



The Princeton Theological Review

APRIL, 1919

HADADEZER OR BEN-HADAD

Ben-hadad of Damascus warred with Ahab of Israel and shortly afterwards Hadadezer of Damascus had the aid of Ahab against the Assyrian invaders. Historians commonly regard Ben-hadad and Hadadezer as in all probability one and the same person,¹ and they look upon the two names as mere variations of one original form.

The identity of person, however, has not been placed beyond the possibility of doubt; and the counter theory of diversity of person is entertained, the view that Ben-hadad was the predecessor of Hadadezer on the throne of Damascus. This counter theory introduces no confusion into the story. The Hebrew, Assyrian and other historical data arrange themselves naturally and render a consistent account of the course of events in northern Israel and at Damascus during an entire century.

The story is this: About the year 896 B. C. Baasha of Israel and a king of Damascus named Ben-hadad entered into an alliance (1 Kin. xv. 19^b), and Baasha advanced against Judah (verse 17). Thereupon Asa, king of Judah, reminded Ben-hadad of an ancient league already existing between him and Ben-hadad, and between his father and Ben-hadad's father, and by a gift of treasure he persuaded Ben-hadad to break his alliance with Baasha (verse 19). Ben-hadad accordingly seized a number of fortified towns in northern Israel along the caravan route between Damascus and the port of Akko on the Mediterranean sea (verse 20).

In the year 886 Omri as general had command of the army of Baasha's son and successor (1 Kin. xvi. 8, 16), and in

¹ "Benhadad II ist vermuthlich, wenn nicht sicher, identisch mit dem keilinschriftlichen auf der Monolithinschrift Salmanassar's II . . . erwähnten Dad-'id-ri," i.e. Hadadezer (Schrader, KAT², 1883, p. 200).

SCIENTIFIC BIBLICAL CRITICISM

In the common law of England, which is followed in most of our American commonwealths, the presumption is that the accused is innocent of an alleged crime until he shall have been proven guilty. It may be called the evidential system of jurisprudence. In contradistinction to this is the inquisitorial system in which the accused is supposed to be guilty unless he can establish his innocence. These two systems have their followers when we leave the forum of legal combat and enter that of biblical literature and history. Those who pursue the inquisitorial method accuse the authors of the Old Testament books of anachronisms, inconsistencies, frauds, forgeries, and false statements, and boldly defy anyone to disprove their accusations. The would-be defenders of the authors are very much in the position of a man who would have defended a friend in the clutches of the Spanish inquisition.¹ He could not gain access to the accused and the accused had no means of communicating with him, except through the inquisitors themselves. So, Moses and Isaiah and Jonah are unable to communicate with us who would defend them; and those who accuse them, or their works, of misstatements and falsehoods wrest their words, stigmatize their motives, assume that their own opinions are testimony, and declare a verdict of guilty. They denounce as unscientific any attempt on the part of the defenders to establish the truthfulness and harmoniousness of the documents. They set themselves up as accusers, witnesses, jury and judges, and call unscholarly and traditional (word of scorn!) all who refuse to accept their verdict. They cry aloud: To the auto da fé with the book and with all the defenders thereof!

¹ See Emil Reich: *The Failure of the Higher Criticism of the Bible*, 81-126.

A. EXAMPLES OF CRITICAL METHODS.

GENESIS XIV

One of the most outstanding examples of the inquisitorial method of criticism is Gen. xiv, where we have the account of the expedition of Chedorlaomer against the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah. Of this expedition and of the defeat of it by Abraham, Wellhausen says, that they "are simply impossibilities." When it is shown that the kings of Babylonia had made similar expeditions as far as the Mediterranean in the time of Lugal-zaggizi and Sargon the First (cir. 3000 B.C.),² and in the time of Hammurabi (2000 B.C.),³ and that in the time of Hammurabi, there were kings with the names of Arioch, Tidal, and with at least the component parts of the name Chedorlaomer, and several persons with the name of Abram, the critics reply that some unknown Jewish archaeologist of some time between 900 and 300 B. C., who happened to be in Babylon, concocted this little story in glorification of Abraham and succeeded in inducing Ezra and Nehemiah, or some later Jewish authorities before 280 B. C. (when the Septuagint translation was made), to accept the fabrication as fact and to embody it among the archives of the Jewish people, by whom it has ever since been considered to be authoritative history.

In favor of the historical character of this narrative we have the evidence⁴ that it suits the time and the place,² that the names of the principal actors are known to be names of persons living in the time of Hammurabi,³ that the names of the three kings confederated with Chedorlaomer and probably of the five kings of Sodom and other cities that fought against him have been identified as kings of the time of Hammurabi,⁴ that Elam had at that time and never afterwards the hegemony of Western Asia,⁵ that expeditions of the kind were common from 4000 B. C. to the time of the

² King, *A History of Sumer and Akkad*, 197, 360.

³ Jeremias: *The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East*, I. 317, 322.

Persians and that oriental armies have again and again been put to flight by a sudden attack of inferior forces.⁴

Against the historical character of this narrative we have the assertion of Wellhausen and other critics of our times (only about 4,000 years after the supposed expedition!) that the expedition was "*simply impossible*," and that it is probable that the account may have been fabricated (or forged) by some person unknown, at some time unknown, in some way unknown, and accepted as true history by some persons unknown, at some time unknown, for reasons unknown. Not one item of evidence in the way of time, place, logic, psychology, language, or customs, has been produced against the trustworthiness of the document. The *prima facie* evidence is supported by the circumstantial evidence. But a German professor says it is "simply impossible"; the English scholars (rightly named) echo "simply impossible," and the American pupils echo again "simply impossible." And this assertion of simply impossible is called an "assured result of scientific criticism"! Rather, it is a result assured by the assurance of those who affirm it. And as to such criticism being *scientific* it will deserve the appellation only when the Latin dictionary defines *scientia* by "ignorance."⁵

THE LAW OF HOLINESS

In contradistinction to the inquisitorial method is that which presumes a man to be innocent until he is proven guilty. As applied to documents it proceeds on the presumption that the document is what it purports to be until

⁴ See Reich: *Loc cit.* p. 81, Sayce PSBA, 1918, and Pilser PSBA, XXXV. 205-216.

⁵ The evidence on Gen. xiv will be found in Hommel: "*The Ancient Hebrew Tradition*," pp. 146-200; Albert T. Clay: *Light on the Old Testament*, pp. 125-143; Alfred Jeremias: *The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East*, pp. 314-324; Pinches: *The Old Testament*, &c.; King: *The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, I, pp. 49ff., III, 68ff., 6-11, 237; Schorr: *Urkunden des Alt-babylonischen Zivil- und Prozessrechts*, pp. 589, 591, 595, 612; Pilser: *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, for 1913 and 1914; and many discussions by Professor Sayce.

it shall be proven that it is not. Thus the presumption is that the so-called Law of Holiness (Lev. xvii-xxvi) was the work of Moses, because seventeen times in these chapters it is said that Jehovah spake unto Moses saying what follows in that section, and because the Law begins with the statement "Jehovah spake unto Moses saying: Speak unto Aaron and unto his sons and unto all the children of Israel, and say unto them: This is the thing which Jehovah hath commanded," and ends with the subscription (xxvi. 46): "These are the statutes and ordinances and laws, which Jehovah made between him and the children of Israel in Mount Sinai by Moses." The superscription and subscription mention the place, time, subject-matter, original speaker, mediators, and persons addressed. The contents of the chapters seem to substantiate the claim of the superscription and subscription.

The issue, then, is clearly drawn. Anyone who successfully assails the veracity of this document must prove either that there is no Jehovah, or that He cannot address nor speak to man, or that there was no Moses or Aaron, or that Jehovah did not speak to Moses, or that there were no children of Israel at that time, or that the laws were not given at Sinai. Its veracity is not directly assailed by an attack on its language for the document does not say that it was written in Hebrew. Nor would it prove its non-existence to show that it was not mentioned, nor observed for four hundred or a thousand years after it was written; nor even to show that before the time of Ezra its injunctions were broken and the very opposite of them obeyed. Nor would it show that the document as a whole was not from Moses, if it could be demonstrated that certain parts of it were not from him, the critics themselves being witnesses; for they all claim that there are interpolations in Amos and Jeremiah while upholding their genuineness as a whole.⁶ Nor would it show that the Law of Holiness was not given by Moses, if it could be proven that he did not write it with

⁶ Compare the last section of the Gospel of Mark.

his own hand.⁷ Nor would it prove that Moses was not the author of the Law of Holiness to affirm that the same kind of argument which has been used with regard to it would prove also that Moses was the author of the Law of the Covenant in Ex. xx-xxiv, and of Deuteronomy and of the other documents of the Pentateuch, and that *they* could not have had the same author. For if Jehovah was really the source of all the laws as the documents state, then any apparent inconsistencies between the codes must be possible to harmonize or must be due to errors of transmission, or, at least, will be no more against the consistency of the laws, if they were all written during Moses' lifetime than if they were uttered at widely separated periods of time. And if they were all the production of Moses, and he merely attributed

