written for our learning,’

but which He wills us to read with intelligent discrimination of its contents, not with a blind unreasoning idolatry of the mere letter, I respectfully protest against the language which the Archbishop of CANTERBURY has, apparently, applied to all those, who read my books with interest, by summing them up under three categories, as either 'ignorant,' or 'half-informed,' or else 'rejoicing in anything which can free them from the troublesome restraints of religion.' The object of my whole work is to bind the consciences of men more imperatively than ever by the law of true Religion, which is the law of life and happiness. But, inasmuch as multitudes have already broken loose from the restraints of that traditional religious teaching, which they know to be contradicted by some of the most familiar results of modern Science, now made the common heritage of every educated English child, I believe that I have only done my duty, as a Minister of the National Church, in endeavouring to reestablish a permanent union between the teachings of Religion and Science, and to heal effectively that breach between them, which otherwise will assuredly widen day by day, with infinite injury to the Church itself, and to the whole community.

And here I think it desirable to correct three mistakes, which (as I gather from the letters addressed to their Clergy by several of the Bishops) have been entertained by many with respect to my work.

(i) It has been stated that I *deny the Inspiration of the Bible*.

I reply that I have nowhere denied it, nor have even considered at all the question of Scripture Inspiration. I have left that subject wholly untouched: it is no part of my present plan to discuss it. Doubtless, the plain results of criticism,

such as those set forth in these volumes, must indirectly affect the views which may be taken of Inspiration, and must certainly, if seen to be true results, conflict entirely with the traditional view of the Divine Infallibility of Scripture. But it is no part of my present *object* to prove even this. (I have only had in view 'to examine critically the Pentateuch and book of Joshua,' with the special purpose of determining, as far as possible, the age and authorship of the different books.)

(ii) Again, it has been said that *I wish to prove the Pentateuch*—and in fact, the whole Bible—*to be untrue*.

Nothing can be further from my wish or purpose than this. Rather, I desire to know what *is* true in the Pentateuch history, and in the Bible generally. I wish to know, if possible, in what age, by what persons, under what circumstances, the different portions of the Bible were written, that I may be able to judge for myself, and help others to judge, the amount of credibility to be attached to the different narratives. If I had found reason to believe that Moses really wrote the account of the Exodus, describing what he had himself personally said, and done, and witnessed, I should have felt bound to believe his statements, as those of a devout, God-fearing, man; and then, whatever miraculous accounts they might have contained, such statements would, assuredly, not have involved the contradictions, which appear upon a close inspection of the present Pentateuch. But the process of critical enquiry, so far from eliciting *proofs* and *confirmations* of the Mosaic origin of these books, leads quite to the opposite conclusion. (All the arguments, drawn from an examination of the Pentateuch, point in one direction. It is well to observe this. There is literally *nothing* in these books distinctly indicative of Mosaic authorship.)

The whole force of the argument for that authorship rests upon tradition, and may be referred back to the opinion of the Jews, who lived nearly a thousand years after the date assigned to Moses. It is not a question of *balanced internal evidence*, but a case where there is a *host* of indications, all tending to show diversity of authorship and late date, and *none* discoverable, by all the ingenuity yet brought to bear upon the subject, which tends decidedly the other way; and the supporters of the traditional view will be found to be constantly occupied,—not in producing ‘internal evidence’ to show that Moses *did* write the Pentateuch, but—in trying to account for the existence, on the assumption of his authorship, of so much internal evidence of the contrary. In short, the strength of the resistance to the critical conclusion lies in the feeling, that we do not *like* to think that those books could have grown up in the way, which the ‘internal evidence’ clearly indicates,—the way in which, be it observed, the religious books of all other nations are known to have been formed.

As soon, then, as I began to examine the question closely, it was impossible long to resist the conviction, that the notion of these books having been actually composed by Moses was a mere popular prejudice, without foundation in matter of fact. And, my eyes being once opened to this, I could not but perceive a multitude of ‘difficulties, contradictions, improbabilities, impossibilities,’ (to use again the words of Dean MILMAN,) involved in the story as it now lies before us, which were due to the complex nature of the work, and caused by the amalgamation into one story of different writings, by different authors, in different ages. Having examined carefully in detail the proofs of this compound authorship, and arrived at definite

and certain views myself upon some questions, *e.g.* as regards the later origin, generally, of the 'Law and Polity of Moses,' and, in particular, as regards 'the age and authorship of Deuteronomy,' I have felt it to be my duty to lay the facts of the case before the English reader. And, in order to do this, I thought it best to set forth, in the first instance, some of the most remarkable of the above contradictions, as likely to fasten upon his mind, and arouse in him the desire and determination to be satisfied, as far as possible, upon the point at issue, and bring to the further consideration of the more important, and yet more difficult, portions of my work, that eager, close, attention, which was needed to produce entire conviction. I believe that I have succeeded in this to some extent; though I must confess that I have been surprised at the amount of ingenuity, which, even in an age like this, can still be expended in framing all kinds of possible or impossible ways of escape from the most overwhelming difficulties. But the plan, which I have followed in Part I, has been misunderstood by many to imply that the whole object of my work—at least, its main object—was *to prove the unhistorical character of the Pentateuch*, and so destroy the authority of the Bible.

(iii) Further, it has been stated, by more than one of my Episcopal Brethren, that I have charged the Clergy generally with *dishonesty*, in concealing their views about the Deluge, and using the Baptismal Form of Prayer without believing in it. I reply that I have never charged any with 'dishonesty' in this respect; and, if I thought that my words justly allowed of such a construction being placed on them, I should express my regret that I have made use of language that was capable of being so misconstrued.) Nor did I *volunteer* to

make any reference at all in this matter to the Clergy. In what I said, I acted strictly in self-defence. I was accused of being 'dishonest' myself, in retaining my clerical office, while disbelieving many or most of the details of the story of the Exodus, —*directly*, by many of the Clergy, and *indirectly* by one, for whose high character, as a lover of truth and fair-dealing, and for whose conduct under present circumstances, I have the most profound esteem. The Bishop of LONDON had stated, in his Charge to his Clergy, that our National Church was based upon the principle of 'free enquiry,'—that to enquire was the *right* of an English Clergyman in all cases, and frequently his *duty*,—but that,—

'if such enquiry led to *doubt*, and if the doubt ended in disbelief of the Church's doctrines, of course he would resign his office as one of the Church's authorised teachers.'

I might have replied to such an observation that WYCLIF did not retire from his sacred office, though disbelieving the doctrines of the Church of which he was a Minister, and that CRANMER, RIDLEY, and LATIMER, and other Bishops, though consecrated as Bishops of the Roman Church, and bound by the solemn vows of their ordination in that Church, did not *resign* their sees as soon as they became *Protestant* Bishops, and the National Church by the National Will had become Protestant also, nor afterwards, when by the same Will the Church ceased to be Protestant, and once more became Romanised.

But I felt that, in the present instance, there was far less reason for urging upon me such a course as a plain duty, inasmuch as very many of the Clergy, I believed, and certainly not a few of my Episcopal Brethren, did *not* accept the story of the Noachian Deluge as literally and historically true, and yet justified themselves in retaining their offices in the Church.

If my conduct was 'dishonest,' so, too, was theirs; for my 'dishonesty,' surely, could not consist in openly professing that which others secretly held. If *they* were 'honest' in the course which they were pursuing—and I expressed no doubt whatever of this—I felt that it was unfair and ungenerous to charge upon me, as a crime, the very same proceeding as their own—the same exactly in principle, though differing, it may be, in degree. I admit fully that any of the Clergy who *do* 'unfeignedly believe'—as some, I presume, do—in the literal historical truth of the story of the Flood as told in G.vi,vii,viii, have a right to bring the charge against me of not believing what they deem essential to a true faith in the authority of the Bible. And, if there are *not*, as I said in my former Preface, 'multitudes of the more intelligent Clergy,' who, on geological or other grounds, have come to disbelieve in that narrative as a true piece of history, then I am wrong in my assumption, and owe my Clerical Brethren an apology for ascribing such disbelief to them.

But as to those, be they many or few in number, who do not believe in the literal truth of the Noachian Deluge, I did not impute to them 'dishonesty' in holding those opinions, and yet retaining their clerical office. On the contrary, I assigned certain reasons, which, I thought, would satisfy different classes of minds, and enable them still with a clear conscience to use the Form of Prayer which referred to that narrative. (Being persuaded, however, that in this age of advancing Science such Clergymen *are* many, and believing also that the Laity have rarely heard from the pulpit any reference to the account of Noah's Flood, as being otherwise than literally and historically true, I am obliged to conclude that, by some cause or other, such Clergymen *have* been prevented from speaking to their people

the plain truth upon this point. And I believe that they have been impeded by the restraints, real or supposed, of those stringent obligations, which the Church of England at the present time enforces on her Clergy at Ordination.

Here, also, I desire to say a few words more plainly in explanation of my present position, with reference to the assumptions made by some of my Episcopal Brethren, in their recent letters of inhibition. His Grace the Archbishop of CANTERBURY, in a letter dated March 31, addressed to the Clergy of his Diocese, has stated that I 'have refused to resign the See of Natal, though I cannot deny that I am unable to exercise the most important functions of that office.'

I presume His Grace to refer, in these words, to the reply which I gave to a letter addressed to me by the great majority of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England. In that reply, I did not think it necessary to contradict formally the three assumptions which had been made by my Episcopal Brethren, considering that anyone acquainted with my books would be aware that they were not correct statements of the facts of the case; and feeling also that an answer at full length was the less needed, as the letter of the Bishops appeared in the *Times* almost as soon as it had reached my hands,—before I had had time to reply to it,—from which circumstance I could only infer that it was intended rather for the *public* than for myself, though expressing 'deep brotherly anxiety' for me. As, however, the Archbishop and several of the Bishops have again referred to this subject, I think it due to myself to notice this charge; and I do it also with a view to those of the Clergy and Laity, who agree with me in believing that the right and duty of free enquiry to its fullest extent is the very foundation on

which—not true Religion only, but — our Protestant National Church is based, and that an honest and fearless statement of the Truth, as the result of such enquiry, is the only condition of its permanent existence, and the only ground of hope for its continuance, from age to age, in healthy and vigorous action, amidst the rapid advances of modern Science.

The letter of my Episcopal Brethren contained, as I have said, three assumptions, which are expressly or virtually negatived by the plain words of my books.

(i) ‘We understand you to say that you do not now believe that which you voluntarily professed to believe, as the indispensable condition of your being entrusted with your present office.’

Ans. When I was ordained Deacon and Priest, I professed to ‘believe unfeignedly all the Canonical Scriptures.’ I have said that I *then* understood those words in their most obvious and natural sense,—the sense in which some of the Bishops, and many of the Clergy, at this very time receive them,—as implying that those Scriptures were, in matters of historical fact, as well as in statements of moral and religious truth, divinely and infallibly true. I have said also that I had ceased to believe this, and that I was pained to find my convictions contradicting, as I conceived, the words of the Ordination Service, until it was declared, on the highest legal authority of the Church of England, that my former view—I may say, the popular view—of the meaning of those words was mistaken, and that they must be held to mean no more than a simple expression of a *bonâ fide* belief that ‘the Holy Scriptures contain everything necessary to salvation,’ and that ‘to that extent they have the direct sanction of the Almighty.’ I have stated distinctly, Part I, p.xxxiii, and I here repeat, that ‘I am not conscious of having said anything which contravenes this decision.’

(ii) ‘We understand you to say that you have entertained, and have not abandoned, the conviction, that you could not use the Ordination Service, inasmuch as in it you must require from others a solemn declaration that they ‘unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament,’ which, with the evidence now before you, it is impossible wholly to believe in.

Ans. I cannot but suppose that His Grace, and others of my Episcopal Brethren who subscribed the above words, could not have been aware that they are directly set aside by my own language on p.xii of Part I, where, after showing that at one time I felt the impossibility of demanding from a candidate for Orders *such* a confession of belief in the Holy Scriptures as I then considered—and as many still consider—to be required by the formula of the Ordination Service, I have added

(since reading in England the judgment of Dr. LUSHINGTON) the following note:—

‘This was written before the recent decision of the Court of Arches, by which, of course, the above conclusion is *materially affected*.’

It would now be possible for me to require such a declaration from a candidate for Orders, provided that I had first fully explained to him, and to the Congregation, *in what sense the Church intends such a declaration to be made*.

(iii) ‘We understand you further to intimate that those who think with you are precluded from using the Baptismal Service, and consequently (as we must infer) other offices of the Prayer Book, unless they omit all such passages as assume the truth of the Mosaic History.’

Ans. This assumption, again, is contradicted by my own language already referred to, Part II, p. xxii, where I have said that many Clergymen, who do not believe in the historical truth of the Noachian Deluge, will yet be able to justify themselves in one of two ways, in using still such a Form of Prayer. If it is perfectly understood that a Minister is at full liberty to explain to his people freely his opinion respecting the Biblical account of the Deluge, the unhistorical character of the Mosaic story, or the age and authorship of Deuteronomy,—(and this appears likewise to be decided in the affirmative by the same legal judgment,)—I apprehend that many, who have an intelligent acquaintance with the results of modern criticism, may still be content to read the allusions in the Liturgy. But I felt also that there might be others, of more scrupulous conscience, who would not be satisfied with this mode of meeting the difficulty, and to whom I could give no other advice than that which I have given, viz. to *omit* such expressions, and take the consequences of such omission.* I consider, however, that such passages ought no longer to be retained, as of absolute obligation, in our Prayer Book; and I hold it to be my duty, as a Bishop of the National Church, to labour for their removal—or, at least, for the liberty being granted of omitting them—as soon as possible.

This, then, is what I meant when I contradicted publicly the

* I need hardly say that it is satisfactory to me to find that, in giving such advice as the above, I am supported by the practice of His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, who stated in his place in the House of Lords, on Monday, June 1, 1863, that ‘he had been consulted frequently’ by clergymen, who had conscientious scruples against using certain words of the Burial Service in particular cases, in which, however, by the *law* and by their ordination *vows* they were required to use them,—‘and he had said this, that *nothing would induce him to pronounce these words*’ in such cases—‘*he would stand the risk of all the penalties of the law rather than do so.*’

assumption of my Episcopal Brethren, that with my present views I cannot use the language of the Baptismal and Ordination Services. I *can* use that language—provided that I claim it as my right, as a Minister of the National Church, and lay it upon myself as a duty, to explain freely and fully to my people in what sense I use it. And what are others doing in this respect? How does my conduct differ essentially, in respect of honest adherence to the principles of the Church of England, from theirs? The Bishop of OXFORD was the *first* to issue a letter of inhibition, after my reply to the address of the Archbishops and Bishops. Not, then, in his personal capacity, but as a representative of those, who have followed him in adopting this extraordinary mode of public Church censure,—upon the mere judgment of each individual Bishop, without any hearing or trial of the accused,—I would ask the Bishop of OXFORD before my fellow-countrymen, Does *he*, a Fellow of the Royal and other Scientific Societies, believe unfeignedly in the literal historical truth of the account of the Creation, the Noachian Deluge, or the numbers of the Exodus? If the Bishop will say that he *does* ‘unfeignedly believe’ in all these matters, as related in the Pentateuch, of course, I have nothing more to say as regards this part of my argument. But, if he does not, then how, I repeat, does his present conduct differ essentially from mine? *He* has some way of explaining these matters, which satisfies his own mind, as I have. And the only difference is this, that I think it to be my duty, and shall make it my practice, to tell my people plainly, on such points, what I believe, and what I know to be true; and the Bishop of OXFORD has not yet, as far as I am aware, thought it necessary to say what he really thinks upon any one of these subjects.

In fact, judging from their published documents, it is very difficult to say what many of those, who have so severely condemned me, do really believe themselves with respect to the narratives of the Pentateuch. They have expressed themselves, indeed, in the strongest terms, as resting their hopes of eternity upon the 'Word of God.' But *that*, I trust, I do, as truly and entirely as they. There is a sense also in which I am quite ready to speak of the Bible as the 'Word of God,'—just as we call a Church the 'House of God,' without meaning, therefore, to say that the plan or material of the building is Divine, or that God meets with us there exclusively. But I prefer the language of the First Homily, '*In it (Holy Scripture) is contained the true Word of God;*' and I agree fully with the language of Dean MILMAN, who says, *Hist. of the Jews*, Pref.p.xi:—

The moral and religious truth, *and this alone*, I apprehend, is the 'Word of God' contained in the Sacred Writings. I know no passage in which this emphatic term is applied to any sentence or saying, which does not convey or enforce such truth.

On this account I am unwilling to make use of the expression 'The Bible *is* the Word of God,'—though in the sense of the words above explained I *can* use it,—because it is so likely to mislead the uneducated, and induce them to attach a superstitious reverence to the mere text of Scripture. But, when my Brethren use the expression 'Word of God,' the question arises, What do *they* mean? Their language at one time seems to imply that they attach a Divine Infallibility to every line and letter of the mere text of the Bible, so that,—

'all our hopes for eternity, the very foundations of our faith, our nearest and dearest consolations, are taken from us, if one line of that Sacred Book be declared to be unfaithful or untrustworthy.'

But, when the writer of the above words is pressed for an

answer, as to a statement of the Bible being true on one particular point of natural history, he immediately, while maintaining his position in words, abandons it in point of fact, and retreats behind the assertion that—

'every line of Scripture will amply bear the pressure of any test applied to it, if viewed with relation to the subject it really refers to, the state, mentally and morally, of those to whom it was addressed, and the effect it was intended to convey'—

a statement, which, whatever may be its precise meaning, at all events allows of the recognition of the results of my own critical enquiries. The other inhibiting Bishops, as I have said, with the single exception of the Bishop of LLANDAFF, have contented themselves with simply condemning my book.*

But what do my Episcopal Brethren mean by this proceeding? Do they really suppose that, by the obstructions of Church censures and anathemas, or the mere exercise of authority, they can bar out the entrance of that light of Critical Science, which God Himself has given us, as one of the special blessings bestowed upon us by His Goodness in this day?] [May it not be that the Science of Biblical Criticism is as needful to our true

* The venerable Bishop of EXETER has surprised me, as much as any of my Brethren, by the course which he has taken. In a letter to his Clergy, he has very justly condemned the practice of 'prejudging matters which must be the subject of Judicial consideration before our Archbishop,' and *not* 'adhering' to the very proper 'resolution of a meeting of the Bishops,' viz. 'to avoid any extra-judicial declaration' on this subject. And his language bears with special force upon those who may be called to sit hereafter as judges, but who, by distinct expression of their sentiments beforehand, in public official documents, have surely gone far to 'endanger the impartiality and purity of the tribunal of justice.' In a further address to his Clergy the Bishop of EXETER is reported to have said that he 'has not read the book which has occasioned so much alarm,' and 'cannot, therefore, speak of its real contents,' and that, 'not having examined the book, he will not condemn it.' Yet he '*is thankful that it has called forth so strong a feeling of indignation against me,*' and he, too, 'inhibits' me from ministering in his diocese.

progress and highest happiness as any other of the Sciences—as Geology, Astronomy, Chemistry, Natural History, &c.—all which have been aroused into new life in this very age, and many of which—like that of which the most recent results are exhibited in the works of DAVIDSON, KALISCH, &c., and in the Parts already published of this work—were almost wholly unknown to our forefathers? May it not be true that each one of these Sciences is as truly intended by the Wisdom and Grace of God for the present stage of human development, as any other of the sisterhood,—that we cannot despise or refuse the help of any one of them, without ‘rejecting the counsel of God against ourselves,’—that, ‘if this work be of God, we cannot overthrow it, lest haply we be found fighting against God’? [In short, may it not be true that this light of Criticism may be but one of the many-coloured rays of modern Science, which come to us all from the ‘Father of Lights,’ in this our own age of wonderful Illumination, and which are meant to blend together into the pure, white, Light of Truth, that Light which our spirits need, and which His Wisdom and His Love at this time impart to us?]

Must we, then, English Christians, live on, as men did in former ages, under strict ecclesiastical restraints, as if there was a ‘dark chamber’ in the house, into which we have once looked, but have shut to the door, and dare not look again, lest we should see something to frighten us out of our ‘hopes for eternity,’ and cause us the loss of ‘all our nearest and dearest consolations’? How much better to open wide the door, and let in the blessed light and air of day, into every part of our spiritual dwelling! That light, indeed, may show us that the stories of the six days’ Creation, the Noachian Deluge, the

slaughter of 68,000 Midianitish women and children, are no longer to be spoken of as historical facts. We may perceive that it is no longer possible to confound the early legends of the Hebrew people, and statements contrary to reason and the facts of nature, or condemned by our moral sense, and by the Voice which witnesses for God within us, with the Eternal 'Word of God.' But we shall find in the Pentateuch, notwithstanding, precious things without number, of which little or no use is made at present in the instruction of the people,—unquestionable facts of ancient history, mixed up, no doubt, with much of uncertain or unreal tradition,—and, above all, rich lessons of spiritual Truth, by which our souls may be cheered and strengthened for the work of life. What a day of regenerated life will it be for the Church of England, when these things shall be spoken of, plainly and freely, in every pulpit of the land,—when the Bible shall be opened, and the story of its origin explained, and the real value of its histories discussed, as the records of living men, like ourselves, written down by living men,—with the reverence due to a Book so venerable, and endeared to the inmost heart of every Christian, but yet without fear of treading with irreligious feet upon holy ground,—rather, with the deepest and most sincere conviction that we can only thus serve God acceptably, and discharge our duty before Him, as Christian men and Ministers, by such free enquiry after Truth, and such free utterance of it.

But another cry has been raised against my work, and, indeed, the loudest and most terrible of all, the cry of 'Heresy!' 'Blasphemy!' To my utter amazement, the two Archbishops have swelled this cry,—not to speak of the language used by others

of my Episcopal brethren, as that of the Bishop of CHICHESTER, already quoted. The Archbishop of CANTERBURY has spoken of my works as 'derogatory to the person, the attributes, and the work, of our Divine Redeemer,' and as 'charging Him, who knew what was in man, with ignorance and imposture.' And, in like manner, the Archbishop of YORK reproaches me with 'having imputed to the Lord of glory ignorance of holy things,' and 'having described our Lord as a blind guide, quoting, for the very Word of Life, the baseless fables of men.'

I say that I have been amazed at such language being used by these eminent Prelates; because I could not have believed that persons so high in office and judicial position would, in statements like these, have branded me publicly, before the whole Church, with charges of 'heresy' and 'blasphemy,' for the expressions which I have used in my books on *this* point. Whatever they might have thought of the soundness of my criticism, or however they might have differed from my views of Inspiration, yet I could not have imagined that they would either have been unaware of the fact, that, in using such expressions with respect to our 'Lord's ignorance as the Son of Man,' I was perfectly justified by the practice of the most eminent theologians, both ancient and modern, or that, being aware of this, they would have allowed me to be covered with reproach and censure on this account,—nay, with their own hands would have flung some of the hardest stones against me. So assured, however, did I feel of the soundness of my views on this point, and that here, at all events, I had the authority of the Church itself on my side, that I did not care to defend myself at length from such charges in my former volumes. But, as some remarks had been made upon the subject, with reference

to what I said in my Preface to Part I, I was content to repeat my words, and refer in support of them to the language of an eminent professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, Dr. HEY. I thought that, of course, the Bishops and Doctors of the Church,—more especially those who, like Archbishop THOMSON and Bishop ELLICOTT, have gained a reputation for theological learning, or who, like Dean ALFORD and Prof. BROWNE, (as will be seen below,) have expressed the very same view in substance as my own,—would protect me, at all events, from such accusations. Otherwise, I should have produced further evidence in my Second Part, to justify my use of the language so much condemned. In support of my position I now produce it, in the contents of the following communication, which has been sent to me by a clergyman, unknown to me personally at present, though well-known as the writer of various zoological papers in scientific journals, and the chief contributor on the Natural History of the Bible to the second volume of Dr. SMITH'S *Dictionary*. I will only add that I am deeply sensible of the courage and sincerity which he has shown, amidst the violent excitement of these times, in thus coming forward, unsolicited, to bear this testimony in the service of the Truth.

MY LORD,

If there is one passage in your recently published work on the Pentateuch, which more than another has subjected you to very severe condemnation, it is that which contains the following statement, (Part II, p. xvii):—

‘This only I repeat once more. The recognition of the gradual growth of JESUS, as the Son of Man, in human knowledge and science of all kinds, such as that which concerns the question of the age and authorship of the Pentateuch, is perfectly compatible with—rather, is absolutely required by—the most orthodox faith in His Divinity, as the Eternal Son of God.’

Very hard words, my Lord, have been uttered against you for maintaining this

so-called 'heretical' opinion. We are told, for instance, in a widely-diffused publication, (Dr. M'CAUL'S '*Examination*' of your difficulties in Part I, p.215, *People's Edition*,) that you 'rob Christ of His Deity, by denying His Omniscience.'

The doctrine, which is embodied in the paragraph quoted above from your book, has lately been occupying my close attention; and, as the result of my investigations, I shall show—

- (i) That it is expressly taught by our Lord Himself;
- (ii) That it has the sanction of very many eminent Biblical writers, both ancient and modern;
- (iii) That it is implied in the language of the formularies of our Church.

(i) Speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem or of the end of the World, our Lord says, 'Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, *neither the Son, but the Father,*' Mark xiii.32.

(ii) This verse appears to have attracted the especial attention of the Patristic Theologians, in their disputes, first, with the Arians, and, subsequently, with a sect called the Agnoetæ, so named because they taught from this passage that 'Christ, as Man, was ignorant of some things, just as we say that He suffered grief,' *ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἠγνοεῖ που Χριστὸς, ὥσπερ καὶ πονέσαι λέγομεν αὐτόν.* But it is evident that the error of the Agnoetæ did not consist simply in maintaining this doctrine, because EULOGIUS,* Bishop of Alexandria, who wrote against them, was compelled to admit with GREGORY NAZ.† that Christ 'knows, indeed, as God, but is ignorant as Man,' *γινώσκει μὲν ὡς Θεὸς, ἠγνοεῖ δὲ ὡς ἄνθρωπος.* But, whatever was the particular heresy of the Agnoetæ, it is certain that the doctrine, which is embodied in the foregoing formula, though so severely censured, has the undoubted sanction of many of the early Fathers.

LEONTIUS *de Sæctis, act. ult.* (I quote from the *Critici Sacri*, not having the works of this author at hand,) writes as follows:—

'One must know that most of the Fathers—indeed, almost all—appear to say that He (CHRIST) was ignorant of some things; for, if He is said to be in all respects of the same substance with us (*ὁμοούσιος*), and we are ignorant of some things, it is manifest that He also was ignorant, and the Scripture says of Him that He increased in age and wisdom.'

St. AMBROSE. *De Fide*, 5, cap.xviii, §221, though he was somewhat afraid of holding the doctrine himself, yet admits that it was held by many, when he says:—

'There are many, however, not quite so timid as I am,—for I had rather fear deep things, than be wise about them,—there are many, I say, relying on what is

* ΠΡΟΤΗ *Myriobiblion*, ed. Hoerschelius, Rothomagi, 1653, p.881.

† *Oratio trigesima-sexta*, ed. Paris. 1609, p.588.

written, 'And Jesus progressed in wisdom, &c.,' who say confidently that, according to His Divine Nature, indeed, He could not have been ignorant of those things which are future, but that, according to His assumption of our condition, He said before His crucifixion that He was ignorant as the Son of Man. . . . He seems, therefore, to be ignorant in the same nature in which He progresses. . . . This, however, let others say, &c.'

GREGORY NAZ. *Or.*xxxvi(xxx).15, writes:—

'To whom can it be a matter of doubt that He has a knowledge of that hour, indeed, as God, but is ignorant of it, as Man? . . . For, inasmuch as the name 'Son' is used in this passage absolutely, and without being referred to any one, and it is not added, *whose* Son, on that account a handle is hence afforded to us (*hinc nobis ansa porrigitur*) of so considering the matter as to interpret this ignorance in the most pious sense, ascribing it to His Humanity, not to His Divinity.'

THEODORET *ad IV Cyr. Anathem.* says:

'The ignorance, then, does not belong to God the Word, but to the form of the servant, which knew at that time such things as the indwelling Divinity revealed.'

ATHANASIUS, *Disc. II against Arianism*, (PUSEY'S translation, *Library of the Fathers*,) ch.xxviii, writes as follows:—

'Why, though He knew, He said 'no, not the Son knows,' this, I think, none of the faithful is ignorant, *viz.* that He made this, as those other declarations, *as Man*, by reason of the flesh. For this, as before, is not the Word's deficiency, but of that human nature, whose property it is to be ignorant. . . . Not then, when the heaven was made by Him, nor when He was with the Father Himself, the Word 'disposing all things,' nor before He became Man, did He say it, but when 'the Word became flesh.' On this account it is reasonable to ascribe to His Manhood everything which, after He became Man, He speaks humanly. . . .

'Certainly, when He says in the Gospel, concerning Himself, in His human character, 'Father, the hour is come, glorify Thy Son,' it is plain that He knows also the hour of the end of all things as the Word, though, *as Man, He is ignorant of it*, for ignorance is proper to man, and especially ignorance of these things. Moreover, this is proper to the Saviour's love of man; for, since He was made man, He is not ashamed because of the flesh which is ignorant, to say 'I know not,' that He may show that, knowing as God, *He is but ignorant according to the flesh*. And, therefore, He said not, 'no, not the Son of God knows,' lest the Godhead should seem ignorant, but simply, 'no, not the Son,' that the ignorance might be *the Son's, as born among men*. . . .

'For, as on becoming man He hungers and thirsts and suffers with men, so with men, *as Man, He knows not*.'

Upon the above Dr. PUSEY notes as follows, after stating what he considers to be the 'doctrine of the Church' on this point:—

'However, this view of the sacred subject was received by the Church after St. ATHANASIUS'S day; and it cannot be denied that he and others of the most eminent Fathers use language, which *primâ facie* is inconsistent with it. They certainly seem to impute ignorance to our Lord as Man, as ATHANASIUS in this passage.'

And Dr. PUSEY quotes St. CYRIL, *Trin. pp.623-4*, 'Why blush they at the conditions of the manhood, and determine to find fault with what especially befits the economy of the flesh?' and he says, 'THEODORET expresses the same opinion very strongly.' He adds also in a note on p.464, 'It is a *question to be decided*, whether our Lord . . . spoke of a *real* ignorance, or of an 'economical' or *professed* ignorance.' He produces several of the Fathers in support of this latter view. But he quotes also THEODORET as 'very severe on the principle of 'economy':—'If He knew the day and, wishing to conceal it, said He was ignorant, see what a *blasphemy* is the result! Truth tells an untruth!'

CYRIL of Alexandria, Ed. *Migne*, Tom.75,p.367, says:—

'We ought not, on account of this expression, to accuse the *Word of God*, and rashly to impute any ignorance to Him. But we should rather admire His love towards man, who did not refuse, out of His love towards us, to bring Himself down to so great humiliation, as to bear all things that are ours, one of which also is *ignorance*.'

And again CYRIL says, *Theo. p.221*:—

'Just as Christ took this upon Himself in common with men, to hunger, thirst, and suffer the other things which are spoken about Him, exactly in the same way *there is nothing to offend any one, if He be said, as Man, to have been ignorant also in common with men*.'

CHRYSOSTOM, *Hom. cxvii*, says:—

'He is ignorant, then, according to His human nature, who knows all things according to the power of His Divinity.'

AUGUSTINE writes on this point, *Opera. vol.xii, Fides Rufini Syri, &c.*:—

'Although no one, as far as I am aware, has charged it as a crime upon Origen, that he has attributed to Christ ignorance of the last day, yet I have little doubt that this form of anathema was produced by Rufinus with special reference to him, although undeservedly and by a suspicious—if I may so say—calumny. There are, then, two parts of the form of anathema: one refers to Christ, as the Word; the other refers to Him as Man. The former alleges that to the Word the day of judgment was known, a point which the Arians denied; the latter admits that to the Man it was unknown, on which point the Fathers of old held various opinions. For, while they all in common contended with the Arians, yet some maintained that Christ, as Man, was really ignorant of the last day, and therefore were wont

to use the distinction that Christ knew the day of judgment in His divine character (*θεϊκῶς*), but in His fleshly nature (*σαρκικῶς*) knew it not. This opinion was entertained by some of the Fathers, even of great name in the Church, EUSTATIUS of Antioch, (as quoted by FACUNDUS HERMIANENSIS,) ATHANASIUS, BASIL, GREGORY NAZ., CYRIL of Alexandria, THEODORET, HILARY, AMBROSE, FULGENTIUS, and others not a few.'

AUGUSTINE himself, however, and the Theologians of his day, interpret the expression, 'neither the Son,' to denote, not that Christ, even as Man, was actually ignorant of the day of judgment, but that he was unwilling to communicate it, an explanation plainly untenable, as Archbishop TILLOTSON has shown in his Sermon cxxix, on the text in question, from which I extract the following:—

'But this is not only hid from the angels, but, which is yet more, from the Son Himself. *Of that day and hour knows none, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son.* This seems strange indeed that the Son of God, who came from the bosom of His Father, and therefore is more likely than any to know His secrets, —that He, *whom God had ordained to be the Judge of the world*, into whose hands He had committed that great trust and authority—should not be acquainted with the time of this judgment. . . . This seems incredible but that He Himself hath told us so. . . . Some, and those of no small account, have understood these words, as if our Saviour only intended to put off His disciples from a more particular enquiry about the matter; not that He was ignorant of the day of judgment, but that He did not know it, so as to reveal it to them,—which is by no means to be admitted; not only because it looks too like the equivocation of the Jesuits, but likewise because the same may be said of *the angels*, since it is not otherwise denied of the angels, that they know this time, than it is of the Son. Others say that His human nature was not ignorant of the day of judgment, but that it did not know this of itself, but by virtue of its union with the Divine nature. But our Saviour absolutely says that *the Son* did not know it. And, therefore, others more reasonably have distinguished between His human nature and His Divine; and, though as God He could not be ignorant of anything, yet *His human understanding did not know it.* . . . If this be not admitted, how can we understand that passage concerning our Saviour, Luke ii. 52, 'that Jesus grew in wisdom, &c.' ? . . . For, if the human nature of Christ did necessarily know all things by virtue of its union with the Divinity, He could not then, as Man, be said to *grow in wisdom*. And this, I think, may be sufficient for the clearing of this difficulty.'

HAMMOND, on Mark xiii. 32, writes:—

'But for the doctrine of those which . . . only affirm that, though as God He knew all, yet as Man He was ignorant of some things, just in the same manner as He was passible and subject to all human infirmities which had not sin in them, and that this is His own express affirmation that *the Son of Man knew not that day and hour*, this sure is so far from heresy that . . . it is the unanimous assertion

of all the *Fathers*, to which neither the Council of Chalcedon nor any other hath taught anything contrary.' Hammond presses the matter too far when he says 'it is the *unanimous* assertion.'

LIGHTFOOT, *Exercit. on Mark xiii.32*, writes:—

'To say that the Second Person in the Trinity knows not something, is blasphemous; to say so of the *Messias*, is not so, who, nevertheless, was the same with the Second Person in the Trinity.'

CALVIN says on Luke ii.40:—'Certainly, when the Apostle teaches that (JESUS) was like to us in all things, sin excepted, without doubt he comprehends this also that His soul was subjected to ignorance. . . . Although the Person of God and Man was one, yet it does not follow that anything, that was proper to the Divine nature, was given to the human nature. . . . In fine, unless anyone pleases to deny that Christ was made a true man, let us not be ashamed also to confess that He voluntarily took upon Himself all things, which cannot be separated from human nature. The objection, however, is foolishly made that ignorance, as being the punishment of sin, does not comport with Christ; for the same would have to be said also with respect to death. . . . But, when Luke says that He was strengthened in spirit, and filled with wisdom, he signifies that whatever wisdom belongs to men, and daily accrues to them, flows from that one only fountain, viz. the Spirit of God.'

But I need not multiply quotations. GROTIUS, CLARIUS, J. CAPPELLUS, the elder ROSENMÜLLER, D'OVLV and MANT, WHITBY, BENDEL, all maintain the doctrine.

Bishop HORNE writes, *Disc. LV.iii.p.203*:—

'He [the Son] had also a Soul, endued with the same faculties as ours. His understanding was capable of learning and improvement; for, as *Man*, He was ignorant of some things which He might know, and He 'grew,' it is said, 'in *Wisdom* as well as *Stature*.'

The late Archbishop of CANTERBURY, though he does not seem to like the opinion, that Christ as Man was ignorant of some things, does not charge the advocates of it with heresy. He writes on Mark xiii.32:—

'It is said that in the same way as confessedly, when He came in our nature, He divested Himself of immortality which He possessed as God, so He might also divest Himself of knowledge. This is hard to understand. It would be strange, however, if there were not difficulties in a case so mysterious as the Union of the Divine and Human nature in the person of Christ.'

WATERLAND, ii.p.162, (*Oxf. Ed. 1856*.) writes as follows:—

'As it may be truly said of the *body* of man that it is not *immortal*, though the soul be, so it may be truly said that the *Son of Man* was *not knowing*, though the *Son of God* knew everything. . . . He denies the knowledge of the day of

judgment, but in respect of His *human nature*; in which respect also He is said to have 'increased in wisdom,' Luke ii.52, the Divine *Logos* having with the human nature assumed the *ignorance* and other *infirmities* proper to it.'

Dean ALFORD writes on Mark xiii.32:—

'This is one of those things, which the Father hath 'put in His own power,' Acts i.7, and with which *the Son*, in His Mediatorial Office, is not acquainted. We must not deal unfaithfully with a plain and solemn assertion of our Lord,—(and what can be more so than *οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός*, in which by the *οὐδὲ* He is *not below*, but *above*, the angels?)—by such evasions as 'He does not know it so as to *reveal* it to us,' WORDSW.² ('non ita sciebat ut tunc discipulis indicaret,' AUG. *de Trin.* xii.3). Of such a sense there is not a hint in the context: nay, it is altogether alien from it.'

So the same author writes on Matt. xxiv.3:—

'Another weighty matter for the understanding of this prophecy is that any obscurity or concealment concerning the *time* of the Lord's Second Coming must be attributed to the right cause, which we know from His own mouth to be, that the Divine Speaker Himself in His humiliation 'did not know the day and the hour.' All, that He had heard of the Father He made known unto His disciples, JOHN xv.15; but that, which the Father 'kept in His own power,' Acts i.7, He did not in His abased humanity know.'

Prof. HAROLD BROWNE writes, *Art.i.p.*96:—

'That He (Jesus) had a perfect human soul appears from His 'increasing in wisdom,' Luke ii.52, *from the possibility of His being ignorant*, Mark xiii.32, which could not be true of Him considered only in His *Divine* nature.'

(iii) Lastly, this doctrine, lately so violently impugned, but so generally acknowledged hitherto, is implied in the language of our Church's formularies. A few words will suffice. The 15th Article teaches that 'Christ in the truth of our nature was made like unto us *in all things, sin only except.*' In the Athanasian Creed we acknowledge Christ to be 'perfect God and *perfect Man.*' How can we possibly receive this doctrine with regard to His human nature, if we deny to that nature one of the most essential attributes of humanity?

Thus, my Lord, you have been judged a heretic for promulgating a doctrine, which is expressly taught by our Lord Himself and by the Evangelist St. Luke, which is implied in the formularies of the Church of England, and is sanctioned by many of the most learned and devout writers, both ancient and modern. It is a pity that those, who have so severely condemned you for publishing this and such like *puerilities which an intelligent youth can answer*, have not taken more trouble to enquire whether 'these things are so,' or not.

And now, my Lord, with respect to the general character of your recent publica-

tions on the Pentateuch, I feel it my positive *duty*, at whatever cost, to say a few plain and honest words. I have diligently, conscientiously, and prayerfully, studied the whole question at issue for the last six months, and am compelled to admit the *general truth* of your arguments, though differing in some particulars. You are aware that I published a pamphlet in reply to your Part I; I have withdrawn that reply from circulation. Before the appearance of your Book, however, I was quite certain that the *Bible* and *Science* were opposed to each other. Four years' examination of almost every word in the Bible relating to its Natural History has convinced me that, in many essential points, the Biblical and Natural records are, to use the words of the learned and candid KALISCH, 'utterly, and irreconcilably at variance.' The more I examine the whole question for myself, the more certain I become that in the Bible 'legend is mixed up with history, poetic imaginings with prosaic narrative, that no miraculous power has been exerted to preserve it from omissions, interpolations, and corruptions of the text,' and that the Bible 'is therefore, not infallible in the sense in which the popular creed assumes it to be.'*

We acknowledge, my Lord, notwithstanding a large admixture of the human, and therefore fallible, element in the Bible, that in that Book there is a *jewel* of heavenly lustre and of priceless value. Why are we to suppose that this *jewel* shines less brilliantly, or loses one iota of its value, because the gold of its *setting* has a considerable per-centage of alloy? Why will men refuse to drink of the 'water of life' because it is offered to them in an earthen vessel?

Your Lordship is at liberty to make any use you please of this letter.

I remain, my Lord, your faithful and obedient servant,

PRESTON RECTORY, WELLINGTON, SALOP:

W. HOUGHTON.

May 20, 1863.

But, it is said, 'the same spirit of enquiry will be carried into the writings of the New Testament.' I answer, undoubtedly it will, and must be; and, if there is any part of the Church's teaching, depending on the New Testament, which will not bear the test of Truth, we shall, of course, as servants of the God of Truth, be bound to reject that also. Is there, then, a 'dark chamber' here too, which we are afraid to examine,—into which we dare not suffer the light of day to enter? Is

* See the very admirable and opportune Sermon preached in the Chapel of Trinity College, Cambridge, by Rev. W. G. Clark, M.A., 'On the Duty of Members of the English Church in the present Controversies.' Macmillan & Co.

this the security on which we hold our 'hopes for eternity,' our 'nearest and dearest consolations,' that we must not venture to apply to the records, on which we build our faith, an honest and searching criticism, such as we should certainly bring to the examination of documents of far less vital consequence? Let not me, or those who think with me, be blamed for this suggestion. It is not mine, and I have no dread of such enquiries; I know that they will only tend still more to advance God's Glory, and our eternal welfare, through the progress of His Truth among men. Let those be blamed who have put forth this argument, for the purpose of keeping men still bound, hand and foot, in the swaddling-clothes of old traditions, and checking all examination like this into the historical truth of the Pentateuch, instead of recognising at once, in the face of the Church, the results of modern criticism, as established facts, and doing their part to harmonise them with those doctrinal teachings, which they deem to be part of the sum and substance of Christianity. *One* important difficulty, upon which we have soon stumbled in the very outset of these enquiries, I have done my best to remove; and for so doing I have been reproached as a 'heretic' and 'blasphemer.' But other difficulties will, no doubt, arise, and, indeed, have already been raised, not merely by the progress of criticism, but by recent discoveries in geological and other sciences, which must tend to modify materially some of those traditional views, which have been hitherto maintained on the assumption of the historical truth of the early portions of the Pentateuch. I believe that I am doing the best service to the cause of true Religion by showing that we are *not* obliged to receive as the Infallible 'Word of God,' these statements, which conflict

with the certain conclusions of Science, and by asserting that the 'Word of God' is wholly independent of the amount of credence which we give to these ancient narratives. Very striking and important are these words of Dean MILMAN, *Latin Christianity*, vi.p.633, quoted by me in Part I (184), but little noticed by those, who have been so severe against me :—

As it is my own confident belief that the words of Christ, and His words alone, (the primal, indefeasible, truths of Christianity,) shall not pass away, so I cannot presume to say that men may not attain to a clearer, at the same time more full and comprehensive and balanced, sense of those words, than has as yet been generally received in the Christian world. As all else is transient and mutable, these only eternal and universal, assuredly, whatever light may be thrown on the mental constitution of man, even on the constitution of nature, and the laws which govern the world, will be concentrated so as to give a more penetrating vision of those undying truths.

And I commend to the consideration of those of my Right Reverend Brethren, who have so strongly condemned me, these other words of the same eminent writer, in his work just published, *Hist. of the Jews*, p.xxxiv :—

If on such subjects [as those here discussed] some solid ground be not found, on which highly educated, reflective, reading, reasoning, men may find firm footing, I can foresee nothing but a wide—a widening—I fear, an irreparable—breach between the thought and the religion of England. A comprehensive, all-embracing, Catholic, Christianity, which knows what is essential to religion, what is temporary and extraneous to it, may defy the world. Obstinate adherence to things antiquated, and irreconcilable with advancing knowledge and thought, may repel and for ever,—how *many*, I know not,—how *far*, I know still less. *Avertat omen Deus!*

That portion of the work, however, which concerns the New Testament, I leave at present to others. The Bishops and Doctors of our Church are many, and I am but one. Several of them are learned in matters specially connected with the criticism of the N.T., with the early records of the history of the Church, and of the origin, progress, and development of dog-

matic teaching within her pale. I must confine myself, — for the present, at least,— to the special work which I have here undertaken, and in which my Brethren have left me hitherto to labour alone, *viz.* that of setting before the Laity and Clergy of the National Church, to the best of my power, the most certain conclusions of modern critical science as to the age and authorship of the different parts of the Pentateuch.

. Since the above Preface was written, the Report of the Committee of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, appointed to examine Parts I and II of my work, has been presented, and endorsed by a vote of ten Bishops of the Province, at the earnest instance of the Bishop of OXFORD, but in opposition to the judgment of two of the most eminent and learned Bishops of the English Bench, the Bishops of LONDON and St. DAVID'S.

I rejoiced at the appointment of that Committee. For the furtherance of the Truth I desired nothing more than that my investigations and conclusions should be brought under review by such a body of English Clergymen, distinguished, most of them, by high ecclesiastical position, and many of them by eminent literary and theological attainments. It is true that Archdeacon DENISON, who moved for the Committee, and has acted as its chairman,—who expressed the wish to 'avoid the appearance of approaching to intemperance in thought or language,' and who, therefore, in his preliminary address to the Convocation, confined himself to speaking of me merely as 'a sacrilegious person,' one ready to 'damage the Bible by misrepresentation, to tear out its leaves, mutilate it, and desecrate what is left,' adding, 'I am going to say, if any man asserts such things as are asserted in this book, ANATHEMA ESTO! Let him be put away!'—took for granted that many members of Convocation had not read the First Part of my work, and desired, apparently, that they should not read either Part for themselves, but simply accept the report of his Committee; for he said, 'I have no doubt,—at all events, I hope,—that there are many here, who have not read the First Part, and I am sure that there are many, who have not read the Second Part,' of the book, on which he was about to call them in due time to pass some kind of judgment.

However, I presume that, at all events, those gentlemen, who have been engaged on this Committee, *have* felt it to be their duty to read my two Parts, and have endeavoured to divest themselves, as much as possible, of all prejudices, and to deliver 'a just and true verdict according to the evidence,' as in God's sight. I regret, indeed, that some of the most distinguished members of the Committee have taken no part at all in its proceedings, including two professors of Divinity in the

University of Cambridge, and others, from whose learning and honesty of purpose I expected much advantage for the cause of Truth. Nevertheless, I accept the Report, as exhibiting the result of nine days' searching enquiry into the contents of my books, by fourteen clergymen, many of them eminent for piety and learning, who also, however strongly animated by the desire to bear witness to the Truth, and do nothing by partiality, yet had, many or most of them, spoken severely beforehand in censure of my books, and would not, therefore, be likely to spare any traces of 'heresy' which might fairly be detected in them.

I observe, then, that the Committee has not reported that my criticisms are *unfounded* or my critical conclusions *false*. They do not impeach the scientific *truth*, but only the *orthodoxy*, of my reasonings; they leave to 'individuals' the business of replying to my books; and they say 'the work of a Synod of the Church is of a different kind.' As Archd. BICKERSTETH observed, 'They have simply taken expressions from the book, and placed them side by side with the Bible, and expressions from the Formularies and Articles.' To me it is of little consequence, comparatively, whether my conclusions are deemed to be orthodox or not, provided only that they are *true*. If so, they are 'orthodox' in the best sense—the only right sense—of the word, in the only one which is recognised by the whole *spirit* of our National Church, based, as it surely is, upon the Truth, and not on authority.

But the Committee of Convocation has reported that, 'bearing in mind that it is not their province to pronounce definitely what are, or are not, opinions heretical, they content themselves with submitting that *three* propositions, being the main propositions of the book, involve errors of the gravest and most dangerous character, subversive of Faith in the Bible as the Word of God.' They then 'proceed to cite from the book a further proposition,' which they evidently mean to characterise as 'heretical' and 'blasphemous.'

These four points, however, sum up the crimes, of which I am supposed to be guilty. Never, I presume, was any book subjected to the ordeal of a more searching scrutiny. And it may be safely concluded that such scrutiny has brought forth fully, into the strongest light, *all* the offences, with which, in the opinion of these eminent divines, my books can justly be charged.

I need hardly say, that I am glad to find that my offences are so few, and that upon the first three points complained of I am in substantial agreement with one of the most learned and distinguished members of Convocation itself, Dean MILMAN of St. Paul's, and upon the fourth with two others, who attended all the meetings of this very Committee, Prof. HAROLD BROWNE and Dean ALFORD of Canterbury. Some passages from these authors have been already quoted in this Preface: but, under the circumstances of the case, it may be well to produce the most important of them again, and to contrast them with the charges made against me.

(i) I have said that '*The Bible is not itself God's Word,*' it being, however, added

by me that 'assuredly God's Word will be heard in the Bible, by all who will humbly and devoutly listen for it.'

Dean MILMAN says, *Hist. of the Jews*, p.xi:—

'The moral and religious truth, and *this alone*, I apprehend, is the 'Word of God' contained in the Sacred Writings.'

(ii) I have said that '*Not Moses, but Samuel, and other persons of a later age, composed the Pentateuch.*'

Dean MILMAN says, *ibid.* p.xxvii:—

'There are two theories, between which range all the conclusions of what may be called the critical school:—

'*First*, that the Pentateuch in its present form is of *very late* date, the reign of Hezekiah, Manasseh, Josiah, or even subsequent to these;

'*Secondly*, that the Pentateuch, even in its present form, is of very high antiquity, as high as the time of Moses, but that *it has undergone many interpolations, some additions, and much modification*, extending to the language, in successive ages.

'If I am to choose, I am most decidedly for the *second*.'

(iii) I have said that '*The story of the Pentateuch, with respect to some, at least, of the chief portions of the narrative, cannot be regarded as historically true.*'

Dean MILMAN says, *ibid.* p.xxxii:—

'Maintain the numbers [of the Pentateuch] as they stand, I see no way, without one vast continuous miracle, out of the difficulties, contradictions, improbabilities, impossibilities.'

The judgment of one such learned and devout historian, who gives the above results as the conclusions of thirty years' careful study of these questions, will weigh more, I imagine, with most intelligent and candid readers, than the mere denunciations of others, who have never thoroughly examined the subject, and are not really aware of its difficulties.

With respect to the *fourth* point, my words are reported as follows:—

'Our Lord Jesus Christ, having taken our nature fully, and having voluntarily entered into all the conditions of humanity, and, among others, into that which makes our growth in all ordinary knowledge gradual and limited, . . . at what period of His life upon earth is it to be supposed that He had granted to Him, as the *Son of Man*, supernaturally, full and accurate information, so that He should be expected to speak about the Pentateuch in other terms than any other devout Jew of that day would have employed? Why should it be thought that He would speak with certain *Divine* knowledge on this matter, more than upon other matters of ordinary science or history?'

And the Report goes on to say:—

'Your Committee observe upon this proposition that it questions our Blessed Lord's Divine knowledge, as witnessed in Scripture by the Holy Ghost.'

I think that, when my readers take account of the passages, which have been already quoted on this point in this Preface,—among which will be found the words of Prof. BROWNE and Dean ALFORD,—they will be surprised at the above statement. They will be surprised also to find that neither the Bishop of OXFORD, nor any one of the Bishops who voted with him, uttered one syllable to imply that he was aware of any such passages existing, or expressed a brotherly hope, that on this particular point, at all events, I might not be altogether so guilty as some have supposed. It is, I repeat, an amazing fact, that so many Bishops, Doctors, and Divines should have adopted this Report, without one single voice breaking the dead silence, to intimate that there was ever the slightest doubt in the Church upon this question,—still less, to give utterance to the simple truth, that here, at least, I am supported by the consentient opinion of very many of the greatest Divines, both ancient and modern.

Above all, I cannot but regret that Dean ALFORD and Prof. BROWNE did not protest against such a clause being inserted, however much it might be desired by others of the Committee. I cannot but regret that the former, at all events, did not feel this to be a time for acting in the spirit of his own brave words, some of which I shall here take the liberty of quoting, as they bear directly upon the circumstances of the present time, and will, I trust, be the means of cheering and comforting others, as they have cheered and comforted me, in coming forward to bear witness to the truth in these matters, as God has granted them the power to see it.

‘Speak thou the Truth. Let others fence,
 And trim their words for pay;
 In pleasant sunshine of pretence
 Let others bask their day.
 Guard thou the Fact: though clouds of night
 Down on thy watch-tower stoop;
 Though thou shouldst see thine heart’s delight
 Borne from thee by their swoop.
 Face thou the wind. Though safer seem
 In shelter to abide,
 We were not made to sit and dream;
The safe must first be tried.

Macmillan’s Magazine, for April, 1863.

J. W. NATAL.

23 SUSSEX PLACE, KENSINGTON, LONDON, W.

June 3, 1863.

CONTENTS.



CHAP.	PAGE
PREFACE	v—xlvi
I. THE DEUTERONOMIST DISTINCT FROM THE OTHER WRITERS OF THE PENTATEUCH	391—406
II. FIRST APPROXIMATION TO THE AGE OF THE DEUTERONOMIST	407—414
III. THE BOOK OF THE LAW FOUND IN THE TEMPLE	415—429
IV. DEUT. I. 1—II. 37	430—441
V. DEUT. III. 1—IX. 29	442—453
VI. DEUT. X. 1—XI. 32	454—465
VII. DEUT. XII. 1—XIII. 18	466—479
VIII. DEUT. XIV. 1—29	480—494
IX. DEUT. XV. 1—XVI. 22	495—502
X. DEUT. XVII. 1—20	503—512
XI. DEUT. XVIII. 1—22	513—518
XII. DEUT. XIX. 1—XXII. 30	519—529
XIII. DEUT. XXIII. 1—XXVI. 19	530—538
XIV. DEUT. XXVII. 1—26	539—549
XV. DEUT. XXVIII. 1—XXXI. 30	550—562
XVI. THE SONG OF MOSES, DEUT. XXXII	563—569
XVII. THE BLESSING OF MOSES, DEUT. XXXIII. 1—7	570—582
XVIII. THE BLESSING OF MOSES, DEUT. XXXIII. 8—12	583—595
XIX. THE BLESSING OF MOSES, DEUT. XXXIII. 13—29	596—605
XX. DEUT. XXXIV. 1—12	606—611
XXI. RESULTS OF THE EXAMINATION OF DEUTERONOMY	612—618
XXII. CONCLUDING REMARKS	619—632

NOS CERTÈ, ÆTERNO VERITATIS AMORE DEVICTI, VIARUM INCERTIS ET ARDUIS ET SOLITUDINIBUS NOS COMMISIMUS; ET, DIVINO AUXILIO FRETI ET INNIXI, MENTEM NOTRAM ET CONTRÀ OPINIONUM VIOLENTIAS ET QUASI INSTRUCAS ACIES, ET CONTRA PROPRIAS ET INTERNAS HESITATIONES ET SCRUPULOS, ET CONTRÀ RERUM CALIGINES ET NUBES ET UNDEQUÀQUE VOLANTES PHANTASIAS, SUSTINIMUS; UT TANDEM MAGIS FIDA ET SECURA INDICIA VIVENTIBUS ET POSTERIS COMPARARE POSSEMUS. . . . NON (INQUAM) ULLAM AUT VIM AUT INSIDIAS HOMINUM JUDICII FECIMUS AUT PARAMUS. VERUM EOS AD RES IPSAS ET RERUM FŒDERA ADDUCIMUS; UT IPSI VIDEANT QUID HABEANT, QUID ARGUANT, QUID ADDANT ATQUE IN COMMUNE CONFERANT. NOS AUTEM SI QUÀ IN RE VEL MALÈ CREDIDIMUS, VEL OBDORMIVIMUS ET MINÙS ATTENDIMUS, VEL DEFECIMUS IN VIÀ ET INQUISITIONEM ABRUPIMUS, NIHILOMINÙS IIS MODIS RES NUDAS ET APERTAS EXHIBEMUS, UT ERRORES NOSTRI, ANTEQUÀM SCIENTIÆ MASSAM ALTIÙS INFI-CIANT, NOTARI ET SEPARARI POSSINT, ATQUE ETIAM UT FACILIS ET EXPEDITA SIT LABORUM NOSTRORUM CONTINUATIO.—BACON. *Inst. Magn. Pref.*

WE, IN VERY DEED, OVERPOWERED BY THE ETERNAL LOVE OF TRUTH, HAVE COMMITTED OURSELVES TO UNCERTAIN, DIFFICULT, AND SOLITARY PATHS; AND, RELYING AND LEANING ON DIVINE HELP, HAVE MAINTAINED OUR VIEWS BOTH AGAINST THE VIOLENCE AND, AS IT WERE, EMBATTLED FORCES OF OPINIONS, AND AGAINST OUR OWN INWARD HESITATIONS AND SCRUPLES, AND AGAINST THE DARKNESS OF THINGS AROUND US, THE CLOUDS, THE FANCIES FLIPPING ON EVERY SIDE; THAT IN THE END WE MIGHT BE ABLE TO PROVIDE FOR THE PRESENT AND FUTURE GENERATIONS MORE TRUSTWORTHY AND RELIABLE EVIDENCES. . . . WE HAVE NOT (I SAY) ATTEMPTED TO CARRY MEN'S JUDGMENTS EITHER BY ASSAULT OR BY AMBUCADE, NOR DO WE PROPOSE TO DO SO. BUT WE BRING THEM INTO THE PRESENCE OF FACTS THEMSELVES AND THE RELATIONS WHICH EXIST BETWEEN THEM; THAT THEY MAY SEE FOR THEMSELVES WHAT THEY POSSESS, WHAT THEY HAVE TO OBJECT TO, WHAT THEY CAN ADD AND CONTRIBUTE TO THE COMMON STOCK. FOR OURSELVES, IF IN ANY POINT EITHER OUR BELIEF HAS BEEN ILL-FOUNDED, OR WE HAVE BEEN CAUGHT NAPPING AND INATTENTIVE, OR WE HAVE GROWN WEARY ON THE JOURNEY AND BROKEN OFF THE ENQUIRY, STILL WE EXHIBIT MATTERS IN THEIR SIMPLE NAKEDNESS IN SUCH A WAY, THAT IT WILL BE POSSIBLE TO NOTE OUR ERRORS AND PUT THEM ON ONE SIDE, BEFORE THEY CAN AFFECT CONSIDERABLY THE GREAT BODY OF SCIENCE, AND ALSO TO CONTINUE OUR LABOURS WITH EASE AND WITHOUT EMBARRASSMENT.

PART III.
THE BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY.

D D

CHAPTER I.

THE DEUTERONOMIST DISTINCT FROM THE OTHER WRITERS OF THE
PENTATEUCH.

536. We shall next proceed to consider more closely the age and authorship of the book of Deuteronomy, upon which we have merely touched in Part II. We may now assume that we are no longer under the necessity of regarding this portion of the Pentateuch as being an actual authentic record, by Moses himself or by one of his contemporaries, of the last addresses of the great Hebrew lawgiver to his people. In fact, if it be true, as we believe, that the other parts of the Pentateuch are, generally, of far later date than the time of the Exodus, there can be no reason for supposing that this book forms an exception to the general rule. And, as we have seen some reason for concluding that the original Elohist story has been very considerably enlarged in later days,—perhaps, by more than one author, in different ages,—it is, from the first, not improbable that the book of Deuteronomy also, which, as we shall presently see, differs remarkably from the rest, not only in its *style* and *tone*, but also in its very *language*, and verbal *forms of expression*, may have been added in a still later age.

537. There can be no doubt that this book is throughout the work of one and the same hand, with the exception of the last chapter, and, perhaps, one or two other short sections, (such as

xxxii.48-52,) which will be pointed out hereafter. Otherwise, the book is complete in itself, and exhibits a perfect unity of style and subject. It consists almost entirely of addresses ascribed to Moses shortly before his death; *viz.*—

(i) An introductory discourse, i.6-iv.40, in which he is represented as recounting to the people, by way of encouragement and warning, a brief sketch of their past history, since their escape out of Egypt, which discourse, however, as we have seen (276, 277), is interrupted, here and there, with geographical and archæological notices, very ill-suited to such an occasion, and involves anachronisms (252), where reference is made to events of the previous weeks as to events of a by-gone age, which betray at once the later time at which it was written;

(ii) The main body of the work, v.1-xxvi.19, a long and impressive address, urging upon the people, by reiterated arguments of the most earnest and affectionate kind, the duty and blessedness of obeying the Divine commands, and the danger of disobedience;

(iii) Additional addresses, xxvii.1-xxx.20, expressed in language of great eloquence, with powerful—almost, at times, appalling—energy, in which the people are warned, again and again, of the fearful consequences of departing from Jehovah;

(iv) The conclusion, xxxi.1-xxxiv.12, containing the ‘Song’ and last ‘Blessing’ of Moses, with the account of his death and burial ‘in the land of Moab, over against Bethpeor; but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day.’ xxxiv.6.

538. No attentive reader of the Bible can have failed to remark the striking difference above referred to, which exists between the style and contents of Deuteronomy and those of the other books, generally, of the Pentateuch. Whereas *they* are occupied almost entirely with long details of legend or history, with circumstantial directions for the construction of

the Tabernacle and its vessels, or with multiplied repetitions of the minutiae of the ceremonial Law, so that the writers only very occasionally break forth, from their usual plain, prosaic, style, into grand prophetic utterances, or soar into the higher regions of poetry, the book of Deuteronomy, on the contrary, almost from beginning to end, is one magnificent poem, or collection of poems, full of noble thoughts and glowing expressions, containing scarcely a single lengthy detail of a purely *historical, artistic, or ceremonial*, nature, but wholly devoted to enforcing, in tones of earnest and impassioned eloquence,—now with the most persuasive and touching tenderness, now with the most impressive and terrible denunciations,—the paramount duties of morality and religion.

539. Prof. RAWLINSON, indeed, writes, *Aids to Faith*, p.245 :—

Considered as a literary work, the Pentateuch is not the production of an advanced or refined, but of a simple and rude, age. Its characteristics are *plainness, inartificiality, absence of rhetorical ornament*, and occasional defective arrangement . . . *We look in vain through the Pentateuch for the gnomic wisdom of Solomon, the eloquent denunciations of Ezekiel or Jeremiah, or the lofty flights of Isaiah.*

But, surely, no one, after reading the glorious rhetoric of D.xxviii or D.xxxii, would hesitate for one moment to pronounce either of these passages to be one of the most ‘eloquent denunciations,’ and one of the most ‘lofty flights’ of prophetic, as well as poetical, imagination, to be found within the whole compass of sacred and profane literature. Most probably, Prof. RAWLINSON was not really thinking, when he wrote the above words, of these chapters, or of the book of Deuteronomy at all. His language, in fact, applies generally, with sufficient accuracy, to the other portions of the Pentateuch. And it is the marked contrast between the general plainness of style in these other books, and the spirit and energy, the fire of holy zeal, the warmth of imagination, which characterise everywhere the book of Deuteronomy, by which we are from the first, before instituting any closer eu-

quiries, compelled strongly to the conviction that they cannot have had the same author or authors.

540. But it may, perhaps, be asked, 'Was not Moses himself capable of producing such a book as this?' At the close of his long life, after so many awful communings with God, being now, as it were, in the very hour of his own dissolution, with his bodily eye, indeed, undimmed, and his natural force unabated, D.xxxiv.7, but with his feet already standing on the verge of the eternal world, and his spirit's eyesight straining into the darkness that lay before him, is it wonderful that he should have felt the prophetic impulse seize him mightily, at such a time, with a power unknown before, and that he should have thus poured forth his dying utterances, of mingled laudation and reproof, encouragement and warning, blessing and cursing, in strains of unwonted force and eloquence? May not Moses, too, like Jacob of old, G.xlix.1-27, have gathered up the manifold and wonderful experiences of his life, in this last burst of grand, heart-stirring, oratory? No longer now occupied with the things of time,—the legends of hoar antiquity, the historical records of the events in the wilderness, the ritual of external worship, the requirements of the Camp and earthly Sanctuary,—may we not believe that he would wish to have his last hours occupied, as here, with the enforcement of eternal realities,—of that worship in spirit and in truth, of which these earthly things are but the symbols,—so as to leave lingering in the ears and in the hearts of his people the echo of those words, which sum up the whole substance of his previous teaching,—

'Hear, O Israel! Jehovah our God is One Jehovah; and thou shalt love Jehovah thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might,' D.vi.4,5,—

words, which One greater than Moses declared to contain the essence of all the Law and the Prophets, only adding to them the new command of the Gospel, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,' Matt.xxii.37-39?

541. This argument, might, indeed, have been employed, with some plausibility, to vindicate to Moses the composition of this book, if we had not already seen sufficiently that the story of the Exodus, generally, cannot be regarded as historically true, — if it were not also plain that the other books of the Pentateuch cannot possibly have been written by Moses, but must have been composed in a much later age than his,—if, lastly, there were not in the book of Deuteronomy itself abundant indications, as we have said, — not only in the general *tone* and *spirit* of the book, which have been already referred to, but also, as will now be shown, in its *language* and *subject-matter*, — which prove, beyond all doubt, that we have here a very different author, and one of a very different age, from those concerned in writing the main portions of the other books of the Pentateuch.

542. We have already noticed (494–496) one instance of this in the fact that, whereas in the other books the Priests are *always* styled the ‘sons of Aaron,’ L.i.5,7,8,11,ii.2,iii.2,xiii.2, N.x.8, comp.L.xxi.21, and *never* the ‘sons of Levi,’ yet in Deuteronomy, on the contrary, they are *always* called the ‘sons of Levi’ or ‘Levites,’ D.xvii.9,18,xviii.1,xxi.5,xxiv.8,xxvii.9,xxxi.9, comp.xviii.1,5,xxxiii.8–11, and *never* the ‘sons of Aaron.’ It is, as we have said, impossible to believe that any writer, whether Moses or any other, should have so suddenly changed his form of expression in such a case as this, in the very short interval of a few days or weeks at most, between the last act recorded in the book of Numbers and the first in Deuteronomy. And let it be observed that in D.xxvii.9, ‘the Priests the Levites,’ and in D.xxxi.9, ‘the Priests the sons of Levi,’ are not the Priests, who should be in future days, but the Priests then actually living or supposed to be living, Eleazar and Ithamar, the ‘sons of Aaron.’

543. Bishop OLLIVANT, however, *Second Letter, &c., p.9*, suggests the following explanations of the above fact:—

When we find that the death of Aaron had been recorded in N.xxxiii.38, six months before one word of Deuteronomy was spoken, I think that we may well

suppose, either that a sense of his own loss might have induced Moses to pass over his brother's name in silence (!), or that, Aaron being now no more, so that *his* feelings could not possibly be wounded by the change, the Lawgiver, remembering the jealousy of certain Levites, which had dictated the cry against himself and Aaron, 'Ye take too much upon you,' might deem it good policy, or even be directed by Jehovah Himself, to endeavour to extinguish a flame, suppressed, but perhaps not altogether extinguished, by henceforth adopting an appellation which referred rather to the common patriarchal ancestor of Priests and Levites, than to the family ancestor of Priests alone.

I leave the above to the consideration of my readers, merely observing that, though the death of Aaron is *referred to* in N.xxxiii.38, the *full account* of it is given in N.xx.22-29, *after* which we find the name of Aaron repeatedly mentioned — (by Moses, as is supposed)—in the narrative, and that in N.xxv.7,11, we have the expression, 'Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of *Aaron the Priest*;' so that, according to the history, neither the 'feelings' of Moses, nor his 'policy,' prevented his producing the name of 'Aaron the Priest,' within six months after his death,—in his writings at all events,—before the people.

544. Again, the Deuteronomist uses תּוֹרָה, *Torah*, 'Law,' invariably of the *whole* Law, i.5, iv.8,44, xvii.11,18,19, xxvii.3,8,26, xxviii.58,61, xxix.20(21),28(29), xxx.10, xxxi.9,11,12,24,26, xxxii.46, xxxiii.4,10; whereas in the other books the word is used most frequently,—indeed, almost always, (the exceptions being E.xiii.9, xvi.4, xxiv.12,)—of *particular* laws, E.xii.49, L.vi.9(2), 14(7),25(18), vii.1,7,11,37, xi.46, xii.7, xiii.59, xiv.2,32,54,57, xv.32, N.v.29,30, vi.13,21, xv.16,29, xix.2,14, xxxi.21.

Also the Deuteronomist confines all sacrifices to *one place*, 'which Jehovah would choose, to put His Name there,' xii.5,11, 13,14,18,21,26, xiv.23,24,25, xv.20, xvi.2,6,7,11,15,16, xvii.8,10, xviii.6, xxvi.2, xxxi.11; whereas the other books say nothing about this, but expressly imply the contrary,—

'In *all places*, where I record my Name, I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee.' E.xx.24.

545. Further, the Deuteronomist, though he strictly enjoins the observance of the other three Great Feasts and the Passover,* xvi.1-17, yet makes no mention whatever of the 'Feast of Trumpets,' L.xxiii.23-25, N.xxix.1-6, or the 'Day of Atonement,' L.xxiii.26-32, N.xxix.7-11, on each of which days it was expressly ordered that they should 'do no servile work,' that they should have 'a holy convocation,' and that they should 'offer an offering made by fire unto Jehovah,' just exactly as at the three Great Feasts, and on the latter of which they were 'to afflict their souls by a statute for ever,' and it is added—

'Whatsoever soul it be, that shall not be afflicted in that same day, he shall be cut off from among his people; and whatsoever soul it be, that doeth any work in that same day, the same soul will I (Jehovah) destroy from among his people.' L.xxiii.29,30.

Let it be borne in mind that the directions in N.xxix are supposed to have been laid down by Jehovah Himself only a few weeks previously to this address of Moses. Yet here, while making, as he is represented to be doing, a final summary of their duties, as to the observance of their annual sacred seasons, he omits all mention of these two important days, upon which the same stress is laid in L.xxiii as on the three Great Feasts, and for the neglect of one of which the punishment of death by the stroke of Divine judgment is threatened.

546. Again, there are a number of sentiments or statements, repeated again and again by the Deuteronomist, which occur, most of them very rarely, and many of them not at all, in any of the other books of the Pentateuch: *e.g.*—

(i) That Israel should possess the land of nations 'greater and mightier' than itself, iv.38, vii.1, ix.1, xi.23; comp. i.28, vii.17; and also G.xviii.18, N.xiv.12;

(ii) That Jehovah had 'led them forty years' through the wilderness, ii.7, viii.2, xxix.5; comp. i.31;

* The 'Passover' is evidently distinguished from the 'Feast of Unleavened Bread,' (with which it was connected,) in L.xxiii.5,6, N.xxviii.16,17.

(iii) That there is only one God, iv.35,39, vi.4, xxxii.39; whereas in the other books this truth is not thus stated in plain terms, but rather the preeminent excellence of Jehovah, the God of Israel, above all other gods, is magnified;

(iv) That obedience will be blessed with long life, and the contrary, iv.1,40, v.16,33, vi.2, viii.1, xi.21, xvi.20, xxv.15, xxx.6,15-20, xxxii.47; comp. E.xx.12, N.xiv.23,xxxii.11;

(v) That the statutes, &c., which Moses had taught them, were those which Jehovah had 'commanded him to teach them,' that they might 'do them in the land which Jehovah gave them,' iv.5,14, v.31, vi.1, xii.1;

(vi) That Mount Sinai 'burned with fire,' and Jehovah spake 'out of the midst of the fire,' iv.11.12.15,33,36, v.4,5,22,23.24,25,26, ix.10,15, x.4, xviii.16, xxxiii.2; it is mentioned in E.xix.18 that Jehovah 'descended on the mount in fire,' and in E.xxiv.17 that 'the appearance of the glory of Jehovah was like devouring fire;' but it is added; 'He called unto Moses *out of the midst of the cloud,*' and not, as in Deuteronomy, '*out of the midst of the fire.*'

(vii) That Jehovah would 'inherit' Israel, iv.20, ix.26,29, xxxii.9; comp. E.xxxiv.9;

(viii) That they should not, when 'fat' and full with the good things of Canaan. 'corrupt themselves,' &c., iv.25,vi.10, &c., viii.10,&c., xi.15,&c., xxxi.20, xxxii.15,&c.;

(ix) That idolatry in every form is specially 'abomination to Jehovah,' iv.25, xi.16, xxvii.15, xxviii.36,64, xxix.17, xxx.17, xxxi.16,20, xxxii.16,17;

(x) That Jehovah is to be served with inward, spiritual worship, 'with all the heart, and with all the soul,' iv.29, vi.5, x.12, xi.13, xiii.4, xxvi.16, xxx.2,6,10;

(xi) That Jehovah had 'chastened' (instructed) them, as a father his child, iv.36, viii.5, xi.2;

(xii) That Jehovah 'would drive out,' iv.38, ix.4,5, xi.23, xviii.12, 'cast out,' vi.19, vii.1,22, ix.4, 'deliver' vii.2,23, xxxi.5, 'destroy' vii.23, viii.20, ix.3, xxxi.3, 'cut off,' xii.29, xix.1, the nations before Israel;

(xiii) That Jehovah had brought out Israel 'by temptations, signs, wonders, &c.' iv.34, vi.22, vii.19, xi.3, xxvi.8, xxix.2,3;

(xiv) That Israel should hear and observe to do Jehovah's commands, that 'it might be well with them,' and that they might be multiplied, &c., vi.3, vii.13, viii.1, xiii.17, xxviii.63, xxx.16;

(xv) That Israel should 'fear' Jehovah, vi.24, viii.6, xiv.23, xxviii.58;

(xvi) That Israel should 'smite,' vii.2, 'exterminate,' vii.2, xx.17, 'devour,' vii.16, 'destroy with a mighty destruction,' vii.23, 'drive out and destroy,' ix.3, 'leave nothing alive of,' xx.16, the nations of Canaan;

(xvii) That the nations of Canaan would be likely to turn the Israelites to idolatrous practices, vii.4, xii.31, xx.18;

(xviii) That Israel is 'holy unto Jehovah,' above all nations upon earth, vii.6, x.15, xiv.2,21, xxvi.19;

(xix) That Jehovah would 'bless' them, if obedient, with plentiful supplies of food and all earthly blessings, vii.12-15, xi.13-15, xxviii.1-14;

(xx) That no man should 'stand' before Israel, vii.24, xi.25, comp. ix.2;

(xxi) That Jehovah would 'go before' them, and lead them into the promised land, ix.3, xxxi.3.

(xxii) That great impression may be expected to be made by capital punishments, xiii.12, xvii.13, xix.20, xxi.21.

547. Besides the above, however, there is a mass of evidence of a similar kind, but still more satisfactory and convincing, from which it will appear that the language of Deuteronomy differs so remarkably from that of the other books of the Pentateuch, that it cannot be believed that so great a change, as is implied by this difference, can have passed over the mind of Moses, or any other writer, in the course of a few days or weeks. Thus we shall find several expressions, which occur frequently and familiarly throughout the other four books, but which never occur at all in Deuteronomy; and, on the other hand, we shall find a multitude of other words and turns of expression, which are used freely by the Deuteronomist, and were evidently favourites with him, but which never appear in the other four books of the Pentateuch.

548. *Expressions common throughout the first four books of the Pentateuch, but never employed by the Deuteronomist.*

(i) אֲחֻזָּה, *akhuzzah*, 'possession,' G.xvii.8, xxiii.4,9,20, xxxvi.43, xlvi.11, xlviii.4, xlix.30, l.13, L.xiv.34,34, xxv.10,13,24,25,27,28,32,33,33,34,41,45,46, xxvii.16,21, 22,24,28, N.xxvii.4,7, xxxii.5,22,29,32,xxxv.2,8,28,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*, except xxxii.49, and this verse belongs to v.48-52, which is evidently a passage of the older narrative, (referring to the death of Moses, and corresponding to N.xx.22-29, where the death of Aaron is described in similar terms,) which has been retained in this place by the Deuteronomist.

Instead of אֲחֻזָּה, *akhuzzah*, the Deut. uses *always* יְרֻשָּׁה, *yërushah*,* for 'possession,' ii.5,9,9,12,19,19, iii.20,—which word is never used in the first four books of the Pentateuch, though the verb יָרַשׁ, *yarash*, 'inherit,' occurs frequently, and the noun יְרֻשָּׁה, *yëreshah*, 'possession,' in N.xxiv.18.

* Strictly, of course, this should be written *yërushshah*; but I express the Hebrew in Italic characters merely for the convenience of the English reader, and it will be sufficient to represent approximately the *sound* of the original, denoting *y* by a *Roman h*.

HENGSTENBERG observes on the above word יָשָׁר as follows, i.408:—

'At a later period [than the time of Moses and the supposed age of the composition of the Pentateuch], it almost disappears from the living language. Except in the books written after [or during] the Captivity,—Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, [Ezekiel].—which drew their phraseology less from actual life than from the earlier Scriptures, and principally from the Pentateuch, it occurs only in Ps.ii.8.'

(ii) אִישׁ אִישׁ , *ish ish*, 'every man,' lit. 'man, man,' E.xxxvi.4, L.xv.2, xvii.3,8,10, xviii.6, xx.2,9, xxii.4,18, xxiv.15, N.i.4, iv.19,49, v.12, ix.10,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*.

The Deut. uses *always* אִישׁ , *ish*, only, i.16,41, iii.20, xii.8, xvi.17, xviii.19, xix.11, 15,16, xxi.15,18,22, xxii.13,22,25,26,28, xxiii.10(11), xxiv.1,5,7,16.

(iii) גָּוַעַת , *gavah*, 'die,' G.vi.17, vii.21, xxv.8,17, xxxv.29, xlix.33, N.xvii.12,13, xx.3,29,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*.

(iv) מִטְּהָ , *matteh*, 'tribe,' 96 times in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*.

The Deut. uses *always* שֶׁבֶט , *shevet*, for 'tribe,' i.13,15,15,23, iii.13, v.23(20), x.8, xii.5,14, xvi.18, xviii.1,5, xxix.8(7),10(9),18(17),21(20), xxxi.28, xxxiii.5: thus the same expression 'half the tribe of Manasseh' in the same context is expressed by מִטְּהָ in N.xxxiv.14, and by שֶׁבֶט in D.xxix.8(7), and so also in N.xxxii.33.

(v) $\text{בְּעֵצֶם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה}$, *behezem hayyom hazzeh*, (lit. 'in the bone of this day' =) 'on the selfsame day,' G.vii.13, xvii.23,26, E.xii.17,41,51, L.xxiii.14,21,28,29,30,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*, except xxxii.48, as above (i).

(vi) 'gathered to his people' = die, G.xxv.8,17, xxxv.29, xlix.29,33, N.xx.24,26, xxvii.13,13, xxxi.2,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*, except xxxii.50, as above (i).

(vii) 'That *soul* shall be cut off' from Israel, from his people, G.xvii.14, E.xii.15,19, xxx.33,38, xxxi.14, L.vii.20,21,25,27, xvii.4,9, xviii.29, xix.8, xx.17,18, xxii.3, xxiii.29, N.ix.13, xv.30, xix.13,20,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*.

The Deut. says *always* 'that *man* shall die' or 'shall be stoned with stones,' and 'thou shalt put away (lit. 'burn up') the evil from the midst of you,' xiii.5, xvii.7,12, xix.13,19, xxi.9,21, xxii.21,22,24, xxiv.7.

(viii) חֹק , *khok*, or חֻקָּה , *khukkah*, 'ordinance,' in the *singular*, E.xv.25, xxx.21, L.vi.11,15, vii.34, x.15, N. xviii.8,11,19,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*.

(ix) 'land of Canaan,' G. (35 times), E.vi.4, xvi.35, L.xiv.34, xviii.3, xxv.38, N.xiii.2,17, xxvi.19, xxxii.30,32, xxxiii.40,51, xxxiv.2,2,29, xxxv.10,14.—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*, except xxxii.49, a fragment of the older document, as above (i).

The Deut. uses twice the expression 'land of the Canaanites,' i.7, xi.30; but he generally uses some periphrasis, such as the 'land which Jehovah swore unto your fathers,' i.8,35, vi.10,18,23, viii.1, &c., the 'good land,' iii.25, iv.21,22, vi.18, viii.7,10, &c., the 'land which Jehovah giveth thee,' iv.1,21, v.31, &c., the 'land whither ye go over to possess it,' iv.5,14,26, vi.1, vii.1, &c., the 'land that floweth with milk and honey,' vi.3, xi.9, xxvi.15, &c.

(x) פָּר, *par*, 'bullock,' occurs 9 times in Exodus, 29 times in Leviticus, 52 times in Numbers,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*.

The Deut. uses *always* שׁוֹר, *shor*, for 'bullock,' v.14,21(18), xiv.4, xv.19, xvii.1, xviii.3, xxii.1,4,10, xxv.4, xxviii.31, xxxiii.17.

(xi) עֲרְבוֹת מוֹאָב, *harvoth Moav*, 'plains of Moab,' N.xxii.1, xxvi.3,63, xxxi.12, xxxiii.48,49,50, xxxv.1, xxxvi.13,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*, except xxxiv.1,8, in the last chapter, which is generally allowed to be not due, or not wholly due, to the Deuteronomist.

The Deut. uses 'land of Moab,' i.5, ii.9,xxix.1(xxviii.69), xxxii.*49, xxxiv.5,6.

(xii) עֵדָה, *hedah*, 'congregation,' 15 times in Exodus, 12 times in Leviticus, 83 times in Numbers,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*.

The Deut. uses *always* קָהָל, *kahal*, 'assembly,' v.22(19),ix.10,x.4,xviii.16,xxiii.1(2),2(3),2(3),3(4),3(4),8(9),xxxi.30.

(xiii) So אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד, *ohel mo'ed*, 'tent of the congregation,' occurs 34 times in Exodus, 43 times in Leviticus, 56 times in Numbers;

מִישַׁן, *nishan*, 'Tabernacle,' 56 times in Exodus, 3 times in Leviticus, (and once *metaphorically*, L.xxvi.11,) 38 times in Numbers;

עֵדוּת, *heduth*, 'Testimony,' 35 times in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers;

קָרְבָּן, *korban*, 'offering,' 78 times in Leviticus and Numbers;

but not one of these expressions is used by the Deuteronomist, though the first occurs in D.xxxi.14,14, and אֹהֶל in v.15,15, a fragment of the older document (790).

549. It may, perhaps, be said, with respect to the instances last quoted, that the Deuteronomist did not use them, because he did not require them, not having occasion to mention the 'Tabernacle,' 'Testimony,' &c., in recording the addresses of Moses; though certainly it would be strange that such long addresses should have really been delivered, in the course of which so many matters of the past history of the people are referred to, without the Tabernacle having been once mentioned. But this cannot, at all events, be said of most of the other instances, where we have shown that the Deuteronomist *did* require to use expressions synonymous with those above quoted, which are used so freely in the earlier books, but where he did not use these latter formulæ. It is plain, therefore, that, if he has everywhere abstained from using them, it was because they were not familiar to his pen as they

* This expression, as will be shown (787), is a Deuteronomistic interpolation in the fragment of the older narrative, xxxii.48-52.

were to those of the other writers, and he fell, therefore, naturally into the employment of other more favourite forms of expression.

550. *Expressions used freely by the Deuteronomist, but never occurring in the first four books of the Pentateuch.*

(i) 'land of Moab,' i.5, ii.9, xxix.1(xxviii.69), xxxii.49, xxxiv.5,6.

(ii) לִּיְהִי , *hinkhil*, 'make to inherit,' i.38,iii.28,xii.10,xix.3,xxi.16,xxx.7,xxxii.8; but נָחַל , *nakhal*, 'inherit,' is often used in the other books, as in D.xix.14.

(iii) 'go in to possess,' 'come in, go in, go over, and possess,' i.8, iv.1,5,14,22,26, vi.1,18, vii.1, viii.1, ix.1,5, x.11, xi.8,8,10,11,29,31, xii.29, xvii.14, xxiii.20(21), xxvi.1, xxviii.21,63, xxx.16,18, xxxi.13, xxxii.47; comp. i.21,39, ix.4,23, xxx.5.

(iv) 'that they may learn to fear Jehovah,' &c., iv.10, xiv.23, xvii.19, xxxi.12,13.

(v) 'out of the midst of the fire,' iv.12,15,33,36, v.4,22,24,26, ix.10, x.4.

(vi) 'which Jehovah giveth thee for an inheritance,' &c. (used of the land of Canaan), iv.21,38, xv.4, xix.10, xx.16, xxi.23, xxiv.4, xxv.19, xxvi.1.

(vii) 'remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt,' v.15, xv.15, xvi.12, xxiv.18,22; comp. x.19.

(viii) כָּל־הַמִּצְוֹת , *kol-hammitzvah*, 'all the commandment,' v.31(28), vi.25, viii.1, xi.8,22, xv.5, xix.9, xxvii.1, xxxi.5,—*nowhere else in the Bible*; but we find בְּכָל־הַמִּצְוֹת , *kol-mitsvotk*, L.iv.2,13,22, v.17, N.xv.39, D.v.29(26), &c., and כָּל־הַמִּצְוֹת , *kol-hammitzvotk*, N.xv.22.

(ix) 'words of this Law,' xvii.19, xxvii.3,8,26, xxviii.58, xxix.29, xxxi.12,24, xxxii.46.

(x) 'written in this Book, in this Book of the Law,' &c. xxviii.58,61, xxix.20,21,27, xxx.10.

551. It will be seen that the above expressions have peculiar reference to the special circumstances, under which Moses is supposed to be addressing the people. And the frequent recurrence of some of them might, perhaps, be explained by the necessity which then constrained him to remind the people in his last address, again and again,—while yet beyond Jordan in the 'land of Moab,' before they 'went in to possess the land which Jehovah gave them as an inheritance,'—of certain main facts of their history, of the cruel 'service' from which they

had been delivered, of the laws which they had received 'out of the midst of the fire,' and of their duty to 'fear Jehovah,' and obey the 'words of the Law,' which were now 'written in a Book' for all future time. But the following instances are of a more general kind, and have no connection with the particular time at which Moses is supposed to be speaking; and, therefore, as they appear so frequently in Deuteronomy, it cannot be doubted that, if the same writer had written also the other books, he must have made use occasionally, at least, of some of them.

552. *Additional Deuteronomistic expressions, which never occur in the first four books of the Pentateuch.*

- (i) לָפָנַי, *nathan lēphanim*, 'set before the face,' = 'deliver up' an enemy, their land, &c., i.8,21, ii.31,33,36, vii.2,23, xxiii.14, xxxi.5; comp. xxviii.7,25.
- (ii) יְרֻשָׁה, *yērushah*, 'possession,' ii.5,9,9,12,19,19, iii.20; we find יְרֻשָׁה, *yērushah*, N.xxiv.18.
- (iii) 'that Jehovah thy God may bless thee,' &c., ii.7, xii.7, xiv.24,29, xv.4,6,10,14,18, xvi.10,15, xxiii.20, xxiv.19, xxx.16; comp. i.11, xxviii.8.
- (iv) 'work of the hands,' ii.7, xiv.29, xvi.15, xxiv.19, xxvii.15, xxviii.12, xxx.9, xxxi.29.
- (v) לָמַד, *lamad*, 'learn,' iv.1,5,10,14, v.1,31(28), vi.1, xi.19, xiv.23, xvii.19, xxxi.12,13.
- (vi) דָּבַק, *davak*, 'cleave' to Jehovah, iv.4, x.20, xi.22, xiii.4, xxx.20.
- (vii) נָדַח, *nadakh*, 'drive, force,' iv.19, xiii.5(6),10(11),13(14), xix.5, xx.19, xxii.1, xxx.1,4,17.
- (viii) בָּעָם, *cahas*, 'provoke,' iv.25, ix.18, xxxi.29, xxxii.16,19,21,21,27.
- (ix) 'with all the heart and with all the soul,' iv.29, vi.5, x.12, xi.13, xiii.3, xxvi.16, xxx.2,6,10.
- (x) אָהַב, *ahav*, 'love,' used of Jehovah loving Israel, iv.37, vii.8,13, x.15, xxxiii.5.
- (xi) 'walk in the ways of Jehovah,' v.33(30), viii.6, x.12, xi.22, xix.9, xxvi.17, xxviii.9, xxx.16.
- (xii) 'forget Jehovah,' vi.12, viii.11,14,19, xxxii.18; comp. iv.23.
- (xiii) פָּדָה, *padah*, 'redeem,' used *metaphorically* of delivering Israel from Egypt, &c. vii.8, ix.26, xiii.5, xv.15, xxi.8, xxiv.18.

(xiv) 'abomination to Jehovah,' vii.25, xii.31, xvii.1, xviii.12, xxii.5, xxiii.18(19), xxv.16, xxvii.15.

(xv) 'which thou knewest not.' 'which thy fathers knew not,' &c., viii.3,16, xi.28, xiii.2,6,13, xxviii.33,36,64, xxix.26, xxxi.13, xxxii.17; comp. vii.15, ix.2.

(xvi) הֵטֵב *heter*, 'thoroughly,' ix.21, xiii.14(15), xvii.4, xix.18, xxvii.8.

(xvii) 'the stranger and the fatherless and the widow,' &c., x.18. xiv.29, xvi.11,14, xxiv.17,19,20,21, xxvi.12,13, xxvii.19.

(xviii) 'a blessing and a curse,' xi.26, xxx.1,19; and הָלָלָה *hēlalah*, 'curse,' xi.28,29,xxi.23,xxiii.5(6),xxvii.13,xxviii.15,45,xxix.27(26), and also G.xxvii.12,13.

(xix) 'eat before Jehovah,' xii.7,18, xiv.23,26, xv.20, xxvii.7.

(xx) כִּי־יָלַח יָדַיִם *mishlakh yadaim*, 'putting to of the hands,' xii.7,18,xv.10, xxi.20,xxviii.8,20,—*nowhere else in the Bible*; כִּי־יָלַח *mishlakh*, is only found besides in Is.vii.25.

(xxi) 'set (שָׁבַעְנִי, *shaccen*) my Name,' xii.11, xiv.23, xvi.2.6,11, xxvi.2.

(xxii) 'burn up (בָּעַר, *bēher*) the evil from the midst,' xiii.5(6), xvii.7,12, xix.13,19, xxi.9,21, xxii.21,22,24, xxiv.7.

(xxiii) דָּם נָקִי *dam naki*, 'innocent blood,' xix.10,13, xxi.8,9, xxvii.25.

553. Now let it be remembered that *not one of the above thirty-three expressions*,—several of which are repeated *more than ten times* in Deuteronomy, and each of which is found on the average *eight times* in that book,—*is found even once in any of the other four books of the Pentateuch.*

And so, too, there are other expressions, which occur three or four times in Deuteronomy, and nowhere else in the Pentateuch:—

(i) עָרַץ *harats*, 'be terrified,' i.29, vii.21, xx.3, xxxi.6.

(ii) הִתְאַנַּף *hithannaph*, 'be angry,' i.37, iv.21, ix.8,20.

(iii) שָׁמַר קוֹדֶר *shamar mēod*, 'take good heed,' ii.4, iv.9,15, xxiv.8.

(iv) 'be strong and of good courage,' iii.28, xxxi.6,7,23.

(v) חֲלִי *khōli*, 'sickness,' vii.15. xxviii.59,61.

(vi) אָוַת *avvath*, 'longing,' xii.15,20,21, xviii.6.

(vii) 'hear and fear,' xiii.12, xvii.13, xix.20, xxi.21.

(viii) 'that shall be in those days,' xvii.9. xix.17, xxvi.3.

(ix) 'all that do these things,' xviii.12, xxii.5, xxv.16.

(x) חָלַל *khillel* (lit. 'profane'), 'eat freely,' xx.6,6, xxviii.30.

(xi) 'forsake Jehovah, His Law, &c.' xxviii.20, xxxi.16, xxix.25.

(xii) נִיָּעָה *rahoth*, 'afflictions,' xxxi.17,17,21, xxxii.23.

554. It is remarkable also how frequently the Deuteronomist uses such phrases as 'Jehovah thy God,' 'Jehovah our God,' &c., compared with the other writers. The following Table shows how often the expressions, 'Elohim,' 'Jehovah,' and 'Jehovah Elohim'—the first and third of these, (i) *without*, (ii) *with*, a pronoun (as 'thy Elohim,' &c.)—occur in each of the five books of the Pentateuch. Of course, considerable allowance must be made for the fact that in Deuteronomy Moses is supposed to be speaking almost throughout, and, therefore, such expressions as 'Jehovah thy God,' &c., would naturally be used more frequently than in the other books. But the preponderance is still very noticeable.

	E.		J.	J.E.	
Genesis	182	1	135	28*	1
Exodus	71	2	360	11	27†
Leviticus	5	21	285	—	26†
Numbers	13	5	390	—	6
Deuteronomy	18	3	234	8	307

555. The conclusion to be drawn from the above facts, in addition to what has been already produced of a similar character, appears to be irresistible. It seems to me *impossible* to believe that either Moses, or any other writer, can have had his whole tone of thought and expression so changed within a few days or weeks at the outside (174), as would be necessary to account for the above phenomena,—unless, indeed, it be supposed that a special miracle was wrought for the express purpose of so modifying his language.

* Of these 20 occur in G.ii.iii. and 6 in G.xxiv.

† It is impossible at present to say how many even of these may really be due to the Deuteronomist, as he may have revised the older document, and interpolated certain passages of his own in it.

We shall assume it, therefore, henceforward, *as a fact that has been proved*, about which we need no longer have any doubt or uncertainty, that, whoever may have composed the book of Deuteronomy, he was undoubtedly a different person from those who were concerned in writing the main portions of the rest of the Pentateuch. Unless the preceding evidence be set aside, *this* fact must stand good, whatever else may be true, and whatever important consequences may follow from this conclusion.

CHAPTER II.

FIRST APPROXIMATION TO THE AGE OF THE DEUTERONOMIST.

556. THE next question would naturally be, to ask in *what* age it is probable that the Deuteronomist lived. But, for the convenience of our argument, it will be best to defer for the present the full consideration of this part of the subject. Something, however, may be said at once towards satisfying the reader's mind on this point. It is plain that he must have lived *after* the other writers, since he refers throughout to passages in the story of the Exodus, which are recorded in the other books, and refers directly in xxiv.8 to the laws about leprosy in Leviticus. If, therefore, we are right in supposing (493), from the evidence produced in Part II, that the Elohist and Jehovistic portions of the Pentateuch were written not earlier than the times of Samuel, David, and Solomon, it is plain, without further enquiry, that the Deuteronomist must have lived not earlier—and, probably, later—than the age of Solomon.

557. And this agrees with other prominent indications. Thus we have seen (542) that the Deuteronomist uses only the phrase 'Levites' or 'sons of Levi' for the Priests, and not 'the sons of Aaron'; and the same expression is used of the Priests in that part of the book of Kings, which refers to the times of Jeroboam, 1K.xii.31:—

'And he made an house of high places, and made Priests *indiscriminately* of the people, (מִקְצוֹת הָעָם, *miktsoth haham*, E.V. 'from the lowest of the people,' but see G.xlvii.2, וּמִקְצֵה אֲנָשִׁים לָקַח חֲמִישָׁה אֲנָשִׁים, *umiktsek ekhayv lakakh khamishah ānashim*, and he took from his brethren *indiscriminately* five men,) which were not of the sons of Levi.'

It is also the formula invariably used by *Jeremiah*, and the other later Prophets, Jer.xxxiii.18,21,22, Ez.xliii.19, xlv.15, xlviii.13, Mal.iii.3; comp. Mal.ii.4,8.

Again, the Deut. uses תּוֹרָה, *Torah*, in the singular *only*, and uses it of the whole Law (544); and so does *Jeremiah*, ii.8, vi.19, viii.8, ix.13(12), xvi.11, xviii.18, xxvi.4, xxxi.33, xxxii.23, xlv.10,23, Lam.ii.9.

Also, the Deut. confines all sacrifices to the place, where Jehovah 'would place His *Name*' (544); and so *Jeremiah* speaks repeatedly of Jerusalem or the Temple, as the place called 'by the *Name*' of Jehovah, vii.10,11,14,30, xxv.29, xxxii.34, xxxiv.15; comp.iii.17, vii.12.

558. Let us now refer to the instances in (548).

(i) The Deuteronomist uses יְרוּשָׁה, *yērushah*, instead of אֲחֻזָּה, *akhuzzah*, for 'possession;' and so does *Jeremiah*, xxxii.8.

(ii) The Deuteronomist employs אִישׁ, *ish*, and not אִישׁ אִישׁ, *ish ish*, for 'every man;' and so do the Prophets universally, e.g. Jer.i.15, vi.3, ix.4(3),5(4), xi.8, xii.15, &c.—except the post-Captivity Prophet Ezekiel in two instances, xiv.4,7.

(iii) The Deuteronomist never uses גָּוַעַ, *gavah*, for 'die,' although the word is often used in the older document; and the Prophets only use it in two instances, Lam.i.19, Zeeh.xiii.8.

It would appear that the above expressions had become antiquated and nearly obsolete in the days of the Prophets, and, probably, in those of the Deuteronomist.

(iv) The same may be true of מִטְּהָ, *mittah*, for 'tribe,' which is found in one place only of all the Prophets, Hab.iii.9, (and even here the expression is obscure); while שֶׁבֶט, *shevet*, the word used by the Deuteronomist, occurs in Hos.v.9, Is.xix.13, xlix.6, lxiii.17, eleven times in Ezekiel, and in Zeeh.ix.1.

(v) 'on the self-same day,' is found only in Ez.ii.3,xxiv.2,2, xl.1.

(vi) 'gathered to his people,' (vii) 'that soul shall be cut off,' and (viii) חֻקָּה, *khukkah*, 'ordinance,' in the *singular*, which are not found in Deuteronomy, do not occur anywhere in the Prophets.

559. The other expressions noticed in (548), as employed in the older document but not by the Deuteronomist, seem not to have become antiquated and out of use in the days of the Prophets, except those in (xiii), which refer especially to the state of things in the wilderness, as 'tent of the congregation,'

'Tabernacle,' 'Testimony,' which never occur in their writings, any more than in that of the Deuteronomist; and this is almost the case with *קֶרְבָּן*, *korban*, 'offering,' which is found only in Ez.xx.28, xl.43.

(viii) Thus *חֹק*, *khok*, 'ordinance,' occurs in the singular in Is.v.14, xxiv.5, Mic.vii.11, Jer.v.22, xxxii.11, Zeph.ii.2, Ez.xvi.27, xlv.14; but *חֻקֵּה*, *khukkah*, as we have said, is found nowhere in the Prophets, any more than in Deuteronomy.

(ix) 'land of Canaan,' occurs in Ez.xvi.29, 'land of the Canaanite' in Ez.xvi.3.

In the above cases, therefore, we can only suppose that the Deuteronomist made choice of the expressions which he has used, because they were more agreeable to his own taste, and not because those, which he discarded, had become already antiquated.

(x) So, too, when he uses *שׁוֹר*, *shor*, and not *פָּר*, *par*, for 'bullock,' it is evidently because he preferred the former, whereas the other writers preferred the latter, since both nouns were in use among the Prophets; thus we have *שׁוֹר* in Hos.xii.11(12), Is.i.3, vii.25, xxxii.20, lxvi.3, *פָּר* in Hos.xiv.2(3), Is.i.11, xxxiv.7, Jer.l.27; while the post-Captivity Prophet Ezekiel has *שׁוֹר* once, i.10, and *פָּר* thirteen times, apparently,—as HENGSTENBERG says (578),—imitating here in his phraseology the style of the older writers.

(xi) 'plains of Moab' could hardly be expected to occur, under any circumstances, in the Prophets, as they would hardly require that expression.

(xii) *עֵדָה*, *edah*, 'congregation,' which is not found in Deuteronomy, occurs in Hos.vii.12, Jer.vi.18, xxx.20; but *קְהָל*, the word used by the Deuteronomist, is used more frequently by the Prophets, Joel.ii.16, Mic.ii.5, Jer.xxvi.17, xxxi.8, xlv.15, i.9, Lam.i.10, and fifteen times in Ezekiel.

560. Upon the whole, it will be plain that the evidence just produced, though far from being conclusive upon the point under consideration, tends, however, to establish a connection in point of time between the Deuteronomist and the later Prophets. The following instances will serve to make it yet more probable that he must have lived in very late days; since it will be seen that he makes use of some expressions, which are either *only* found in the latest books of the Bible, as the post-Captivity prophets and historians, or in none earlier than the time of *Jeremiah*.

561. *Expressions used by the Deuteronomist, and only by the later Biblical writers.*

- (i) סֶמֶל, *semel*, 'image,' D.iv.16, Ez.viii.3,5, 2Ch.xxxiii.7,15.
- (ii) יְהוָה (אֵל) דִּבֶּר סָרָח הַל (עַל) *Yehovah*, 'to speak rebellion against Jehovah,' D.xiii.5, Jer.xxviii.16, xxix.32, comp. *Is.**lix.13,—*nowhere else in the Bible.*
- (iii) לְעִצְיָהּ, *lezahāvah*, for a removing,' D.xxviii.25, Jer.xv.4, xxiv.9, xxix.18, xxxiv.17, Ez.xxiii.46, 2Ch.xxix.8.
- (iv) שְׁרִירֻת לֵב, *shērīruth lev*, 'stubbornness of heart,' D.xxix.19(18), Jer.iii.17, vii.24, ix.14(13), xi.8, xiii.10, xvi.12, xviii.12, xxiii.17, Ps.lxxxii.12(13),—*nowhere else in the Bible.*
- (v) רָוָה, *ravah*, 'thirst,' D.xxix.19(18), Jer.xxxi.12, *Is.*lviii.11.
- (vi) קָדָה, *kadah*, 'kindle,' D.xxxii.22, Jer.xv.14, xvii.4, *Is.*l.11, lxiv.2(1).
- (vii) קְהִלָּה, *kehillah*, 'assembly,' D.xxxiii.4, Neh.v.7.

562. It will be noticed that in several of the above expressions, some of which are peculiar, especially (ii),(iii),(iv), the Prophet *Jeremiah* agrees with the Deuteronomist. And, in like manner, it will be found that almost all the expressions in (552), which are found repeatedly in Deuteronomy, but do not occur in any other book of the Pentateuch, are also found more or less freely used in *Jeremiah*.

- (i) 'set before the face,'—'deliver up,' Jer.ix.13(12), xxi.8, xxvi.4, xxxv.5, xlv.10.
- (ii) יְרֻשָּׁה, *yērushah*, 'possession,' Jer.xxxii.8.
- (iii) 'that Jehovah thy God may bless thee,' Jer.xxxi.23.
- (iv) 'work of the hands,' Jer.i.16, x.3, xxv.6,7,14, xxxii.30, xlv.8, Lam.iii.64, iv.2.
- (v) לָמַד, *lamad*, 'learn,' Jer.ii.33, ix.5(4), 14(13), 20(19), x.2, xii.16, 16, 16, xiii.21, xxxi.18, 34, xxxii.33.
- (vi) דָּבַק, *davak*, 'cleave' to Jehovah, Jer.xiii.11.
- (vii) נָדָה, *nadah*, 'drive, force,' Jer.viii.3, xvi.15, xxiii.2,3,8, xxiv.9, xxvii.10, 15, xxxix.14, 18, xxx.17, xxxii.37, xl.12, xliv.5, xlvi.28, xlix.5,36, l.17.
- (viii) בָּעָס, *cahas*, 'provoke,' Jer.vii.18, 19, viii.19, xi.17, xxv.6,7, xxxii.29,30,32, xlv.3,8.
- (ix) 'with all the heart and with all the soul,' Jer.xxxii.41, comp. iii.10, xxiv.7, xxix.13.

* We use *Is.* to denote the writings of the *later* Isaiah, the 'unknown Prophet,' to whom chap.xl-lxvi of the present book of Isaiah are assigned by modern critics. That some, at least, of these prophecies were uttered after the Captivity is obvious from such passages as lxiii.17-19, lxiv.10,11.

- (x) אָהַב, *ahav*, 'love,' used of Jehovah loving Israel, Jer.xxxi.3.
- (xi) 'walk in the ways of Jehovah,' Jer.vii.23.
- (xii) 'forget Jehovah,' Jer.ii.32, iii.21, xiii.25, xviii.15, xxiii.27.
- (xiii) פָּדָה, *padah*, 'redeem,' Jer.xv.21, xxxi.11.
- (xiv) 'abomination to Jehovah,' not in Jer., nor anywhere else in the Bible, except Is.i.13, and repeatedly in the book of Proverbs; but comp. Jer.xliv.4, and see 'abomination' in Jer.ii.7, vi.15, vii.10, viii.12, xvi.18, xxxii.35, xliv.22.
- (xv) 'which thou knewest not, &c.,' Jer.v.15, vii.9, ix.16(15), xiv.18, xv.14, xvi.13, xvii.4, xix.4, xxii.28, xxxiii.3, xliv.3.
- (xvi) הֵיטִיב, *hetev*, 'thoroughly,' Jer.vii.5, but perhaps the word may be only used as an *inf. abs.* with its cognate verb.
- (xvii) 'the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow, &c.,' Jer.vii.6, xxii.3, comp. v.28, xlix.11.
- (xviii) 'a blessing and a curse,' not in Jer., but קִלְלָה, *kèlalah*, 'curse,' Jer.xxiv.9, xxv.18, xxvi.6, xxix.22, xlii.18, xliv.8,12,22, xlix.13.
- (xix) 'eat before Jehovah,' not in Jer.
- (xx) מִשְׁלַח יָדַיִם, *mishlakh yadain*, 'putting to of the hands,' not in Jer., nor anywhere else in the Bible; but comp. Jer.i.9.
- (xxi) 'set (שָׁעַן, *shaccen*) my name,' Jer.vii.12.
- (xxii) 'burn up (בִּהַר, *biher*) the evil from the midst,' not in Jer., but in 2K.xxiii.24, which many (573.v) ascribe to Jeremiah.
- (xxiii) דָּם נָקִי, *dam naki*, 'innocent blood,' Jer. vii.6, xxii.3,17, xxvi.15, comp. xix.4.

Upon analysing the above, it will be found that of the twenty-three expressions in (552), each of which occurs on the average eight times in Deuteronomy, but not one of which is used in the other books of the Pentateuch, *all but six* are found repeated more or less frequently in Jeremiah, and, of those six, four, at least, are *partially* repeated.

563. So, too, many of those in (550) find their representatives in his prophecies, though with some of them, from the nature of the case, it could hardly have been expected.

- (i) 'land of Moab,' Jer.xlviii.24,33.
- (ii) 'make to inherit,' Jer.iii.18, xii.14.
- (iii) 'which ye go in to possess,' &c., Jer.xxxii.23.

(iv) that they may 'learn to fear Jehovah,' &c., not in Jer.; but comp. לְיִרְאָה אֹתִי כָּל־הַיָּמִים *l'ējirah othi kol-hayyamim*, 'to fear me all the days,' D.iv.10, Jer.xxxii.39.

(v) 'out of the midst of the fire,' not in Jer.

(vi) 'which Jehovah giveth thee for an inheritance,' Jer.xvii.4.

(vii) 'remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt,' not in Jer.'

(viii) כָּל־הַמִּצְוָה *kol-hammizvah*, 'all the commandments,' not in Jer.

(ix) 'words of this Law,' comp. Jer.vi.19.

(x) 'written in this Book,' &c., Jer.xxv.13.

And the same is true of most of those in (553).

(i) עָרִין *harats*, not in Jer., but עָרִיץ *harits*, 'terrible,' Jer.xv.21, xx.11.

(iii) שָׁמַר מְאֹד *shamar m'od*, 'observe much,' comp. Jer.ii.10.

(v) חֲלִי *khōli*, 'sickness,' Jer.vi.7, x.19.

(vi) אַוְּתָה *avvath*, 'longing,' Jer.ii.24.

(ix) 'all that do these things,' comp. Jer.iii.7.

(x) חָלַל *khillel*, 'eat freely,' Jer.xxxi.5.

(xi) 'forsake Jehovah,' Jer.i.16, ii.13, xvii.19, v.7,19, ix.13, xvi.11,11, xviii.13, xix.4, xxii.9.

(xii) רַעוּת *rahoth*, 'afflictions,' Lam.iii.38.

564. The above agreement in phraseology is certainly very remarkable; and, if further evidence tends to confirm the indications, which we have already observed, of the *late* origin of the book of Deuteronomy, there is enough here to raise a strong suspicion that Jeremiah may have been its author. But we shall need more decisive proof of this connection before we should be justified in pronouncing any definite opinion upon the question. It will suffice for the present to have drawn the reader's attention to this point in particular, as well as to the general fact, that there are signs already before us of the Deuteronomist having lived in a somewhat late period of the history of Israel.

565. It is plain, however, that the above phenomena, are just what we might expect to find in documents differing from one another in age by some considerable interval of time.

The first four books of the Pentateuch were written mainly, as we have seen reason to believe (493.xiv-xvii), by persons living nearly in the same age, and in the same literary circle; and, though we shall expect to find the different parts of these books, which are due to different writers, exhibiting characteristic differences in style and tone, and even betraying, by incidental allusions, the different circumstances of the times in which they were written, yet, if our view be correct, we should not be able to detect any marked distinction between the *Hebrew* of the Elohist and Jehovistic authors any more than between the *English* men of letters of our own country, who may have lived in the reigns of George III and Queen Victoria. We *should* expect, however, to perceive a more decided difference between good English compositions of the *Elizabethan* and of the *present* age, even though the spelling of the former were modernised; since words and expressions would most probably have been used by the older writers, which have now become antiquated, while the later would be found to give signs of the possession of a more copious vocabulary, would be likely to employ a more free and flowing style, and to make use of new words and new expressions, reflecting the spirit and practices of their time.

566. Besides the numerous formulæ above noticed, not one of which is found in the first four books of the Pentateuch, there are several other similar expressions, which occur freely in all parts of Deuteronomy, but are found also in *certain well-defined portions* of the other books; that is to say, they do not appear in all parts of those books, as they do in Deuteronomy, but *only* in those particular sections, limited in extent, which betray also, when carefully examined, other close affinities with the style of the Deuteronomist. We can scarcely doubt that such passages are interpolations by his hand. And, indeed, it would be strange if there were no such insertions. The writer, who could conceive the grand idea of adding the whole book of Deuteronomy

to the existing roll of the Tetrateuch, would be almost certain, we may well believe, to have first revised the work of the older writers which had come into his hands, and to have inserted passages, here and there, if he saw any reason for so doing, in the original document. The wonder, we repeat, would be, if he did not do this.

For the present, however, it is unnecessary to point out and investigate these passages, which will come more properly under consideration hereafter. It will be sufficient to have drawn attention here to the fact of their existence.

CHAPTER III.

THE BOOK OF THE LAW FOUND IN THE TEMPLE.

567. IN 2K.xxii,xxiii, we find an account of the following remarkable occurrence.

‘In the eighteenth year of king Josiah, the king sent Shaphan the scribe to the House of Jehovah, saying, Go up to Hilkiah the High Priest, that he may sum the silver which is brought into the House of Jehovah, which the keepers of the door have gathered of the people. . . . And Hilkiah the Priest said unto Shaphan the scribe, *I have found the Book of the Law in the House of Jehovah.* And Hilkiah gave the Book to Shaphan, and he read it. . . . And Shaphan the scribe shewed the king, saying, Hilkiah the Priest hath delivered me a Book. And Shaphan read it before the king. And it came to pass, when the king had heard the words of the Book of the Law, that he rent his clothes. And the king commanded Hilkiah the Priest, &c. saying, Go ye, enquire of Jehovah for me, and for the people, and for all Judah, concerning the words of this Book that is found; for great is the wrath of Jehovah that is kindled against us, because our fathers have not hearkened unto the words of this Book, to do according to all that which is written concerning us. . . . And the king sent, and they gathered unto him all the elders of Judah and of Jerusalem. And the king went up into the House of Jehovah, and all the men of Judah, and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem with him, and the Priests, and the Prophets, and all the people, both small and great; and he read in their ears all the words of the Book of the Covenant, which was found in the House of Jehovah. And the king stood by a pillar, and made a covenant before Jehovah, to walk after Jehovah, and to keep His commandments, and His testimonies, and His statutes, with all their heart and with all their soul, to perform the words of this Covenant that were written in this Book. And all the people stood to the Covenant.’

568. If we met with the above narrative in any other book than the Bible, we should certainly feel it necessary to examine more closely into the statement, and see what this occurrence really means, by which the young king was influenced to take in

hand so strenuously the Reformation of Religion throughout the land. The High-Priest 'finds' this Book of the Law in the Temple. If it really had been written by Moses, where, we must ask, had it been lying all this while, during more than eight centuries? It could not have been lying *in* the Ark itself; for then Hilkiah would not have 'found' it, as he dared not look into the Ark: and, besides, we are expressly told that there was 'nothing in the Ark save the the two tables of stone,' 1K.viii.9. Nor could it have been lying for those eight centuries *outside* the ark. For then, surely, it would have been named among the things, that were brought into the Temple by Solomon; and, at all events, it would have been well-known to David and Solomon and other pious kings, as well as to the successive High Priests, and we should not find them so regardless of so many of its plain precepts, as the history shows them to have been, *e.g.* with respect to the worshipping on high places, and the neglect of the due observance of the Passover.

569. When, further, we consider that in this same book of Deuteronomy is found also the command, said to have been given by Moses to the Levites, xxxi.26,—

'take this Book of the Law, and put it *beside* (בְּצֵדָה) E.V. 'in the side of,' but see R.ii.14, 'she sat *beside* the reapers,' 1S.vi.8, 'in a coffer *by the side* thereof,' &c.) the Ark of the Covenant of Jehovah your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee,'—

it is scarcely possible to resist the suspicion that the writing of the Book, the placing it, and the finding it, were pretty nearly contemporaneous events; and that, if 'there was no king before Josiah,'—not David, in his best days, nor Solomon, in his early youth, not Asa, nor Jehoshaphat, nor Hezekiah,—'that turned to Jehovah with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his might, *according to all the Law of Moses*,' 2.K.xxiii.25, —it must have been because there was no king before him who had ever seen this portion, at least, of the Pentateuch, or had believed that such portions, as had come into his hands, were

really authoritative and binding, upon himself and his people, as being the direct utterance of the Divine Will. And this suspicion seems to be confirmed into a certainty, when we call to mind the proofs which we have already had before us, that Deuteronomy was written in a later age than the rest of the Pentateuch.

570. For it could hardly have been the *whole* Pentateuch, that Hilkiah now found. He gave it, we are told, to Shaphan, and Shaphan 'read it,'—perhaps, read only part of it,—or, as the Chronicler says, 'read *in* it,' 2Ch.xxxiv.18,—before he returned to the king on the business, about which he had been sent to the Temple. And Shaphan read it also before the king, and appears to have read to him *all* the words of the Book. But, the next day again,—perhaps, the same day,—the king himself, we are told, read in the ears of the people '*all* the words of the Book of the Covenant, which was found in the House of Jehovah.' It cannot be supposed that he would read on this occasion all the histories in Genesis, the long account of the construction of the Tabernacle and its vessels, or the details of the Levitical Law. Besides, the Book found by Hilkiah is repeatedly called the 'Book of the Covenant,' 2K.xxiii.2,3,21, which name can scarcely have been used of the whole Pentateuch, though it very well applies to Deuteronomy, or to the chief portion of that book, since we find it written. D.xxix.1.—

'These are the words of the Covenant, which Jehovah commanded Moses to make with the Children of Israel in the land of Moab, beside the Covenant which he made with them in Horeb.'

571. So, too, this 'Book of the Law,' which was found by Hilkiah, contained also directions about the Passover, 2K.xxiii.21, such as we find in D.xvi.1-8, and severe denunciations of the Divine displeasure against all who transgressed the commands contained in it, 2K.xxii.13, such as we find in D.xi.16,17, xxix.18-28, xxx.15-20, and, especially, in D.xxviii.15-68. And it led directly to the putting down with a strong hand of every

kind of idolatrous practice, of all groves, high places, altars, &c., as we read in 2K.xxiii.24 : —

‘Moreover the familiar spirits, and the wizards, and the images, and the idols, and all the abominations, that were spied in the land of Judah and in Jerusalem, did Josiah put away, that he might perform the words of the Law, which were written in the Book, that Hilkiyah the Priest found in the House of Jehovah.’

And this too was in accordance with the commands of the book of Deuteronomy, xii.2,3, xiii. xvi.21,22, xvii.2-7, xviii.10-12.

In short, the whole description of the nature and effect of the words contained in this ‘Book of the Law,’ shows that it must have been the book of Deuteronomy. Accordingly, we have seen already, and shall see yet more plainly, as we proceed, that there are internal signs in this book, which tend to fix the date of its composition to somewhere about this period in the Jewish history.

572. It was, we may believe, the desire of Hilkiyah, and, perhaps, of men of yet higher mind about the young king, to take advantage of his own religious and impressible spirit, and of the humbled state of the people, when Judah had been brought low through the oppressions of Manasseh, and the ten tribes had been carried into captivity, to abolish once for all the idolatrous practices which had so long prevailed, and to try to bind the hearts of the remnant of Israel to the Court and to the Temple at Jerusalem. Accordingly, there ensued immediately upon the discovery of this ‘Book of the Law,’ a complete Reformation of Religion throughout the land, with a thorough and violent rooting up of all idolatrous practices, as described in 2K.xxiii. And then a great Passover was held by the king in Jerusalem. For once, it would seem, the attempt was made to draw all the people thither: and never, we are told,—

‘from the days of the Judges that judged Israel, nor in all the days of the Kings of Israel, nor of the Kings of Judah,’—

was such a Passover held, as this that was held in the eighteenth year of king Josiah.

573. But *we have no sign whatever of another such Passover being held even by Josiah*. Perhaps, after a time, the young king also became aware of the real facts of the case, and his zeal may have been damped by this discovery. At all events, we hear no more of any such gatherings.

Nor is there the least indication that the *other two Feasts* were kept by Josiah with similar solemnity in that very same year; and yet the Law is laid down with equal distinctness for all three in E.xxiii.17, xxxiv.23,24. And according to the more ancient law,—‘Three times in the year all thy males shall appear before Jehovah,’—it was just as necessary that they should go up to Jerusalem at the Feast of Pentecost, and especially at the Feast of Tabernacles,—at which, once in seven years, the Law was to be read in the ears of the assembled people, D.xxxi.10–13,—as at the Passover.

574. We shall reserve for the present the full discussion of the very interesting question which now arises, whether the book of Deuteronomy is to be ascribed to the hand of *Jeremiah*, who was himself a Priest, the son of Hilkiyah, Jer.i.1, and was called to the Prophetical office in the ‘thirteenth year’ of the reign of king Josiah, v.2, *five* years before the discovery of the Book of the Law in the ‘eighteenth year of his reign,’ 2K.xxii.3. But we shall here consider what HÄVERNICK says on the subject of this ‘discovery.’ *Pent.p.407–413*.

‘DE WETTE has come to the conclusion that, ‘in the discovery of the Book of the Law in the Temple, *the first certain trace of the existence of a Mosaic book* is to be found.’ But the following considerations speak most decidedly against this.

(i) ‘The very words, ‘I have found the Book of the Law,’ v.8, clearly show the contrary. How could the High Priest use these words in delivering the book to Shaphan, supposing that the latter knew nothing at all about it? Both individuals, on the contrary, are so well acquainted with it, that it only requires to be designated by this its known name, for one to know what it is.’

Ans. We believe that the greater portion of the first four books of the Pentateuch had long been composed, and that the fact was known, more or less, to the more eminent men of the day, and even to the people generally, that some ‘written Law’ at one time existed. Perhaps, in the time of Josiah’s idolatrous father,

Manasseh, or even before his time, the roll of the Pentateuch, or, rather, as we believe, the Tetrateuch, had disappeared. It may have been lying, little heeded or even noticed, among the archives of the Temple, and so came into the hands of the successive High Priests, until it reached those of Hilkiah himself, and now is brought forward with special emphasis, mainly acquired by the addition of the book of Deuteronomy.

(ii) 'The conduct of the king and of the Court is inexplicable, supposing that they now for the first time heard news of this book. We find no sign in the narrative of mistrust or astonishment on their part at the existence of such a book. Would the king have been seized with such terror, when he heard the words of this book? Would he immediately have adopted such energetic measures, if he had not recognised it at once as authentic?'

Ans. No doubt, the king believed it to be authentic. He, too, was aware that some such a book had once existed; and if, for some time past, the book of Deuteronomy was, as we suppose, in actual process of composition, we may be sure that measures would have been taken to keep alive in his thoughts, and in the thoughts of others, the remembrance of that fact, until the day of the 'discovery.'

This would explain fully the words of Hilkiah just considered, 'I have found the Book of the Law in the House of Jehovah,' as well as the *apparent* want of surprise on the part both of Shaphan and the king,—*apparent*, we say, because none, at all events, is betrayed in the Scripture narrative, whatever may have been really the case.

(iii) 'Further, the narrative says not a word of the king's astonishment respecting the *existence* of the Book, but only respecting its *contents*, and the long non-observance of the Law and the refractory opposition to it. When he complains that the fathers had not acted according to it, it is evident that he must have been convinced that the Law was known and accessible to them.'

Ans. No doubt: this precisely agrees with our own view of the previous existence of the first four books of the Pentateuch. But, let it be well observed, *the contents of those first four books are of a very different character from those of Deuteronomy.* They consist mainly, as we have said, of historical narratives, or ceremonial directions, while thirteen whole chapters of Exodus are devoted to the minute description of the details of the construction and setting up of the Tabernacle. In Deuteronomy it is the *moral Law* which is delivered throughout, in some of the grandest and most impressive language that has ever been written.

(iv) 'It would also, assuredly, be a decidedly false conclusion, to infer a *general* non-acquaintance with the Pentateuch from the circumstance of the king's betraying an ignorance of its contents. In such a court, as must have existed during the long reign of Manasseh, does not such an ignorance appear quite probable, and admit of being so explained?'

Ans. Josiah had already reigned *seventeen* years, and, when he came to the throne, he was too young,—indeed, only eight years old, 2K.xxii.1,—to have been very much

influenced by the state of things in the Court of Manasseh, — laying out of consideration the story, which the Chronicler gives us, of Manasseh's deep repentance and reformation, 2Ch.xii.12-16, when, of course, he would have restored the Law, (supposed by the Chronicler to have been in full operation in the days of his father Hezekiah, 2Ch.xxx.5,16, xxxi.3,21,) if he knew of it. But, according to the more authentic history of the book of Kings, Josiah from the first 'did that which was right in the sight of Jehovah, and walked in all the ways of David his father,' 2K.xxii.2; and from his youth he must have been, we may believe, in these early days of his reign, greatly under the influence of the High Priest Hilkiah. If, then, during the first seventeen years of his reign, this pious young king was all the while ignorant of the contents of the 'Book of the Law,' as HÄVERNICK admits, it is surely inconceivable that the people generally were better informed about it, whatever may have been the case with the few individuals, who were privy to the present movement. And, indeed, the whole story of the reading of the Book to the people, 2K.xxiii, implies this.

(v) 'But the opposite of this conclusion may be proved convincingly (!) from the narrative itself. The king sends a message to the Prophetess, Huldah, and makes enquiry of her respecting the 'Book' and its declarations. She then at once confirms the truth of those words by a Prophetic declaration, and evidently knows the Book that is spoken of, for she says, 'All the words of this Book, wherein the king hath read, shall be fulfilled.'

Ans. Upon HÄVERNICK's supposition, how could Huldah have known the Book? If she knew it, why did not Hilkiah the High Priest, and the King himself, know it? It is clear that the idea cannot be maintained. It would be more reasonable to say that she recognised the words of the Book, when she heard them, (as she might have heard them from the messengers sent to consult her,) as Divine words, or that she may have given her attestation to the Book by prophetic instinct. But, according to our view, Huldah, most probably, did know the Book; for she was in the secret, and shared in the hope of a great Reformation.

And this may seem, at first sight, to be confirmed by the fact that she actually makes verbal references to favourite expressions of the Deuteronomist.

Thus in 2K.xxii.17, we read 'that they might provoke me to anger through all the work of their hands,' as in D.xxxi.29, 'to provoke Him to anger through the work of your hands.'

And we have also the following resemblances:

- (α) v.17, 'forsake' Jehovah (553.xi);
- (β) 'other gods,' D.v.7, vi.14, vii.4, viii.19, xi.16,28, xiii.2.6,13, xvii.3, xviii.20, xxviii.14,36,64, xxix.26, xxx.17, xxxi.18,20, and also E.xx.3, xxiii.13, xxxiv.14;
- (γ) עָרָא. *cahas*, 'provoke' (552.viii);
- (δ) 'work of the hands,' (552.iv);
- (ε) v.19, הַמְנוּהוּ, *shammah*, 'desolation,' (E.V. 'astonishment,') D.xxviii.37, nowhere else in the Pentateuch;
- (ζ) קְלָלָה, *kēlalah*, 'curse,' (552.xviii).

These coincidences can hardly be *accidental*. And, if we could be sure that the text really records the words of Huldah, they would show decisively that she must have been familiar with the book of Deuteronomy, and, therefore, as she could not have known it, in the usual way, as a book publicly known, (since then the King and High Priest must have known it also,) it would follow beyond a doubt that she knew it *privately*,—that there *was* some such a course pursued as we have supposed, and that Huldah was privy to it. But it is very possible that these are not really the words of Huldah, but those ascribed to her by the writer of the narrative. We have already suggested that *Jeremiah* may have been the Deuteronomist, and the reasons which more fully support this conjecture shall be produced in due time; and we also believe, with many critics, that the latter part of the Second Book of Kings was written by the Prophet, who was contemporary with the events described in it. Thus Dr. DAVIDSON, ii.37, while not giving his own assent to this hypothesis, observes—‘According to the Talmudists, followed by many of the older theologians, Jeremiah was the compiler of the Book of Kings. This opinion has been adopted in modern times by HÄVERNICK and GRAF, &c.’ The many points of coincidence between this passage 2K.xxii.16–20, and Jeremiah, as well as Deuteronomy, are, indeed, remarkable, as follows:

- (α) v.17, ‘forsake Jehovah,’ (563.xi).
- (β) ‘other gods,’ Jer.i.16, vii.6,9,18, xi.10, xiii.10, xvi.11,13, xix.4,13, xxii.9, xxv.6, xxxii.29, xxxv.15 xlv.3,5,8,15.
- (γ) עָרַב, *cahas*, ‘provoke,’ (562.viii).
- (δ) ‘work of the hands,’ (562.iv).
- (ε) שָׁמָיִם, *shammah*, ‘desolation,’ Jer.ii.15, iv.7, v.30, &c., *twenty-four* places.
- (ζ) קְלָלָה, *kēlalah*, ‘curse,’ (562.xviii).

The full phrase ‘burn incense to other gods’ occurs in Jer.i.16, xix.4, xlv.5,8,15, and *nowhere else in the Bible*, except in the duplicate of the passage now before us, 2Ch.xxxiv.25.

Also the complete phrase ‘desolation and a curse,’ occurs in Jer.xxv.18, xlii.18, xlv.12,22, and *nowhere else in the Bible*,—though the two words occur separately in Deuteronomy.

If this second conjecture be true, it would be easy to account for Jeremiah’s putting his own familiar expressions into the mouth of Huldah.

(vi) ‘Hence the Prophetess Huldah must have had a share also in the ‘concerted scheme.’ But we meet here with a fresh confirmation of our view. Not only does the Prophetess give confirmation to the Book that has been discovered, but it is also read out of, in presence of the Priests, the Prophets, and the whole people! What a conjoint plot must this ‘concerted scheme’ have been! Who were the persons deceived here, since all appear to have nothing else in view than to deceive?’

Ans. It is obvious that very few besides the writer may have been privy to the scheme,—perhaps, only the Priest Hilkiyah, and, possibly, Huldah, and one or two others.

(vii) 'The relations between the Priests and Prophets of that age were not exactly of the kind that will allow us to imagine such a combination, (see Jer.viii.8,) in which both parties joined hand in favour of falsehood, which the Prophets on other occasions so unsparingly expose and rebuke.'

Ans. Jer.viii.8 does not refer to the time of Hilkiah. But, as we have said, there is no reason to suppose that the Priests and Prophets, *generally*, were privy to the affair.

(viii) 'We must accordingly suppose that, in the time of Josiah, even according to our narrative, the 'Book of the Law' was by no means generally unknown, and that it is only the king in particular that betrays an ignorance of its contents, without showing, however, a total ignorance of the existence of the Book.'

Ans. Rather, it seems impossible that the people, generally, should have had knowledge of the contents of the Book, and that, at the same time, the king,—such a king as Josiah, who from his youth 'did that which was right in the sight of Jehovah,' 2K.xxii.2,—should have been totally ignorant of them. It is probable that both king and people had some knowledge of a written Law having been formerly in existence.

(ix) 'This circumstance rises to a still greater certainty, when we consider that, even before the finding of that Book, the king had made reforms with regard to the idolatry which had prevailed to a great extent.'

Ans. This fact, if true, would only make it more inconceivable than ever that the king should have been more ignorant of the contents of the Book than his idolatrous people were. But the account of this earlier attempt of Josiah, for the Reformation of Religion in his land, rests only on the unsupported statement of the Chronicler, who says that 'in his *eight* year he began to seek after the God of David his father, and in the *twelfth* year he began to purge Judah and Jerusalem from the high places and the groves, and the carved images, and the molten images, &c.' 2Ch.xxxiv.3-7.—in fact, carrying out at that early age, of his own mere motion, the very Reformation, which, according to the more trustworthy book of Kings, only *followed* the finding and reading of the 'Book of the Law.'

(x) 'Josiah does know that there is a 'Book of the Law,' and he is partially acquainted, probably by tradition, with the matter of its contents, as is shown by his obeying its Commandments. But now, by a remarkable occurrence,—the discovery of the Temple copy,—his knowledge of it is not only made complete, but a powerful impression is also produced in his heart; it now becomes the purpose of his life to live as far as possible according to such a Law in its entire extent. In this way, the whole history of the occurrence and the life of the king stand in perfect accordance with each other.'

Ans. The only reason for supposing that Josiah was 'partially acquainted with the contents of the Book,' is, as HÄVERNICK says, the fact that he is represented as 'obeying its Commandments' in the purging of his land from idolatries. But this, as we have said, rests only on the authority of the Chronicler, and is con-

traded by the whole tenor of the story, as told in the book of Kings. If Josiah, indeed, had been '*partially* acquainted' with the contents of such a Book, we may be sure that he would have taken care to make himself *fully* acquainted with it; and, in fact, Josiah was just the person, if ever king of Judah was, to have literally fulfilled the command laid down for every king in D.xvii.18-20,—to write with his own hand a copy of the law.

We believe that both king and people were '*partially* acquainted by tradition' with the fact that a Law-Book once existed, and even with the *general* nature of its contents. But we see no signs of their being acquainted with the *details* of the stories or laws contained in the present Pentateuch.

(xi) 'But, apart also from all these arguments, if we only consider the matter more seriously for a moment, as it appears when viewed in itself, the inadmissibility of the hypothesis, advanced by the opponents of the genuineness, is clearly exhibited. A book, which penetrates so deeply into the whole life of the nation, impressing on it the most peculiar character,—which comes forward with the most direct opposition to an age sunken in idolatry, and unsparingly denounces war against it,—which is promulgated at a time when the Prophets, such even as Jeremiah, were exposed to the mockery of frivolous contemporaries, from whom neither Law nor Prophecy could expect any hearty recognition,—this book is said to make its appearance suddenly, being a deceptive fabrication of the Priests, announcing to the people their punishment, and producing the deepest impression upon them, without anyone raising the cry of deceit and falsehood, without a voice being raised against it, when it appears to have been the interest of all to detect and expose the falseness of the book, and the deception which had been practised with it! Yet there was nothing more simple and easy than the adduction of proof in such a case, which besides could not but reckon on the accordance and sympathy of numbers.'

Ans. (i) There was every reason to expect that, *at first*, the whole body of the people would be greatly affected by the discovery,—both because they had a general traditionary knowledge of the existence of some such a book in former days, and because of the earnestness with which the king and leading men received it, as well as because of the solemn and impressive character of the language of the book itself,—especially, that part of it, *Deuteronomy*, which we believe to have been read in their hearing.

(ii) But how do we know that no voice was raised against it,—if not immediately, in the first years of zeal, upon the new discovery, yet afterwards, at all events, when men's feelings began to cool, and they began to reconsider the matter? We have no record except from one, who may himself have been a party to the whole scheme,—who may, indeed, have been the chief person concerned in it.

(iii) We do not, in fact, find that even the thrilling language of this book made any great *permanent* impression on the people. There is no sign, as we have said, that the Passover was ever *kept again* with such solemnity, or that the Feast of Weeks and the Feast of Tabernacles,—respecting which the command is

laid down so distinctly in E.xxiii.14-17, xxxiv.22-24, L.xxiii.15-21,33-36, D.xvi.16, where we find it so strongly enjoined, 'Three times in a year shall all thy males appear before Jehovah thy God in the place which He shall choose, in the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and in the Feast of Weeks, and in the Feast of Tabernacles, and they shall not appear before Jehovah empty.'— were ever kept at all, even by Josiah.

(iv) It would seem also that not till the reign of Zedekiah, the son of Josiah, did 'the king and princes and all the people,'—probably at the instance of Jeremiah himself,—make a covenant to carry out the law in D.xv.12, for releasing their Hebrew servants, and this covenant they presently broke, Jer.xxxiv.8-11. So, too all the solemn threatenings of the Law did not prevent the children of Judah from 'remembering their altars and their groves by the green trees upon the high hills,' Jer.xvii.2,—from 'loving and serving, walking after, seeking, worshipping, the sun and the moon and all the host of heaven,' Jer. viii.2,—from 'having gods according to the number of their cities, and setting up altars, according to the number of the streets of Jerusalem, to that shameful thing, even to burn incense unto Baal,' Jer.xi.13.

(xii) 'The copy found in the Temple was beyond dispute the Temple copy. It is quite an useless question, whether it was the autograph of Moses, or a later transcription instead of it; for even in the latter case it should be regarded as being as good as the autograph, with as much justice as if we should say that the Temple, when repaired by Josiah, still remained Solomon's Temple . . . It is manifest how easily such a copy might remain unobserved, especially as it did not lie in the Ark itself, and be neglected,— how easily even, under Priests who, to please the Kings, favoured, rather than hindered, idolatrous practices, especially under Josiah's immediate predecessors, the obnoxious testimony of Jehovah against His people might be intentionally put aside; as, on the other hand, it is manifest, that just such a copy as this must also have made a remarkable impression when it was found. The only thing, concerning which we are left in the dark by the history, that is specially occupied by the *sequel* of this occurrence, is the way and manner in which the copy had been lost. This circumstance, however, is so little essential, and may so easily and naturally be explained from the preceding accounts,—those of the practices of Manasseh, in particular,—that any unprejudiced writer might suitably enough pass it over. But on that account it is also inadmissible, to attempt to settle how long that copy had been missing or unknown; and the main point of the whole narrative must still be regarded as this, that a particularly remarkable copy of the 'Book of the Law' was found in the Temple, the discovery and reading of which produced an exceedingly beneficial impression on the king and the nation, because it was recognised by all as a sacred obligatory book and as the Mosaic Law.'

Ans. It is strange that for *eighteen* years of Josiah's reign, (not to speak of the penitential years of Manasseh, which rest upon the very doubtful authority of the Chronicler,) the Temple copy should have been *in* the Temple all the while, yet

never have been found by Hilkiah till now. It is also very strange that the historian should not have given the least hint anywhere, that the Book now found was the identical Temple copy, which had been long mourned as lost.

575. Thus there is nothing in the known facts of the case to negative the supposition, that the 'Book of the Law' was now for the first time produced, and read in the ears of the people,—except, of course, the moral difficulty which we find in attributing such a proceeding as this to *good men*, as Hilkiah and, perhaps, Jeremiah. But we must not judge of those times by our own; nor must we leave out of consideration the circumstances, which may have justified to their minds such an act as this. The deplorable condition of their people, sunk in the most debasing idolatries, might be thought to require some powerful influence to be brought upon them, beyond even an ordinary prophet's voice. Prophets had already spoken,—Joel, Hosea, Amos, Isaiah, Micah; but their words had not availed to keep back the people from those deadly sins, which had already brought down upon the Ten Tribes a fearful judgment, and threatened before long a yet more terrible woe upon Judah and Jerusalem. What if the authority of the great Lawgiver should be brought to bear upon them? And,—since the Law-Book, as it then existed, was not well suited for the present necessity, with its long details of the lives of their forefathers, and of the events which attended the deliverance out of Egypt and the march through the wilderness, as well as its minute directions about artistic and ceremonial matters,—what if the very *spirit* of the older Law should be summed up in a powerful address, adapted to the present circumstances of the times—such as he *would* have delivered, if now present with his people—and put into the mouth of the departing Lawgiver?

576. Let it be remembered, that in the Book of Deuteronomy it is *Moses* always, and not *Jehovah*, who is introduced as speaking, except in xi.14,15, xxix.5,6, where the writer seems unconsciously to have passed from the person of Moses into that of *Jehovah*,—

'I will give you the rain of your land in due season . . . and I will send grass in thy fields for thy cattle.' 'And I have led you forty years in the wilderness . . . that ye might know that I am Jehovah your God.'*

Otherwise, the writer is only ascribing to Moses himself such thoughts as he might naturally be supposed to have, when taking leave of his people.

Besides, though it cannot be supposed, as we have said, that the old Law-Book was *read* out at length by the king in the ears of his people, yet it *may* have been only increased by the portion newly added to it; and, when the whole Book was found by Hilkiah, he might have been able to say with truth that he had found the 'Book of the Law,' even if we lay no stress upon the fact that the Hebrew words, סֵפֶר הַתּוֹרָה, *sepher hatTorah*, 2K.xxii.8, might be very properly translated, 'a Book of the Law,' as, in fact, it stands in the LXX, and in the parallel passage of our own Authorised Version, 2Ch.xxxiv.14.

577. There is also another point of view from which the matter must be regarded. Supposing (to fix our ideas) that Jeremiah really wrote the book, we must not forget that he was a Prophet and, as such, habitually disposed to regard all the special impulses of his mind to religious activity, as direct inspirations from the Divine Source of Truth. To us, with our inductive training and scientific habits of mind, the correct statement of *facts* appears of the first necessity; and consciously to misstate them, or to state as fact what we do not know or believe from *external* testimony to be fact, is a crime against Truth. But to a man who believed himself to be in *immediate* communication with the Source of all Truth, this condition must have been reversed. The *inner* Voice, which he believed to be the Voice of

* The LXX avoids this anomaly in xi.14,15, by writing δώσει, 'He will give;'; and so in xxix.5 they write ἡγάγευ, 'He led,' so that the phrase, 'I am Jehovah your God,' was apparently supposed to be the beginning of the Decalogue; but the construction is very harsh and unnatural, 'He led you forty years in the wilderness, . . . that ye might know that 'I am Jehovah your God,' [as it stands in the Decalogue.]

the Divine Teacher, would become all powerful—would silence at once all doubts and questionings. What it ordered him to do, he would do without hesitation, as by direct command of God, and all considerations as to morality or immorality would either not be entertained at all, or would only take the form of misgivings as to whether, possibly, in any particular case, the command itself was really Divine.

578. Let us imagine, then, that Jeremiah, or any other contemporary Seer, meditating upon the condition of his country, and the means of weaning his people from idolatry, *became possessed* with the idea of writing to them an address, as in the name of Moses, of the kind which we have just been considering, in which the laws ascribed to him, and handed down from an earlier age, which were now in many respects unsuitable, should be adapted to the present circumstances of the times, and re-enforced with solemn prophetic utterances. This thought, we may believe, would take in the Prophet's mind the form of a Divine command. All question of *deception* or *fraus pua* would vanish. And Huldah, too, in like manner, if she knew of what was being done, would consider, not whether it was right or wrong to speak to the Jews in the name of Moses, but what might happen, since these threats of coming judgment, thus spoken, were uttered by Divine Inspiration, and, therefore, were certainly true.

579. And this is very much what her words imply, if truly reported. She makes *no reference to Moses*; she does not even refer, as Josiah is said to have done, to '*our fathers* not having *hearkened to the words of this book*;' 2K.xxii.13. She says only, v.16,17:—

'Thus saith Jehovah, Behold, I will bring evil upon this place, and upon the inhabitants thereof, even all the words of the book which the king of Judah hath read, because they have forsaken me, and have burned incense unto other gods,' &c.

One might almost say that she *studiously avoids* asserting anything affirmatory of the notion that the book itself was

an old book, the work of Moses, and confines herself to her prophetic function of declaring that the evil threatened would surely come to pass. And this is equally true if this part of the history was written, as we conceive, by Jeremiah, and these words are *his* words, expressing the *tenor*, rather than the actual language, of Huldah's reply.

580. Again, the effect upon the king's mind, and the consequent movement among the people, *may* have been far greater than had been even anticipated. It might have been intended merely to produce this new work, as a 'prophesy in disguise,' in the hope that it might take some strong hold upon the national mind, and confirm the hands of those who were labouring to restore the true Faith in Judah. And, perhaps, at first, it was felt to be difficult or undesirable to say or do anything which might act as a check upon the zeal and energy which the king himself exhibited, and in which, as it seems, he was generally supported by the people, in putting down by force the gross idolatries which abounded in his kingdom. That impulsive effort, which followed immediately the reading of the 'Book,' might have been arrested, if he had been told at once the true origin of those awful words, which had made so strong an impression on him. They were not less awful, indeed, or less true, because uttered in the name of Moses by such a Prophet as Jeremiah. But still it is obvious that their effect was likely to be greatly intensified under the idea that they were the last utterances of Moses himself. And, as we have said, we seem to have an indication that the real facts of the case subsequently became known to the king, if not to the people generally, in the circumstance that no such efforts appear to have been made afterwards in his reign to bring the people to Jerusalem at the other Great Feasts, even in that same year, and that no other Passover seems to have been kept with any such solemnity.

CHAPTER IV.

DEUT. I. 1—II. 37.

581. WE shall consider that the following points have now been established:—

(i) The book of Deuteronomy must have been written chiefly by one writer:

(ii) This writer must have been a different person from the writer or writers, by whom the rest of the Pentateuch, speaking generally, was written;

(iii) The Deuteronomist, whoever he may have been, must have lived in a later age than either the Elohist or Jehovist, since he takes for granted facts recorded in their narrative;

(iv) There are some indications of this book having been written in a *very late* age of the Hebrew history;

(v) There are historical circumstances, which suggest that it may have been composed in the early part of Josiah's reign;

(vi) There is a remarkable correspondence between the peculiar expressions of the Deuteronomist and the language of *Jeremiah*, who did live in that age.

582. We shall next proceed to show that this book contains very distinct signs of such a later origin, in the existence of numerous *contradictions* to the older narrative, such as would naturally be expected to arise under such circumstances, when a later writer is adding freely from his own mind, and from his own point of view, to writings of an older time, and is not careful to preserve strictly the unity of the different parts of the story.

This implies, however, that he did not regard the older document as so inexpressibly sacred and so infallibly Divine, as is implied in modern popular views of inspiration.

583. In order to set these contradictions plainly before the reader, it will be desirable to pass under review the whole book of Deuteronomy, taking notice only of those passages, which affect in any way the questions now under consideration, and carefully watching for any *signs of time*, which may betray themselves in the writer's expressions. We may assume that we know now that he lived in a *later* day than the other writers of the Pentateuch. But we are now seeking to ascertain, if possible, from the internal evidence of the book itself, in *what* later day he lived.

We shall prefix an asterisk (*) to those passages, which appear most important in this last respect, as involving 'signs of time.'

584. D. i. 1.

'These be the words which Moses spake unto *all* Israel on the other [E.V. this] side Jordan, in the wilderness, in the Arabah over against Zuph, between Paran, and Tophel, and Laban, and Hazeroth, and Dizahab.'

The above words are, of course, perfectly intelligible, if we are not obliged to believe that the book of Deuteronomy is historically true, or, rather, if we are allowed to suppose (what is, doubtless, the true state of the case) that it is merely the product of a devout writer's imagination,—a poem, in short, in which he puts such words into the mouth of Moses as he deemed appropriate to the occasion. The writer, in such a case, would not have realised to himself the full meaning of his own words. Doubtless, the expression 'all Israel' may *sometimes* be used for the 'elders,' &c. by whom an order might be communicated to the whole host. But that it means certainly in this passage the assembled host, and is *intended* to mean it, and not the 'elders' or 'headmen' only, as some have suggested, if the narrative is to be regarded as literally and historically true;

cannot, as it appears to me, be reasonably denied. And surely the words in D.xxix.10,11, are enough to decide the question:—

‘Ye stand this day all of you before Jehovah your God,—your captains of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, all the men of Israel,—your little ones, your wives, and the stranger that is in thy camp, from the hewer of thy wood unto the drawer of thy water.’

585. The writer, however, I repeat, was not guilty of any such absurdity as the words, understood in their natural and proper meaning, would imply: for he never realised to himself the thing stated as an historical fact, any more than TACITUS would have imagined that the words, which he has put into the mouth of the barbarian chief, Galgacus, would be supposed by any intelligent reader to have been actually uttered by him. SCOTT, of course, takes the literal view of the matter, and explains it as follows:—

‘The words,’ as here mentioned, seem to mean the subsequent exhortations, which Moses delivered to the principal persons in Israel, that they might make them known in their several tribes and families. Perhaps he spake some of the principal passages many times over to the people in general, assembled in large companies for that purpose. But there is no ground to suppose that his voice was *miraculously* rendered audible to the whole nation at once, as some have asserted.

586. KNOBEL observes, *Deut.p.207*:—

It is not easy to perceive for what reason the author has denoted this locality in an extraordinary and unnecessary way *with six names*, especially as it has been so often named already, N.xxii.4,xxvi.3,63,xxxi.12,xxxiii.48,49,50,xxxv.1,xxxvi.13, and must have been well known to the reader.

This circumstance is most naturally to be accounted for by the fact of a later — rather, a *much* later — writer wishing to define more accurately in his own age a locality, which he found distinguished so remarkably in the older records,—especially as it lay within reach, as it were, of everyone who cared to see it, not far away in the Arabian waste, and he designed to take it as the scene of the farewell addresses of Moses. And this is confirmed by his adding in a parenthesis, ‘There are eleven days’ journey from Horeb by the way of Mount Seir unto Kadesh-Barnea,’ *v.2*,—words, which could never have been inserted in this way by Moses or any contemporary writer.

587. D. i. 6—18.

The account of the appointment of officers, as here given, involves more than one inconsistency. First, the Deuteronomist loses sight of the fact that, according to the story, N. xxvi. 64, the whole generation was *dead* which received the Law at Horeb; and so he makes Moses say, v. 6, 'Jehovah our God spake unto *us* in Horeb,' and still more distinctly, v. 9, 'I spake unto *you* at that time, saying, I am not able to bear you myself alone,' and v. 14, 'Ye answered me, and said.' But a more remarkable discrepancy exists in v. 15, where the statement is wholly at variance with that in E. xviii. 25, 26. In this latter passage, the appointment of the officers takes place *before* the giving of the Law at Sinai; here it takes place nearly twelve months afterwards, when they are *just about to leave* Horeb, v. 6. If it be said that we must extend the meaning of the phrase 'at that time' in v. 9, 18, to include the whole twelve months, and must suppose that the fact stated in v. 6-8 occurred in point of time subsequently to that in v. 9-18, yet both these accounts are contradictory to that in N. xi. 14-17, where, *after they have left Horeb*, Moses complains of the burden of the people, (though, according to either of the other two statements, he had a multitude of officers to help him,) and he is commanded then to appoint seventy elders, 'and they shall bear the burden of the people with thee, that thou bear it not thyself alone.'

588. SCOTT attempts to reconcile the difficulty as follows:—

The counsel, here referred to, seems to have been suggested by Jethro *before* the giving of the Law. Moses, in consequence, proposed it to the Lord, who approved it, and then with the concurrence of the people it at length took place, about the time when they departed from Horeb, and at no great distance from that of the appointment of the seventy elders.

That is to say, according to SCOTT, though Moses was 'wearing away' with the labour of judging the people, he delayed twelve months to carry out his father-in-law's advice! But the words in E. xviii. 24, 25, plainly imply that he acted at once on Jethro's advice; and they state also that '*Moses* chose

able men out of all Israel' for these offices, *v. 25*, whereas in *D. i. 13* we read 'Take you wise men, and understanding, and known among your tribes, and *I* will make them rulers over you.'

Further, as *KNOBEL* observes, in *E. xviii. 21* the stress is laid upon their being 'such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness,' whereas in *N. xi. 17–29* it is laid on the fact that, 'Jehovah put His Spirit upon them, and they prophesied,' and in *D. i. 13, 15*, on their being 'wise men and known.'

589. *D. i. 22, 23.*

'And ye came near unto me, every one of you, and said, We will send men before us, and they shall search us out the land, and bring us word again by what way we must go up, and into what cities we shall come. And the saying pleased me well; and I took twelve men of you, one of a tribe, &c.'

But in *N. xiii. 1, 2*, the sending of the spies is ascribed, not to a suggestion from the people, but to an express command of Almighty God:—

'And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, Send thou men, that they may search the land of Canaan, which I give unto the children of Israel; of every tribe of their fathers shall ye send a man, every one a ruler among them.'

SCOTT says on this point:—

We find elsewhere that the people first proposed to Moses this design of searching the land, who, not suspecting the distrust and unbelief which had suggested it, approved the proposal and asked counsel of the Lord. He, having been provoked by their former rebellions, permitted it, and gave directions accordingly, in order to a further discovery of their wickedness, the display of His own glory, and for the instruction of His Church in all ages.

And so writes *HÄVERNICK*, *Pent. p. 316*:—

According to *D. i. 22, 23*, the sending out of the spies originates with the people, who prepare the severe temptation for themselves; but Moses does not accede to their request, without having obtained God's sanction to the plan; then at His command the spies are despatched.

590. But here again the writer seems to have forgotten that these things took place, according to the story, forty years before, when most of those, whom he was now addressing, were not even born, and none of them, except Caleb and Joshua, were of age to be numbered. Yet he makes Moses say, '*Ye* came near unto

me, every one of you, &c.,' v.22, and the spies 'brought us word again,' v.25, and 'ye would not go up,' v.26, and 'ye murmured in your tents,' v.27. So we have in v.29, 'Then I said unto you, Dread not, neither be afraid of them,' and v.32, 'Yet in this thing ye did not believe Jehovah your God,'—with many more like instances, as iv.11,12, 'and ye came near, and stood under the mountain, and Jehovah spake unto you out of the midst of the fire; ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude; only ye heard a voice.' See also the passage quoted below in (600).

Also in D.i.21, Moses is made to exhort the people to 'go up and possess the land,' *before* sending the spies; whereas the whole account in N.xiii implies, though it does not exactly state, the contrary.

591. D.i.37–39.

'Also Jehovah was angry with me for your sakes, saying, Thou also shalt not go in thither. But Joshua, the son of Nun, which standeth before thee, he shall go in thither; encourage him, for he shall cause Israel to inherit it. Moreover, your little ones, which ye said should be a prey, and your children which in that day had no knowledge between good and evil, they shall go in thither, and unto them will I give it, and they shall possess it. But as for you, turn you, and take your journey into the wilderness by the way of the Red Sea.'

Here, again, the Deuteronomist, though thoroughly imbued with a *general* notion of the story, seems to have lost sight of the particular fact that Moses was sentenced to die, and Joshua appointed to succeed him, not at the time which is here referred to, in the days of the former generation, but after an interval of thirty-seven years, at the *end* of the wanderings, N.xxvii.15–23, only a few months before this address is supposed to be delivered. The fact may be that, knowing that Caleb and Joshua were excepted in the story from the general doom, he names Caleb as so excepted in v.36, and then goes on to mention Joshua as also excepted, but inadvertently anticipating his appointment to succeed Moses, and so falling also into the anachronism of antedating the doom of Moses. SCOTT says—

It was natural for Moses here to introduce this subject, though the event took place many [thirty-seven] years after that of which he was discoursing. For it would occur to his mind that he also was excluded, and thus involved in the general sentence, in consequence of a temptation, which the unbelief of the people had laid in his way.

592. D.i.46.

‘So ye abode in Kadesh many days, according unto the days that ye abode there.’

In this strange way is summed up the account of the thirty-seven years’ sojourn in the wilderness. It is all that the Deuteronomist can tell us about it,—it being all, which the authorities he had before him, in the Elohist and Jehovistic narratives, have told him. SCOTT observes on this point:—

Here again an almost total silence is observed concerning more than thirty-seven years of the time, which the Israelites passed in the wilderness. We may, however, suppose that Moses, Aaron, and the Priests and Levites, were diligently employed in instructing the people, and that many, even of them ‘whose carcases fell in the wilderness,’ were thus prepared for heaven, while the survivors were humbled and proved, in order to their entrance into the Promised Land.

It is inconsistent with SCOTT’S theory, of ‘many’ of the survivors being ‘humbled and proved,’ that we find them murmuring, as of old, in N.xxi.5, and on that account visited with fiery serpents, and then ‘committing whoredom with the daughters of Moab,’ N.xxv.1, for which they were stricken with the plague.

*593. D.ii.4,5.

‘And command thou the people, saying, Ye are to pass through the coast of your brethren the children of Esau, which dwell in Seir; and they shall be afraid of you. Take ye good heed unto yourselves therefore; meddle not with them; for I will not give you of their land, no, not so much as a foot-breadth; because I have given Mount Seir unto Esau for a possession.’

Upon the above KNOBEL remarks, *Deut.p.213*:—

The writer has immediately the Mosaic time in his eye, and the subjection of the Edomites since David’s time is regarded by him not so much in the light of a conquest of the land, as in that of a subjugation of the people.

Rather, we have here, most probably, an indication of the *later time*, when the Deuteronomist lived, and when Edom was

independent, and there was no likelihood of its being subject again to the yoke of Israel. We read in 1K.ix.26—

‘And king Solomon made a navy of ships in Ezion-geber, which is beside *Eloth*, [or *Elath*, D.ii.8.] on the shore of the Red Sea, in the land of *Edom*.’

But the possession of Elath was lost for a time, and recovered at last by Uzziah, who ‘built Elath, and restored it to Judah,’ 2K.xiv.22. In the days of his grandson, Ahaz, it was lost permanently; for we read, 2K.xvi.6—

‘At that time Rezin, king of Syria, recovered *Elath* to Syria, and drave the Jews from Elath; and the Syrians came to Elath, and dwelt there *unto this day*.’

From that time the Edomites appear to have maintained completely their independence as regards Judah. In Jeremiah’s time this was the case, as we gather from Jer.ix.26, xxv.21, xxvii.3, where Edom is reckoned as on a par with Egypt, Judah, Ammon, Moab, &c., and in Jer.xlix.16 is threatened with punishment for its pride:—

‘Thy terribleness hath deceived thee, and the pride of thine heart, O thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock, that holdest the height of the hill; though thou shouldest make thy nest as high as the eagle, I will bring thee down from thence, saith Jehovah.’

594. D.ii.9.

‘And Jehovah said unto me, Distress not the Moabites, neither contend with them in battle; for I will not give thee of their land for a possession; because I have given Ar unto the children of Lot for a possession.’

Here also we have most probably an indication of the long and flourishing independence of the Moabites in the time of the Deuteronomist. Thus we read in Jer.xlviii.11:—

‘Moab hath been at ease from his youth, and he hath settled on his lees, and hath not been emptied from vessel to vessel, neither hath he gone into captivity; therefore his taste remaineth in him, and his scent is not changed.’

And again:

‘We have heard the pride of Moab, (he is exceeding proud,) his loftiness, and his arrogancy, and his pride, and the haughtiness of his heart.’ Jer.xlviii.29.

‘We have heard of the pride of Moab; he is very proud; even of his haughtiness, and his pride, and his wrath.’ Is.xvi.6.

*595. D.ii.12.

‘As Israel *did* unto the land of his possession, which Jehovah gave unto them,’

G G

We have already pointed out (265-6) that the above language indicates that the writer was living *after* the Conquest of the land of Canaan. RIEHM observes, p.80:—It is arbitrary to consider these words as an *interpolation* or to refer them to the trans-Jordanic land, which Israel, at the time when Moses spoke them, had already taken into its possession. The expression, אֶרֶץ יְרֻשָׁתוֹ *erets yerushatho*, 'land of his possession,' can denote nothing else but the identical Palestine, and though it might *include* the trans-Jordanic land, could not have been used to denote that alone.

596. D.ii.19.

'When thou comest nigh over against the children of Ammon, distress them not, nor meddle with them; for I will not give thee of the land of the children of Ammon any possession; because I have given it unto the children of Lot for a possession.'

With respect to the Ammonites also we read in Jer.xlix.1,4:—

'Concerning the Ammonites, thus saith Jehovah: Hath Israel no sons? hath he no heir? Why then doth their king inherit Gad, and his people dwell in his cities? . . . Wherefore gloriest thou in the valleys, thy flowing valley, O back-sliding daughter,—that trusted in her treasures, saying, Who shall come unto me?'

And in Jer.xl.14 mention is made of 'Baalis, king of the Ammonites,' so that these also were independent in Jeremiah's days.

597. Nothing is said in the earlier books, as in N.xx.14-21, about the Israelites being *forbidden*, as here, to attack either Edom or Moab, because 'Jehovah had given Mount Seir unto Esau, and Ar unto the children of Lot, for a possession.'

Rather, N.xxi.24 seems to imply that the Israelites abstained from invading the territory of Ammon, not because they were forbidden to do so, but because 'the border of the children of Ammon was strong'; and, at all events, in N.xxiv.17-19, the conquests of David over both Edom and Moab seem to be plainly foretold:—

'There shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth. And Edom shall be a possession, Seir also shall be a possession for his enemies; and Israel shall do valiantly. Out of Israel shall come he that shall have dominion, and shall destroy him that remaineth of the city.'