⁷ The critics reiterate the statement that it is not said in the Pentateuch that *Moses* wrote any of it except the curse on Amalek, the Ten Commandments and certain other portions, as if this were an unanswerable argument against the Mosaic authorship of the Law. Is one to allege, then, that Hammurabi cannot be called the author of the code named after him, unless, forsooth, he inscribed it with his own hand? And yet the monument expressly ascribes itself to Hammurabi in the words of the epilogue (Col. xli. 59-67); "In the days that are yet to come, for all future times, may the king who is in the land observe the words of righteousness which I have written upon my monument." Or, is Sennacherib not to be called the author of Cylinder No. 103,000, unless he himself inscribed it? Yet it begins with his name and titles and is full of his words and deeds recorded in the first person, singular number. "I fashioned a memorial tablet," "I set it up," "I flayed Kirua," "I sent my troops." It is all I, I, I, my, my, my, from beginning to end; and yet, it is certain that he never wrote a word of it with his own hand. Or, is Darius Hystaspis not the author of the Behistun Inscription, whose sentences are largely in the first person and of which nearly every section begins with "Thus saith Darius the king"? What a subject for the painter's brush! Darius, the Persian Achaemenid, king of Babylon and of the lands, king of Upper and Lower Egypt, sitting on a scaffolding, his chisel in his left hand and his mallet in his right, cutting into the imperishable rock the record of his achievements by the grace of Ahuramazda! And how about Thothmes I and III, and Rameses II, III and XIII, and Shishak, and Tiglath-Pileser I and III, and Nebuchadnezzar I and II, and others, whose numerous and lengthy records have been preserved? Are we to suppose that Moses cannot have recorded his thoughts and words and deeds just in the same way that his predecessors, contemporaries, and successors, did?

them to Jehovah, this would simply remove the onus of the alleged inconsistencies from the shoulders of Ezra and the later Jews and place it upon the back of Moses. Why must we suppose that Moses would have avoided all inconsistencies, but that Ezra and all the numerous unknown but cunning redactors who are alleged to have composed the Pentateuch should have retained them? It is passing strange, also, that the Pharisees and Rabbis who tried to observe fully all laws and actually thought they were doing so, should have failed to find in them those inconsistencies which to the modern critic seem so numerous and incomprehensible and irreconcilable.

Nor is there anything in The Law of Holiness that may not have been written 1500 years before Christ as well as 500 years before. Indeed, we can scarcely conceive of a human society so ignorant as not to have understood all of its injunctions. No lawyer is needed to explain its simple, clear, and concise language; and it is concerned with every day matters, such as the shedding of blood, the relation of the sexes, and duties to parents, strangers, and God.⁸

Nor can it be shown that there are any geographical or archaeological references in the Law of Holiness that are unsuitable to the age of Moses. Nor can it be shown that

⁸ The following is an analysis of the Law of Holiness: xvi, the day of atonement; xvii, laws concerning blood; xviii, laws of incest and lust; xix, xx, laws of holy living such as fearing parents (xix. 3), rejecting idols (vs. 4), offering acceptable peace offerings (5-8), helping the poor (9, 10), forbidding stealing and lying and profanity (11, 12), defrauding the workingman (13), injuring the deformed (14), perverting judgment (15), being a talebearer or hater of neighbors (16, 17), vengeance (18), mingling of cattle, seed or textiles (19), fornication (20-22), eating of holy fruit (23-25), or blood (26), practising magic (26), or mutilation (27, 28), or prostitution (29), profaning the sabbath or the sanctuary (30), defiling themselves with familiar spirits, etc. (31), dishonoring the aged and stranger (32), and falsifying the weights and measures (35-36), giving seed to Moloch (xx. 1-5), wizards (6), cursing parents (9), adultery (10-21); xxi and xxii, laws concerning holiness of priests; xxiii, the feasts; xxiv, xxv, various laws such as that concerning the oil and the lamp (1-4), the shew-bread (5-9), blasphemy (10-16), and the *lex talionis* (17-22); xxvi, epilogue.

the ideas of Holiness are such as could not have been known to Moses, or that they are so different from the ideas of JE, D and P as that they could not all have proceeded from the fertile brain of one man and age. Where the ideas of the different documents are the same and are expressed in the same language, they may of course have been by the same author. Where the ideas differ in phraseology but are substantially the same, this is also no indication of different authorship.⁹ Where the subjects are the same and the ideas expressed differ, the author may have changed his mind, or he may have had different circumstances and conditions in view. Mohammed changed his views on marriage and other subjects and he changed the laws to suit his changing views. The condition of the Muslim changed after he went to Medina and especially after he set out to conquer the world; so, he began to make new laws for his anticipated empire.

Nor, finally, is the language such as would indicate a time inconsistent with that of Moses. To be sure, there are in this particular document words and phrases which occur seldom, or never, elsewhere. But this is no proof of age or authorship but simply of subject, aim, and method. Nowhere else in the Old Testament is this subject of holiness treated of fully. The aim of the writer is to secure the holiness of the people and he bases this holiness upon the holiness of God. Hence the frequent use of the phrases: "I Jehovah am holy," "I am Jehovah," and "I am Jehovah which sanctify you." Since this holiness was to be secured by obeying Jehovah's law, we have the frequent injunction to walk in, or to observe and do, the statutes and judgments of Jehovah; and the threats of God's setting his face against them and of their even bearing their own sins and being excommunicated if they profaned his name, sanctuary, or sabbaths. As to words occurring in this passage alone, or infrequently elsewhere, this is characteristic of every document and almost of every chapter of the Old Testament.

⁹ Thus in the Koran, Mohammed refers five different times to the means by which Sodom and Gommorrah were destroyed. In two cases only is the language the same.

As to the claim that certain technical expressions¹⁰ indicate a different author or age, it is an assertion entirely unsupported by direct evidence and contrary to analogy¹¹. That the word for man should be repeated in the protasis in the sense of "whoever"¹² and that this phrase should occur eleven times in H and three times in P but not at all in JE or D is to be accounted for partly by the fact that JE and D are mostly in the second person and H and P in the third. Further, it is not clear that the idea of "whoever" as expressed by the repetition of the word for man is exactly the same as that expressed by other words and combinations. And lastly analogy shows that such variations are no necessary indication of different author or date.¹³

We have thus shown that in the peculiarities of H there is nothing opposed to its Mosaic authorship. But how about its authorship by another than Moses? Is it likely that a forger of a document would, scores of times, use phrases that occurred seldom, if ever, in the documents recognized as having been written by the author whose works he was imitating? Would not the perpetrator of a pseudepigraph, intended to be accredited as a genuine work of the author whose name was falsely attached to it, have had the prudence or common sense to avoid as far as possible all indications of recognizable variations from the acknowledged originals of the man whose name he had attached? To at-

¹⁰ Such as שֶׁרָא and עִמִּית (LOT, 49).

¹¹ Thus the omen texts (or laws) published by Dennefeld (*Babylonisch-Assyrische Geburts-Omina*, Leipzig, 1914), have eleven new words to denote parts of the human body and about twenty other new words, or new meanings of words.

¹² אִישׁ אִישׁ.

¹³ Thus in Dennefeld's *Geburts-Omina* there are five different ways of expressing the idea of "the one" and "the other". See his introduction, pages 22, 23. The above remarks are based on the peculiarities of H as given in Dr. Driver's *Literature of the Old Testament*, pp. 49, 50. The same arguments which LOT uses to disprove the unity of the Pentateuch would disprove the unity of the Koran. We have in Mohammed's great work the same variety in the use of the names for God, duplicates, synonyms, contradictions, hapax legomena, and peculiar or favorite expressions. And yet all admit the unity of authorship of the Koran!

tempt to prove a forgery by showing the alleged writer never existed, or that the dates of events, or kind of language are wrong, is fair and according to the law of evidence;^{13a} but to expect us to believe that the forger of a document which was designed to be accepted as genuine should have made its language *differ* repeatedly, obtrusively and unnecessarily from that of another document by the alleged author, is contrary to common sense as well as to common law.

B. LAWS IN THE PENTATEUCH ASCRPTIONS

Taking up the remaining portions of the Pentateuch we find that the collections of laws, however great or small these collections may be and whatever their subject-matter, are attributed invariably to Moses. The so-called Code of the Covenant in Ex. xix-xxiv says in the prologue that Moses went up unto God in Mount Sinai and that the Lord said unto him: "These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the Children of Israel" (xix. 2-6). So "Moses went down unto the people and spake unto them" (xix. 25) the words of chapter xx and the judgments of xxi-xxiii. Then in chapter xxiv we are told that Moses told the people all the words of the Lord and all the judgments (vs. 3) and Moses wrote all the words of the Lord (vs. 4) and afterwards read the book of the covenant in the audience of the people; and they said, "All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient" (vs. 7).

In like manner the prologue to Deuteronomy again and again ascribes the laws to Moses. Thus it begins: These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel on the banks of Jordan in the wilderness of the Arabah in the land of Moab (vs. 1-5). Again, in the epilogue in xxix. 1, it is said: These are the words of the covenant which the Lord commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel in the land of Moab, besides (i.e., apart from, or in addition to) the covenants which he made with them in Horeb.

^{13a} Compare Bentley's great argument against the genuineness of the Epistles of Phalaris.