The statement in D.ii.4, 'they (the Edomites) shall be afraid of you,' is at variance with those in N.xx,—

‘And Edom said unto him (Israel), Thou shalt not pass by me, lest I come out against thee with the sword,’ *v.*18 ;

‘And he said, Thou shalt not go through. And Edom came out against him with much people and with a strong hand,’ *v.*20.

598. D.ii.9-12,19-23.

We have already noticed (277) that the introduction of these archæological notices about the ‘Emims,’ ‘Horims,’ and ‘Zam-zummims,’ who in ancient days inhabited the countries subsequently occupied by Moab, Edom, and Ammon, betrays the hand of a later writer, who took an interest in recording such facts as these, which implied that these nations, akin to Israel, had, like Israel, been favoured with special help and guidance from above, and put in possession of the lands of other occupants, whom Jehovah ‘destroyed before them.’

KNOBEL observes, *Deut.p.*214, with regard to the expression in D.ii.12,—

This remark is not suitable in the mouth of Moses, but has slipped from the writer by an oversight.

599. D.ii.23.

‘The Avims, which dwelt in the villages [בְּחֶזְרִים, *bakhätserim*, E.V. ‘in Hazerim’] unto Azzah [Gaza], the Caphtorims, which came out of Caphtor, destroyed them, and dwelt in their stead.’

On this passage, KNOBEL writes as follows, *Deut.p.*215 :—

Having once touched upon the ancient peoples, who inhabited the Jordan-lands, he adds yet another notice concerning the Avites, who lived there in villages as far as Gaza, and were exterminated by the Caphtorim out of Caphtor, *i.e.* Crete. To this also refers Amos,ix.7, ‘Have not I brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor?’ and *Jeremiah* says, xlvi.4, ‘Jehovah will spoil the Philistines, the remnant of the isle (אֶרֶץ, E.V. ‘country’) of Caphtor,’ where, however, the Philistines are named instead of the Caphtorim. The Avites are, probably, to be reckoned among the Canaanites, in whose district they [*i.e.* Gaza, &c.] fall, G.x.19, and in the Mosaic time they still lived in the locality here indicated, Jo.xiii.3. In the time of Saul and David the Cherethites (כֶּרֶתִי, *Crethi*) or Cretans appear in their place [in the same locality], 1S.xxx.14, ‘We made an invasion upon the south of the Cherethites, and upon the coast which belongeth to Judah, and upon the south of the Galeb, and we burned Ziklag with fire:’ comp. Ez.xxv.16, ‘I will stretch out mine hand upon the Philistines, and I will cut off the Cherethims,

and destroy the remnant of the sea-coast,' and Zeph.ii.5, 'Woe unto the inhabitants of the sea-coast, the nation of the Cherethites! The word of Jehovah is against you, O Canaan, the land of the Philistines!' These are also called 'Carians' (כָּרִי *Cari*), comp. 2S.xx.23. [where David's 'guard' are called 'the Cherethites (text כְּרִי, *hacCreyi*, margin כְּרִי, *hacCari*, or כְּרִיתִי, *hacCrethi*,) and Pelethites,'] and 2K.xi.4,19, [where the guard are called כְּרִי, *hacCari*.] Hence the extermination of the Avites and the settlement of the Caphtorim or Cretans falls in the time of the Judges, when the Carians disappeared from the coasts of Asia before Minos, the powerful king of Crete, THUC.i.4,8. The Caphtorim in the present case are beyond doubt the fugitives who came from the island of Crete, and occupied the nearest parts of Libya, TAC.*Hist.*v.2. A connection with Crete is betrayed also by the circumstance that in Gaza the Cretan Zeus was worshipped. Hence we have good reason for supposing that by Caphtor is meant Crete. [But little dependence can be placed upon the arguments derived from the statements of THUCYDIDES and TACITUS.]

In Ez.xxv.16, Zeph.ii.5, the LXX have 'Cretans.'

600. D.ii.29.

The statement, which is here made, viz. that the Edomites and Moabites sold meat and water to the Israelites, is directly contrary to those in N.xx.18,20,21, and D.xxiii.3,4; and in Ju.xi.17 we read —

'Then Israel sent messengers unto the king of Edom, saying, Let me, I pray thee, pass through thy land; but the king of Edom would not hearken thereto. And in like manner they sent unto the king of Moab; but he would not consent.'

Upon this KURTZ remarks, iii.p.332 :—

There is more plausibility, at any rate, in another discrepancy, which has been adduced by rationalistic critics. In N.xx the Edomites, and in Ju.xi.17 the Moabites also, are said to have *refused* the petition of the Israelites for a free passage, and their offer to pay for bread and water. But in D.ii.29, on occasion of a message sent to Sihon, king of the Amorites, the Edomites and Moabites are praised for having provided the Israelites with food and water*for money, when they passed through their land. But a very simple solution of the apparent discrepancy is furnished by the old rule, 'distingue tempora, et concordabit Scriptura.' 'The same people,' says LEAKE, 'who successfully resisted the attempt of the Israelites to cross the strongly-fortified western frontier, were terrified when they saw that they had gone completely round, and reached the weakly defended eastern border.' On the western side, the mountains of Edom rise abruptly from the Arabah. There are only a few passes, which are at all accessible from this side, and these can easily be occupied. But, on the east, the mountains slope gently off into a desert tract of table-land, which is still a hundred feet higher, at least, than the

desert of El Tih. On this side, therefore, the land was open; and they were not very likely to assume a hostile attitude towards the 600,000 fighting men of Israel. And the very fact that they had offended the Israelites, by opposing them on the western border, would make them the more eager to avoid everything that could give occasion for anger or revenge, now that they had come round to the eastern side.

601. But this does not dispose of the difficulty; because in D.xxiii.3,4, we read—

‘An Ammonite or *Moabite* shall not enter into the congregation of Jehovah, because they met you not with bread and with water in the way, when ye came out from Egypt, and because they hired against thee Balaam, the son of Beor, to curse thee.’

KURTZ and HENGSTENBERG say that D.ii.29 refers to a request to *sell* bread and water to the Israelites, which the Moabites did, but not out of any kindness,—they did it only ‘as a manifestation of their selfish and grasping disposition’; whereas in D.xxiii.4 the charge made against them is that they did not come forward *of their own accord* to greet their brethren, the Israelites, and ‘meet them’ on the way with presents of food. But, whatever *Edom* may have done in the way of kindness, (of which, however, there is no indication in the book of Numbers,) there is not the least sign in the older story that Balak, king of Moab, and his people, supplied the Israelites with bread and water at all, whether for love or for money.

CHAPTER V.

DEUT. III. I—IX. 29.

602. D.iii.11,14.

We have considered already (268–270) the story of Og's 'iron bedstead' referred to in *v.11*, and (257) the expression 'unto this day' in *v.14*, as signs of this book having been composed at a later date than the age of the Exodus. It is very probable that this 'bed' was really a large sarcophagus, made of the dark basalt which abounds in the district of Bashan. Many of these stone coffins still exist in these regions, and are used as water-troughs by the inhabitants.

For an interesting account of the ruined cities of Bashan, described in *v.4,5*, as 'threescore cities, all fenced with high walls, gates, and bars,'—which now remain, 'crowded together' in the country S.E. of Damascus, called the Haurân,—

of great size, of very high antiquity, and in a high state of preservation,—not mere sites, in many cases not even ruins, but still standing almost uninjured, the streets perfect, the houses perfect, the walls perfect, the stone doors still hanging on their hinges—

see papers by C. C. GRAHAM, Esq. in the *Journal of the Geog. Soc.* for 1858 and *Cambridge Essays* for 1858.

Doubtless these massive Cyclopean ruins existed in the time of the Deuteronomist, as they exist now, and as they probably existed for ages before him.

603. D.iii.29.

'So we abode in the valley over against Beelpheor.'

Here again we have, as KNOBEL observes, *p.*223—

An accurate note of place, which the author has made for his readers, not Moses for his Israelites.

This will be evident, when it is considered that, according to the story (173-4), the facts related in this chapter—to which the phrase ‘at that time’ is repeatedly applied—had only just occurred, and that they were actually now ‘abiding in the valley over against Bethpeor,’ according to the notice in *iv.*46.

604. D.iv.3,4.

‘Your eyes have seen what Jehovah did because of Baal-Peor; for *all the men that followed Baal-Peor, Jehovah thy God hath destroyed them from among you.* But ye that did cleave unto Jehovah your God, are alive every one of you this day.’

Upon this phrase Dean GRAVES remarks, *i.p.*137,138:—

The legislator, in order to deter the Jews from idolatry, alludes to this fact; but he notices no circumstance but one which, though in the original narrative not stated, was infinitely the most important to advert to on this occasion, but which no persons but spectators of the fact, and perfectly acquainted with every individual concerned in it, could possibly feel the truth of.

And so SCOTT observes on *v.*5:—

The people had been often ready to conclude that Moses taught them by his own authority. But, at the close of his life, he solemnly assured them that he had instructed them exactly as the Lord had commanded him, neither more, nor less, nor otherwise. This is a most express declaration that he was divinely inspired, and utterly incompatible with integrity of character if he was not.

Upon such frail foundations are based many of the much-commended arguments of our standard books on the authenticity and historical veracity of the Pentateuch! It is obvious that the whole question at issue is begged in the first instance, when it is taken for granted as a fact, that Moses actually delivered this address.

*605. D.iv.19.

‘And lest thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the sun and the moon and the stars, even all the host of heaven, shouldest be driven to worship them, &c.’

The ‘sun’ seems to have been an object of worship in early days among the tribes of Canaan, as is implied by the fact that,

the name of the town *Beth-shemesh* means 'House of the Sun,' corresponding to *Beth-el*, 'House of God.' Probably, the sun was worshipped under the name *Baal*, 'Lord,' and the moon under that of 'Astarte.'

But the worship of the 'host of heaven' is first named in the history, as one of the sins for which the Ten Tribes were carried captive, in 2K.xvii.16; and it seems to have been first generally practised in Judah in the reign of Manasseh, the father of Josiah, 2K.xxi.3,5, 2Ch.xxxiii.3, and is explained by KNOBEL, *Deut.p.*226, to have arisen out of Assyrian and Chaldee influences. Manasseh's grandfather Ahaz may, indeed, have introduced it, as appears from a comparison of 2K.xxiii.12, where we read of 'the altars that were on the top of the upper chamber of Ahaz,' with Jer.xix.13, 'the houses upon whose roofs they have burnt incense unto all the host of heaven;' but it is not mentioned among his special offences in 2K.xvi.3,4, and, therefore, if introduced in that reign, probably was not much practised, and it was certainly not adopted by his son Hezekiah. In Manasseh's reign, however, it seems to have flourished. Hence we find express mention made of this worship in the story of Josiah's reformation, 2K.xxiii, where we read of the vessels that were made 'for all the host of heaven,' v.4, the Priests that burned incense 'to the sun and to the moon and to the planets and to all the host of heaven,' v.5, 'the chariots of the sun,' v.11.

606. Though put down by Josiah so strongly, it appears, however, to have revived again, since we find in this very reign Zephaniah prophesying the destruction of 'them that worship the host of heaven upon the housetops,' i.5, and *Jeremiah* says,—

'Seest thou not what they do in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem? The children gather wood, and the fathers kindle the fire, and the women knead their dough, to make cakes to the queen of heaven,' &c., vii.17.18;—

'And they shall spread them before the sun and the moon and all the host of heaven, whom they have loved, and whom they have served, and after

whom they have walked, and whom they have sought, and whom they have worshipped,' &c., viii.2;—

'And the houses of Jerusalem, and the houses of the kings of Judah, shall be defiled as the place of Tophet, because of all the houses upon whose roofs they have burned incense unto all the host of heaven,' &c., xix.13.

And see especially Jer.xliv.17,18,19,25, Ez.viii.16.

Observe that this worship is not mentioned in any part of the Pentateuch, except D.iv.19,xvii.3; and that *complete phrases*, similar to this, 'the sun and the moon and all the host of heaven,' occur *only* in D.iv.19, xvii.3, Jer.viii.2, and 2K.xxiii.5, which was very probably written by Jeremiah himself (574.v).

607. D.iv.21.

'Furthermore, Jehovah was angry with me, for your sakes, and *swore* that I should not go over Jordan,' &c.

On this passage KNOBEL observes, *p.*227 :—

Nothing is said in the older record, N.xx, about any divine *oath* at this point of the history: we seem to have here some confusion with the oath recorded in N.xiv.21,28.

*608. D.iv.25—28.

'When thou shalt beget children, and children's children, and *ye shall have remained long in the land*, and shall corrupt yourselves. . . . I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that ye shall utterly perish from off the land whereunto ye go over Jordan to possess it. . . . And Jehovah shall seat you among the nations, and ye shall be left few in number among the heathen, whether Jehovah shall lead you. And there ye shall serve gods, the work of men's hands, wood and stone, which neither see, nor hear, nor eat, nor smell.'

Assuming that these words were not spoken by Moses prophetically, with a view to *future* events, they seem to imply that the writer had before him the captivity of the Ten Tribes, and wished to preserve Judah from the same judgment.

SCOTT observes:—

Many expressions in this prophecy evidently refer to times much later than even the Babylonish Captivity. The Jews could not then, with any propriety, be said to have 'utterly perished' out of the Promised Land, as they returned to it after seventy years. [The Ten Tribes had perished in Josiah's time, and the Deuteronomist, as we suppose, is referring to the example of their punishment, as a warning to Judah.] But their present state, in which they have been 'scattered among

the nations' for almost 1,800 years, without any access to their own land, and their condition, as dispersed individuals, not as a nation under regular government, answers the language of the prediction with great exactness. [Are the Jews, then, 'few in number' now, and have they been 'left'—that is, as the context plainly implies, 'left *in captivity*'—among the heathen?] They do not, indeed, at present worship images, except as in popish countries they sometimes conceal their religion, and conform to the idolatrous worship there performed, in order to escape persecution. But they are grossly ignorant of the True God; for 'he, that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father who sent Him.' Numbers of Israelites also have, doubtless, been incorporated with idolaters.

609. D.iv.29,30.

'But, if from thence thou shalt seek Jehovah thy God, thou shalt find Him, if thou seek him with all thy heart and with all thy soul. When thou art in tribulation, and all these things are come upon thee, in the latter days, if thou turn to Jehovah thy God, and shalt be obedient unto His Voice,—for Jehovah thy God is a merciful God,—He will not forsake thee, neither destroy thee, nor forget the covenant of thy fathers which He sware unto them.'

Here also the Deuteronomist evidently contemplates the possibility of the Ten Tribes being restored from their captivity, and reinstated in their own land, if only they would repent and return to Jehovah their God. His hope was, doubtless, that the tribes of Israel would all be gathered again one day under the government of the House of David. We shall see other similar indications of these warm, patriotic expectations of brighter days for Israel, which were cherished by this writer.

*610. D.iv.38.

'To drive out nations from before thee greater and mightier than thou art, to bring thee in, to give thee their land for an inheritance, *as it is this day.*'

We have here also an indication that the writer was living in an age after the Conquest; though the proof is not so decisive as that in (595), since it might be argued that the above language is sufficiently explained by reference to the Conquest of the trans-Jordanic lands, which had already taken place at the time when Moses is supposed to be speaking.

611. D.iv.41—49.

This section, with the exception of v.45, appears to be a

fragment of the older document, removed from its proper place in connexion with the narrative in N. xxxv. In its present position, it interrupts very awkwardly the address of Moses, or, rather, it is inserted abruptly between two separate addresses, which have no connexion either with it or with each other, for D. v. 1 begins very abruptly.

In v. 41, 47, 49, we have the expression 'beyond (E.V. 'on this side') Jordan toward the sunrising (בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן מִזְרְחָהּ, *beve'er hayyarden mitsrakhah*),' which the Deuteronomist *never* uses, whereas it occurs twice in the old document, N. xxxii. 19, xxxiv. 15.

Also in v. 44 we have the phrase, לִפְנֵי יְיָ, *sum liphne*, 'set before,' as in E. xi. 7, xxi. 1, comp. E. xv. 25, for which the Deuteronomist uses לְפָנַי, *nathan liphne*, iv. 8, xi. 32.

612. It should be observed, however, that, in v. 44, the expression, הַתּוֹרָה, *hatTorah*, 'the Law,' savours strongly of the Deuteronomist (544); but KNOBEL considers that these words, 'This is the Law, which Moses set before the children of Israel,' point to a Law, which *followed* this verse in the older document, as a *later* Law, given by Moses in the plains of Moab, besides the Law given on Sinai. And he supposes that in D. xii—xxvi the writer has included several of the injunctions of this second older Law. We shall have occasion to refer to this subject again. Meanwhile, v. 45, which, according to KNOBEL, 'is quite superfluous after v. 44,' but which *may* only be an amplification of it, is *certainly* Deuteronomistic. The multiplication in this verse of synonymous terms, 'the testimonies, and the statutes, and the judgments,' is very common in Deuteronomy, e.g. iv. 1, 5, 8, 14, 40, v. i. 31, vi. 1, 17, 20, &c.; and the noun עֲדָה, *hedah*, (different from עָרָה, *hedah*, 'congregation,') occurs only twice in the rest of the Pentateuch, and then in the singular, and in a different sense, viz. that of 'witness,' G. xxi. 30, xxxi. 52, whereas the plural עֲדוֹת, *hedoth*, is used, as here, in the sense of 'precepts,' or 'ordinances,' in D. iv. 45, vi. 17, 20.

613. On v. 46, 49, KNOBEL observes, p. 231 :—

The Deuteronomist has already, in i. 4, 5, made this circumstantial definition of the place, and has already, in iii. 8-17, in like manner described at full length the conquest of the regions here mentioned. The phrase, 'in the valley over against Bethpeor,' v. 46, occurs again in a fragment of the older writer, D. xxxiv. 6, from whom the Deuteronomist has adopted the notice in D. iii. 29, 'So we abode in the valley over against Bethpeor.' The name Sion, שִׁיֹן, for Hermon, occurs only here; but, perhaps, זִיֹן, Zion, in Ps. cxxxiii. 3, 'As the dew of Hermon, that descends upon the mountains of Zion,' may be another form of it. The Deuteronomist has already made *his* remarks upon the name of Hermon in iii. 9.

614. D. v. 2-5.

'Jehovah our God made a covenant with *us* at Horeb. Jehovah made not this covenant with our fathers, but *with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day*. Jehovah talked with *you* face to face in the mount out of the midst of the fire. I stood between Jehovah and *you* at that time, to shew you the word of Jehovah; for *ye* were afraid by reason of the fire, and went not up unto the mount.'

Here we have the strongest instances of the oversight referred to in (590). It may, of course, be said in all these cases that Moses is addressing the people collectively, and that the fathers, with whom the covenant was made at Horeb, included the children to whom he was now speaking at the end of the wanderings. But, if every one of those fathers was dead, as the narrative tells us, and only a small proportion of those now listening to Moses was present on the former occasion, as children under age, the above words could scarcely have been used by one taking note of this circumstance.

So, too, we read in xi. 2-7:—

'I speak not with *your children*, which have not known His miracles and His acts, which He did in the midst of Egypt, unto Pharaoh the king of Egypt, and unto all his land, &c.; but *your eyes have seen* all the great acts of Jehovah which He did.'

615. D. v. 6-21.

We have already noticed (497-500) the remarkable variations which exist between the Ten Commandments, as given here, and in E. xx. 2-17, more especially with reference to the Fourth

Commandment. And yet, in each case, the writer professes to state the identical words, which were spoken by Jehovah himself, at the very same time. Thus we have not only a striking contradiction in a matter of fact, which by itself is decisive against the strict historical accuracy of the Mosaic story; but we see also how little the later writer was withheld, by any strong religious scruples, from altering and amending — or, as might be thought by some, corrupting — the older form. In other words, he could not have regarded the older form of words as so unspeakably sacred and Divine, that it would be profane for a human hand to alter them.

616. On this point HÄVERNICK says, *Pent.p.281* :—

‘Would a later writer have permitted himself such an alteration of what he himself in the most decided manner attributes to Moses, and with the sacredness and inviolability of which he is deeply impressed, and not rather have observed the most conscientious exactness in the repetition of the Mosaic form?’

Ans. Certainly not, if he had really believed them to have been the very words written down by Moses, or rather by the finger of God.

‘Nothing is gained by the supposition of an original traditional formula of a simpler kind; for, as soon as that had been once consigned to writing,—in which case it is hardly conceivable that it should have already received a paraphrase,—that form must then have been preserved.’

Ans. We do not suppose the existence of any ‘original traditional formula of a simpler kind.’

‘Thus the very construction of the Decalogue, considered both in itself and in its twofold form, necessarily leads us to the belief of its Mosaic origin.’

Ans. This conclusion, we need hardly say, does not appear to us to follow in any way from HÄVERNICK’S premisses.

617. DR. GRAY observes, *Key to the Old Testament*, p.119 :—

In the preceding books of the Pentateuch, Moses speaks of himself in the third person, but here [in Deuteronomy], in a more animated manner, he drops, as it were, the character of an historian, and is introduced as immediately addressing himself to his countrymen. Hence it is that, in describing what he uttered, he repeats the Decalogue *with some slight change of expression* (!) from that which was used at its first delivery; a variation, which, as it affected not the import of the commandment, might have served to indicate that not the letter, but the spirit, of the Law should be regarded.

We shall have occasion hereafter to point out more distinctly the numerous minor variations between the two copies of the Decalogue. But it is difficult to see how a commentator could justly characterise such a difference as that exhibited below as ‘some slight change of expression.’

E.xx.11.

For in six days, Jehovah made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: *wherefore* Jehovah blessed the Sabbath-Day and hallowed it.

D.v.15.

And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that Jehovah thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: *therefore* Jehovah thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-Day.

618. D.viii.4.

‘Thy raiment waxed not old upon thee, neither did thy foot swell, these forty years.’

So, too, we read in xxix.5:—

‘Your clothes are not waxen old upon you, and thy shoe is not waxen old upon thy foot.’

No mention is made of this miraculous provision of clothing in the older narrative. KURTZ observes, iii.312,313:—

The history of the exposition of these verses furnishes one of the most striking examples of the extent to which a merely literal exegesis of the Scriptures may go astray. A whole series of both Jewish and Christian commentators interpret these passages, without the least hesitation, as meaning that the clothes and shoes of the Israelitish children grew with their growth, and remained for the whole of the forty years not in the least the worse for wear. Thus JUSTIN says (*Dial. c. Tryph. c. 131*), ‘The strings of whose sandals never broke; nor did the sandals themselves get old, nor their clothes wear out, but those of the children grew with their growth.’ So PFEIFFER, ‘By a remarkable miracle, not only did the clothes of the Israelites in the desert never get old, but they grew with the growth of the Israelites themselves, so as to fit both boys and men in succession.’ PFEIFFER also quotes a Rabbinical saying with approbation: ‘Go, and learn from the snail, whose shell grows with its body.’ Other Rabbins suppose the angels of God to have acted as tailors to the Israelites, while they were in the desert, and interpret Ez.xvi.10–13 as containing a literal allusion to the fact. Without going to such an absurd length as this, AUGUSTINE, CHRYSOSTOM, THEODORET, GROTIUS, and even DEYLING, abide by the literal explanation, that, through the blessing of God, the clothes and shoes never wore out; so that those, who grew to manhood, were able to hand them over, as good as new, to the rising generation. By thus as-

suming a succession of wearers, these commentators, at all events, escaped the fatal notion that the clothes and shoes grew with the bodies of the wearers. When first PEYRERUS denied that the clothes and shoes of the Israelites were miraculously preserved for forty years, and maintained that 'the meaning of the Mosaic account was nothing more than this, that the Jews were never in want of anything, during the whole of the forty years that they were in the desert, but had so abundant a supply of everything, especially of wool from their flocks, of cloth, of skins, and of leather, that they never were without materials from which to make their clothes.'—DEYLING, who is usually so very temperate, protested most vehemently against such '*petulantia et impictus*.' Nevertheless, the opinion expressed by PEYRERUS became gradually the prevailing one. We find it advocated, for example, by CLERICUS, BUDDEUS, and LILIENTHAL. The last of the three, however, thinks it necessary to point, not only to the flocks possessed by the Israelites, from which they could obtain both wool and leather in great abundance, but also to the fact, that every Israelite must certainly have brought some clothes and shoes with him out of Egypt,—that they asked the Egyptians for clothes, and obtained them (E.iii.22, xii.35),—that they would, no doubt, take off the clothes of the Egyptians, who were drowned in the Red Sea and afterwards washed on shore (E.xiv.30), and, lastly, that they took the booty of the conquered Amalekites, including, according to Josephus, a quantity of clothes.

619. But, surely, the literal interpretation of the texts in question is the true one, and plainly implies a miracle of some kind, which prevented their clothes and shoes from wearing out, whatever may be the difficulty of conceiving what kind of miracle it could possibly have been. Accordingly SCOTT remarks:—

The Israelites, doubtless, brought out of Egypt more raiment than what they had upon them; they might manufacture the fleeces of their flocks in the wilderness; and they might be favoured in Providence with other supplies. Yet, when we consider their immense numbers, their situation and long continuance in the wilderness, and the strong expressions here made use of, there seems no reason to question the constant and most extraordinary miraculous interposition of God in this respect, as well as in others. We may, however, safely reject the Jewish tradition, that the garments grew along with the bodies of the young people, not because it is too difficult to be credited, but because it wants the warrant of scriptural testimony, and does not appear to have been in the least necessary; for the grown persons might wear the clothes of those who died, and the young might take theirs.

And he adds further, on D.xxix.5:—

As by far the greatest part of the clothing, of all ranks and ages in Israel, was made of *linen*, for which they had no resources in their own possession, and

exceedingly little opportunity of obtaining supplies from others, the reality and greatness of the miraculous interposition in this behalf were the more extraordinary.

620. D.viii.9.

'A land whose stones are *iron*, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass.'

We may notice, in passing, the familiar mention of 'iron' in this and other places of Deuteronomy, as where the writer speaks of the 'iron furnace,' iv.20, and iron tools, xix.5, xxviii.23,48, in the (supposed) age of Moses, preceding that of Homer by about five centuries.

621. D.ix.3.

'So shalt thou drive them out, and destroy them quickly, (מַהֵר, *maher*), as Jehovah hath *said* unto thee.'

KNOBEL observes here, p.244:—

In the ardour of the discourse, the writer forgets that he has just forbidden this destroying them quickly (מַהֵר) in vii.22.

622. D.ix.7, &c.

Here the writer, as KNOBEL says, p.245, 'allows himself some very important variations from the older narratives.' Nothing is said in E.xxiv.18 of Moses 'fasting' on the first occasion of his spending 'forty days and forty nights' on the mount: but this the writer has very naturally assumed, as KNOBEL suggests, from the fact being recorded of his fasting thus on the second occasion, E.xxxiv.28. But, on the other hand, the Deuteronomist omits the earnest prayer of Moses on behalf of the people, E.xxxii.11—13, by which Jehovah was pacified, and 'repented of the evil which He thought to do unto his people,' v.14, *before* Moses went down from the Mount: and he represents him as saying that he began to intercede for them *after* his descent, v.19—

'For I was afraid of the anger and hot displeasure, wherewith Jehovah was wroth against you to destroy you. But Jehovah hearkened unto me at that time also.'

623. Moreover, he makes Moses say, v.18—

'I fell down before Jehovah *as at the first*, forty days and forty nights: I did neither eat bread nor drink water, because of all your sins which ye sinned, in doing wickedly in the sight of Jehovah, to provoke Him to anger.'

And so again, *v.25*,—

'Thus I fell down before Jehovah forty days and forty nights, *as I fell down at the first*, because Jehovah had said He would destroy you.'

Whereas, according to the older story, he fasted these forty days and nights, when he had gone up into the mount the second time in obedience to the Divine command, *E.xxxiv.1,2,28* :

'And Jehovah said unto Moses, Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first; and I will write upon these tables the words that were in the first tables, which thou brakest. And be ready in the morning, and come up in the morning unto Mount Sinai, and present thyself there to me in the top of the mount. . . . And he was there with Jehovah forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread, nor drink water. And He wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments.'

624. But this very command, 'Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first, and come up unto me into the mount,' is represented by the Deuteronomist, *x.1*, as having been, apparently, issued *after* the forty days' fasting of Moses, and as a gracious answer to it.

KNOBEL notices also that, in *E.xxxii.15*, nothing is said about the mount 'burning with fire,' and that there also Moses descends with the two tables 'in his hand,' but here, *D.ix.15*, 'in his two hands,' that is, held upon his breast. In *D.x.3*, however, Moses says, 'I went up into the mount with the two tables in mine hand.'

So, too, the older record is silent about Jehovah's anger against Aaron and the intercession of Moses on his behalf, *D.ix.20*.

In *N.xi.3,35*, Taberah and Kibroth-hattaavah appear to be different names of one and the same encampment; comp. *N.x.33*, *xi.3*, with *xxxiii.16* : the Deuteronomist, *v.22*, seems to regard them as names of different places.

There are also other contradictions to the narrative as told in *E.xxxii,xxxiv*, which will be considered in their proper place.

CHAPTER VI.

DEUT.X.1—XL.32.

625. D.x.1-5.

Great contradiction exists between the narrative here and that in the book of Exodus: in the words of KNOBEL, 'the writer here treats the older records with great freedom.' It will be observed that in E.xxxiv.29 the two stone-tables with the Ten Commandments are in the hands of Moses, before any receptacle has been made in which to place them. *Here*, however, the Ark is commanded to be made, *v.1*, and is actually made, *v.3*, *at the same time* with the second set of tables, *before* Moses goes up into the mount to receive them. But the account in Exodus makes this impossible. Not only is there nothing said about the Ark in E.xxxiv.1, where he is commanded to make the tables; but it is only after coming down with the second set of tables that Moses, E.xxxv.10-12, summons the 'wise-hearted' to 'come and make all that Jehovah hath commanded, the Tabernacle, and his tent, and his covering, &c., the *Ark* and the staves thereof with the Mercy-seat, &c.,' and afterwards, in E.xxxvii.1-9, we have the full account of Bezaleel making it. And yet the Ark of the Deuteronomist was not, as might be suggested, a mere temporary *Ark*; for he makes Moses say, *v.5*:—

'I turned myself, and came down from the Mount, and *put the tables into the Ark which I had made, and there they be*, as Jehovah commanded me.'

626. Upon this point SCOTT observes:—

'Probably, before Moses ascended the Mount the second time, he gave express orders to Bezaleel to get the Ark ready against he came down; and, having *directed*

and *ordered* the making of it, he speaks as if he had made it; as Solomon is said to have builded the Temple, which he caused to be builded by the hands of others.'

Ans. Of course, there is no difficulty in supposing that, what Moses ordered to be made, he may be said to have made himself. The difficulty is that, according to the story in Exodus, the orders were plainly *given*, xxxv.10, and *executed*, xxxvii.1-9, *after* Moses came down from the mount with the second set of tables, which involves a direct contradiction to the account in Deuteronomy.

'Some, however, think that Moses prepared the Ark himself, as made of shittim-wood, and carried it up with the tables into the mount, and that Bezaleel afterwards covered it with gold.'

Ans. But the text of E.xxxvii.1,2, will not allow of this—'Bezaleel *made* the Ark of shittim-wood: two cubits and a half was the length of it, and a cubit and a half the breadth of it, and a cubit and a half the height of it. And he *overlaid* it with pure gold within and without, &c.'

627. But may we not have here also a sign of time? We have already noticed the fact (548.xiii) that the *Tabernacle*, which is so constantly mentioned in the middle three books of the Pentateuch, is never once named by the Deuteronomist under either of its designations, מִשְׁכָּן, *mishkan*, אוֹהֶל מוֹעֵד, *ohel mohed*. May not this, perhaps, have arisen from the fact that he was living in a later age, when David's *Tabernacle* had long passed away out of the sight and memory of men, and the writer, consequently, did not recognise its existence to himself so vividly, as he did that of the *Ark*, which he mentions in x.1,2,3,5,8, xxxi.9,25,26, and which was actually present, in his own days, in the Holy Place of the Temple? On the other hand, the earlier writer, living, as we suppose, in the later days of David, or the beginning of Solomon's reign, would have had the *Tabernacle* on Mount Zion before him, as his help in realising the idea of the Tent in the wilderness.

628. D.x.6,7.

'And the children of Israel took their journey from Beeroth of the children of Jaakan to Mosera; there Aaron died, and there he was buried; and Eleazar his son ministered in the Priest's office in his stead. From thence they journeyed unto Gudgodah, and from Gudgodah to Jotbath, a land of rivers of waters.'

This passage is evidently quite out of its place, and, as here introduced, it involves a complete contradiction. For the death of Aaron is here described as happening *before* the separation of the Levites, v.8,9,—‘*at that time* Jehovah separated the tribe of Levi, &c.,’ which took place, according to the older story, in his life-time, N.iii.5,6,9,—

‘And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, Bring the tribe of Levi near, and present them before Aaron the Priest, that they may minister unto him . . . And thou shalt give the Levites unto Aaron and to all his sons; they are wholly given unto him out of the children of Israel . . . And I, behold, I have taken the Levites from among the children of Israel instead of the firstborn that openeth the matrix among the children of Israel; therefore the Levites shall be mine.’

Nor can the difficulty be relieved by understanding the expression ‘at that time’ in a general sense, as equivalent to ‘*about* that time;’ for the death of Aaron took place in the *fortieth* year of the wanderings, N.xxxiii.38, and the separation of the Levites in the *second*, N.i.1.

629. It is possible that D.x.6,7, may be a fragment of the older record. But, even then, it is at variance with N.xxxiii.31–33, where the order of march is given from Moseroth to Bene-jaakan; whereas here we have just the opposite, from Beeroth of the children of Jaakan (Bene-jaakan) to Mosera (Moseroth). Again, we are here told that, Aaron died at *Mosera*; whereas in N.xxxiii.31–38 we read that they marched from Moseroth to Bene-jaakan, thence to Hor-hagidgad (Gudgodah), thence to Jotbathah (Jotbath), and three stations afterwards they reach Kadesh, and thence proceed to Mount Hor, where Aaron died.

SCHULTZ, *Deut.p.*362, explains the matter as follows:—

Mosera was the station whence Moses, Aaron, and Eleazar ascended *Mount Hor*, N.xx.27, and *Bene-Jaakan* was a place in the *district of Kadesh*; so that ‘*Moseroth to Bene-Jaakan*,’ N.xxxiii.31, = ‘*Mount Hor to Kadesh*’; and we have these same names in *reverse* order on the *return* march in N.xxxiii.37, D.x.6, ‘*Kadesh to Mount Hor*.’

Ans. But we have ‘*Gudgodah to Jotbath*,’ D.x.7, in *direct* order, as in N.xxxiii.33, whereas these names also ought to have been in *reverse* order.

SCOTT observes on this passage, D.x.6,7:—

These verses so break in upon the connexion of Moses's discourse, that they perplex commentators. *It is evident that Moses did not much regard exactness of method in his discourse.* Yet, perhaps, by some means a transposition has taken place; for these verses would come in more regularly after v.11. . . . Several of the places mentioned seem to have had more names than one; and some particulars, which for want of further information we cannot reconcile with other accounts, might be perfectly intelligible to the Israelites.

630. D.x.S,9.

'At that time Jehovah separated the *tribe of Levi*, to bear the Ark of the Covenant of Jehovah, to *stand before Jehovah to minister unto Him*, and to *bless in His Name*, unto this day. Wherefore Levi hath no part nor inheritance with his brethren; Jehovah is his inheritance, according as Jehovah thy God promised him.'

It was the duty of the 'sons of Kohath,'—not of the Levites generally,—to bear the Ark, N.iv.15.

But the duty of 'blessing in the name of Jehovah' is expressly assigned to the *Priests*, 'Aaron and his sons,' in N.vi.22–27, and is, accordingly, performed by Aaron, in L.ix.22. So, too, 'the *Priests*, the sons of Aaron,' were to *stand before Jehovah to minister unto Him*, whereas the Levites were to be presented (Heb. 'made to stand') *before Aaron the Priest, that they may minister unto him*, N.iii.6, or to *stand before the congregation, to minister unto them*, N.xvi.9, xviii.2.

And so, too, we read, xviii.6–8,—

'And, if a *Levite* come from any of thy gates out of all Israel where he sojourned, and come with all the desire of his mind unto the place which Jehovah shall choose, then he shall minister in the Name of Jehovah his God, *as all his brethren the Levites* do, which *stand there before Jehovah*. They shall have like portions to eat, beside that which cometh of the sale of his patrimony.'

This agrees with what we have already observed of the Deuteronomist, that he knows nothing whatever of that very sharp distinction between *Priests* and *Levites*, which the books of *Leviticus* and *Numbers* exhibit throughout, and which *Jehovah* himself is supposed to have made only a few months previously in N.xviii; but he calls the former always 'sons of

Levi' and never, as the other writers do, 'sons of Aaron.' Hence he says:—

'For Jehovah thy God hath chosen him (*Levi*) out of all thy tribes, to stand to minister in the name of Jehovah, him and his sons for ever,' xviii.5;

'And the Priests, *the sons of Levi*, shall come near; for them Jehovah thy God hath chosen, to minister unto Him and to bless in the Name of Jehovah,' xxi.5.

631. So in N.xviii.20 the declaration, 'I am thy part and thine inheritance among the children of Israel,' is made only with reference to Aaron and his sons; and so in N.xxxi.28,29, 'Jehovah's tribute' of the spoil of the Midianites was given to Eleazar the Priest; while the Levites received their share from the 'children of Israel,' v.30. But here it is said, 'Jehovah is the inheritance' of *Levi*, generally; see also xviii.2.

Here also, and in xxxi.25, the Levites are to carry the Ark, which agrees, as we have said, in some sense, with the *command* in N.iv.15, and the *practice* in N.x.21; but in xxxi.9 we read of 'the *Priests*, the sons of Levi, the bearers of the Ark.' So in 1K.viii.3 'the *Priests* took up the Ark;' and, if it be said that this was a grand occasion at the dedication of the Temple, on which they might be expected to depart from the ordinary custom, and discharge themselves the duty of the inferior order, yet in 1K.ii.26 Solomon says to the *Priest* Abiathar, 'I will not at this time put thee to death, because *thou barest the Ark* of Jehovah Elohim before David my father.'

And so the *Levites* are to utter the curses, xxvii.14, and to put the Book of the Law 'beside (מִצַּד, *mitsad*, E.V. 'in the side of') the Ark,' xxxi.25; whereas, according to N.iv.15, the Levites were not even to come near to carry the Ark, till the Priests had covered it; and Aaron was expressly ordered to keep them from touching the holy vessels, N.xviii.3:—

'Only they shall not come nigh the vessels of the Sanctuary and the Altar, that neither they, nor ye also, die.'

* 632. D.x.9.

'Wherefore Levi had no (לֹא הָיָה לְלֵוִי) *lo hayah leLevi*, lit. 'there was not to Levi') part nor inheritance with his brethren.'

The Deuteronomist, in order to have carried out properly the part of Moses, should have written, 'Wherefore Levi *shall have* no part with his brethren'; for the Israelites are still supposed to be only on the point of crossing the Jordan, and no partition of the Holy Land had yet been made among them. It is plain that he writes from a later state of things than that of Moses, when the separate position of the Levites, as ministers of the Sanctuary, was recognised in Israel.

633. RIEHM, p.37, tries to distinguish here between the Priests and Levites. He supposes the former to be spoken of in v.1-5, and the latter in v.6-8. But he adds:—

The service of the Levites is here denoted by the very same words which are used elsewhere to denote that of the Priests, viz. 'minister in the name of Jehovah,' v.7, (comp.xviii.5,xxi.5,) and 'stand before Jehovah,' v.7, (comp.xviii.5, xvii.12, and the contrary expression, 'stand before the congregation,' used of the Levites in N.xvi.9). So, then, it is here set forth that the ministering Levites received their support out of the Temple income, and through this law the right is maintained for every Levite that used to take part in that ministry. We cannot here think either of the 'tithes' or the 'offerings' and 'firstlings,' which belonged to the Priests alone, and must, consequently, assume that here reference is made to other supplies accruing to the Temple through vows, free-will gifts, and otherwise, and preserved in the treasuries and storehouses, and that from these, in the time of the Deuteronomist, the ministering Levites received their support. How much, however, this is at variance with the directions of the other books is obvious.

634. D.xi.6.

Here the destruction of 'Dathan and Abiram, the sons of Eliab, the son of Reuben,' is mentioned; but nothing is said about the death of 'Korah, the son of Izhar, the son of Kohath, the son of Levi,' who, according to N.xvi, perished fearfully at the same time, and who was, indeed, as appears from that narrative, the leader in the rebellion in question; nor is any notice taken of the destruction of the 'two hundred and fifty men, (Levites, apparently,) who offered incense.' v.5-11,35.

This, too, agrees with the practice of the Deuteronomist, in making no distinction between Priests and Levites. The sin of Korah and his company is stated to have been this, that, though

only *Levites*, they ‘sought the *Priesthood* also,’ N.xvi.10. This, it would seem, was considered to be not such a very grievous offence in the days of the Deuteronomist.

635. D.xi.14,15.

‘I will give you the rain of your land in his due season, the first rain and the latter rain, that thou mayest gather in thy corn, and thy wine, and thine oil. And I will send grass in thy fields for thy cattle, that thou mayest eat and be full.’

Here the writer passes unconsciously, from speaking in the assumed character of Moses, to speaking directly in the person of Jehovah. This single instance — (see also the similar instance in xxix.5,6,)—is sufficient to satisfy us as to the real nature of this book and its unhistorical character.

SCHULTZ observes here, *Deut. p.379*: —

‘Moses knows himself to be so entirely at one here, in all that he says, with the Lord, that he involuntarily passes over to introduce the Lord Himself as speaking, without having expressly indicated Him. The discourse gains hence, exactly here in the promise, where it was very appropriate, a special emphasis.’

Ans. There are many such promises scattered throughout the book, and some much stronger than these now before us, as in xxviii.1-14. How is it that in none of those the writer ‘involuntarily passes over’ in this way?

The LXX has avoided the difficulty, which probably was perceived by the translators, and reads, ‘And *He* will give you rain, &c.’

*636. D.xi.29,30.

I have already (242) drawn attention to the anachronism involved in the mention of the name ‘Gilgal’ in this passage, supposed to have been uttered by Moses in his address, before the name was given to the place by Joshua, as related in Jo.v.9.

One of my Reviewers, however, (*Guardian*, Feb.-11, 1863,) has remarked upon the above criticism as follows: —

‘Here is a blunder so gross that the man, who could perpetrate it, ought to be forever discredited as a caviller against Scripture. For nothing can be clearer than that there are two Gilgals, at least, mentioned in Scripture, one near Jericho, where Joshua crossed the Jordan, and the other mentioned in the above-cited passage of Deuteronomy, and also in Jo.xii.23. This last is identified and dis-

tinguished from the former Gilgal as 'beside the plains of Moreh.' The two places are scores of miles apart, and will be found set down quite distinctly in a good map of ancient Palestine. The site of the Gilgal 'beside the plains of Moreh,' over against Mount Ebal and Mount Gerizim, or in the neighbourhood of the 'coast of Dor,' Jo. xii. 23, 'is still marked by the large modern village of Jilgilia to the left of the Nablûs road, about two hours north of Bethel.' (SMITH'S *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geography*, Art. *Gilgal*.) Now we could easily pardon Bishop COLENSO'S ignorance of the fact that there were assuredly two Gilgals, though certainly, before a man comes forward to except against ancient documents of established credit, he might be expected to inform himself on such matters: we could regard with indulgence his slip as to the locality of the plains of Moreh, though Moreh be not an unfamiliar name, (*vide e.g.* G. xii. 6, Ju. vii. 1): but what shall we say as to the stupendous blunder, involved in the above extract, of supposing Mount Ebal and Mount Gerizim to be on the banks of the Jordan? Between these two mountains was the famous Shechem, for a time the capital of Ephraim; on the latter of them was in later times the Temple, the chief seat of the Samaritan worship. Yet all, and with them the scene from our Lord's conversation with the woman of Samaria, are by implication transferred by this D. D. to the place where Joshua crossed the Jordan! We don't doubt that the Natal Sunday Schools have more than one sharp Zulu scholar, 'a simple-minded, but intelligent, native—one with the docility of a child, but the reasoning powers of mature age,' who will be enabled to enlighten his Bishop about the geography of the Holy Land. We heartily wish that the exposure of this gross mistake may tend to make the Bishop more careful and more modest for the future.'

Ans. The Reviewer has evidently not observed that in (326) I have distinctly connected 'the plains (rather, oaks) of Moreh' with mount Gerizim, and have also spoken of that mountain as 'in a *central* situation, visible to all the country round.' It is a mistake, therefore, to suppose that I 'have committed the stupendous blunder, of supposing Mount Ebal and Mount Gerizim to be on the banks of the Jordan.'

Some, it is true, as KNOBEL (on D. xi. 30), suppose that the Gilgal here spoken of is different from the Gilgal near Jericho. Even if this were true, the argument in (242) would still remain. If there had been such a place known to their fathers, when they left Canaan to go down to Egypt two hundred and fifty years before, (though no such place is named in the histories of Genesis,) yet how could Moses reckon upon it as still existing, and still called by this name, or how could he speak to the people as knowing these facts? Or, if we suppose *Moses* to have known of this place by special Divine Inspiration, yet how could it be here mentioned, as a place with which the *people* were quite familiar, and by reference to which they might determine the site of mounts Ebal and Gerizim?

But what valid reason is there for supposing that the Gilgal in D. xi. 30 is different from that near Jericho, where Joshua pitched his camp? The only ground for this supposition, (except, of course, the anachronism which we are now considering,) seems to be that it is imagined that the description here given of the two

mountains would place them *near* Gilgal, and, therefore, near the banks of the Jordan, whereas their position was nearly central between the Jordan and the Mediterranean Sea. But the expression in D.xi.30 does not imply at all that Gerizim and Ebal were *near* Gilgal. 'Are they not on the other side Jordan, by the way where the sun goeth down (=towards the west), *in the land of the Canaanites which dwell in the Arabah over against Gilgal, beside the oaks of Moreh?*' The phrase 'over against Gilgal, מוֹלֵהַ הַגִּלְגָּל, *mul hag Gilgal,*' seems to be used to mark the position of those tribes of the Canaanites, which are here referred to, as not being in the *north* or *south*, but about the *middle* of the Holy Land. In fact, the very mention of 'the land of the Canaanites which dwell, &c.,' implies, not a place, but a *tract of country*, which might reach away from the Jordan to some distance, though capable of being described generally as 'over against,' = 'about the latitude of,' Gilgal. The more exact position of the mountains is defined by the words 'beside (near) the oaks (terebinths) of Moreh.'

Again, it is plain that some *famous* Gilgal must here be referred to,—not a place of lesser note, if any such there was, which might happen to bear the name of Gilgal. If there were *two*, or even *three* or *four*, Gilgals, as KNOBEL supposes, existing before the time of Moses and Joshua, the Gilgal here mentioned *must* surely have been the most distinguished of them all, or else it would not have been merely named, without any further definition, as a guide to the Israelites towards determining the site of the two mountains; and, indeed, unless the place were *very notable*, it would have been much more natural to have referred to these remarkable mountains as determining the situation of the place, instead of referring to the place in order to identify the mountains. Now the Gilgal near Jericho is, as KNOBEL himself says, (on Jo. xv.7,) 'very often mentioned, *e.g.* as the place where Joshua erected twelve stones, Jo.iv.19,20, which, in a later day, seem to have been replaced by *hewn* stones, Ju.iii.19,—where also he circumcised the Israelites, Jo.v.9,10, and had his camp for a long time, Jo.ix.6, x.6,7,9,15,43, xiv.6, Mic.vi.5,—where Samuel held public assemblies, and consecrated Saul, 1S.vii.16, x.8, xi,14,15,—where Saul undertook to offer sacrifice, 1S.xiii.4,7,8,12,15, xv.12,21,33,—whither David came on his return home, 2S.xix.15,40. As the first place where Israel encamped in Canaan it was a holy town.' KNOBEL considers also that the same place is referred to in Jo.xv.7. And he has here quoted *every* passage in Joshua, Judges, and the books of Samuel, where the name Gilgal is mentioned, and referred them all to the Gilgal by Jericho,—except *one*, Jo.xii.23, 'The king of Dor in the coast of Dor, one; the king of the nations of Gilgal, one;' and here he supposes another Gilgal to be meant, the same as in D.xi.30. His words are these (on D.xi.30): 'The Gilgal named for the definition of the site of Gerizim and Ebal must have been remarkable, and is, therefore, probably, the seat of royalty mentioned in Jo.xii.23. EUSEBIUS and JEROME speak of a *Galgulis* six miles, or about two hours, north of Antipatris [on the sea-coast], the modern *Kefr-Saba*, west of Nablôus. That would be the modern *Kilkilia*, a small tract north-east of *Kefr-Saba*, which, according to others, is called *Gilgoul*. There is also a *Jiljuleh* south-east of *Kefr-Saba*, on the road from Egypt to Damascus,

which formerly must have been remarkable. One of these two is meant here [*i.e.* in D.xi.30],—perhaps, also the district, since it was named after the place. Different from this is the Gilgal by Jericho, as well as the modern *Jiljilia*, south of Nabloûs, a large village which lies very high, and commands an extensive prospect. Probably this *Jiljilia* is the same as the Gilgal, from which Elijah and Elisha *went down* to Bethel, 2K.ii.1, and where Elisha was afterwards found, 2K.iv.38, the same also as the famous place of idolatrous worship, Hos.iv.15, ix.15, xii.11, Am.iv.4, v.5.'

We have now had brought before us *every single instance* in the Bible, where the word Gilgal is named. All the passages just quoted, however, are referred by Canon STANLEY to the Gilgal by Jericho, *Jewish Church*, p.230: 'Gilgal long retained reminiscences of its ancient sanctity. The twelve stones taken up from the bed of the Jordan continued at least till the time of the composition of the Book of Joshua, and seem to have been invested with a reverence, which came to be regarded at last as idolatrous, Ju.iii.19,26, Hos.iv.15, ix.15, xii.11, Am.iv.4, v.5.' Equally plain it seems to be that the Gilgal named in 2K.ii.1, iv.38, is the same 'Gilgal by Jericho.' It was a place where 'sons of the prophets' lived, 2K.iv.38-41, as they would be likely to do at a place so hallowed; and it was *near the Jordan*, 2K.vi.4, which seems at once to decide the question. It is not said that Elijah and Elisha 'went down' *from Gilgal* to Bethel; but 'Elijah went with Elisha from Gilgal,' 2K.ii.1; and *on the way*, apparently, the conversation in v.2 is supposed to have taken place; and so 'they went down to Bethel.' They may be supposed, therefore, to have reached some place, where Bethel was either *below or to the south of* them; in which case they would be said to 'go down' to it.

On Jo.xii.23, KEIL writes as follows:—'King of the Goyim at Gilgal. The word גוֹיִם, *Goyim*, 'nations,' generally means *Gentiles*; but this rendering does not seem appropriate here, since all the Canaanites were, of course, Gentiles. And from the fact that in G.xiv.1 a king of the Goyim (E.V. 'nations') is mentioned in connection with Shinar, Ellasar, and Elam, it seems most natural to suppose that there were certain tribes, called by the *Proper Name* of 'Goyim,' and that the inhabitants of Gilgal belonged to these tribes. The Gilgal mentioned here is *not* the city spoken of in Jo.ix.6, x.6, &c., and D.xi.30, which still exists in the village of *Jiljilia*; but is the town by the name of Galgulis about six miles north of Antipatris, which is still to be seen as a village in *Jiljule*.'

It will be seen that KNOBEL and KEIL, while both holding that the Gilgal of D.xi.30 is not the Gilgal-by-Jericho, yet are directly at variance with each other in determining *what* Gilgal it is. KNOBEL says it is the royal city in Jo.xii.23, and not *Jiljilia*; KEIL says it is *Jiljilia*, and *not* the place in Jo.xii.23. From what has been said, it can scarcely be doubted that it really—neither one nor the other, but is meant to be the famous Gilgal-by-Jericho, to which so much celebrity was attached in all times of the Hebrew history.

As regards the 'king of the tribes at Gilgal,' it is possible that the place near Antipatris may be meant, as both KNOBEL and KEIL suppose, since the places named in the immediate context before and after, v.20-24, Shimron, Achsaph, Taanach, Megiddo, Kedesh, Jokneam, Dor, Gilgal, Tizrah, were all in this neigh-

bourhood. There is, however, a great leap in the map from Kedesh or Kadesh-Naphtali to Jokneam, and still greater from Megiddo to Kedesh, the order of the places being so confused and retrograde that it can scarcely be believed that the list of conquered kings is intended to be regarded as expressing the *topographical* order of the places, and, indeed, KEIL observes, (on Jo.xii.15), 'Historical considerations prevail in this list above the geographical; and hence the fact, that two places are mentioned in immediate connection, does not involve their having originally stood close together.' In fact, the leap from Dor to Gilgal-by-Jericho would be not much more than from Megiddo to Kedesh. It may be noted that in *every* instance where Gilgal is named, except in Jo.xii.23, it is always used with the *article*, הַגִּלְגָּל, *hag-Gilgal*; whereas in this particular instance we have simply מְלֶכְ הַגִּלְגָּל, *melek goyim lëGilgal*, the 'chief of the tribes at Gilgal.' This may, perhaps, indicate a different place from the Gilgal. Further, the LXX has βασιλέα τῆς Γαλιλαίας, 'king of *Gey of Galilee*,' which suggests that the original reading may have been מְלֶכְ הַגִּלְגָּל, *melek goyim lëGalil*, 'king of the nations of Galilee;' comp. גְּלִיל הַגִּוִּיִּם. *Gëtil haggoyim*, 'Galilee of the nations,' Is.viii.29(ix.1). But it is impossible to suppose that such an obscure place as this, whose very existence is doubtful, which is placed on the sea-coast, and is named only this once in the Bible, can be meant as a mark by which the two mountains, which were so remarkable in themselves, might be distinguished from other mountains.

KEIL, however, as we have seen, supposes that the modern village of *Jiljilia* is the site of Gilgal in Jo.ix.6,x.6, &c. as well as in D.xi.30, and he further identifies it with the Gilgal mentioned in Judges and 1Samuel—directly in opposition again to KNOBEL. His words are these (on Jo.ix.5): 'Gilgal, though regarded by the great body of commentators and geographers as the same place as that in which the Israelites first encamped, Jo.iv.19, is a different place altogether. It was no other than the Gilgal which we frequently meet with in Judges and 1Samuel, situated on the mountains in the vicinity of Bethel, and which still exists under the name of *Jiljilia*. . . . Nothing but the fact of there being no other Gilgal in Canaan could justify us in supposing that the present Gilgal was situated in the valley of the Jordan. But, as there was another, and it is said moreover to have stood opposite to the mountains Ebal and Gerizim, D.xi.30, we assume without hesitation that Joshua pitched his tent there. *For we dare not for a moment attribute to Joshua the folly of going back, after he had penetrated to the very heart of the country, and again taking up his position on the extreme eastern border of the land, thus leaving the Canaanites at perfect liberty to move unfettered amidst the very cities and places that he had already conquered.*'

KEIL, it appears, assuming the *historical truth* of the narrative in the book of Joshua, finds that Joshua would have been guilty of a great act of 'folly,' if he had done what he is there said to have done; and, therefore, he makes no scruple of assuming that he *must* have changed his camp from one Gilgal to another Gilgal; though the first name was given by himself to the place of encampment, to commemorate the occasion of circumcising the people, Jo.v.9; and, therefore, if he did remove to a second Camp, called by the same name, it would be the natural and

almost necessary conclusion, that he himself gave it the name of Gilgal, in commemoration of the former Camp, in which case the arguments against the historical value of the record in D.xi.30 would remain as before, since this place, 'opposite the mountains Ebal and Gerizim,' could not have received its name of Gilgal, till Joshua's time. But, in truth, there is not the slightest pretence for supposing that the story intends this camp of Joshua to be removed from *the* Gilgal by Jericho.

He adds: 'It may be objected to this that we are not told that Joshua removed the camp to Gilgal [*i.e.* this *second* Gilgal] after the capture of Ai. This is true, but it proves nothing, as anyone may perceive who reflects that in Jo.viii.30 we find no account of his proceeding from Ai to the mountains Ebal and Gerizim, and that in fact the book does not give a consecutive account of all the marches and tactics of Joshua, but merely a cursory description, from the theocratic point of view, of the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites under Joshua. It was, no doubt, the favourable opportunities, which Gilgal [this *second* Gilgal] afforded to Joshua for the execution of his plans both in the North and South of the land, that induced him to select it as his head-quarters. It was in the centre of the country, situated upon a steep hill with good table-land upon the top, and commanded a most extensive prospect of the large plain in the west, and also towards the north and east.'

But a reference to Jo.viii.30 will show that the cases are not at all similar, though we do not regard that record as historically true. In fact the account of Joshua's sacrifice in Jo.iv.30,31, comes in disjointedly and is obviously quite out of place, being suitable only to a time when the whole country had been conquered, not to the time at which it is placed. Who can suppose that 'all the congregation of Israel,' including 'the women and the little ones and the strangers,' v.30, had marched into the very heart of the country, when the army had done nothing beyond taking the towns of Jericho and Ai?

But it is impossible to believe that in Jo.v.10 it should be written, 'the children of Israel encamped in Gilgal,' and in Jo.ix.6, 'they went to Joshua unto the Camp at Gilgal,' and that no intimation whatever should be given that the places of encampment, though called by the same name, were entirely different. Besides, the Gilgal, in Jo.iv.19 seems to have been near 'the city of palm-trees,' Ju.iii.13, that is, Jericho, D.xxxiv.3. And so in 1S.x.8 Samuel speaks of 'Saul going down to Gilgal,' which would suit very well the Gilgal by Jericho, but could hardly have been used of such a place as KEIL supposes, 'situated on a steep hill,' near Ebal and Gerizim, and, therefore, lying to the *north* both of Samuel at Ramah and of Saul at Gibeah.

Upon the whole, we conclude that there is no reason to doubt that the Gilgal mentioned in D.xi.30 is Gilgal-by-Jericho, and that, consequently, we have here a remarkable anachronism in the narrative. It is open, of course, for any one to say that this verse is a later interpolation. But what did the Israelites know of *Ebal* or *Gerizim* at the time when the words in D.xi.29 are supposed to have been spoken?

CHAPTER VII.

DEUT.XII.1—XIII.18.

* 637. D.xii.2—8.

‘Ye shall utterly destroy all the places, wherein the nations which ye shall possess served their gods, upon the high mountains, and upon the hills, and under every green tree; and ye shall overthrow their altars, and break their pillars, and burn their Asheras (E.V. ‘groves’) with fire, and ye shall hew down the graven images of their gods, and destroy the names of them out of that place. Ye shall not do so unto Jehovah your God. But unto the place which Jehovah your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put His Name there, even unto His habitation shall ye seek, and thither thou shalt come; and thither ye shall bring your burnt-offerings, and your sacrifices, &c. . . . Ye shall not do after all the things that we do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes.’

Here we have the first time the announcement, which we find in none of the earlier books of the Pentateuch—not even in N.xxviii,xxix, where the laws of the offerings at the different festivals are laid down, it is supposed, by the Divine Being himself, only a few months previously,—but which is repeated again and again in this Book of Deuteronomy, *viz.* that there should be one special place, which Jehovah would ‘choose out of all the tribes to put His Name there.’ All this — (if we assume that Deuteronomy was written at a later age than the rest of the Pentateuch)—is indicative of such a time as that of Hezekiah, 2K.xviii.4, or, more probably, Josiah, 2K.xxiii.4—20, for the composition of this book.

638. The idea, indeed, of *drawing* the affections of the people to Jerusalem, existed, no doubt, in the time of David and Solomon. But the notion of requiring them to bring to the

Temple all their ‘burnt-offerings, sacrifices, tithes, heave-offerings, and vows,’ *v.11*, and making attendance at Jerusalem *compulsory* three times a year, *xvi.16*, could scarcely have arisen in an age, when Solomon, though he ‘loved Jehovah, walking in the statutes of David his father,’ yet ‘sacrificed and burnt incense in the high places,’ *1K.iii.3*, and specially at the ‘great high place’ of Gibeon, *v.4*, (whereas the Ark, the symbol of God’s Presence, was at that time in the Tabernacle on Mount Zion,) nor in an age when the people of the Ten Tribes would have had to travel all the way to Jerusalem for that purpose. We do not read that the prophets of Israel, such as Elijah or Elisha, ever went to Jerusalem to keep the Passover, or obeyed the solemn command to go up thrice in every year to the ‘place which Jehovah had chosen.’ And the most pious kings, such as Asa, Jehoshaphat, Joash, Amaziah, Uzziah, and Jotham, Hezekiah’s grandfather, still sacrificed without hesitation on the high places, and brought their offerings to other altars than that erected in the Temple,—which they would not have done, we must believe, if this law existed, and was known to be of Divine, or even of Mosaic, origin.

639. RIEHM observes, *Gesetzgebung in Lande Moab*, p.40:—

It was certainly impracticable that every Israelite out of the *whole* land should come to Jerusalem to make atonement for every trespass wittingly or unwittingly committed.

According to the older law in *L.v,vi*, sacrifices were to be offered for trespasses of every day occurrence, *e.g.*—

‘If a soul touch any unclean thing, whether it be a carcase of an unclean beast, or a carcase of unclean cattle, or the carcase of unclean creeping things, and *it be hidden from him*, he also shall be unclean and guilty,’ *L.v.2*;

‘If he touch the uncleanness of man, whatsoever uncleanness it be that a man shall be defiled withal, and *it be hid from him*, when he knoweth of it, then he shall be guilty,’ *v.3*;

‘If a soul commit a trespass, and *sin through ignorance*, in the holy things of Jehovah, then he shall bring for his trespass unto Jehovah a ram, &c.’ *v.15*;

‘If a soul sin, and commit any of those things which are forbidden to be done by the commandments of Jehovah, *though he wist it not*, yet is he guilty, and shall bear his iniquity; and he shall bring a ram without blemish out of the flock . . .

for a trespass offering, unto the Priest . . . he hath certainly trespassed against Jehovah, v.18,19.

In short, comparing v.2, above quoted, with L.xi,29,30, where among 'unclean creeping things' are registered the 'mole,' 'mouse,' 'tortoise,' 'frog,' 'snail,' and certain lizards, anyone who accidentally touched the carcass of one of these, by that act 'had certainly trespassed against Jehovah,' and must offer a trespass offering.

640. It is impossible to believe that such laws were ever expected literally to be carried out, much less that they were ever uttered by the Almighty, as in that case they must have so entirely confused all principles of right and wrong in the minds of the people. They were laid down, as we believe, and shall hereafter give our reasons for believing, in the days of Solomon, when the Temple Services were first instituted, and some directory was needed for the guidance of the Priests in such matters as these, as well as for regulating the supply for the Priests themselves from the offerings of the people. And thus we find the prescriptions laid down, not as for the wilderness only, but especially for the settled life in the Holy Land, by the express mention of 'turtle doves' and 'young pigeons' as victims in v.7,11.

641. There is no sign, however, that such laws were *promulgated* among the people at large: though, doubtless, pious persons were taught by the Priests their duty in this respect, and some would at all times wish to be cleansed, by the appointed course of sacrifice, from any special pollutions of this kind, which they had contracted. But it cannot be supposed that for each such offence, however trifling, it was needful for every Israelite, who desired to obey strictly the (supposed) Law of Jehovah his God, to go up with a sacrifice to Jerusalem, whether from the distant Dan, a journey of two hundred miles, or from the trans-Jordanic lands, when that river 'overflowed its banks in time of harvest.' And, though the Deuteronomist seems to include all manner of sacrifices in

v.6, yet he seems afterwards, in v.13,14, to restrict the command to 'burnt-offerings' only, and allows that the places, 'which Jehovah would choose to put His Name there,' might be 'too far' for them to allow of their going up to it in order to kill, when they wished to 'eat flesh,' v.15,21.

642. But, doubtless, the Temple, with its comparative grandeur and its choral services, *was* the means of drawing many from all parts of the land to Jerusalem,—more especially as the older Sanctuaries at Ramah, Bethel, Mizpeh, &c. seem to have been discontinued at the time when David erected his Tabernacle on Mount Zion. The 'high places,' indeed, were still left standing at Gibeon and elsewhere; and it is possible that many still continued the custom, which the older laws seem to have allowed, E.xx.24, xxiii.14,17, of presenting themselves before Jehovah three times a year, by frequenting the high place nearest to their own neighbourhood. But others, no doubt, would be attracted by the new Temple and its services, which probably surpassed even those of David's Tabernacle. The presence of the Court would be an additional inducement. And, doubtless, also, there was a continual *pressure*, though, perhaps, of a gentle kind, exerted upon the people, to draw them more and more to Jerusalem. Hence we find Jeroboam fully aware of the political tendency of this practice, 1K.xii.27,—

'If this people go up to do sacrifice in the House of Jehovah at Jerusalem, then shall the hearts of this people turn again unto their lord, even unto Rehoboam, king of Judah.'

And, accordingly, he says to the Ten Tribes, 'It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem,' and sets up the calves in Dan and Bethel, marking these as the principal places of concourse for his people on festal occasions.

643. In Solomon's days, however, the time was not yet ripe for a formal command that 'all the males' should go up to Jerusalem at each of the great Feasts. Rather, the announcement of such a law seems to point to a time, when the Ten Tribes had

been carried off into captivity, and *there remained only the small centralised kingdom of Judah*. In that case, the injunction, that all the males should go up to Jerusalem three times a year from all parts of the land, would not have been so utterly extravagant, or so impossible to be obeyed, as the people could all be living within a day or two's journey of the capital. But even then the inconveniences must have been so very great, that it is incredible that such a law could ever have been strictly and habitually acted on, as its language requires. Nor is there any indication in the history of its ever having been put in practice, except once in the days of Josiah, when, probably, as we have seen (571), this very Book of Deuteronomy had just been found in the Temple.

644. And this view is confirmed, as we have said (620, 638), by the fact that the best of the kings of Judah, down to the time of Hezekiah, are spoken of in the Books of Kings—and without any very *strong* word of censure, though the Chronicler, writing in a much later day, condemns their conduct in this respect—as allowing the people still to sacrifice in the high places, while the Ark was now set up at Jerusalem, as Asa, 1K. xv. 14, Jehoshaphat, xxii. 43, Joash, 2K. xii. 3, Amaziah, xiv. 4, Uzziah, xv. 4, Jotham, xv. 35. In each of these cases there is some decisive language used in commendation of the king's conduct: thus—

Asa's 'heart was perfect with Jehovah all his days,'—

Jehoshaphat 'walked in all the ways of Asa his father, he turned not aside from it, doing that which was right in the eyes of Jehovah,'—

Joash 'did that which was right in the sight of Jehovah, all his days *wherein Jehoiada the Priest instructed him*,'—

Amaziah, Uzziah, Jotham,—each 'did that which was right in the sight of Jehovah, yet not like David his father; he did according to all things as his father had done.'

And in each case it is added,—

'Howbeit the high places were not removed; the people sacrificed and burned incense still in the high places.'

645. It can hardly be believed that the stringent commands of the Book of Deuteronomy, to 'utterly destroy' all the high places

of the heathen, and sacrifice to Jehovah only at Jerusalem, could have been read and studied by these pious princes, much less *copied*, as D.xvii.18–20 directs, by each of them with his own hand, when seated upon the throne of his kingdom. More especially does this apply to the case of Joash, who began to reign when seven years old, 2K.xi.21, and for the greater part of his life was directed wholly by the High Priest, Jehoiada.

646. Hezekiah, 2K.xviii.4, seems to have been the first of the kings of Judah, who set himself to destroy the high places, which, although originally intended for the worship of Jehovah, were probably perverted, more or less, to the practice of idolatry, and, as such, had become fruitful nurseries of vice. In his time, or shortly before it, the prophets, Hosea in Israel, Isaiah and Micah in Judah, had condemned, in strong terms, the worship on high places.

‘They sacrifice upon the tops of the mountains,
And burn incense upon the hills,
Under oaks and poplars and elms,
Because the shadow thereof is good;
Therefore your daughters shall commit whoredom,
And your daughters-in-law shall commit adultery.
I will not punish your daughters when they commit whoredom,
Nor your daughters-in-law when they commit adultery;
For themselves are separated with whores,
And they sacrifice habitually with harlots.’ Hos.iv.13,14.

‘Ye shall be ashamed of the oaks which ye have desired,
And ye shall be confounded for the gardens which ye have chosen.’ Is.i.29.

‘For the transgression of Jacob is all this,
And for the sins of the House of Israel.

What is the transgression of Jacob? Is it not Samaria?

And what are the high places of Judah? Are they not Jerusalem?’ Mic.i.5.

647. It is probable that such prophetic words as these were sharpened by the fact of the Ten Tribes having been carried captive in the sixth year of Hezekiah, by which his zeal also may have been stimulated to destroy the high places, and check the other idolatrous practices of Judah, 2K.xviii.4. But the very expressions in D.xii.8,—

‘Ye shall not do after all the things that we do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes,’—

wholly inapplicable, as they must surely be considered to be, to any conceivable condition of the people of Israel, in the ‘plains of Moab,’ with Moses himself in their midst, correspond thoroughly to the feelings of a Prophet writing in the age of Josiah, after the godless reigns of Manasseh and Amon. As RIEHM observes, *Gesetzgebung*, &c. p.30:—

The writer, in these words, betrays his consciousness that the attaching all public worship to one Sanctuary was *in his time* somewhat *new*, and that he is putting into the mouth of Moses what he himself could say of his own contemporaries, who sacrificed, as they chose, in various places. It seems to me certain that Moses himself could not have spoken such words as these in D.xii.8, if the real substance of L.xvii.1-9 and other laws of sacrifice are really his.

648. Upon the whole, it may be concluded that such a law as this, confining all sacrifices to Jerusalem, could not have been written before the age of Hezekiah. The destruction of the high places would be a practical measure, which would draw more direct attention to the Temple. In the reign of his son Manasseh, these high places were rebuilt, 2K.xxi.3, and idolatry, again prevailed throughout the land. The short reign of Amon, for two years only, 2K.xxi.19, continued the same corrupt practices. And then, as we suppose, may have been the time, in the early years of Josiah when the young king’s piety, and the limited extent of his kingdom, together favoured the idea of realising such a unity of worship, by which idolatrous practices (it was supposed) might be effectually and for ever done away, at which the attempt was made to *enforce* attendance at the Temple for all sacrifices, by the authority of a (supposed) Mosaic and Divine law.

* 649. D.xii.12.

‘And the Levite that is within your gates.’

We must here draw special attention to the fact that the Deuteronomist in this verse, and throughout the whole book, instead of speaking of the Priests and Levites as about to be

settled in their forty-eight cities, N.xxxv.1-8, and as sure to be abundantly supplied with the necessaries of life from the sacrifices, tithes, and freewill offerings of the people, represents them everywhere — the *Levites*, at all events, and we have seen that in the term ‘*Levites*’ he includes the ‘*Priests*’ — as likely to be generally in a very necessitous condition, living as stragglers about the land, in ‘any of the gates’ of the people. It is true that in xviii.1-8 he makes some provision from the sacrifices for ‘the *Priests* the *Levites*, all the tribe of *Levi*,’— though here also, as we shall see (716—720), he is strikingly at variance with the older document. And in xvii.9-13, xix.17, xxi.5, certain judicial duties are assigned to them, at variance again (700, 703, 704) with the provisions of the older law. Further, in xxxiii.10,11, he speaks very highly of the office and dignity of the *Levites* :—

‘They shall teach Jacob Thy judgments,
 And Israel Thy Law ;
 They shall put incense before Thee,
 And whole burnt sacrifice upon Thine altar.
 Bless, O Jehovah, his substance,
 And accept the work of his hands ;
 Smite through the loins of them that rise against him,
 And of them that hate him, that they rise not again.’

But he makes not the least allusion to their being settled in cities of their own ; he takes it for granted that they will be mostly living ‘within the gates’ of others, and that the ordinary condition of a *Levite*—at least, of any that had *not* ‘come from any of the gates out of all Israel, where he sojourned, and come with all the desire of his mind unto the place which Jehovah should choose,’ xviii.6—would be one of utter poverty and dependence.

650. Thus, throughout the Book of Deuteronomy, the *Levites* are coupled continually with the poor and destitute, ‘the widow, the stranger, and the fatherless.’ Not a word is said of their having any divine right to *demand*, or, at least, to *expect*, the payment of *tithes* from the people, according to the provision,

supposed to have been made by Jehovah himself, N.xviii.21, only a few months before, through Moses, who is now represented to be speaking —

‘Behold, I have given the children of Levi all the tenth] in Israel for an inheritance.’

But they are spoken of, again and again, as depending, like other necessitous persons, mainly upon the charity of others.

‘And ye shall rejoice before Jehovah your God, ye, and your sons, and your daughters, and your menservants, and your maidservants, and *the Levite that is within thy gates*, forasmuch as he hath no part nor inheritance with you,’ xii.12; so also v.18.

‘Take heed to thyself that thou *forsake not the Levite*, as long as thou livest upon the earth,’ xii.19.

‘And *the Levite*, (because he hath no part nor inheritance with thee,) and *the stranger*, and *the fatherless*, and *the widow*, that are within thy gates, shall come, and shall eat and be satisfied,’ xiv.29.

‘And thou shalt rejoice before Jehovah thy God, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy manservant, and thy maidservant, and *the Levite that is within thy gates*, and *the stranger*, and *the fatherless*, and *the widow*, that are among you,’ xvi.11.

‘And thou shalt rejoice in thy feast, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy manservant, and thy maidservant, and *the Levite*, and *the stranger*, and *the fatherless*, and *the widow*, that are within thy gates,’ xvi.14.

So we have ‘the Levite and the stranger that is among you,’ ‘the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow,’ xxvi.11–13; and in xviii.6 the Levite is actually spoken of as one of the גֵרִים, *gerim*, ‘strangers’ or ‘sojourners’ within the gates of others. And all this, as we have said, is supposed to be said by Moses only a few months after the laws had been laid down by Jehovah Himself, which provided for them abundant supplies of food, and cities of their own with their suburbs, thirty-six for the Levites, twelve for the Priests!

Not a trace of this poverty is found in the other books of the Pentateuch.

651. D.xii.15,16.

‘Notwithstanding thou mayst kill and eat flesh in all thy gates, whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, according to the blessing of Jehovah thy God, which he hath

given thee; the unclean and the clean may eat thereof, as of the roebuck and as of the hart. Only ye shall not eat the blood; ye shall pour it on the earth like water.'

It is obvious that this Law is directly at variance with L.xvii. 3,4, where it is said,—

'What man soever there be of the house of Israel, that killeth an ox, or lamb, or goat in the camp, or that killeth it out of the camp, and bringeth it not unto the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation, to offer an offering unto Jehovah before the Tabernacle of Jehovah, blood shall be imputed unto that man, he hath shed blood; and that man shall be cut off from among his people.'

652. RIEHM, *Gesetzgebung*, &c., p.29, observes on this point as follows:—

Although the Deuteronomist and the more ancient legislations agree in this, that they restrict the lawful, public, worship of God to one place, yet are they distinguished in this respect, that the latter knows nothing of a *fixed, permanent* place of the one Sanctuary, while the Deuteronomist speaks constantly of the one Sanctuary in such a manner that he sets forth the *permanence* of the place, and, as such, does not, indeed, expressly name Jerusalem, but yet indicates it plainly enough. The Deuteronomist, then, wishes to attach all public worship to the Temple at Jerusalem. On this account, also, he orders the destruction of all Canaanitish idol-places. Since, however, through this the law, that *all* animals, of the kinds used for sacrifice, should be slaughtered as thank-offerings in front of the Sanctuary, could no longer be carried out, the writer *expressly removes it*, in that he allows the slaughtering and eating of animals at pleasure in the separate towns, and only prescribes that they shall treat the food as *common*, not as *consecrated*, food—'the unclean, as well as the clean, shall eat thereof,' as of ordinary game.

653. He adds also, p.410:—

The blood, as the seat of life, is throughout the whole Law always treated with the greatest respect and reverence. Hence the oft repeated warning against eating blood, G.ix.4, L.iii.17, vii.26,27, xvii.10-14, xix.26, appears again in Deuteronomy, where permission is given to slay and eat cattle at will. But yet that religious consideration for blood seems somewhat weakened. For, whereas formerly it was so great, that even the blood of an animal killed in hunting must be *covered with earth*, L.xvii.13, (see Job xvi.18, Ez.xxiv.7,8,) that it might not cry to God for vengeance, the Deuteronomist only provides that the blood of an animal slain for private use shall be *poured out upon the ground like common water*, D.xii.16,24, xv.23.

654. D.xii.17-19.

'Thou mayest not eat within thy gates the tithe of thy corn, or of thy wine, or of thy oil, or the firstlings of thy herds or of thy flock, nor any of thy vows which thou vowest, nor thy freewill offerings, or heave offering of thine hand. But thou

must eat them before Jehovah thy God, in the place which Jehovah thy God shall choose, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy manservant, and thy maid-servant, and the Levite that is within thy gates; and thou shalt rejoice before Jehovah thy God in all that thou puttest thine hands unto. Take heed to thyself that thou forsake not the Levite as long as thou livest upon the earth.'

But the *tithes* above mentioned belonged *wholly* to the Levites, according to the law in N. xviii. 21, 24, 26, supposed to have been laid down only just before, in the very same year in which this 'last address' of Moses was delivered; and the *firstlings* belonged wholly to the Priests, N. xviii. 15-18.

And here the *people* are to feast upon them, and not to forsake' the Levite within their gates, but admit him to a share in their enjoyment!

The most complete contradiction obviously exists between the two sets of laws, supposed to be uttered, the first directly by Jehovah Himself, the second by Moses, within a few months of each other.

655. SCOTT, with other commentators, imagines a *second* tithe, and supposes that—

Either the *female firstlings*! [where has one ever heard of these?] or some other of thy young cattle, [but the text says distinctly 'firstlings of thy herds and of thy flocks,' the same expression exactly as in D. xii. 6, 17, xv. 19, and the same word, בְּכֹרִים, *bēchor*, 'firstling,' is used in E. xi. 5, xii. 12, 29, xiii. 2, 15, L. xxvii. 26, N. iii. 41, and, especially, N. xviii. 15, 17,] being presented as peace-offerings, were thus to be feasted on before the Lord.

But the notion of 'firstling females' being here intended is at once set aside by the plain words of D. xv. 19, 20:—

'All the *firstling males*, that come of thy herd and of thy flock, thou shalt sanctify unto Jehovah thy God. Thou shalt do no work with the firstling of thy bullock, nor shear the firstling of thy sheep; thou shalt—[have the blood sprinkled, and the fat offered, and leave the flesh for the Priests, as commanded in N. xviii. 17, 18? no, but]—*eat* it before Jehovah thy God, year by year, in the place which Jehovah shall choose, *thou and thy household.*'

But SCOTT is not discouraged even here, and writes directly in the teeth of the above text,—

The firstling, *being a male*, was sacrificed, and those parts, which were not burnt upon the Altar, were eaten by the Priests. But, *if it were a female*, it was offered as a peace-offering, and feasted upon by the offerer and his friends.

656. As to the supposed 'second tithe' it must be said :—

(i) The 'tithes' are here spoken of just in the same way as the 'firstlings.' If the latter are the same as those spoken of in the old legislation, it is reasonable to suppose that the same is true of the former also.

(ii) If the 'firstlings' are no longer to be given to the Priests, it is not reasonable to suppose that the 'tithes' of the old Law would be left for the Levites ;

(iii) Not a hint is given of the (supposed) *first* tithes in Deuteronomy, nor of the *second* tithes in the law of N.xviii, supposed to be laid down by Jehovah a few months previously ;

(iv) Not a word is said in D.xviii,3,4, of the *tithe of the first tithe* forming any portion of the income of the Priests, as commanded in N.xviii.28.

657. D.xii.27.

'And the blood of thy *sacrifices* shall be *poured out upon the altar* of Jehovah thy God.'

But, according to the Levitical Law, the blood, in the case of *burnt-offerings*, *peace-offerings*, or *trespass-offerings*, was to be '*sprinkled round about upon the altar*,' L.i.5,11, iii.2,8,13, vii.2, or, if the offering was a bird, '*wrung out at the side of the altar*,' i.15 ; in the case of *sin-offerings*, some of it was to be sprinkled before the vail, some put upon the horns of the altar, and the rest poured at the bottom of the altar, Liv.6,7,17,18,25,30,34, or, if a bird, '*sprinkled upon the side*,' and the rest '*wrung out at the bottom*' of the altar, v.9. In *no* case was it ordered that the blood should be '*poured out upon*' the altar.

658. D.xiii.12-16.

'If thou shalt hear say in one of thy cities, which Jehovah thy God hath given thee to dwell there, saying, Certain men, children of Belial, are gone out from among you, and have withdrawn the inhabitants of their city, saying, Let us go and serve other gods, which ye have not known ; Then shalt thou enquire, and make search, and ask diligently ; and behold, if it be truth, and the thing certain, that such abomination is wrought among you, thou shalt surely smite the inhabitants of that city with the edge of the sword, destroying it utterly, and all that is therein, and the cattle thereof, with the edge of the sword. And thou shalt gather all the spoil of it into the midst of the street thereof, and shalt burn with fire the city, and all the spoil thereof, every whit, for Jehovah thy God ; and it shall be an heap for ever ; it shall not be built again.'

SCOTT remarks on this passage as follows :—

Many distinctions have been made, both by Jewish and Christian expositors, to abate the severity of this law : but the text gives no countenance to any of them. It should not, indeed, be supposed that the crime was charged on the city, unless a majority of the inhabitants concurred in it, or that any individuals, who had entirely escaped the general contagion, might not separate from their guilty neighbours ; and, perhaps, space might on some occasions be allowed for repentance. The destruction of the spoil would evince that the prosecution and execution were not the effect of avarice, but of zeal for the honour of God and religion ; and nothing can be conceived more suited to restrain the people from idolatry than this statute. But *we never read that it was carried into execution*, and have reason to think that this neglect was a national sin, which hastened the Babylonish Captivity. Had some mortified limbs been cut off, the life of the state might have been prolonged.

659. Such a law, it is plain, could never have been carried out in this legal form. How were they to put a city on its trial, for the offence in question, so as to give it an opportunity of clearing itself of the charge ? And was every city to be destroyed, and utterly exterminated in this way, where, perhaps, an unruly mob—the majority—might have become for a time too strong for the better souls among them, and were these, too, to be involved in the general ruin ? For, as SCOTT says, the text gives no countenance to any abatement of the severe rigour of the law.

Probably, this law merely represents the strong feeling of the Deuteronomist upon the subject of idolatry. If it were possible, this is what he would have done to a city guilty of such abominations, which brought down the wrath of God upon Israel ; this is what such a city deserved in the eyes of God and of all good men. In this way he seeks to stir up a pious horror of the accursed sin. And the text points to a time when such guilt was prevalent.

660. HENGSTENBERG, ii.75, maintains that this law of Deuteronomy *was* carried out upon the Benjamites and Jabeshites in Ju.xx,xxi. But, in order to bring the offence in each case under the denomination of ‘worshipping other gods,’ we require, he says, ‘a spiritual, but not an arbitrary (!), interpretation,’ according to which any city, for any public offence whatever,

might have been brought in guilty of idolatry, and put under the curse. But then, he adds, there are special *verbal coincidences* between D.xiii.1,5, and Ju.xx.48, which imply that the law of Deuteronomy, as already existing, is referred to in the latter story. For they each contain the expression 'with the edge of the sword,' (which occurs 34 times in the Bible, *e.g.* Jer.xxi.7,) and the first commands to 'smite the inhabitants and the cattle thereof,' while the second says, 'they smote them, as well the men of the city, as the beast,' (and so Jer.vii.20, xxi.6, &c.); and D.xiii.16, orders 'Thou shalt burn with fire the city,' while Ju.xx.48, has 'They set on fire all the cities that they came to!'

The above is one of HENGSTENBERG's decisive arguments to show that the laws of the Pentateuch were actually in force in the time of the Judges.

CHAPTER VIII.

DEUT.XIV.1-29.

661. D.xiv.3-20.

We have here a repetition of the animals, allowed and disallowed for food, as in L.xi. The laws laid down are almost identical, except that the Deuteronomist —

(i) mentions by name the clean beasts, *v.4,5*, which the other writer does not;

(ii) introduces among the birds some bird of prey, Heb. *בְּיָהּ*, *dayah*, *v.13*; ;

(iii) omits mention of the locusts, as allowed for food, and of eight unclean animals, named in L.xi.29,30, where are reckoned together, in the same category as ‘creeping things,’ the ‘weasel, mouse, tortoise, ferret, chameleon, lizard, snail, and mole,’ of which those italicised are identified by Hebrew scholars, while there may be doubts about the others. KNOBEL observes on L.xi.29—

The writer mentions only those of the ‘creeping things,’ which were usually eaten, and forbids them. The Deuteronomist passes them over, and seems in his more advanced time to have found it no longer necessary to forbid them.

In fact, the statement in D.xiv.19, ‘every creeping thing that flieth (בְּלִשְׁרֵץ הָעוֹף, *kol sherets hahoph*,) is unclean unto you, they shall not be eaten,’ is at variance with that in L.xi.21-23, where we read, ‘These ye may eat, of every creeping thing that flieth, (מִכָּל לִשְׁרֵץ הָעוֹף, *mikkol sherets hahoph*,) and four forms of the locust are mentioned.

662. In L.xi.5,6, D.xiv.7, the *coney* (*shaphan*=jerboa?) and *hare* are spoken of as 'chewing the cud.' This, as KNOBEL says, is a mistake, which has probably arisen from the fact of these animals moving their jaws when they eat, as if they were chewing the cud, 'whence to all outward appearance they seemed to the ancients as ruminants.'

663. I have already quoted elsewhere on this point the authority of Prof. OWEN, who says,—

'The Hare does *not* chew the cud: it has not the stomach of a ruminant.'

For the following information I am indebted to Mr. BARTLETT, the superintendent of the Royal Zoological Gardens, London.

I have several hares living in the collection; and, having for some years carefully studied these animals in every stage of their existence, in order, if possible, to obtain a cross between this animal and the rabbit, to which it is nearly allied, I have in consequence become well acquainted with its habits and structure, both external and internal. My frequent examination of the stomach and intestines has convinced me that these animals have not the power to ruminate, and consequently that they 'do not chew the cud.'

The structure of the stomachs of all ruminating animals is remarkable, and well known to comparative anatomists. And this peculiar structure does not exist in any of the Order 'Rodentia,' to which the hare belongs.

But these animals possess very fleshy lips, and the muscles of the mouth are largely developed. By these means the parts are moved with great ease, and are kept in almost constant motion; and this, when noticed by persons whose knowledge of the subject is limited, might easily lead them to believe that the animal was chewing. This has, doubtless, led to the mistake made by the early writers.

664. D.xiv.22-27.

'Thou shalt truly tith all the increase of thy seed, that the field bringeth forth year by year. And *thou shalt eat* before Jehovah thy God, in the place which He shall choose to place His Name there, *the tithe of thy corn, of thy wine, and of thine oil, and the firstlings of thy herds and of thy flocks*; that thou mayest learn to fear Jehovah thy God always. And, if the way be too long for thee, so that thou art not able to carry it, or if the place be too far from thee, which Jehovah thy God shall choose to set His Name there, when Jehovah thy God hath blessed thee, then shalt thou turn it into money, and bind up the money in thine hand, and shalt go unto the place which Jehovah thy God shall choose. And thou shalt bestow that money for whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, for oxen, or for sheep, or for wine, or for strong drink, or for whatsoever thy soul desireth; and thou shalt eat there before Jehovah thy God, and *thou shalt rejoice, thou and thine household,*

and the Levite that is within thy gates; thou shalt not forsake him; for he hath no part nor inheritance with thee.'

665. In this passage, the permission is given that, if the way was too long, the whole of the *tithes* and *firstlings* might be turned into money; and the person must go up with this money in his hand, 'to the place which Jehovah shall choose,' and there buy with the money 'what his soul lusteth after, oxen, sheep, wine, strong drink, whatsoever his soul desireth;' and the good things thus provided were to be 'eaten before Jehovah' by the man and his household, and 'the Levite that is within thy gates—thou shalt not forsake him.'

666. But no such provision is made for the conversion of the *firstlings* into money, in N.xviii.17, a law supposed to be given by Jehovah Himself only a few months previously, which says:—

'The firstling of a cow, or the firstling of a sheep, or the firstling of a goat, thou shalt *not* redeem; they are holy; thou shalt *sprinkle their blood upon the Altar*, and shalt *burn their fat for an offering made by fire*, for a sweet savour unto Jehovah.'

And, as before observed (654), all the meat of the firstlings was expressly given to the *Priests* by the law in N.xviii.18, where we read,—

'And the flesh of them shall be thine, as the wave breast and as the right shoulder are thine.'

So, too, the *tithes* were expressly to be consumed by the Levites (except a tenth of them which they were to give to the *Priests*) by the law in N.xviii.25-32, where it is said, v.31—

'Ye (the *Levites*) shall eat it *in every place*, ye and your households; for it is your reward for your service in the Tabernacle of the Congregation.'

667. Here, however, in D.xiv.22-27, it is ordered, in direct contradiction to the above laws, issued, according to the story, *from the mouth of Jehovah Himself*, N.xviii.8,20,25, a few months previously, that the man who offers, and his family, and 'the Levite that is within his gates,' shall make a feast upon the produce of both the *Priests'* firstlings and the *Levites'* tithes,

at *Jerusalem*, xii.6,17-19, xiv.22-27, xv.19-23, whereas the Levites were to have eaten them at their homes 'in every place.'

SCOTT, as we have seen (655), takes refuge in the notion of 'female* firstlings,' and a 'second tithe.'

These verses require a second tithe from the produce of the land, which, with that appropriated for the maintenance of the Levites, amounted to a fifth part.

This certainly agrees with JOSEPHUS, *Ant.*iv.8.8:—

Let there be taken out of your fruits a tenth, besides that which you have allotted to give to the Priests and Levites. This you may indeed sell in the country; but it is to be used in those feasts and sacrifices, that are to be celebrated in the holy city.

But, if this be a *second* tithe, how is it, we repeat, that the Deuteronomist gives no intimation of this fact, and *makes no mention whatever of the first tithe*, to be contributed for the support of the Levites? Nor, when summing up the income of the Priests in D.xviii.1-5, does he take any account of the *tenth of the tithes*, which they were to receive from the Levites, N.xviii.25-32, or mention anywhere the tithe of *cattle*, L.xxvii.32,33.

668. The fact seems to be, as we have intimated, that the book of Deuteronomy only represents the state of ecclesiastical matters, which existed in the *later* days when that book was written. As already observed, the Priests are called by the later Prophets, as they are by the Deuteronomist, 'Levites,' simply, Jer.xxxiii.18,21,22, Ez.xliii.19, xlv.10,15, xlv.5, xlvi.13, or 'sons of Levi,' Ez.xl.46, Mal.iii.3, comp. Mal.ii.4,8,— and never 'sons of Aaron;' and so Jeroboam is censured, 1K.xii.31, for making Priests of men, 'which were not of the sons of Levi.' The name of Aaron, in fact, is but incidentally mentioned *once* by all the Prophets, Mic.vi.4; and Ezekiel calls

* SCOTT may have been misled by the feminine form בְּכוֹרוֹת, *bēchoroth*, which is used in D.xii.6,17, xiv.23, G.iv.3; but its meaning is masculine; since in the only other place where it occurs, Neh.x.37, we have וְאֶת-בְּכוֹרוֹת קִיָּנָה, *vēth bēchoroth banenu*, 'and the firstborns of our sons.'

the *faithful* Priests by the title 'sons of Zadok,' xl.46, xliii.19, xliv.15, xlviii.11.

669. It is probable, indeed, that we very greatly over-estimate the *number* and *importance* of the Priests in the time of the kings, taking for granted that they really enjoyed the privileges and dignities assigned to them by the laws of the Pentateuch. Yet, if we carefully examine the more authentic history of the later kings, which we find in the Second Book of Kings, we shall perceive indications that their number was but small and their influence inconsiderable. In the days of Josiah there were a 'chief Priest,' some 'Priests of the second order,' and others who are called 'keepers of the door,' 2K.xxiii.4. These 'door-keepers' are expressly called 'Priests' in 2K.xii.9; and in the time of Josiah's son, Zedekiah, there were only *five* 'Priests' ministering in the Temple, 2K.xxv.18, *viz.* one 'chief Priest,' one 'second Priest,' (בְּהֵן מִשְׁנֵה, *cohen mishneh*,) or 'Priest of the second order,' (see 2K.xxiii.4, בְּהֵן הַמִּשְׁנָה, *cohāne hammishneh*,) and three 'keepers of the door.'

670. This office of 'door-keeper,' however, is so totally unlike any assigned to the Priests in the earlier books of the Pentateuch, that the question is naturally suggested whether these 'Priests of the second order' do not, in reality, correspond to the *Levites* of those books, from among whom, we should suppose, the door-keepers would be taken. At any rate, it is easy to see how the Deuteronomist, if writing in these later days, would make no distinction between the higher and lower clergy, but would call them all by one common name, 'Priests' or 'Levites.' How very little regard, indeed, was paid in those days to the rank and authority of the Priests is shown by the fact that, when the King of Babylon carried Jehoiachin captive in the eighth year of his reign, and placed his uncle Zedekiah on the throne of Judah, we are told of his carrying with him 'all Jerusalem, and all the princes, and all the mighty men of valour, and all the craftsmen and smiths,' 2K.xxiv.14,—but

not a word is said about the Priests; yet it is plain that some Priests were carried off, since Jeremiah addresses them (Jer. xxix.1), and this may partly account for their being only *five* in number as we have said, in Zedekiah's time, shortly afterwards, 2K.xxv.18.

671. There is no indication, however, that they were ever very much more numerous. It is common to suppose that there must have been always a large body of Priests and Levites in attendance at the Temple, because the size of the Temple, as well as that of the City itself in Solomon's time, is very commonly over-estimated. As to the City, 'its *circumference*,' says BARTLETT, *Walks about Jerusalem*, p.28, 'at the best never exceeded *four miles*,' and *three* Temples of Solomon* might have been placed on the ground now occupied by the Church of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields in LONDON. We cannot wonder that in Solomon's, as in David's, time we read of only *two* Priests, 1K.iv.4, who had, doubtless, some attendants, or that in Zedekiah's time the whole body of ecclesiastics employed at the Temple was only *five*. Indeed, if two or three clergymen can discharge the duties of St. Martin's Church and Parish in London, two Priests and three door-keepers may very well have sufficed for a Temple one-third as large, and for a population so small as the ordinary population of Jerusalem must have been, considering that, at its widest extent, it was not two-thirds of a mile from the centre to the circumference.†

* The Temple was 60 cubits long and 20 cubits wide, 1K.vi.2, that is, since a cubit=1.824 ft., its area was 108 ft. by 36 ft.=3,991 sq. ft. That of the Church of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields is 137 ft. 8 in. by 81 ft. not including the steps and portico, (*Lib. of Entertaining Knowledge, Egypt. Ant. i.p.89.*)=11,151 sq. ft.

† I take no account here of the data of the books of Chronicles, which we have seen to be so very untrustworthy, when unsupported by other evidence. Thus it is stated that 'there came to David to Hebron, to turn the kingdom of Saul to him,' 4,600 Levites and 3,700 Priests of the sons of Aaron, 'and with them Zadok, a young man mighty of valour, and of his father's house twenty and two captains,' 1Ch.xii.26-28; and yet, although 'David consulted with the captains of thousands and hundreds, and with every leader,' about bringing up

K K

672. It would seem, however, that even for this small body of Priests and Levites the supplies of food were sometimes deficient; and it is very probable that the 'tithes' and 'firstlings' never were duly contributed for their support, as the earlier laws of the Pentateuch direct. Either these laws in Leviticus and Numbers had never been published extensively, which is most likely, or, if known to many among the people, they were not regarded as having any special authority, human or divine. And so the Priests and Levites appear to have fared but badly, like clergy in a colonial diocese upon a voluntary system. Having no Levitical cities nor pasture-lands, but living for the most part in a dependent condition, scattered about the land, 'in the gates' of others,—having no regular, abundant, supply from tithes, first-fruits, or firstlings, but deriving their sustenance almost entirely from the casual offerings and sacrifices, which pious persons brought to the Temple,—they seem, under the later kings, to have been often in real distress for the very necessaries of life. It is reasonable to believe that, in the time of David and Solomon, a portion of the royal revenues was applied directly to the support of Divine Worship. Even Saul had such a revenue, as we may gather from the language used in 1S.viii.15, 'he will take the tenth of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give to his eunuchs and to his servants;' though these words were, no doubt, written at a much later

the Ark, 1Ch.xiii.1, and 'gathered all Israel together' for the purpose, v.5, including, of course, and above all, these 8,300 Priests and Levites, he made use of *laymen* to remove the Ark in the first instance; and when, warned of his fault by the death of Uzzah, 1Ch.xv.12,13, he 'gathered all Israel,' again, v.3, and specially 'assembled the sons of Aaron and the Levites,' v.4, under such solemn circumstances, for so momentous an occasion, only *two* Priests and 862 Levites are reported as answering to the call, v.5-10.

We shall have occasion hereafter to consider more closely the details of the Chronicler's narrative, upon which, in fact, mainly rests the notion that the laws of the Pentateuch were really carried out in Judah before the Captivity. But not a hint is given in the more trustworthy history, 2S.vi, of the presence of these Priests and Levites on either occasion.

date, perhaps in the days of Solomon, and may express, rather, the practice of *that* time.

673. But under the later kings—at all events, in the record of the Chronicler—we have unmistakable indications of the poverty of the Priests. We find such indications in the disorderly and impoverished state, in which the Temple itself was found in the days of Hezekiah, at the end of the idolatrous reign of his father Ahaz.

‘They have shut up the doors of the porch, and put out the lamps, and have not burnt incense nor offered burnt-offerings in the holy place unto the God of Israel. . . . And the Priests went into the inner part of the House of Jehovah to cleanse it, and brought out all the uncleanness that they found in the Temple of Jehovah into the court of the House of Jehovah. And the Levites took it, to carry it out abroad into the brook Kidron.’ 2Ch.xxix.7,16.

Ahaz himself, the Chronicler tells us, had ‘shut up’ the Temple, 2Ch.xxviii.24, which he could hardly have done, if the Levites had been an important and influential body. At all events, their receipts from tithes, &c., must, according to this account, have been very small in his reign.

674. Moreover, we are told that Hezekiah ordered afresh the courses of the Priests and Levites, and provided for their maintenance, by enjoining that tithes and firstfruits should be brought in, and they were brought in abundantly ‘in heaps.’

‘Then Hezekiah questioned with the Priests and Levites concerning the heaps. And Azariah, the chief Priest of the House of Zadok, answered him and said, *Since the people began to bring the offerings into the House of Jehovah, we have had enough to eat, and have left plenty.*’ 2Ch.xxxi.10.

It would seem from the above that, *before* the order in question was issued, the Priests and Levites had *not* enough to eat. And this is the testimony of the Chronicler, whose tendency to magnify the office and position of the Priesthood and Levitical body is evident throughout his narrative.

675. But the numerous passages in Deuteronomy, which include the Levite with the poor and destitute, ‘the widow, the fatherless, and the stranger,’ furnish far more satisfactory evidence

of the generally needy condition of the ecclesiastical body in the time of the later kings, supposing, as we may now do, (with the evidence which we have had already before us, and which we shall find still further confirmed as we proceed,) that this book was written about the time of Josiah. This being the case, it can scarcely be doubted that the laws which we are now considering D.xii.17-19, xiv.22-27, were intended to secure some better provision for the support of this necessitous priesthood. The original tithe-system, as laid down in the book of Leviticus, was evidently no longer effective, if, indeed, it was ever at any time fully put into operation, which seems very doubtful. Here, however, it would seem, an attempt is made to exchange it for one much more likely to be popular, and practically effective; since the tithes on this system were to be consumed in feasting by the tithe-payer and his family, the poor Levite 'within their gates' being included only as a guest. It is evident that any single *wealthy* farmer, who made it a religious duty to obey such a law as this, when promulgated under the combined influence of priestly, prophetic, and royal authority, would be likely to bring many firstlings of his cattle and sheep annually, far more than he himself and his family could consume in feasting. Thus the ecclesiastics at the Temple would have a reasonable probability of *sharing*, at all events, in the enjoyment of these good things; though, according to the Levitical Law, they *had a right to the whole*.

676. D.xiv.28,29.

'At the end of three years thou shalt bring forth all the tithe of thine increase the same year, and shalt lay it up within thy gates. And the Levite, because he hath no part nor inheritance with thee, and the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow, which are within thy gates, shall come and shall eat and be satisfied; that Jehovah thy God may bless thee in all the work of thine hand which thou doest.'

On the above-direction KNOBEL observes, *Deut.p.265*:—

This tithe at the end of every three years is with this writer the *principal* tithe. For both here and in xxvi.12, he speaks of it as 'all the tithe' of that year, and

in the latter passage he speaks of the third year itself as the 'year of tithing.' The annual tithe was hardly a whole tithe, though called so. According to xiv.22, it was to be brought 'year by year,' and, therefore, could not be discontinued in the third year. If we reckon it as *two-thirds* of the whole, then this *annual* tithe [in three years], together with the *full* tithe in the third year, would only make up three whole tithes.

SCOTT, however, maintains here also the notion of a 'second' tithe, and quotes from MEDE as follows:—

Two years together they paid the *Levites'* tithe and the *festival* tithe. But in the third year they paid the *Levites'* tithe and the *poor man's* tithe, that is, what was wont in other years to be spent in feasting [was now spent on the poor at home].

JOSEPHUS, *Ant.* iv.8,22, explains the matter by a *third* tithe, to be paid in the third year, and introduces Moses as saying:—

Besides these two tithes, which I have already said you are to pay every year, the one for the Levites, the other for the festivals, you are to bring every third year a tithe to be distributed to those that want, to widows also, and to orphans.

677. Thus we have three different ways of explaining the difficulty. But the last two are at once set aside by the fact that, if the tithe named in D.xii.17,18, xiv.22-27, be the 'second' tithe, and that in D.xiv.28,29, the 'third' tithe, both of which were to be *shared* by the Levite with others, then in all the book of Deuteronomy no mention whatever is made of the 'first' tithe, which belonged wholly to the Levites. Nor is there any real foundation for the supposition of KNOBEL, that the 'annual' tithe may have been two-thirds of a full tithe, and so the deficiency in three years may have been complemented by the third year's additional full tithe; since the direction for the annual tithe is very explicit in xiv.22, and implies that it was to be a *full* tithe:—

'Thou shalt truly tithe *all* the increase of thy seed, that the field bringeth forth year by year.'

678. The fact seems to be, as has been said, that those, who speak of a 'second' and 'third' tithe, merely *assume* that the 'first' or Levites' tithe was actually paid, because it was enjoined in N.xviii.20-24; though there is not a trace of

any such payment having been made throughout the whole history of the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings, and in the books of Chronicles, as we have seen, there are distinct indications of the contrary; and though, further, not a word is said about this Levites' tithe throughout the whole book of Deuteronomy, either in xviii.8, where the provision for the Levites out of the sacrifices is mentioned, — 'they shall have like portions to eat, beside that which cometh of the sale of his patrimony,'—or still less in xiv.28, where it is expressly ordered that 'the Levite,' as well as 'the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow,' shall 'come and eat' of this third year's tithe, or, as MEDE calls it, 'the poor man's tithe'—having already, it is supposed, received their own full tithe, 'the Levites' tithe,' that year—'and be satisfied.'

679. But there is no real ground, as it appears to me, for supposing that more than *one* tithe is meant throughout,—the same which in N.xviii is ordered to be given wholly to the Levites, as the firstlings were to be given to the Priests. And it seems not unlikely that the Deuteronomist,—though he had laid down the directions in xii.17,18, xiv.22-27, for the annual tithe and the firstlings to be spent in feasting at Jerusalem, with the view (675) of securing for the Priests and Levites in this way some share, at least, in those good things, which *ought* to have been given wholly to them, but which in his own time, at all events, were not so given,—yet was not very sanguine even of this modification of the original direction being generally obeyed. Hence, it may be, he introduced this additional provision for the third year's tithe to be eaten *at home*, expecting, perhaps, that this mode of disposing of the tithe would be more popular, and more likely to be observed, than the more strict one of taking it up to Jerusalem. This command, at all events, might be pretty generally obeyed, if the other was disregarded.

680. This view of the case seems rather confirmed by the fact,

which KNOBEL has noticed (676), that this 'third year's tithe' is most insisted on by the Deuteronomist, and the 'third year' itself is called the 'year of tithing.' It would seem that each pious person, who might be disposed to carry out this law, was to be left at liberty to reckon his third year as he pleased. KNOBEL, indeed, suggests that these triennial tithes were meant to fall due in the *third* and *sixth* years after each Sabbatical year. But this is only conjecture; and, if this had been intended, it is reasonable to believe that some such definition of this 'third' year would have been made in the text. In fact, in that case, the writer would, most probably, have mentioned explicitly *both* the 'third' *and* the 'sixth' year.

681. It may, indeed, be thought that this 'third year's tithe' was meant to be given *wholly* to the poor, since it is not expressly said here, as in xii.18, that the householder and his family were to feast upon them as well as the Levite, &c. But the language used with reference to this same tithe in xxvi.13,14, seems to imply that the giver was expected to partake of them himself,—and if so, then, of course, in common with the members of his family,—but only on proper occasions of festivity, not for unlawful or unbecoming uses: since he is made to say,—

'I have consumed (בִּעֲרַתִּי, *biharti*, E.V. 'brought away') the hallowed things out of mine house, and also have given them unto the Levite, &c; I have not eaten thereof in my mourning, neither have I consumed (E.V. 'taken away') ought thereof for the dead.'

It would surely have been said, 'I have not consumed ought thereof *at all, for any purpose,*' if it had been intended that the tithe should be given *wholly* away.

682. In Am.iv.4 we read as follows:—

'Come to Bethel, and transgress; at Gilgal multiply transgression; and bring your sacrifices every morning, *your tithes after three years*; and offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving with leaven, and proclaim and publish the free-offerings: for this liketh you, O ye children of Israel, saith Jehovah Elohim.'

These words appear to have been addressed *ironically* to the people of the Ten Tribes, who are represented as substituting

outward observances—and these, perhaps, idolatrous—for purity of heart and life. It is difficult, however, to see what is exactly meant by the expression מַעֲשֵׂי תְּרֵינִי יָמִים לִשְׁלוֹשֶׁת יָמִים, *lishlosheth yamim mahs'rothechem*, (E.V. 'your tithes after three years'). The LXX render them, εἰς τὴν τριημέριαν τὰ ἐπιδέκαστα ὑμῶν, 'your tithes for the three-days' feast.' HENGSTENBERG, i.142, says that they are equivalent to saying, 'If ye would bring every three days the tithes, which the Lord required to be given every three years, it would avail you nothing.' But, at any rate, they cannot imply that the command for the triennial tithe in D.xiv.28 was actually carried out in the Kingdom of Israel,—(which, indeed, under any circumstances, could hardly have been expected,)—since D.xiv.28 expressly enjoins that the third year's tithe should be feasted on *at home*, 'within thy gates,' whereas here the tithes, whatever they may be, are taken to the sacred place, Bethel or Gilgal.

683. If that of the E.V. be the correct translation of the Hebrew, we might suppose that, among the Ten Tribes, tithes were really paid at this time with some readiness, once in three years, perhaps for the support of the Priesthood which Jeroboam had appointed, and perhaps by his order or suggestion. And this might also be held to imply that in the immediately foregoing time of Solomon the annual tithe-system, enjoined in the book of Numbers, and, as we believe, first laid down in that reign with a view to the maintenance of the Priests in attendance at the new-built Temple, was really carried out to some extent, which example Jeroboam copied for the maintenance of his own Priesthood, though he modified it to a *triennial* tithe; and from this modification may even have been derived the idea of the later law of the Deuteronomist in xiv.28.

684. In the story of Tobit, indeed, we have a full account of *first, second, and third* tithes, *every year*, and of other dues, being paid in the most regular manner, and of the Feasts being

regularly kept, and of his going up to Jerusalem to keep them, before the captivity of the Ten Tribes.

‘Now all the tribes which together revolted, and the house of my father Nephthali, sacrificed unto the heifer Baal. But I alone went *often* [why not *always*, as the Law enjoined, E.xxiii.17, xxxiv.23?] to Jerusalem at the Feasts, as it was ordained unto all the people of Israel by an everlasting decree, bearing the first-fruits and tenths of increase, with that which was first shorn; and them gave I at the altar to the Priests the *sons of Aaron*. The first tenth of all increase I gave to the *sons of Aaron*, who ministered at Jerusalem, [the command in N.xviii.21 says it should be given to the *Levites*;) another tenth part I sold away, and went and spent it every year at Jerusalem, and the third I gave unto them to whom it was meet.’ i.5,8.

But the story of Tobit is notoriously a mere fiction, written long after the Captivity. The above statement, however, accords with the well-known fact that, after the return from the Babylonish Captivity, great efforts were made to carry out more strictly the laws of the Pentateuch—those of the earlier books, as well as those of Deuteronomy. The difficulty, which we have been considering about the *tithes*, was probably then perceived, and, perhaps, by some pious persons obviated in the way described by Tobit. But, as we have noted above, the Law gave the tithes to the *Levites*, not to the Priests ‘the sons of Aaron.’

685. BLEEK, while maintaining that the Law in N.xviii is genuine Mosaical, writes with reference to the law in Deuteronomy as follows, p.215 :—

No one, upon an unprejudiced comparison of these two laws, can mistake the fact, that they vary much from one another, as regards both their contents and character. In the last, strictly speaking, no mention whatever is made of a special *legal* provision by way of tax for the benefit of the Levites, but only of a free-will act of benevolence, which the Israelites are required to show to the landless Levites, just as to other needy persons. Hence they are placed in one and the same rank with the other destitute people, and their whole position is entirely changed. That *Moses himself*, with reference to the maintenance of the Levites, should have delivered two laws, so different from each other as is their whole character [*within the space of a few months*], cannot well be believed, especially as the former law, just as much as the latter, refers to the time when the tribes of Israel would find themselves in possession of their promised land. We cannot but assume, that if the one law is

Mosaic, the other belongs to a later time. And here there can be no doubt that the law in Numbers is the original, which also has all the character of a Mosaic law. On the other hand, in Deuteronomy, we probably possess it in a form, to which it was changed in a later time, — probably at a time when the original law, with so many other Mosaic directions, had long ceased to be followed, and when the relations also had so settled themselves, that no more hope could be entertained that they ever would again be followed. Then, probably, it was sought in this way, at all events, to awaken the compassion of the Israelites for the, perhaps, in part, very necessitous Levites.

CHAPTER IX.

DEUT. XV. 1—XVI. 22.

686. D. xv. 1—11.

The Deuteronomist here enjoins that every *seventh* year shall be a 'year of release,' with reference, no doubt, as most commentators suppose, to the Sabbatical Year; though, if he really meant and expected that this law should be *practically carried out* in the Sabbatical Year, it is reasonable to believe, as before observed (680), that he would have more strictly defined the meaning of the expression 'at the end of seven years.' KNOBEL observes —

The Jews and others erroneously understand the law to speak of an *entire remission of debts* in each Sabbatical Year. The word 'release' (שָׁמַט, *shamat*) does not of itself imply this, and the expression 'exact,' v. 2, 3, indicates that by 'release' is meant nothing more than 'not exacting.' This is also shown by the analogy of the lands, which were only left to *rest* in the Sabbatical Year, and afterwards were again tilled. A law of this kind also would have been quite contrary to the object aimed at, since with such a prospect before him no one would have lent anything to the needy person. We must only, therefore, think of the *not pressing* of claims—the allowing of debts to *rest*—during the Sabbatical Year.

687. It is true that the expression 'at the end of seven years,' מִקֵּץ שִׁבְעֵי-שָׁנִים, *mikkets shev'ah shanim*, may mean, according to the Hebrew idiom, 'in the last of seven years'; see Jer. xxxiv. 14; and, therefore, KNOBEL's view of the case may be admissible. Or the fact may be that the writer, ever tender-hearted and considerate for the poor and needy among his countrymen, (as is shown by such a multitude of passages throughout the book,) has availed himself of one of

the older laws about the Sabbatical Year, E.xxiii.11, L.xxv.1-7, (in neither of which passages, however, let it be noted, is a single word said about releasing debts,) to recommend compassion to creditors, and *suggest* to them the duty of remitting debts, which pressed heavily upon their debtors. He may have connected this duty with that portion of the older document, which instituted the Sabbatical Year, (seeking in this way to gain, as it were, the authority of Moses for such remission, after a debt had been long due,) *even if the practice of observing the Sabbatical Year itself had altogether ceased*, or, perhaps, had never even been practised at any time in Israel.

688. For, in the whole history of the Hebrew people, there is no sign of this law of observing the Sabbatical Year having been ever once obeyed. Rather, there is a passage, 2Ch.xxxvi.21, which would tend to prove the contrary, where it is said that ‘the land enjoyed her Sabbaths, for, as long as she lay desolate, she kept Sabbath,’ the reference being plainly to the expressions in L.xxvi.34,43. So in his note on 2K.xix.29, SCOTT remarks:—

The devastations of the Assyrians had, probably, prevented the land from being sown that year; and the next is *supposed* to have been the Sabbatical Year; though *this is the only intimation, in all the history of Israel, that any regard was paid to that institution.*

The passage referred to by SCOTT, 2K.xix.29, is this:—

‘And this shall be a sign unto thee: Ye shall eat this year such things as grow of themselves, and in the second year that which springeth of the same, and in the third year sow ye, and reap, and plant vineyards, and eat the fruits thereof.’

It is evidently a mere conjecture that reference is here made to the Sabbatical Year, without any supporting ground for it.

689. KNOBEL observes, p.541:—

The Sabbath-Year was prescribed by all lawgivers; before the exile, however, it was either not at all, or, at least, not regularly observed, but was first carried out in the post-captivity time.

And so KALISCH remarks, on E.xxiii.10,11:—

When the cycles of the Sabbath-Year commenced is uncertain. The *Sedar Olam Rabbah* states that they were first introduced fourteen years after the entrance of the Hebrews into Canaan, immediately after the distribution of the land, which, like its conquest, lasted, according to tradition, seven years. It is, however, known that the observance seems to have been almost entirely neglected before the exile L.xxvi.34, 2Ch.xxxvi.21, from which passage it has been concluded that it was not observed during a period of about 500 years, but that it was really carried out after the return from the Babylonian captivity, Neh.x.31.

JOSEPHUS, *Ant.*xi.8.6, says that the Samaritans applied to Alexander with the petition that he would remit their taxes in the seventh year, because they did not sow their fields in that year.

690. D.xv.12–18. This is very nearly a repetition of the law in E.xxi.2–6, with the exception that the Deuteronomist—

(i) Names the Hebrew *maid*-servant, as well as the *man*-servant,—

(ii) Commands that some means of sustenance shall be given to the bondman set free,—

(iii) Is silent about the ear of the servant, who wished to remain with his master, being bored through with an awl *in the presence of the judges*.

KNOBEL observes on this last point, *Deut.* p.268:—

The judicial action, prescribed in E.xxi.6, seems at the time of the writer to have been no longer in practice; the master might perform the act at home.

The fact may be, however, that the ‘ear-boring,’ which may have suited the earlier and more barbarous age, in which the original law in E.xxi.6 was, most probably, laid down, may have been wholly out of place in the time of the later kings, and, though the Deuteronomist repeats the ancient law, it is more for the purpose of enjoining such release of bondservants, than with a view of this obsolete practice being revived.

691. In Jer.xxxiv.8–22 we have an account given how king Zedekiah—

‘had made a covenant with all the people which were at Jerusalem to proclaim liberty unto them, that every man should let his manservant, and every man his

maidservant, being a Hebrew or Hebrewess, go free — that none should serve himself of them. to wit, of a Jew his brother.’

Accordingly, we are told, they did so release them, but afterwards —

‘turned, and caused the servants, whom they had let go free, to return, and brought them into subjection for servants and for handmaids.’

Whereupon Jeremiah prophesies thus, *v.* 13–17 :—

‘Thus saith Jehovah, the God of Israel : I made a covenant with your fathers in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondmen, saying, At the end of seven years let ye go every man his brother an Hebrew, which hath been sold unto thee, and, when he hath served thee six years, thou shalt let him go free from thee : but your fathers hearkened not unto me, neither inclined their ear. And ye were now turned, and had done right in my sight, in proclaiming liberty every man to his neighbour ; and ye had made a covenant before me in the House which is called by my Name. But ye turned and polluted my Name, and caused every man his servant, and every man his handmaid, whom he had set at liberty at their pleasure, to return, and brought them into subjection, to be unto you for servants and for handmaids. Therefore thus saith Jehovah, Ye have not hearkened unto me in proclaiming liberty, every man to his brother, and every man to his neighbour. Behold, I proclaim a liberty to you, saith Jehovah, to the sword, to the pestilence, and to the famine ; and I will make you to be removed to all the kingdoms of the earth.’

692. Upon the above passage we may remark as follows :—

(i) It is plain that, neither before nor after the time here referred to, was it the practice to manumit their Hebrew slaves in the seventh year. And, consequently, this passage, as far as it goes, shows that the command in question was *not* obeyed, even in Judah,— much less in Israel.

(ii) The king and princes seem to have had some strong influence brought to bear upon them, probably, by the urgent representations of Jeremiah himself, and at first to have complied with the injunction, either regarding it as Divine, or perhaps only as a proper and humane institution.

(iii) For some reason they afterwards changed their minds, and made no scruple of retracing their steps, either because they had become satisfied, in the interim, that the law in question was *not* of Divine origin, or because more selfish motives prevailed over their religion and humanity.

(iv) The Prophet, in the passage before us, refers not to the older law in E.xxi.2, but to the later Deuteronomistic version of it, D.xv.12, as appears by his quoting from it three expressions:—

(i) יִמָּכַר לְךָ, *yimmacher lēcha*, ‘be sold unto thee,’ (instead of E.xxi.2, כִּי תִקְנֶה, *ki thikneh*, ‘if thou shalt buy;’)

(ii) וַעֲבָדְךָ שֵׁשׁ שָׁנִים, *vahāvodcha shesh shanim*, ‘and he shall serve thee six years,’ (instead of E.xxi.2, שֵׁשׁ שָׁנִים יַעֲבֹר, *shesh shanim yahāvod*, ‘six years shall he serve;’)

(iii) תִּשְׁלַחְנֻהוּ חֶפְזִי מֵעִמָּךְ, *tšshallēkhenu khophshi mehimmach*, ‘and thou shalt let him go free from thee,’ (instead of E.xxi.2, יֵצֵא לְחֶפְזִי חֶנָּם, *yetse lakhophshi khinnam*, he ‘shall go out free for nothing’).

(v) Hence it can scarcely be doubted that Jeremiah had been setting before the king and princes the language of the book of Deuteronomy, then recently found in the Temple in the days of Zedekiah’s father Josiah, and written, it may be, with the full cognisance, if not by the hand, of Jeremiah himself, and that this was the influence, which he had brought to bear for a time upon them, whether they believed in the Divine authority of that book or not.

693. In fact, this prophecy of Jeremiah was uttered about B.C. 595, in Zedekiah’s time, Jer.xxxiv.8; and the book of Deuteronomy, as we suppose, was first publicly produced and acted on by the whole people in the eighteenth year of Josiah, B.C. 624, about thirty years before, and, therefore, it might very well be referred to by the prophet as a well-known document. It is noticeable that Zedekiah and his princes and people made a solemn covenant, at first, to carry out this command to release their servants, as if moved to it by some appeal of the Prophet, representing it as having issued from Jehovah Himself, which *virtually*, no doubt, as a command founded upon the principles of humanity and brotherly kindness, he himself believed it did. But, afterwards, ‘they turned, and caused the servants and the handmaids, whom they had let go free, to return, and brought them into subjection for servants and for handmaids;’

as if they had by this time begun to doubt the Divine authority of this injunction.

694. D.xv.19-23.

Here, again, as in (654), the firstling males of the herd and of the flock are to be feasted on by the offerer and his household, instead of their flesh being given to the Priest.

As to this point KALISCH observes on E.xiii.2:—

The firstborn animals also belonged to God, to whom they were to be offered as sacrifices; and it was therefore ordained that all clean firstborn male beasts should be offered from the eighth day of their birth within their first year. Now the flesh was, according to D.xii.17,18, xv.19,20, to be consumed in the holy places by the offering Israelites; whereas in N.xviii.18 it seems to be assigned to the Priests, —‘and the flesh of them shall be thine, as the wave breast and as the right ‘shoulder’ [(717) E.V. ‘leg’] are thine.’

This apparent contradiction had already been felt by AUGUSTINE, who, however, attempted no reconciliation. EBN EZRA and JARCHI believe that the commands in D.xii.15 are addressed to the *Priests*, which is completely against the context and the words. Not happier are the opinions of GERHARD that they refer to *female* firstborn animals, or of J. D. MICHAELIS, whom JAHN and BAUER follow, that the *first* firstborn animal belonged to the Priests, the *second* firstborn (!) to the Israelites, or of EICHHORN, who simply supposes—a mistake. But the addition in N.xviii.18,—‘as the wave breast and as the right leg, it shall be thine,’—fully decides the question. The *blood* and the *fat* belonged to God, v.17; and, if we compare herewith L.vii.28, &c. we find that the *breast* and the *right leg* were the portions of the Priest; *all the other parts were retained and consumed by the Israelite*. And thus exists the greatest harmony between the different precepts concerning the firstborn of animals.

695. But we have only to read the whole context in N.xviii.15-18, to see how impossible it is that this solution of the difficulty can be correct. L.vii.28, &c. speaks only of *freewill* ‘peace-offerings,’ of which the Priest was to have the breast and right leg; and N.xviii.15, &c. makes the dedication of ‘firstlings’ *compulsory*, and says that they shall be as entirely the Priest’s, as the breast and right leg of the peace-offering. When we find such words as these,—

‘Every thing that openeth the matrix in all flesh, which they bring unto Jehovah, whether it be of men or beasts, *shall be thine*. Nevertheless, the firstborn of man

shalt thou surely redeem, and the firstling of unclean beasts shalt thou redeem. But the firstling of a cow, or the firstling of a sheep, or the firstling of a goat, thou shalt not redeem; they are holy; thou shalt sprinkle their blood upon the altar, and shalt burn their fat for an offering made by fire, for a sweet savour unto Jehovah. And the flesh of them shall be thine, as the wave breast and as the right leg are thine,' N.xviii.15-18—

it is surely impossible to doubt that the firstlings are in this passage given *wholly* to the Priests, and not their breasts and right legs only.

696. D.xvi.

In this chapter the regular observance of the three great Feasts is enjoined, the addition being now made for the first time, 'three times a year shall all thy males appear before Jehovah thy God *in the place which He shall choose,*' v.16. According to the original command, the Passover sacrifice was always to be a 'lamb' or a 'kid,' E.xii.3,21; whereas here we read, v.2,—

'Thou shalt therefore sacrifice the Passover unto Jehovah thy God of the flock and of the herd (צֹאֵן וּבְקָרָה, *tsou uvakar*), in the place which Jehovah shall choose to place His Name there.'

Hence KNOBEL writes on E.xii.5 —

In a later age *cattle* also were allowed for Pesehal animals, D.xvi.2, and thus they appear in large numbers at the Passovers of Hezekiah and Josiah, 2Ch.xxxv.7-9; they were, as well as the lambs, destined 'for Passovers (לֶפְסַחִים, *lappšakhim*), and were manifestly not merely used for sacrifices, but also for the Pesehal Feast. which thus received an extension at variance with the original direction.

And so writes Dr. M'CAUL, *Examination, &c.* p.60:

If the Israelites had not *lambs* enough, they could take *kids*; and, if both failed, we learn from D.xvi.2 that even *oxen* might be used. From 2Ch.xxx.24, xxxv.7, it appears that in the Passover of Hezekiah and Josiah bullocks were actually employed as well as lambs and kids.

If so, there was certainly a departure in these later days from the law laid down in E.xii.1-10.

697. D.xvi.7.

'And thou shalt roast and eat it in the place which Jehovah thy God shall choose; and thou shalt turn in the morning, and go unto thy tents.'

L L

Upon these words RIEHM observes, *p.*51 :—

That the writer is here speaking of the morning following the night in which the Passover was to be eaten, that is, of the morning of the fifteenth day, is plain from the context. But that he here allows those, who had come from other towns to Jerusalem for the festival, to go away *home* on the morning of the fifteenth, is impossible, since then there could not be held the 'solemn assembly,' (עֲצֵרֶת, *hätsereth*, 'day of restraint,') *v.*8, on the seventh day. We can only therefore assume that the Paschal lamb was slaughtered at the Temple,—(and what else could have been sprinkled with the blood, except the Altar, if it was slain at all at Jerusalem? comp. 2Ch.xxxv.11)—and eaten in the fore-court of it, and that the writer in the above words allows every one to return in the morning from the Temple-court, to the hostel in Jerusalem in which he was living during the feast.

698. The above seems to be the true explanation of the passage; and in this very way, probably, the famous passover in Josiah's time was actually carried out. This, of course, excludes the notion of so many sheep and cattle being killed, and cooked, and eaten, in the Temple-court on this occasion, as the Chronicler states, *viz.* 37,600 lambs and kids, and 3,800 oxen, 2Ch.xxxv. 7,8,9. The more trustworthy historian—perhaps, Jeremiah himself—says nothing of all these, but merely writes, 2K.xxiii. 22—

'Surely there was not holden such a passover from the days of the Judges that judged Israel, nor in all the days of the Kings of Israel, nor of the Kings of Judah; but in the eighteenth year of King Josiah, wherein this passover was holden to Jehovah in Jerusalem.'

The Deuteronomist also, as we have said (545), makes no mention whatever of the 'Feast of Trumpets' and 'Great Day of Atonement,' the celebration of which is enforced in L.xxiii as solemnly as that of the three Great Feasts.

CHAPTER X.

DEUT.XVII.1-20.

699. D.xvii.2-7.

'If there be found among you . . . man or woman, that hath wrought wickedness in the sight of Jehovah thy God, in transgressing His covenant, and hath gone and served other gods, and worshipped them, either the sun, or moon, or any of the host of heaven, . . . then shalt thou bring forth that man or that woman, . . . and shalt stone them with stones, till they die. . . . So thou shalt put the evil away from among you.'

In this passage the Deuteronomist again expresses strongly his abhorrence of all manner of idolatry, and especially, *v.3*, of the worship of 'the sun, or moon, or any of the host of heaven,' of the prevalence of which, as we have said (605), the first intimation, in the more authentic history of the kings of Judah, is found in the reign of Josiah's father, Manasseh, 2K.xxi.3,5.

700. D.xvii.8-13.

'If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment, . . . then shalt thou arise, and get thee up into the place which Jehovah thy God shall choose, and thou shalt come unto the Priests the Levites, and unto the Judge that shall be in those days, and enquire, and they shall show thee the sentence of judgment. . . . And the man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the Priest . . . or unto the Judge, even that man shall die; and thou shalt put away the evil from Israel, and all the people shall hear and fear, and do no more presumptuously.'

KUENEN, *p.150*, is of opinion that we have here a reference to the High Court of Judicature, said by the *Chronicler* to have been established by Jehoshaphat in Jerusalem, 2Ch.xix.8-11:—

‘Moreover in Jerusalem did Jehoshaphat set of the *Levites*, and of the *Priests*, and of the chief of the fathers of Israel, for the judgment of Jehovah, and for controversies, when they returned to Jerusalem. And he charged them, saying, Thus shall ye do in the fear of Jehovah, faithfully, and with a perfect heart. And what cause soever shall come to you of your brethren that dwell in their cities, between blood and blood, between law and commandment, statutes and judgments, ye shall even warn them that they trespass not against Jehovah, and so wrath come upon you, and upon your brethren: this do, and ye shall not trespass. And, behold, Amariah the Chief Priest is over you in all matters of Jehovah; and Zebadiah, the son of Ishmael, the ruler of the house of Judah, for all the king’s matters: also the *Levites* shall be officers before you. Deal courageously, and Jehovah shall be with the good.’

Assuming KUENEN’S view of the case to be true, the fact of Jehoshaphat having been the *first* to establish such a Court would rather tend to show that the law in Deuteronomy was *not* Mosaic and Divine, since Jehoshaphat’s act is spoken of as quite a novel one, without any reference to this law.

701. But KUENEN goes on to observe:—

It is plain that D.xvii.8-13 *assumes* the existence of the Court of Judicature at Jerusalem, and does not establish it. . . . This all leads to the conclusion that the law in Deuteronomy, and, consequently, the whole Book, whose unity is generally recognised, came into existence *after* Jehoshaphat’s reign, perhaps, even a considerable time after Jehoshaphat, when the Court of Justice set on foot by him required no more the sanction of the great Lawgiver for its establishment, but was so thoroughly interwoven with the customs of the people, that its existence could be simply assumed.

It seems doubtful, however, if there is really any reference in D.xvii.8-13 to such an ecclesiastical Court, as that supposed to be described in 2Ch.xix.8-11, or to any regular Court at all. The very language used by the Deuteronomist,—

‘Thou shalt come unto the Priests the Levites, *and unto the Judge that shall be in those days*,’—‘the man that will not hearken unto the Priest that standeth to minister there before Jehovah thy God, *or unto the Judge*’—

is so vague and uncertain, as rather to imply the contrary.

702. It may be doubted also, perhaps, whether the Chronicler, as KUENEN and most critics suppose, is here giving an account of some one particular High Court of Judicature first established by Jehoshaphat, or whether his statements, so far as we can depend upon them, should be understood as saying more than

that Jehoshaphat, like our HENRY II, was traditionally famous as a judicial reformer. It is possible, indeed, that his *name*,—*יְהוֹשָׁפָט*, *Yēhoshaphat*, ‘Jehovah *judges*,’ may have some connection with this account of his judicial arrangements. It may have had a real historical connection with them in Jehoshaphat’s lifetime, or it may have given rise to the tradition of this king’s having taken a lively interest in such matters, or it may have suggested to the Chronicler himself the probability of his having set the courts of justice in his time in active operation, as described in the narrative.

703. Of course, in the later days of the monarchy, and above all in the time of Josiah, who came to the throne at eight years of age, 2K.xxii.1, the chief and other principal Priests must have been persons of some consequence in Jerusalem, and would naturally be called to take a part in the decision of important causes, especially any connected with matters ecclesiastical.

And so in D.xix.17,18, we read,—

‘Then both the men, between whom the controversy is, shall stand before Jehovah, before the Priests and the Judges, which shall be in those days; and the *Judges* shall make diligent inquisition,’ &c.

If, however, reference *is* here supposed to be made to a regular Court, then, as KNOBEL observes, it deserves to be noted (as a token that the writer is not Moses himself) that the Court is not here introduced as one established by Moses, to be called into operation hereafter, but is set forth as already existing.

704. It need hardly be said that the notion of referring all difficult matters to the Priests the Levites,—‘by whose word shall every controversy and every stroke be tried,’ D.xxi.5,—could never have arisen in the days of David and Solomon, or any of the more powerful kings of Judah, who, we may be certain, decided themselves, as a Supreme Court, either in person or by their judicial officers, all such questions. Thus we are told that David ‘executed judgment and justice unto all

people,' 2S.viii.15; and Solomon prays for 'an understanding heart,' that he may be able to 'judge so great a people,' 1K.iii.9. And, accordingly, we have very soon an instance of his deciding personally in such a case between the two women, 1K.iii.16-27; and it is added, v.29, 'And all Israel heard of the judgment, which the King had judged; and they feared the King; for they saw that the wisdom of God was in him to do judgment.'

705. And this is confirmed when we observe the very subordinate position which the principal Priests occupy in the lists of the great officers of David and Solomon. Here, instead of finding—as we might expect from what we observe in the Pentateuch and book of Joshua, (where Aaron always ranks *next* to Moses, and Eleazar to Joshua, or even *before* him, Jo.xiv.1,)—that the High Priest is named, as first in honour and highest in rank and dignity, next to the King, we have mentioned, first, the chief captain, Joab—then the recorder, Jehoshaphat,—*then* the Priests, Zadok and Ahimelech, the scribe, Seraiah, the captain of the guard, Benaiah,—and, last of all, it is added,

'And David's sons were *chief rulers*,' 2S.viii.16-18.

And so in 1K.iv.1-6 we find them in a still lower position:—

'So King Solomon was king over all Israel. And these were the princes which he had,—Azariah, the son of Zadok, *chief officer*,—Elihoreph and Ahiah, the sons of Shisha, secretaries,—Jehoshaphat, the son of Ahilud, the remembrancer,—and Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada, was over the host,—and *Zadok and Abiathar were the Priests*,—and Azariah, the son of Nathan, was over the officers,—and Zabud, the son of Nathan, was *principal officer* and the king's friend,—and Ahishar was over the household,—and Adoniram, the son of Abda, was over the tribute.'

706. It is also very noticeable that the word translated 'chief rulers' in 2S.viii.18 is in the original 'Priests.' It stands distinctly 'David's sons [of the tribe of Judah] were (בְּנֵי־יְהוּדָה, *cohārim*,) Priests.' The Hebrew word is the same as is used everywhere else for Priest, viz. כֹּהֵן, *cohen*,—the same exactly as that used for Aaron, Eleazar, or Phinehas. So in 2S.xx.26 we read, 'And Ira also, the Jairite, was a Priest (E.V. 'chief

ruler') about David.' And in the passage just quoted from 1K.iv.1-6, the word translated 'chief officer' is *הַכֹּהֵן*, *hacohen*, 'the Priest,' and that rendered 'principal officer' is *כֹּהֵן*, *cohen*, 'Priest.'

On this point KALISCH writes, on E.ii.16 :—

The sons of David are called *Cohanim*, which, it is asserted, cannot mean *Priests*,—as these were only the descendants of Aaron,—but must here mean *civil officers*. But, as *David himself certainly offered sacrifices, and blessed the people, which are, undoubtedly, Sacerdotal functions*, he could as well confer upon his sons some of these ministrations. We, therefore, rather accede to EBN EZRA's opinion, that every minister, even one of an idolatrous religion, is called Priest (*Cohen*). In E.xviii.12, pontifical functions are ascribed to Jethro. '*Cohen*' means in a more extended sense *public servant or officer, and might signify either a civil or clerical dignitary, or both at the same time; for it is well-known that the functions of Sovereign and Priest were, in ancient polities, united in the same person.*

707. With the latter portion of the above note we entirely agree. But when we observe that—not the sons of David alone, but—'Ira, the Jairite,' also, 2S.xx.26, and 'Zabud, the son of Nathan,' 1K.iv.5, are each designated by this name 'Cohen,' and that 'Azariah the son of Zadok' was 'the Cohen' in Solomon's days, 1K.iv.2, it can scarcely be supposed that the Hebrew word is used exclusively of 'Priests' in the ordinary sense, or that David's sons are called 'Cohanim,' because he had empowered them to exercise certain sacerdotal functions. It is true, undoubtedly, as KALISCH observes, that both David and Solomon *did* discharge Priestly functions on various occasions; and this is one of the numerous evidences, which the history, as contained in the books of Samuel and Kings, when closely examined, (as it shall be, we trust, in the course of this work,) betrays of the non-existence of the laws of the Pentateuch in their present form in the days of David and Solomon, or, at least, of their not being in operation, and so of their not being regarded in those days as authoritative and Divine.

708. But it is clear that the word 'Cohen' was not used in those times, nor even in the yet later time when the above passages were written, exclusively with reference to religion. The very

fact, that it could be employed thus freely of *laymen*, shows that the more restricted use of the word, which afterwards prevailed, when the Priestly office became more dignified, had not yet come into vogue. It would be strange that a word, *already appropriated* to denote such a high sacred office, should be so lightly used of mere laymen. And, in, fact, we do not find the word so used in the later ages of the Jewish history. The Chronicler, indeed, says, 1Ch.xxvii.5,—

‘The third captain of the host for the third month was Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada, the *chief priest*; (הַכֹּהֵן רֹאשִׁי, *hacchen rosh*, E.V. *margin*, ‘principal officer’).’

It is impossible to say what he exactly means by this expression, whether that Benaiah, or Jehoiada, was ‘Cohen Rosh.’ But he probably has adopted the phrase from the passages just quoted, 2S.viii, 1K.iv. At all events, he never uses it again; and, instead of saying that the sons of David were ‘Cohanim,’ he writes, 1Ch.xviii.17, ‘the sons of David were at the hand of the King.’ In other words, they were, probably, ‘Councillors of State,’ and Azariah the son of Zadok, ‘*the Cohen*,’ was perhaps, the ‘President of the Council.’ In course of time, as the Priestly office gained ground, more and more, in position and influence,—though not in wealth,—the word Cohen became restricted to those who were set apart for sacred offices, and had charge of the ministrations of the Sanctuary—just as if in England the word ‘Minister’ should no longer be used for ‘ministers of state,’ but be restricted to ‘ministers of religion.’

*709. D.xvii.14-17.

‘When thou art come unto the land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee, and shalt possess it, and shalt dwell therein, and shalt say, I will set a king over me, like as all the nations that are about me, thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom Jehovah thy God shall choose; one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee; thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, which is not thy brother. But he shall not multiply horses to himself, nor cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he should multiply horses; forasmuch as Jehovah hath said unto you, Ye shall henceforth return no more that way. Neither shall

he multiply wives unto himself, that his heart turn not away, neither shall he greatly multiply to himself silver and gold.'

It is plain that this passage, which distinctly allows the appointment of a king, and, indeed, would have been enough to *suggest* it, if the desire for one had not otherwise arisen, —which, so far from disapproving of the introduction of the kingdom, rather promises a special blessing, and a permanent continuance of royalty, to any pious king and his children,— could not have existed, as the declaration of the Divine Will, in the time of Samuel, or in the still later time of the author of the history of the election of the first king of Israel.

710. There we find Samuel charging it upon the people as a *great sin*, that they had desired a king,—

'That ye may see that your wickedness is great, which ye have done in the sight of Jehovah, in asking for a king . . . And all the people said unto Samuel, Pray for thy servants unto Jehovah thy God, that we die not; for we have added unto all our sins this evil to ask us a king.' 1S.xii.17-19.

Nay, Jehovah himself is introduced as saying to Samuel, 1S.viii.7—

'They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them.'

Throughout the whole narrative, not the least reference is made to this law, as surely must have been the case if it was really in existence in those days; since either Samuel might have been expected to quote it, as laying down the conditions of the kingdom, if they were determined to have it, or the people would naturally have adduced it, as sanctioning, or, at any rate, excusing, their wish for a king.

711. Solomon, as we know, was the first king who 'multiplied' horses brought out of Egypt:—

'And Solomon had forty thousand stalls of horses for his chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen,' 1K.iv.26;

'And Solomon gathered together chariots and horsemen; and he had a thousand and four hundred chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen, whom he bestowed in the cities for chariots, and with the king at Jerusalem, 1K.x.26;

'And Solomon had horses brought out of Egypt . . . And a chariot came up and went out of Egypt for six hundred shekels of silver, and an horse for an hundred

and fifty; and so for all the kings of the Hittites, and for the kings of Syria did they bring them out by their means,' 1K.x.28,29.

In later days Jotham also, Hezekiah's grandfather, did this, as Isaiah tells us, ii.7:—

'Their land also is full of silver and gold, neither is there any end of their treasures; their land is also full of horses, neither is there any end of their chariots.'

And Hezekiah did the same:—

'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!' Is.xxxi.1;

'How wilt thou turn away the face of one captain of the least of my master's servants, and put thy trust on Egypt for chariots and for horsemen?' Is.xxxvi.9.

712. But, later still, Jeremiah condemns the kings of Judah strongly in his days for going down again to Egypt for help:—

'And now what hast thou to do in the way of Egypt, to drink the waters of Sihor? . . . Why gaddest thou about so much to change thy way? thou also shalt be ashamed of Egypt, as thou wast ashamed of Assyria,' ii.18,36.

And he speaks with special emphasis against the people's 'returning' to Egypt to sojourn there.

'Thus saith Jehovah of Hosts, the God of Israel: If ye wholly set your faces to enter into Egypt, and go to sojourn there, then it shall come to pass that the sword, which ye feared, shall overtake you there in the land of Egypt, and the famine, whereof ye were afraid, shall follow close after you there in Egypt: and there ye shall die. So shall it be with all the men that set their faces to go into Egypt to sojourn there. They shall die by the sword, by the famine, and by the pestilence; and none of them shall remain or escape from the evil that I will bring upon them. For thus saith Jehovah of Hosts, the God of Israel: As mine anger and my fury hath been poured forth upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, so shall my fury be poured forth upon you, when ye shall enter into Egypt; and ye shall be an execration, and an astonishment, and a curse, and a reproach; and ye shall see this place no more. Jehovah hath said concerning you, O ye remnant of Judah; Go ye not into Egypt; know certainly that I have admonished you this day.' xlii.15-19.

While, therefore, in forbidding the multiplication of wealth and of wives, special reference may be made by the Deuteronomist to the well-known causes of Solomon's declension, 1K.x.xi, yet such a passage as that before us might very well have been written in the age of Josiah, and by the hand of such a Prophet as Jeremiah.

713. D.xvii.18-20.

‘And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this Law in a book, out of that which is before the Priests the Levites; and it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life; that he may learn to fear Jehovah his God, to keep all the words of this Law and these statutes, to do them; that his heart be not lifted up above his brethren, and that he turn not aside from the commandment, to the right hand or to the left, to the end that he may prolong his days in his kingdom, he and his children, in the midst of Israel.’

We observe here, first, that the Book of the Law is said to be ‘*before the Priests the Levites,*’ which seems to imply that, as we have been supposing, the roll, containing the Mosaic story, was left in the custody of the Priests all along, before and after the ‘discovery of the Law’ in Josiah’s days.

714. But upon this passage SCOTT observes:—

It is probable that this law was very seldom observed by the kings of Judah, and never by the kings of Israel.

In another note, upon 2K.xxii.8-11, he says,—

It seems to have been *entirely neglected*, as well as the command to read the Law publicly to the people every year at the Feast of Tabernacles.

It is possible that Josiah, *after* the discovery of this book by Hilkiyah the High Priest in the Temple, did actually proceed to carry out the direction, and begin, at all events, to copy the Book of the Law with his own hand. But what sign is there that either David or Solomon each made a copy for himself of this Law, or that any of the best kings did so,—even Joash, as a youth, under the ‘direction’ of the chief Priest Jehoiada? If they did, pious kings as they were, how is it to be explained that they completely neglected its precepts in so many points, as we know they did,—for instance, in sacrificing at Gibeon and other high places, 1K.iii.3,4, and in not duly keeping the Passover, 2K.xxiii.22?

715. On the other hand, if they did *not* make a copy of the Law, why was *this*? Can it be believed that they *knowingly* omitted to do so,—that is to say, that, having the Law itself (as is supposed) in their hands, with Pro

phets and Priests to remind them of their duties, they wilfully or negligently passed by so solemn, and, indeed, so essential, a part of their duty, to themselves and to their people? Rather, have we not here also a proof, that the book of Deuteronomy, at all events, was not known to these kings, or to the Priests and Prophets of their day,—and, therefore, probably, did not exist, or, at least, if it did, was not recognised as having Divine authority? Indeed, if, instead of writing out the Law, these kings, or any of their Priests and Prophets, had only *heard* it or *read* it, as a Divine Law, it would be equally impossible to explain their surprising disregard of its most plain and positive injunctions, as we have seen in the instances above noted, and as we shall see more fully, when we come to consider hereafter, in another part of this work, the facts recorded in their history.

CHAPTER XI.

DEUT.XVIII.1-22.

716. D.xviii.1-5.

'The Priests the Levites,* all the tribe of Levi, shall have no part nor inheritance with Israel; they shall eat the offerings of Jehovah made by fire, and his inheritance. Therefore shall they have no inheritance among their brethren; Jehovah is their inheritance, as He hath said unto them. And this shall be the Priest's due from the people, from them that offer a sacrifice, whether it be ox or sheep; and they shall give unto the Priest the *shoulder* and the *two cheeks*, and the *maw*. The firstfruit also of thy corn, of thy wine, and of thine oil, and the *first of the fleece of thy sheep*, shalt thou give him. For Jehovah thy God hath chosen him out of all thy tribes to stand to minister in the Name of Jehovah, him and his sons for ever.'

Here, again, the Priests and Levites are treated as identically the same. Jehovah is the 'inheritance' of the whole tribe of Levi; whereas in N.xviii.20, He is spoken of as the inheritance of Aaron and his sons only, and, accordingly, in N.xxxi.28,29, as we have seen (631), 'Jehovah's tribute' is given to the Priests alone, and the Levites are supplied from the share of the booty which belonged to the people.

Here, also, as in x.8, '*Levi* and his sons'—not '*Aaron* and his sons'—are said to have been 'chosen out of all the tribes to stand to minister in the Name of Jehovah.'

717. Again, we have here the income of 'the Priests the Levites' laid down, and in this account also there are some notable variations from the original directions.

* As before observed, the translators of the E.V., by inserting 'and' before 'all the tribe of Levi,' have here modified greatly the meaning of the original.

(i) The firstfruits of *wool* are added *v.4* ; comp. N.xviii.12.

(ii) The *tithes* are altogether omitted, of which one-tenth belonged to the Priests, and the rest to the Levites.

(iii) A much more sumptuous provision than here is made for the Priests in E.xxix.28, L.vii.31-34, x.14, N.vi.20, xviii.18, *viz.* the breast or *brisket*, and the *hind-leg* (שׁוֹק, *shok*, E.V. 'shoulder,')—

'The wave-breast and the heave-hind-leg have I taken of the children of Israel from off the sacrifices of their peace-offerings, and have given them unto Aaron the Priest and unto his sons, by a statute for ever from among the children of Israel.' L.vii.34.

Here, however, the Priest is only to have 'the *shoulder*' (שׁוֹמֵר, *šěroōh*, 'fore-arm'), the two cheeks, and the maw.' SCOTT remarks —

The two cheeks, (probably, the whole head with the tongue,) and the maw are supposed to have been at this time *first granted out* of the peace-offering, *in addition* to what had before been allotted to the Priests and Levites; for they are not mentioned in the preceding laws.

But, if this provision for the Priests is an *additional* one, why then is nothing said about the former?

It seems probable that the more moderate provision was thought to be more suitable to the circumstances of the times in which the Deuteronomist lived.

718. KNOBEL, *Deut.p.274*, considers that —

D.xviii.1-4 belongs, perhaps, to the ^{*}laws indicated in D.iv.44, while the rest of the chapter is Deuteronomistic.

He supports his view, however, only by observing that the Deuteronomist says 'with *you*,' xii.12, or 'with *thee*,' xiv.27,29, instead of 'with *Israel*,' as here, *v.1*, and that the expressions 'tribe of Levi, לְבֵיט לֵוִי, *shevet Levi*, and 'offering made by fire,' אִשָּׁה, *ishah*, are strange to him.

Ans. (i) In the older ordinances the expression is 'in the midst of the *children of Israel*,' N.xviii.20,23,24; and the use of 'Israel' to express the whole people is very usual with the Deuteronomist, i.38, ii.12, iv.1, v.i, vi.3,4, ix.1, x.12, xvii.4,12, xix.13, xx.3, &c.

(ii) The Deuteronomist has לְבֵיט לֵוִי, *shevet Levi*, in x.8; and, in fact, the expression occurs nowhere else in the Pentateuch; in the other books, we have always לְבֵיט לֵוִי, *matteh Levi*, N.i.49, iii.6, xviii.2.

(iii) אִשָּׁה, *ishah*, is here merely a technical expression, and could not well have

been avoided by any writer, who wished to state what the Priests were to receive of the 'sacrifices made by fire.'

719. Some have supposed that the sacrifices here meant are merely the ordinary slaughtering of cattle for private use; and reference is made to N.vi.19,20, where, in the case of a Nazarite's offering, the Priest is to receive a 'wave-shoulder' of the ram, besides the 'wave-breast and heave-leg.' But these last were only exceptional cases: and the law, which we are now considering, is manifestly intended to provide for the Priests a regular income. And so KNOBEL further remarks, p.275:—

The Jews, as JOSEPHUS and PHILO, whom some moderns follow, understand the passage not of sacrificial offerings, but of private slaughtering, at which the pieces in question were always to be given [to the Priests]. But v.3 is manifestly a more full explanation of the 'offerings of Jehovah made by fire' in v.1, and the Deuteronomist at such private slaughtering requires nothing, xii.25-27, but the maintenance of the law against eating blood. Could it then have been here prescribed in addition that the Hebrews should at every slaughtering send off those pieces to the often distant places of abode of the Priests and Levites? Or must they only slaughter in the presence of a Priest, and he himself carry off his portion to his home?

720. D.xviii.6-8.

'And if a Levite come from any of thy gates out of all Israel, where he sojourned, and come with all the desire of his mind unto the place which Jehovah shall choose, then he shall minister in the name of Jehovah his God, as all his brethren the Levites do, which stand there before Jehovah. They shall have like portions to eat, beside that which cometh of the sale of his patrimony.'

On the above we make the following remarks:—

(i) By 'Levite' is meant, as usual in this book, 'Priest.' This appears from the mention made of 'his brethren, the Levites,' as '*standing before Jehovah,*' a phrase only used of the Priests (615). Besides which he is spoken of as having a right, like the rest, to have his 'portion' to eat of the sacrifices, which it was only lawful for the *Priests* to partake of, L.vi.18,29, vii.6, though they might, probably, invite others, as an act of favour, to share in the Priest's portion of the *peace-offerings*, L.vii.34.

(ii) We have here again the representation of the 'Levite,' or 'Priest,' living 'in the gates' of others, with no reference of any kind to his living in a Levitical or Priestly city.

(iii) The impression left by the language used in this passage is that the Levites, as a body, were *not* very desirous of being employed at the Sanctuary,— that they did not generally come with 'all the desire of their mind' unto the place which Jehovah had chosen. This corresponds with the general declension of religion, and the impoverished state of the ecclesiastical body, which must have existed towards the close of Manasseh's, and in the beginning of Josiah's, reign.

721. D.xviii.15-22.

'Jehovah thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him shall ye hearken. According to all that thou desiredst of Jehovah thy God in Horeb in the day of the assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the voice of Jehovah my God, neither let me see this great fire any more, that I die not. And Jehovah said unto me, They have well spoken that which they have spoken. I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren like unto thee, and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass that, whosoever will not hearken unto my words, which he shall speak in my Name, I will require it of him. But the Prophet, which shall presume to speak a word in my Name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that Prophet shall die. And, if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which Jehovah hath not spoken? When a Prophet speaketh in the name of Jehovah, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which Jehovah hath not spoken, but the Prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him.'

KURTZ declares himself 'unconditionally in favour of the exclusive reference [of these words] to one distinct individual, *viz.* the Messiah.' But he complains, iii.p.475:—

Wherever we have looked among the theologians of the present day, we have nowhere found the opinion reproduced, which prevailed both in the Synagogue and the Church down to modern times, *viz.* that we have here a pure and express prophecy of Christ. Thus HÄVERNICK is of opinion that 'the writer had in mind the various occasions, on which the people would stand in need of a Prophet, and announces accordingly, that on every such occasion a Prophet would be raised up. *A Prophet will I raise up*, that is, whenever circumstances require it.'

HENGSTENBERG finds here again that something or nothing, which he calls an ideal person. 'The Prophet here is an *ideal* person, comprehending all the true Prophets, who appeared between Moses and Christ, inclusive of the latter.' BAUMGARTEN alone comes round towards it, but without breaking away from the collective idea. He says, 'Moses speaks of the Prophet in such a way, that he may very well have had a plurality of Prophets in his mind, *viz.* as many as Israel might need for its guidance.'

722. It is needless to discuss the arguments, which KURTZ gives at considerable length in support of his view, that Moses is here distinctly referring to one individual, the Messiah; because we believe that it must now be considered to be a certain conclusion of criticism, that this book of Deuteronomy was written at a much later date than the others, so that these words can no longer be regarded as words recorded by Moses from the mouth of Jehovah Himself. They appear to embody a promise of Divine help for the people, in any of their future difficulties, as is shown by their connection with the preceding context. 'The Israelites are not to consult diviners, soothsayers, and necromancers, as the heathen do: Jehovah will not leave them under any necessity or with any excuse for doing this. But He will Himself supply them with counsel and comfort, when they need it, by sending some Prophet such as Moses, who, like him, should stand between them and God, should hear the words of God, and deliver them to the people. This is what they desired at Horeb, and they promised to listen, and diligently obey such Divine commands, if only God would speak to them by human mediation, and not with that terrible voice. Jehovah granted their request then, and will do so still, when Moses their present guide is gone. They shall never be without a divinely-instructed Teacher, if only they will obey him.'

723. Such seems to be the meaning of the above passage, which the Deuteronomist has very naturally put into the mouth of the aged lawgiver, before he bids farewell to his people.

In Hos. iv. 5 we have נָבִי, *navi*, 'Prophet,' in the singular without the article, used, as here, collectively,—

'Therefore shalt thou fall in the day, and the prophet also (גַּמ־נָבִי, *gam-navi*) shall fall with thee in the night.'

The same idea of 'raising up (הִקִּים, *hekim*) a Prophet,' or of 'a Prophet rising (קָם, *kam*),' occurs only in D.xiii.1(2), xviii.15,18, xxxiv.10, and Jer.xxix.15; comp. Am.ii.11.

724. KNOBEL observes on this passage, *Deut.p.276* :—

'While other nations have had recourse to magicians and astrologers, Jehovah has not allowed this to Israel. Rather, He will awaken, cause to come forth, out of the midst of Israel, out of his brethren, Prophets, and them shall Israel hear — Prophets such as I am, who receive revelations from Jehovah, to declare them to the people.'

The passage applies to Prophets generally. For the writer has in his eye the whole post-Mosaic time, from the conquest of Canaan down to his own age, and promises for them the Prophet, upon whom they may rely. He contrasts him also with the different kinds of heathen soothsayers, and intends him manifestly in v.20 to be considered as a plurality [since he there speaks of *lying* Prophets, who are to be put to death]. He regards the Prophets, however, as connected together, or as a collective whole, which comprises all the successors of Moses, as the body of post-Mosaic Divine messengers,—the 'Prophetdom,'—and hence uses the singular. So we have the phrase 'servant of Jehovah,' used collectively of all pious worshippers in Isaiah; and similar collective nouns are יוֹשֵׁבִים, *yoshev*, 'dwellers,' G.iv.20, אָבוֹת, 'fathers,' E.iii.6, [Is.xliii.27,] מִזְבְּחֹתַי, *mizbeakh*, 'altars,' E.xx.24.

CHAPTER XII.

DEUT. XIX. 1—XXII. 30.

725. D. xix. 1—10.

‘When Jehovah thy God hath cut off the nations, whose land Jehovah thy God giveth thee, and thou succeedest them, and dwellest in their cities and in their houses, thou shalt separate three cities for thee in the midst of the land, which Jehovah thy God giveth thee to possess it. *Thou shalt prepare thee a way*, and divide the coasts of thy land, which Jehovah thy God giveth thee to inherit, into three parts, that every slayer may flee thither. . . . Wherefore I command thee saying, *Thou shalt separate three cities for thee*. And, if Jehovah thy God enlarge thy coast, as He hath sworn unto thy fathers, and give thee all the land which He promised to give unto thy fathers, . . . *then shalt thou add three cities more for thee, beside these three*, that innocent blood be not shed in thy land, &c.’

It seems plain that the writer contemplates only *six* cities of refuge altogether; first, ‘thou shalt separate three cities for thee,’ *v. 2*, and then, when their land should be enlarged, ‘thou shalt add three cities more for thee, *besides these three*,’ *v. 9*.

And so we have the command to the same effect in N. xxxv. 9-15:—

‘And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When ye be come over Jordan into the land of Canaan, then ye shall appoint you cities to be cities of refuge for you. . . . Ye shall give three cities on this side Jordan, and three cities shall ye give in the land of Canaan, which shall be cities of refuge. These *six* cities shall be a refuge.’

Here also, as in the passage of Deuteronomy which we have now before us, the designation of the six cities is to be a *future* event, ‘when ye be come over Jordan’; in both passages, first, the three cities on the East of Jordan are to be named, and then those on the West; and there is no sign whatever of more than six cities.

But then in D.iv.41-43 we are told, as of an act *already past* —

'Then Moses severed three cities on this side Jordan toward the sun-rising . . . namely, Bezer in the wilderness, in the plain country, of the Reubenites, and Ramoth in Gilead, of the Gadites, and Golan in Bashan, of the Manassites.'

726. SCOTT supposes *nine* cities to be intended, when the territory of Israel should have reached its full extent:—

Three cities of refuge had already been allotted on the East of Jordan; and the other three were ordered to be set apart, as soon as the people were settled in the country West of Jordan; and, in case their boundaries should in after ages be enlarged, three more were to be added.

But this explanation, however at first sight plausible, is not consistent with the language of the Deuteronomist, v.2,7,9, which clearly speaks only of *six* cities, in accordance with N.xxxv.9-15. Besides which, it can hardly be thought that, if he himself had written D.iv.41-43, he would have written also the passage now before us, without making any allusion to the three cities already set apart.

727. But, assuming now that the later origin of this book has been demonstrated, the explanation of the matter may be as follows. We have seen already (611) that D.iv.41-43 is a fragment of the older narrative, which has been inserted here by the Deuteronomist. It would seem that the older writer meant these six cities to be named, as soon as the Conquest was complete, and to be reckoned at once as *Levitical* cities, to which forty-two more were to be added out of the different tribes. Now, as the conquest of the territories on the East of Jordan was already made, this writer went on to represent Moses himself as separating before his death three cities for this purpose. The Deuteronomist has removed this passage from its original connection, and placed it at the end of the *first* of the addresses, which he puts into the mouth of Moses. Here, perhaps, he may have originally intended to have *brought his work to a close*. But, afterwards, he begins again abruptly, v.1, another address, in the course of which he introduces the direc-

tions for the six cities being severed, xix.1-10, without noticing, apparently, the contradiction thus caused with the passage of the older writer, iv.41-43, which he had previously inserted, and, perhaps, had retained by an oversight.