The smaller portions, also, and individual laws claim Moses as their author. Thus, the offering for the tabernacle and its plan were commanded by God to the people through Moses (Ex. xxv. 1, 9 f., xxix. 42, 43). So also with the laws of offering, Lev. i. 1, 2, vii. 37, 38; of the consecration of the priests, Lev. viii. 1, 5, 25, 36; of unclean food, Lev. xi. 1, 46, 47; of leprosy, Lev. xiii. 1, xiv. 54-57; and, in short, of all the other laws of the Pentateuch.

Now, with regard to any one in particular of these codes and laws, we do not see how any living man can have the assurance, the assumption of an impossible knowledge, to assert that it may not have been, as it claims to be, the work of Moses. Language, subject-matter, and circumstances, all favor the claim of each particular section to have been what it professes to be. It is only by resorting to what we deem an unjustifiable method of procedure that any case can be made out on behalf of the deniers of Mosaic authorship. This method is based on the presumption that the documents are forgeries and that the writers were guilty of false statements as to the time and place and authors of the documents. Being utterly unable to substantiate these charges by direct evidence bearing on the separate documents, these deniers of Mosaic authorship resort to two expedients. They charge, first, that some of the documents contain numerous unnecessary repetitions, and that these repetitions are often incongruous; secondly, that these incongruities result from the fact that the documents represent widely different periods of development in the history of Israel.

REPETITIONS

Taking up these charges in order, it is admitted that there are numerous repetitions of laws bearing on the same subject, but it is denied that the repetitions prove that Moses was not the author. Every great teacher repeats. Every great reformer repeats. Witness Paul on the resurrection and on salvation by faith. Witness Mohammed on the unity of God and the condemnation of unbelievers. The duality,

or multiplicity, of authors cannot, then, be proven by the mere fact of repetitions.¹⁴ Nor can it be argued from the fact that we cannot see the sense, or the reason, for the repetitions. Nor can it be argued from the fact that the repetitions are exactly alike, nor from the fact that they differ. To be sure, the critics make much of their inability to account satisfactorily to themselves for many of the differences and even adduce their ignorance of the reasons for them as if it were evidence against Mosaic authorship. And yet, good and sufficient reasons for most persons are evident in some of the repetitions. For example, take the laws with regard to the altar. Might not Moses (or at least Jehovah) have foreseen that it would be several hundred years before the worship at the central sanctuary could be established and that even afterward the union of the tribes might be disrupted, so that men like Elijah might not be able to go to the central altar to sacrifice even when they would? Could a God, or a law-giver, who provided for a second passover for those who could not attend the first, and permitted a pair of turtle doves, or even a handful of flour (a bloodless offering) to be given by those who were too poor to present a kid, not be expected to authorize an altar for special cases and circumstances?¹⁶

INCONGRUITIES.

The second charge is that there are in the Pentateuch at least five principal documents representing different periods of time and different points of view; and that these differences of aim and time account for the alleged incon-

¹⁴ Numerous parallels in the Koran.

¹⁵ Nor can diversity of authorship be argued from the fact that similar events are recorded as having occurred in the life of the same or different persons. All history and romance are full of such repetitions. Herodotus records several similar attacks on Athens by the Pisistratidae and two great expeditions of the Persians against Greece. Caesar says that he built two bridges over the Rhine and that he sailed twice against Britain. Don Quixote and Don Caesar are full of repetitions. Everyone's life is full of them. So was that of Abraham; so was that of Moses.

¹⁶ Cf. 1 K. iii. 2, 3.

by H 1190

gruities of the works attributed to Moses and exclude the possibility of Mosaic authorship. This charge is based upon the assumptions: (a) that Deuteronomy (D) was written in, or shortly before, 621 B.C., (b) that the real, or alleged, incongruities between the parts of the Pentateuch can be explained only by assuming a wide difference of date in the time of their composition and a series of forgeries on the part of their authors.

DATE OF DEUTERONOMY

For the assumption that Deuteronomy was written in, or shortly before, 621 B.C., there is absolutely no direct evidence. The testimony of Deuteronomy itself is that it was given by Moses in the plains of Moab. The passage in 2 Kings xxii-xxiii ascribes it to Moses (xxiii. 25). Josiah attributes the wrath of Jehovah to the fact that the fathers had not hearkened to the words of the book that had just been found and read before him (xxii. 8-13). Huldah the prophetess, represents Jehovah as saying, I will bring upon this place all the words of the book which the king of Judah hath read (xxii. 16). The elders of Judah and of Jerusalem, and the king, and all the men of Judah and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the priests, and the prophets, and all the people, both small and great heard the words of the book of the covenant which was found in the house of the Lord and covenanted to perform the words of the covenant that were written in this book (xxiii. 1-3). Although the book of Deuteronomy contains laws affecting the king (xvii. 14 f.) and the prophets (xviii. 15 f.) and the priests (xviii. 1 f.), and although it must be admitted that kings and prophets and priests had existed in unbroken succession from the time of Samuel down to the time of Josiah, and that the kings and prophets and priests must have had the customary laws and regulations, yet no protest against the genuineness and authenticity of the newly-discovered book was made by king, or prophet, or priest. All accepted it as authoritative, and proceeded to carry its injunctions into execution (xxiii. 1-25).

Against this evidence of the documents themselves, the critics make the charge that writers of the sources of 2 Kings xxii-xxiii (that is "the book of the Chronicles of the kings of Judah," cf. xxiii. 28), the composer of the books of Kings, Hilkiyah the high priest, Shaphan the scribe, Huldah, the prophetess, and Jeremiah the prophet, were either forgers or dupes; and that Deuteronomy was not a work of Moses at all, but a composite work of an unknown author put together for the purpose of deceiving the people into the acceptance of a great reform in worship. The kernel of this reform is affirmed to be the confining of the worship to the central sanctuary at Jerusalem. To be sure, the book of Deuteronomy says nothing expressly about Jerusalem. Huldah, also, does not mention it as a central sanctuary (2 Kings xxii. 15-20). The king and people, including prophets, priests and scribes, do not specifically mention a central sanctuary in their covenant with Jehovah (xxiii. 3). Jerusalem itself is mentioned, it is true in xxiii. 23, as the place where the passover was held; but according to the book of Kings, the temple at Jerusalem was to be the dwelling place of Jehovah (1 King viii. 29, ix. 3), in accordance with the promise made by God through Nathan to David (2 Samuel vii. 13). Jeremiah, who prophesied in the days of Josiah, speaks not merely of the fact that Jehovah had chosen Jerusalem to put his name there (vii. 11, 14, xxxii. 34), but also says that at the first Shiloh had been the place where the Lord had set his name (xix. 12). Not merely in the Pentateuch, but also thirty times in Joshua, once in Judges (xx. 17), sixty times in Samuel, and thirteen times in Kings, the ark is named as the centre of the worship of the people of Israel. When this ark was removed to Jerusalem by David, and not till then, did the city become the place where men ought to worship (Jer. iii. 16, 17). Moreover, that Jerusalem was recognized as the place of the central sanctuary in the time of Solomon is clear from the fact that one of the first acts of Jeroboam son of Nebat was to appoint Bethel and Dan as rival centers, so as permanently to remove

the people of Israel from the influence of the cult at Jerusalem (1 Kings xii. 28-33).

Thus neither for their general charge nor for their principal specification do the critics find any direct evidence in Deuteronomy or Kings nor in any other Old Testament document. Jeremiah, whose genuineness they acknowledge, is silent as to the general charge, but absolutely clear in his evidence against the specification with regard to the time of the organization of the central sanctuary. It is time for the body of intelligent Christian believers, who are deemed capable of sitting on juries in a court of common law, to assert themselves against these self-styled scholars who would wrest from them the right of private judgment. For in the settlement of this question no special scholarship is involved—no knowledge of Hebrew or philosophy. The English version affords all the facts. The evidence is clear. On the face of it, it is all against the critics. Only by throwing out the evidence of the very document on which they rely for the proof of their own theory and by placing a childish confidence in what remains, can they find any support for their destructive views.¹⁷

THE FOUR CODES OF LAW

The critics charge that the incongruities which they allege are to be found between the code of the covenant (E) and Deuteronomy (D), and the Law of Holiness (H), and the priestly codex (P), are due to the fact that E represents the law as it existed prior to 700 B.C., D a law written about 621 B.C., H a law written about 600 B.C., and P a law written mostly before the events recorded in Neh. viii-x. Since the direct evidence of the documents themselves is against this fourfold date and ascribes all four documents to Moses, the critics have undertaken the difficult task of proving that these laws constitute a series of forgeries, extending over a

¹⁷ For good discussions of the origin of Deuteronomy, see Möller: *Are the Critics Right?*; Finn: *The Unity of the Pentateuch*; McKim: *The Problem of the Pentateuch*; Orr: *The Problem of the Old Testament*; and Green: *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*.

period of about 500 years, committed by more than seventeen different persons, all reformers of the highest ethical standards and all devoted to the service of Jehovah, the God of truth. Besides *mirabile dictu*, the forgeries were all successful in that prophets, priests, Levites, kings, and people, were all alike induced to receive them as genuine and to adopt them as obligatory, as soon as they were made known to them. The Jews and the Samaritans, the Pharisees and the Sadducees, the Rabbis, Aristean, Josephus, Philo, Christ and the Apostles, all accepted the combined work as of real Mosaic authorship. But no amount of camouflage could deceive the critical eyes of the German professors and their scholars (all of whom agree with them; hence the phrase, "All scholars are agreed"). To them the imperfections of the codes and their disagreements, yes, even the particular half century in which each law was promulgated, are as clear as the spots on the sun, if only you will look through their glasses, and are not blinded by prejudice occasioned by faith in Jehovah, or Christ, or by the rules of evidence. Now, whether those who believe in Jehovah and Christ are blinded by prejudice, or not, it seems obvious that they who profess to believe in both cannot be expected without stultification to ignore the testimony of all the documents that Jehovah himself was the real author of the laws, Moses being merely his mouthpiece, or prophet. This testimony cannot be set aside in the case of the laws without being set aside also in the case of the prophets. There is no more ground for calling it a form of speech in the one case than in the other. And if Jehovah did speak the laws and command the people to obey them, it must seem reasonable to suppose that He at least thought that they were harmonious. Christians, also, and professedly Christian professors need make no excuse for the prejudice that this testimony of the documents themselves is confirmed for them (however it may be with infidels) by the attestation of the New Testament writers and of the Lord Jesus Christ. But whether Christians or infidels, we should all be bound strictly by

a prejudice in favor of the rules of evidence. Binding ourselves, then, to abide by the evidence, let us proceed to state the evidence for the defense in the case of the critics against Moses.