728. However this may be, it is plain that the anachronism exists. It may be observed also that no notice is taken in D.xix of the fact, that in the older document, N.xxxv.6, it is expressly ordered, that these six cities shall be 'among the cities which he shall give to the Levites'; and these cities are limited to *forty-eight*, which are afterwards mentioned by name in Jo.xxi, all situated in the districts lying immediately east and west of the Jordan. He *adds* the direction to 'prepare (keep in order) a way' to the refuge-cities, and *omits* all reference to the slayer's abiding in the city, which he had safely reached, 'unto the death of the High Priest, which was anointed with the holy oil,' N.xxxv.25.

729. There is no indication in the history that such cities of refuge ever really existed. But the Deuteronomist shows in this chapter, and elsewhere, (xix.10,13, xxi.8,9, xxii.8, xxvii.25), great earnestness in warning against the shedding of 'innocent blood,' by which the land would be defiled, and guilt lie upon them, with special reference, we may believe, to the crying sins of his own time. And *Jeremiah* refers repeatedly to such offences as common in his days, vii.6, xix.4, xxii.3,17, xxvi.15; and so we read, (perhaps, recorded, as we have said (574.v.), by the very same hand that wrote the solemn warnings of the book of Deuteronomy,)—

'Moreover, Manasseh shed innocent blood very much, till he had filled Jerusalem from one end to another,' 2K.xxi.16;

'Surely, at the commandment of Jehovah came this upon Judah, to remove them out of His sight, for the sins of Manasseh, according to all that he did; and also for the innocent blood that he shed, for he filled Jerusalem with innocent blood, which Jehovah would not pardon.' 2K.xxiv.3,4.

730. D.xix.14.

'Thou shalt not remove thy neighbour's landmark, which *they of old time have*

set in thine inheritance, which thou shalt inherit in the land that Jehovah thy God giveth thee to possess it.'

This language is that of one writing long after the conquest and division of the land of Canaan, notwithstanding the reference to a future time in the last clause of the verse. Unless, however, we had already proved sufficiently the later age of the Deuteronomist, it would be unsafe to infer it merely from such a text as the above, as the Hebrew would, probably, allow of the translation, 'which they of old time *shall* have set, &c.'

731. D. XX. 5, 6.

'And the officers shall speak unto the people, saying, What man is there that hath built a new house, and hath not dedicated it? Let him go and return to his house, lest he die in the battle, and another man dedicate it. And what man is he that hath planted a vineyard, and hath not yet eaten of it? &c.'

The Deuteronomist is plainly here referring to his own times, when houses were built and vineyards planted, and has lost sight of the fact that the wars, in which the people would be engaged for some years, according to the story, would be wars of conquest. And so writes BLEEK, *p.* 210:—

It is plain that this law could only refer to the later times, when the relations of the Israelitish people were already settled in the land. Here, however, there is no reference whatever to this; but the law is given in general terms, as if it were capable of immediate application. We might certainly assume that if Moses had laid down such a regulation at a time (as it would seem from Deuteronomy) when the people were yet on the other side of Jordan, and had still to drive out the Canaanitish tribes from the land promised by Jehovah, it would have been uttered quite differently, and that, if the lawgiver had here been regarding at the same time the later relations, he would at all events have distinguished the two, and would have especially made prominent what he laid down for the immediate pressure of the circumstances of the people.

732. D. XX. 10—15.

'When thou comest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it. And it shall be, if it make thee answer of peace, and open unto thee, then it shall be that all the people that is found therein shall be tributaries unto thee, and they shall serve thee. And if it will make no peace with thee, but will make war against thee, then thou shalt besiege it. And, when Jehovah thy God hath delivered it into thine hands, thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword. But the women, and the little ones, and the cattle, and all that is in

the city, even all the spoil thereof, shalt thou take unto thyself; and thou shalt eat the spoil of thine enemies, which Jehovah thy God hath given thee. Thus shalt thou do unto all the cities which are very far off from thee, which are not of the cities of these nations.'

It is well that we are no longer obliged to believe that the above frightful command emanated from the mouth of the Most Holy and Blessed One. This does not apply to the cities of Canaan only. But *any* city, which the Israelites might decide for any cause to 'fight against,' if it did not surrender on the very first summons, 'make an answer of peace,' and open to the foe, on the condition of becoming 'tributaries and servants,' was, according to this injunction, to be besieged and captured, and to this end the express aid of the Almighty is promised; and then all the males, except young children, are to be put ruthlessly to death.

733. SCOTT has, evidently, some difficulty in making his comments on the above.

We must suppose, in the cases here intended, that the Israelites had some warrantable cause of levying war, which covetousness, ambition, and the thirst of dominion could not be. When, therefore, they had been injured or assaulted by any foreign nation, they were required to proceed in the manner here prescribed: for the Lord purposed by these means to enlarge their dominions, whilst they continued obedient. There were, doubtless, wise reasons why they were not only *allowed*, but, as it seems, *commanded*, to put to death all the males who were capable of resistance. The lives and property of all men are the Lord's, forfeited to His Justice, to be disposed of at His Pleasure, and for His Glory. These regulations, however, are not to be the rule of our conduct, which must be directed by the general law of love; and that prohibits unnecessary bloodshed and plunder, in war as well as peace.

734. D. xx. 16—18.

'But of the cities of these people, which Jehovah 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, as Jehovah thy God hath commanded thee; that they teach you not to do after all their abominations, which they have done unto their gods; so should ye sin against Jehovah your God.'

Here also it is well for us to know that these are the words of the later Deuteronomist, and that such commands were never

really carried out, (as we know by the cases of Uriah the Hittite and Araunah the Jebusite,) nor ever meant by the writer to be carried out, but express, rather, his burning zeal against the idolatrous vices of his own countrymen in his own age, which he desired thus to brand with infamy, and to represent as worthy only of death. A people, that could practise these abominations, was only fit to be exterminated; and that would surely be the fate of Israel, if they persisted in them, according to the doom here denounced upon the nations of Canaan.

735. D.xxi.7,8.

‘And they shall answer and say, Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it. Be merciful, Jehovah, unto Thy people Israel, whom thou hast redeemed, and lay not innocent blood unto thy people of Israel’s charge.’

We have instances of similar ‘liturgical’ formulæ in several places in Deuteronomy, *e.g.* xxi.7,8, xxvi.3,5-10,13-15, xxvii.15,16; comp. xx.2-8, xxii.16,17, xxv.7-10. The only instance in the other books of the Pentateuch is N.vi.24-26; comp. N.x.35,36. It may be doubted whether such formulæ were ever really in use, or intended to be used. But, in the case before us, the Deuteronomist gives another indication of the horror which he had of the shedding of ‘innocent blood’ (729).

736. D.xxi.10-14.

‘When thou goest forth to war against thine enemies, and Jehovah thy God hath delivered them into thine hand, and thou hast taken them captive, and seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire unto her, that thou wouldest have her to thy wife; then shalt thou bring her home to thine house; and she shall shave her head, and pare her nails; and she shall put the raiment of her captivity from off her, and shall remain in thine house, and bewail her father and mother a full month; and after that thou shalt go in unto her, and be her husband, and she shall be thy wife. And it shall be, if thou have no delight in her, then thou shalt let her go whither she will; but thou shalt not sell her at all for money, thou shalt not make merchandise of her, because thou hast humbled her.’

Here also we have the manners and customs of the writer’s age exhibited, and not the justice, mercy, and purity, which would have marked a command really emanating from the Divine Wisdom

and Goodness. The Persian Cyrus or the Roman Scipio, though heathens, taught by their lives a higher morality than this, which, besides the inhumanity involved in it, practically sanctions concubinage and polygamy, as do also the following words, v. 15—17—

‘If a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated, &c.’

737. SCOTT remarks here—

By taking the captive into the house, and there keeping her retired, her disposition would be discovered more easily; and, if that proved disagreeable, the passion might abate. The becoming attire and ornaments, in which she might be taken captive, being changed for the mean habit of a mourner, might tend to diminish her attractions (!); ‘shaving her head’ would certainly have this effect; and the words, rendered ‘paring her nails,’ seem rather to mean ‘letting them grow.’ Some, however, think that she was in the interim to be instructed in the Law; and that these were external tokens of her renouncing idolatry, and embracing the religion of Israel.

Only ‘one full month’ was to be allowed for the captive maiden to bewail her parents, and, when ‘humbled,’ she was not to be sold. Probably, the practices of the times, to which the Deuteronomist is here referring, were even more unrighteous and inhuman than this, and the law, which he has here laid down, may have been designed to remedy such evils to some extent.

738. D. xxi. 18—21.

‘If a man have a stubborn and rebellious son, which will not obey the voice of his father or the voice of his mother, and that, when they have chastened him, will not hearken unto them; then shall his father and his mother lay hold on him, and bring him out unto the elders of his city, and unto the gate of his place; and they shall say unto the elders of his city, This our son is stubborn and rebellious; he will not obey our voice; he is a glutton and a drunkard. And all the men of his city shall stone him with stones that he die; so shalt thou put evil away from among you, and all Israel shall hear and fear.’

It can hardly be believed that the above command was ever carried out, or written with a view to its being carried out, as it involves a number of inconsistencies, which will appear sufficiently by considering SCOTT’S comment upon the passage.

This law has great wisdom and mercy couched under its apparent severity; and it could not fail of producing most salutary effects, *as far as any regard was paid*

it. The parents were the only prosecutors; both must concur in the prosecution: [no notice is taken of the case of a widower or widow having a rebellious son, or of a son being disobedient to one parent, and, perhaps, encouraged in his faults by the other, or of a rebellious and dissolute *daughter*, or of, perhaps, the most common case of all, when a son has been corrupted by the example of *vicious* parents, or ruined by the mismanagement of *weak* ones;] and the elders of the city must decide the cause. The prosecution could not be admitted but for stubbornness and rebellion, connected with gluttony and drunkenness, and persisted in after rebukes and corrections; and these vices tended directly to ruin families and communities. [How much more the vices or weaknesses of the *parents*, which had *brought* up such a child to the injury of the State!] The offender must be convicted and proved incorrigible, by evidence sufficient to induce the judges to denounce the sentence, and the men of the city to execute it. [There is nothing to indicate that any evidence was needed beside the simple assertion of the parents.] Natural affection would *seldom* be so overcome even by the *basest crimes*, as to admit *both* parents thus to join in prosecuting a son, much less to do so without sufficient cause. And in the very few instances, in which hasty rage, or implacable resentment, might induce parents to attempt such a *horrid unnatural murder*, as a needless prosecution must imply, the most effectual precautions were taken to prevent the consequences. [Where is there any sign of such 'precautions'?] The execution of the law must, of course, very seldom take place; and, if ever it did, it could not fail to excite general attention and alarm, and prove a salutary warning to tens of thousands. Its very existence, *as far as known*, would exceedingly strengthen the authority of parents, give weight to their commands, reproofs, and corrections, and create an additional fear of provoking their deep resentment. It would fortify young men against the enticement of bad companions, and the force of strong temptations, and thus check the progress of wickedness. Moreover, it would be a constant admonition to parents to watch over their children, and not *unwisely* to indulge them or withhold correction, but to establish their authority over them while young, to pray for them, to check the first buddings of vice, and to set them a good example. [It is difficult to see how such a law as this could *fail* to produce this effect on the *parents*. A law to punish *them*, for the misconduct of their children of either sex, might in many cases have been at once more just and more beneficial.] This statute, therefore, so *harmless* and beneficial in its operations, yet so contrary to human policy [and the laws of natural affection], rather *proves* than *invalidates* the Divine authority of the book in which it stands recorded. No impostor would ever have thought of enacting such a law.

739. As before observed, there is no reason to suppose that the above law, though *imagined* by the Deuteronomist, was ever really meant to be acted on. It was, as SCOTT says, very 'harmless' in its operations, as regards any actual execution of its injunctions.

But it may be that the writer intended to teach a great lesson to the people of his time and of all times, by thus insisting on the paramount dignity of the parental authority. Besides the fact that, in a profligate age, 'disobedience to parents' is sure to be one of the prominent signs of the general corruption, Rom.i.30, the guilt of which attaches as much to the parents themselves as to the children, the Deuteronomist may have had a special purpose in marking *this* sin as deserving condign punishment, inasmuch as it shadowed forth the crying sins of the people of his time in their relations to Almighty God.

740. Accordingly, we find *Jeremiah* continually appealing to the Fatherhood of Jehovah, and condemning in the strongest terms the disobedience of His Children, the people of Israel. Thus he complains of their 'saying to a stock, Thou art my Father, to a stone Thou hast brought me forth,' ii.27.

And he writes:—

'Wilt thou not from this time cry unto me, My Father, Thou art the Guide of my youth?' iii.4.

'But I said, How shall I put thee among the children, and give thee a pleasant land, a goodly heritage, of the hosts of nations? And I said, Thou shalt call me, My Father, and shalt not turn away from me.' iii.19.

'I am a Father to Israel, and Ephraim is my firstborn,' xxxi.9.

'I have surely heard Ephraim bemoaning himself thus: Thou hast chastised me, and I was chastised, as a bullock unaccustomed to the yoke . . . Is Ephraim my dear son? is he a pleasant child? for since I spake against him, I do earnestly remember him still; therefore my bowels are troubled for him, I will surely have mercy upon him, saith Jehovah,' xxxi.18-20.

And in ch.xxxv he compares the obedience of the sons of 'Jonadab, the son of Rechab,' with the stubborn and unruly conduct of His own children: comp. the following passages:—

'I have spoken unto them, but they have not heard; and I have called unto them, but they have not answered,' Jer.xxxv.17;

'If a man have a stubborn and rebellious son, which will not obey the voice of his father, or the voice of his mother, and that, when they have chastened him, will not hearken unto them, &c.' D.xxi.18.

In this view of the case, the words of D.xxi.21 would have a great significance, 'and all Israel shall hear and fear.'

741. D. xxii. 1—12.

KNOBEL observes on this passage, *Deut.* p. 286.

We have here various commands, which seem to belong in part to the law indicated in iv. 44. For in the language there is much, e.g. (i) אֲבֵדָה, *āvedah*, 'lost thing,' v. 3, (ii) כֵּלִי, *kēli*, 'article,' v. 5, (iii) מְלֵאָה, *mēleah*, 'fulness,' v. 9, and (iv) כְּסוּת, *kēsuth*, 'vesture,' v. 12, which are not found elsewhere in Deuteronomy, and v. 6—8 is, apparently, an insertion in the midst of the laws forbidding the mixture of various things. The author has, however, so worked together his own and the older passages, that it is impossible to separate them with certainty.

Ans. It is true that (i) אֲבֵדָה, *āvedah*, is only found in the whole Bible in E. xxii. 9(8), L. vi. 3, 4(v. 22, 23), and here,—(ii) מְלֵאָה, *mēleah*, in E. xxii. 29(28), N. xviii. 27,—while in the Pentateuch we find (iii) כֵּלִי, *kēli*, used in the above sense only in E. xxii. 7(6), and (iv) כְּסוּת, *kēsuth*, in E. xxi. 10, xxii. 27(26).

But it is plain from v. 1, 4, in which the writer quotes almost the very words of E. xxiii. 4, 5, enlarging upon them, that he has his eye especially on the laws contained in E. xxi, xxii, xxiii, and is reproducing some of them. Hence we may easily account for his employing the four unusual words above referred to, which are all found near each other in E. xxii. 7, 9, 27, 29, (6, 8, 26, 28).

Also the direction in v. 5, 'The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment; for all that do so are an abomination unto Jehovah thy God'—does *not* appear to be of the same class exactly, as those in v. 9—11—'Thou shalt not sow thy vineyard with divers seeds. . . . Thou shalt not plow with an ox and an ass together. Thou shalt not wear a garment of divers sorts, as of woollen and linen together'—that is to say, it does not merely forbid the 'mixing' male and female garments, but seems rather to be based upon the idea of *indecenty* in the practice forbidden; and most probably refers to some obscene practices in the idolatrous worship of the times, to which also we find allusion in D. xxiii. 17, 18. There is, consequently, as it appears to us, no sufficient ground for supposing with KNOBEL that v. 6—8 is an interpolation, breaking the connection between v. 5 and v. 9—11.

Upon the whole, therefore, we conclude that there is no reason to assign any part of this section to any other writer than the Deuteronomist himself.

742. D. xxii. 13—24.

Upon this passage also KNOBEL observes, *Deut.* p. 287:—

Here also enactments from the law indicated in iv. 44 seem to lie at the bottom, as we may conjecture from some expressions otherwise strange to the language of the Deuteronomist:—

(i) קָרַב, *karav*, 'come near' (of sexual intercourse), v. 14;

- (ii) עֵנִישׁ, *hanash*, 'amerce,' v.19;
 (iii) בְּעֵלְתָּ-בַעַל, *behulath bahal*, 'possessed by a husband,' v.22;
 (iv) עַל דְּבַר, *hal dēvar*, 'because of,' v.24.

Scarcely, however, does the author give us all which he found in the older document, but only so much of it as seemed to him to be still necessary after L.xviii.20. On the other hand, he has probably made additions, e.g. 'put evil away from among you,' v.21,22,24.

Ans. The last-mentioned phrase is certainly peculiar to the Deuteronomist, xiii.5, xvii.7,12, xix.13,19, xxi.9,21, xxii.21,22,24, xxiv.7.

With respect to the others we observe as follows:—

(i) The Deuteronomist uses בּוֹא, *bo*, 'go in' to a woman, in xxi.13, xxv.5, but not, as KNOBEL observes, *instead of* קָרַב, *karav*: a little consideration will show that the latter word is used in a more restricted sense than the former; thus Ezekiel uses both, as we believe the Deuteronomist does, under different circumstances: e.g. 'Yet they went in (בּוֹא) unto her, as they go in (בּוֹא) unto a woman that playeth the harlot; so went they in (בּוֹא) unto Aholah and Aholibah, the lewd women,' Ez.xxiii.44.

Here בּוֹא, *bo*, is used of *visiting*, for improper purposes, a dissolute woman: but קָרַב, *karav*, is used more definitely by the same writer:—

'Neither hath defiled his neighbour's wife, neither hath come near (קָרַב) to a menstruous woman.' Ez.xviii.6.

So in D.xxi.13, xxv.5, the context required בּוֹא only, but in xxii.14, קָרַב.

(ii) עֵנִישׁ, *hanash*, 'amerce,' appears to have been adopted, as the four words in (741), from E.xxi.22, where it occurs twice: it is a rare word in the Bible, occurring only elsewhere in Am.ii.8, Pro.xvii.26, xxi.11, xxii.3, xxvii.12, 2Ch.xxxvi.3; but עֵנֶשׁ, *honesh*, 'tribute, fine,' is used (perhaps, by Jeremiah the Deuteronomist) in 2K.xxiii.33.

(iii) בְּעֵלְתָּ-בַעַל, *behulath bahal*, occurs only once besides in the Bible, viz. G.x.3. It is impossible to find any argument upon it, more especially as it seems to be a kind of *technical* phrase for a married woman or *femme coverte*. The *verb* בַּעַל, *bahal*, is found in D.xxi.13, xxii.22, xxiv.1, Jer.iii.14, xxxi.32, and eleven times besides in the Bible.

(iv) עַל דְּבַר, *hal dēvar*, occurs also in xxiii.5, which, however, KNOBEL reckons also to the older document, but, apparently, without sufficient reason (743). We find the plural form, עַל דְּבָרַי, *hal divre*, in the same sense in Jer.xiv.1.

Upon the whole, we conclude that this passage also is due to the Deuteronomist.

CHAPTER XIII.

DEUT. XXIII. 1—XXVI. 19.

743. D. xxiii. 1—8(2—9).

Here again, says KNOBEL, *Deut. p. 290*:—

‘These words also belong probably to the Law indicated in iv. 44. For the unfavourable notice in v. 4 does not suit the Deuteronomist; and the expressions קָהַל יְהוָה, *kēhal Yehovah*, v. 1, 2, 3, 8, and עַל דְּבַר, *hal dēvar*, v. 4, are elsewhere unknown to him; however, v. 4(*h*)—6 may be his. . . The second clause of v. 4, —where, in variation from the first clause, ‘because they met *you* not with bread and water,’ Israel is spoken of in the *singular*, ‘and because they hired against *thee* Balaam. . . to curse *thee*,’—seems to be a Deuteronomistic addition. The statement, that Jehovah would not listen to Balaam, and had turned his curse into a blessing, stands here quite superfluous, and is due to the Deuteronomistic speaker. Only he in the Pentateuch uses אָהַב, *ahav*, of Jehovah ‘loving’ Israel (552.x), and the phrases, ‘Jehovah thy God,’ (554) and קִלְלָהּ, *kēlalah*, ‘curse’ (552.xviii), are especially current with him.’

Ans. We have a similar change of *numbers* in other places of Deuteronomy, e.g. xii. 5, ‘unto His habitation shall *ye* seek, and thither *thou* shalt come,’ v. 7, ‘*ye* and *your* households, wherein Jehovah *thy* God hath blessed *thee*,’ xxix. 5, ‘*your* clothes are not waxen old upon *you*, and *thy* shoe is not waxen old upon *thy* foot.’

We have already considered עַל-דְּבַר (742.iv): and as to קָהַל יְהוָה, we have seen (548.xii) that קָהַל, *kahal*, is the only word used by the Deuteronomist for ‘congregation,’ and *Jeremiah* uses it also in Lam. i. 10, with express reference to this very command in D. xxiii. 3.

There does not appear, therefore, to be any sufficient reason for *not* ascribing this passage, like the rest, wholly to the Deuteronomist; though there appears to be a contradiction, as KNOBEL observes, between the statement *here* made, v. 4, that neither Ammonite nor Moabite ‘met the people with bread and water’ on their way out of Egypt, and the fact incidentally

mentioned with respect to the Moabites in ii.29, which may be the result of inadvertence on the part of the writer.

744. The superstitious rules in xxiii.1,2, (the like to which have even been repeated in the Christian Church,) cannot certainly be ascribed without irreverence to the Gracious God and Father of all. Especially, the exclusion of a 'bastard' *to the tenth generation* from the privileges of the Sanctuary, while the *father*, the guilty cause of his child's illegitimate birth, was not excluded, and when children by a concubine, — by one, perhaps, of many belonging to the same man, — had also free access to the sacred place, — seems, to our modern sense of right and equity, most unjust. The law was evidently designed to act as a check on promiscuous fornication and adulterous connexions, while polygamy and concubinage were allowed. But its action would have been directly opposed to the principles of Divine government, as announced by Ezekiel, xviii.20, and, indeed, by the Deuteronomist himself in another place, xxiv.16,—

'The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin;' whereas this law punished the child and his descendants for centuries for the sin of the parent.

745. The 'Ammonite' and 'Moabite' are mentioned here, in connection with the 'bastard,' &c. with manifest reference to the story of the incestuous origin of Moab and Ammon in G. xix. 30-38; and these also are to be excluded from the 'congregation of Jehovah' unto their tenth generation, v.3. There is, doubtless, here a reference also to the inveterate enmity which existed between these nations and Israel in the writer's own time. We have already quoted passages (594, 596), which show that both the Moabites and Ammonites were independent and powerful communities in the days of *Jeremiah*; and in 2K. xxiv.2 bands of each nation are spoken of as harassing Judah, together with the Chaldees and Syrians, shortly after the death of Josiah. We may infer that both these kindred peoples entertained the

same spirit of hostility towards the people of Jehovah, which we find expressly ascribed to Moab in Jer. xlviii. 26, 27, 42 :—

‘Make ye him drunken, for he magnified himself against Jehovah; Moab also shall wallow in his vomit, and he also shall be in derision. For was not Israel a derision unto thee? . . . Moab shall be destroyed from being a people, because he hath magnified himself against Jehovah.’

It may be with reference to this permanent state of ill feeling, which existed between Israel and these two nations, that the Deuteronomist charges the Israelites with respect to them, v. 6—

‘Thou shalt not seek their peace nor their prosperity all thy days for ever.’

746. D. xxiii. 7, 8.

‘Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite; for he is thy brother. Thou shalt not abhor an Egyptian; because thou wast a stranger in his land.’

The singular reason here given for ‘not abhorring the Egyptian,’ after all the afflictions which the people had suffered in the ‘iron furnace,’ the ‘house of bondage,’—*viz.* ‘because thou wast a stranger in his land,’—points, probably, as we have said (712), to some close connection with Egypt in the days of the Deuteronomist. Josiah himself was killed by Pharaoh-Necho, king of Egypt, 2K. xxiii. 29. But it is very probable that, in the earlier part of his reign of 31 years, there was a much better feeling between Judah and Egypt.

747. In the time of his grandfather Hezekiah there must have been an alliance between them; since Rabshakeh says, 2K. xviii. 21, —

‘Now, behold, thou trustest upon the staff of this broken reed, even upon Egypt.’

And though the Prophet did not approve of this connection, yet there was evidently a great deal of friendliness between the two peoples in the days of Isaiah. Thus he writes :—

‘Woe to the rebellious children . . . that walk to go down into Egypt, and have not asked at my mouth, to strengthen themselves in the strength of Pharaoh, and to trust in the shadow of Egypt. . . . For the Egyptians shall help in vain and to no purpose.’ Is. xxx. 2, 7.

‘Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help. . . . Now the Egyptians are men, and not God, and their horses flesh, and not spirit.’ Is. xxxi. 1, 3.

And, as observed above (746), the language of Jeremiah in ii. 18, 36, implies that in the early part of his reign Josiah expected friendly help from Egypt:—

‘What hast thou to do in the way of Egypt, to drink the waters of Sihor? . . . Thou also shalt be ashamed of Egypt, as thou wast ashamed of Assyria.’

748. Egypt also was a place of refuge for many Jewish fugitives after the destruction of Jerusalem, in spite of the strong remonstrances of the Prophet, whom they carried with them, Jer. xliii. 6, 7. The reason for his opposition to this movement was, evidently, the certainty which he felt that the people would there give themselves up to gross idolatry, as, in fact, they did, Jer. xliv. 7, 8:—

‘Wherefore commit ye this great evil against your souls, to cut off from you man and woman, child and suckling, out of Judah, to leave you none to remain; in that ye provoke me unto wrath with the works of your hands, burning incense unto other gods in the land of Egypt, whither ye be gone to dwell?’

749. Of Judah’s relations with Edom we know nothing from the history in the reigns of Hezekiah, Manasseh, Amon, and Josiah. In the days of Ahaz, Hezekiah’s father, the Edomites had come, and smitten Judah, and carried away captives, according to the Chronicler, 2Ch. xxviii. 17. There may have been peace with them afterwards,—at all events, at the time when the Deuteronomist was writing; and, indeed, we hear nothing of their troubling Judah any further, till they seem to have triumphed at the Fall of Jerusalem, Lam. iv. 21, Ob. 10–14.

750. D. xxiii. 16–26.

Here also KNOBEL observes, *Deut.* p. 291:—

These verses probably belong in part to the Law indicated in iv. 44; at least in v. 16–19 there is much which elsewhere is foreign to the language of the Deuteronomist, e.g. (i) the plural form, אֲדוֹנִים *ădonim*, ‘lord,’ v. 15(16), used of men, (ii) הוֹנָה *honah*, ‘oppress,’ v. 16(17), (iii) קְדֵשָׁה *kědeshah*, ‘prostitute,’ v. 17(18), (iv) ‘House of Jehovah,’ v. 18(19).

Ans. (i) אֲדוֹנִים *ădonim*, is used, it is true, of a human master in G. xxiv. 9, 51, xxxix. 2, 3, 7, 8, 16, 19, 20, xl. 1, 7, &c., E. xxi. 4, 4, 6, 6, 8, 32; but the same writer uses also the singular form in G. xlii. 10, xliii. 20, xliv. 5, 7, &c., E. xxi. 5, so that the plural form is not characteristic of his style. In Deuteronomy the plural occurs *twice* in the

passage now before us, and *twice* also in x.17 in the phrase 'Lord of lords;' but the Deuteronomist does not employ the word again either in the singular or plural, so that it is impossible to say that this form is 'foreign' to his style. From the facts before us we should infer rather the contrary; perhaps, he would have used both forms, as the other writer has done; or, in the case before us, the word may really be used with a plural meaning, 'thou shalt not deliver unto his masters the servant which is escaped from his masters,'—the case supposed being evidently that of a slave escaped, not from a Hebrew master, but from a foreign country.

(ii) הוֹקָה, *hukah*, occurs in E.xxii.21(20), which the Deuteronomist may have had in view, also in Lxix.33, xxv.14,17, and in Jer.xxii.3; and the root הִקָּה, *yahah*, is used in the same sense in Jer.xxxv.38, xlvi.16, l.16.

(iii) קִדְּשָׁה, *kadesh*, 'sodomite,' fem. קִדְּשָׁה, *kēdeshah*, is a word unlikely to be repeated in Deuteronomy; the former occurs in 1K.xiv.24, xv.12, xxii.46(47), 2K.xxiii.7, (perhaps, by the hand of Jeremiah, [?] the Deuteronomist), and Job xxxvi.14; the latter is only found besides in G.xxxviii.21,22, Hos.iv.14. It cannot be said to be 'foreign' to the Deuteronomist.

(iv) 'House of Jehovah' occurs nowhere else in the Pentateuch, except in E.xxiii.19, so that no argument can be built on this expression; but the entire phrase 'the House of Jehovah thy God' would seem to be decidedly Deuteronomistic (554).

On the whole, there appears to be no sufficient reason for not ascribing this whole passage to the Deuteronomist, more especially as KNOBEL himself observes —

The phrase 'in one of thy gates,' v.16, seems to be a Deuteronomistic addition; unless, indeed, this whole direction generally, v.15,16, is due to the Deuteronomist.

In v.19,20, the law against usury, as laid down by the older writer in E.xxii.25–27, is qualified in a way which indicates the growth of *commercial intercourse* in the writer's time. 'A Jew may lend on usury to a stranger, but not to his brother Jew.'

751. D.xxiii.17,18.

There shall be no whore of the daughters of Israel, nor a sodomite of the sons of Israel. Thou shalt not bring the hire of a whore, or the price of a dog (= 'reward of salomy'), unto the House of Jehovah thy God for any vow: for even both these are abomination unto Jehovah thy God.'

The words קִדְּשָׁה, *kadesh*, קִדְּשָׁה, *kēdeshah*, here translated 'sodomite' and 'whore,' mean literally 'consecrated.'

It appears from the above that the practice, which prevailed among the Aramaean tribes, of maidens and boys prostituting themselves in honour of their deities, existed also in the writer's

time among the Hebrews, and was not thought incompatible with the worship of Jehovah. This no doubt arose from the mixture of Jehovah-worship with idol-worship in the 'high places,' and accounts for the energy with which the Deuteronomist declares himself against them, and the strong effort he makes to abolish them throughout the land. Reference is most probably made to these vicious practices in the account of the sins of Israel, committed with the 'daughters of Moab' in N.xxv. But the older legislation, apparently, did not find it necessary to forbid these abominations, which were the growth of a more advanced state of corrupt civilisation.

752. D.xxiv.5,6.

These verses also, according to KNOBEL, p.295, may belong to the older document, since for יָצֵא בְצָרָא , *yatsa vatsava*, 'go out in the host,' the Deuteronomist uses the phrase יָצֵא לְמִלְחָמָה , *yatsa lamilkhamah*, 'go out to the war,' xx.1, xxi.10. Also here the newly-married man is *not* to go out; whereas in xx.7 the rule is laid down that the man betrothed must join the forces, but be dismissed at the muster to go home.

Ans. xx.7 speaks of a man only betrothed, who 'hath not yet taken' his wife while xxiv.5 says 'when a man hath taken a new wife, &c.': so that there is really no contradiction in the two injunctions. As to the use of לְמִלְחָמָה instead of בְצָרָא , the former is used in N.xxxi.21, and the latter by the *same* writer in v.36, and for 'men of war' he uses $\text{אֲנָשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה}$, *anshe hammilkhamah*, v.49, and אֲנָשֵׁי הַצָּרָא , *anshe hatsava*, v.53.

There seems no sufficient reason, therefore, for not ascribing these verses to the Deuteronomist.

753. D.xxiv.8,9.

Take heed in the plague of leprosy that thou observe diligently, and do according to all that the Priests the Levites shall teach you; as I commanded them, so ye shall observe to do. Remember what Jehovah thy God did unto Miriam by the way, after that ye were come forth out of Egypt.'

This is the only *direct* reference to the older statute-book, which we find in Deuteronomy; and here we have no longer his usual phrase, 'as I command thee this day.' It is plain from the above that the older document, with its laws about leprosy,

&c. *did* remain, as we have supposed, in the keeping of the Priests, in a book that was 'before the Priests the Levites,' D.xvii.18, and served as a kind of directory for their proceedings in all matters of this kind, and as a record from which they might instruct the people. This is in accordance with the words of the old Law, Lx.11, addressed to the Priests—

'And that ye may teach the children of Israel all the statutes which Jehovah hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses.'

And this explains also the allusions in the Prophets to the Priests being the professed teachers of the Law, *e. g.*—

'The Law shall not perish from the Priest, nor counsel from the wise, nor the word from the Prophet,' Jer.xviii.18;

'And they shall teach my people (the difference) between the holy and profane, and cause them to discern between the unclean and the clean,' Ez.xliv.23;

and see also Hag.ii.11–13, Mal.ii.7.

754. D.xxv.5–10.

This law, that a brother must take to wife his dead brother's widow, must in all cases, where the surviving brother was already married, not only have permitted and sanctioned, but actually encouraged, nay, even enjoined, polygamy, under the penalty of a lasting disgrace attaching to the man who refused to take this additional wife,—not to speak of the consequences of his disregarding a (supposed) Divine command. Even if unmarried, it would have been a great hardship to have had his brother's widow forced upon him, as his *only* companion for life. It cannot be supposed that such a man would generally have been content with her alone, especially as polygamy was permitted. She might be old, ill-favoured, ill-tempered, sickly; and his dead brother might have left him more wives than one to be taken in this way.

Regarding the law, however, as of human origin, it may be observed that a similar practice prevails among the Zulus and other South African tribes.

755. HENGSTENBERG observes, ii.p.87 :—

That Deuteronomy is more ancient than the book of Ruth appears from the circumstance that the writer of the latter describes the symbolic action of taking off the shoe as one that has grown obsolete in his time, while in Deuteronomy it is spoken of as in actual use, and requiring no explanation.

Ans. The 'symbolic action' described in Deuteronomy has not the slightest resemblance to that spoken of in R.iv.7,8. In the latter passage we read, 'Now this was the manner in former time in Israel concerning redeeming and concerning changing, for to confirm all things—a man plucked off his shoe, and gave it to his neighbour; and this was a testimony in Israel.' The writer is expressly speaking of a symbolic practice in effecting a sale of land: the seller gave his shoe to the buyer, in token that he gave him the right of walking over it. But here in D.xxv.8,9, the case is that of a man who refuses to marry his dead brother's wife; and we read, 'If he stand to it, and say, I like not to take her, then shall *his brother's wife* come unto him in the presence of the elders, and *loose his shoe from off his foot*, and spit in his face, and shall answer and say, So shall it be done unto that man, that will not build up his brother's house. And his name shall be called in Israel, The house of him that hath his shoe loosed.'

The two 'symbolic actions,' therefore, are entirely different in their object and nature.

756. D.xxv.17–19.

We have here the command enforced upon Israel—

'Thou shalt blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven; thou shalt not forget it.'

We hear nothing of the Amalekites in the history of the later kings. But in Ps.lxxxiii.7, written apparently in David's time, we find mention made of Amalek, as joined with the other neighbouring nations, Edom, Moab, Ammon, the Philistines, and the Syrians, in a grand confederacy against Israel. They may have survived as a people down to the days of the Deuteronomist, though, perhaps, they existed in his time as a small and inconsiderable tribe, dwindling away to nothing.

757. D.xxvi.12–15. Upon this passage see (654).

It can scarcely be supposed that this diffuse formula was ever really intended to be used. It was meant most probably to remind the pious Israelite of his duty towards the poor and the Levite; and, as before noticed, the stress is here distinctly laid

upon the due employment in works of charity of the tithe of the *third* year, 'the year of tithing,' which was to be spent *at home* in general feasting, to which, besides all the members of the family, the needy and destitute of all kinds were to be invited. It seems as if the writer *did* hope that this law with respect to the tithes might be carried out, whatever might be the case with the others.

CHAPTER XIV.

DEUT.XXVII.1-26.

758. D.xxvii.1-8.

‘And Moses, with the elders of Israel, commanded the people, saying, Keep all the commandments, which I command you this day. And it shall be on the day, when ye shall pass over Jordan into the land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee, that thou shalt set thee up great stones, and plaster them with plaster. And thou shalt write upon them all the words of this Law, when thou art passed over, that thou mayest go in unto the land, which Jehovah thy God giveth thee, *a land that floweth with milk and honey*, as Jehovah, the God of thy fathers, hath promised thee. Therefore it shall be, when ye be gone over Jordan, that ye shall set up these stones, which I command you this day, in *Mount Ebal*, [Sam. ‘*Gerizim*,’ LXX. ‘*Ebal*’], and thou shalt plaster them with plaster. And there shalt thou build an altar unto Jehovah thy God, an altar of stones; thou shalt not lift up any iron tool upon them. Thou shalt build the altar of Jehovah thy God of whole stones; and thou shalt offer burnt-offerings thereon unto Jehovah thy God; and thou shalt offer peace-offerings, and shalt eat there, and rejoice before Jehovah thy God. *And thou shalt write upon the stones all the words of this Law very plainly.*’

759. The Samaritan Pentateuch has the following addition after E.xx.17, that is to say, immediately after the Ten Commandments:—

‘And it shall be, when Jehovah thy God shall bring thee into the land of the Canaanites, whither thou goest to possess it, then thou shalt set thee up great stones; and thou shalt plaster them with plaster, and shalt write upon the stones all the words of this Law. And it shall come to pass, when ye are passed over Jordan, that ye shall put these stones, which I command you this day, upon *Mount Gerizim*. And thou shalt build thee an altar to Jehovah thy God, an altar of stones; thou shalt not lift up any iron tool upon them. Thou shalt build the altar of Jehovah thy God of whole stones; and thou shalt offer burnt-offerings thereon unto Jehovah thy God; and thou shalt sacrifice peace-offerings, and shalt eat there, and rejoice before Jehovah thy God. That mountain is on the other side Jordan, by the way where the sun goeth down, in the land of the Canaanites, which dwell in the

champaign, (properly, desert, Arabia,) over against Gilgal, beside the plain of Moreh, near Sichem.

In short, the second passage is almost identically the same with the first, except that it has *Mount Gerizim* as the place, where the stones of the Law were to be set up, instead of *Mount Ebal*.

760. The following are the particulars, more precisely, in which the passage in Deuteronomy differs from that in the Samaritan Pentateuch after E.xx.17:—

(i) In v.2, for 'It shall be when Jehovah thy God shall bring thee into the land of the Canaanites, whither thou goest to possess it,' the Deuteronomist writes, 'It shall be on the day when ye shall pass over Jordan unto the land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee.'

(ii) In v.3, after 'the words of this Law,' he has added, 'when thou art passed over, that thou mayest go in unto the land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee, a land that floweth with milk and honey, as Jehovah thy God hath promised thee.'

(iii) In v.4, he has changed 'Mount Gerizim' into 'Mount Ebal,' and repeated superfluously the command, 'Thou shalt plaster them with plaster,' already given in v.2.

(iv) He has omitted the last sentence of the Samaritan passage, and inserted it, slightly modified, in D.xi.30.

761. Upon this point, KENNICOTT writes as follows, *Diss.i.p.96* :

It must have appeared strange, surprisingly strange, during the reader's perusal of the preceding remarks, that it is not more clearly expressed *what* this Law, thus to be engraved, *was*,—that a point of so much importance should not have been, somewhere or other, very accurately noted, and very particularly circumscribed by Moses, partly for the more secure direction of Joshua, and partly to render this awful transaction more intelligible through future ages. But all this surprise ceases—all this puzzle is unravelled—all this uncertainty is at once removed—if we allow the authority of the Samaritan Pentateuch, if we will but grant that there may have been in the Hebrew text a certain passage, which is now found in all the copies of the Samaritan Text and Version, and which is also found, exactly as in the Samaritan Pentateuch, in that Arabic version of it, in the Arabic character, which has been before mentioned, and which is a very valuable, because a very literal, version. For in E.xx, as soon as the Tenth Commandment is concluded, we read in the Samaritan Pentateuch the five following verses—'And it shall be, &c.' [as above.]

Here, then, according to this truly venerable copy of the Book of Moses, all is clear. The whole is perfectly regular, and in harmonious proportion. We have seen the several circumstances, concurring to render it highly probable that the

Ten Commandments constituted the Law, which was to be engraved. And, as it can scarcely be conceived that such a point could have been quite omitted by Moses, it makes greatly for the honour of the Samaritan Pentateuch, to have preserved so considerable a passage. *Why* the ancient Jews should omit this passage, can be a matter of no doubt at all with those, who mark the honour it does to Mount Gerizim. And, therefore, the same men who corrupted D.xxvii.4, have but acted with uniformity, if they have also corrupted E.xx, *omitting* Gerizim in the latter instance just as honestly as they *altered* it in the former.

But that some few verses *did* formerly follow after the Tenth Commandment in E.xx.17, and before v.18, we have not only the authority of the Samaritan Pentateuch, (which, together with the several foregoing confirmations, may be thought satisfactory,) but we have also the authority of an ancient Syrian MS., which contains a version of the O.T., and is catalogued in the Bodleian Library. 3,130. Between v.17 and v.18, at the very place where the passage is now found in the Samaritan Pentateuch, in this Syriac MS., though translated from a *Hebrew* copy, there is left, in the middle of the page, a vacant space, just equal to the five verses expressed in the Samaritan. And *no such vacant space* is left anywhere else through the whole MS., excepting a space somewhat larger in Ecclus.xxvii and one somewhat less in 2Macc.viii. The inference from this very remarkable circumstance I leave to the learned reader.

That the Samaritan Text should be condemned as corrupted *merely* for having more in it than the Hebrew, no man of learning will maintain. Certainly, the Jews *might omit*, as easily as the Samaritans *might insert*. And I presume that it has been, and will be hereafter more fully, proved, that several whole passages, now in the Samaritan, but not in the Hebrew Pentateuch, are not interpolations in the former, but omissions in the latter.

762. In addition to the above remarks of KENNICOTT we may observe:—

(i) If the Samaritans *introduced* the passage after E.xx.17, in order to do special honour to their sacred Mount Gerizim, they must have copied it from the passage in Deuteronomy already existing, only changing Ebal into Gerizim.

(ii) But in that case they would not surely have omitted the very characteristic expression, ‘a land that floweth with milk and honey,’ which occurs in the latter, v.3.

(iii) There was a reason why, *after* the Captivity, when such hostility existed between the Jews and Samaritans, and the latter had built their opposition Temple on Mount Gerizim, the *Jews* should have corrupted the Text of these Scriptures, as KENNICOTT supposes.

(iv) But there was no reason why any Jewish writer, living in any age *before* the Captivity, should not have chosen the splendid Table-Mountain* of Gerizim (326.i), in the very centre of the land of Canaan, and visible afar off, as the site on which the stones should be set up, containing the record of God's covenant with Israel, in sight, as it were, of all the people of the land.

(v) And we actually find Gerizim chosen—and, as we shall see (770), probably, by the Deuteronomist himself—as the Mount of *Blessing*, xxvii.12, on which Joshua himself was to take his stand, with the principal tribes of Levi, Judah, Joseph, and Benjamin; whereas Ebal was to be the Mount of *Cursing*, v.13, on which the inferior tribes were stationed.

763. There seems, therefore, every reason to believe that KENNICOTT's suggestion is well founded, *viz.* that —

(i) The passage D.xxvii.2-8 has been copied by the Deuteronomist from the passage which stood originally in the Hebrew MS. after E.xx.17;

(ii) He has inserted in it the phrase 'a land that floweth with milk and honey,' which is one of his favourite phrases (793, iv.);

(iii) The later Jews have altered in v.4 the name Gerizim, which the Deuteronomist wrote, into Ebal, and have struck out also altogether the original passage after E.xx.17.

764. Hence we can explain the origin of the expression 'all

* It seems doubtful if LUDOLF's description of the fertility of Gerizim and comparative barrenness of Ebal, quoted from KENNICOTT in (326.ii), can be altogether relied on. ROBINSON writes, *Bibl. Res.* iii. p. 96: 'Mounts Gerizim and Ebal rise in steep rocky precipices immediately from the valley on each side, apparently some 800 feet in height. The sides of both these mountains, as here seen, were to our eyes equally naked and sterile; although some travellers have chosen to describe Gerizim as fertile, and confine the sterility to Ebal. The only exception in favour of the former, so far as we could perceive, is a small ravine coming down opposite the western end of the town, which, indeed, is *full of fountains and trees*. In other respects, both mountains, as here seen, are desolate, except that a few olive-trees are scattered upon them.'

the words of this Law,' v.3,8, which in the context, in which they now stand, can only, as KNOBEL says, be referred—

not to the 'blessings and curses,' nor to the 'law of Deuteronomy' only, but to the whole Mosaic Law, though the writer means only the actual prescriptions of the Law,—according to the Jews. 613 in number.—and not, at the same time, all narratives, warnings, admonitions, speeches, reasonings, &c.

But to engrave on stones even the 'blessings and curses,' if by this is meant the matter in D.xxvii.15-xxviii.68, would have required an immense amount of labour and material,—much more the whole Law of Deuteronomy, or the 613 precepts.

SCOTT says on this point :—

Some expositors think that the whole book of Deuteronomy was written on these plastered stones, and that they were twelve in number, according to the tribes of Israel; others restrict the writing to the *preceptive* part of it; others to the *Ten Commandments* only; while many are of opinion that the latter part of this chapter alone is meant. Indeed, as the stones were placed on Mount *Ebal*, whence the *curses* were denounced, it is probable that these were added. But we may conclude that at least the Ten Commandments, and the great outlines of the whole Law, were likewise inscribed in the most legible manner.

765. Applied, however, as the direction appears to have been in its original position, only to the 'Ten Commandments,' the 'ten words,' E.xxxiv.28, which are expressly 'called *the Law*, התורה, *haTorah*, E.xxiv.12, (not 'a Law,' E.V.) the phrase 'all the words of this Law' is quite intelligible. The Deuteronomist appears to have transferred the direction from the end of the Ten Commandments to the end of (what may be considered to be) his *expansion* of the Ten Commandments, without observing that in that connection it was incongruous and impracticable, as, in fact, he never really contemplated its being actually carried out.

766. KNOBEL is of opinion that —

In v.5-7(a) we have an older notice, retouched by the Deuteronomist, while the rest is pure Deuteronomistic matter.

He does not, however, give his reason for this. Certainly, the command is given in v.5,6, to 'build an altar of stones, of *whole* stones—thou shalt not lift up any tool upon them,' which seems more suited to the age of the older document, where it is

expressly forbidden, E.xx.25, to build an altar of *hewn* stone—‘for, if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it,’—than to the later days of the Deuteronomist, when such altars, made with tools, must have been common. But this direction is accounted for upon KENNICOTT’S theory. In the original position of the words, after E.xx.17, the command in question was most appropriate, in close connection with the words immediately following in E.xx.25; and the Deuteronomist has only repeated the same language. We may observe also, that in v.7 the expression ‘peace-offerings’ is used, which is found nowhere else in Deuteronomy. But this also *may* have been merely copied from the original passage, when it would have stood in close connection with the words, ‘thy burnt-offerings and thy peace-offerings,’ in E.xx.24. If, however, as KNOBEL says, the ‘rest of the passage,’—or, as we believe, the *whole* of it, since throughout, in v.2,3,5,6,7,7, we find the favourite Deuteronomistic formula, ‘Jehovah thy God,’—is ‘pure Deuteronomistic matter,’ the question remains to be considered hereafter, when we examine closely the book of Exodus, whether the *original* passage after E.xx.17 may not have been a Deuteronomistic insertion in the earlier narrative. ‘Peace-offerings’ are named in 1K.iii.15, viii.63,64,64, 2K.xvi.13, and the complete phrase ‘burnt-offerings and peace-offerings’ in 1K.ix.25; so that the Deuteronomist *might* have used it.

767. D.xxvii.11-26.

‘And Moses charged the people the same day, saying, These shall stand upon Mount Gerizim to bless the people, when ye are come over Jordan.—Simeon, and Levi, and Judah, and Issachar, and Joseph, and Benjamin; and these shall stand upon Mount Ebal to curse,—Reuben, Gad, and Asher, and Zebulun, Dan, and Naphtali. And the *Levites* shall speak, and say unto all the men of Israel with a loud voice, Cursed be the man, &c. And all the people shall answer and say, Amen.’

It is not easy to see what is the exact meaning of the above direction, as it now stands. Six tribes are to *bless*, and six to *curse*, and among the *former* is placed the tribe of *Levi*: then,

afterwards, the *Levites*, who should be standing with the other five *blessing* tribes, are to pronounce the *curses*, and *all* the people are to 'say, Amen.' It is true, these 'Levites' are most probably the 'Priests,' whom we find so continually mentioned as 'Levites' in Deuteronomy; and, if the whole passage is due to one hand, we may suppose that the whole *tribe* of Levi was to stand on Gerizim to bless, while the small body of Priests were to take their place, perhaps, in such a position as to command both parties, and 'give out' the words both of blessing and of cursing. Still it seems strange that the *same* writer should have left such a confusion in his story as now exists, setting the '*tribe of Levi*' to *bless*, in *v.12*, and the '*Levites*' to pronounce the *curse*, in *v.14*, without any kind of explanation. Nor is there any indication whatever of the original direction being carried out, of six tribes blessing and six cursing. And the '*blessings*' which follow in xxviii.3-6 are not given at all in the same way as the curses. In fact, ch.xxviii begins abruptly, in such a manner, that it is impossible to say from the *context* who is supposed to be speaking, though from the *contents* we may infer that it is Moses.

768. It might be suggested that *v.11-13* may be a fragment of the older document, in which Joseph is reckoned thrice as *one* tribe, and Levi numbered as a tribe with the rest, *viz.* G.xlix, E.i.2-5, N.xvii, instead of the twelve tribes, comprising 'all the people,' being made up without the Levites, by the two tribes of the house of Joseph, Ephraim and Manasseh, as is so frequently done, N.i.5-15, ii,vii, xiii.4-16, xxvi. Yet this seems hardly to be the correct solution of the difficulty. There can be no doubt that *v.9,10*, are by the Deuteronomist, since they contain the expression 'the Priests the Levites,' which is *never* used by any of the other writers. And *v.14-26* are also his, as appears from the expressions employed in it.

(i) In *v.14* we have לְכֹל־אִישׁ־יִשְׂרָאֵל, *kol ish Israel*, 'all the men of Israel,' which only occurs again in D.xxix.10(9), undeniably due to the Deuteronomist;

(ii) in v.15 we have **פָּסַל**, *psal*, (552.iv), 'work of the hands' (552.iv), **בַּסֵּתֶר**, *basseth r.* 'secretly,' xiii.6(7), xxvii.15,24, xxviii.57, *nowhere else in the Pentateuch.*

(iii) in v.16, **מִקְלָה**, *makleh*, 'making light,' from **קָלָה**, *kalah*, xxv.3, *nowhere else in the Pentateuch*: in the corresponding passage E.xxi.17, we have **מִקְלָל**, *m-kallel*;

(iv) in v.17, **מִסִּיג**, *massig*, 'removing,' xix.14, *nowhere else in the Pentateuch*;

(v) in v.19, 'the stranger, the widow, and the fatherless' (552.xvi);

(vi) in v.20, 'uncover his father's skirt,' as in xxii.30 (xxiii.1);

(vii) in v.24, **בַּסֵּתֶר**, *bassethur*, as above (ii);

(viii) in v.25, **דָּם נָקִי**, *dam naki*, 'innocent blood' (552.xxiii);

(ix) in v.26, 'the words of this Law.' (550.ix).

769. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the curses in v.14-26 are due to the Deuteronomist; and if so, it is unlikely that v.11-13 should be by a different hand, as in that case the Deuteronomist must have suppressed the curses of the original document, and replaced them by matter of his own. Further in v.13 we have **קְלָלָה**, *kēlalah*, 'curse,' which occurs *eleven* times in Deuteronomy (552.xviii), and only besides in the Pentateuch in G.xxvii.12,13; and it seems plain that v.11-13 refer directly to xi.29:—

'And it shall come to pass, when Jehovah thy God hath brought thee in unto the land whither thou goest to possess it, that thou shalt put the blessing upon Mount Gerizim and the curse upon Mount Ebal.'

770. We must conclude, therefore, that the whole passage, including v.11-13, is by the Deuteronomist, and that he means the whole body of the tribe of Levi to stand with the other five tribes on the Mount of Blessing, while the *Levites proper*, or Priests, were to stand by the Ark in some central position,—at one end, it may be, of the long narrow valley which parted the two mountains, on the slopes of which the twelve tribes were to be stationed. This agrees with the description in Jo.viii.33:—

'And all Israel, and their elders and officers, and their judges, stood, on this side the Ark and on that side, before the Priests the Levites, which bare the Ark of the covenant of Jehovah. . . half of them over against Mount Gerizim, and half of them over against Mount Ebal.'

This agrees, too, with the fact that the Deuteronomist speaks of Joseph as a single tribe in xxxiii.13, and it seems to be con-

firmed by the expressions in xviii.1-8, already considered (720, iii), which imply that, according to his view, only *some* of the tribe of Levi would be likely to enter upon the sacred office.

771. Still, however, the difficulty remains to conceive in what way the Deuteronomist meant this 'blessing' and 'cursing' to be conducted. I must confess that I cannot explain the matter in any way satisfactorily, or without some extravagant assumption as to what the writer has *omitted* to state. It may be suggested, for instance, that in v.14 it should be translated, 'And the Levites shall *answer* (אָנָּן), *hand*, and say unto all the men of Israel with a loud voice,' as if they were first to hear the curses from the party on Mount Ebal, and then repeat them to the whole community. But then there is no explanation of the way in which the 'blessings' were to be delivered. And it is plain that ch.xxviii passes away altogether from any formal utterance of the blessings like that of the curses, and shapes itself into a solemn address of the Lawgiver, abruptly begun without any introduction.

772. Upon the whole, it appears to me to be most probable that the writer has *departed* from his original intention. In xi.29 he meant the *tribes* to pronounce the blessings and curses, and made the arrangement for that purpose in xxvii.11-13; but he then decided to place them in the mouths of the Priests, and make the people say, 'Amen'; and this he actually did with the curses. But, instead of limiting himself in this way with respect to the blessings, he has insensibly been carried away by his subject, and poured out his full heart in the glowing and vehement words of ch.xxviii. This chapter he has now left without any introduction or explanation, without any intimation of its connection with the matter before or after. He may have intended that the Levites should be made to utter a series of short blessings, like the curses, such as those in xxviii:3-6, which correspond almost exactly to the curses in v.16-19, so that these cannot be themselves the blessings

intended in xxvii.13. But, if so, he was presently overpowered by his own intensity of feeling, and has thus left us the magnificent language of this chapter, in which blessings and cursings, both of the strongest kind, are mixed up together.

773. As it is plain that this whole transaction is only an ideal scene, which the author himself, apparently, has not even realised completely in his own imagination, it is hardly necessary to consider at any length the question of the physical possibility of such blessings and curses being uttered in this way, so as to be heard by the people and duly responded to. The length of the valley between the two mountains is said to be about three miles, and its breadth from 200 to 300 yards.

Professor STANLEY writes, *Sinai and Palestine*, p.237,—

High above the fertile vale [of Shechem] rose the long rocky ridge of Mount Gerizim, facing the equally long and rocky range of Ebal,—

and he quotes also JEROME's statement with respect to the two mountains,—

They are a considerable distance apart; nor would the sounds of persons blessing or cursing in turns be heard from one to the other.

JEROME, accordingly, wishes to select two other mountains near Jericho. But, as STANLEY observes,—

The positive statement, that the mountains were by the terebinths of Moreh, G.xi. 30. compels us to adhere to the common view. . . . The ceremony may have taken place on the lower spurs of the mountains, where they approach more nearly to each other. And I am informed that even from the two summits shepherds have been heard conversing with each other.

774. Doubtless, in peculiar states of the air, as when, perhaps, in a calm and still evening, the dews are beginning to fall, shepherds may be able to hear and answer one another, and even to maintain, by special effort, a conversation at considerable distances, as the natives of Australia and Natal now do. But can such an exertion of the voice be thought of in connection with such a solemn ceremony as this? In this particular case, there is no possibility of evading the full meaning of the expression 'the whole congregation,' as implying the great body,

at all events, of the 600,000 warriors, and of substituting for them the 'elders,' since in Jo.viii.33, just quoted, where the transaction in question is described, we are told that—

'All Israel, and their elders and officers, and their judges, stood on this side the Ark and on that side, before the Priests the Levites, the bearers of [E.V. 'which bare'] the Ark of the covenant of Jehovah, as well the stranger as he that was born among them; half of them over against Mount Gerizim, and half of them over against Mount Ebal; as Moses the servant of Jehovah had commanded before, that they should *bless* the people of Israel.'

This immense host, surely, though posted (as STANLEY supposes) 'on the lower spurs of the mountains,' would have stretched along, we must suppose, for miles.

775. It is common, however, to suppose a magnificent scene, where the people would be standing as above, and the 'curses' in v.15-26 would be repeated by the Levites, and heard by those standing nearest to them. These might then begin the 'Amen,' which would be swelled by the tremendous thunder of the 'whole congregation,' who need not be supposed to have *heard* the words, as they knew them beforehand. But what are the 'blessings' to which special reference is made in the above quotation, as well as in D.xxvii.12?

CHAPTER XV.

DEUT.XXVIII.1—XXXI.30.

*776. D.xxviii.1—68.

This grand chapter appears to have been written by one who had already the ruin of the Ten Tribes before him, and who foreboded the same terrible calamity for Judah also, if it persisted in its idolatry and wickedness. The nation of 'fierce countenance and strange tongue from afar,' *v.*49,50, was either the Assyrian, if he wrote in the days of Hezekiah, or the Chaldee, if he wrote, as seems most probable, in the days of Josiah. It will be seen, as we proceed, that many of the expressions here used are used also by Jeremiah in his prophecies with reference to the Chaldæans. Thus the 'yoke of iron,' *v.*48, appears in *Jer.*xxviii. 14, the 'nation from afar,' *v.*49, in *Jer.*v.15, 'as the eagle flieth,' *v.*49, in *Jer.*xlviii.40, *xlix.*22, *comp.* *iv.*13, *Lam.*iv.19; and *v.*53—

'Thou shalt eat . . . the flesh of thy sons and of thy daughters . . . in the siege and in the straitness, wherewith thine enemies shall distress thee,'—
is repeated in *Jer.*xix.9—

'I will make them eat the flesh of their sons and the flesh of their daughters . . . in the siege and in the straitness wherewith their enemies shall distress them; and, as we shall see hereafter, there are many other similar resemblances. According to the Chronicler, *2Ch.*xxxiii.11, Josiah's father, Manasseh, was actually carried captive to Babylon; but this is not mentioned in the more authentic history. However, this prediction that, if they continued in their sins, the whole people with their king, *v.*36, would suffer

at the hand of the Chaldæans the same fate as their brethren of the Ten Tribes had experienced from the Assyrians, was written, no doubt, with reference to the king then reigning, whether Manasseh, Amon, or Josiah in his early years.

777. D.xxviii.36.

‘Jehovah shall bring thee, and *thy king which thou shalt set over thee*, unto a nation which neither thou nor thy fathers have known.’

Here the writer, as in xvii.14–20, represents Moses as assuming that they will ‘set over’ themselves ‘a king’ in later days, and referring to such a proceeding as a very natural one, instead of speaking of it as a ‘rejection of Jehovah,’ 1S.viii.7, a ‘great wickedness,’ xii.17: see (709).

RIEHM observes, *Gesetzgebung im Lande Moab*, p.81:—

The writer here—very probably, at least—sets forth the kingdom as already existing. For how should Moses have come to think of this, *viz.* that, while seeking to stimulate the people of *his own time*, (to whom, of course, his discourse is primarily addressed,) through threatenings of punishment, to a closer observance of the Law, he should threaten with evil a king who was first to be set over them in a *far later time*?

778. D.xxviii.68.

‘And Jehovah shall bring thee into Egypt again with ships, by the way whereof I spake unto thee, Thou shalt see it no more again: and there ye shall be sold unto your enemies for bondmen and bondwomen, and no man shall buy you.’

By these ‘ships,’ the writer may have meant either the *Phœnician* merchant-ships, which would carry off the Hebrew slaves, purchased from the Chaldæans to sell them in different countries, Joel iii.4–8, Am.i.6,9, Ez.xxvii.13, and, among others, in Egypt, where they would be bondmen a second time to the Egyptians, or, more probably, the famous *Egyptian* fleets of Pharaoh-Necho, HEROD.ii.159. It is not necessarily implied that there were already hostile relations with Egypt, or that danger was to be immediately dreaded from that quarter. On the contrary, as we have seen (746,747), the Deuteronomist recognises a certain amount

of friendliness on the part of the Egyptians towards Israel at the time of his writing, as he does also on the part of the Edomites. But this state of amicable relation might at any moment be disturbed; and so, in fact, we find that Josiah himself was killed by Pharaoh-Necho, 2K.xxiii.29, and his son Jehoahaz, after a reign of three months, was 'put in bands' by the King of Egypt, 'that he might not reign in Jerusalem;' and 'he put the land to a tribute of an hundred talents of silver,' and he 'took Jehoahaz away, and he came to Egypt, and died there.'

779. HÄVERNICK writes on this verse as follows, *Pent.* p.349:—

'These words form the conclusion of a longer prophecy, descriptive of the curse that should light upon the nation, if it became disloyal to God's Law. They are especially threatened with a dispersion among all nations. Yet no nation, with which Israel had yet formed acquaintance as such, is named, with the exception of the 'land of bondage.' That country alone is adduced by name, as that which should anew have the mastery over Israel. A fiction-writer of a later age, who was here only attributing to Moses his own feelings fictitiously, could not possibly have spoken thus. . . . This, indeed, has been thought to refer to the time of Josiah, who was himself slain in battle against the Egyptians. But, in that very age, the people had already become acquainted with Assyria as the enemy, that had already accomplished upon them a part of these predictions [in the Captivity of the Ten Tribes.] At that period Egypt could not possibly have still been viewed in such a light, — either by a writer living before the death of Josiah, for, that Egypt was not then such an object of dread, is proved by the very circumstance that Josiah ventured to engage in battle with Pharaoh, — nor subsequently, for Egypt then became humbled by Babylon, and Israel was menaced by quite another enemy than Egypt. Let us admit it, that the way in which Egypt is here designated, does not permit us to suppose that the prophecy was composed in any age but the Mosaic.'

Ans. Of course, no nation but Egypt could very well have been named by an author writing in the assumed character of Moses. But, though not named, the Assyrian or rather, as we believe, the Chaldean, is plainly enough pointed out as the probable conqueror in this prophecy—'a nation which neither thou nor thy fathers have known.' Egypt is only referred to in the last verse, whether as the conqueror, or merely as the enemy, of Israel. And in the early part of Josiah's reign, as we have seen, it is very possible that the relations with Egypt, though still, perhaps, friendly, were already threatened with the disturbance, which ultimately led to the death of Josiah. Or the mention of 'enemies' may

be introduced only as an *aggravation* of their calamities, like the concluding words, 'and no man shall buy thee.' They should be sold to those who disliked them, and would, therefore, ill-treat them; but even these would not think them worth having.

780. D. xxix. 4—8.

'Yet *Jehovah* hath not given you an heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to hear unto this day. And *I* have led you forty years in the wilderness [see D. viii. 2]: your clothes are not waxen old upon you, and thy shoe is not waxen old upon thy foot. Ye have not eaten bread, neither have ye drunk wine or strong drink; that ye might know that *I* am *Jehovah* your God. And when ye came unto this place, *Sihon* the king of *Heshbon*, and *Og* the king of *Bashan*, came out against *us* unto battle, and *we* smote them, and *we* took their land, and gave it for an inheritance unto the *Reubenites*, and to the *Gadites*, and to the half tribe of *Manassch*.'

It is obvious that the writer has here inadvertently slid from speaking in the character of *Moses* in v. 4, to speaking in that of *Jehovah* in v. 5, 6, and has again returned to that of *Moses* in v. 7, 8. The LXX, as we have already seen, appear to have perceived, and avoided, *this* difficulty. We have a similar and yet more noticeable instance (635) in xi. 14, 15.

781. D. xxix. 10, 11.

'Ye stand this day all of you before *Jehovah* your God; your captains of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, all the men of *Israel*, your families (תַּיִם, *taph*, E.V. 'little ones') your wives, and thy stranger that is in thy camp, from the hewer of thy wood unto the drawer of thy water.'

Manifestly, the whole assembled host of two or three millions is here described as present before *Moses* at one time. If words have any meaning, surely this is what is meant here, and, therefore, as we may reasonably believe, in the other places also where *Moses* and *Joshua* are spoken of as addressing 'all *Israel*' at one time. Accordingly, *Knobel* observes here, *Deut.* p. 314:—

Hereupon *Moses* directs their attention to the entrance into the covenant, which is now being ratified anew. Before *Jehovah* stands to-day 'all *Israel*,'—consequently their heads, tribes, elders and officers, their men, families, and wives, also their strangers down to the lowest, the 'hewers of wood and drawers of water.' Scarcely had *Israel* at that time very many strangers: the writer speaks according to his own time, and does not well maintain that of *Moses*.

*782. D. xxix. 24—29.

‘Even all nations shall say, Wherefore hath Jehovah done thus unto this land? What meaneth the heat of this great anger? Then men shall say, Because they have forsaken the covenant of Jehovah, the God of their fathers, which he made with them when he brought them forth out of the land of Egypt; for they went and served other gods, and worshipped them, gods whom they knew not, and whom He had not given unto them; and the anger of Jehovah was kindled against this land, to bring upon it all the curses that are written in this book; and Jehovah rooted them out of their land in anger, and in wrath, and in great indignation, and cast them into another land, as it is this day. The secret things belong unto Jehovah our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law.’

In this way the writer would have the people of Judah, in his own time, look back upon the desolated kingdom of Israel. They had been grievously chastened for their sins, and cast into another land, ‘as it is this day,’ for an example to their brethren of the kingdom of Judah, lest they also provoke the righteous anger of Jehovah, and come at last to suffer the same terrible visitation. What mercy, indeed, may yet be in store, even for the afflicted Ten Tribes, the Prophet knows not, though there are expressions in this book which imply that he had still great hopes for them in their latter end, if only they would repent and return to the stronghold of their Hope, *e.g.* xxx. 1—9:—

‘And it shall come to pass,—when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse, which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations, whither Jehovah thy God hath driven thee, and shalt return unto Jehovah thy God, and shalt obey His Voice according to all that I command thee this day, thou and thy children, with all thine heart and with all thy soul,—that then Jehovah thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the nations, whither Jehovah thy God hath scattered thee. . . . And Jehovah thy God will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it, and He will do thee good, and multiply thee above thy fathers. . . . And Jehovah thy God will make thee plenteous in every work of thine hand, in the fruit of thy body and in the fruit of thy cattle, and in the fruit of thy land, for good; for Jehovah will again rejoice over thee for good, as He rejoiced over thy fathers.’

But these ‘secret things belong unto Jehovah’ xxix. 29; He will know what to do in His own good time for the restoration of His people. Meanwhile ‘those things which are re-

vealed,'—the manifest signs, which we have had before us, of God's righteous judgment upon His sinful children,—'belong unto us and to our children for ever,' that we may lay them to heart with all earnestness, and 'do all the words of this Law.'

*783. D.xxix.28.

'And Jehovah rooted them out of their land in anger, and in wrath, and in great indignation, and cast them into another land, *as it is this day.*'

Upon which SCOTT observes —

Probably, the clause 'as it is this day' was added by Ezra, or by some scribe, who had witnessed the desolations of the Babylonish Captivity. But the emphasis of it, as the acknowledgment of the accomplishment of this ancient prophecy, supposing the words 'as it is this day' to be spoken by a modern Jew, after the long-continued dispersion of the nation, is inconceivably enhanced.

The words, as we believe, were written by one, who had before him the actual desolation of the Ten Tribes, who were carried away captive B.C. 721, and may very well have been described in Josiah's reign, about B.C. 630, some eighty or ninety years afterwards, as having been 'cast into another land, as it is this day.' This expression could not have been employed so naturally at a much earlier time,—for instance, by one writing in Hezekiah's reign, B.C. 727–698, in the sixth year of which the Captivity in question took place.

784. D.xxxi.1–9.

KNOBEL observes on this passage, *p.*319:—

This section [and *v.*10–13,] is purely Deuteronomistic matter, as we perceive by its relation to what precedes, and by its whole expression. But the statement in *v.*2, [where Moses is made to say, 'I am an hundred and twenty years old this day, *I can no more go out and come in,*'] does not agree with that in xxxiv.7, [where we read, 'Moses was an hundred and twenty years old when he died; *his eye was not dim nor his natural force abated.*']

We shall find (832) that this latter passage is a fragment of the older document, from which the Deuteronomist has borrowed the datum as to the *age* of Moses, though he has not

adhered to the rest of the statement, as to his still retaining his eye-sight and vigour to the last.

785. D. xxxi. 9.

'And Moses wrote this Law, and delivered it unto the *Priests* the sons of Levi, the bearers of the Ark (הַנְּשִׂיָאִים אֶת־יָרֵחַן, *hannosim eth-āron*) of the covenant of Jehovah, and unto all the elders of Israel.'

The Hebrew participle in the above implies the *habitual practice* of the Priests in bearing the Ark, not that they bore it on the present occasion, as the E.V. 'which bare the Ark' might be supposed to imply. When, however, the same author writes again, on the very same occasion, *v. 25*, 'Then Moses commanded the *Levites*, the bearers of the Ark,' he does not really contradict *himself*, though he does contradict the language of the other books of the Pentateuch; for his 'Levites,' *v. 25*, as we have seen, are Priests, 'the Priests the Levites,' *v. 9*, who, according to him, were the regular Ark-bearers, instead of the common Levites, 'the sons of Kohath,' to whom the duty of carrying it is assigned in the book of Numbers, *iv. 15, vii. 9, x. 21*.

786. As to this 'Book of the Law,' SCOTT observes:—

Some understand this of the book of Deuteronomy alone. But it is far more reasonable to conclude that the whole Law was delivered to the Priests and Elders, *a copy perhaps to the principal person in each tribe*, besides one to be deposited in the side of [beside] the Ark. It may be supposed that afterwards many more copies would be taken, though they would not be greatly multiplied in that infancy, as it were, of writing.

There is, however, no sign that any such copies were taken, nor any indication that the 'whole Law' was known to David and the best kings of Israel, who habitually, and, in their most earnest and pious days, transgressed so thoroughly its plain commandments. The writer, probably, referred to the book of Deuteronomy, as 'this Law'; for by this expression he repeatedly distinguishes it from that portion of the Law contained in the other books, *e.g.*—

'On this side Jordan, in the land of Moab, began Moses to declare *this Law*,' *i. 5*;
'*This Law*, which I set before you this day,' *iv. 8*;

'And *this is the Law*, which Moses set before the children of Israel. . . on this side Jordan, &c.,' iv.44-46.

787. Moses is here spoken of as first 'writing this Law, and delivering it' unto the Priests and Elders, v.9, and even commanding the Levites to 'put it beside the Ark,' v.26, and still continuing to write on, as in ch.xxxii,xxxiii. Hence some, who maintain the Mosaic origin of Deuteronomy, allow that these chapters, at least, must have been inserted into the book by a later hand, or else suggest that Moses must have taken it back again for the purpose of making these additions to it, or that the 'delivering it' to the Priests in v.9 may have merely a 'symbolical' action, and that he immediately resumed possession of it again. But then we find him in still *earlier* passages *speaking* of the book as already existing, before he had finished the addresses, of which it is mainly composed, and, of course, before he, or any one else, could have *written* them down; *e.g.*—

'If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this Law, that are written in this Book,' xxviii. 58;

'Every sickness, and every plague, which is not written in the Book of this Law,' v.61;

'All the curses that are written in this Book,' xxix.20,21,27;
and in xvii.18 the king is commanded to—

'write him a copy of this Law in a book, out of that which is before the Priests the Levites.'

All these are obvious indications of the later origin of the Book of Deuteronomy, and of the unhistorical character of the addresses recorded in it.

788. D.xxxi.10-13.

'And Moses commanded them, saying, At the end of every seven years, in the solemnity of the year of release, in the Feast of Tabernacles, when all Israel is come to appear before Jehovah thy God in the place which He shall choose, thou shalt read this Law before all Israel in their hearing.'

There is no indication in the history that this command was ever carried out till after the return from the Captivity, Neh.viii. SCOTT observes:—

Doubtless, this was not merely confined to one person or place; but numbers were engaged in different situations, so that everyone might have an opportunity of hearing. Though the men alone were obliged to attend at the festivals, it might be supposed that many of the women, children, and servants, would come on this occasion. A few (!) instances of the observation of this command are recorded; but the neglect of it seems to be one main cause why the nation was so soon carried away with idolatry and iniquity.

789. The *only* instances, to which SCOTT refers his readers, are *two*, (i) that in the time of Josiah, after the discovery of the 'Book of the Law,' when, probably, the book of Deuteronomy *was* read to the people,—but this was an accidental occurrence, *not* at the Feast of Tabernacles, and in no way to be regarded as an instance of obedience to the Law—and (ii) that of Ezra's reading after the return from the Captivity. There is not the slightest indication that Samuel, David, Solomon, or Hezekiah, paid any attention to this important Law. KNOBEL observes on this point, *p.*319:—

The writer can scarcely have meant the whole Law-Book, the reading of which would have been too great an undertaking: he leaves the choice, accordingly, to the rulers of the people. When this direction was complied with at a Feast of Tabernacles in Ezra's time, he only read, each day of the Feast, '*in the Book of the Law of God.*' Nch.viii.8. According to JOSEPHUS, *Ant.*iv.8.12, the High Priest was to read; according to *Mischn. Sota* 7.8, the King also did it, *e.g.* AGRIPPA, but confined himself, however, to some sections of Deuteronomy. *We know no more about the carrying out of this ordinance.*

790. D.xxxi.14–30.

KNOBEL observes on this passage, *p.*320:—

The greater part of what is here related has been recorded already by the Deuteronomist in v.1–13, and, therefore, he cannot be the writer of this section. He also never mentions the 'Tabernacle,' which here reappears in v.14,15, and in the language there is much which is foreign to him, [which we shall consider below.] The prophetic song which follows, D.xxxii, in its present form, no doubt, is due to this writer. But, probably, an older song lies at the foundation, which the writer regarded as Mosaic, and derived from a Divine communication to Moses in the Tabernacle, the usual place where God revealed himself.

Ans. There can be no doubt that v.14,15, in which the 'Tabernacle' is mentioned, are part of the older document. The Deuteronomist never refers to the Tabernacle,—perhaps, from the circumstance that he had it not daily before his

mind's eye, as he had the *Ark*, (which he names in x.1,2,3,5,8, xxxi.9,25,26,) the Tabernacle of David having long disappeared from the sight, and almost from the memories, of men, while the Ark was still in the Temple.

791. In this passage it will be seen that Moses and *Joshua* go into the Tabernacle, as in E.xxxiii.7–11, the Tabernacle, apparently, being supposed to stand, as then, *without* the camp, E.xxxiii.7; and Jehovah appears in the 'pillar of cloud,' which stands over the door of the Tabernacle,' v.15, just as in E.xxxiii.9. So, also, we read in N.xii.4,5,—

'And Jehovah spake suddenly unto Moses and unto Aaron and unto Miriam, *Come out*, ye three, unto the Tabernacle of the Congregation. And they three *came out*. And Jehovah came down in the pillar of the cloud, and stood in the door of the Tabernacle, and called Aaron and Miriam; and they both came forth.'

It seems plain that D.xxxi.14,15, is due to the same writer as E.xxxiii.7–11 and N.xii.4,5, whoever this may be.

792. But KNOBEL, p.320, produces certain verbal expressions in v.16–21, which, as he considers, are *not* Deuteronomistic. We shall first show that these expressions, although *not peculiar* to this writer, are yet used by him in certain places and also by *Jeremiah*.

(i) v.18, 'turn towards other gods:' for 'other gods' see (573.v.β); the complete phrase 'turn the face (פָּנָה, *panah*) unto other gods' is found nowhere in the Pentateuch or whole Bible, except in the passage now before us. It may, therefore, be the Deuteronomist's, especially as he uses the verb itself, פָּנָה, repeatedly, and in xxix.18(17) uses it in a sense very similar to that in which it is employed here—'whose heart *turneth* (פָּנָה) away this day from Jehovah our God, to go and serve the gods of these nations;' comp. Jer.ii.27, xxxii.33.

(ii) v.16, זָנָה, *zanah*, 'commit whoredom,' used of idolatry, E.xxxiv.*15,16,16, Jer.ii.20, iii.1,3,6,8: comp. Jer.iii.2,9, xiii.27.

(iii) v.20, נָאֵץ, *naats*, 'despise,' D.xxxii.19, Jer.xiv.21, xxxiii.17, xxxiii.24, Lam.ii.6.

(iv) v.16,20, הִפַּר בְּרִית, *hepher b'ērith*, 'break a covenant,' L.xxvi.*15,44, Jer.xi.10, xiv.21, xxxi.32, xxxiii.20,21.

(v) v.17,18, הִסְתִּיר פָּנָיו, *histir panim*, 'hide the face,' D.xxxii.20, Jer.xxxiii.5.

(vi) v.17,21, טָרָה, *tsarah*, 'trouble,' Jer.iv.31, vi.24, xiv.8, xv.11, xvi.19, xxx.7, xlix.24, l.43; and we have רָעָה וְטָרָה, *rahah v'tsarah*, 'evil and trouble,' joined in Jer. xv.11 as in D.xxxi.17,21.

* We use the asterisk to mark certain passages in other parts of the Pentateuch, which we shall show in Part IV. to be Deuteronomistic interpolations.

(vii) v.21, בְּתֵרֶם, *bêterem*, 'before,' Jer.i.5,5.

(viii) v.16, 'lie down with thy fathers,' generally in Kings, as in 2K.xx.21, xxi.18, xxiv.6, &c. (probably written by Jeremiah?)

Upon the whole we conclude that there is no sufficient reason for *not* ascribing this section, v.16–21, to the Deuteronomist.

793. On the contrary, the above expressions, when closely examined, help rather to fix the passage upon him, as do also the following.

(i) v.16, אֱלֹהֵי נֹכַר, *élohe nocar*, 'strange gods,' D.xxxi.16, xxxii.12, Jer.v.19, comp. Jer.viii.19.

(ii) 'forsake Jehovah,' (553.xi, 562.xi).

(iii) v.20,21, 'the land which I swore unto their fathers,' D.i.8,35, ii.14, vi.10,18,23, vii.13, viii.1, x.11, xi.9,21, xxvi.3,15, xxviii.11, xxxi.7,20,21,23, xxxiv.4, Jer.xxxii.22, and *eight* other cases in the Pentateuch.

(iv) 'that floweth with milk and honey,' D.vi.3, xi.9, xxvi.9,15, xxvii.3, xxxi.20, Jer.xi.5, xxxii.22, and *nine* times besides in the Pentateuch.

(v) אָכַל וְשָׂבַע, *acal v'savah*, 'eat and be full,' D.vi.11, viii.10,12, xi.15, xiv.29, xxiii.24(25), xxvi.12, xxxi.20, L.xxvi.*5,26, and *twice* besides in the Pentateuch, E.xvi.3, L.xxv.19.

(vi) 'and waxen fat, then will they turn to other gods,' D.vi.11–14, viii.12–19, xi.15,16, xxxii.15,16.

It is possible, however, that the first clause of v.16, 'And Jehovah said unto Moses, Behold, thou shalt *sleep with thy fathers*,' (as we find this phrase in the Pentateuch only in G.xlvii.30,) may be the first words of an address, which the older writer put into the mouth of Jehovah, the rest of which the Deuteronomist has suppressed, and replaced by words of his own.

794. D.xxxi.22.

'Moses therefore wrote this song the same day, and taught it the children of Israel.'

If the preceding section, in which the first mention is made of the song, v.19,21, is by the Deuteronomist, as we have shown, then this verse also will be his. But KNOBEL observes, p.322:—

Manifestly, the writer found a Warning-Song already existing, which he held for true Mosaic, and worked up anew in ch.xxxii. With the same freedom have the Prophets handled older prophecies: comp. Jer.xlviii with Is.xv,xvi, and Obad. with Jer.xlix.7–22.

We shall see that there is no clear indication whatever of D.xxxii being an old song, retouched by the Deuteronomist. It will appear to be, in all probability, entirely his own composition, as, in our view, is the whole of the present chapter, except v.14,15, notwithstanding some confusion and repetition in parts of it.

795. D.xxxi.23-26.

KNOBEL, p.322, considers this to be the continuation of v.14,15, or, according to him, of v.14-16(a), and he writes,—

'Here, however, the older writer has left out something which Jehovah spake to Moses and Joshua, and supplied the blank by a divine speech out of his second original document. The subject of וַיִּצַו, *vaytsav*, 'and he commanded,' can, according to the contents of the discourse, ['I swear unto them,' 'I will be with thee,'] be only Jehovah; according to the present connexion it seems to be Moses. The older writer would have had to insert יהוה, *Jehovah*, after וַיִּצַו.'

Ans. v.23 contains decidedly Deuteronomistic expressions; e.g. 'be strong and of a good courage,' (553.iv) 'the land which I swear unto them,' (793, iii).

It would seem, therefore, that the subject to וַיִּצַו is 'Jehovah,' carried on from v.21, the intermediate v.22 being inserted as a parenthetical notice.

796. Again, on v.24-26 KNOBEL observes, p.322 :—

'Hereupon Moses ends the writing down of the Law, and we must suppose the Law indicated in iv.44. . . . From v.14 to v.26 Israel is not addressed as in v.1-13. Hence the two words [at the end of v.26, לְעֵד לָעָר, *lēcha lehed*, 'against thee for a witness,'] belong to the Deuteronomistic addition, which reaches to v.29.'

Ans. But here again we have Deuteronomistic expressions;

(i) v.24, בְּבִלְוֹת, *kēcallōth*, 'when he had made an end of,' [E.xxxi.18, N.xvi.31, quoted by KNOBEL in support of his view, but also] D.xx.9. Jer.xxvi.8. xliiii.1, li.63;

(ii) 'words of this Law,' (550.ix).

(iii) v.25, 'the Levites, bearers of the Ark of the Covenant,' D.x.8, xxxi.9.

(iv) v.26, 'this Book of the Law,' (550.x).

We conclude, therefore, that the *whole* passage is Deuteronomistic, and, as KNOBEL says, as far as v.29. The contents of this verse, however, he considers to be 'entirely superfluous after the similar words in v.16-21.' But v.16-21 are ascribed to Jehovah, and v.29 to Moses; and, when we take account of the extreme anxiety of the writer upon this point, *viz.* Israel's 'corrupting themselves' and 'provoking Jehovah to anger,' and observe that throughout the whole book he is dwelling continually upon it, it is easy to understand how unwilling he would be, as it were, to leave the subject, and would be still heard dropping his warnings to the last.

797. Lastly, KNOBEL assigns v.30 to the older writer, and says, p.323:—

'Moses here explains the song to the *people*, for which the Deuteronomist in v.28 names the 'elders and officers;' קהל ישראל, *kēhal Israel*, 'assembly of Israel,' is foreign to the Deuteronomist, and is found only in E.xii.6, L.xvi.17, N.xiv.5; the passage sets forth v.16-22.'

Ans. The same phrase קהל ישראל, *kēhal Israel*, is found only in L.xvi.17; in the other two cases it is קהל עדת ישראל, *kēhal hādath-Israel*, 'assembly of the congregation of Israel.' The word קהל, 'assembly,' is the *only* one used for 'congregation' by the Deuteronomist (548.xii); so that no argument can be based on the fact of the phrase in question being found once in Leviticus and once in Deuteronomy, especially as it occurs freely in 1K.viii.14,14,22,55, xii.3, by the hand either of the Deuteronomist himself, or, at least, of a contemporary. The writer probably supposed that the elders and officers would draw near, and be 'gathered unto' Moses, while 'all the congregation' would stand around and hear (?) the words of the song. No doubt, v.30 refers to the 'song' mentioned in v.16-22, which we ascribe throughout to the Deuteronomist.

Upon the whole, then, we believe ch.xxxi to be wholly Deuteronomistic, except v.14,15, and, perhaps, 16(a), which are a fragment of the older document.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE SONG OF MOSES, DEUT.XXXII.

798. D.xxxii.1-43.

KNOBEL considers that this 'Song' must be attributed to a writer older than the Deuteronomist, but later than the Elohist, perhaps living about the time when the Syrians oppressed Israel. He says, *Deut.p.326* :—

Some difficulty is caused by the fact that the writer states that Moses had received this Song from Jehovah, xxxi.19,22,30, which he would hardly have said if it was all his own composition. Perhaps, therefore, he found an older song already existing, regarded it as Mosaic, retouched it, and adopted it into his work in this new form.

But we shall see, as before, that there is, apparently, no sufficient reason for supposing that this Song is not also due to the Deuteronomist.

799. The following are the critical notes, which seem to prove sufficiently the Deuteronomistic origin of this chapter.

N.B. As before, it will be understood that the expressions here noticed *do not occur elsewhere in the Pentateuch*, unless the fact of their so doing is mentioned.

Also (*) denotes passages, which will be shown in Part IV to be Deuteronomistic interpolations.

(i) v.1, 'Give ear, O ye heavens, and I will speak, and hear, O earth, the words of my mouth:' so the Deuteronomist calls heaven and earth to witness in iv.26, xxx.19, xxxi.28.

(ii) v.2, עָרַף, *haraph*, 'drop,' D.xxxiii.28, *nowhere else in the Bible*.

(iii) רֶבִיבִים, *rēvivim*, 'showers,' Jer.iii.3, xiv.22, and only *three* other places.

(iv) v.3, קָבַע, *kavu*, 'ascribe ye,' D.i.13, G.xlvii.16, *nowhere else in the Pentateuch*.

(v) גֹּדֶל, *godel*, 'greatness,' D.iii.24, v.24(21), ix.26, xi.2, xxxii.3, and N.xiv.19.

(vi) v.4, אֱמוּנָה, *ēmunah*, 'truth,' Jer.v.1,3, vii.28, ix.3(2), Lam.iii.23, and E.xvii.12.

- (vii) עוֹל *havel*, 'iniquity,' D.xxv.16, Jer.ii.5, and L.xix.15,35.
- (viii) v.8, הִנְחִיל *hinkhil*, 'cause to inherit' (550.ii).
- (ix) v.6, Jehovah, the 'father' of Israel, v.18,19,20, Jer.ii.27, iii.4,19, xxxi.9, compare xxxv throughout, and E.iv.22,23, N.xi.12.
- (x) v.10, נָצַר *natsar*, 'keep,' D.xxxiii.9, E.xxxiv.*7, Jer.iv.16, xxxi.6.
- (xi) v.11, עוּר *hur*, 'stir up,' Jer.vi.22, xxv.32, l.9,41, li.1,11.
- (xii) רָהַף *rakhaph*, 'flutter,' Jer.xxxiii.9, and G.i.2, *nowhere else in the Bible*.
- (xiii) 'bearing on eagles' wings,' comp. E.xix.4 ; see also D.i.31.
- (xiv) v.13, תְּנוּבָה *tēnuvāh*, 'fruit,' Lam.iv.9.
- (xv) חַלְמִישׁ *khalmish*, 'flint,' D.viii.15.
- (xvi) גּוֹזַל *gozal*, 'young bird,' G.xv.9, *nowhere else in the Bible*.
- (xvii) v.14, 'rams of the breed of Bashan' is used familiarly, as if the writer, and the people for whom he wrote, had been long acquainted with the breed, instead of only recently arrived in Bashan, as the story supposes.
- (xviii) 'blood of the grape,' G.xlix.11, *nowhere else*.
- (xix) v.15,15, שָׁמֵן *shaman*, 'wax fat,' Jer.v.28, and *twice besides in the Bible*.
- (xx) 'waxed fat and kicked,' comp. the idea in D.vi.10, viii.10, xi.15, xxx.20.
- (xxi) יִשְׁרוּן *Yeshurun*, 'D.xxxiii.5,26, Is.xliv.2, *nowhere else*.
- (xxii) v.16, זָרִים *zarim*, 'strange (gods),' Jer.ii.25, iii.13.
- (xxiii) כָּעָם *cahas*, 'provoke' (552.viii).
- (xxiv) v.17, יִשָּׁעַר *sahar*, 'fear,' Jer.ii.12.
- (xxv) 'gods whom they know not,' D.xi.28,xiii.2,6,13, xxviii.64, xxix.26, Jer.vii.9, xix.4, xlv.3 ; see also (552.xv).
- (xxvi) v.18, הוֹל *khul*, 'bring forth, be in pain,' D.ii.25, Jer.iv.19, v.3,22,xxiii.19, xxx.23, li.29.
- (xxvii) 'forget' Jehovah (552.xii).
- (xxviii) v.19, נָאֵץ *naatz*, 'despise,' D.xxxi.20, Jer.xiv.21, xxiii.17, xxxiii.24, Lam.ii.6, and N.xiv.11,23, xvi.30.
- (xxix) v.21, הֶבֶל *havel*, 'vanity,' Jer.ii.5, viii.19, x.3,8,15, xiv.22, xvi.19, li.18, Lam.iv.17.
- (xxx) לֹא-אֵל *lo-El*, 'no gods,' so לֹא-אֱלֹהִים *lo-Elohim*, Jer.v.7, 2K.xix.18, Is.xxxvii.19, 2Ch.xiii.9.
- (xxxi) v.22, קָדַח *kadakh*, 'be kindled,' Jer.xv.14,xvii.4, *twice besides in the Bible*.
- (xxxii) יִבּוֹל *yēvol*, 'increase,' D.xi.17, L.xxvi.*4,20.
- (xxxiii) v.22, מוֹסְדוֹת *mosadoth*, 'foundations,' Jer.xxxi.37, li.26.
- (xxxiv) v.23, רַעוּת *rahoth*, 'afflictions' (553.xii).
- (xxxv) v.24, 'I will send the teeth of beasts upon them,' L.xxvi.*22.

(xxxvi) v.25, בַּחֲרֹר, *bakhur*, 'young man,' Jer.vi.11, ix.21(20), xi.22, xv.8, xviii.21, xxxi.13, xlviii.15, xlix.26, l.30, li.3,22, Lam.i.15,18, ii.21, v.13,14.

(xxxvii) 'the sword without and terror within;' compare Jer.xiv.18, 'If I go forth into the field, then behold the slain with the sword! and, if I enter into the city, then behold them that are sick with famine!'

(xxxviii) v.27, 'Were it not that I feared the wrath of the enemy, lest their adversaries should behave themselves strangely, and lest they should say, Our hand is high, and Jehovah hath not done all this;' compare ix.28, 'Lest the land whence Thou broughtest us out say, Because Jehovah was not able to bring them into the land which He promised them,' &c., and E.xxxii.12, N.xiv.16.

(xxxix) v.28, הֶצֶה, *hetsah*, 'counsel,' Jer.xviii.18,23, xix.7, xxxii.19, xlix.7, 20,30, l.45.

(xl) v.32,33, 'Their vine is of the vine of Sodom, and of the fields of Gomorrah; their grapes are grapes of gall, their clusters are bitter; their wine is the poison of dragons, and the cruel venom of asps;' compare Jer.ii.21, 'Yet I had planted thee a noble vine, wholly a right seed; how then art thou turned into the degenerate plant of a strange vine unto me?' It is obvious how little this language (italicised) of the Prophet would agree with the statement of Deuteronomy, if really written, as commonly supposed, by Moses.

(xli) v.33, אַחְזָר, *achzar*, 'cruel,' Lam.iv.3, twice besides in Job; אַחְזָרִי, *achzari*, 'cruel,' Jer.vi.23, xxx.14, l.42, and five other places.

(xlii) v.34, אוֹצֵר, *otsar*, 'treasure,' D.xxviii.12, Jer.x.13, xv.13, xvii.3, xx.5, xxxviii.11, xlviii.7, xlix.4, l.25,37, li.13,16.

(xliii) v.35, נָקָם, *nakam*, 'vengeance,' v.41,43, and L.xxvi.*25.

(xliv) אֵיִד, *eyd*, 'calamity,' Jer.xviii.17, xlv.21, xlviii.16, xlix.8,32.

(xlv) v.36, אָזַל, *azal*, 'be gone,' Jer.ii.36, four times besides, and seven times in later Chaldaic passages in Ezra and Daniel.

(xlvi) אָזַר וְעָזַר, *hatsur vehazur*, 'shut up and left,' 1K.xiv.10, xxi.21, 2K.ix.8, xiv.26.

(xlvii) v.37,38, 'And He shall say, Where are their gods, their rock in whom they trusted, which did eat the fat of their sacrifices, and drank the wine of their drink-offerings? Let them rise up, and help you, and be your protection;' compare Jer.ii.28, 'But where are thy gods that thou hast made thee? Let them arise, if they can save thee in the time of thy trouble.'

(xlviii) v.39, 'See now that I, even I, am He, and there is no god with me;' compare Jer.v.12, 'They have belied Jehovah, and said, It is not He,' and Is.xliiii. 10-13.

(xlix) v.40, 'lift up the hand' =swear, G.xiv.22; E.vi.8, N.xiv.30.

(l) v.41, שָׁנָן, *shanan*, 'whet,' D.vi.7.

800. Upon the whole, it will be seen that there are some very *strong* signs of the Deuteronomist in this Song, *e.g.* (i),(v),(viii), (xxiii),(xxv),(xxvii),(xxxii),(xxxiv), and other very strong resemblances to the style of Jeremiah, *e.g.* (iii),(vi),(xi),(xxv), (xxxi), &c., besides a multitude of minor correspondences of each kind; nor is there anything, as far as appears, to indicate that he is *not* the author of it, except that (xlix) does not occur either in Deuteronomy itself or in Jeremiah. KNOBEL considers that the very severe language used in this Song, in speaking of the idolatrous conduct of the Israelites, *v.*15, does not accord with the general tone of the Deuteronomist. But, surely, the same tone is heard sufficiently,—sometimes, indeed, in the form of *warning*,—in *vi.*14,15,16, *viii.*19,20, *ix.*6,7,8, 23,24, &c.; *e.g.*—

‘Ye have been rebellious against Jehovah from the day that I knew you,’ *ix.*24:

‘I know thy rebellion and thy stiff neck. Behold, while I am yet alive with you this day, ye have been rebellious against Jehovah; and how much more after my death?’ *xxxi.*27.

801. It is true, this Song contains a great number of words which occur nowhere else in the Bible, and does not contain a great number of the Deuteronomist’s favourite expressions. It does, however, contain *some* of them, (viii),(xxiii),(xxv),(xxvii), (xxxiv), each of which is repeated several times in Deuteronomy, but not one of which is found in any of the other books of the Pentateuch. The occurrence of so many unusual words, which are not found elsewhere in the Bible, might have been reasonably looked for in a Song like this, written in the highest style of poetry, and not in the mere rhetorical prose of the rest of the book. And for the same reason we should not expect to find many of the prosaic phrases, which are so common in the other parts of the book, repeated here.

We conclude, therefore, that this Song is also due to the Deuteronomistic author.

802. In this passage we have clear signs of the late

date at which this Song was written. Thus v.15,17, we read—

‘But Jeshurun waxed fat and kicked ;
 Thou art waxen fat, thou art grown thick, thou art covered with fatness.
 Then he forsook God which made him,
 And lightly esteemed the Rock of his salvation.
 They provoked Him to jealousy with strange gods,
 With abominations provoked they Him to anger.
 They sacrificed unto devils, to no-gods (E.V. ‘not to God,’).
 To gods whom they knew not,
 To new gods that came newly up,
 Whom your fathers feared not.’

Of course, the above words cannot be supposed to describe the state of Israel in the wilderness. Those, who desire to maintain the Mosaic origin of this book, will have recourse to the supposition of ‘prophetical perfects.’ After the evidence, which we have had before us, of the later origin of the book, there can be little doubt that the words really refer to the idolatries practised in the kingdom of Israel, and almost as freely in Judah also.

803. So v.35–43 refer also very plainly to the hardships which the captives of the Ten Tribes had already suffered, and which, in His own due time, Jehovah would visit upon their conquerors:—

‘To me belongeth vengeance and recompense ;
 Their foot shall slide in due time :
 For the day of their calamity is at hand,
 And the things, that shall come upon them, make haste.
 For Jehovah shall judge His people,
 And repent Himself for His servants,
 When He seeth that their power is gone,
 And there is none shut up or left. . . .
 Rejoice, O ye nations, with His people ;
 For He will avenge the blood of His servants,
 And will render vengeance to His adversaries,
 And will be merciful unto His land and to His people.

In fact, our view differs from KNOBEL’s mainly in this, that he considers the Song as actually composed *in* some time of

national distress, and so explains the allusions which occur in it to some great misery; whereas it seems to us that the writer is *looking back* upon such a time in the sister-kingdom, and using it as a warning for Judah.

804. D.xxxii.44-47.

KNOBEL considers that v.44,45, belong to the older writer, apparently because they refer to the 'Song,' and, as we have seen, he ascribes the previous mention of it in xxxi.19-22 also to that writer. We have shown, however, that this latter section belongs to the Deuteronomist, and we see no reason to doubt that v.44,45, belong to him also, as well as v.46,47, which KNOBEL himself assigns to him.

In v.44, we have 'the words of this Song,' as in xxxi.30; and in v.45 the phrase 'all Israel,' Di.1, v.1, xi.6, xiii.11, xviii.6, xxi.21, xxvii.9, xxix.2, xxxi.1,7,11,11, xxxiv.12, and E.xviii.25, N.xvi.34.

It is singular that in v.44 we have 'Hoshea' instead of 'Joshua,' as he is called everywhere except in N.xiii.8,16. The Sam. text has Joshua in all three passages.

805. D.xxxii.48-52.

This is an enlarged form of the announcement of the death of Moses, which we find in N.xxvii.12-14, and belongs to the older document, except that, as KNOBEL justly observes, it can hardly be supposed that the original writer would have put into the mouth of Jehovah the words 'which is in the land of Moab, which is over against Jericho,' thus defining for *Moses himself* the exact site of the mountain, close to which he is supposed to be encamped. Accordingly, these words are, most probably, a Deuteronomistic interpolation, and we have already seen that 'land of Moab' is a *Deuteronomistic* phrase, (550.i), whereas '*plains* of Moab' is that employed by the older writer (548.xi).

806. That the whole passage, however, with the above exception, is a fragment of the older document, appears from the following phrases:—

- (i) v.48, **בְּעֵצֶם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה**, *behetsem hayyom hazzeh*, (548.v);
 (ii) v.49, 'land of Canaan' (548.ix);
 (iii) **אֲחֻזָּה**, *ākhuzzah*, possession (548.i);
 (iv) v.50, 'be gathered to thy people' (548.vi);
 (v) v.51, **מֵעַל**, v., **מֵעַל**, n., *māhal*, 'trespass,' L.v.15, vi.2(v.21), xxvi.40, N.v.6, 12.27, xxxi.16, only here in Deuteronomy;
 (vi) 'wilderness of Zin,' N.xiii.21, xx.1,xxvii.14, xxxiii.36, xxxiv.3,4, only here in Deuteronomy.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE BLESSING OF MOSES, DEUT.XXXIII.1-7.

807. CHAPTER xxxiii also, which contains the 'Blessing of Moses,' KNOBEL ascribes to an older writer than the Deuteronomist. It may be desirable to give first his own words, *Deut.p.337-340*.

The writer first produces the first four sons of Leah, then the two sons of Rachel, then Leah's other two sons, and, lastly, the four sons of the two maidens, Bilhah and Zilpah. Hence he varies from the order of the tribes according to birth, G.xxix,xxx, from that observed in 'Jacob's Blessing,' G.xlix, as well as in the other notices of the sons of Jacob, G.xxxv.23-26, xlv.8-27, E.i.2-5, and of the Israelitish tribes, N.i,ii,xiii.4-15, xxvi.5-51, xxxiv.19-28. It is especially strange that Judah is set before Levi, Zebulon before Issachar, and Benjamin before Joseph, and that the sons of Leah are separated by those of Rachel, and Zilpah's by Bilhah's. Scarcely, however, can one on this account infer the existence of another tradition as to the order in age of the sons of Jacob; but we must assume that the writer, generally, wished to maintain a geographical progression from South to North, and that his poem has received later modifications in some particulars, as also we find something of this kind in G.xlix. Throughout he makes Moses in the third person treat of the tribes, and only towards the end, v.18,25, allows him to come out in a more living manner, and pass over into an actual address. The individual 'blessings' are exhibited, partly in the form of prayers addressed to Jehovah, v.7,11, partly as exclamations to those concerned, v.18, partly as wishes for them, v.6,23,24,25, partly as announcements and descriptions, v.8-10,12-17,19-22, a change which explains itself from the freedom of poetical impulse. All is here blessing; only in the case of Levi, v.8, reference is made to the fault of Moses and Aaron, and the utterance over Dan, v.22, seems to contain a mixture of disapproval. Levi and Joseph are extolled with especial enthusiasm. For Levi was the divinely-chosen tribe, and Joseph's descendants were more numerous than those of any of his brothers. Strange is the short notice of the tribe of Judah, so important as it was, which comes forward so powerfully in the 'Blessing of Jacob.' Throughout the whole song breathes a brisk and vigorous, and yet a mild and respectful, spirit; hearty thankfulness

towards the Divine Protector and Benefactor, Love and Goodwill towards the people, (different in this respect from ch.xxxii, [but see (800)]), and contentment and joy over its happy condition, are the feelings which inspire the writer. The sharp passage in v.11 has its especial ground. The style exhibits numerous peculiarities. These peculiarities, for the most part, make this poem the most difficult passage in the whole Pentateuch.

Already, on this account, it has been assigned to an earlier, rather than a later, time. Still more does one feel compelled to this through its contents. At the time of the writer, the twelve tribes were still in Canaan [?], and found themselves in a flourishing condition [?]; Israel had the sovereignty in the land, and the nations flattered him, v.29; we find no trace here [?] of a reference to the national misfortunes, which the Hebrews experienced in the Syrian, Assyrian, and Chaldee times. As the political, so also were the religious circumstances of the people satisfactory; at least the writer makes not the most distant allusion [?] to the religious misconduct so strongly bewailed in ch.xxxii, and praises, on the contrary, Zebulon and Issachar, that they brought 'offerings of righteousness.' All this prevents our setting the composition of the Poem in the time of the Captivity, with HOFFMANN and GESENIUS, or in that of Josiah with EWALD, or in that of Jeroboam II with GRAF, or, generally, in the time of the two kingdoms with LENGKERKE. It falls in a much earlier time; it cannot, however, have proceeded from Moses, as the ancient and many modern interpreters assume. For it betrays an accurate acquaintance with the post-Mosaic times, such as Moses could not have had. Decisive is the passage about Judah, v.7, which can only be explained as referring to the time when David lived in foreign parts on his flight from Saul. To the same time points the announcement about Benjamin, v.12; it manifestly refers to Gibeon, whither Saul had brought the Tabernacle [?] after the destruction of Nob. Therewith best accords all the rest, e.g. the severe passage, v.11, against the persecutors of the Priesthood, who had been ill-treated by Saul and his people, the utterance, v.29, about the lordship of the Hebrews in the land, and the *satisfactory* religious circumstances, [after the butchery by Saul of the High Priest, nay, of 'four-score and five persons that did wear a linen ephod'! 1S.xxii.18,] since Saul maintained the worship of Jehovah. The short treatment of Judah, also, deserves notice, and the absence of any reference to Jerusalem: first in the time of David and Solomon became Judah the royal tribe, and Jerusalem the centre of the 'people of God.' From the vehemence of v.11 we may conclude that the writer was a Priest or Levite. Through this definition of time is settled also the question, whether the 'Blessing of Moses' is older than 'Jacob's Blessing,' G.xlix, or whether, on the contrary, our author has imitated G.xlix, as almost all modern critics suppose, e.g. VATER, GESENIUS, HOFFMAN, VON BOHLEN, TUCH, VON LENGKERKE, EWALD, GRAF. The 'Blessing of Moses' belongs to the time of Saul, 'Jacob's Blessing' to that of David. Whether, however, the later writer has used the earlier is very doubtful. Both appear as equally peculiar and original, and no imitation can be detected[?]. The similar use of some forms of expression in both poems, G.xlix.25,26, D.xxxiii.13,15,16, gives no proof of this: it explains itself sufficiently with the

assumption that such sayings about Joseph might be current popularly in Israel. Without doubt the legend represented that Moses had taken his leave of his people, as formerly Jacob took leave of his sons, with 'blessing.' As words of a 'Man of God,' these blessings must have been fulfilled, and, consequently, the fates of the tribes since Moses [so the writer considers] allow of our recognising *what* blessing had been assigned to each. The author confines himself to the relations of Israel from the time of Moses to Saul, and makes Moses speak conformably to these. He wishes, however, that only the substance of the 'Blessing' should be regarded as Mosaic, and all the rest, on the contrary, *e.g.* the introduction and the conclusion, to be considered as his own work. For in *v.*4 he reckons himself with the people, and contrasts it with Moses, 'Moses commanded *us* a Law, the inheritance of the Congregation of Jacob.' He speaks also in *v.*7,8,12,13, 18,20,22, of Moses in the third person, *e.g.* *v.*8, 'And of Levi *he* said,' = 'Moses has left the following saying about Levi': and, in fact, in *v.*28,29, he makes no concealment of his position in the post-Mosaic time. Meanwhile, also, in respect of the blessings, he permits himself some liberties, *e.g.* when he allows Moses, in *v.*7, to put into words a wish which Judah had first in Saul's time, and in *v.*21, to indicate God's post-Mosaic acts, as having already happened. His poem, *v.*2-29, was found in existence by a later writer, who treated it as Mosaic, supplied it with the superscription, *v.*1, and adopted it into a work (Deuteronomy) of his own composition.

808. As before, however, a close critical examination of its contents seems to fix this passage also, though not, perhaps, so certainly as ch.xxxii, upon the later Prophet, who wrote the rest of Deuteronomy. We shall point out the critical signs of authorship, and then consider the substance of the chapter.

- (i) *v.*2,21, אָתָּה, or אַתָּה, *athah*, 'come,' *v.*21, Jer.iii.22, xii.9, a Chaldaic word.
- (ii) דָּת, *dath*, 'law,' only in later writers, Ezra, Esther, and Daniel.
- (iii) קְהֵלָה, *kēhillah*, 'congregation,' Neh.v.7, nowhere else; but קָהָל is common in Deut.
- (iv) 'Jacob' used for 'the people,' when not required to complete the parallelism with 'Israel,' D.xxxii.9, Jer.x.25, xxx.7,10,18, xxxi.7,11, xxxiii.26, xlvi.27,28, li.19, Lam.i.17, ii.2.
- (v) *v.*5, 'Jeshurun,' *v.*26, D.xxxii.15, Is.xliv.2.
- (vi) 'heads of the people,' *v.*21, N.xxv.4.
- (vii) *v.*6, וְיָהִי מִתְיָו מִסְפָּר, *vihī mēthayv mispar*, 'and let his men be few (lit. a number),' iv.27, Jer.xliv.28, G.xxxiv.30, Ps.cv.12, and 1Ch.xvi.19.
- (viii) *v.*8, תְּקַיֵּר, *khasid*, 'gracious, pious,' Jer.iii.12.
- (ix) מִסָּה, in the sense of 'Massah,' D.vi.16, ix.22, and Ex.vii.7, in the sense of temptation,' D.iv.34, vii.19, xxix.3(2).

- (x) v.9, אִמְרָה, *imrah*, 'word,' D.xxxii.2; אִמְרָה, *emrah*, 'word,' Lam.ii.17.
- (xi) v.10, 'they shall teach Jacob thy judgments, and Israel thy law'; compare D.xvi.18, xvii.8.
- (xii) v.11, מִן־יָקוּמוּן, *min-yēkumun*, 'from rising again.' 'This,' says KNOBEL, 'is the only place in the whole O.T. where מִן stands before a finite verb, in the place of מֵאֲשֶׁר, *meāsher*, 'from (that) they rise again'; though it is common with the infinitive. In like manner אֲשֶׁר, *āsher*, is omitted after the adverbs אַחֲרַי, *akhār*, עִקֵּב, *hakev*, יָעַן, *yahan*, respectively, in N.xiv.24, xxv.48, N.xx.12.
- (xiii) v.12, יָדִיד, *yēdid*, יְדִידוֹת, *yēdiduth*, 'darling, beloved one,' Jer.xi.15, xii.7.
- (xiv) v.11, מַחֲטֵי, *makhats*, 'smite through,' D.xxxii.39.
- (xv) בֵּטָח, *betakh*, 'secure,' בִּטְחָה, *batakh*, 'be secure,' v.28, D.xii.10, xxviii.52, Jer. (19 times), and G.xxxiv.25, L.xxv.18,19, xxvi.5.
- (xvi) v.13, מְגֵד, *meḡed*, 'precious things,' only here, v.13,14,14,15,16, and Cant.iv.13,16, vii.14.
- (xvii) v.15, הָרָר, *harar*, 'mountain,' D.viii.9, Jer.xvii.3.
- (xviii) קֶדֶם, *kedem*, 'ancient,' v.27, Jer.xxx.20, xli.26, xlix.28, Lam.i.7, ii.17, v.21.
- (xix) v.17, 'his horns,' Jer.xlviii.25, Lam.ii.3,17.
- (xx) הָדָר, *hadar*, 'glory,' L.xxiii.40, Lam.i.6.
- (xxi) אֲפֵסֵי אֲרָץ, *aphsey arets*, 'ends of the earth,' Jer.xvi.19.
- (xxii) v.18, 'tents,' = dwellings, as in D.xvi.7.
- (xxiii) v.20, הִרְחִיב, *hirkhiv*, 'enlarge,' D.xii.20, xix.8, and E.xxxiv.*24.
- (xxiv) v.21, סָפָן, *saphan*, 'cover,' Jer.xxii.14, only besides, 1K.vi.9, vii.3,7, Hag.i.4.
- (xxv) v.26, גִּאֲוָה, *ga'vah*, 'excellency,' v.29, Jer.xlviii.29.
- (xxvi) שְׁתַּחֲקִים, *shēkhakim*, 'clouds,' Jer.li.9.
- (xxvii) v.27, מְעוֹנָה, *mehonah*, מַעוֹן, *mahon*, 'habitation,' xxvi.15, Jer.ix.11(10), x.22, xxi.13, xxv.30, xlix.33, li.37.
- (xxviii) הִשְׁמִיד, *hishmid*, 'destroy,' D.i.27, ii.12,21,22,23, iv.3, vi.15, vii.4,24, ix.3,8,14,19,20,25, xxviii.48,63, xxxi.3,4, and Lxxvi.*30, N.xxxiii.52.
- (xxix) v.28, 'his heaven,' comp. D.xxviii.23, 'thy heaven,' Lxxvi.*19, 'your heaven'; and note that these are the only places in the Bible where such expressions are used, with the pronoun referring to human beings, though in Ps.viii.3, cxliv.5, 'Thy heaven' is used with reference to Jehovah, and comp. Lam.iii.66.
- (xxx) v.29, נִשְׁעָה, *noshah*, 'saved' = 'helped generally,' Jer.xxiii.6, xxxiii.16.
- (xxxi) דָּרַחַ, *darach*, 'tread,' D.i.36, xi.24,25, Jer.ix.3(2), xxv.30, xli.9, xlviii.33, l.14,29, li.3,33, Lam.i.15, ii.4, iii.12, and N.xxiv.17.

* As before, an asterisk is used to mark passages which will be shown in Part IV to be Deuteronomistic interpolations in the other four books.

809. Upon the whole, it will be seen that (xxiii),(xxviii),(xxix), point *strongly* to the Deuteronomist as writer of this poem, and this is confirmed, with more or less cogency, by (iv),(v), (ix),(x),(xiv),(xvii),(xxvii),(xxx), and specially by the fact that in v.10 we have *Levi*, *i.e.* the Levites generally, spoken of as chosen to 'put incense before' Jehovah, and 'whole burnt sacrifice upon His Altar,' which proper duties of the Priesthood, as we have seen, the Deuteronomist assigns to the 'whole tribe of Levi,' whereas by the earlier writers they are restricted to the 'sons of Aaron.' So (iv),(viii),(x),(xv),(xvii),(xviii),(xix), (xxi),(xxv),(xxvi),(xxvii),(xxx),(xxxi), point to Jeremiah; also (ii) and (xvi) indicate a *late* date for its composition.

810. Upon (ii), indeed, KNOBEL observes, *Deut.p.341* :—

This is a *locus vexatissimus*. The usual reading is קֵדָשׁ , *esh dath*, and the Law itself is understood by 'Fire of the Law,' or 'Fire-Law,' (which last the Grammar does not allow,) because the Law was given amidst Fire, and has a power and effect like that of Fire. But there is this objection to the above reading, that the Persian קֵדָשׁ is found first in later Hebrew, and would be exceedingly strange in *so old a passage*; besides which the designation would be strange and unheard of, and the writer comes to speak of the Law first in v.4. . . . Later critics rightly connect the two words after very numerous MSS. [GES. says 50, and two Sam. MSS.] but understand the word [so formed] אֶשְׁדֹּת , *āshadoth*, of 'streams of water,' 'fountains,' which does not suit the 'right-hand' of God, or of 'strong ones,' *i.e.* the 'ten thousands of saints,' which is still less suitable, since the Arabic root means 'lion,' but not the 'strong' generally.

Accordingly, he understands by אֶשְׁדֹּת the 'streams of light or glory,' which poured from God's right-hand. But *why* is such glory said to have streamed from God's *right-hand*, and not from His whole *Presence*? On the other hand, the 'right-hand' was the sign of *Power*, from which such a Law would proceed; and it is particularly to be noticed that the Deuteronomist refers expressly and repeatedly to the *Fire*, which attended the giving of the Law, and says 'Jehovah spake out of the midst of the Fire,' iv.11,12,15,33,36, v.4,5,20,22,24,26, ix.10,15,21, x.4, xviii.16, whereas in the rest of the Pentateuch we find very little notice of this Fire, E.xix.18, xxiv.17(546.vi).

811. Besides which, if this poem was written by a different writer from him who wrote the rest of the book of Deuteronomy, we should expect to see *more of that writer's compositions* mixed up in the Pentateuch: at least, it would be strange if so powerful a composer wrote no more than this, or that no more of his compositions have come down to us. As we have seen, the *peculiar* expressions of this chapter do resemble considerably the style of the Deuteronomist and of Jeremiah; while there is no such *special* resemblance between them and those of the other books of the Pentateuch. That the resemblance between this passage and the rest of Deuteronomy is not more complete, may arise from this composition, like the Song in ch.xxxii, being highly poetical; and *both of them, or, at least, the Blessing, may very possibly have been written some years before the book of Deuteronomy, if* (as is not at all impossible) *the writer intended them originally to close his new edition of the earlier document, before he conceived the idea of writing the book of Deuteronomy itself.*

If, therefore, upon a closer consideration of the contents of this chapter, we find nothing which really militates with the supposition that the Deuteronomist was its author, we shall have no hesitation in ascribing it to him.

812. We may first, however, quote the words of KURTZ, who, it will be seen, while contending for the Mosaic authorship of the main part of the 'Blessing,' yet is compelled by his sense of truth to make admissions, which are, in fact, fatal to its Mosaic origin. He writes as follows, iii.493:—

The authenticity of the 'Blessing of Moses' has been most conclusively demonstrated by DIESTEL. In fact, there is nothing in the particular blessings, which could give the least warrant for regarding it as a *vaticinium post eventum*. The introductory and concluding clauses, however, the critic just named feels obliged to set down as additions of a later hand. But, so far as the concluding words are concerned, I do not see on what ground the authorship of Moses can possibly be disputed. It is somewhat different with the introduction, seeing that there is at least one clause here, (*viz.* in v.4, 'Moses commanded us a Law,') which seems to favour DIESTEL'S view. It must be admitted that these words sound somewhat

strangely from the lips of Moses. BAUMGARTEN has offered a plausible solution of the difficulty. 'With these words,' he says, 'Moses threw himself into the very heart of the people; the mediator of the Law and the man of God was to him an objective person, just as David appropriates the common sentiment of the nation; and speaks of the 'king of Israel,' in Ps.xx,xxi.' But the two cases are not *perfectly* analogous. If the passage before us had read, 'Moses gave *you* a Law,' there would be nothing strange about it. But, when we bear in mind that Moses did not write down this 'Blessing,' as he did the 'Song' and the Law of Deuteronomy,—that, on the contrary, he uttered them verbally to the people a short time—perhaps immediately—before his departure to Mount Nebo, and that they were probably first appended to the book by the last editor of the Pentateuch, there cannot be anything very dangerous in the assumption that the introductory, and possibly also the concluding, words, which were the production of some other divinely-inspired psalmist, were also added by him.

Ans. It can scarcely be believed that any one would have presumed to introduce in this way his own words in v.4, in the midst of such a remarkable composition, the memorial of the last hours of the Lawgiver. Accordingly, SCOTT says, 'It is probable that the heads of the several tribes gathered around Moses, after he had received the summons recorded in the close of the former chapter, and just before he ascended the Mount where he ended his life, and that he delivered to them, both by word of mouth and in writing, these his last dying words.'

But what 'danger' can there be in following the light of Truth, and admitting the fact, which is patent, that v.4 at all events, was certainly not written nor uttered by Moses, and that, consequently, it is highly probable *à priori* that the whole 'Blessing' is by a later hand.

813. D.xxxiii.6.

'Let REUBEN live, and not die;

And let his men be somewhat (lit. a number),' v.6.

There is some doubt as to the proper rendering of the second line of the above. The E.V. supplies 'not' from the foregoing line, as in Ps.xxxviii.1(2),lxxv.5(6), 'And let his men (not) be a number,' *i.e.* not be so small as to be numbered; the LXX has 'and let him be many in number.' But it is obvious that the feeble wish implied in the clause, 'and not die,' hardly agrees with the LXX translation. REUBEN receives, indeed, a blessing, but one which sounds mournfully, and tells of the dwindled numbers of the tribe in the writer's time. In the days of Jehu we are informed, 2K.x.32,33:—

'Jehovah began to cut Israel short, and Hazael smote them in all the coasts of Israel, from Jordan eastward, all the land of Gilead, the Gadites, and the

Reubenites, and the *Manassites*, from Aroer which is by the river Arnon, even Gilead and Bashan.'

And this is the last glimpse which we have of Reuben in the Scripture history.

814. It is next noticeable that SIMEON is altogether omitted. KNOBEL observes, *Deut.p.344* :—

In many texts and editions of the LXX, the second member of v.6 reads thus, 'And let *Simeon* be many in number.' This seems to be the original Text. The wish suits Simeon very well, who at the second numbering was much smaller than at the former. He would then be connected with Reuben as Issachar is with Zebulon, v.18. If this is not allowed, then we must suppose him left out for the reason given in G.xlix.7, [where Jacob says of *Simeon and Levi*, 'Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce, and their wrath, for it was cruel; I will divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel.']

KURTZ also remarks on this point as follows, ii.p.493 :—

The first thing which strikes us, on examining this 'Blessing,' is the omission of the tribe of Simeon. BAUMGARTEN observes that 'we are not to imagine, from the fact that Simeon is passed over, that he is to be regarded as left without a blessing. In any case he was included in the general blessing in v.1,29, just as even the sons of Jacob, to whom threatening words were addressed by their father, were still said to be 'blessed.' But the fact that Simeon is not mentioned by name, and that the harsh words addressed to him by the patriarch, as well as to Reuben and Levi, are not softened down in his case, has been correctly explained as denoting that the sentence of dispersion pronounced on Simeon, according to which he was not to have an independent position, but to live within the boundaries of the rest, had not been repealed or mitigated, as in the case of Levi, in consequence of any act of obedience and faith, but, on the contrary, had been greatly strengthened by the wickedness of his prince Zimri, N.xxv.14. A striking proof of this, we believe, is to be found in the remarkably diminished number of Simeon, N.xxvi.14.' This is, probably, the best solution of the difficulty, if we are unable to adopt DRETEL's conclusion, that the 'Blessing' has not come down to us in its fullest integrity.

815. But was not the rebellion of Dathan, Abiram, and On, sons of Reuben, which drew down upon the people a plague, by which '14,700 perished, beside them that died about the matter of [the *Levite*] Korah,' N.xvi.49, a very notable event, as well as the affair of Zimri by which 24,000 died? Yet Reuben receives a blessing, though a mild one. And what reason is there to suppose that the Simeonites, generally, were

more guilty than the other tribes, because one of their princes was compromised?

The fact is, most probably, that in the time of the writer — and, therefore, long after the time which KNOBEL assigns to him—the tribe of Simeon had been long *absorbed in Judah*, and lost sight of.

816. The tribe of Simeon, we are told, ‘obtained their inheritance *in the midst of the inheritance of the men of Judah*,’ Jo.xix.1-9. Seventeen cities, with the surrounding villages, are assigned to them, which means, no doubt, that, at the time when this passage was written, the Simeonites were either found occupying these cities, or were known to have occupied them in former days, or, at least, to have had some special connection with them. But of these seventeen towns, Hormah and Beersheba are numbered, in the times of David and Ahab, respectively, among the towns of Judah, 1S.xxx.30, 1K.xix.3; another of their towns, Ziklag, was given by the Philistine king, Achish, to David, 1S.xxvii.6; ‘wherefore Ziklag pertaineth unto the kings of Judah unto this day.’ They are said to have conquered, with Judah’s help, Hormah, Gaza, Askelon, and Ekron, Ju.i.17,18; but, if they did so, they could not keep their hold on these cities, since Hormah, as we have said, is reckoned to Judah in 1S.xxx.26,30, and the other three are spoken of as independent Philistine cities in 1S.vi.17. It is mentioned in 2Ch.xi.6 that Rehoboam ‘built’ Etham or Ether, which also belonged to Simeon, Jo.xix.7.

817. Thus seven, at all events, of their seventeen towns were lost to them, four of which are distinctly reckoned to Judah. And, imperceptibly, the tribe of Simeon appears, as we have said, to have become so completely absorbed in Judah, that they entirely disappear from the history. In 1K.xii.21,23, where the military force of Rehoboam is mustered, which, we must suppose, from their situation, included the Simeonites, we find no mention of them, and we read:—

'The word of God came unto Shemaiah, the man of God, saying, Speak unto Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, king of Judah, and unto all the house of *Judah* and *Benjamin*, and to *the remnant of the people*.'

The Simeonites must have been included among this 'remnant of the people.' Their name, in fact, is not once mentioned in the books of Samuel and Kings, though it occurs in the books of Chronicles, 1Ch.iv.42,vi.65,xii.25,xxvii.16, 2Ch.xv.9,xxxiv.6; and in one of these places, 1Ch.xii.25, they are spoken of as bringing help to David:—

'Of the children of Simeon, mighty men of valour for the war, seven thousand one hundred.'

But this statement must, like so many other of the Chronicler's *data*, be rejected as untrustworthy.*

818. D.xxxiii.7.

*'Hear, Jehovah, the voice of JUDAH,
And bring him unto his people;
Let his hands be sufficient for him,
And be Thou an help to him from his enemies,' v.7.*

Very remarkable is the difference in tone between this prayer, almost a cry of anguish, and the grand words which are spoken of Judah in the 'Blessing of Jacob,' G.xlix.8-12:—

*'Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise;
Thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies;
Thy father's children shall bow down before thee.*

* Here, of those who supported David, there are numbered only 6,800 of *David's own tribe* of Judah, and 3,000 of Benjamin; whereas the Levites (including the Aaronites) were, according to the Chronicler, 8,300, and the Simeonites 7,100, and of Ephraim there were 28,000, of Western Manasseh, 18,000, of Zebulun, 50,000, of Naphtali, 1,000 captains, with 37,000 men, of Dan, 28,600, of Asher, 40,000, of Issachar, 200 men, 'that had understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do,' v.32, with all their brethren at their command, of the trans-Jordanic tribes, 120,000, [44,760 only. 1Ch.v.18-? in whose reign,] making altogether 348,000 men—five times as large as Wellington's whole force at Waterloo, ALISON,xix.401—of which Judah supplied only 6,800! and Simeon, 7,100! and 'all these men of war, that could keep rank, came with a perfect heart to Hebron, to make David king over all Israel; and all the rest also of Israel were of one heart to make David king. And there they were with David three days, eating and drinking; for their brethren had prepared for them. 1Ch.xii.38,39.

Judah is a lion's whelp :
 From the prey, my son, thou art gone up ;
 He stooped down, he couched as a lion,
 And as an old lion— who shall rouse him up ?
 The sceptre shall not depart from Judah,
 Nor a lawgiver from between his feet,
 Until he come to Shiloh, [E.V. ' Until Shiloh come'] ;
 And unto him shall the gathering of the people be.
 Binding his foal unto the vine,
 And his ass's colt unto the choice vine ;
 He washed his garments in wine,
 And his clothes in the blood of grapes.
 His eyes shall be red with wine,
 And his teeth white with milk.'

819. KNOBEL, from his point of view, explains the meaning of v.7, as follows, *Deut.p.344* :—

'Hear, Jehovah, the voice of Judah, and bring him to his people,' *i.e.* (say some), 'give to him, as the royal tribe, the people which belongs to him.' (others) 'allow him, after driving out the Canaanites, to take possession of his territory,' (others) 'conduct him successful out of war back again to his own.' The last is as contradictory to the Text as the others; the words cannot say this. The person meant is manifestly separated and removed far from his people, and the entreaty of the men of Judah is that he may return to his people. The reference to those carried captive with Jehoiachin would suit, perhaps, if the poem did not belong to a much earlier time, and if the singular pronoun did not point to something else. So, too, it can hardly be thought to refer to the reunion of the kingdom of Judah with the kingdom of Israel. For Judah had not severed itself from Israel, but Israel from Judah; and the longing and expectation in the time of the two kingdoms did not go towards Judah's being attached to Israel, but to the return of all the tribes to the royal house of Judah — and this even in Israel itself, Hos.iii,5, [Jer.xxx.4,9.] Besides, there is nothing said here about the *kingdom* of Judah, but at most about the *tribe*. This tribe, after Saul's death, chose David as king, formed for itself a kingdom, and for seven years and a half maintained a separate position, while the other tribes abode by the house of Saul, 2S.ii.4,10,11. The writer may have had this in his eye. However, the expression 'bring him unto his people' will not suit that either, and the Jews, who had chosen their tribesman David as king, and had voluntarily separated themselves, certainly did not then beseech to be attached to the other tribes, which was quite open to them, but wished for the subjection of the tribes under the divinely-chosen David, which also followed in course of time. The passage can only apply to David in his flight before Saul, when he had to live in a foreign land, and felt this painfully. There was then no greater petition for Judah than that David should return, attain the sovereignty, and elevate his tribe to a royal tribe.

And, instead of 'Let his hands be sufficient for him,' KNOBEL translates, 'With his hands has he contended for it (the people),'—thereby, however, destroying the parallelism in the two members of *v.7*.

820. According to our view, the words, 'bring him unto his people,' express a prayer that the tribe of Judah might again be restored to its old sovereignty, by the return of the Ten Tribes, at no very distant day, as it seems to have been already in some measure, 2K.xxiii.15-20, by the gathering of the scattered fragments of them still remaining in the land, (and these, probably, far more numerous than is generally supposed,) under the sceptre of the sons of David. We have seen (782) that the Deuteronomist did, apparently, entertain such a fond hope for the restoration of Israel; and Jeremiah breathes it in his prophecies, xxx.3-9:—

'For, lo, the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will bring again the captivity of my people Israel and Judah, saith Jehovah, and I will cause them to return to the land that I gave to their fathers, and they shall possess it. . . . For it shall come to pass in that day, saith Jehovah of Hosts, that I will break his yoke from off thy neck, and will burst thy bonds, and strangers shall no more serve themselves of him. But they shall serve Jehovah their God, and David their king, whom I will raise up unto them.'

And see also the glorious prophecies in Jer.xxxi,xxxiii, where we read,—

'There shall be a day that the watchmen upon the Mount Ephraim shall cry, Arise ye, and let us go up to Zion, unto Jehovah our God,' xxxi.6;

'For thus saith Jehovah, If my covenant be not with day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth, then will I cast away the seed of Jacob and David my servant, so that I will not take any of his seed to be rulers over the house of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; for I will cause their Captivity to return, and have mercy upon them,' xxxiii.25,26.

821. In point of fact, the deportation of the Ten Tribes into Captivity seems to have been by no means so great and so universal as is generally supposed. After Shalmaneser had 'carried Israel away into Assyria,' 2K.xvii.6, we are told that 'Hezekiah wrote letters to Ephraim and Manasseh,' to beg them to come and keep the Passover;

Q Q

‘but they laughed them to scorn, and mocked them; nevertheless, divers of Asher and Manasseh and Zebulun humbled themselves, and came to Jerusalem,’ 2Ch.xxx.10,11.

This, however, depends on the unsupported testimony of the Chronicler.

But Josiah’s authority evidently extended over Samaria as well as Judah; since he destroyed the altar which was at Bethel, and the high place which Jeroboam had made;—

‘both that altar and the high place he brake down, and burned the high place, and stamped it small to powder, and burned the Ashera [E.V. grove]. . . And all the houses also of the high places, that were in the cities of Samaria, which the kings of Israel had made to provoke Jehovah to anger, Josiah took away, and did to them according to all the acts that he had done in Bethel. . . . And he slew all the priests of the high places, that were there, upon the altars, and burned men’s bones upon them, and returned to Jerusalem.’ 2K.xxiii.15-20.

It is possible, also, that in this phrase, ‘bring him unto *his people*,’ there may be a reference to the words spoken of Judah in Jacob’s blessing, G.xlix.10, ‘Unto him shall the gathering of *the people* be.’

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE BLESSING OF MOSES, DEUT.XXXIII.8-12.

822. D.XXXiii.8-11.

*'And of LEVI he said,
 Let Thy Thummim and Thy Urim be with Thy holy one,
 Whom Thou didst prove at Massah,
 Whom Thou didst right (תִּרְיֶכְהוּ, terivku, E.V. 'strive with,' but see
 Is.i.17, רִיבוּ אֶלְמָנָה, rivu almanah, '[strive for=] right the
 widow,') at the waters of Meribah ;
 Who said of his father and his mother, I saw him not ;
 Neither did he acknowledge his brethren, nor knew his own children ;
 For they have observed Thy word, and kept Thy covenant.
 They shall teach Jacob Thy judgments,
 And Israel thy Law ;
 They shall put incense before Thee,
 And whole burnt sacrifice upon Thine Altar.
 Bless, O Jehovah, his substance,
 And accept the work of his hands ;
 Smite through the loins of them that rise against him,
 And of them that hate him, that they rise not again.'*

Still more surprising, than even that which we have observed
 in the case of Judah, is the contrast between the strong language
 of praise here addressed to Levi, and the sentence of censure in
 G.xlix.5-7 :

'SIMEON and LEVI are brethren ;
 Instruments of cruelty are in their habitations.
 O my soul, come not thou into their secret ;
 Unto their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united ;
 For in their anger they slew a man,
 And in their selfwill they digged down a wall.
 Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce,—
 And their wrath, for it was cruel ;
 I will divide them in Jacob,
 And scatter them in Israel.'

823. Indeed, the change is wholly unaccountable on the ordinary view. For the usual notion that, because of their zeal, in slaying three thousand of their brethren, about the affair of the golden calf, E.xxxii.26-28, (which some suppose to be referred to in v.9,) they were really distinguished with such words of high commendation, can scarcely be admitted, when it is remembered that Aaron himself, the head of the tribe, to whose sons all its *chief* honours, in point of fact, were to be given, was the very leader in that sin, and was so greatly at fault also at the waters of Meribah, N.xx.12, that, for his offence on that occasion, he, as well as the other principal Levite, Moses, was sentenced to die, without setting his foot upon the holy land. We do not read at all in the narrative of the Levites distinguishing themselves at Massah and Meribah.

SCOTT, accordingly, remarks—

The Prophet, in this passage, seems to have referred to some remarkable instances, not elsewhere recorded, in which the Levites were tried, and honourably distinguished themselves in the cause of God.

824. KNOBEL notes as follows, *Deut. p.345* :

In the case of Levi, the first word applies to the head of the Levites, the High Priest. '*Thy Right and Thy Light is with Thy pious man,*' i.e. he has and bears the Urim and Thummim, the signs of his high office and authority, with which Thou distinguishest him. . . . The writers in the Pentateuch do not, however, record in E.xvii, N.xx, that Jehovah put Moses and Aaron to the proof, and know only of their failing and being rejected at Kadesh [Meribah-Kadesh, N.xx.12]. The writer follows a different legend. '*Who says of his father and his mother, I saw him not, &c.*' i.e. who gives himself wholly up to his sacred office, and thereupon leaves worldly concerns out of consideration; God and His service is more to him than all, even than his nearest relations, while the other Israelites wholly attend to their earthly connexions. '*For they observe Thy word and keep Thy covenant,*' i.e. they follow the divine prescriptions, and maintain their theocratic duties, devote themselves wholly to this calling. The second clause shows that the writer has here the whole Priestly tribe in his eye. The passage might also be referred to impartial discharge of justice, such as the Levites had exhibited in the case of the golden calf. The writer, however, comes first to the discharge of justice in the following context. '*They teach Jacob Thy judgments and Israel Thy Law,*' while they give judicial decisions to the people, and thereby make it acquainted with the divine law as Moses did. . . . '*Smite through the loins of them that rise up against him, &c.*' This severe passage is strange in this poem, which is otherwise so mild and gentle.

The writer, however, looks back at the rage of Saul and his adherents against the Priests at Nob, and gives vent to his dissatisfaction, which, doubtless, all Priests shared. The longing after David, in *v.7*, accords with this.

825. There is, obviously, much of truth in the above explanation of KNOBEL; but on some points he seems to have been led astray by his theory of the early origin of this poem. Abandoning, with KNOBEL, the notion of its Mosaic origin, there surely was nothing, in the history of Saul's times, in the position of the Levites, to correspond in any sense with such language as this. They are nowhere even mentioned in that history; and, indeed, if we were only to form a judgment from the more authentic records of that age, there is no trace even of the existence of the *tribe*, as one set apart for religious duties. Even when David had been ten years on the throne, we find that the Levites were *not* employed at the removal of the Ark—at least, not on the first attempt to remove it, as appears on the testimony of the Chronicler himself, 1Ch.xv.2,12,13.

826. But believing, as we do, that this chapter of Deuteronomy was written at a much later age—probably, at the very beginning of Josiah's reign (792), before the composition of the rest of this book, or even towards the end of Manasseh's,—and that it was written by a Priest, very probably by Jeremiah himself,—it is easy to explain every allusion in these verses. In those days, by all truly *religious* persons, devoted to the worship of Jehovah, the Levites—at least, the chief Priest and the other Levites or Priests, who ministered at the Sanctuary—if known as earnest and devout men, would be held in high estimation, as the guardians of the true faith in a corrupt age, amidst an idolatrous and gainsaying generation. Well might the writer—a Priest himself—utter for his own brethren, (including his own father, who may have been Hilkiab, then, perhaps, already, as he was a few years afterwards, 2K.xxii.4, at the head of the Priesthood,) the prayer, 'Let Thy Thummim and Thy Urim—Thy Truth and Thy

Light—be ever with Thy holy one, *whom Thou didst prove at Massah* (temptation), *whom Thou didst justify at the waters of Meribah* (strife); *i.e.* whom Thou dost expose now, as Thou didst then, to the rebellious, trying, tempers,—the angry strife and turbulence,—of an unthankful, unbelieving, people.

827. If we refer to the story in E.xvii, N.xx, we shall find that, in each case, the faith and patience of the religious leaders,—in one case, Moses, in the other, Moses and Aaron,—are represented as ‘tried’ in this way. The people come to them murmuring, and complaining that they had not the supplies of good things, or even necessaries, which they required, and they are ready to go back to the ‘feshpots of Egypt.’

‘And the people murmured against Moses, and said, Wherefore is this, that thou hast brought us up out of Egypt, to kill us, and our children, and our cattle with thirst? And Moses cried unto Jehovah, saying, What shall I do unto this people? They be almost ready to stone me,’ E.xvii.3,4;

‘And they gathered themselves together against Moses and against Aaron. And the people chode with Moses, and spake, saying, Would God that we had died when our brethren died before Jehovah! And why have ye brought up the Congregation of Jehovah into this wilderness, that we and our cattle should die there? And wherefore have ye made us to come up out of Egypt, to bring us unto this evil place? It is no place of seed or of figs, or of vines, or of pomegranates, neither is there any water to drink,’ N.xx.2-5.

828. Who can doubt that in the age of the later kings, and especially just before the time of Josiah’s reformation, there must have been much ‘murmuring’ of this kind, even among those who still adhered outwardly to the worship of Jehovah, but in their hearts had gone back to Egypt, and were ready to say with those of old, E.xvii.7, ‘Is Jehovah among us or not?’ A pious and zealous Priest, like Hilkiyah, must have had a painful life in such times, with those in high places (Manasseh and his princes) violently opposed to his endeavours to keep up the true faith in the Living God. He must have found it a hard task at times to bear up, in the path of duty, against the strength of public feeling,—the expressed illwill of some, the

secret dislike of others, the neglect and indifference of almost all. Living in such days, and sharing fully in the sentiments of his more faithful brethren, the writer might well refer to the record of similar 'trials' of the great leaders in the wilderness,—to their being succoured and supported by Divine Power, when tempted,—to their being 'righted' or 'justified' before the people by the direct interference of Jehovah, in answer to their cry, and in reply to the rebellious unbelief of the multitude.

829. So would it be again, the writer hopes, in God's own time. Let the Levite (*i.e.* the Priest) be faithful still to his sacred calling, saying to father, mother, brothers, children, 'I know you not;' *i.e.* let him not be turned by any family ties from the straight path of duty; let him be ready to *for-sake home and its delights*, (as some, doubtless, of that day had done,) and —

'go up from the gates out of all Israel, where he sojourned, and come with all the desire of his mind to minister in the Name of Jehovah his God at Jerusalem,' D.xviii.6,7.

Let him still possess his soul in faith and patience, 'observing Jehovah's word, and keeping his covenant,' 'teaching Jacob His judgments, and Israel His Law,' 'putting incense before Him, and whole burnt sacrifices upon His Altar.' Then would the Blessing of the Most High attend him; then would he in due time be 'justified,' though 'tried' to the uttermost; his Priesthood should continue, his office be held in honour, his judgments be respected, his teachings obeyed. Then Jehovah would 'bless his substance, and accept the work of his hands; would smite through the loins of them that rise against him, (the adversaries of the true religion whether high or low, in Israel,) and of them that hate him, that they rise not again.'

Such appears to us the more rational and intelligible explanation of these verses, regarded as referring to the circumstances of the times in which the writer lived.

830. It is true that Jeremiah in many passages of his prophecies describes the state of the *Priests*, as well as of the *Prophets*, in his time as excessively bad: *e.g.*—

‘The *Priests* said not, Where is Jehovah? and they that handle the Law knew me not: the pastors also transgressed against me, and the *Prophets* prophesied by Baal,’ ii.8;

‘As the thief is ashamed, when he is found, so is the house of Israel ashamed, they, their Kings, their Princes, and their *Priests*, and their *Prophets*, saying to a stock, Thou art my father, and to a stone, Thou hast brought me forth; for they have turned their back unto me, and not their face,’ ii.26,27, xxxii.32,33;

‘A wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land,—The *Prophets* prophesy falsely, and the *Priests* bear rule by their means; and my people love to have it so; and what will ye do in the end thereof,’ v.30,31;

‘From the least of them even unto the greatest of them every one is given to covetousness; and from the *Prophet* even unto the *Priest* every one dealth falsely,’ vi.13, viii.10;

‘Both *Prophet* and *Priest* are profane; yea, in my House have I found their wickedness, saith Jehovah,’ xxiii.11;

‘For the sins of her *Prophets* and the iniquities of her *Priests*, that have shed the blood of the just in the midst of her,’ &c., Lam.iv.13.

831. Yet still there must have been exceptions to this general rule. In Josiah’s reign Zephaniah prophesied, and Jeremiah himself was both a *Priest* and a *Prophet*; and there seems no reason to suppose that Hilkiyah and the *Priests* under him were any other than pious men, who did their best to discharge the duties of their office amidst the difficulties of the time. This passage may have been written at a time when Hilkiyah was in office, and had entered on his sacred duties with a deep sense of his responsibilities, and a determination to stem, to the uttermost of his power, the corruption of the times. But the writer may also, and specially, have had in view that glorious restoration for which he longed, when ‘the sons of David’ should reign in righteousness, and the ‘sons of Levi’ minister in faithfulness, in the midst of the regenerated and rejoicing people. To this hope Jeremiah points when he says,—

‘Jehovah hath redeemed Jacob, and ransomed him from the hand of him that was stronger than he. Therefore they shall come and sing in the height of Zion,

and shall flow together to the goodness of Jehovah, for wheat, and for wine, and for oil, and for the young of the flock and of the herd; and their soul shall be as a watered garden, and they shall not sorrow any more at all . . . And I will satiate the soul of the *Priests* with fatness, and my people shall be satisfied with my goodness, saith Jehovah,' xxxi.11-14;

'Thus saith Jehovah, David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel; neither shall the *Priests the Levites* want a man before me to offer burnt-offerings, and to kindle meat-offerings, and to do sacrifice continually,' xxxiii.17,18;

'Thus saith Jehovah, If ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season, then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne, and with the *Levites the Priests*, my ministers. As the host of heaven cannot be numbered, neither the sand of the sea measured, so will I multiply the seed of David my servant and the *Levites that minister unto me.*' xxxiii.20-22.

832. D.xxxiii.12.

'Of BENJAMIN he said,

The beloved of Jehovah shall dwell securely (by Him, E.V.);

He shall cover him at all times, and dwell between his shoulders.'

We have seen that KNOBEL notices the peculiar *order* in which the tribes are here mentioned, differing from any other in which they are found in the Bible; and he explains this fact by supposing that the writer meant to notice them in a kind of 'geographical order from South to North.' But it will be seen at once that this account of the matter is not at all satisfactory; since, even if we suppose that Levi, being so closely connected with Jerusalem, might properly be placed between Judah and Benjamin, yet Gad lay on the *eastern* side of Jordan, to the north of Reuben, and is placed between Issachar and Dan, both on the *western* side, with which it had no geographical relations.

833. Perhaps, the following explanation of the order here observed may be more satisfactory. Reuben comes first, as usual, as first-born, and it is possible also, as having been, from his position, on the East side of the Dead Sea, less exposed to the consequences of the great Assyrian invasion, than the other

trans-Jordanic tribes, which lay *more directly* in the track of the invading hosts. The remnant of Reuben, therefore, in Josiah's time may really have been more considerable than those of Gad and Eastern Manasseh. Then come Judah, Levi, Benjamin, the *only* substantial tribes remaining in Josiah's time, Judah having absorbed Simeon, and constituting, with Benjamin, the kingdom of Judah. Hence we find Jeremiah joining together repeatedly 'the cities of Judah, and the places about Jerusalem, and the land of Benjamin,' xvii.26, xxxii.44, xxxiii.13. The other tribes had all been carried captive. They are named, however, one after another, as they *must* have been by one personating the part of Moses, and something is said about each, corresponding, probably, in some measure to their circumstances either then or aforetime, as well as to those *which the writer fondly hoped to see in due time revived through the Mercy of God*, when Judah should be 'brought to his people' again.

834. KNOBEL notes as follows on the blessing of Benjamin, p.347:

'The beloved of Jehovah dwells in security,' i.e. Benjamin, is secured in his abode from hostile assaults, enjoys a secure situation. He is called the 'beloved of Jehovah,' because at that time the Sanctuary, the dwelling-place of God, stood in his territory, and thus Jehovah had advanced him before the other tribes. Elsewhere, the expression is only used of Israel as the divinely-chosen people, Jer.xi.15,xii.7, Ps.lx.5.

The first יִלְּךְ, *halayv*, (E.V. 'shall dwell in safety *by him*'), is very heavy, [being repeated in the second clause]; since the writer means to speak of Jehovah's dwelling in Benjamin, not of Benjamin's dwelling by or on Jehovah. The Sam. and Syr. have it not; but they have the copula before the following clause; also in many copies either the first or the second יִלְּךְ is wanting, and the Vulg. expresses only one. The LXX have [for the second] καὶ ὁ Θεός, which, probably, is only a free supplement of the sense of the passage, and hardly points, as some suppose, to the correction הַיְלִיךְ, *helayon*, 'the Most High,' which in no other place is expressed by Θεός. In all probability, it arises from some transcriber, led to it by the second יִלְּךְ.

Benjamin dwells securely, since Jehovah, as his Protector, hangs over him, and has His earthly abode between the ridges of Benjamin . . . The writer points to Gibeon, where the Tabernacle stood after the destruction of Nob through Saul. The modern *Djib*, two full hours north-west from Jerusalem, with four fountains

and springs, lies on a ridge in the middle of a fruitful and pleasant valley or basin, which consists of broad valleys or plains, and is surrounded by different mountains. The length of the beautiful valley is, from east to west, ten English miles, the breadth five miles. The word *קַתֶּפֶף*, *catheph*, 'wing, shoulder,' in geographical notices, signifies not the side generally, but the mountain-side, which rises to the mountain or mountain-ridge, N.xxxiv.11, Jo.xv.8,10,xviii.12,13,16,18,&c. The passage cannot, therefore, apply to Jerusalem, since Jehovah dwelt there not between mountain-ridges, but on Moriah. So, too, it does not suit Jerusalem, if we take *קַתֶּפֶף* in the sense of 'side,' and understand the notice of the territory of Benjamin, generally. For Jerusalem lay on the south side of this tribal territory, and not in the midst of Benjamin. The phrase 'between the shoulders' occurs also 1S.xvii.6. The suspended javelin hung down from the right shoulder to the left hip, and so between the shoulders.

835. There is, however, no good reason to believe that the 'Tabernacle' ever was transferred from Nob to Gibeon, as KNOBEL supposes.

It is true the Chronicler states that it was at Gibeon in the time of David and Solomon, in the following passages:—

'The Tabernacle of Jehovah, which Moses made in the wilderness, and the Altar of the burnt-offering, were, at that season, [when David built the altar in the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite at Jerusalem,] in the high place at Gibeon.' 1Ch.xxi.29.

'David left there, before the Ark of the covenant of Jehovah in Jerusalem, Asaph and his brethren to minister before the Ark continually, as every day's work required, and Zadok the Priest and his brethren the Priests, before the Tabernacle of Jehovah, in the high place that was at Gibeon, to offer burnt-offerings unto Jehovah upon the Altar of the burnt-offering continually, morning and evening, and to do according to all that is written in the Law of Jehovah, which He commanded Israel.' 1Ch.xvi.37-40.

'So Solomon and all the Congregation with him went to the high place that was at Gibeon; for there was the Tabernacle of the Congregation of God, which Moses, the servant of Jehovah, had made in the wilderness. Moreover, the brazen Altar, that Bezaleel, the son of Uri, the son of Hur, had made, he put before the Tabernacle of Jehovah, and Solomon and the Congregation sought unto it. And Solomon went up thither to the Brazen Altar before Jehovah, which was at the Tabernacle of the Congregation, and offered a thousand burnt-offerings upon it.' 2Ch.i.3.

836. Upon which we observe as follows:—

(i) The more authentic history, in the books of Samuel and Kings, says nothing whatever of the Tabernacle being at Gibeon,

which is the more remarkable, since in the latter it is recorded that—

‘Solomon went to Gibeon to sacrifice there, for that was the great high-place; a thousand burnt-offerings did Solomon offer upon that altar.’ 1K.iii.4.

The writer would surely have mentioned the existence of the Mosaic Tabernacle and the Brazen Altar of Bezaleel at Gibeon at this time, as some reason for Solomon’s sacrificing there, if he knew that they were there, more especially as in the previous verse, *v.3*, he blames Solomon for ‘sacrificing and burning incense in high places.’

(ii) We might ask, which, in the opinion of the Chronicler, was the place which ‘Jehovah had chosen to put His Name in,’—Gibeon, with its Tabernacle and Brazen Altar, where ‘Zadok and the *Priests*’ attended, but where the Ark was not,—or Mount Zion, where the Ark and Mercy Seat were placed, and where ‘God dwelt between the cherubims,’ though only the *Levites*, ‘Asaph and his brethren,’ were stationed to ‘minister before it continually’? Under such circumstances, the people would have paid a very divided allegiance. And it is difficult to understand how Solomon could sacrifice *before the Ark* at Jerusalem, 1K.iii.15, when neither the *Priests* were there, nor the *Brazen Altar*, upon which alone it was lawful for him to sacrifice, according to the Law laid down in L.xvii.8,9,—

Whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers which sojourn among you, that offereth a burnt-offering or a sacrifice, and *bringeth it not unto the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation*, to offer it unto Jehovah, even *that man shall be cut off from among his people.*

Hence, in Jo.xxii.29, the trans-Jordanic tribes are made to say—

‘God forbid that we should rebel against Jehovah, and turn this day from following Jehovah, to build an altar for burnt-offerings, for meat-offerings, or for sacrifices, beside the Altar of Jehovah our God, that is *before His Tabernacle.*’

(iii) Again, if the Tabernacle was ever moved from Shiloh to Nob, and from Nob to Gibeon, how is it that we have no account of such removal, either in the books of Samuel or of Chronicles? It was just as great an act of sacrilege, according

to the Pentateuch, to touch the *Tabernacle* with profane hands, as to touch the *Ark* itself.

'When the Tabernacle setteth forward, the *Levites* shall take it down; and, when the Tabernacle is to be pitched, the *Levites* shall set it up; and *the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death.*' N.i.51.

Since, therefore, the Tabernacle was so much more cumbrous than the Ark, much greater preparations must have been made for moving it than for merely taking up the Ark; and, surely, some notice would have been taken in the history of so remarkable an event.

(iv) Above all, how was it that the Ark, when brought back from the Philistines, was not restored to the 'Tabernacle of Moses,' by the directions of Samuel, if that Tabernacle was really at hand, instead of being stored away for so many years in the house of Abinadab, 1S.vii.1,2? And what need was there for David to have *built* a Tabernacle on Mount Zion, to hold the Ark, if the 'Tabernacle of the Congregation' was actually in existence? Surely, no tent that he could build was so fitted to receive it as this grand, ancient, Mosaic Tabernacle, so venerable through its age, and so unspeakably sacred from its history,—framed, even as to its minutest details, as is supposed, after the express instructions of Jehovah, according to 'the pattern which Moses saw in the Mount,' E.xxv.40,xxvi.30,—sanctified by the most holy and stupendous events, glorious with so many grand associations, endeared by the most precious memories,—which had shared all along the fortunes of Israel, and had passed through so many most astonishing and awful scenes in the wilderness,—at the entrance of which not only Moses and Aaron had stood, but the Divine Presence itself had more than once been seen, when 'Jehovah came down in the pillar of a cloud, and stood in the door of the Tabernacle, and talked with them,' N.xi.25,xii.5,—so splendid, also, with its costly curtains of 'fine twined linen, blue, purple, and scarlet,' its coverings of goats' hair and rams' skins, its

boards of shittim wood with their sockets of silver, upon which alone, as we are told, E.xxxviii.27, were spent a hundred talents (34,000*l.*) of silver,—which (according to the views of KNOBEL,) had been removed so often and so easily, and might, therefore, without any very serious difficulty have been removed again, —which (according to the Chronicler) had certainly been moved to Gibeon, and was not *worn out*, and unfit for further sacred uses, since Zadok and the Priests were stationed at it. Such a Tabernacle as this would never have been allowed by the pious David to remain standing empty of the Ark which belonged to it, whether it stood at Shiloh or at Gibeon. He would not, surely, have dared to substitute for it one built by his own contrivance. It would have been an act of sacrilege to have done this. He *must* have brought up such a Tabernacle to Jerusalem, as the only fitting home for the Ark. We may, surely, say with confidence, it is *certain* that he would have done so, had such a Tabernacle really been at that time in existence.

837. We shall have occasion to consider more fully hereafter the history of those times, and the special history of the Ark and the Tabernacle. But we have, as we believe, shown sufficiently that there is no real ground for supposing that the Tabernacle was at Gibeon in the time of Saul; and, even if it had been, the *Ark* was not there, and *that* was the sign of Jehovah's Presence; He would scarcely be said to 'dwell' at a place where the Ark was not. From this, however, it appears that the very ground, on which KNOBEL'S opinion rests, is gone from under him. And we fall back on the explanation that he rejects, *viz.* that the words *do* refer to Jerusalem, where the Ark was, and where Jehovah was specially said to '*cause His Name to dwell.*' The word קַתֶּפֶן, *catheph*, 'shoulder,' is, in fact, used for 'side' in N.xxxiv.11, 'the *side* of the sea of Cinnereth,' and so in 1K.vi.8,39, 'the right *side* of the House,' 2Ch.iv.10, 'he set

the sea [on the right *side* of the east end,' 2Ch.xxiii.10, 'from the right *side* of the Temple to the left *side* of the Temple.' Possibly, the idea in the writer's mind was this, that, as Jerusalem lay in the middle of the southern boundary of Benjamin, it was thus between the shoulders of the tribe, *i.e.* between the southern ends of the *Eastern* and *Western* sides of it—supported, like the head, between the shoulders, as it were, and not lower down upon the back.

838. It may be noticed that it is the *Deuteronomist* alone, who speaks, as here, of Jehovah 'dwelling' in Jerusalem, and that the phrase שָׁכַן לְבֵטָח, *shachan lavetakh*, 'to rest safely,' occurs only in v.12,28, of this chapter, and in Jer.xxiii.6, xxxiii.16, Ps.xvi.9, Pr.i.33, in the first of which passages we have the whole phrase, as in D.xxxiii.28, 'Israel shall dwell safely.' We must not forget, also, that Jeremiah himself was one of the 'Priests that were at Anathoth in the land of Benjamin'; so that, when at home, he lived in 'one of the gates of Benjamin,' and felt, doubtless, a special tenderness for the tribe, which is here called the 'darling of Jehovah.'

CHAPTER XIX.

THE BLESSING OF MOSES, DEUT.XXXIII.13-29.

839. D,xxxiii.13-17.

*'And of JOSEPH he said,—
 Blessed of Jehovah be his land,
 For treasures of heaven above [E.V. 'for the dew'],
 And of the deep that lieth beneath,
 And for treasures brought forth by the sun,
 And for treasures put forth by the moon,
 And for the chief things of the ancient mountains,
 And for treasures of the lasting hills,
 And for treasures of the earth and fulness thereof,
 And for the goodwill of Him that dwelt in the bush;
 The blessing shall come upon the head of Joseph,
 And upon the crown of the consecrated of his brethren.*

*His firstborn steer is his glory;
 And his horns are like the horns of a buffalo [E.V. 'unicorn'];
 With them he shall push the people together to the ends of the earth:
 And they are the ten thousands of Ephraim,
 And they are the thousands of Manasseh.'*

840. This blessing on Joseph certainly presents at first sight some difficulty, as the Ten Tribes, of which Ephraim was the head, had been carried into Captivity in the days of Hezekiah, and therefore such language as the above would seem altogether inapplicable to them in the time of Josiah, and to accord much more completely with the views of KNOBEL.

BLEEK, p.305, who maintained originally that this 'Blessing' was very ancient, and probably uttered by Moses himself, and much older, at all events, than the 'Blessing of Jacob,' has been obliged to abandon this view, and now conceives that the Deuteronomist has here adapted to his present purposes a poem

of an earlier day, composed *after* the building of the Temple, v.12, and *after* the tribe of Levi had become distinguished, v.8-11, but yet while the two kingdoms were still standing, v.7,13-16, and the house of Ephraim was even stronger than that of Judah, v.17, and when the circumstances, generally, of both kingdoms were fortunate and prosperous, v.26-29. He places its composition, therefore, about 800 B.C., when both kingdoms were ruled by peaceful princes, Judah by Uzziah, Israel by Jeroboam II.

841. But a closer consideration of the question will show that there is absolutely *no* one time in the history of the people, to which the different parts of the 'Blessing' will apply. Laying aside for the moment the critical reasoning, which has already led us to ascribe the composition of it, as well as the rest of Deuteronomy, to a later hand than that of Moses, we may observe as follows:—

(i) MOSES could not have written it; for, if, looking down with prophetic eye along the stream of time, he had been moved by Divine impulse to utter these intimations as to the future destinies of the tribes of Israel, it is impossible that he should have dismissed the illustrious tribe of Judah, from which David and David's son, the Messiah, were to spring, with a few mournful words, and glorified the tribes of Joseph—who in later days were to be distinguished by rebellion, idolatry, and even apostacy from the worship of Jehovah — with such extraordinary laudation as this.

(ii) Nor will the time of SAMUEL suit better for all parts of the Blessing, since, though Judah was not yet famous, and Ephraim was very flourishing, yet *Levi* was quite in the background, and the remarkable language, which we have just been considering, v.8-11, could hardly have been used with reference to that tribe.

(iii) Nor will the days of DAVID answer to the requirements of the case; for then *Judah* could not have been passed over so

lightly, with so little distinction, or, rather, with a prayer expressive of sadness, while the praise of Joseph is loud and triumphant.

(iv) A similar consideration forbids still more decidedly the supposition of its having been composed in the age of SOLOMON, when the splendour of Judah was at its highest.