First, we find that in every one of the legal documents of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, the superscription as in Num. xv, xix, xxxv, and in the case of all the longer collections such as Ex. xx-xxiv, xxv-xxxv, Lev. i-vii, xvii-xxvi, and Deuteronomy, and many of the smaller collections such as Ex. xii. 1-28, xxxiv, Lev. viii, xiii, xvi, xxvii, Num. i, ii, iv, vi. 1-21, viii. 1-4, 5-22, xxvii. 6-23, xxviii-xxix, xxx, the subscriptions also expressly attribute their authorship to Moses. In many cases the locality and the time in which these codes, or special laws, were given are specified. Thus, Ex. xii was given in Egypt in the first part of the first month (vs. 1, 3); Ex. xix-xxiv, at Sinai in the third month of the first year of the Exodus (Ex. xix. 1, 11); Deuteronomy, in the land of Moab, on the first day of the eleventh month of the fortieth year (i. 1, 3, 5). In other cases as in Lev. xvii-xxvi and Ex. xxv-xxxv, the place at least is expressly stated. Here, then, are twenty separate documents all ascribed to Moses in the proper place and manner with dates and places affixed.

Secondly, we find that the variations in the form, treatment and subject-matter of the laws support the claim that Moses was the author. Some of the laws as Lev. xi-xiii, treat of but one subject; others as Ex. xxxiv treat of several subjects: and others as Lev. xvii-xxvi and Deuteronomy may be dignified with the name of code. Some of them as Lev. xvi are so constructed that scarcely a verse could be omitted without marring the effect of the whole, whereas, others are composed of many parts, each distinct in its purpose, but all necessary to the carrying out of the laws of its remaining parts.¹⁸ Moreover, the laws of the covenant of JE in Ex. xx-xxiv and the epitome in xxxiv. 1-26, and

¹⁸ Again, the persons addressed differ. In the codes it is the whole people who are enjoined whereas the laws of P affect ordinarily only certain classes or individuals, such as priests, lepers, and Nazarites.

the codes of H and D are mostly a collection of short injunctions more or less disconnected and without specification as to how they are to be carried out, whereas the laws in P are generally entirely separated from other laws, are detailed in their regulations and embrace many matters not discussed, or barely mentioned in the codes of JE, D and P. To this difference in treatment and details corresponds also a difference in literary form. The laws of JE, D and H are codal in form and resemble the prototype set by the code of Hammurabi in that they have lengthy prologues or epilogues; D and H containing at the end, just like the Babylonian code, a large number of curses upon those who should disobey their injunctions. The laws of leprosy vary according to the subject of which they treat. As to the laws of P there is an analogy to the law of leprosy in the birth-omens,¹⁹ and we may infer from the frequent references of Nabunaid to the necessity of discovering the corner-stone of the temples originally built by Naram-Sin, Hammurabi, and others of his predecessors, that these temens or corner-stones contained detailed plans for the construction of the houses of the gods, corresponding to the plan of the tabernacle in Ex. xxv-xxx. The narrative in Ex. xxxvi-xl of the manner in which this plan was carried out under the direction of Bezaleel is paralleled, also, in many respects by the account in the autobiography of the Erpa Tehuti, the director of the artificers of the temples, and shrines of Hatshepsut, who according to most Egyptologists was queen of Egypt two centuries before the times of Moses.²⁰ The form of the numeration of Num. i-iv bears many resemblances to those of the Annals of Tahutmes III.²¹ The boundaries of the land given in Num. xxxiv resemble closely similar forms in Egypt.²² The form of the ceremonies of the day

¹⁹ See the *Babylonisch-Assyrische Geburts-Omina*, by Ludwig Dennefeld, Leipzig, 1914.

²⁰ Budge: *The Literature of the Egyptians*, London, 1914, p. 145.

²¹ Petrie: *History of Egypt*, II, 103f.

²² Hinke: *A New Boundary Stone of Nebuchadnezzar I*, and the tablet from the time of Hammurabi in KB, IV, 17.

of atonement in Lev. xvi may be compared with the Ritual of the Divine Cult,²³ and the laws of issues, jealousy, and the red heifer (Lev. xv, Num. v, xix) with the Ritual of Embalmment.^{23a} That minute directions for the conduct of sacrifices, similar to those in Lev. i-vii, must have been in use among the Egyptians is evident from the Liturgy of Funerary Offerings found in the Pyramid Texts;²⁴ as also from the Liturgy of the Opening of the Mouth.²⁵ That detailed directions for the selection and clothing of priests like those in Leviticus must have existed among the Egyptians is to be seen in the Liturgy of the Opening of the Mouth,²⁶ and the form of the regulations of Leviticus has a parallel in the inscription of Agum-Kakrimi (1350 B. C.) which describes the dress of Merodach and Sarpanit (KB, III, I, 135f.).

We thus see that the various forms in which the sections of the law are preserved to us in the Pentateuch are paralleled in almost every instance by the forms of laws to be found in known documents of ancient Babylon and Egypt dating from 1000 to 4000(?) B. C. And what in general is true of the form is true also of the contents of the laws. The civil and criminal laws of E, D, and H, bear a striking resemblance to those found in the Code of Hammurabi.²⁷ The moral precepts find their prototype and often their parallels in the maxims of Ptah-hotep (3000 B. C.), and in the moral precepts of the 125th chapter of the Book of the Dead.²⁸ As to the ceremonial laws it can be claimed that the elaborate, lengthy, and intricate, systems of worship centering around the numerous temples of the polytheistic Babylonians and Egyptians make the system of worship and

²³ Budge: *op. cit.* p. 248.

^{23a} *Id.* 247.

²⁴ Budge, *op. cit.* 16.

²⁵ *Id.* 13.

²⁶ *Id.* p. 14.

²⁷ See especially Müller: *Die Gesetze Hammurabis* and Kohler: *Hammurabi's Gesetz*.

²⁸ 18th Dynasty or earlier. Budge, *Egyptian Literature* 52, 224.

religious observances enjoined in H and P seem in comparison models of clearness, simplicity, and ease in execution.

In the third place, the laws of Moses, as Emil Reich has so well argued, demand a single great originator. Granting a great man like Moses, possessed of the monotheistic idea, and the fabric of the tabernacle, with the priesthood, and the sacrifices, and the sacred seasons, and the laws of holiness, and the covenants between the holy people and their unique God, rises before us as naturally as the constitution of the imperial Caesars from the mind of Augustus, or the religion of Islam from the life of the Arabian prophet, or the Christian Church from the life and death and precepts of its Founder. It was the idea of God which Moses had that was the spring of his activities, the source and unifier of his thoughts and laws. No one can deny that the idea of a unique God was first obtained from the Israelites nor that their literature always ascribes the first clear and full apprehension of this idea to Moses. How much of it he got from his meditations beneath the desert skies and how much by the direct revelation of the all-wise and all-powerful Jehovah, may be questioned; but that he had it, is the concurrent testimony of J and E and D and H and P and of all Jewish literature in legislation, history, and song. Prophets, priests, kings, poets, and people,—all had this great idea, and all unite in saying that they derived it from Moses. And whatever Israelites were the first to be possessed with the Old Testament idea of an only God, let us remember, that some Israelite certainly must have been thus possessed, seeing that the idea is to be found in ancient literature in the Old Testament and there alone. What more natural, then, than that the great thinker who first grasped the idea in its fulness should have found a revolution wrought in the whole system of his thinking. The universe with all its rolling years, the sun, the moon, the stars, the earth with its seas and islands, its plants and living creatures, must all be correlated to the great I AM, who made them all.

But the most engrossing subject of his thought must have been man in his relation to the earth and God and sin and death and redemption. And so he gathers up the history and the traditions of the past and centers the whole about the idea of a promise and the covenants, the covenant with Adam, the covenant with Noah, and the covenant with Abraham. And when God makes a covenant with the people of Israel through him as mediator he sets all his mind and energies to work to enable the people to observe their part of the covenant until the star should arise out of Jacob and he whose right it is, that prophet like unto himself, should come, whom Israel should hear, and to whom should be the obedience of the nations. And with this great thought in mind he sets himself to work to separate the Israelites from all the surrounding nations and from the polytheistic nations which had ruled them in the past. He takes the two great conceptions of natural religion, holiness and righteousness,²⁹ and seeks to separate them from their idolatrous associations and to raise them to a higher ethical and religious plane in the service of the one, ever-living, and true God.

As for a language and a literary form in which to express his thoughts, he did not have to invent them. They were already there.³⁰ All he had to do was to infuse new meaning into the old vehicles of thought, as in later times the New Testament writers did with the vocables of Greece, and Mohammed with those of the Arabs.³¹

As for the festivals, there were already plenty of them in use among the Babylonians and Egyptians and doubtless among the Israelites themselves,—New Year, and New Moons, and Sabbaths. He simply had to take the old seasons and sanctify them to better purposes.³² Sacrifices there

²⁹ קִרְשׁ and צִדְקָה.

³⁰ We have shown this already for the latter. As to the existence of the Hebrew language before the time of Moses, it is abundantly shown in the proper names of the inscriptions of the times of Hammurabi, Tahutmes III and Amenophis IV.

³¹ *E.g.* in the case of *hanif*.

³² It is not meant that some entirely new festivals may not have been added.

also were and altars and priests. He brings them all into ordered harmony with his idea of holiness and righteousness in the service of Jehovah. Ethics there were. He gives them the sanction of the divine command, and approval. Customs there were, laws of clean and unclean food, laws of jealousy, and revenge and disease and personal uncleanness, and fringes on garments, and tattooing, and vows and inheritances, and slavery and marriage. He brings all into his all embracing scheme and makes them all subserve the one great purpose of bringing and keeping the people in obedience to their covenant God. Requirements and observances were multiplied until it was impossible for the people not to sin; but for the sins there was atonement and for the sinners, substitution, redemption and forgiveness, of a God that was long-suffering and gracious, plenteous in mercy, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, though he would by no means spare the guilty.³³

Fourthly, against this *prima facie* case in favor of the Mosaic origin of the laws and against the life of Moses and the history of Israel as recorded in the books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, the critics bring a general charge and a number of specifications. The general charge is that the Pentateuch was not the work of Moses, but that it, together with the book of Joshua, is a compilation of the works of seventeen, or more, authors and of laws and traditions of little historic value gathered together during a period of five or six hundred years from 800 or 900 B. C. to 300 B. C. Inasmuch as no claim is made in Genesis or Joshua that they are the works of Moses, we claim the privilege (without precluding or prejudicing the right of Moses to be considered the author of Genesis) of confining for the present discussion the defense of Mosaic authorship to the four last books of the Pentateuch. And, as the charge involves not merely the question of the authorship, but the

³³ That is, those who refused the means of grace or willfully disobeyed his commands, like the man who gathered sticks on the Sabbath day, or Korah, Dathan and Abiram.

much more important question of the historicity of the books we shall discuss at length this fundamental question of authorship.

AUTHORSHIP. It must then, clearly be defined what exactly is meant by Mosaic *authorship*. Certainly, it cannot mean that to be the author Moses must have written his literary works with his own hand. Else, would Prescott not be the author of the Conquest of Mexico, nor Milton of Paradise Lost, nor the kings of Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, and Persia, of their inscriptions, nor Jesus of the Sermon on the Mount. Lest this statement should seem too naïve, let us recall that a favorite and reiterated, traditional argument of the critics against Mosaic authorship is based on the fact that it is said that he was charged by God to write the curse against Amalek and an account of the wanderings in the wilderness (Ex. xvii. 14, Num. xxxiii. 2). Besides these small portions of the narrative, he is said expressly to have written the code of the covenant in Exodus xx-xxiv, and a portion at least of Deuteronomy.³⁴ In fact it may reasonably be inferred from Deut. xxxi. 9, 24-26, iv. 44, 1, 5, xxviii. 58, 61, xxix. 20, 26, and other passages, that the whole Pentateuch, or at least all of the legal portions, was intended by the writers of these passages to have been designated as the work of Moses.

But even if he did not write a word with his own hand, it is evident that whoever wrote the book, meant to imply that the authorship of Moses extends to the laws and visions and commands which God gave to him in the same manner that the Code of Hammurabi was the work of the king whose name it bears. That is, the laws came through him and from him. This is the fundamental authorship for which we contend, and which we claim to have been unimpeached by all the testimony that has been produced, in the endeavor to impair our belief that as John says: The law was given by Moses.

³⁴ See Dr. Green on the Pentateuch, p. 37.

The case then, as it stands, is as follows. The documents of the Tetrateuch state that Moses at expressly stated places and times wrote, or caused to be written³⁵, certain parts of them. The critics charge that these statements of the documents are all false. What proof have they to substantiate this charge?

MOSES WROTE

First, they allege that "Moses wrote" in these passages is not a forgery, but simply a technical expression, or form of speech. But what evidence have they for this allegation? None whatever; but on the contrary, the evidence of the other books of the Old Testament is all against it. Thus in the book of Joshua, the earlier legislation is invariably attributed to Moses,^{35a} and the new regulations are ascribed to Joshua himself.³⁶ So in Samuel, the old laws are ascribed to Moses and the new ones to Samuel.³⁷ So in Kings, Solomon regulates his kingdom and Jeroboam the son of Nebat régulates the worship of Israel with laws that are never ascribed to Moses, but to the kings themselves, who are represented as departing in large measure from the law of God already known (1 Kings viii-xi; xii. 25-33; xiv. 7-16). So in Chronicles David divides the priests and Levites and writes out the pattern of the temple. Jehoshaphat himself gives laws, and sets judges in the land, and gives them charge as to their duties (2 Chron. xix. 5-11), and proclaims a fast without reference to the laws of Moses; and Hezekiah sets the Levites according to the commandment of David (2 Chron. xxix. 25-27). In Nehemiah, the singers and the porters keep the ward of their God according to the commandment of David and of Solomon his son (Neh. xii. 45).³⁸ Moreover, is it not marvelous that no example has been

³⁵ The verbs may be pointed as Hiphil.

^{35a} i. 7, xx. 1, xxiii. 6.

³⁶ xxiv. 26.

³⁷ I Sam. viii. 6-22.

³⁸ Whenever Chronicles and Nehemiah were written, their testimony shows that their writers did not know anything about a legal fiction ascribing all laws to Moses.

found in pre-Christian literature of the ascription to Moses of a law not found in the Pentateuch? You may be sure that if one such were known it would have been proclaimed by the traducers of the unity of the Pentateuch with a blare of trumpets, for it would be the unique specimen of direct evidence bearing on their alleged common use of the phrase to denote non-Mosaic authorship, a sort of *lucus* from *non-lucendo* argument. But no. Tobit has his hero burn the fish's liver at the command of an angel, not according to a law of Moses. The Zadokite fragments never ascribe their additions to the Pentateuchal laws to Moses. Therefore, let those who allege that the phrase "the Lord said to Moses" is a legal fiction produce some evidence or let the indictment of the claim of the laws of the Pentateuch to Mosaic authorship be dropped. May not some later writer by mistake or intention have ascribed even one law not found in the Pentateuch to Moses? We know of none.

Again, we find that no law of the four books from Exodus to Deuteronomy inclusive is, in the Pentateuch, or anywhere else in the pre-Christian Jewish literature, attributed to anyone but Moses. The modern critic asserts that the laws called Mosaic were not given by him but that they were written by at least seventeen different authors and redactors; and yet not one of these critics can mention the name of even one of these seventeen. To be sure, some of them have assumed that Hilkiyah forged the portion of Deuteronomy which, according to the accounts in Kings and Chronicles (the only sources of our information on the subject) Hilkiyah himself attributed to Moses. And we find that some have alleged that Ezekiel *may* have written the Code of Holiness in Lev. xvii-xxvi, but Ezekiel who is never backward about affixing his name to his other works, unfortunately for the critics, abstained from doing so to the work under consideration.

Again some have asserted that Ezra may have written P or even have composed the whole Pentateuch; but here again they draw on their imagination for their facts, since

the books of Ezra and Nehemiah both state clearly that Zerubbabel and Ezra and Nehemiah established in Jerusalem the laws and institutions that had been given by God to Israel through Moses.³⁹

WHERE MOSES WROTE

In the next place, all the laws of the Pentateuch attributed to Moses are either expressly, or impliedly, said in the record to have been given at certain *places*, that is, either in Egypt, or somewhere on the way from Egypt to the Jordan. This evidence, as to the localities in which the documents were written, so important in establishing the genuineness of any document, is almost absolutely ignored by the assailants of Mosaic authorship. What kind of a lawyer would he be who attacked or defended the genuineness of a letter without considering whether the locality where it was written was mentioned and whether paper, ink, language, and contents, harmonized with the alleged place of its production? Now it is said that the following sections of the law were commanded in the localities cited, to wit: Ex. xii. in Egypt (Ex. xii. 1), Ex. xix-xxiv, xxv-xxxi., and xxxiv, at the mountain; Lev. i-vii, in the wilderness of Sinai; Ex. xix. 1, 2, 3, 20, xxiv. 12, 13, 16, xxxi. 18, xxxiv. 2, 29, Lev. vii. 38, xxv. 1, xxvi. 46, xxvii. 34 Num. i. 1 iii. 1, ix. 1, out of the tabernacle of the congregation (Lev. i. 1). Others are preceded by the phrases: after they had left Egypt (Lev. xi. 45, xxii. 33,

³⁹ Thus, according to Ezra iii. 3, Jeshua and Zerubbabel built the altar, "as it is written in the law of Moses," and offered sacrifices and set the priests and the Levites in their offices "as it is written in the book of Moses," (vi. 18). According to Neh. viii. 1, 3, Ezra the scribe brought and read the book of the law of Moses, which the Lord had commanded to Israel. And in vs. 14, we are told that they "found written in the law which the Lord had commanded by Moses" certain laws with regard to the feast of Tabernacles. In ix. 3, it is said that the book of the law of God was read and it is acknowledged in vs. 34 that the kings and princes and fathers had not kept the law. But the people covenanted (x. 29) to walk in God's law which was given by Moses the servant of God. Again, in xiii. 1, we are told that "they read in the book of Moses." On the other hand, the service of song is said to have been reinstated after the ordinance of David, king of Israel (Ezra iii. 10).

xxiii. 43, xxv. 55, Num. xxv. 41); from the camp (Lev. xxiv. 23, Num. v. 2); when ye come into the land (Num. xv. 2, 18, xxxiii. 51, xxxiv. 2, Deut. xxvi. 1, xxvii. 2); while they were in the wilderness (Num. xv. 32); in the plains of Moab (Num. xxvi. 3, 63, xxvii. 3 [by implication] xxxi. 1, xxxvi. 13, Deut. i. 5, xxix. 1).

Now, the critics adverse to Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch have been sharp enough to see that if they can throw doubt upon the accuracy of the documents with regard to these places, they will impugn the veracity of the accounts. So, after a hundred and fifty years of diligent search they find one apparent flaw. It seems that E and D use Horeb in place of the Sinai of J and P as the locality of the giving of the law. Horeb is said to be the designation of the mountain of God used in the northern part of Palestine where E is assumed to have been written and Sinai that used in Judah, where J and P were written. But the critics fail to attempt even to show why D, a document of the southern kingdom, should have followed E instead of J, and why P should have failed to harmonize this alleged discrepancy, or even to have remarked upon it. Perhaps, the simplest and most obvious explanation is the best. Horeb and Sinai were in a sense the same, just as the Apalachian chain and the Alleghany Mountains and Chestnut Ridge are the same. I was born near the Chestnut Ridge of the Alleghany Mountains of the Apalachian Chain. In Europe I might speak of the Appalachian Mountains as my birthplace; in California, of the Alleghanies; in Western Pennsylvania, of the Chestnut Ridge. But I was born in only one place. So, as Hengstenberg long ago said,⁴⁰ "at a distance the mountain of God was called Horeb; near at hand, it was called Sinai, or once possibly Horeb."⁴¹ The use of mountain before Horeb is no proof that it was a single eminence and not a ridge; for Mount Ephraim was "the hill country of Ephraim" or as

⁴⁰ *On the Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, II, 327.

⁴¹ Ex. xxxiii. 6, in a passage of which Dr. Driver said: "No satisfactory analysis has been effected," LOT. 38.

Hastings Dictionary says⁴², "the mountain ridge in Central Palestine stretching N. to S. from the Great Plain to the neighborhood of Jerusalem."

WHEN MOSES WROTE

But lastly, not merely are all of the documents of the Tetrateuch (with the exception of a few ascribed to Aaron) ascribed to Moses, and the place where most of them originated indicated, many of them are *dated* as to year, month, and day. The critics quietly ignore these dates. They would possibly attribute them to the cunning of the forger, and assert that they were inserted with the express purpose of giving to the documents in which they occur the appearance of verisimilitude. Think of a counsel arguing before a court that the fact that a document—a will, a contract, a letter, a cheque—was correctly dated was *prima facie* evidence, not that it was genuine, but that it was a forgery! Let the critics show at least that the dates are not in the form of dates used in the time of Moses. But this they cannot do. But, on the other hand, it can be shown that in every particular the dates are of the same form as those that were used before 1500 B. C. There are two full forms of dates in the Pentateuch. The first, gives the order of day, month, year, as in Num. i. 1; "the first day of the 2nd month of the 2nd year after their going out from Egypt"; and the second, the order of year, month, day, as in Num. x. 11, "in the 2nd year, in the 2nd month, in the 20th day of the month" and Deut. i. 3, "in the 40th year in the 11th month on the first day of the month" and Num. xxxiii. 38, "in the fortieth year of the going out of the children of Israel from the land of Egypt in the fifth month on the first day of the month." The distinguishing feature of these two systems of dating is that the former puts the year last and the latter the year first. The first system was used in Babylon and Nineveh from the earliest documents down to the latest and the second system was used in Egypt in

⁴² Vol. I, p. 727.

like manner from the earliest dynasties down to the time of the Ptolomies. Thus "in the month Ab, the 22nd day, in the year after king Rim-Sin had conquered Isin";⁴³ "in the month Ayar, day 20, of the year after king Samsuiluna, etc.";⁴⁴ "in the month Shebat the 14th day, the second year after the destruction of Kiš."^{45 46} It will be noted that in every particular but one the dating of Num. i. 1 is like the datings from the time of Abraham. This particular is that Numbers puts the day before the month. This, however, was a usual departure of the Hebrew writers in using the Babylonian system. Jer. lii. 12 is the only place in the Old Testament where we find the order month, day, year. In Hag. i. 15; ii. 10; Zech. i. 7; and Ezra vi. 15, all from post-captivity times, we find the order day, month, year, as in Num. i. 1. In all of these post-captivity writings the name of the king is given exactly as we find it on the Babylonian documents from the time of Nebuchadnezzar II; whereas in Num. i. 1, the dating is "after the going out of Egypt" just as in the earliest Babylonian documents.

Examples of the Egyptian system of dating are to be found in numerous places in Petrie's *History of Egypt*,⁴⁷ in Breasted's *Ancient Records*,⁴⁸ and in the *Oxyrynchus Papyri*.⁴⁹ It is worthy of note, also, that the phrase "after the going out from Egypt" is paralleled in many cases in the earliest Egyptian records.⁵⁰ The Egyptian system is the one used commonly in the Old Testament by the writers who wrote before the return from Babylonia, and occasionally by those who wrote after 550 B. C. Thus we find the order year, month, day in Jer. xxxix. 2; xii. 4, 31; Ezek. i. 1;

⁴³ Schorr: *Urkunden des altbabylonischen Zivil-und Prozessrechts*, p. 53.

⁴⁴ *Id.* 153.

⁴⁵ *Id.* 214.

⁴⁶ These kings lived in or about the time of Hammurabi. See also Schorr, p. 249, 328, 416 for other examples.

⁴⁷ *E.g.* II, 67, 100-103.

⁴⁸ *E.g.* I, 137, 139, 140, 145, 160, etc.

⁴⁹ *E.g.* I, 170, 178, etc.

⁵⁰ Breasted *loc. cit.* I, 54.

viii. 1; xxiv. 1; xxix. 1, 11; xxx. 20; xxxi. 1; xxxii. 1; xxxiii. 21; and Hag. i. 1; and the order year, day, month in Ezek. xx. 1; xxvi. 1; xxxii. 17; xl. 1; Zech. vii. 1.

We see, therefore, from the above evidence that of the four full datings in the Pentateuch three follow the Egyptian system and one the Babylonian. Of the three following the Egyptian system one is in the prologue to D⁵¹ and two are in P.⁵² The one in Num. i. 1 follows the Babylonian order and belongs also to P. But the clause affixed (i.e. after the going out from Egypt) resembles the dates from the Hammurabi dynasty and not those from the time of Nebuchadnezzar or later. So that in respect to dates, as well as in respect to names and places, we find that the genuineness of the documents of the Pentateuch cannot be successfully assailed.

CONCLUSION

In regard to no one of these great *prima facie* marks of genuineness in documents—names, places, dates—have the destructive critics been able to show that the Pentateuch is false. As to these three specifications of the indictment, the assured result of scientific criticism, in strict adherence to the law of evidence, is that Moses gave the laws which have his name at the times and places indicated in the documents attributed to him as the mouthpiece of Jehovah. Why do the critics rage and the professors imagine a vain thing?

C. THE OLD TESTAMENT TEXT

Having thus shown by three examples taken from the documents of the Pentateuch that from a *prima facie* point of view these documents are substantiated by the evidence from the forms of contemporary documents and by the evidence as to their author and as to the times, places, and contents of their composition, we shall proceed to consider the attacks of the the critics upon the text,

⁵¹ i. 3.

⁵² Num. xi. 11; xxxiii. 38; both assigned in LOT. to P.

the grammar, vocabulary and contents of the documents of the Old Testament, on the basis of whose "assured results" they seek to establish their reconstruction of the literature and history of the people of Israel.

In the remainder of this article we shall confine ourselves to the *text* and shall endeavor to show that in view of the evidence bearing upon its origin and transmission the Hebrew text of the Massoretic Bible now in our possession is substantially reliable. In this and the succeeding discussions, we shall seek to follow without prejudice the laws of evidence as laid down in Sir James Stephen's *Digest of the Law of Evidence* insofar as they relate to documents. Where the evidence is already published and accessible to all, we shall merely refer our readers to the works containing the evidence. In cases where new evidence bearing on the subject can be produced we shall go more largely into particulars in order to show the grounds for our statements. As it will be impossible within the limits of an article such as this to give all the items of evidence, numerous citations of the sources of the testimony will be given; since it is the purpose of the writer to remove the discussion as far as possible from the field of subjective opinion to that of objective reality.

In the space at our disposal, it will be impossible to do more than suggest the reasons why we think that the charges against the general reliability of the Massoretic text cannot be supported by the evidence, that is, by the "documents produced for the inspection of the Judges,"⁵⁴ and by the opinion of experts which may be called evidence as to what the evidence of the documents really is.⁵⁵

⁵⁴ See for this definition of "evidence," Sir James Fitzjames Stephen's work *A Digest of the Law of Evidence*, p. 3. He defines evidence as "documents produced for the inspection of the Court or Judge." In this case of the critics against Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, every intelligent reader may consider himself the Court and judge and jury.

⁵⁵ The fact that a person is of the opinion that a fact in issue, or

TESTIMONY OF EXPERTS NECESSARY

The testimony of experts as to what the evidence really is, is especially necessary as to all subjects requiring special study or experience, such as all matters of science and art.⁵⁶ "It is a general rule of evidence that witnesses must give evidence of *facts*, not of *opinions*."⁵⁷ But "facts, not otherwise relevant, are deemed to be relevant if they support or are inconsistent with the opinions of experts, when such opinions are deemed to be relevant." "Whenever the opinion of any living person is deemed to be relevant, the grounds on which such opinion is based are also deemed to be relevant," and "an expert may give an account of experiments performed by him for the purpose of forming his opinions."⁵⁸

In fact, in questions of philology and history it is the experiments, i.e. the investigations of the original sources, which afford the grounds for the opinions of the expert, that are the most important part of his evidence; for they give the facts on which his conclusions are based. If the experiments or investigations have been faulty, either from an incomplete induction of the facts, or from a wrong

relevant or deemed to be relevant to the issue, does or does not exist is deemed to be irrelevant to the existence of such fact, except when "there is a question as to any point of science or art." When such a question arises, "the opinions upon that point of persons especially skilled in any such matter are deemed to be relevant facts."

⁵⁶ Science and art "include all subjects on which a course of special study or experience is necessary to the formation of an opinion." Persons thus qualified are called "experts." "The opinion as to the existence of the facts on which his [*i.e.* the expert's] opinion is to be given is irrelevant unless he perceived them himself."

⁵⁷ Italics in Stephen. He says further: "An expert may not only testify to opinions, but may state general facts which are the result of scientific knowledge." "The unwritten or common law of other states or countries may be proved by expert testimony." Genuine writings "may be used for comparison by the jury" or "by experts to aid the jury." "Experts in hand-writing may also testify to other matters, as *e.g.*, whether a writing is forged or altered, when a writing was probably made, etc."

⁵⁸ See Stephen's *Digest*, 100-112. The words not in quotation marks and the italicizing are due to the present writer.

interpretation of them, the grounds, or reasons, or opinions, based on the facts will also be faulty.

IMPORTANCE OF A CORRECT TEXT

In the case, therefore, of a literary document the first fact to investigate and establish is the original text of the document, and the second is the meaning of that text. When the original text can be produced, the correct interpretation of it is the principal matter, unless charges of interpolation are made. If, however, the original document cannot be produced, certified copies of the original, or copies approximating as nearly as possible to the original, may be introduced as evidence, and will have value for all parties to a controversy in proportion as they are recognized as genuine copies of the original. It is this fact that makes the question of the transmission of the text of the Old Testament fundamental to all discussions based upon the evidence of that text. Only in so far as we can establish a true copy of the original text shall we have before us reliable evidence for our inspection and interpretation. In regard to the Old Testament therefore, the first question to determine is whether we have a reliable copy of the original text. To this question the answer of the experts must be an unhesitating admission that in the text of our common Hebrew Bibles, corrected here and there especially by the evidence of the ancient versions and through the evidence from palaeography, we have substantially the original text. That is, we have it with sufficient accuracy to be reliable as evidence on all great questions of doctrine, law, and history. In support of this opinion, we shall in accordance with p. 54 of Stephen's *Digest*, give the following grounds, with the statement of the investigations on which they are based.

I. DIRECT EVIDENCE FOR TEXT

1. An examination of the Hebrew manuscripts now in existence shows that in the whole Old Testament there are scarcely any variants except in the use of the full and

defective writing of the vowels.⁵⁹ This carries us back to about the year 916 A. D., the date of the oldest MS. of any large part of the Hebrew Bible.

2. The Massorites have left to us the variants which they gathered and we find that they amount altogether to about 1200, less than one for each page of the printed Hebrew Bible.^{59a}

3. The various Aramaic versions (or Targums), the Syriac Peshitto, the Samaritan version, and the Latin Vulgate support with slight variations the present text.⁶⁰

4. The numerous citations in the New Testament, Josephus, Philo, and the Zadokite Fragments carry us back to the year 40 to 100 A. D. These citations show that those who used them had our present text with but slight variations. The numerous citations in the Hebrew of the Zadokite Fragments are especially valuable as a confirmation of the Hebrew text of Amos and other books cited.⁶¹

⁵⁹ See the collection of DeRossi and of Holmes and Parsons.

^{59a} These variants are to be found on the bottom margin of the printed Hebrew Bible.

⁶⁰ See my comparison of the Hebrew and Peshitto texts of Chronicles in the *Pres. and Ref. Review* for 1894. A comparison of the proper names of the Hebrew original and the Syriac version shows hundreds of variations of sight, largely between *r* and *d*, *n* and *y*, and *k* and *b*; hundreds more of variations due to sound, as *sh* and *s*, *z* and *s*, *d* and *t*, *d* and *z*, *b* and *m*, *b* and *p*, *m* and *n*, *l* and *r*, *n* and *l*, *n* and *r* (very uncommon), *a*, *y*, *m*, or *r*, or *k*, with gutturals, and palatals, inter-changing in almost every possible way. One great peculiarity of the Peshitto is the frequency with which the proper names are translated and the large number of cases of the transposition of letters. This statement is based on a collection of the variation of the proper names of the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, made and possessed by myself in manuscript. There are over two thousand variants in this collection. The Samaritan Targum scarcely varies at all in sense from the Samaritan-Hebrew original. Its variants are mostly in the gutturals which are used almost indiscriminately. This statement is based upon a concordance made by myself with the assistance of Prof. Jesse L. Cotton, D.D., Rev. Robert Robinson, and Rev. C. D. Brokenshire. The variations of Jerome's version arose mostly from a vowel pointing different from the Massoretic. The textual variations of the Targums are similar to those of the Hebrew manuscripts and of the Massoretic readings. See Cappelus: *Critica Sacra* II, 858-892.

⁶¹ Thus we find that the Zadokite Fragments cite the canonical books

5. The Septuagint version, the citations of Ecclesiasticus, the Book of Jubilees, and other pre-Christian literature, carry us back to about 300 B. C.⁶²

6. For the Pentateuch, the present Samaritan-Hebrew text (which has been transmitted for 2300 years or more, by copyists adverse to Rabbinical and Massoretic in-

226 times; 13 times from Genesis, 7 Ex., 29 Lev., 20 Num., 23 Deut. (92 Pentateuch); 3 Joshua, 3 Judges, 6 Samuel, 2 Kings, 30 Is., 9 Jer., 16 Etek., 9 Hos., 2 Amos, 1 Ob., 7 Mi., 1 Na., 3 Zech., 4 Mal. (Minor Prophets 27); 13 Ps., 1 Ru., 10 Prov., 3 Job, 1 Lam., 1 Est., 4 Dan., 2 Ezra, 1 Nah., 3 Chron. Some of these citations agree exactly with the consonants of our *textus receptus*; some differ slightly, some considerably; but they all indicate that the present text is substantially the same as that which was in existence when the book of Zadok was written. That Philo had the text of our Old Testament before him will be manifest to anyone who reads a page or two of Ryle's *Philo and Holy Scripture*, which gives Philo's citations from the canonical books of the Jews. For the New Testament, Toy's work on New Testament Quotations, shows plainly the same thing. As for Josephus, he himself claims that his *Antiquities* is based on the sacred writings of the Israelites and the writings demonstrate the truth of his statement.

⁶² The differences between the Hebrew Massoretic text and the Greek Septuagint are often grossly exaggerated. The vast majority of them arise merely from a difference of pointing of the same consonantal text. The real variants arose from errors of sight such as those between *r* and *d*, *k* and *b*, *y* and *w*, or from errors of sound such as between gutturals, labials, palatals, sibilants, and dentals. There is a goodly number of transpositions, some dittographies, many additions or omissions, sometimes of significant consonants, but almost all in unimportant words and phrases. Most of the additions seem to have been for elucidation of the original. In the case of Jeremiah we have in the Greek a recension which excludes many recurrent phrases. It may be compared with the Babylonian and Aramaic recension of the Behistun inscription as contrasted with the Persian and Susian. While substantially the same, they vary in many particulars.—For the Old Testament citations and allusions of Ben-Sira, see my article on "The Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus" in the *Pres. and Ref. Review* for 1900.—For the Book of Jubilees, see the collection of variants by R. H. Charles in the *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* of the Old Testament, II. 5, 6. Prof. Charles has gathered only 25 variants, 8 of single consonants, 1 of transposition of words, 9 of omission of a word and 1 of a phrase, 2 cases of change of gender, 1 of number, and 3 inexplicable corruptions. The result of his investigation is a wonderful corroboration of the substantial correctness of our present Hebrew text.

fluences) agrees substantially with the received text of our Hebrew Bibles. Most of the variants are the same in character as those which we find in the transmission of all originals and especially in the transmission of our Hebrew text itself.⁶³ This carries the text back at the latest to about 400 B. C.

7. The Hebrew Scriptures contain the names of 26 or more foreign kings whose names have been found on documents contemporary with the kings. The names of most of these kings are found to be spelled on their own monuments, or in documents from the time in which they reigned in the same manner that they are spelled in the documents of the Old Testament. The changes in the spelling of others, are in accordance with the laws of phonetic change as those laws were in operation at the time when the Hebrew documents claim to have been written. In the case of two or three names only are there letters, or spellings, that cannot as yet be explained with certainty; but even in these few cases it cannot be shown that the spelling in the Hebrew text is wrong. Contrariwise, the names of many of the kings of Judah and Israel are found on the Assyrian contemporary documents with the same spelling as that which we find in the present Hebrew text.

The names of Chedorlaomer and his confederates are written in the Hebrew as follows: Amraphel (אמרפל), Chedorlaomer. (כדרלעמר), Arioch (אריוך), and Tidal (תדעל). The first name is undoubtedly meant to denote Hammurabi, king of Babylon, and is to be divided into *'ammu, rafi* and *ili*. The first syllable is usually written in Babylonian *ha* but there are cases where it is written *'a*. The *l* at the end stands for *ilu* "god." This word *ilu* is found at the end of the names of other kings of the same

⁶³ See Gesenius', *De Pentateuchi Samaritani origine*, the standard work on this subject; and, also, the able criticism of the work of Gesenius by J. Iverach Munro, entitled, *The Samaritan Pentateuch*. See also a review of Petermann's *Pentateuchus Samaritanus* by R. D. Wilson in *Pres. and Ref. Review*, III. 199.

dynasty as Hammurabi, such as *Sumula-ilu*, *Samsu-ilu-na*, and also of persons not kings as *Šumman-la-ilu*.⁶⁴ The omission of the Aleph from לֵן is found also in the Hebrew of the מֵן of Sennacherib and Esarhaddon. As to the names of the other kings, no one can deny that they are spelled correctly. For *kudur* occurs in names of the time of Hammurabi and *Laomer* occurs in Ashurbanipal's list of the gods of Elam.⁶⁵ The *Kudur-Lakhgumal* of Pinches inscription⁶⁶ is certainly the same as the *Kudur-Laomer* of Gen. xiv. The changes of the gutturals and palatals and of *l* and *r* are common ones in the transliterations of languages. Thus Babylonian *l* equals Persian *r*, Hebrew *l* equals Egyptian *r*; Hebrew *y* often equals Egyptian *k*, Greek *g*, Babylonian *g*.⁶⁷ In Tidal the *y* is regular for מ. In Arioch the consonants are exact equivalents of the like word in Sumerian. No one can doubt therefore, that the Hebrew text of the proper names may have been written in the time of Hammurabi; and that, whenever it was written, it has been handed down correctly

⁶⁴ King: *Letters* II, pp. 21, 215, 241.

⁶⁵ KB II 205. In an article on the gods of Elam by M. H. de Genouillac in the *Receuil de Travaux*, xxvii. 94f, we learn that the Elamite way of spelling the name was *La-ga-mar*. M. Francois Martin in his *Textes Religieux* gives the spellings as *La-ga-ma-al* (for which he cites two cases) and *La-ga-mar* (for which he cites two cases). Ashurbanipal spells the name *La-ga-ma-ru* (V. R. 6a, 33). The LXX gives it as Χοδολλογομόρ, having assimilated the first *r* to the following *l*. The name appears already in the time of Kutur-Nahhunti and again in an inscription of his brother, Shilhak-in-Shushinak. A son of Kutur-Nahhunti was called Shilhina-hamru-Lagamar (in three different texts), and Shutruru speaks of him as "the great."—King in his *History of Babylon*, p. 113, gives 2282 B. C. as the date of Kutur-Nahhunti (whose name he spells Kutur-Nankhumdi) and about 2080 B.C. as that of Hammurabi (id. 111). See also Scheil in the *Memoires of the Delegation en Perse*, Tome III, *Textes Élamites-Anzanites*, p. 49; and Deimel in the *Pantheon Babylonicum, Nomina Deorum, etc.*, Romae 1914, p. 160f.

⁶⁷ In the case of *Laomer* the changes of *l* and *r* are found on the documents of Elam, Babylon, and Assyria.

to our times. The very disputes about their names are the very strongest corroborations of the general belief of all critics in the accurate transmission of the Hebrew text. In the twenty consonants of these four names we have, therefore, twenty witnesses to the correctness of the Hebrew *textus receptus*.

The five kings of Egypt are: Shishak (ששק), So (סוא), Tirhakah (תרהקה), Necho (נכו), and Hophra (חפרע), reigning at intervals from 1,000 to 600 B. C. There are here 18 consonants in the Hebrew text and they represent 18 consonants in the *cartouches* of the kings named. Here we have one of the most remarkable instances of exact transmission of proper names on record. For first, the guttural consonants, א, ה, ח, and ע; the palatals and *r* all represent the same letters in the original. The only changes from the original are the assimilation of the *n* in Sheshank, the adding of the vowel letter ה at the end of Tirhakah, the changing of *sh* to *s* and of *b* to *w* in *So*, and the change of *b* to *p* in Hophra,—all changes in harmony with the general laws of variations in sounds in the passing from one language to another.

The kings of Assyria are Tiglath-pileser (תגלת פלאסר), Shalmaneser (שלמנאסר), Sargon (סרגון), Sennacherib (סנחריב), and Esarhaddon (אסרחדן); and the kings of Babylon Merodachbaladan (מרדך בלאדן), Nebuchadnezzar (נבוכדנצר), Evil-Merodach (אویل מרדך), and Belshazzar (בלשצר). These words contain 63 letters of which 59 are consonants. Comparing these consonants with those of the originals we find that the only changes in the Hebrew text contrary to general rules are the representing of *sh* in Shalmaneser by *sh*, and the assimilation or dropping of *r* in the *sha(r)* of Belshazzar.⁶⁸ As to the rendering of the Assyrian *sh* by *sh* it is to be noted that this is the way in which this particular root שלם is always written in both the Aramaic

⁶⁸ For the latter compare the confusion of שמע and שמר by the Septuagint translators and the falling out or assimilation of *r* in the examples given in Lidzbarski's *Epigraphik*, p. 393.

and Canaanitish dialects.⁶⁹ The writing in Daniel of Nebuchadnezzar for Nebuchadrezzar, involving the change of *r* to *n*, may be explained either by assuming that the former is the Aramaic form of the latter, or that the *r* is changed to *n* as in the example given in Lidbarski.⁷⁰

The four names of Achaemenid kings found in the Scriptures are Cyrus (כרש), Darius (דריוש), Ahasuerus (אחשורוש), and Artaxerxes (ארתחשסתא), of which the last part is written also ששת and ששתא. The *Aleph* in Xerxes is prosthetic as in the word *satrap* (אחשדרפן) and the final *Aleph* as found in certain spellings of the name Artaxerxes is *otiant*. The *Wau* in Xerxes is a contraction of *aya*. In the case of Artaxerxes the dental and sibilant are transposed in accordance with general laws of dental and sibilants. In the Sachau Papyri from the eighth century B.C. the names are written כרש, דריוש (or דרוהוש, דרוהוש), חשירש, and ארתחשמש. In Babylonian the *Wau* in Darius is commonly written *m*, Xerxes has often a prosthetic vowel, and Artaxerxes is written in the Babylonian recension 'of the original inscription Artak-satsu (or with an *h* instead of *k*).⁷¹ Thus we see that every one of the 22 consonants composing the names of the kings of Persia mentioned in the Bible has been transmitted correctly to us over a space 23 or 24 hundred years. It may be added that in no other non-Persian document are they so accurately transliterated.

Other kings of foreign countries mentioned in the Bible and also on contemporary documents outside the Bible are Hadadezer (הדדעזר), Hazael (חזואל), and Rezin (רצין), of Damascus, Hiram (חירם), and Ethbaal (אתבעל) of Tyre, and משע of Moab. These names

⁶⁹ This appears from numerous examples in Lidbarski's *Epigraphik*, pp. 376, 377, for Phœnician, Punic, Hebrew, Nabatian, Palmyrene, and Egypto-Aramaic.

⁷⁰ *Epigraphik*, pp. 329, 393. See also my *Studies on the Book of Daniel*, p. 167, note.

⁷¹ See Weissbach *Keilinschriften der Achaemeniden*, and Strassmaier's *Inschriften von Darius* and numerous tablets in CT and VASD.

contain