(v) After Solomon's time, and the division of the two kingdoms, the question first arises, was the writer one of the *northern* or the *southern* kingdom? The glorification of Joseph might be thought, at first sight, to indicate the former. But, on the other hand, we observe that the Levitical Priesthood was confined to Jerusalem, and the roll of the Tetrateuch was, no doubt, kept in their charge,—that there is no trace of the hand of a writer of the northern kingdom to be found in any portion of it,—and that the mention of Jehovah 'dwelling' between the shoulders of Benjamin, *i. e.* as we have seen, in Jerusalem, as well as the high commendation of the Levites, point distinctly to a *Jewish* writer. But what Jewish writer, *during the existence of the separate kingdoms*, would have written of Judah so mildly and of Joseph so warmly, as the writer of this Blessing does?

842. Thus we are brought down to the time *after* the Captivity of the Ten Tribes, without finding any period, which suits all the parts of the Blessing. As far, therefore, as Joseph is concerned, there is no reason why it should not have been written in Josiah's time, as well as any other, and this time suits best, as we have seen, the words spoken of the other chief tribes. It is plain also that such laudatory language would be more likely to be used of Joseph by a pious Jewish writer, *when the northern kingdom no longer existed*, and when all the best feelings of an Israelite would go forth in tender pity and hope towards his brethren in their time of distress, than while it still stood forth as the rival, and, by its idolatries, the corrupter of Judah.

843. Compare in this point of view the language of *Jeremiah*, xxxi, and especially the following verses :

‘At the same time, saith Jehovah, will I be the God of *all the families of Israel*, and they shall be my people,’ v.1.

‘Again I will build thee, and thou shalt be built, O *virgin of Israel*; thou shalt again be adorned with thy tabrets, and shalt go forth in the dances of them that make merry,’ v.4.

‘For there shall be a day that the watchmen upon the *Mount Ephraim* shall cry, Arise ye, and *let us go up to Zion*, unto Jehovah our God,’ v.6.

‘Behold, I will bring them from the north country, and gather them from the wastes of the earth. . . . a great company shall return thither. They shall come with weeping, and with supplications will I lead them; I will cause them to walk by the rivers of waters in a straight way, wherein they shall not stumble; for I am a *Father to Israel*, and *Ephraim is my firstborn*,’ v.8,9.

‘Hear the word of Jehovah. O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off, and say, *He that scattered Israel, will gather him*, and keep him, as a shepherd doth his flock. For Jehovah hath redeemed Jacob, and ransomed him from the hand of him that was stronger than he. Therefore they shall come and sing in the height of Zion, &c.’ v.11,12.

And, from beginning to end, the whole chapter sets forth these delightful prophetic anticipations of the future reunion of Israel and Judah, and their happy estate in those blessed days which were coming, when chastisement should have done its work effectually, v.18, and the gracious promise should be fulfilled, v.33,—

‘I will be their God, and they shall be my people.’

844. In short, the most reasonable explanation of the matter seems to be that the Deuteronomist has here expressed confidently a prophetic *hope* for the future prosperity and glory of Joseph, as he has for the reunion of all the tribes under the sway of Judah, for the continuance of a pious and faithful Priesthood in the tribe of Levi, and for the permanent resting of Jehovah ‘between the shoulders’ of Benjamin. He views the whole people reunited once more; and thus, after briefly touching upon each of the other tribes, with a few words suggested by their situation, character, or past or present circumstances, he closes the address

by imagining all Israel compacted again into one great nation, rejoicing once more in the favour and blessing of Jehovah, v.26-29 :—

'There is none like unto the God of Jeshurun,
Who rideth upon the heaven in thy help,
And in His excellency on the sky.
The Eternal God is thy refuge,
And underneath are the Everlasting Arms ;
And He shall thrust out the enemy from before thee,
And shall say, Destroy them.
Israel then shall dwell in safety alone ;
The fountain of Jacob shall be upon a land of corn and wine ;
Also his heavens shall drop down dew.
Happy art thou, O Israel !
Who is like unto thee, O people saved by Jehovah,
The shield of thy help, and who is the sword of thy excellency !
And thine enemies shall dissemble (use glozing speeches) unto thee,
And thou shalt tread upon their high places.'

845. This view of the blessing of Joseph will be found confirmed, when we examine the language of it, which, except v.17, is in many places a literal transcript of the words addressed to Joseph in Jacob's Blessing, G.xlix.22-26, and respects only, as the reader will perceive, the *land* of Joseph, whose extreme fertility is well known, and whose qualities were not affected by the captivity of its inhabitants. The chief of these correspondences are given below :—

G.XLIX.	D.XXXIII.
בְּרַכְתָּ שָׁמַיִם מֵעַל v.25. בְּרַכְתָּ תְּהוֹמוֹת רֶבֶצֶת תַּחַת	מִמְּנַגְד שָׁמַיִם מֵעַל* v.13. וּמִתְהוֹמוֹת רֶבֶצֶת תַּחַת
עַד תִּאָּנֹת נִבְעֵת עוֹלָם v.26. תִּהְיוּ לְרֹאשׁ יוֹסֵף וּלְקַרְקֹד נְזִיר אֶחָיו	וּמִמְּנַגְד נִבְעוֹת עוֹלָם v.15. תִּבּוֹאֲתָה לְרֹאשׁ יוֹסֵף v.16. וּלְקַרְקֹד נְזִיר אֶחָיו

* 'For *לְרֹאשׁ*, 'of the dew,' many MSS. give *מֵעַל* as in G.xxvii.39, xlix.25, Ps.14, and Onk. and the Syr. express both. In point of fact, *מֵעַל* is an unpoetical explanation of *מִמְּנַגְד*, and the parallelism with *תַּחַת* speaks also for the other reading. —KNOBEL.

v.25, Blessings of the heavens above,
Blessings of the deep that lieth beneath.

v.26, To the desire of the everlasting hills :
They shall be upon the head of Joseph,
And on the crown of the consecrated of his
brethren.

v.13, From treasures of the heavens above,
And from the deep that lieth beneath.

v.15, And from treasures of the everlasting hills.
v.16, It shall come upon the head of Joseph,
And on the crown of the consecrated of his
brethren.

846. It is plain that the writer had before him the 'Blessing of Jacob.' And, though he has *not* used its expressions in speaking of Reuben, Judah, Levi, or Benjamin, the tribes which were still in existence, and of which he could speak in accordance with their present circumstances, yet, when he comes to the captive Joseph, as if at a loss almost what to say, he refers to the older document, and adapts its very words with slight changes and amplifications. But, as before observed, the greater portion of the blessing refers entirely to the fertility of his land, including 'the *goodness* of Him that dwelt in the bush,' by which, probably, allusion is made to the expressions in E.iii.8, 'a *good* land and a large, a land flowing with milk and honey.' Joseph is here, and in G.xlix.26, spoken of as 'consecrated by his brethren,' because the tribe of Ephraim was recognised as the leader of the Northern tribes, (as Judah was of the Southern,) from a very early age down to the time of the Captivity.

847. In v.17 is described the strength of this populous tribe, which, when restored to its pristine vigour, as the Prophet hoped, would push the nations with its horns, like a Reem or buffalo, as once it did of old in the days of David. Then should the son of David reign triumphantly once more in the place 'which Jehovah had chosen to set His Name there,' and Ephraim be the 'strength of his head,' and Judah his 'Lawgiver.' Joseph's 'firstborn steer' is Ephraim, whom Jacob 'set before Manasseh,' his elder brother, G.xlviii.20, and whose tribe was in later times by far the strongest, in agreement with the words of the text, 'And they are the ten thousands of Ephraim, and they are the thousands of Manasseh,' though not in accordance

with the statements at the second 'muster' of the people at the end of their wanderings, according to which the number of Manasseh was 52,700, N.xxvi.34, and that of Ephraim only 32,500, v.37; and yet the story represents Moses as making this muster only just before he uttered the Song.

848. There is nothing very remarkable in the other blessings, which, as has been said, seem to be uttered, because something *must* be said of each tribe, (by one who had undertaken to place a Blessing in the mouth of Moses, like that ascribed to Jacob,) with some kind of reference to their past or present circumstances, and the hope that, though now only a remnant of each tribe occupied the seat of its forefathers, yet in God's own time the tribe would be restored to its old locality, and flourish abundantly again, and the Blessing be fulfilled. In almost every case there is a reference to the language used in the Blessing of Jacob, G.xlix, as if the Deuteronomist was at a loss for other words, in which to speak of these tribes now carried into captivity.

849. The following are some of KNOBEL'S remarks on them:—

v.18, *Rejoice, ZEBULUS, in thy going out.*

And, ISSACHAR, in thy tents.

The relations of both tribes shall be joyful and prosperous, the one carrying on a brisk and pleasant commerce, *e.g.* with the Phœnicians, (so G.xlix.13, 'Zebulun shall dwell at the haven of the sea, and he shall be for an haven of ships, and his border shall be unto Zidon,') and the other remaining at home, and practising comfortably agriculture and cattle-breeding in the productive land where it dwells (so G.xlix.14,15, 'Issachar is a strong ass, couching down between two burdens; and he saw that rest was good, and the land that it was pleasant').

v.19, *'They shall call the people unto the Mountain;*

Thus shall they offer sacrifices of righteousness.'

By the 'Mountain' the writer understands certainly not Jerusalem, as many suppose, which was too distant for the sacrificial feasts of both the tribes, and in his time, [that of Saul, according to KNOBEL.] was, besides, no chief place of religion, —nor, probably, Tabor, as others think, which is nowhere else mentioned in the O.T. as a holy station,—but Carmel, which lay near both tribes, and was a holy sacrificial place, 1K.xviii.19-21,42, 2K.ii.25, iv.25.

Ans. According to our view, the 'Mountain' is certainly the holy 'Mount Zion' at Jerusalem, to which, as the writer hoped, and as the Deuteronomist enjoined,

all the tribes would in future days go willingly up in great numbers; though, of course, it was never supposed that the command for 'every male' to go up thrice a year would be literally obeyed. Comp. Jer.xxvi.18, 'the Mountain of the House,' and especially, Jer.xxxi.23, 'Thus saith Jehovah of hosts, the God of Israel, As yet they shall use this speech, in the land of Judah and in the cities thereof, when I shall bring again their (*i.e.* Ephraim's) captivity, Jehovah bless thee, O habitation of justice, O Mountain of holiness.'

*'For they shall seek the affluence of the sea,
And the hidden treasures of the sand.'*

They shall draw profit from the sea, have gain which the sea brings to them, *e.g.* through commerce, and the taking of fish, purple-shells, and sponges, which are still carried on. . . . By 'treasures of the sand' the writer means 'glass,' which by the ancients was considered as something costly, (Job xxviii.17, 'The gold and the crystal cannot equal it,') and which has been found by the river Belus, a small distance south from Akko. . . . Also, more north, between Akko and Tyre, the coast yielded a glassy sand, which, however, was first melted in Sidon. In Tyre there are still remains of a glass-melting-house of ancient times.

v.20, '*Blessed be He that enlargeth Gad:*

As a lion he coucheth, and teareth arm, yea, and crown.'

Blessed be Jehovah, who gives this tribe a spacious territory, and lets him extend himself far and wide, (G.xlix.19, 'Gad, a troop shall overcome him; but he shall overcome at the last'). Just in the same way is 'Blessing' ascribed to the God of Shem, G.ix.26, where Shem's prosperity is to be brought forward. Gad is like a lion, which has made a prey, and, couching in peaceful security, tears it asunder and devours it.

v.21, '*And he saw the firstfruits [e.g. of the Conquest] for himself;*

i.e. he chose, 'provided,' for himself, (נִרְאָה לוֹ, *vayyar lo*, as in G.xxii.8,) the first conquered land as a possession. This was the kingdom of Sihon; Gad had the northern half of it, and in the southern also he had cities,—at least in the Mosaic time, N.xxxii.34. The Gadites seem, at the Conquest of the trans-Jordanic lands, to have been specially forward. For they appear, N.xxxii.2,6,25,29,31,33, at the head of the 2½ tribes, who obtained that district, and they rebuilt cities not only in their own, but in the Reubenite territory, while the Reubenites confined themselves to their own land. N.xxxii.34-36.

'For there was the portion of the leader laid up;

And he came as head of the people:

He did the righteousness of Jehovah,

And His judgments with Israel.'

The firstfruits of the Hebrew Conquest belonged to the 'leader'; but Gad showed at the head of the tribes a special activity and bravery, and therefore laid claim to that land, which, however, was only as good as something 'laid up' for him, since the regular possession could only begin after the fulfilment of the condition laid down by Moses, N.xxxii.19. So must we take מְחֹקֵק, *mēkhokek*, *lit.* 'one who de-

crees,' hence 'a ruler, leader, prince,' Ju.v.9, not understanding it with reference to Moses, as if it were meant, (with some) 'Gad was laid up, concealed, in the portion assigned to him by the Lawgiver,' or (with others) 'there was the portion assigned to him by the Lawgiver preserved,' or 'there was the portion of the hidden, that is, buried, Lawgiver.' For Gad saw the land to be beautiful, before it was assigned to him and before the death of Moses; hence neither the consent of the Lawgiver, nor his burial-place, (which, besides, does not concern the matter at all,) can be here referred to.

At the head of the people, as foreman, fighting in advance, Gad marched with them into Canaan, D.iii.18, N.xxxii.17,20-22, Jo.i.14,iv.12, and fulfilled what Jehovah had commanded as becoming and right, as a duty towards Israel. The writer speaks of a 'coming' and in the imperfect, since he looks back on the events from his present standpoint in time and place.

[Although the above explanation is not altogether satisfactory, it is difficult, knowing so little as we do of the special history of the different tribes, to offer a better. The difficulty, however, is not at all removed by assigning the composition of the Song to Moses.]

v.22, '*Dan is a young lion,*

That springs forth from Bashan (Кноб. the plain):'

i.e. he seizes, where one least expects him, falls upon the prey unawares, and grasps it. The reference is to the capture of Laish, Jo.xix.47, Ju.xviii.27; so G.xlix.17, 'Dan shall be a serpent by the way, an adder in the path, that biteth the horse-heels, so that his rider shall fall backward.' The lion couches usually on mountains or in forests and thickets, seldom upon the treeless and shrubless plain; here it is something unexpected by the wanderer, and so much the more dangerous, since trees for escape are wanting. Interpreters find here a lion 'springing from *Bashan*.' But the lion springs out of his lair, thicket, place, not from a country or a kingdom, and nothing is known elsewhere of a 'lion of Bashan.'

[With reference to KNOBEL's remark about there being no lions in Bashan, it should be noted that 'Shenir' and 'Hermon' were in the district of Bashan, and we read, Sol.Song iv.8, 'From the top of Shenir and Hermon, from the lions' dens, from the mountains of the leopards.' Zechariah also seems to connect the 'oaks of Bashan,' xi.2, with the 'roaring of the young lions' on the banks of the adjacent Jordan, v.3.]

v.23, '*NAPHTALI, be fat with favour,*

And full with the blessing of Jehovah;

The sea (E.V. west) and the south do thou possess:'

i.e. may he possess a territory rich in advantages, in pleasantnesses which come from God's blessing, and take in a sea-coast and a southern, *i.e.* warm, land, although his territory lies in the north and far from the sea. [But נַי, *yam*, may be here used merely for 'west,' and Naphtali lay *west* and *south* of Dan.]

v.24, '*Blessed with children be ASHER;*

May he be a source of pleasure to his brethren,

And dipping his foot in oil.'

KNOBEL here translates, 'Blessed before the sons [of Jacob] be Asher; may he be the pleasant one of his brethren, &c.' *i.e.* may he enjoy a rich land, flowing with oil, [G.xlix.20, 'Out of Asher his bread shall be fat, and he shall yield royal dainties,'] and find himself in so extensive and pleasant a situation, that the other tribes may have their joy and pleasure in him.

*v.25, 'May thy bars [E.V. 'shoes'] be iron and brass,
And as thy days thy rest (repose, security).'*

KNOBEL for 'bars' (GESEN.) reads 'castles, forts,' and writes: 'The Asherites lived as far as Lebanon, where mining was practised, and where they seem to have obtained metals, of which they may have made much use in strengthening their towns, and in fact, they needed this in the midst of hostile people.'

v.26-29. With this conclusion, in which the greatness and glory of Jehovah are set forth, and the happy estate of Israel, under His protection and blessing, is described in glowing terms, 'There is none like unto the God of Jeshurun, &c.,' 'Israel then shall dwell securely, &c.,' 'Happy art thou, O Israel! who is like unto thee, O people saved by Jehovah! &c.' the following passages may be compared from the Prophet Jeremiah:

'There is none like unto Thee, Jehovah:

Thou art great, and Thy Name is great in might.

Who would not fear Thee, O King of nations?

For to Thee doth it appertain:

Forasmuch as among all the wise of the nations, and in all their kingdoms,
There is none like unto Thee. x.6,7.

In his days Judah shall be saved,

And Israel shall dwell securely. xxiii.6, xxxiii.16.

850. KURTZ, iii.492, remarks on D.xxxiii as follows:

We cannot fail to be struck with the fact, that the 'Blessing of Moses' *does not contain the slightest trace of any special Messianic allusion*, whereas they are so very prominent in that of Jacob, and, since his time, the Messianic expectations had been so greatly enlarged by the prophecy of the 'Star out of Jacob' and the 'Prophet like unto Moses.' But this may, perhaps, account sufficiently for the omission here. Since the time of Jacob, the Messianic expectation had advanced so far, that it had assumed the form of a belief in one single personal Messiah; but from which of the families or tribes the personal Messiah would spring was not yet known. The prophecy of Balaam, like that of Moses, had simply intimated that he would spring out of the midst of Israel, and from the posterity of Jacob. It is true that even in G.xlix the tribe of Judah is distinguished above all the rest, as the one to which belonged the supremacy among the tribes. But there was something too indefinite in the description for the belief to take root in Israel, that from this particular tribe a personal Messiah would spring. This did not take place until the time of David. It might even be said that the distinction, conferred by 'Jacob's Blessing' upon the tribe of Judah, had fallen since then into the shade; for neither Moses, nor Aaron, nor Joshua, belonged to this tribe.

CHAPTER XX.

DEUT.XXXIV.1-12.

*851. D.xxxiv.1-3.

'And Moses went up from the plains of Moab unto the mountain of Nebo; to the top of Pisgah, that is over against Jericho; and Jehovah showed him all the land of Gilead unto Dan, and all Naphtali, and the land of Ephraim, and Manasseh, and all the land of Judah, unto the utmost sea, and the south, and the plain of the valley of Jericho, the city of palm-trees, unto Zoar.'

Here we have signs of a later writer in the mention of '*Dan*' (243), and '*all Naphtali, and the land of Ephraim, and Manasseh, and all the land of Judah,*' — where the different terms are used as well known, though the land was not yet divided. So we have 'unto this day,' v.6.

SCOTT observes: —

The last chapter closed the words and writings of Moses, and this chapter must have been added by another hand; but it is uncertain whether by Joshua, or by Samuel, or by some other Prophet. Some, indeed, maintain that Moses himself wrote it by the spirit of prophecy; this, however, is not at all probable. But, by whomsoever it was written, the information must have been originally communicated by immediate revelation. Perhaps, the three last verses were added by Ezra; but all the subsequent books of Scripture assume as undoubted facts the things recorded in it.

852. These verses, v.1-3, are plainly part of the older document, in continuation of xxxii.52, but we have here the expression 'plains of Moab,' which is used exclusively (548.xi) by the older writer. In v.1, however, we have the phrase *עַל-יַרְדֵּן יִרְחֹו*, *hal-pěney yěrekho*, 'over against Jericho,' which occurs also in the Deuteronomistic interpolation in xxxii.49, whereas, the older writer, whenever he introduces a similar reference to Jericho,

employs invariably the form, מְעַבְרֵי יַרְדֵּן יְרִיחוֹ, *mehever leyarden yěrekho*, 'on the other side Jordan (near) Jericho,' or עַל יַרְדֵּן יְרִיחוֹ, *hal yarden yěrekho*, 'by Jordan (near) Jericho,'—in each case, יְרִיחוֹ, *yěrekho*, 'Jericho,' being used without any governing words, N.xxii.1,xxvi.3,63,xxxi.12,xxxiii.48,50,xxxiv.15, xxxv.1,xxxvi.13. This suggests that the whole defining clause, 'the top of Pisgah that is over against Jericho,' is an insertion by the Deuteronomist.

In v.2 we have the phrase הַיָּם הַחֲסָרֹן, *hayyam haakhāron*, 'the hinder sea,' the Mediterranean, which expression occurs in D. xi.24, but nowhere else in the Pentateuch; the older document has 'the great sea,' N.xxxiv.6,7, and 'hinder sea' is found in Joel ii.20, Zech.xiv.8, nowhere else in the Bible.

853. D.xxxiv.4-7.

'And Jehovah said unto him, This is the land which I swore unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, saying, I will give it unto thy seed; I have caused thee to see it with thine eyes, but thou shalt not go over thither. So Moses, the servant of Jehovah, died there, according to the word of Jehovah. And He buried him in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Bethpeor; but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day. And Moses was an hundred and twenty years old, when he died; his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated.'

This passage, again, belongs partly to the older document, though some part also is by the hand of the Deuteronomist, as is shown by the expression, v.5,6, 'land of Moab,' (550.i). Probably v.4 is his entirely, and the two insertions 'land of Moab' in v.5,6, and the rest belongs to the older document (784).

854. D.xxxiv.8,9.

'And the children of Israel wept for Moses in the plains of Moab thirty-days: so the days of weeping and mourning for Moses were ended. And Joshua, the son of Nun, was full of the spirit of wisdom; for Moses had laid his hands upon him; and the children of Israel hearkened unto him, and did as Jehovah commanded Moses.'

We have here the older writer, as appears by the expression, *v.*8, 'plains of Moab,' (548.xi). Also the 'thirty days' of weeping correspond to those for Aaron, N.xx.29; and the phrase 'as Jehovah commanded Moses,' *v.*9, is constantly recurring in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers.

855. D.xxxiv.10-12.

'And there arose not a Prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom Jehovah knew face to face, in all the signs and the wonders, which Jehovah sent him to do in the land of Egypt, to Pharaoh, and to all his servants, and to all his land, and in all that mighty hand, and in all the great terror which Moses shewed in the sight of all Israel.'

These words appear to belong to the Deuteronomist, since we have in *v.*11, 'signs and wonders,' D.iv.34, vi.22, vii.19, xiii.1(2),2(3), xxvi.8, xxviii.46, xxix.3(2), xxxiv.11, Jer.xxxii.20,21, and E.vii.3, and in *v.*12, 'mighty hand,' D.iii.24, iv.34, v.15, vi.21, vii.8,19, ix.26, xi.2, xxvi.8, xxxiv.12, and E.iii.19, vi.1,1, xiii.9, xxxii.11, N.xx.20, and תרֹבָה, *mora*, 'terror,' iv.34, xi.25, xxvi.8, and G.ix.2, Jer.xxxii.21.

856. Upon the 'burial' of Moses, xxxiv.6, KURTZ writes as follows, iii.p.494:—

'Moses died there,' says the scriptural account, 'according to the mouth—*i.e.* according to the word—of God.' The Rabbins render this 'at the mouth of God,' and call the death of Moses 'a death by a kiss.' Immediately afterwards it is stated that 'He buried him in the valley in the land of Moab.' Even if it were grammatically admissible to render the verb impersonally, ('they buried him' LXX, ἐθαψαν αὐτόν,) or to take the subject from the verb itself, 'he buried him,' *viz.* 'whoever did bury him,' (ROSENM. *et sepelivit eum i.e. sepeliens*), the context would not allow it, but would still force us to the conclusion that Jehovah is the subject. The clause, 'and no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day,' unquestionably implies a peculiar mode of burial. The *valley*, in which Moses was buried, must have been a depression at the top of the mountains of Pisgah.

From the time of the Fathers, the answer given to the question, 'Why should Jehovah Himself have buried Moses?' has almost invariably been this, to prevent a superstitious or idolatrous veneration of his sepulchre or his remains. But, notwithstanding all the pious feelings of the nation, and their veneration of the greatest of all the Prophets of the O. T., such a result as this was certainly not to be apprehended at the time in question. The notions which prevailed, with reference to the defiling

influence of graves and of the bodies of the dead,—notions which the Law had certainly only adopted, sanctioned, and regulated, and had not been the first to introduce,—were sufficiently powerful to guard against any such danger as this. Abraham's sepulchre was known to everybody. But it never entered the mind of any Israelite under the O. T. to pay idolatrous or even superstitious veneration to it, however nearly the reverence of later Jews for the person of Abraham might border upon superstition and idolatry. The remains of Jacob and Joseph were carried to Palestine, and buried there. But we cannot find the slightest ground for supposing that they were the objects of superstitious adoration.

857. KURTZ then attempts to account for this strange burial.

If Moses, therefore, was buried by Jehovah Himself, the reason must certainly have been, that such a burial was intended for him, as no other man could possibly have given. That there was something very peculiar in the burial of Moses, is sufficiently evident from the passage before us. And this is confirmed in a very remarkable manner by the N. T. history of the Transfiguration, where Moses and Elias appeared with the Redeemer. We may see here very clearly that the O. T. account may justly be understood, as implying that the design of the burial of Moses by the hand of Jehovah was to place him in the same category with Enoch and Elijah, to deliver him from going down into the grave like the rest of Adam's children, and to prepare for him a condition, both of body and soul, resembling that of those two men of God. It is true that Moses was not saved from *death* itself in the same manner as Enoch and Elijah; he really *died*, and his body was really *buried*; this is expressly stated in the Biblical history. But we may assume with the greatest probability, that, like them, he was saved from *corruption*. Men bury the corpse that it may see corruption. If Jehovah, therefore, would not suffer the body of Moses to be buried by men, it is but natural to seek for the *reason* of this in the fact, that He did not intend to leave him to corruption, but at the very time of his burial communicated some virtue by His own hand, which saved the body from corruption, and prepared for the Patriarch a transition into the same state of existence, into which Enoch and Elijah were admitted without either death or burial. The *state of existence* in the life beyond, into which Moses was introduced by the hand of Jehovah, was, probably, essentially the same as that into which Enoch was taken, when he was translated, and Elijah, when he was carried up to heaven, though the way was not to be the same. What the way may have been we can neither describe nor imagine. We are altogether in ignorance as to what the state itself was. The most that we can do is to form some conjecture of what it was not. For example, it was not one of absolute glorification and perfection, of which Christ alone could be the firstfruits, 1Cor. xv. 20, 23; nor was it the dim 'sheol' life, into which all the other children of Adam passed. It was something between the two—a state as inconceivable as it had been hitherto unseen.

858. KURTZ goes on to say that he considers his view to be supported by the mention in Jude v. 9 of a conflict and dispute

between the archangel Michael and the Devil respecting the body of Moses. CLEM. ALEX., ORIGEN, and DIDYMU, he says, speak of an apocryphal book entitled the 'Ascension or Assumption of Moses,' from which Jude took this story. But this he cannot allow: the author of that book and of Jude most probably drew from the same source, *tradition*, and independently of each other. In short, he considers the epistle of Jude to be 'canonical and written under the guidance of the Holy Spirit,' and that 'the adoption and use of this tradition in a canonical epistle gives it all the sanction of apostolical authority,' which means, in other words, that it is 'accredited by the Spirit of God.' When, therefore, it is said that He, Jehovah, 'buried him,' KURTZ understands it to mean that the 'Angel of Jehovah,' who was Jehovah's personal representative in all transactions with Israel in the wilderness, did so, and this 'Angel of Jehovah' he regards as identical with Michael the Archangel, and not with the Logos, as HENGSTENBERG does. In conclusion, he adds—

The death of Moses was not like the death of the first Adam, which issued in corruption, nor was it like that of the second Adam, which was followed by a resurrection. It was rather something intermediate between the two forms of death, just as Moses himself occupied an intermediate position between the first and the second Adam,—between the head of sinful, dying humanity, and the Head of humanity redeemed from sin.

859. We might embrace KURTZ'S view in this quotation, if there was any ground for believing that this narrative contains an historically true account of the death and burial of Moses. But the above notes of KURTZ show to what extremities an honest mind must be driven in the attempt to recognise such a statement as infallibly true, and to realise it, as in that case we should be bound to do, in its details and consequences. There is no greater intellectual cowardice than to shrink from contemplating the results to which any tenet fairly leads, and so to profess a belief in the gross, which we shrink from analysing in particulars.

CHAPTER XXI.

RESULTS OF THE EXAMINATION OF DEUTERONOMY.

860. WE have now completed the review of this book, and, even if we had not previously proved the fact upon other grounds, the phenomena which we have here observed,—the contradictions, variations, and numerous indications of a more advanced state of civil and religious development,—would be sufficient to satisfy us that it must have been written in a different age from that in which the other four books, generally, of the Pentateuch were written, and in a much later day.

861. Upon this point RIEHM observes, *p.*78 :—

The different character of the Deuteronomistic laws from the legislation of the earlier books, and the numerous, and in part important, differences between them, make it impossible to assume that *one* man should have delivered the earlier, as well as the Deuteronomistic, laws. So that, if the earlier books of the Pentateuch, in the form in which they have reached us, had been written by Moses—which I certainly cannot assume, while fully recognising that many laws entirely, and others at least as to their substance, (though not as to their present form,) are derived from Moses,—yet *Deuteronomy, certainly, is composed by another man, living in a considerably later age.* In particular, the complete alteration of the law about tithes and firstlings compels us to this conclusion; for, assuredly, one and the same lawgiver could not have laid down such different directions for the application of the selfsame holy gifts. We cannot help ourselves with the assumption, (in order to maintain the Mosaic origin of the whole Pentateuch,) that Moses himself in the land of Moab, shortly before his death, and the passage of the people over the Jordan, had so changed the laws about those institutions, as well as some others, that they might become more suited to the new relations, into which the people stepped through the possession of Canaan. For, as is quite obvious with respect to the tithe-arrangement, these institutions of the old legislation were themselves already calculated for the people settled in the holy land, and needed at that time no change. [Besides which, it could hardly be supposed that *Moses*, in his last

address, would change completely these earlier laws, which *Jehovah* Himself had issued only a few months previously.]

862. If we now proceed to sum up the 'signs of time,' which we have observed in the course of our examination, we may state the conclusions to which they would lead us, as follows:—

(i) Deuteronomy was written after the Elohist and Jehovistic portions of the other four books, since reference is made throughout to matters of fact related in them, and expressly to the laws about leprosy (556).

(ii) Hence it was written (473.xiv,xv,) after the times of Samuel and David; and this is further confirmed by the fact that the laws referring to the *kingdom* (709) seem not to have been known to Samuel, 1S.viii.6-18, nor to the later writer of Samuel's doings.

(iii) The mention of the kingdom in xvii.14-20, with the distinct reference to the dangers likely to arise to the State from the king multiplying to himself 'wives,' and 'silver and gold,' and 'horses,' implies that it was written after the age of Solomon; and this is confirmed by the very frequent references to the 'place which *Jehovah* would choose,' that is, Jerusalem and the Temple.

(iv) The recognition of the independence of Edom (593) carries down its composition to the time of their complete liberation from the control of the kings of Judah in the reign of Ahaz.

(v) It was written after the time of Hezekiah's Reformation (637-648), when the high places were removed, which the former kings of Judah, even the best of them, had freely permitted.

Upon this point KUENEN observes, *p.*150:—

The Reformation of Hezekiah, as well as that of Josiah, had in view the putting down of idolatry, and the centralisation of public worship. Both, therefore, agree in their object with that of the Deuteronomistic legislation. This latter preceded the reformation of Josiah. Did it also that of Hezekiah?

We must answer this question in the negative:—

(i) Because the oldest record about Hezekiah's Reformation makes no mention whatever of its legislative foundation, whereas it is quite otherwise in the case of Josiah;

(ii) Because Hezekiah's contemporaries, Isaiah and Micah, give no sign of knowing the book of Deuteronomy, which is inexplicable, in case it had exercised so very important an influence upon their lifetime.

(vi) It was written *after* the Captivity of the Ten Tribes, in the sixth year of Hezekiah's reign; since the sorrows of that event are evidently referred to (608) as matters which were well known, but which now were things of the past.

(vii) It was written after the great spread in Judah, in Manasseh's time, of the worship of the 'sun and moon and the host of heaven' (605).

(viii) It was written *before* the time of Josiah's Reformation, since the words ascribed to Huldah (574.v) expressly refer to it, and, indeed, there can be little doubt (570-1) that this book, whether alone or with the other books, was that found in the Temple by Hilkiyah, and was the direct cause of that Reformation.

(ix) Hence it can scarcely be doubted that the book of Deuteronomy was written, either in *the latter part of Manasseh's reign*, or in *the early part of Josiah's*.

863. EWALD, RIEHM, BLEEK, KUENEN, and others, are of opinion that the most probable supposition is that the book was written in the latter part of Manasseh's reign; DE WETTE, VON BOHLEN, KNOBEL, &c. (with whom we agree, for reasons which shall be presently stated), place its composition in the reign of Josiah. The difference in this point of detail is, of course, inconsiderable, and of no importance whatever with reference to the main question, whether or not this book of Deuteronomy was written by Moses. The above able critics may vary within a limit of thirty or forty years in fixing the precise date of its composition; but they are all agreed in assigning it to the same later period of Jewish history; and this, indeed, may be ranked among the most certain results of modern scientific Biblical criticism.

864. RIEHM, p.98-105, fixes the age of the Deuteronomist,

with EWALD, in the latter half of Manasseh's reign, and writes as follows:—

¶ In D.xxviii.68, among the punishments threatened to the people in case of their departing from Jehovah, *this* is threatened as the sorest and last, that Jehovah will carry them back to Egypt in ships, so that they would be sold there to their enemies into shameful and endless slavery. Hence it appears, *first*, that, in the time of the Deuteronomist, Egypt had become again so strong that he might expect the full destruction of the Israelitish State—not from the Assyrians, (to whom *v.*36, 48–50, refer,)—but from the Egyptians, and, *secondly*, since a removal in *ships* is threatened, that the Egyptians were at that time already powerful at sea. *Lastly*, it follows from the passage about the king, D.xvii.16, which forbids the king to 'cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he should multiply horses,' that at that time already the Egyptian kings sought and employed foreign soldiers, so that the Israelitish king could only obtain horses out of Egypt upon the condition that he, on his part, should send Israelitish foot-soldiers (comp. Is.xxxvi.8), and place them at the disposal of the Egyptian king . . . All this suits Egypt only during the reign of Psammetichus, but does not suit the state of Egypt before that reign. Certainly, we cannot through ancient testimony maintain that Psammetichus had a remarkable fleet; but, since he besieged Ashdod for twenty-nine years, (HEROD.ii.157,) he must have brought the troops which he marched thither, and their supplies, not surely by the laborious land-journey, but by ships; and so it is not improbable that he possessed already a rather considerable navy, and that Pharaoh-Necho, of whom HERODOTUS tells us, ii.159, that he built two fleets, only carried on in this instance, as in others, his father's undertakings.

That, however, through Psammetichus the Egyptian kingdom, altogether weakened through internal dissension, and, as it seemed, tending to its fall, suddenly attained to new power, and raised itself to such might, that it became very dangerous to its neighbours, and even, in course of time, was destructive to the Jews, 2K.xxiii.29, is well known. Since, however, at that time the Assyrian power, after the death of Esarhaddon II. was manifestly tending more and more to its end, while Babylon was not yet an independent, mighty, kingdom, our writer might probably expect the greater danger for the kingdom of Judah from the rejuvenescent Egyptian power, especially since the army of Psammetichus, which was besieging Ashdod, was in such threatening neighbourhood. That Psammetichus sought and employed strange soldiers, and particularly Arabians, we know from ancient authorities. If, therefore, at any time, the possibility existed of an alliance of the above kind between Judæa and Egypt, it existed in the time of Psammetichus. We must then, with EWALD, assume that Deuteronomy was written during the reign of Psammetichus, . . . *in the latter half of the reign of Manasseh.*

Who, however, was the author, it is impossible to say. The assumption of EWALD, that the author wrote in Egypt, 'in the presence of the unhappy people whom Manasseh had sold into Egypt,' rests upon no foundation, and is altogether improbable. . . . How could such a writer have laid down the command that all

male Israelites should go up to the Temple at Jerusalem three times yearly? The untenable supposition, that Deuteronomy was written by Jeremiah, has already been copiously refuted by KÖNIG, *A. T. Studien*, II. Justly also has EWALD protested against the groundless assumption, that the discoverer of the Law-Book, the High Priest Hilkiah, had himself composed Deuteronomy, but denied his authorship.

That the author must have been a very eminent man, in a spiritual point of view, is certain, and equally so that he, on one side, was well acquainted with the ancient legislation, and, on the other, was influenced by the writings of the earlier Prophets, and himself highly gifted with the Prophetic spirit. And so one might, perhaps, assume that the author was a Priest, who, however, was at the same time conscious of a prophetic gift. More nearly to determine is impossible without arbitrariness. That we do not know so great and very remarkable a man ought not to perplex us, since it is just the same with us in the case of the not less remarkable author of the second part of Isaiah, and since analogous phenomena are *not* wanting in the New-Testament literature, (*e.g.* Ep. to the Hebrews).

Ans. (i) The moral difficulty remains the same whether Jeremiah, or any other eminent person, or 'prophetic Priest,' of those days wrote the book of Deuteronomy.

(ii) It seems to us almost incredible that so great a writer as the Deuteronomist—evidently a master-mind, and a man of political, as well as religious, activity,—should have so completely disappeared from history, and left no other work of a similar kind behind him.

(iii) The case of the later Isaiah is not a parallel case, since he lived in the midst of the confusion and distress of the Captivity, of which no historical records have come down to us; whereas the Deuteronomist lived in a well-known age, of which distinct accounts are left to us, possibly by the hand of Jeremiah himself.

(iv) The Epistle to the Hebrews is still less a case in point, especially if written by St. PAUL, since he left many other signs of his activity behind him.

(v) While admitting that the book *may* have been written, as far as internal evidence shows, in the latter half of Manasseh's reign, yet it seems *more probable*, from the same internal evidence, that its author lived in a yet later age, perhaps in the earlier part of Josiah's time, for the following reasons:—

(a) The expressions in D.xxviii.49,50, — 'Jehovah shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, as the eagle flieth, a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand, a nation of fierce countenance, &c.'—seem hardly to refer to the weak and sickly *Assyrian* power, 'manifestly tending more and more to its end,' but to the young and vigorous *Babylonian* kingdom; and this last, as RIEHM says, was not sufficiently developed till towards the end of Manasseh's days;

(β) We do not know *for certain* that Psammetichus had notable fleets; but we do know this of his son Pharaoh-Necho, who was reigning at the time when Josiah came to the throne;

(γ) The Deuteronomist appears to have doubted from which of these two great powers the danger was most likely to come; which corresponds to the fact

that 'Pharaoh-Necho, king of Egypt, went up against the king of Assyria (? the Babylonian power) to the river Euphrates,' on which occasion Josiah also went up,—apparently, to fight with the Egyptians,—and was killed, 2K.xxiv.29, in the thirty-ninth year of his life and the thirty-first of his reign;

(5) The 'book of the Law' was found in the *eighteenth* year of his reign, *thirteen years* before; and previously to that time Josiah seems to have been on friendly terms with Egypt, Jer.ii.18,36, and, perhaps, was lending soldiers, and obtaining horses, in the very way condemned in D.xvii.16. It is probable that this very language of Deuteronomy, or rather, (as we suppose,) the remonstrances of the living Deuteronomist, may have produced this change of relations, which ended, however, fatally for the young king.

(vi) We shall consider fully in the proper place the *negative* arguments of Κόσις, as well as the *positive indications* of JEREMIAH'S authorship.

865. The following argument, however, tends strongly (in our opinion) to fix the composition of Deuteronomy in the early years of Josiah.

If it really was written in Manasseh's time, we are then met by the following difficulties. In that case, the author may have placed it in the Temple in Manasseh's lifetime, without the knowledge of anyone, which, of course, is conceivable. But then he must have gone his way, *leaving so valuable a fruit of so much labour to the chances of the future*,—or we may say to the overruling of Providence,—without communicating to anyone the fact of its existence; and he must have *died*, without betraying his secret,—without showing any personal interest in the success of his great enterprise, or caring to see any result of it in his own days,—nay, without even making any provision against the possibility of the book itself being neglected, destroyed, or lost, while it lay unknown and unheeded in the Temple, during the latter portion of Manasseh's idolatrous reign. For we take no account of the Chronicler's story of Manasseh's repentance, 2Ch.xxxiii.18,19, of which the book of Kings says nothing.

866. Or if the writer himself survived the reign of Manasseh, and the short reign of Amon, and so was living in the early years of Josiah,—or if any one was then living, to whom the writer,

before his death, *had* communicated his secret,—it seems very difficult to account for the long and total silence with respect to the existence of this book, which was maintained during *seventeen* years of Josiah's reign, when the king's docile piety and youth would have encouraged the production of such a book, if it really existed, and there was such imperative necessity for that Reformation to be begun as soon as possible, with a view to which the book itself was written.

867. Thus it seems to us, on the above grounds only, *most* reasonable to suppose that the book was *in process of composition* during these first seventeen years of Josiah's reign. The youth of the prince—his piety—his willingness to follow the teaching of the Prophets around him—gave every encouragement for such an attempt being made to bring about the great change that was needed. Possibly some years of Josiah's reign had passed before the work was begun, though we can scarcely doubt that it must have taken some time for its completion. Still two or three years, at most, might suffice for this; and during that interval, however short or long, we may conceive insertions to have been made from time to time, as fresh ideas occurred to the writer, and thus we may account in some measure for the numerous repetitions of the same sentiment, by which the book is characterised.

868. But who was the writer? KNOBEL observes very truly, iii.p.591:—

The author seems to have been an *eminent* man, who took upon himself to make so free with the Law-Book.

Independently of this 'free handling' of the earlier records, the man who could conceive, and carry out so effectively, the idea of adding another book to the existing Tetrateuch, must have been, indeed, a remarkable person. A writer of such originality, power, and eloquence,—of such earnest piety, such ardent patriotism, such tender human affections,—must have surely filled a very prominent position in the age in which he

lived. As we have said, he can hardly have disappeared so completely from the stage of Jewish history, in an age when historical records were diligently kept, without leaving behind any other trace of his existence and activity than this book of Deuteronomy. That *Jeremiah* lived in this very age we know, and that he began to prophesy 'in the thirteenth year of king Josiah,' Jer.i.2, four or five years before this book was found in the Temple; and we have also seen, as our investigations have advanced, not a few very striking indications of a close resemblance between the language of Jeremiah and that of the Deuteronomist. May it be that the two writers are identical,—that among the prophecies of Jeremiah, during the first five years of his labours, may be reckoned the addresses, which are here delivered under the name of Moses?

We must reserve for another Part of this work the full consideration of this question, as well as of the additional reasons, derived from a close examination of the book of Genesis, which appear to us to determine, with some approach to certainty, the age of the Elohist as contemporary with that of SAMUEL.

CHAPTER XXII.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

869. As the result of the preceding investigations, it must, as we think, be admitted that the traditional belief, that the whole Pentateuch, with a few unimportant exceptions, was written by Moses himself, can no longer be maintained in face of the plain facts of the case, as they lie before us in this volume. These facts, it would seem, compel us to this conclusion, that, whatever portion of the other four books may have been actually composed by the hand of Moses, whatever of the laws and ceremonies contained in them may have been handed down from the Mosaic age, yet certainly the book of Deuteronomy was *not* written by him, but is the product of a much later time, and bears the distinct impress of that time and its circumstances.

870. And, if this be so, we cannot serve God by wilfully shutting our eyes to the truth, and walking still in darkness, when He is pleased to give us light. It would be no acceptable worship of Him, who is the very Truth, to do so: it would be sinful and displeasing in His Sight. We are bound to obey the Truth, which we see and know, and to follow it whithersoever it may lead us, calm in the assurance that, in so following, we are best doing the blessed Will of our Heavenly Father, that His Voice will cheer and strengthen us, His Hand lead on and uphold us, and we shall know sufficiently all that we need to know for this life and for the life to come. Only we must be 'strong and of good courage'; we must fear no evil, since He is with us, but go straightforward at His Word in the path of duty.

871. Unless, therefore, the evidence, which has here been produced, can be set aside by reasonable argument, we must accept it henceforth, as a matter of fact,—which is now, perhaps, to many made plain for the first time, though long well-known to a few scholars here in England, and to very many on the Continent,—that, whatever may be true of the rest of the Pentateuch, the book of Deuteronomy, at all events, was not the work of Moses. We must accept this, I repeat, with all its important consequences.

872. And yet this book it is, and this alone, of which the authorship is actually claimed for Moses. We find mention made in the other books of his ‘writing’ on several occasions: *e.g.*—

‘And Jehovah said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial in a book, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua,’ E.xvii.14;

‘And Moses wrote all the words of Jehovah . . . and he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people,’ E.xxiv.4-7;

‘And Jehovah said unto Moses, Write thou these words: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel,’ E.xxxiv.27;

‘And Moses wrote their goings out according to their journeys by the commandment of Jehovah,’ N.xxxiii.2.

From such passages it might be fairly argued, (though it certainly is not distinctly stated,) that other portions also of these books, besides those to which direct reference is made in the above quotations,—perhaps, the main portions of them,—are, of course, to be regarded as also the work of Moses.

873. But that, which can only be inferred in the case of these books, is expressly asserted with respect to Deuteronomy. Not only are we told, D.xxxi.22, that Moses ‘wrote’ the Song, which we find recorded in D.xxxii, but the writing of the whole book or, at least, of the principal portion of it, is plainly ascribed to him in D.xxxi.9-11:—

‘And Moses wrote this Law, and delivered it unto the Priests the sons of Levi. . . . And Moses commanded them saying, At the end of every seven years, in the solemnity of the year of release, in the Feast of Tabernacles, when all Israel is come to appear before Jehovah thy God in the place which He shall choose, thou shalt read this Law before all Israel in their hearing.’

874. We have already said in (575-580) what we have deemed it right to say—not to justify, indeed, but—to explain this proceeding, consistently with the conviction that the writer was a devout Prophet, a true servant of the living God. We shall here add further the remarks of RIEHM on this point, *Gesetzg. Mosis im Lande Moab*, p.113-126.

But with what right could the author allow himself such a literary fiction? Must we not charge him with the purpose to deceive? With that we should certainly do him wrong. Essentially he has here allowed himself no greater freedom than the author of Ecclesiastes, when he introduces Solomon speaking, and ascribes to this master of wisdom his own thoughts, [or the author of the book of Job, who puts into the mouth of Job and his friends, and the Divine Being himself, his own language]. Why should we concede this freedom to the Philosopher, and not also to the Lawgiver [and Prophet? In and by itself this literary fiction is nowise blamable. There is, however, between that case and ours *this* difference—that the writer of Ecclesiastes, when he introduced Solomon as speaking, had not in his eye any distinct practical object with his fiction,—that his fiction, consequently, is merely poetical; whereas the Deuteronomist, when he ascribed the new Law-Book to Moses, had—if not certainly, yet probably—this object in view, to secure thereby to the new Law-Book respect and recognition. This object, certainly, alters the state of the case; from our moral point of view we cannot justify the proceeding of the Deuteronomist; it appears in the light of the ‘Law of perfect freedom’ as somewhat insincere. But it would also be an injustice towards the writer, if we desired to measure him by the New Testament rule. . . .

What now was the object of the writer in the publication of this new legislation, appearing under the form of an address delivered by Moses in the land of Moab? . . . Usually it is assigned as his chief object to make Jerusalem the only place for the public worship of God. But, certainly, this is not the first and chief direct object, but it is only something which, according to the relations of the time, was necessarily required by the writer’s chief object. We must rather take this view of the case. In the time of the Deuteronomist, the whole theocratic state, which was founded on the exclusive worship of Jehovah, was in such great danger, from idolatrous practices getting ever more and more the upper hand, that, unless soon a fundamental and thorough reformation took place, its complete destruction was certain. The King himself, the Princes, even many Priests and Prophets, devoted as they were to idolatry, and promoting it as much as possible, had taken all pains to undermine the very foundations of the state. In addition to this the Judges were arbitrary and unjust, family life was corrupted, the poor were in the greatest want, the rich were hard-hearted and unmerciful; the condition of the slave was disconsolate, and lawless was the cruelty of their masters; in one word, the whole life of the people was in full process of dissolution. The old legislation could not check this impending dissolution, and, without being changed in some respects,

was no longer applicable. There existed now new circumstances and relations, which it could not have taken account of from the first; and many institutions of the present time, such as the kingdom, &c., had in it neither legal sanction nor wholesome restraining definition. Even the prophetic activity had shown itself, notwithstanding the powerful reproofs of the Prophets, insufficient to check the ever-spreading corruption. So the Deuteronomist decided, summoning to his aid together the might of both the Prophet and the Lawgiver, to make the attempt, through a new set of laws laid down in the name and spirit of Moses, to give a new and firmer foundation to the theocratic state. . . .

But the people was already sunk too low. The destructive tendency to idolatry and to other heathen practices had already struck its roots too deep; dissoluteness of morals had already insinuated itself too much everywhere, and cankered and poisoned everything. The people broke again the newly-made covenant; and so the destruction, threatened by the author as Divine punishment for the repeated breach of the covenant, must no longer be withheld; the state was overthrown and brought to an end by the Chaldeans. On its reconstitution after the return from captivity, it was at first grounded firmly and strongly upon the Law—not that of Deuteronomy only, but the whole Law-Book, already considered as Mosaic. The strong distinction between Priests and Levites was again made of force according to the old legislation. . . . On the other hand, the restriction of the public worship to the temple-service at Jerusalem was strictly carried out, and attained now its end, to keep the people from idolatry. But there arose now other dangers for the religious life of the people, springing out of this very strict and careful observance of the Law. It sank more and more into dead formalism, and stiffened into this by degrees, till through new chastisements, and at last through the complete cessation of an independent Israelitish state, the whole O. T. 'kingdom of God' drew near its end, in order that the far higher and eternal divine kingdom of the N. T. covenant might step into its place.

875. But this book also it is, in point of fact, which forms, so to speak, the most living portion, the very sum and substance, of the whole Pentateuch. When we speak of the 'Law of Moses,' we mean chiefly the book of Deuteronomy. And we cannot but remember that it is this book also, which is quoted again and again, with special emphasis, in the New Testament: *e.g.*—

'He answered and said, It is written, Thou shalt not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God,' *Matt. iv. 4*;

'Jesus said unto him, It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God,' *v. 7*;

'Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan! for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve,' *v. 10*.

Here we have quotations from D.viii.3,vi.16,vi.13,x.20. And it is well known that there are many other passages in the Gospels and Epistles, in which this book is referred to, and in some of which Moses is expressly mentioned as the writer of the words in question, *e.g.* Actsiii.22, Rom.x.19. And, though it is true that, in the texts above quoted, the words are not, indeed, ascribed to Moses, but are merely introduced with the phrase, 'It is written,' yet in Matt.xix.7 the Pharisees refer to a passage in Deut.xxiv.1 as a law of Moses, and our Lord in His reply, *v.*8, repeats their language, and practically adopts it as correct, and makes it His own.

876. Here, then, we come again upon one of the grave questions, which inevitably must be stirred in the course of this enquiry. We dare not, I repeat, shut our eyes to the plain facts which lie before us, and *prove*, as it seems, beyond a reasonable doubt, the later origin of the book of Deuteronomy. And I can only repeat that there appears to me no other possible solution of this difficulty than that which I have suggested in each of my former volumes, which has been severely censured by many devout persons, but which will now, I trust, after consideration of the authorities produced in the Preface to the present volume, be admitted to be consistent with the most perfect orthodoxy, and certainly not deserving to be spoken of as 'heretical' and 'blasphemous.'

877. I say, then, again, once more, whatever other questions may be raised by the progress of scientific criticism, *this* difficulty vanishes for all who believe that our Lord Jesus Christ was born into the world to be a true 'Son of Man,'—that He was 'made like unto His brethren,'—that He was 'tried in all points like as we are,' was weak, and faint, and weary, as we are, was hungry and thirsty, as we are,—that He was subject also to all the other limitations of our nature, mental and spiritual, as well as bodily, needing food for the mind as well as for the body, and growing, like any other of the sons of men, in wisdom and knowledge as He

did in strength and stature, in both respects within the bounds of human development,—nay, needing also, as we do, supplies of spiritual sustenance, the Living Bread and Living Water, which He too received, as we do, from the fulness of His Father's Love, His Father and our Father, His God and our God.

878. When, however, such words as the above are quoted from Deuteronomy, are they the less true—have they less binding power upon the conscience—because they were written by some later prophet, and not by Moses? are they true *only* because they are 'written' in this 'Book of the Law?' Are they not rather true, because they are true in themselves, by whomsoever written or spoken,—eternally and unchangeably true,—and, as such, come home at once, with living power and authority, to the hearts and consciences of living men?

879. It is 'written' in the Bible, 'Truly, the light is sweet, and a pleasant thing it is for the eyes to behold the sun,' Eccl. xi.7. But is the light sweet to our eyes *because* it is thus stated in the Bible—by Solomon, as is generally believed, writing under Divine inspiration? Or would it be less sweet, if the results of modern criticism should show that the book of Ecclesiastes, though ascribed to the 'Son of David, king in Jerusalem,' Eccl.i.1, was *not* written by Solomon, but by some unknown author long after the Captivity? Is not the light sweet to our eyes, because our gracious God and Father has made the sun, and given us our visual powers, that we may open our eyes and they shall be filled with light, and we shall behold the glorious beauty of His universe?

880. And is the Light of Truth only sweet to us—does it only exist for us—because we find the bright reflection of it in the Bible? Is it not rather joy for us to know that God's Truth exists eternally, and shines like the sun in the spiritual heavens, and that we, His children upon earth, have a spiritual sense and spiritual eyesight given us, to which this Light of the inner man is 'sweet,' by which we can 'behold' its brightness,—whether

it comes to us direct from the 'Father of Lights' in some moment of blessed inspiration, or shines upon us as reflected from the pages of the Bible, or, rather, as *refracted* through the human media, by which in the Bible the 'Word of God' is given to us?

881. For will it be any longer maintained, in this age of scientific enlightenment, that all our 'hopes for eternity' depend upon every 'line' of the Bible being vouched by Divine authority as infallibly true? Is the statement, that the 'hare chews the cud,' to be received as true, because written down in Leviticus and Deuteronomy? Or would it have become true, if quoted, as it might have been, in the New Testament, as part of the 'Law of Moses'? No one, surely, with the known facts of science before him, will hesitate to give the answer to *such* a question.

882. But, if we are obliged to allow that some portions of the teaching of the Bible cannot be regarded as having Divine authority,—as being 'faithful' and 'trustworthy' statements, 'infallibly true,'—because they contradict the known facts of science, there are surely others which we must equally reject, because they are at variance with the laws of our moral being, because they conflict at once with the plain lessons of the Gospel, and with those eternal principles of right and wrong, which the great Creator has planted within us, in respect of which it is specially true that man is made 'in the image,' and 'after the likeness,' of God.

883. Must we not feel, for instance, that the Eternal Law of Justice and Equity, which God Himself has written with his own Finger upon the tables of our hearts, is directly at variance with such commands as these quoted below,—that these cannot, at all events, be regarded as utterances of the blessed Will of God,—that the writer of them, though an inspired man, cannot certainly have written *thus* by Divine inspiration? *e.g.*—

(i) D.xxiii.1, which excludes from the congregation of Jehovah

one mutilated, perhaps, in helpless infancy, while those, by whose agency the act in question was encouraged, or, perhaps, performed, are allowed free access to the Sanctuary;

(ii) D.xxiii.2, which excludes in like manner an innocent base-born child, but takes no account of the vicious parent;

(iii) D.xxi.18-21, which commands that a 'stubborn and rebellious son' shall be stoned to death, when oftentimes the father and mother, who by their bad example had corrupted, or by their faulty training had ruined, their child, deserved rather to suffer punishment;

(iv) D.xx.10-15, which orders that any city of any distant people, with whom Israel might be at war, shall first be summoned to surrender, and, if it will make no peace on condition of *all the people becoming tributaries and doing service to Israel*, shall then be besieged, and with Divine help captured; and then it is written—

'When Jehovah thy God hath delivered it into thine hands, *thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword; but the women and the little ones, and the cattle, and all that is in the city, even all the spoil thereof, shalt thou take unto thyself*; and thou shalt eat the spoil of thine enemies, which Jehovah thy God hath given thee. Thus shalt thou do unto all the cities which are very far off from thee, which are not of the cities of these nations.

'But of *the cities of these people*, which Jehovah thy God doth give thee for an 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, as Jehovah thy God hath commanded thee; that they teach you not to do after all their abominations, which they have done unto their gods: so should ye sin against Jehovah your God.'

884. Such laws as the above are felt at once to be directly contradictory to those first principles of humanity and equity, which God our Creator has planted within us, to be our monitors and guides through life; and they equally contradict the plainest teaching of the Gospel of Christ. I have explained how the writer may be justly relieved from the reproach of having set on record such sanguinary laws as these, with any idea of their being really carried out. The 'rebellious son' is only a figure

of 'rebellious Israel'; and the judgment denounced against his disobedience shadows forth the penalty deserved by those, who will not 'obey the voice of Jehovah,' their Heavenly Father; and so, too, the last of the above laws simply expresses the burning zeal which glowed within him against the idolatrous practices, which were then common among his own people, and which they had adopted either from the Canaanite nations of former days, or more probably from the heathen tribes then living around them.

885. The Prophet here makes use of the tribes of Canaan as a standing type of such idolaters. In the age of Josiah, when these words were written down, those tribes, we may believe, no longer existed: they had long disappeared, or been merged in the Israelitish people. The history teaches us that they never were exterminated,—that 'Uriah the Hittite' served as a captain in David's army, and 'Araunah the Jebusite' had his threshing-floor on the site of the future temple at Jerusalem. But the Deuteronomist, by setting forth before his people the *figure* of these tribes, driven out from their old abodes, as a judgment for their sins, and ruthlessly exterminated by the hands of Jehovah's worshippers, seeks to remind the latter of their duty and of their danger, of the terrible woe of expatriation, and even extermination, which would be their just recompense, if they, too, practised the like abominations. The command to slay the men of a distant city, and to save the women and children, &c. alive, is probably introduced by way of *contrast* to the other more terrible command, and not with any view of its being really executed; and, indeed, in Josiah's time there was little probability of any such distant conquests being made by Israel.

886. In such a way as this we can explain intelligibly the fact, that even a good man, a lover of justice and mercy, an inspired Prophet, could yet write down such laws as these. But it is surely nothing else than a tampering with the truth, an

unintentional, doubtless, but yet a real, dishonesty,—and therefore, if done with a religious motive, only (disguise it as we will) an *idolatrous*, worship, of a God, who is *not* the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the very God of Truth,—if we endeavour to defend such laws as these as truly and infallibly Divine, and really uttered from the mouth of the most Holy and Blessed One, on the principle that—not a mere man like Moses, but—the Divine Being Himself, was compelled to adapt His laws to an imperfect state of society,—to ‘preconceived and popular ideas,’—and, therefore, was led to utter commands, which a child instructed in the first lessons of the Gospel,—nay, which a heathen walking in that Light, which ‘lighteneth every man that cometh into the world,’—can at once condemn as unjust and inhuman.

887. We must, then, even in reading the Scriptures, ‘try the spirits, whether they are of God.’ In this way only can we do the Will of God, and discharge the true duty, and rise to the true dignity, of man as the child of God. We might wish, perhaps,—many do wish,—to have it otherwise, to be able to fall back upon the notion of an Infallible Book, or an Infallible Church. But God has not willed it so. He will not give us,—at least He has not given us,—a Revelation of such a kind, as to relieve us from the solemn duty of judging, each for himself, what is right and true in His Sight. His Spirit has quickened us, that we may do, as living men, His work in the world: He will not suffer us to abdicate the glorious office to which He calls us. We *must*—not only claim and exercise the *right*, but—bear the *responsibility* of private judgment, upon the things of the life to come, as well as of this world.

888. The Deuteronomist himself will teach us this lesson. He tells us, indeed, that God in all ages will raise up prophets like unto ourselves, xviii.18, will kindle His Fire within the heart,

and put His words into the mouth, of men, who, in all the weakness of humanity, shall speak to their fellow-men all that they feel commanded to teach in His Name,—who shall utter His Eternal Truth, and minister to their brethren the lessons of ‘doctrine, reproof, correction, instruction in righteousness.’ And their brethren shall ‘hear’ them; they dare not neglect the Truth, of whatever kind, which God’s own grace imparts and brings home to them from the lips of a fellow-man, however high or humble.

889. But they must not listen to him with a blind unreasoning acquiescence, though He speak to them in the Name of Jehovah, and though the ‘sign or wonder,’ come to pass, xiii.2, which he brought to them as the very credentials of his mission. They must ‘try the spirit’ of the Prophet’s words by that law which they have within them, written upon their hearts. Jehovah, their God, is proving them, to know whether they truly and entirely love Him, and love His Truth, ‘with all their heart and with all their soul.’ If the words, which that Prophet speaks to them, come home to their consciences as right and true words, then in God’s Name let them acknowledge and welcome them, and send them on with a blessing of ‘God speed!’ to others. If the Voice, which speaks within, declares that the utterance from without is false, then ‘shalt thou not hearken,’ xiii.3; the word is not God’s; and he, who hears, must *not* obey it.

890. In this spirit we must read the book of Deuteronomy itself, and we shall find the Living Bread which our souls may feed on,—we shall find in it the Word of God. And that Word will *not* be at variance with the eternal and essential substance of Christianity, with those words which ‘shall not pass away’. Then we shall live no more in constant fear, that some rude stroke of criticism may shake, perhaps, the ‘very foundations of our faith,’ or that the announcement of some simple fact of science or natural history

T T

may threaten to 'take from us our nearest and dearest consolations.' We shall learn thus to have 'faith in God,' as our Lord has bidden us, Mark xi.22, and not in the written records, through which He has been pleased, by inspiring the hearts of our brother men with life, to quicken and comfort our own. When we hear such words as these—

'Man doth not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God doth man live,' D.viii.3 —

'Thou shalt also consider in thine heart that, as a man chasteneth his son, so the Living God, thy God, doth chasten thee,' D.viii.5 —

'If from thence—from the very depth of sin-wrought misery—thou shalt seek the Living God, thy God, thou shalt find Him, if thou seek Him with all thy heart and with all thy soul,' D.iv.29 —

we shall joyfully welcome them as messages of truth, not merely because we find them in the Bible, but because they are true—eternally true.

891. It *is* true that God loves us as dear children, and that we may go to Him at all times, as to a wise and tender Father, with a child-like trust and love, as with a child-like reverence and fear. Rather, we *must* go to Him thus if we would please Him, and act upon the words of Him who has taught us all to say, 'Our Father.' We must 'consider in our hearts' that He, who has planted in our breasts, as parents, dear love to our children, a love stronger than death, does by that very love of ours shadow forth to us His own Eternal Love. *Our* love can take in every child of the family; *our* hearts can find a place for all; yes, and our love embraces the far-off prodigal, in his miserable wanderings, no less surely and no less tenderly, than the dear obedient child, that sits by our side, rejoicing in the sweet delights of home. He that has taught us to love our children in this way, how shall He not also love His children, with a Love in which the separate loves of earthly parents are blended, and find their full, infinite, expression,—the Father's loving wisdom and firmness, to guide and counsel, and, if need be, to correct and chasten,—the Mother's tender pity and compassion, that will

draw near with sweet consolations, in each hour of sorrow and suffering, will sympathise with every grief and trial, will bow down to hear each shame-stricken confession, will be ready to receive the first broken words of penitence, and whisper the promise of forgiveness and peace.

892. Ah! truly, the little child may cling to its mother's neck, and the mother's love will feel the gentle pressure, and will delight to feel it: but it is not the feeble clinging of the little one that holds it up; it is the strong arm of love that embraces it. And we, in our most earnest prayers and aspirations, in our cleaving unto God, in our longing and striving after Truth as in these poor enquiries, are but as babes, 'stretching out weak hands of faith' to lay hold of Him, Whom no man hath seen or can see, but Who, unseen, is ever near us, whose tender love embraces all His children, those that are far off as well as those that are near, the heathen and the Christian, the sinner and the Saint.

893. Happy, indeed, are we, who are blessed to know this—to know the high calling and the glorious privileges of the children of God—not that we may be more *safe* than others, who as yet know it not, but that we may be filled with hope and strength and courage in the assurance of this Truth,—that we may be more living and earnest and joyful in our work,—more brave to speak the Truth, to do the Right, to wage eternal war with all that is false and base and evil, within us and without,—more patient in suffering,—more firm and true in temptation and trial,—more sorrowful and ashamed when we have fallen,—more quick to rise, and go on again, in the path of duty, with tears and thanksgivings,—more eager to tell out the Love of God to others, whether to those who as yet are groping, 'if haply they may feel after Him and find Him,' Who 'is not far from any one of them,' 'in Whom they live and move and have their being,' or to those who *have* known Him, but know no longer now the joy of His children, 'sitting in darkness and in the shadow of death, fast bound in misery and iron.'

894. But, in all this, it is not our knowledge, however clear, or our faith, however firm and orthodox, or our charity, however bright or pure, that holds us up daily, and binds us to the Bosom of our God. 'Our Father' will delight in all the sacred confidences of His children,—their clingings of faith and hope,—their longings of pure desire for a closer sense of His Presence,—their holy aspirations and penitential confessions. But it is not our prayer that will hold us up. It is His Love alone which does this.

'THE ETERNAL GOD IS OUR REFUGE,
AND UNDERNEATH ARE THE EVERLASTING ARMS.' D.XXXIII.27.

LONDON

PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE

14 LUDGATE HILL, E.C.
(During the rebuilding of the Premises in Paternoster Row)
LONDON, April 1863.

GENERAL LIST OF WORKS,

NEW BOOKS AND NEW EDITIONS,

PUBLISHED BY

MESSRS. LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, ROBERTS, AND GREEN.



'THE STORY OF THE GUNS.' By Sir J. EMERSON
TENNETT, K.C.S. LL.D. F.R.S. &c. Fcp. 8vo. with numerous Woodcuts.
[*Nearly ready.*]

**JOURNAL OF A RESIDENCE ON A GEORGIAN PLAN-
TATION IN 1838-39.** By FRANCES ANNE KEMBLE. Post 8vo.
[*Nearly ready.*]

THE CAPITAL OF THE TYCOON: A Narrative of a
Three Years' Residence in Japan. By Sir RUTHERFORD ALCOCK, K.C.B.,
Her Majesty's Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary in
Japan. With 2 coloured Maps, 16 Chromo-lithographs, and 126 Wood
Engravings. 2 vols. 8vo. 42s.

**HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN EUROPE
IN THE TIME OF CALVIN.** By J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNÉ, D.D.
VOLS. I. and II. 8vo. price 28s.

THE PENTATEUCH AND BOOK OF JOSHUA Criti-
cally Examined. PART I. the Pentateuch Examined as an Historical
Narrative. By the Right Rev. JOHN WILLIAM COLENSO, D.D., BISHOP
of NATAL. Second Edition, revised. 8vo. 6s. PART II. *the Age and
Authorship of the Pentateuch Considered.* 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE STORY OF A SIBERIAN EXILE. By M. RUFIN
PIETROWSKI. Followed by a Narrative of Recent Events in Poland.
Translated from the French. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

SIR JOHN ELIOT: A BIOGRAPHY. By JOHN FORSTER.
With Two Portraits, from original Paintings at Port Eliot.

[*In the Autumn.*]

NARRATIVE OF A SECRET MISSION TO THE DANISH ISLANDS IN 1808. By the Rev. JAMES ROBERTSON. Edited from the Author's MS. by his Nephew, ALEXANDER CLINTON FRASER. Square fcp. 8vo. 5s.

REMINISCENCES OF THE LIFE AND CHARACTER OF COUNT CAVOUR. By WILLIAM DE LA RIVE. Translated from the French by EDWARD ROMILLY. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

JEFFERSON AND THE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY :
An Historical Study. By CORNÉLIS DE WITT. Translated, with the Author's permission, by R. S. H. CHURCH. 8vo. 14s.

DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA. By ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE.
Translated by HENRY REEVE, Esq. New Edition, with an Introductory Notice by the Translator. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF THE EMPEROR CHARLES V.
Recently Discovered in the Portuguese Language by Baron Kervyn De Lettenhove, Member of the Royal Academy of Belgium. Translated by LEONARD FRANCIS SIMPSON, M.R.S.L. Post 8vo. 6s. 6d.

THE LAW OF NATIONS CONSIDERED AS INDEPENDENT POLITICAL COMMUNITIES. By TRAVERS TWISS, D.C.L., Regius Professor of Civil Law in the University of Oxford, and one of Her Majesty's Counsel. PART I. *The Right and Duties of Nations in Time of Peace.* 8vo. 12s. PART II. *The Right and Duties of Nations in Time of War,* is just ready.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND, since the Accession of George III. 1760—1860. By THOMAS ERSKINE MAY, C.B. VOL. II. completion, 8vo. price 18s. A New and Revised Edition of the FIRST VOLUME is nearly ready.

H.R.H. THE PRINCE CONSORT'S FARMS: An Agricultural Memoir. By JOHN CHALMERS MORTON. Dedicated by permission to Her Majesty the QUEEN. With 40 Illustrations on Wood, comprising Maps of Estates, Plans, Vignette Sketches, and Views in Perspective of Farm Buildings and Cottages. 4to. £2. 12s. 6d.

THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND, from the Accession of James II. By the Right Hon. LORD MACAULAY. Library Edition, complete in Five Volumes; with Portrait and brief Memoir. 5 vols. 8vo. price £4 cloth, or £5 15s. 6d. bound in tree-calf extra by RIVIÈRE.

LORD MACAULAY'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND, from the Accession of James II. New Edition, revised and corrected, with Portrait and brief Memoir. 8 vols. post 8vo. price 48s. cloth, or £4 4s. bound in tree-calf extra by RIVIÈRE.

THE HISTORY OF FRANCE. (An entirely new Work, in Four Volumes.) By EYRE EVANS CROWE, Author of the 'History of France,' in the *Cabinet Cyclopædia*. 8vo. VOL. I. 14s.; VOL. II. 15s.
* * * The THIRD VOLUME is in the press.

A HISTORY OF THE ROMANS UNDER THE EMPIRE.
By the Rev. CHARLES MERIVALE, B.D., late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. 7 vols. 8vo. with Maps, £5 6s.

By the same Author.

THE FALL OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC: A Short History of the Last Century of the Commonwealth. 12mo. 7s. 6d.

A CRITICAL HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE OF ANCIENT GREECE. By WILLIAM MURE, M.P., of Caldwell. 5 vols. 8vo. £3. 9s.

THE HISTORY OF GREECE. By the Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP of ST. DAVID'S (the Rev. Connop Thirlwall). 8 vols. 8vo. with Maps, £3; an Edition in 8 vols. fcp. 8vo. 28s.

LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND, delivered at Chorleywood. By WILLIAM LONGMAN. VOL. I. From the Earliest Times to the Death of King Edward II. (A.D. 1327). Illustrated by MAPS of Early England, the English Possessions in France, Ancient Wales, the Battle of Evesham, the Battle of Bannockburn, and Scotland in the 13th Century, a Coloured Plate representing a Tournament (from the Cotton MSS.), and 53 Woodcuts; and accompanied by a copious INDEX. 8vo. [Nearly ready.]

THE ANGLO-SAXON HOME: a History of the Domestic Institutions and Customs of England, from the Fifth to the Eleventh Century. By JOHN THURPP. 8vo. 12s.

LIVES OF THE QUEENS OF ENGLAND. By AGNES STRICKLAND. Dedicated by permission to Her Majesty, and embellished with Portraits of every Queen. 8 vols. post 8vo. 60s.

LIVES OF THE PRINCESSES OF ENGLAND. By Mrs. MARY ANNE EVERETT GREEN. With numerous Portraits, 6 vols. post 8vo. 63s.

LORD BACON'S WORKS. A New Edition, collected and edited by R. L. ELLIS, M.A.; J. SPEDDING, M.A.; and D. D. HEATH, Esq. VOLS. I. to V., comprising the Division of *Philosophical Works*. 5 vols. 8vo. £4. 6s. VOLS. VI. and VII., comprising the Division of *Literary and Professional Works*. 2 vols. 8vo. £1. 16s.

THE LETTERS AND LIFE OF FRANCIS BACON, including all his Occasional Works and Writings not already printed among his *Philosophical, Literary, or Professional Works*. Collected and chronologically arranged, with a Commentary, biographical and historical, by J. SPEDDING, Trin. Col. Cam. VOLS. I and II. 8vo. 24s.

MEMOIR OF THE LIFE OF SIR M. I. BRUNEL, Civil Engineer, &c. By RICHARD BEAMISH, F.R.S. *Second Edition*, revised; with a Portrait, and 16 Illustrations. 8vo. 14s.

LIFE OF ROBERT STEPHENSON, F.R.S., late President of the Institution of Civil Engineers. By JOHN CORDY JEAFFRESON, Barrister-at-Law; and WILLIAM POLE, F.R.S. Member of the Institution of Civil Engineers. With Two Portraits and numerous Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo. [Nearly ready.]

THE LIFE OF SIR PHILIP SIDNEY. By the Rev. JULIUS LLOYD, M.A. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE LIFE OF AMELIA SIEVEKING. Translated from the German with the Author's sanction by CATHERINE WINKWORTH. Post 8vo. With Portrait and 2 Illustrations.

THE PRINCIPLES OF CHARITABLE WORK — Love, Truth, and Order—as set forth in the Writings of AMELIA SIEVEKING, Foundress of the Female Society for the Care of the Sick and Poor in Hamburg. Post 8vo.

HISTORICAL AND CHRONOLOGICAL ENCYCLOPÆDIA, presenting in a brief and convenient form Chronological Notices of all the Great Events of Universal History; including Treaties, Alliances, Wars, Battles, &c.; Incidents in the Lives of Great and Distinguished Men and their Works; Scientific and Geographical Discoveries; Mechanical Inventions, and Social, Domestic, and Economical Improvements. By B. B. WOODWARD, F.S.A., Librarian to the Queen. 8vo.

[*In the press.*]

THE ROLL OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS OF LONDON; compiled from the Annals of the College, and from other Authentic Sources. By WILLIAM MUNK, M.D., Fellow of the College, &c. VOLS. I. and II. 8vo. 12s. each.

THE HISTORY OF MEDICINE: Comprising a Narrative of its Progress, from the Earliest Ages to the Present Time, and of the Delusions incidental to its advance from Empiricism to the dignity of a Science. By EDWARD MERYON, M.D., F.G.S., Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, &c. VOL. I. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

MATERIALS FOR A HISTORY OF OIL PAINTING.
By Sir CHARLES L. EASTLAKE, R.A. 8vo. 16s.

HALF-HOUR LECTURES ON THE HISTORY AND PRACTICE of the FINE and ORNAMENTAL ARTS. By WILLIAM B. SCOTT, Head Master of the Government School of Design, Newcastle-on-Tyne. 16mo. with 50 Woodcuts, 8s. 6d.

THE LIFE OF WILLIAM WARBURTON, D.D. Lord Bishop of Gloucester from 1760 to 1779; with Remarks on his Works. By the Rev. JOHN SELBY WATSON, M.A. M.R.S.L. 8vo. with Portrait, price 18s.

By the same Author.

LIFE OF RICHARD PORSON, M.A., Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge from 1792 to 1808. With Portrait and 2 Facsimiles. 8vo. 14s.

HISTORY OF SAVONAROLA AND HIS TIMES. By PASQUALE VILLARI, Professor of History in the University of Pisa; accompanied by new Documents. Translated from the Italian by LEONARD HORNER, F.R.S. with the co-operation of the Author. 2 vols. post 8vo. with Medallion, price 18s.

BIOGRAPHIES OF DISTINGUISHED SCIENTIFIC MEN. By FRANÇOIS ARAGO. Translated by Admiral W. H. SMYTH, D.C.L., F.R.S., &c.; the Rev. B. POWELL, M.A.; and R. GRANT, M.A., F.R.A.S. 8vo. 18s.

By the same Author.

METEOROLOGICAL ESSAYS. With an Introduction by Baron HUMBOLDT. Translated under the superintendence of Major-General E. SABINE, R.A., V.P.R.S. 8vo. 18s.

POPULAR ASTRONOMY. Translated and edited by Admiral W. H. SMYTH, D.C.L., F.R.S.; and R. GRANT, M.A., F.R.A.S. With 25 Plates and 358 Woodcuts. 2 vols. 8vo. £2. 5s.

TREATISE ON COMETS, from the above, price 5s.

GEOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA, principally in the District South-East of Adelaide. By the Rev. JULIAN EDMUND WOODS, F.G.S. With 38 Woodcut Illustrations. 8vo. 14s.

LIFE OF THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON, partly from the French of M. BRIALMONT; partly from Original Documents. By the Rev. G. R. GLEIG, M.A., Chaplain-General to H.M. Forces. *New Edition*, in One Volume, with PLANS, MAPS, and a PORTRAIT. 8vo. 15s.

MEMOIRS OF SIR HENRY HAVELOCK, Major-General, K.C.B. By JOHN CLARK MARSHMAN. With Portrait, Map, and 2 Plans. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 12s. 6d.

MEMOIRS OF ADMIRAL PARRY, THE ARCTIC NAVIGATOR. By his Son, the Rev. E. PARRY, M.A. Seventh Edition; with Portrait and coloured Chart. Fep. 8vo. 5s.

VICISSITUDES OF FAMILIES. By Sir BERNARD BURKE, Ulster King of Arms. FIRST, SECOND, and THIRD SERIES. 3 vols. crown 8vo. price 12s. 6d. each.

GREEK HISTORY FROM THEMISTOCLES TO ALEXANDER, in a Series of Lives from Plutarch. Revised and arranged by A. H. CLOUGH, sometime Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. With 44 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

TALES FROM GREEK MYTHOLOGY. By the Rev. G. W. COX, M.A., late Scholar of Trinity College, Oxford. Square 16mo. price 3s. 6d.

By the same Author.

TALES OF THE GODS AND HEROES. With 6 Landscape Illustrations from Drawings by the Author. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

THE TALE OF THE GREAT PERSIAN WAR, from the Histories of *Herodotus*. With 12 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

A DICTIONARY OF ROMAN AND GREEK ANTIQUITIES, with nearly 2,000 Wood Engravings, representing Objects from the Antique, illustrative of the Industrial Arts and Social Life of the Greeks and Romans. Being the Second Edition of the *Illustrated Companion to the Latin Dictionary and Greek Lexicon*. By ANTHONY RICH, Jun., B.A. Post 8vo. 12s. 6d.

ANCIENT HISTORY OF EGYPT, ASSYRIA, AND BABYLONIA. By ELIZABETH M. SEWELL, Author of 'Amy Herbert,' &c. With Two Maps. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

By the same Author.

HISTORY OF THE EARLY CHURCH, from the First Preaching of the Gospel to the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325. *Second Edition.* Fcp. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. SYDNEY SMITH. By his Daughter, LADY HOLLAND. With a Selection from his Letters, edited by MRS. AUSTIN. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

SPEECHES OF THE RIGHT HON. LORD MACAULAY, Corrected by HIMSELF. *New Edition.* 8vo. 12s.

LORD MACAULAY'S SPEECHES ON PARLIAMENTARY REFORM IN 1831 AND 1832. Reprinted in the TRAVELLER'S LIBRARY. 16mo. 1s.

THOMAS MOORE'S MEMOIRS, JOURNAL, AND CORRESPONDENCE. People's Edition. With 8 Portraits and 2 Vignettes. Edited and abridged from the First Edition by the Right Hon. EARL RUSSELL. Square crown 8vo. 12s. 6d.

SOUTHEY'S LIFE OF WESLEY, AND RISE AND PROGRESS OF METHODISM. Fourth Edition, with Notes and Additions. Edited by the Rev. C. C. SOUTHEY, M.A. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 12s.

THE HISTORY OF WESLEYAN METHODISM. By GEORGE SMITH, F.A.S., Member of the Royal Asiatic Society, &c. A New Edition, embellished with Portraits, in course of publication in 31 Parts, price 6d. each.

THE VOYAGE AND SHIPWRECK OF ST. PAUL: With Dissertations on the Life and Writings of St. Luke, and the Ships and Navigation of the Ancients. By JAMES SMITH, of Jordanhill, Esq., F.R.S. *Second Edition*; with Charts, &c. Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d.

THE LIFE AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL. By the Rev. W. J. CONYBEARE, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; and the Rev. J. S. HOWSON, D.D., Principal of the Collegiate Institution, Liverpool. *People's Edition*, condensed; with 46 Illustrations and Maps. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 12s.

CONYBEARE AND HOWSON'S LIFE AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL. New Edition of the Intermediate Edition; with a Selection of Maps, Plates, and Wood Engravings. 2 vols. square crown 8vo. 31s. 6d.

CONYBEARE AND HOWSON'S LIFE AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL. The Original Library Edition, with more numerous Illustrations. 2 vols. 4to. 48s.

THE GENTILE AND THE JEW IN THE COURTS OF THE TEMPLE OF CHRIST. An Introduction to the History of Christianity. From the German of Professor DÖLLINGER, by the Rev. N. DARNELL, M.A., late Fellow of New College, Oxford. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s.

PORT-ROYAL; A Contribution to the History of Religion and Literature in France. By CHARLES BEARD, B.A. 2 vols. post 8vo. price 24s.

HIPPOLYTUS AND HIS AGE; or, the Beginnings and Prospects of Christianity. By C. C. J. BUNSEN, D.D. D.C.L. D.Ph. 2 vols. 8vo. 30s.

By the same Author.

OUTLINES OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF UNIVERSAL HISTORY, applied to Language and Religion: Containing an Account of the Alphabetical Conferences. 2 vols. 8vo. 33s.

ANALECTA ANTE-NICÆNA. 3 vols. 8vo. 42s.

EGYPT'S PLACE IN UNIVERSAL HISTORY: An Historical Investigation, in Five Books. Translated from the German by C. H. COTTRELL, M.A. With many Illustrations. 4 vols. 8vo. £5. 8s. VOL. V., completing the work, is in preparation.

A NEW LATIN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY. By the Rev. J. T. WHITE, M.A., of Corpus Christi College, Oxford; and the Rev. J. E. RIDDLE, M.A., of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford. Imperial 8vo. 42s.

A GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON. Compiled by HENRY GEO. LIDDELL, D.D., Dean of Christ Church; and ROBERT SCOTT, D.D., Master of Balliol. *Fifth Edition*, revised and augmented. Crown 4to. price 31s. 6d.

A LEXICON, GREEK AND ENGLISH, abridged from LIDDELL and SCOTT'S *Greek-English Lexicon*. Ninth Edition, revised and compared throughout with the Original. Square 12mo. 7s. 6d.

A NEW ENGLISH-GREEK LEXICON, Containing all the Greek Words used by Writers of good authority. By CHARLES DUKE YONGE, B.A. *Second Edition*, thoroughly revised. 4to. 21s.

A DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. By ROBERT G. LATHAM, M.D. F.R.S. Founded on that of Dr. SAMUEL JOHNSON, as edited by the Rev. H. J. TODD; with numerous Emendations and Additions. 2 vols. 4to. to be published in Monthly Parts. PART I. is nearly ready.

THESAURUS OF ENGLISH WORDS AND PHRASES, classified and arranged so as to facilitate the Expression of Ideas, and assist in Literary Composition. By P. M. ROGET, M.D., F.R.S., &c. *Twelfth Edition*, revised and improved. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

A PRACTICAL DICTIONARY OF THE FRENCH AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES. By LÉON CONTANSEAU, lately Professor of the French Language and Literature in the Royal Indian Military College, Addiscombe (now dissolved); and Examiner for Military Appointments. *Sixth Edition*, with Corrections. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

By the same Author.

A POCKET DICTIONARY OF THE FRENCH AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES; being a careful abridgment of the above, preserving all the most useful features of the original work, condensed into a Pocket Volume for the convenience of Tourists, Travellers, and English Readers or Students to whom portability of size is a requisite. Square 18mo. 5s.

LECTURES ON THE SCIENCE OF LANGUAGE, delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain. By MAX MÜLLER, M.A., Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford. *Third Edition*, revised. 8vo. 12s.

THE STUDENT'S HANDBOOK OF COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR, applied to the Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Gothic, Anglo-Saxon, and English Languages. By the Rev. THOMAS CLARK, M.A. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE DEBATER: A Series of Complete Debates, Outlines of Debates, and Questions for Discussion; with ample References to the best Sources of Information. By F. ROWTON. Fep. 8vo. 6s.

THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. By R. G. LATHAM, M.A. M.D. F.R.S. late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. *Fifth Edition*, revised and enlarged. 8vo. 18s.

By the same Author.

HANDBOOK OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, for the Use of Students of the Universities and Higher Classes of Schools. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

ELEMENTS OF COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY. 8vo. 21s.

MANUAL OF ENGLISH LITERATURE, HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL; With a Chapter on English Metres. For the use of Schools and Colleges. By THOMAS ARNOLD, B.A., Professor of English Literature, Cath. Univ. Ireland. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

ON TRANSLATING HOMER: Three Lectures given at Oxford. By MATTHEW ARNOLD, M.A., Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford, and formerly Fellow of Oriel College. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.—MR. ARNOLD'S *Last Words on Translating Homer*, price 3s. 6d.

A GUIDE TO THE WESTERN ALPS; comprising Dauphiné, Savoy, and Piedmont; with the Mont Blanc and Monte Rosa Districts. Edited by JOHN BALL, M.R.I.A. F.L.S. To be followed by a similar Guide to the *Central and Eastern Alps*: the whole forming a complete *Alpine Guide*. Post 8vo. with Maps.

PEAKS, PASSES, AND GLACIERS: a Series of Excursions by Members of the Alpine Club. Edited by J. BALL, M.R.I.A. F.L.S. Fourth Edition; with Maps, Illustrations, and Woodcuts. Square crown 8vo. 21s.—TRAVELLERS' EDITION, condensed, 16mo. 5s. 6d.

SECOND SERIES OF PEAKS, PASSES, AND GLACIERS. Edited by E. S. KENNEDY, M.A. F.R.G.S. President of the Alpine Club. With 4 Double Maps and 10 Single Maps by E. WELLER, F.R.G.S.; and 51 Illustrations on Wood by E. WHYMPER and G. PEARSON. 2 vols. square crown 8vo. 42s.

NINETEEN MAPS OF THE ALPINE DISTRICTS, from the First and Second Series of *Peaks, Passes, and Glaciers*. Square crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

MOUNTAINEERING IN 1861; a Vacation Tour. By JOHN TYNDALL, F.R.S., Professor of Natural Philosophy in the Royal Institution of Great Britain. Square crown 8vo. with 2 Views, 7s. 6d.

A SUMMER TOUR IN THE GRISONS AND ITALIAN VALLEYS OF THE BERNINA. By MRS. HENRY FRESHFIELD. With 2 coloured Maps and 4 Views. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

By the same Author.

ALPINE BYWAYS; or, Light Leaves gathered in 1859 and 1860. With 8 Illustrations and 4 Route Maps. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

A LADY'S TOUR ROUND MONTE ROSA; including Visits to the Italian Valleys of Anzasca, Mastalone, Camasco, Sesia, Lys, Challant, Aosta, and Cogne. With Map and Illustrations. Post 8vo. 14s.

THE ALPS; or, Sketches of Life and Nature in the Mountains. By Baron H. VON BERLEPSCH. Translated by the Rev. LESLIE STEPHEN, M.A. With 17 Tinted Illustrations. 8vo. 15s.

SOUTH AMERICAN SKETCHES; or, a Visit to Rio De Janeiro, the Organ Mountains, and the Paraná. By THOMAS W. HINCHLIFF, M.A. F.R.G.S. Author of 'Summer Months among the Alps.' Post 8vo. with Map and Illustrations.

THEBES, ITS TOMBS AND THEIR TENANTS, Ancient and Modern; including a Record of Excavations in the Necropolis. By A. HENRY RHIND, F.S.A. With 17 Illustrations, including a Map. Royal 8vo. 18s.

LETTERS FROM ITALY AND SWITZERLAND. By FELIX MENDELSSOHN-BARTHOLDY. Translated from the German by LADY WALLACE. *Second Edition*, revised. Post 8vo. 9s. 6d.

A GUIDE TO THE PYRENEES; especially intended for the use of Mountaineers. By CHARLES PACKE. With Frontispiece and 3 Maps. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

The MAP of the *Central Pyrenees* separately, price 3s. 6d.

HERZEGOVINA, or, Omer Pacha and the Christian Rebels: With a Brief Account of Servia, its Social, Political, and Financial Condition. By Lieut. G. ARBUTHNOT, R.H.A., F.R.G.S. Post 8vo, Frontispiece and Map, 10s. 6d.

CANADA AND THE CRIMEA; or, Sketches of a Soldier's Life, from the Journals and Correspondence of the late Major RANKEN, R.E. Edited by his Brother, W. B. RANKEN. *Second Edition*. Post 8vo. with Portrait, price 7s. 6d.

NOTES ON MEXICO IN 1861 AND 1862, Politically and Socially considered. By CHARLES LEMPRIERE, D.C.L. of the Inner Temple, and Law Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford. With Map and 10 Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 12s. 6d.

EXPLORATIONS IN LABRADOR : The Country of the Montagnais and Nasquapee Indians. By HENRY YOULE HIND, M.A., F.R.G.S., Professor of Chemistry and Geology in the University of Trinity College, Toronto. 2 vols. [Just ready.]

By the same Author.

NARRATIVE OF THE CANADIAN RED RIVER EXPLORING EXPEDITION OF 1857 ; and of the **ASSINNIBOINE AND SASKATCHEWAN EXPLORING EXPEDITION OF 1858.** With several Coloured Maps and Plans, numerous Woodcuts, and 20 Chromoxylographic Engravings. 2 vols. 8vo. 42s.

HAWAII ; the Past, Present, and Future of its Island-kingdom : An Historical Account of the Sandwich Islands (Polynesia). By MANLEY HOPKINS, Hawaiian Consul-General. Post 8vo. Map and Illustrations, 12s. 6d.

WILD LIFE ON THE FJELDS OF NORWAY. By FRANCIS M. WYNDHAM. With Maps and Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

SOCIAL LIFE AND MANNERS IN AUSTRALIA ; Being the Notes of Eight Years' Experience. By a RESIDENT. Post 8vo. 5s.

IMPRESSIONS OF ROME, FLORENCE, AND TURIN. By the Author of *Amy Herbert*. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE LAKE REGIONS OF CENTRAL AFRICA : A Picture of Exploration. By RICHARD F. BURTON, Captain H.M. Indian Army. 2 vols. 8vo. Map and Illustrations, 31s. 6d.

By the same Author.

FIRST FOOTSTEPS IN EAST AFRICA ; or, An Exploration of Harar. With Maps and coloured Illustrations. 8vo. 18s.

PERSONAL NARRATIVE OF A PILGRIMAGE TO EL MEDINAH AND MECCAH. *Second Edition ;* with numerous Illustrations. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 24s.

THE CITY OF THE SAINTS ; and Across the Rocky Mountains to California. *Second Edition ;* with Maps and Illustrations. 8vo. 18s.

THE AFRICANS AT HOME: A Popular Description of Africa and the Africans, condensed from the Accounts of African Travellers from the time of Mungo Park to the Present Day. By the Rev. R. M. MACBRAIR, M.A. Fcp. 8vo. Map and 70 Woodcuts, 7s. 6d.

LOWER BRITTANY AND THE BIBLE; its Priests and People: with Notes on Religious and Civil Liberty in France. By JAMES BROMFIELD, Author of 'Brittany and the Bible,' &c. Post 8vo. price 9s.

AN AGRICULTURAL TOUR IN BELGIUM, HOLLAND, AND ON THE RHINE; With Practical Notes on the Peculiarities of Flemish Husbandry. By ROBERT SCOTT BURN. Post 8vo. with 43 Woodcuts, 7s.

A WEEK AT THE LAND'S END. By J. T. BLIGHT; assisted by E. H. RODD, R. Q. COUCH, and J. RALFS. With Map and 96 Woodcuts by the Author. Fcp. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

VISITS TO REMARKABLE PLACES: Old Halls, Battle-Fields, and Scenes illustrative of Striking Passages in English History and Poetry. By WILLIAM HOWITT. With about 80 Wood Engravings. 2 vols. square crown 8vo. 25s.

By the same Author.

THE RURAL LIFE OF ENGLAND. Cheaper Edition. With Woodcuts by Bewick and Williams. Medium 8vo. 12s. 6d.

ESSAYS ON SCIENTIFIC AND OTHER SUBJECTS, contributed to the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly Reviews*. By Sir HENRY HOLLAND, Bart., M.D., F.R.S., &c., Physician-in-Ordinary to the Queen. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 14s.

By the same Author.

MEDICAL NOTES AND REFLECTIONS. *Third Edition,* revised, with some Additions. 8vo. 18s.

CHAPTERS ON MENTAL PHYSIOLOGY; founded chiefly on Chapters contained in *Medical Notes and Reflections.* *Second Edition.* Post 8vo. 8s. 6d.

PSYCHOLOGICAL INQUIRIES : in a Series of Essays intended to illustrate the Influence of the Physical Organisation on the Mental Faculties. By Sir BENJAMIN C. BRODIE, Bart. &c. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.
PART II. Essays intended to illustrate some Points in the Physical and Moral History of Man. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

AN INTRODUCTION TO MENTAL PHILOSOPHY, on the Inductive Method. By J. D. MORELL, M.A. LL.D. 8vo. 12s.

By the same Author.

ELEMENTS OF PSYCHOLOGY : Part I., containing the Analysis of the Intellectual Powers. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

OUTLINE OF THE NECESSARY LAWS OF THOUGHT : A Treatise on Pure and Applied Logic. By the Most Rev. WILLIAM THOMSON, D.D. Archbishop of York. *Fifth Edition.* Post 8vo. 5s. 6d.

THE COMPARATIVE ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY OF THE VERTEBRATE ANIMALS. By RICHARD OWEN, F.R.S. Superintendent of the Natural History Department, British Museum, &c. 8vo. with upwards of 1,200 Wood Engravings. [*In the press.*]

HANDBOOK OF ZOOLOGY. By J. VAN DER HOEVEN, M.D. Professor of Zoology in the University of Leyden. Translated from the *Second Dutch Edition* (with additional References by the *Author*) by the Rev. W. CLARK, M.D. F.R.S. Professor of Anatomy in the University of Cambridge. 2 vols. 8vo. with 24 Plates of Figures, price 60s.

THE CYCLOPÆDIA OF ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY. Edited by R. B. TODD, M.D. F.R.S. Assisted in the various departments by nearly all the most eminent cultivators of Physiological Science of the present age. 5 vols. 8vo. with 2,853 Woodcuts, price £6. 6s.

A DICTIONARY OF PRACTICAL MEDICINE : Comprising General Pathology, the Nature and Treatment of Diseases, Morbid Structures, and the Disorders especially incidental to Climates, to Sex, and to the different Epochs of Life. By JAMES COPLAND, M.D. F.R.S. 3 vols. 8vo. price £5. 11s.

HEAT CONSIDERED AS A MODE OF MOTION : A Course of Lectures delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain. By JOHN TYNDALL, F.R.S., Professor of Natural Philosophy in the Royal Institution. With 1 Plate and 100 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 12s. 6d.

VOLCANOS, the Character of their Phenomena; their Share in the Structure and Composition of the Surface of the Globe; and their Relation to its Internal Forces: including a Descriptive Catalogue of Volcanos and Volcanic Formations. By G. POULETT SCROPE, M.P. F.R.S. F.G.S. *Second Edition*, with Map and Illustrations. 8vo. 15s.

A MANUAL OF CHEMISTRY, Descriptive and Theoretical. By WILLIAM ODLING, M.B. F.R.S., Secretary to the Chemical Society, and Professor of Practical Chemistry in Guy's Hospital. PART I. 8vo. 9s.

A DICTIONARY OF CHEMISTRY AND THE ALLIED SCIENCES, founded on that of the late Dr. URE. By HENRY WATTS, B.A. F.C.S. Editor of the *Journal of the Chemical Society*; assisted by eminent Contributors. In course of publication in 16 monthly Parts, price 5s. each, forming THREE VOLUMES.

HANDBOOK OF CHEMICAL ANALYSIS, adapted to the Unitary System of Notation: Based on the 4th Edition of Dr. H. Wills' *Anleitung zur chemischen Analyse*. By F. T. CONINGTON, M.A. F.C.S. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

CONINGTON'S TABLES OF QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS, to accompany in use his Handbook of *Chemical Analysis*. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

A HANDBOOK OF VOLUMETRICAL ANALYSIS. By ROBERT H. SCOTT, M.A. T.C.D., Secretary of the Geological Society of Dublin. Post 8vo. 4s. 6d.

A TREATISE ON ELECTRICITY, in Theory and Practice. By A. DE LA RIVE, Professor in the Academy of Geneva. Translated for the Author by C. V. WALKER, F.R.S. With Illustrations. 3 vols. 8vo. £3. 13s.

AN ESSAY ON CLASSIFICATION [The Mutual Relation of Organised Beings]. By LOUIS AGASSIZ. 8vo. 12s.

A DICTIONARY OF SCIENCE, LITERATURE, AND ART: Comprising the History, Description, and Scientific Principles of every Branch of Human Knowledge. Edited by W. T. BRANDE, F.R.S. L. and E. The Fourth Edition, revised and corrected. 8vo. [In the press.]

THE CORRELATION OF PHYSICAL FORCES. By W. R. GROVE, Q.C. M.A. V.P.R.S., Corresponding Member of the Academies of Rome, Turin, &c. *Fourth Edition.* 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE ELEMENTS OF PHYSICS. By C. F. PESCHEL, Principal of the Royal Military College, Dresden. Translated from the German, with Notes, by E. WEST. 3 vols. fcp. 8vo. 21s.

PHILLIPS'S ELEMENTARY INTRODUCTION TO MINERALOGY. A New Edition, with extensive Alterations and Additions, by H. J. BROOKE, F.R.S. F.G.S.; and W. H. MILLER, M.A. F.G.S. With numerous Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 18s.

A GLOSSARY OF MINERALOGY. By HENRY WILLIAM BRISTOW, F.G.S., of the Geological Survey of Great Britain. With 486 Figures on Wood. Crown 8vo. 12s.

ELEMENTS OF MATERIA MEDICA AND THERAPEUTICS. By JONATHAN PEREIRA, M.D. F.R.S. *Third Edition*, enlarged and improved from the Author's Materials. By A. S. TAYLOR, M.D., and G. O. REES, M.D. With numerous Woodcuts. VOL. I. 8vo. 28s.; VOL. II. PART I. 21s.; VOL. II. PART II. 26s.

OUTLINES OF ASTRONOMY. By Sir J. F. W. HERSCHEL, Bart., M.A. *Fifth Edition*, revised and corrected. With Plates and Woodcuts. 8vo. 18s.

By the same Author.

ESSAYS FROM THE EDINBURGH AND QUARTERLY REVIEWS, with Addresses and other Pieces. 8vo. 18s.

CELESTIAL OBJECTS FOR COMMON TELESCOPES. By the Rev. T. W. WEBB, M.A. F.R.A.S. With Woodcuts and Map of the Moon. 16mo. 7s.

A GUIDE TO GEOLOGY. By JOHN PHILLIPS, M.A. F.R.S. F.G.S., &c. *Fourth Edition.* With 4 Plates. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

THE EARTH AND ITS MECHANISM; an Account of the various Proofs of the Rotation of the Earth: with a Description of the Instruments used in the Experimental Demonstrations; also the Theory of Foucault's Pendulum and Gyroscope. By HENRY WORMS, F.R.A.S. F.G.S. 8vo. with 31 Woodcuts, price 10s. 6d.

THE LAW OF STORMS considered in connexion with the ordinary Movements of the Atmosphere. By H. W. DOVE, F.R.S., Member of the Academies of Moscow, Munich, St. Petersburg, &c. Second Edition, translated, with the Author's sanction, by R. H. SCOTT, M.A. Trin. Coll. Dublin. With Diagrams and Charts. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE WEATHER-BOOK; A Manual of Practical Meteorology. By Rear-Admiral ROBERT FITZ ROY, R.N. F.R.S. *Third Edition*, revised; with 16 Illustrations engraved on Wood. 8vo. 15s.

ON THE STRENGTH OF MATERIALS; Containing various original and useful Formulæ, specially applied to Tubular Bridges. Wrought-Iron and Cast-Iron Beams, &c. By THOMAS TATE, F.R.A.S. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

MANUAL OF THE SUB-KINGDOM CŒLENTERATA. By J. REAY GREENE, B.A. M.R.I.A. Being the SECOND of a New Series of MANUALS of the *Experimental and Natural Sciences*; edited by the Rev. J. A. GALBRAITH, M.A., and the Rev. S. HAUGHTON, M.A. F.R.S. Fellows of Trinity College, Dublin. With 39 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

By the same Author and Editors.

MANUAL OF PROTOZOA; With a General Introduction on the Principles of Zoology, and 16 Woodcuts: Being the First Manual of the Series. Fcp. 8vo. 2s.

THE SEA AND ITS LIVING WONDERS. By Dr. GEORGE HARTWIG. Translated by the Author from the Fourth German Edition; and embellished with numerous Illustrations from Original Designs. 8vo. 18s.

By the same Author.

THE TROPICAL WORLD: a Popular Scientific Account of the Natural History of the Animal and Vegetable Kingdoms in Equatorial Regions. With 8 Chromoxylographs and 172 Woodcut Illustrations. 8vo. 21s.

FOREST CREATURES. By CHARLES BONER, Author of 'Chamois Hunting in the Mountains of Bavaria,' &c. With 18 Illustrations from Drawings by GUIDO HAMMER. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

SKETCHES OF THE NATURAL HISTORY OF CEYLON :

With Narratives and Anecdotes illustrative of the Habits and Instincts of the Mammalia, Birds, Reptiles, Fishes, Insects, &c., including a Monograph of the Elephant. By Sir J. EMERSON TENNENT, K.C.S. LL.D. &c. With 82 Illustrations on Wood. Post 8vo. 12s. 6d.

By the same Author.

CEYLON ; An Account of the Island, Physical, Historical, and Topographical; with Notices of its Natural History, Antiquities, and Productions. Fifth Edition; with Maps, Plans, and Charts, and 90 Wood Engravings. 2 vols. 8vo. £2. 10s.

MARVELS AND MYSTERIES OF INSTINCT ; or, Curiosities of Animal Life. By G. GARRATT. *Third Edition*, revised and enlarged. Fcp. 8vo. 7s.

KIRBY AND SPENCE'S INTRODUCTION TO ENTOMOLOGY ; or, Elements of the Natural History of Insects: Comprising an Account of Noxious and Useful Insects, of their Metamorphoses, Food, Stratagems, Habitations, Societies, Motions, Noises, Hybernation, Instinct, &c. *Seventh Edition*. Crown 8vo. 5s.

YOUATT'S WORK ON THE HORSE ; Comprising also a Treatise on Draught. With numerous Woodcut Illustrations, chiefly from Designs by W. Harvey. New Edition, revised and enlarged by E. N. GABRIEL, M.R.C.S. C.V.S. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

By the same Author.

THE DOG. A New Edition; with numerous Engravings, from Designs by W. Harvey. 8vo. 6s.

THE DOG IN HEALTH AND DISEASE: Comprising the Natural History, Zoological Classification, and Varieties of the Dog, as well as the various modes of Breaking and Using him. By STONEHENGE. With 70 Wood Engravings. Square crown 8vo. 15s.

By the same Author.

THE GREYHOUND ; A Treatise on the Art of Breeding, Rearing, and Training Greyhounds for Public Running. With many Illustrations. Square crown 8vo. 21s.

- THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RURAL SPORTS ;** A Complete Account, Historical, Practical, and Descriptive, of Hunting, Shooting, Fishing, Racing, &c. By D. P. BLAINE. With above 600 Woodcut Illustrations, including 20 from Designs by JOHN LEECH. 8vo. 42s.
- COL. HAWKER'S INSTRUCTIONS TO YOUNG SPORTSMEN** in all that relates to Guns and Shooting. 11th Edition, revised by the Author's SON; with Portrait and Illustrations. Square crown 8vo. 18s.
- THE DEAD SHOT,** or Sportsman's Complete Guide ; A Treatise on the Use of the Gun, with Lessons in the Art of Shooting Game of all kinds; Dog-breaking, Pigeon-shooting, &c. By MARKSMAN. *Third Edition*; with 6 Plates. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.
- THE FLY-FISHER'S ENTOMOLOGY.** By ALFRED RONALDS. With coloured Representations of the Natural and Artificial Insect. *Sixth Edition*, revised by an Experienced Fly-Fisher; with 20 new coloured Plates. 8vo. 14s.
- THE CHASE OF THE WILD RED DEER** in the Counties of Devon and Somerset. With an APPENDIX descriptive of Remarkable Runs and Incidents connected with the Chase, from the year 1780 to the year 1860. By C. P. COLLYNS, Esq. With a Map and numerous Illustrations. Square crown 8vo., 16s.
- THE HORSE'S FOOT, AND HOW TO KEEP IT SOUND.** *Eighth Edition*; with an Appendix on Shoeing and Hunters. 12 Plates and 12 Woodcuts. By W. MILES, Esq. Imperial 8vo. 12s. 6d.
- Two Casts or Models of Off Fore Feet—No. 1, *Shod for All Purposes* ; No. 2, *Shod with Leather*, on Mr. Miles's plan—may be had, price 3s. each.
- By the same Author.*
- A PLAIN TREATISE ON HORSE-SHOEING.** With Plates and Woodcuts. *New Edition.* Post 8vo. 2s.
- HINTS ON ETIQUETTE AND THE USAGES OF SOCIETY;** With a Glance at Bad Habits. *New Edition*, revised (with Additions). By a LADY of RANK. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

SHORT WHIST ; its Rise, Progress, and Laws : With Observations to make anyone a Whist-player. Containing also the Laws of Piquet, Cassino, Ecarté, Cribbage, Backgammon. By Major A. Fcp. 8vo. 3s.

TALPA ; or, the Chronicles of a Clay Farm : An Agricultural Fragment. By C. W. HOSKYNs, Esq. With 24 Woodcuts from Designs by G. CRUIKSHANK. 16mo. 5s. 6d.

THE SAILING-BOAT : A Treatise on English and Foreign Boats, descriptive of the various forms of Boats and Sails of every Nation ; with Practical Directions for Sailing, Management, &c. By H. C. FOLKARD, Author of *The Wildfowler*, &c. Third Edition, considerably enlarged ; with about 90 Illustrations on Copper and Wood, including upwards of 50 New in this Edition. Post 8vo. price 12s. 6d.;

ATHLETIC AND GYMNASTIC EXERCISES : Comprising 114 Exercises and Feats of Agility. With a Description of the requisite Apparatus, and 64 Woodcuts. By JOHN H. HOWARD. 16mo. 7s. 6d.

THE LABORATORY OF CHEMICAL WONDERS : A Scientific Mélange for the Instruction and Entertainment of Young People. By G. W. S. PIESSE, Analytical Chemist. Crown 8vo. 5s. 6d.

By the same Author.

CHEMICAL, NATURAL, AND PHYSICAL MAGIC, for the Instruction and Entertainment of Juveniles during the Holiday Vacation. With 30 Woodcuts and an Invisible Portrait. Fcp. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THE ART OF PERFUMERY ; being the History and Theory of Odours, and the Methods of Extracting the Aromas of Plants, &c. Third Edition ; with numerous additional Recipes and Analyses, and 53 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE CRICKET FIELD ; or, the History and the Science of the Game of Cricket. By the Rev. J. PYCROFT, B.A. Trin. Coll. Oxon. *Fourth Edition* ; with 2 Plates. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

By the same Author.

THE CRICKET TUTOR ; a Treatise exclusively Practical, dedicated to the Captains of Elevens in Public Schools. 18mo. 1s.

THE WARDEN : A Novel. By ANTHONY TROLLOPE. New and cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

By the same Author.

BARCHESTER TOWERS : A Sequel to the *Warden*. New and cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s.

ELLICE : A Tale. By L. N. COMYN. Post 8vo. 9s. 6d.

THE LAST OF THE OLD SQUIRES : A Sketch. By the Rev. J. W. WARTER, B.D., Vicar of West Tarring, Sussex. *Second Edition*. Fcp. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

THE ROMANCE OF A DULL LIFE. Second Edition, revised. Post 8vo. 9s. 6d.

By the same Author.

MORNING CLOUDS. Second and cheaper Edition, revised throughout. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

THE AFTERNOON OF LIFE. Second and cheaper Edition, revised throughout. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

PROBLEMS IN HUMAN NATURE. Post 8vo. 5s.

THE TALES AND STORIES OF THE AUTHOR OF AMY HERBERT. New and cheaper Edition, in 10 vols. crown 8vo. price £1. 14s. 6d. boards; or each work separately, complete in a single volume, as follows:—

AMY HERBERT	2s. 6d.	IVORS	3s. 6d.
GERTRUDE	2s. 6d.	KATHARINE ASIITON .	3s. 6d.
The EARL'S DAUGHTER	2s. 6d.	MARGARET PERCIVAL	5s. 0d.
EXPERIENCE of LIFE...	2s. 6d.	LANETON PARSONAGE	4s. 6d.
CLEVE HALL	3s. 6d.	URSULA	4s. 6d.

SUNSETS AND SUNSHINE; or, Varied Aspects of Life. By ERSKINE NEALE, M.A., Vicar of Exning, and Chaplain to the Earl of Huntingdon. Post 8vo. 8s. 6d.

MY LIFE, AND WHAT SHALL I DO WITH IT? A Question for Young Gentlewomen. By an OLD MAID. *Fourth Edition*. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

DEACONESSES: An Essay on the Official Help of Women in Parochial Work and in Charitable Institutions. By the Rev. J. S. HOWSON, D.D., Principal of the Collegiate Institution, Liverpool. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

ESSAYS IN ECCLESIASTICAL BIOGRAPHY. By the Right Hon. Sir JAMES STEPHEN, LL.D. Fourth Edition, with a Biographical Notice of the Author, by his SON. 8vo. 14s.

By the same Author.

LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF FRANCE. Third Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 24s.

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL ESSAYS contributed to The Edinburgh Review. By the Right Hon. Lord MACAULAY. Four Editions, as follows:—

1. LIBRARY EDITION (the *Tenth*), 3 vols. 8vo. 36s.
2. The TRAVELLER'S EDITION, complete in ONE VOLUME, with Portrait and Vignette. Square crown 8vo. 21s.
3. An EDITION in VOLUMES for the POCKET, 3 vols. fcp. 8vo. 21s.
4. The PEOPLE'S EDITION, complete in 2 vols. crown 8vo. price 8s.

LORD MACAULAY'S MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS: comprising his Contributions to *Knight's Quarterly Magazine*, Articles contributed to the Edinburgh Review not included in his *Critical and Historical Essays*, Biographies written for the *Encyclopædia Britannica* Miscellaneous Poems and Inscriptions. 2 vols. 8vo. with Portrait, 21s.

THE REV. SYDNEY SMITH'S MISCELLANEOUS WORKS: Including his Contributions to The Edinburgh Review. Four Editions, viz.

1. LIBRARY EDITION (the *Fourth*), in 3 vols. 8vo. with Portrait, 36s.
2. The TRAVELLER'S EDITION, complete in ONE VOLUME, with Portrait and Vignette. Square crown 8vo. 21s.
3. An EDITION in VOLUMES for the POCKET, 3 vols. fcp. 8vo. 21s.
4. The PEOPLE'S EDITION, complete in 2 vols. crown 8vo. 8s.

By the same Author.

ELEMENTARY SKETCHES OF MORAL PHILOSOPHY, delivered at the Royal Institution. Fcp. 8vo. 7s.

THE WIT AND WISDOM OF THE REV. SYDNEY SMITH: A Selection of the most memorable Passages in his Writings and Conversation. 16mo. 7s. 6d.

ESSAYS SELECTED FROM CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE
Edinburgh Review. By H. ROGERS. 2nd Edition, 3 vols. fcp. 8vo. 21s.

THE ECLIPSE OF FAITH; or, A Visit to a Religious
Sceptic. By HENRY ROGERS. *Tenth Edition*. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

DEFENCE OF THE ECLIPSE OF FAITH, by its Author:
Being a Rejoinder to Professor Newman's *Reply*. Fcp. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

SELECTIONS FROM THE CORRESPONDENCE OF R. E.
H. GREYSON, Esq. Edited by the Author of *The Eclipse of Faith*.
Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

ESSAYS AND REVIEWS. By the Rev. W. TEMPLE,
D.D. the Rev. R. WILLIAMS, B.D. the Rev. B. POWELL, M.A. the Rev.
H. B. WILSON, B.D. C. W. GOODWIN, M.A. the Rev. M. PATTISON, B.D.
and the Rev. B. JOWETT, M.A. *Tenth Edition*. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

THE HISTORY OF THE SUPERNATURAL IN ALL
AGES AND NATIONS, IN ALL CHURCHES, CHRISTIAN AND
PAGAN: Demonstrating a Universal Faith. By WILLIAM HOWITT,
Author of *Colonisation and Christianity*, &c. 2 vols. post 8vo. 18s.

THE MISSION AND EXTENSION OF THE CHURCH AT
HOME, considered in Eight Lectures, preached before the University
of Oxford in the year 1861, at the Lecture founded by the late Rev. J.
Bampton, M.A. By J. SANDFORD, B.D. Archdeacon of Coventry. 8vo.
price 12s.

THE TYPES OF GENESIS BRIEFLY CONSIDERED AS
REVEALING THE DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN NATURE. By
ANDREW JUKES. *Second Edition*, revised. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL COMMENTARY ON THE
OLD TESTAMENT; with a New Translation. By M. M. KALISCH,
Ph.D. VOL. I. The Book of Genesis, 8vo. 18s.; or the same
adapted to the use of the General Reader, 12s. VOL. II. The Book of
Exodus, 8vo. 15s.; or the same adapted to the use of the General
Reader, 12s.

A HEBREW GRAMMAR WITH EXERCISES. By M. M.
KALISCH, Ph.D. PART I. *The Outlines of the Language, with Exercises;*
being a Practical Introduction to the Study of Hebrew. 8vo. 12s. 6d.
PART II. *The Exceptional Forms and Constructions;* preceded by an
Essay on the History of Hebrew Grammar. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR'S ENTIRE WORKS: With Life by BISHOP HEBER. Revised and corrected by the Rev. C. P. EDEN, Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. 10 vols. 8vo. £5. 5s.

MOSHEIM'S ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY. The Rev. Dr. MURDOCK's Literal Translation from the Latin, as edited, with Additional Notes, by HENRY SOAMES, M.A. *Third Revised Edition*, carefully re-edited and brought down to the Present Time by the Rev. WILLIAM STUBBS, M.A. Vicar of Navestock, and Librarian to the Archbishop of Canterbury. 3 vols. 8vo. [In the press.]

A COURSE OF ENGLISH READING, adapted to every taste and capacity; or, How and What to Read: With Literary Anecdotes. By the Rev. J. PYCROFT, B.A. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

PASSING THOUGHTS ON RELIGION. By the Author of *Amy Herbert*. Seventh Edition. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

By the same Author.

SELF-EXAMINATION BEFORE CONFIRMATION: With Devotions and Directions for Confirmation-Day. 32mo. 1s. 6d.

READINGS FOR A MONTH PREPARATORY TO CONFIRMATION: Compiled from the Works of Writers of the Early and of the English Church. Fcp. 8vo. 4s.

READINGS FOR EVERY DAY IN LENT; Compiled from the Writings of BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

LEGENDS OF THE SAINTS AND MARTYRS, as represented in Christian Art. By Mrs. JAMESON. Fourth Edition, revised; with 17 Etchings and 180 Woodcuts. 2 vols. square crown 8vo. 31s. 6d.

By the same Author.

LEGENDS OF THE MONASTIC ORDERS, as represented in Christian Art. New and cheaper Edition, being the Third; with 11 Etchings and 88 Woodcuts. Square crown 8vo. price 21s.

LEGENDS OF THE MADONNA, as represented in Christian Art. Second Edition, enlarged; with 27 Etchings and 165 Woodcuts. Square crown 8vo. 28s.

THE HISTORY OF OUR LORD AND OF HIS PRECURSOR JOHN THE BAPTIST; with the Personages and Typical Subjects of the Old Testament, as represented in Christian Art. Square crown 8vo. with many Etchings and Woodcuts. [In the press.]

CATS' AND FARLIE'S BOOK OF EMBLEMS : Moral

Emblems, with Aphorisms, Adages, and Proverbs of all Nations : Comprising 60 circular Vignettes, 60 Tail-pieces, and a Frontispiece composed from their works by J. LEIGHTON, F.S.A., and engraved on Wood. The Text translated and edited, with Additions, by R. PIÇOT. Imperial 8vo. 31s. 6d.

BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS : With 126 Illustra-

tions on Steel and Wood, from Original Designs by C. Bennett ; and a Preface by the Rev. C. KINGSLEY. Fcp. 4to. 21s.

THEOLOGIA GERMANICA : Translated by SUSANNA

WINKWORTH. With a Preface by the Rev. C. KINGSLEY ; and a Letter by Baron BUNSEN. Second Edition. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

LYRA GERMANICA. Translated from the German by

CATHERINE WINKWORTH. FIRST SERIES, Hymns for the Sundays and Chief Festivals of the Christian Year. SECOND SERIES, the Christian Life. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s. each series.

HYMNS FROM LYRA GERMANICA. 18mo. 1s.**LYRA GERMANICA.** FIRST SERIES, as above, translated

by C. WINKWORTH. With Illustrations from Original Designs by John Leighton, F.S.A., engraved on Wood under his superintendence. Fcp. 4to. 21s.

THE CHORALE-BOOK FOR ENGLAND ; A Complete

Hymn-Book for Public and Private Worship, in accordance with the Services and Festivals of the Church of England : The *Hymns* from the *Lyra Germanica* and other Sources, translated from the German by C. WINKWORTH ; the *Tunes*, from the Sacred Music of the Lutheran, Latin, and other Churches, for Four Voices, with Historical Notes, &c., compiled and edited by W. S. BENNETT, Professor of Music in the University of Cambridge, and by O. GOLDSCHMIDT. Fcp. 4to. price 10s. 6d. cloth, or 18s. half-bound in morocco.

HYMNOLOGIA CHRISTIANA ; or, Psalms and Hymns

selected and arranged in the order of the Christian Seasons. By BENJAMIN HALL KENNEDY, D.D. Prebendary of Lichfield. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

LYRA DOMESTICA: Christian Songs for Domestic Edification. Translated from the *Psaltery and Harp* of C. J. P. SPITTA. By RICHARD MASSIE. Fourth Edition. Fcp. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

LYRA EUCHARISTICA; Hymns and Verses, Ancient and Modern, on the Holy Communion. Edited by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. Fcp. 8vo. uniform with *Lyra Germanica*.

LYRA SACRA; Being a Collection of Hymns, Ancient and Modern, Odes, and Fragments of Sacred Poetry. Compiled and edited by the Rev. B. W. SAVILE, M.A. Second Edition. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

THE WIFE'S MANUAL; or, Prayers, Thoughts, and Songs on Several Occasions of a Matron's Life. By the Rev. W. CALVERT, M.A. Ornamented in the style of *Queen Elizabeth's Prayer-Book*. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

HORNE'S INTRODUCTION TO THE CRITICAL STUDY AND KNOWLEDGE OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. *Eleventh Edition*, revised, corrected, and brought down to the Present Time. With 4 Maps and 22 Woodcuts and Facsimiles. 4 vols. 8vo. £3. 13s. 6d.

VOL. I.—A Summary of the Evidence for the Genuineness, Authenticity, Uncorrupted Preservation, and Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. By the Rev. T. H. HORNE, B.D. 8vo. 15s.

VOL. II. by AYRE.—An Introduction to the Criticism of the *Old Testament* and to *Biblical Interpretation*. Revised and Edited by the Rev. JOHN AYRE, M.A. 8vo. 25s.

Or—VOL. II. by DAVIDSON.—The Text of the *Old Testament* considered: With a Treatise on Sacred Interpretation; and a brief Introduction to the *Old Testament Books* and the *Apocrypha*. By S. DAVIDSON, D.D. (Halle) and LL.D. 8vo. 25s.

VOL. III.—A Summary of Biblical Geography and Antiquities. By the Rev. T. H. HORNE, B.D. 8vo. 18s.

VOL. IV.—An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the *New Testament*. By the Rev. T. H. HORNE, B.D. The Critical Part re-written and the remainder revised and edited by S. P. TREGELLES, LL.D. *Second Edition*. 8vo. 18s.

HORNE'S COMPENDIOUS INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE BIBLE. *Tenth Edition*, carefully re-edited by the Rev. JOHN AYRE, M.A., of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. With 3 Maps and 6 Illustrations. Post 8vo. 9s.

INSTRUCTIONS IN THE DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE OF CHRISTIANITY. Intended chiefly as an Introduction to Confirmation. By the Right Rev. G. E. L. COTTON, D.D., BISHOP of CALCUTTA. 18mo. 2s. 6d.

THE TREASURY OF BIBLE KNOWLEDGE : Comprising a Summary of the Evidences of Christianity; the Principles of Biblical Criticism; the History, Chronology, and Geography of the Scriptures; an Account of the Formation of the Canon; separate Introductions to the several Books of the Bible, &c. By the Rev. JOHN AYRE, M.A. Fcp. 8vo. with Maps, Engravings on Steel, and numerous Woodcuts; uniform with *Maunder's Treasuries*. [Nearly ready.]

BOWDLER'S FAMILY SHAKSPEARE ; in which nothing is *added* to the Original Text, but those words and expressions are *omitted* which cannot with propriety be read aloud. Cheaper Genuine Edition, complete in 1 vol. large type, with 36 Woodcut Illustrations, price 14s. Or, with the same ILLUSTRATIONS, in 6 volumes for the pocket, price 5s. each.

GOLDSMITH'S POETICAL WORKS. Edited by BOLTON CORNEY, Esq. Illustrated with numerous Wood Engravings, from Designs by Members of the Etching Club. Square crown 8vo. 21s.

MOORE'S LALLA ROOKH. With 13 Plates, engraved on Steel, from Original Designs by Corbould, Meadows, and Stephanoff. Square crown 8vo. 15s.

TENNIEL'S EDITION OF MOORE'S LALLA ROOKH: With 68 Woodcut Illustrations from Original Drawings, and 5 Ornamental Titles of Persian Design by T. SULMAN, Jun. Fcp. 4to. price 21s.

MOORE'S IRISH MELODIES: With 13 highly-finished Steel Plates, from Original Designs by Eminent Artists. Square crown 8vo. 21s.

MOORE'S POETICAL WORKS, Cheapest Edition of the entire Works, complete in One Volume, including the Autobiographical Prefaces and Notes contributed to the Collective Edition; printed from Ruby Type, with Portrait on Steel. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. cloth extra, gilt edges.

POETICAL WORKS OF LETITIA ELIZABETH LANDON

(L.E.L.) Comprising the *Improvisatrice*, the *Venetian Bracelet*, the *Golden Violet*, the *Troubadour*, and Poetical Remains. New Edition; with 2 Vignettes. 2 vols. 16mo. 10s.

LAYS OF ANCIENT ROME; with *Ivry* and the *Armada*.

By the Right Hon. Lord MACAULAY. 16mo. 4s. 6d.

LORD MACAULAY'S LAYS OF ANCIENT ROME. With

about 90 Illustrations, Original and from the Antique, engraved on Wood from Drawings by GEORGE SCHARF. Fcp. 4to. 21s.

POEMS. By MATTHEW ARNOLD. FIRST SERIES, Third Edition. Fcp. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

By the same Author. •

MEROPE: A Tragedy. With a Preface and an Historical Introduction. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

SOUTHEY'S POETICAL WORKS; with all the Author's last Introductions and Notes. *Library Edition*, complete in One Volume, with Portrait and Vignette. Medium 8vo. 14s.; or in 10 vols. fcp. 8vo. with Portrait and 19 Vignettes, 35s.

By the same Author.

THE DOCTOR, &c. Complete in One Volume. Edited by the Rev. J. W. WALTER, B.D. With Portrait, Vignette, Bust, and coloured Plate. Square crown 8vo. 12s. 6d.

CALDERON'S THREE DRAMAS: *Love the Greatest Enchantment*, *The Sorceries of Sin*, and *The Devotion of the Cross*, attempted in English Asonante and other Imitative Verse, by D. F. MACCARTHY, M.R.I.A., with Notes, and the Spanish Text. Fcp. 4to. 15s.

TUSCAN SCULPTURE, from its Revival to its Decline.

By CHARLES C. PERKINS. 1 vol. 4to. with numerous Illustrations.

[*In the press.*]

A SURVEY OF HUMAN PROGRESS TOWARDS

HIGHER CIVILISATION: a Progress as little perceived by the multitude in any age, as is the growing of a tree by the children who sport under its shade. By NEIL ARNOTT, M.D., F.R.S., &c. 8vo. price 6s. 6d.

COLONISATION AND COLONIES: Being a Series of Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford in 1839, '40, and '41. By HERMAN MERIVALE, M.A., Professor of Political Economy. Second Edition, with Notes and Additions. 8vo. 18s.

C. M. WILLICH'S POPULAR TABLES for Ascertaining the Value of Lifehold, Leasehold, and Church Property, Renewal Fines, &c.; the Public Funds; Annual Average Price and Interest on Consols from 1731 to 1861; Chemical, Geographical, Astronomical, Trigonometrical Tables, &c. &c. *Fifth Edition*, enlarged. Post 8vo. 10s.

THOMSON'S TABLES OF INTEREST, at Three, Four, Four and a-Half, and Five per Cent., from One Pound to Ten Thousand and from 1 to 365 Days. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

A DICTIONARY, PRACTICAL, THEORETICAL, AND HISTORICAL, of Commerce and Commercial Navigation. By J. R. M'CULLOCH, Esq. Illustrated with Maps and Plans. New Edition, containing much additional Information. 8vo. 50s.

By the same Author.

A DICTIONARY, GEOGRAPHICAL, STATISTICAL, AND HISTORICAL, of the various Countries, Places, and principal Natural Objects in the World. New Edition, revised; with 6 Maps. 2 vols. 8vo. 63s.

A MANUAL OF GEOGRAPHY, Physical, Industrial, and Political. By WILLIAM HUGHES, F.R.G.S., &c., Professor of Geography in Queen's College, London. New and thoroughly revised Edition: with 6 coloured Maps. Fcp. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Or, in Two Parts: PART I. Europe, 3s. 6d.; PART II. Asia, Africa, America, Australasia, and Polynesia, 4s.

By the same Author.

THE GEOGRAPHY OF BRITISH HISTORY; a Geographical Description of the British Islands at Successive Periods, from the Earliest Times to the Present Day: with a Sketch of the Commencement of Colonisation on the part of the English Nation. With 6 coloured Maps. Fcp. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

A NEW BRITISH GAZETTEER; or, Topographical Dictionary of the British Islands and Narrow Seas: Comprising concise Descriptions of about 60,000 Places, Seats, Natural Features, and Objects of Note, founded on the best Authorities. By J. A. SHARP. 2 vols. 8vo. £2. 16s.

A NEW DICTIONARY OF GEOGRAPHY, Descriptive, Physical, Statistical, and Historical: Forming a complete General Gazetteer of the World. By A. K. JOHNSTON, F.R.S.E., &c. *Second Edition*, revised. In One Volume of 1,360 pages, comprising about 50,000 Names of Places. 8vo. 30s.

AN ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF CIVIL ENGINEERING, Historical, Theoretical, and Practical. Illustrated by upwards of 3,000 Woodcuts. By E. CREST, C.E. *Second Edition*, revised and extended. 8vo. 42s.

THE ENGINEER'S HANDBOOK; explaining the Principles which should guide the young Engineer in the Construction of Machinery, with the necessary Rules, Proportions, and Tables. By C. S. LOWNDES, Engineer. Post 8vo. 5s.

USEFUL INFORMATION FOR ENGINEERS: Being a FIRST SERIES of Lectures delivered before the Working Engineers of Yorkshire and Lancashire. By W. FAIRBAIRN, LL.D., F.R.S., F.G.S. With Plates and Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

SECOND SERIES: Containing Experimental Researches on the Collapse of Boiler Flues and the Strength of Materials, and Lectures on subjects connected with Mechanical Engineering, &c. With Plates and Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

By the same Author.

A TREATISE ON MILLS AND MILLWORK. VOL. I. on the principles of Mechanism and on Prime Movers. With Plates and Woodcuts. 8vo. 16s.

AN ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF ARCHITECTURE, Historical, Theoretical, and Practical. By JOSEPH GWILT. With more than 1,000 Wood Engravings, from Designs by J. S. Gwilt. 8vo. 42s.

LOUDON'S ENCYCLOPÆDIA of Cottage, Farm, and Villa Architecture and Furniture. New Edition, edited by Mrs. Loudon; with more than 2,000 Woodcuts. 8vo. 63s.

THE ELEMENTS OF MECHANISM, designed for Students of Applied Mechanics. By T. M. GOODEVE, M.A., Professor of Natural Philosophy in King's College, London. With 206 Figures on Wood. Post 8vo. 6s. 6d.

URE'S DICTIONARY OF ARTS, MANUFACTURES, AND MINES. Fifth Edition, re-written and enlarged; with nearly 2,000 Wood Engravings. Edited by ROBERT HUNT, F.R.S., F.S.S., Keeper of Mining Records, &c., assisted by numerous gentlemen eminent in Science and connected with the Arts and Manufactures. 3 vols. 8vo. £4.

AN ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF DOMESTIC ECONOMY: Comprising such subjects as are most immediately connected with House-keeping. By THOS. WEBSTER; assisted by Mrs. PARKES. With nearly 1,000 Woodcuts. 8vo. 31s. 6d.

MODERN COOKERY FOR PRIVATE FAMILIES, reduced to a System of Easy Practice in a Series of carefully-tested Receipts, in which the Principles of Baron Liebig and other eminent Writers have been as much as possible applied and explained. By ELIZA ACTON. Newly revised and enlarged Edition; with 8 Plates, comprising 27 Figures, and 150 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

A PRACTICAL TREATISE ON BREWING, based on Chemical and Economical Principles: With Formulæ for Public Brewers, and Instructions for Private Families. By W. BLACK. 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

ON FOOD AND ITS DIGESTION: Being an Introduction to Dietetics. By W. BRINTON, M.D., Physician to St. Thomas's Hospital, &c. With 48 Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 12s.

HINTS TO MOTHERS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF THEIR HEALTH DURING THE PERIOD OF PREGNANCY AND IN THE LYING-IN ROOM. By T. BULL, M.D. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

By the same Author.

THE MATERNAL MANAGEMENT OF CHILDREN IN HEALTH AND DISEASE. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

LECTURES ON THE DISEASES OF INFANCY AND CHILDHOOD. By CHARLES WEST, M.D., &c. *Fourth Edition*, carefully revised throughout; with numerous additional Cases, and a copious INDEX. 8vo. 14s.

THE PATENTEE'S MANUAL: A Treatise on the Law and Practice of Letters Patent, especially intended for the use of Patentees and Inventors. By J. JOHNSON and J. H. JOHNSON, Esqrs. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE PRACTICAL DRAUGHTSMAN'S BOOK OF INDUSTRIAL DESIGN. *Second Edition, Enlarged.* By W. JOHNSON, Assoc. Inst. C.E. 4to. 28s. 6d.

THE PRACTICAL MECHANIC'S JOURNAL: An Illustrated Record of Mechanical and Engineering Science, and Epitome of Patent Inventions. 4to. price 1s. monthly.

THE PRACTICAL MECHANIC'S JOURNAL SCIENTIFIC RECORD OF THE INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION OF 1862. A full and elaborate Illustrated Account of the Exhibition, contributed by 42 Writers of eminence in the Departments of Science and Art. In One Volume, comprising 630 pages of Letterpress, illustrated by 20 Plate Engravings and 900 Woodcuts. 4to. 28s. 6d.

COLLIERIES AND COLLIERS; A Handbook of the Law and leading Cases relating thereto. By J. C. FOWLER, Barrister-at-Law; Stipendiary Magistrate for the District of Merthyr Tydfil and Aberdare. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

THE THEORY OF WAR ILLUSTRATED by numerous Examples from History. By Lieut.-Col. MACDOUGALL, late Superintendent of the Staff College. *Third Edition*, with 10 Plans. Post 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

PROJECTILE WEAPONS OF WAR AND EXPLOSIVE COMPOUNDS. By J. SCOFFERN, M.B. Lond. late Professor of Chemistry in the Aldersgate School of Medicine. *Fourth Edition.* Post 8vo. with Woodcuts, 9s. 6d.

SUPPLEMENT, containing New Resources of Warfare, price 2s.

A MANUAL FOR NAVAL CADETS. By JOHN M'NEIL BOYD, late Captain R.N. Published with the Sanction and Approval of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty. Second Edition; with 240 Woodcuts, 2 coloured Plates of Signals, &c., and 11 coloured Plates of Flags. Post 8vo. 12s. 6d.

PROJECTION AND CALCULATION OF THE SPHERE.

For Young Sea Officers; being a complete Initiation into Nautical Astronomy. By S. M. SAXBY, R.N., Principal Instructor of Naval Engineers, H.M. Steam Reserve. With 77 Diagrams. Post 8vo. 5s.

By the same Author.

THE STUDY OF STEAM AND THE MARINE ENGINE.

For Young Sea Officers in H.M. Navy, the Merchant Navy, &c.; being a complete Initiation into a knowledge of Principles and their Application to Practice. Post 8vo. with 87 Diagrams, 5s. 6d.

A TREATISE ON THE STEAM ENGINE, in its various Applications to Mines, Mills, Steam Navigation, Railways, and Agriculture. With Theoretical Investigations respecting the Motive Power of Heat and the Proportions of Steam-Engines; Tables of the Right Dimensions of every Part; and Practical Instructions for the Manufacture and Management of every Species of Engine in actual use. By JOHN BOURNE, C.E. Fifth Edition; with 37 Plates and 546 Woodcuts (200 new in this Edition). 4to. 42s.

By the same Author.

A CATECHISM OF THE STEAM ENGINE, in its various Applications to Mines, Mills, Steam Navigation, Railways, and Agriculture; with Practical Instructions for the Manufacture and Management of Engines of every class. *New Edition*, with 80 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

HANDBOOK OF FARM LABOUR: Comprising Labour Statistics; Steam, Water, Wind; Horse Power; Hand Power; Cost of Farm Operations; Monthly Calendar; APPENDIX on Boarding Agricultural Labourers, &c.; and INDEX. By JOHN CHALMERS MORTON, Editor of the *Agricultural Gazette*, &c. 16mo. 1s. 6d.

By the same Author.

HANDBOOK OF DAIRY HUSBANDRY: Comprising Dairy Statistics; Food of the Cow; Choice and Treatment of the Cow; Milk; Butter; Cheese; General Management of a Dairy Farm; Monthly Calendar of Daily Operations; APPENDIX of Statistics; and INDEX. 16mo. 1s. 6d.

CONVERSATIONS ON NATURAL PHILOSOPHY: In which the Elements of Physical Science are familiarly Explained and Illustrated. By JANE MARCET. *Nineteenth Edition*, carefully revised throughout; with 34 Plates. Fcp. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

By the same Author, on the same plan.

CONVERSATIONS ON CHEMISTRY. 2 Vols. fcp. 8vo. 14s.

CONVERSATIONS ON LAND AND WATER, price 5s. 6d.

CONVERSATIONS ON POLITICAL ECONOMY, price 7s. 6d.

BAYLDON'S ART OF VALUING RENTS AND TILLAGES, and Claims of Tenants upon Quitting Farms, at both Michaelmas and Lady-Day. *Seventh Edition*, enlarged. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

AN ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF AGRICULTURE: Comprising the Theory and Practice of the Valuation, Transfer, Laying-out, Improvement, and Management of Landed Property, and of the Cultivation and Economy of the Animal and Vegetable Productions of Agriculture. By J. C. LOUDON. With 1,100 Woodcuts. 8vo. 31s. 6d.

By the same Author.

AN ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF GARDENING: Comprising the Theory and Practice of Horticulture, Floriculture, Arboriculture, and Landscape Gardening. Corrected and improved by Mrs. LOUDON. With 1,000 Woodcuts. 8vo. 31s. 6d.

AN ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF TREES AND SHRUBS: Containing the Hardy Trees and Shrubs of Great Britain, Native and Foreign, Scientifically and Popularly Described, With 2,000 Woodcuts. 8vo. 50s.

AN ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF PLANTS: Comprising the Specific Character, Description, Culture, History, Application in the Arts, and every other desirable Particular respecting all the Plants found in Great Britain. Corrected by Mrs. LOUDON. With upwards of 12,000 Woodcuts. 8vo. £3. 13s. 6d.

THE CABINET LAWYER: A Popular Digest of the Laws of England, Civil and Criminal: Comprising also a Dictionary of Law Terms, Maxims, Statutes, and much other useful Legal Information. *19th Edition*, extended by the Author; with the Statutes and Legal Decisions to *Michaelmas Term*, 24 and 25 Victoria. Fcp. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE EXECUTOR'S GUIDE. By J. C. HUDSON. New and enlarged Edition, revised by the Author. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

By the same Author.

PLAIN DIRECTIONS FOR MAKING WILLS IN CONFORMITY WITH THE LAW. New Edition, corrected and revised by the Author. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

THE BRITISH FLORA: Comprising the Phaenogamous or Flowering Plants, and the Ferns. 8th Edition, with Additions and Corrections; and numerous Figures engraved on 12 Plates. By Sir W. J. HOOKER, K.H., &c.; and G. A. WALKER-ARNOTT, LL.D., F.L.S. 12mo. 14s.; with the Plates coloured, 21s.

BRYOLOGIA BRITANNICA: Containing the Mosses of Great Britain and Ireland, systematically arranged and described according to the method of *Bruch* and *Schimper*; with 61 illustrative Plates. By WILLIAM WILSON. 8vo. 42s.; or, with the Plates coloured, price £4. 4s.

HISTORY OF THE BRITISH FRESH-WATER ALGÆ: Including Descriptions of the Desmideæ and Diatomaceæ. By A. H. HASSALL, M.D. With 100 Plates of Figures. 2 vols. 8vo. £1. 15s.

By the same Author.

ADULTERATIONS DETECTED; or, Plain Instructions for the Discovery of Frauds in Food and Medicine. By ARTHUR HILL HASSALL, M.D. Lond., Analyst of *The Lancet* Sanitary Commission. With 225 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 17s. 6d.

CORDON-TRAINING OF FRUIT TREES, Diagonal, Vertical, Spiral, Horizontal, adapted to the Orchard-House and Open-Air Culture. By Rev. T. COLLINGS BRÉHAUT. Fcp. 8vo. with Woodcuts, 3s. 6d.

THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF HORTICULTURE; or, An Attempt to Explain the Principal Operations of Gardening upon Physiological Grounds. By J. LINDLEY, M.D., F.R.S., F.L.S. With 98 Woodcuts. 8vo. 21s.

By the same Author.

AN INTRODUCTION TO BOTANY. New Edition, revised and enlarged; with 6 Plates and many Woodcuts. 2 vols. 8vo. 24s.

THE ROSE AMATEUR'S GUIDE : Containing ample Descriptions of all the fine leading varieties of Roses, regularly classed in their respective Families; their History and Mode of Culture. By THOMAS RIVERS. *Seventh Edition.* Fcp. 8vo. 4s.

INDOOR GARDENING for Balconies, Plant-Cases, Green-houses, and Windows. By Miss MALING, Author of 'Indoor Plants.' Fcp. 8vo. with Frontispiece.

THE TREASURY OF NATURAL HISTORY ; or, Popular Dictionary of Zoology : in which the Characteristics that distinguish the different Classes, Genera, and Species are combined with a variety of interesting information illustrative of the Habits, Instincts, and General Economy of the Animal Kingdom. By SAMUEL MAUNDER. With above 900 accurate Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. 10s.

By the same Author.

THE SCIENTIFIC AND LITERARY TREASURY : A Popular Encyclopædia of Science and the Belles-Lettres ; including all branches of Science, and every subject connected with Literature and Art. Fcp. 8vo. 10s.

THE TREASURY OF GEOGRAPHY, Physical, Historical, Descriptive, and Political ; containing a succinct Account of every Country in the World. Completed by WILLIAM HUGHES, F.R.G.S. With 7 Maps and 16 Plates. Fcp. 8vo. 10s.

THE HISTORICAL TREASURY : Comprising a General Introductory Outline of Universal History, Ancient and Modern, and a Series of Separate Histories of every principal Nation. Fcp. 8vo. 10s.

THE BIOGRAPHICAL TREASURY : Consisting of Memoirs, Sketches, and Brief Notices of above 12,000 Eminent Persons of All Ages and Nations. *12th Edition.* Fcp. 8vo. 10s.

THE TREASURY OF KNOWLEDGE AND LIBRARY OF REFERENCE : Comprising an English Dictionary and Grammar, a Universal Gazetteer, a Classical Dictionary, a Chronology, a Law Dictionary, a Synopsis of the Peerage, useful Tables, &c. Fcp. 8vo. 10s.

Uniform with the above.

THE TREASURY OF BOTANY. By Dr. J. LINDLEY.
[*In the press.*]

THE TREASURY OF BIBLE KNOWLEDGE. By Rev. J. AYRE, M.A.
[*In the press.*]

INDEX.

<i>Acton's Cookery-Book</i>	32	Calderon's Dramas, by <i>MacCarthy</i>	29
Afternoon of Life	22	<i>Calvert's Wife's Manual</i>	27
<i>Agassiz</i> on Classification	16	<i>Cats' and Farlie's Emblema</i>	26
<i>Aicock's Japan</i>	1	Chorale-Book (The) for England.....	26
Alpine Guide (The).....	11	<i>Clark's Comparative Grammar</i>	10
<i>Arago's Scientific Biographies</i>	6	<i>Clough's Lives from Plutarch</i>	7
<i>Arago's Meteorological Essays</i>	6	<i>Colenso</i> on the Pentateuch.....	1
<i>Arago's Popular Astronomy</i>	6	<i>Collins</i> on Stag-Hunting.....	20
<i>Arago's Treatise on Comets</i>	6	<i>Comyn Ellice</i> , a Tale.....	22
<i>Arbuthnot's Herzegovina</i>	12	<i>Conington's Chemical Analysis</i>	16
<i>Arnold's Manual of English Literature</i>	11	<i>Conington's Qualitative Analysis</i>	16
<i>Arnold's Poems</i>	29	<i>Contanseau's French Dictionaries</i>	10
<i>Arnold's Merope</i>	29	<i>Conybeare and Howson's St. Paul</i>	8
<i>Arnold</i> on Translating Homer	11	<i>Copland's Dictionary of Medicine</i>	15
<i>Arnott</i> on Progress.....	29	<i>Cotton's Instructions in Christianity</i>	28
Autobiography of Charles V.....	2	<i>Cox's Tales from Greek Mythology</i>	7
<i>Ayre's Treasury of Bible Knowledge</i>	28	<i>Cox's Tale of the Great Persian War</i>	7
Bacon's Life, by <i>Spedding</i>	4	<i>Cox's Tales of the Gods and Heroes</i>	7
<i>Bacon's Works</i>	4	<i>Cresy's Encyclop. of Civil Engineering</i>	31
<i>Ball's Guide to the Western Alps</i>	11	Cricket Field (The).....	21
<i>Bayldon's Rents and Tillages</i>	35	Cricket Tutor (The)	21
<i>Beard's Port-Royal</i>	9	<i>Crowe's History of France</i>	3
<i>Berlebach's Alps</i>	12	<i>D'Aubigné's Calvin</i>	1
Black on Brewing	32	Dead Shot (The)	20
<i>Blaine's Encyclopædia of Rural Sports</i>	20	<i>De la Rive's Reminiscences of Cavour</i>	2
<i>Blight's Land's End</i>	14	<i>De la Rive's Electricity</i>	16
<i>Boner's Forest Creatures</i>	18	<i>De Tocqueville</i> on Democracy	2
<i>Bourne</i> on the Steam Engine	34	<i>De Witt's Jefferson</i>	2
<i>Bourne's Catechism</i> of ditto	34	<i>Döllinger's Gentile and Jew</i>	8
<i>Bowdler's Family Shakspeare</i>	28	<i>Dove's Law of Storms</i>	18
<i>Boyd's Naval Cadet's Manual</i>	34	<i>Eastlake</i> on Oil Painting	5
<i>Brande's Dictionary of Science</i>	16	Eclipse of Faith (The)	24
<i>Bréhaud</i> on Cordon-Training	36	Defence of ditto	24
<i>Brodie's Psychological Inquiries</i>	15	Essays and Reviews	24
<i>Brinton</i> on Food.....	32	<i>Fairbairn's Information for Engineers</i>	31
<i>Bristow's Glossary of Mineralogy</i>	17	<i>Fairbairn's Treatise on Millwork</i>	31
<i>Bramfield's Brittany and the Bible</i>	14	<i>Fitz Roy's Weather Book</i>	18
Brunel's Life, by <i>Beamish</i>	4	<i>Folkard's Sailing Boat</i>	21
<i>Bull's Hints to Mothers</i>	32	<i>Forster's Life of Eliot</i>	2
<i>Bull</i> on Management of Children	32	<i>Fowler's Collieries</i>	33
<i>Bunsen's Hippolytus</i>	9	<i>Freshfield's Alpine Byways</i>	11
<i>Bunsen's Outlines of Universal History</i> ...	9	<i>Freshfield's Tour in the Grisons</i>	11
<i>Bunsen's Analecta Ante-Nicæna</i>	9	<i>Garratt's Marvels of Instinct</i>	19
<i>Bunsen's Ancient Egypt</i>	9	<i>Goldsmith's Poems</i> , illustrated	28
<i>Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress</i> , illustrated....	26	<i>Goodeve's Elements of Mechanism</i>	32
<i>Burke's Vicissitudes of Families</i>	6	<i>Green's English Princesses</i>	4
<i>Burn's Agricultural Tour in Belgium</i>	14	<i>Greene's Manual of Cæuterata</i>	18
<i>Burton's Lake Regions of Central Africa</i> ..	13	<i>Greene's Manual of Protozoa</i>	18
<i>Burton's Footsteps in East Africa</i>	13	<i>Greyson's Correspondence</i>	24
<i>Burton's Medina and Mecca</i>	13	<i>Grove</i> on Physical Forces.....	17
<i>Burton's City of the Saints</i>	13		
Cabinet Lawyer (The)	35		

<i>Guill's</i> Encyclopædia of Architecture.....	31	<i>Lyra Domestica</i>	27
<i>Hartwig's</i> Sea	18	<i>Lyra Eucharistica</i>	27
<i>Hartwig's</i> Tropical World	18	<i>Lyra Germanica</i>	26
<i>Hassall's</i> Freshwater Algæ	36	<i>Lyra Sacra</i>	27
<i>Hassall's</i> Adulterations Detected.....	35	<i>Macaulay's</i> England	3
<i>Havelock's</i> Life, by <i>Marshman</i>	6	<i>Macaulay's</i> Essays	23
<i>Hawker</i> on Guns and Shooting.....	20	<i>Macaulay's</i> Miscellaneous Writings.....	23
<i>Herschel's</i> Outlines of Astronomy.....	17	<i>Macaulay's</i> Lays of Ancient Rome	29
<i>Herschel's</i> Essays.....	17	<i>Macaulay's</i> Speeches	7
<i>Hinchliff's</i> South American Sketches.....	12	<i>MacBrair's</i> Africans	14
<i>Hind's</i> American Exploring Expeditions ..	13	<i>MacDougall's</i> Theory of War.....	33
<i>Hind's</i> Labrador	13	<i>M'Culloch's</i> Commercial Dictionary	30
Hints on Etiquette.....	20	<i>M'Culloch's</i> Geographical Dictionary	30
<i>Holland's</i> Essays	14	<i>Maling's</i> Indoor Gardening	37
<i>Holland's</i> Medical Notes	14	<i>Marcel's</i> Land and Water	35
<i>Holland</i> on Mental Physiology	14	<i>Marcel's</i> Political Economy.....	35
<i>Hooker's</i> British Flora	35	<i>Marcel's</i> Conversat. on Natural Philosophy	35
<i>Hopkins's</i> Hawaii.....	13	<i>Marcel's</i> Conversations on Chemistry	35
<i>Horne's</i> Introduction to the Scriptures	27	<i>Maunder's</i> Biographical Treasury.....	37
<i>Horne's</i> Compendium of ditto	27	<i>Maunder's</i> Geographical Treasury	37
<i>Hoskyns's</i> Talpa	21	<i>Maunder's</i> Historical Treasury	37
<i>Hovard's</i> Athletic Exercises	21	<i>Maunder's</i> Natural History	37
<i>Howitt's</i> History of the Supernatural	24	<i>Maunder's</i> Scientific and Literary Treasury	37
<i>Howitt's</i> Remarkable Places	14	<i>Maunder's</i> Treasury of Knowledge	37
<i>Howitt's</i> Rural Life of England	14	<i>May's</i> England	2
<i>Howson's</i> Deaconesses	23	Memoir of Sydney Smith.....	7
<i>Hudson's</i> Directions for Making Wills	36	Memoirs, &c. of Thomas Moore	8
<i>Hudson's</i> Executor's Guide	36	<i>Mendelssohn's</i> Letters.....	12
<i>Hughes's</i> Geography of His tory	30	<i>Merivale's</i> Romans under the Empire	3
<i>Hughes's</i> Manual of Geography.....	30	<i>Merivale's</i> Fall of the Roman Republic... 3	
<i>Jameson's</i> Saints and Martyrs	25	<i>Merivale's</i> (H.) Lectures on Colonisation.. 30	
<i>Jameson's</i> Monastic Orders	25	<i>Meryon's</i> History of Medicine	5
<i>Jameson's</i> Legends of the Madonna	25	<i>Miles</i> on Horse's Foot	20
<i>Jameson's</i> Legends of the Saviour	25	<i>Miles</i> on Shoeing Horses.....	20
<i>Johnson's</i> Dictionary, by <i>Latham</i>	9	<i>Moore's</i> Lalla Rookh	28
<i>Johnson's</i> Patentee's Manual	33	<i>Moore's</i> Irish Melodies	28
<i>Johnson's</i> Book of Industrial Designs.....	33	<i>Moore's</i> Poetical Works	28
<i>Johnston's</i> Geographical Dictionary	31	<i>Morell's</i> Mental Philosophy.....	15
<i>Jukes's</i> Types of Genesis	24	<i>Morell's</i> Elements of Psychology	15
<i>Kalisch's</i> Hebrew Grammar	24	Morning Clouds	22
<i>Kalisch's</i> Historical Commentary on Genesis		<i>Morton's</i> Royal Farms	2
and Exodus	24	<i>Morton's</i> Dairy Husbandry.....	34
<i>Kemble's</i> Residence in Georgia	1	<i>Morton's</i> Farm Labour	34
<i>Kennedy's</i> Hymnologia Christiana.....	26	<i>Mosheim's</i> Ecclesiastical History	25
<i>Kirby</i> and <i>Spence's</i> Entomology	19	<i>Müller's</i> Lectures on Language	10
<i>L. E. L.'s</i> Poetical Works	29	<i>Munk's</i> College of Physicians.....	5
<i>Lady's</i> Tour round Monte Rosa	12	<i>Mure's</i> Language and Literature of Greece 3	
<i>Latham's</i> Comparative Philology	10	My Life, and What shall I do with it?.... 22	
<i>Latham's</i> English Language	10	<i>Neale's</i> Sunsets and Sunshine	22
<i>Latham's</i> Handbook of ditto	10	<i>Odling's</i> Chemistry	16
<i>Lempriere's</i> Notes on Mexico.....	13	<i>Owen's</i> Comparative Anatomy and Physio-	
<i>Liddell</i> and <i>Scott's</i> Greek Lexicons	9	logy of the Vertebrate Animals	15
<i>Lindley's</i> Horticulture	36	<i>Packe's</i> Guide to the Pyrenees	12
<i>Lindley's</i> Introduction to Botany	36	<i>Parry's</i> Memoirs	6
<i>Longman's</i> Lectures on History of England . 3		<i>Peaks, Passes, and Glaciers</i>	11
<i>Loudon's</i> Encyclo. of Cottage Architecture.. 31		<i>Pereira's</i> Materia Medica	17
<i>Loudon's</i> Encyclo. of Agriculture.....	35	<i>Perkins's</i> Tuscan Sculpture	29
<i>Loudon's</i> Encyclo. of Gardening	35	<i>Peschel's</i> Elements of Physics	17
<i>Loudon's</i> Encyclo. of Trees and Shrubs ... 35		<i>Phillips's</i> Guide to Geology.....	17
<i>Loudon's</i> Encyclo. of Plants	35	<i>Phillips's</i> Introduction to Mineralogy	17
<i>Louendes's</i> Engineer's Handbook	31	<i>Piesse's</i> Art of Perfumery	21
		<i>Piesse's</i> Chemical Wonders	21

<i>Piesse's</i> Chemical and Natural Magic	21	<i>Strickland's</i> Queens of England	4
<i>Pietrowski's</i> Siberian Exile.....	1	<i>Sydney Smith's</i> Works	23
Porson's Life, by <i>Watson</i>	5	<i>Sydney Smith's</i> Moral Philosophy.....	23
Practical Mechanic's Journal.....	33	<i>Tate</i> on Strength of Materials	18
Problems in Human Nature	22	<i>Taylor's</i> (<i>Jeremy</i>) Works	25
<i>Pycroft's</i> English Reading	25	<i>Tennent's</i> Ceylon	19
<i>Ranken's</i> Canada and the Crimea	12	<i>Tennent's</i> Natural History of Ceylon	19
Record of International Exhibition.....	33	<i>Tennent's</i> 'Story of the Guns'	1
<i>Rhind's</i> Thebes	12	Theologia Germanica	26
<i>Rick's</i> Roman and Greek Antiquities.....	7	<i>Thirlwall's</i> Greece	3
<i>Rivers's</i> Rose Amateur's Guide.....	37	<i>Thomson's</i> Interest Tables	30
<i>Robertson's</i> Mission to the Danish Isles ..	2	<i>Thomson's</i> Laws of Thought	15
<i>Rogers's</i> Essays	24	<i>Thrupp's</i> Anglo-Saxon Home	4
<i>Roget's</i> English Thesaurus	10	<i>Todd's</i> Cyclopædia of Anat. and Physiology	15
Romance of a Dull Life	22	<i>Trollope's</i> Warden	22
<i>Ronald's</i> Fly-Fisher	20	<i>Trollope's</i> Barchester Towers.....	22
<i>Routon's</i> Debater.....	10	<i>Twiss's</i> Law of Nations.....	2
<i>Sandford's</i> Bampton Lectures	24	<i>Tyndall</i> on Heat	15
<i>Sarby</i> on Projection of Sphere	34	<i>Tyndall's</i> Mountaineering	11
<i>Sarby</i> on Study of Steam	34	<i>Ure's</i> Dictionary of Arts, Manufactures,	
<i>Scoffern</i> on Projectiles	33	and Mines.....	32
<i>Scott's</i> Lectures on the Fine Arts	5	<i>Van Der Hoven's</i> Handbook of Zoology ..	15
<i>Scott's</i> Volumetrical Analysis.....	16	<i>Villari's</i> History of Savonarola	6
<i>Scrope</i> on Volcanoes	16	<i>Warburton's</i> Life, by <i>Watson</i>	5
<i>Sewell's</i> Ancient History	7	<i>Warter's</i> Last of the Old Squires.....	22
<i>Sewell's</i> Early Church	7	<i>Watts's</i> Dictionary of Chemistry	16
<i>Sewell's</i> Passing Thoughts on Religion....	25	<i>Webb's</i> Celestial Objects	17
<i>Sewell's</i> Self-Examination for Confirmation..	25	<i>Webster</i> and <i>Parke's</i> Domestic Economy..	32
<i>Sewell's</i> Readings for Confirmation.....	25	<i>Wellington's</i> Life, by <i>Gleig</i>	6
<i>Sewell's</i> Readings for Lent.....	25	<i>Wesley's</i> Life, by <i>Southey</i>	8
<i>Sewell's</i> Impressions of Rome, &c.	13	<i>West</i> on Children's Diseases	33
<i>Sewell's</i> Stories and Tales	22	<i>White</i> and <i>Riddle's</i> Latin Dictionary.....	9
<i>Sharp's</i> British Gazetteer.....	31	<i>Wilson's</i> Bryologia Britannica	36
Short Whist	21	<i>Willich's</i> Popular Tables	30
<i>Sidney's</i> (Sir P.) Life, by <i>Lloyd</i>	4	<i>Wit</i> and <i>Wisdom</i> of <i>Sydney Smith</i>	23
<i>Sievekings's</i> (Amelia) Life.....	4	<i>Woodward's</i> Chronological and Historical	
<i>Sievekings's</i> Principles of Charitable Work..	5	Encyclopædia.....	5
<i>Smith's</i> (J.) St. Paul's Shipwreck	8	<i>Woods's</i> Geology of South Australia	6
<i>Smith's</i> (G.) Wesleyan Methodism	8	<i>Worms</i> on the Earth's Motion	17
Social Life in Australia.....	13	<i>Wyndham's</i> Norway	13
<i>Southey's</i> Poetical Works.....	29	<i>Yonge's</i> English-Greek Lexicon.....	9
<i>Southey's</i> Doctor	29	<i>Youatt's</i> work on the Horse.....	19
<i>Stephen's</i> Essays	23	<i>Youatt's</i> work on the Dog	19
<i>Stephen's</i> Lectures on the History of France	23		
<i>Stephenson's</i> Life, by <i>Jeaffreson</i> and <i>Pole</i> ..	4		
'Stonehenge' on the Dog	19		
'Stonehenge' on the Greyhound	19		

115565

Bible
Comment(O.T.) Colenso, John William Bp
C Pentateuch and Book of Joshua
critically examined. Part III.

Pentateuch

DATE

NAME OF BORROWER

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED

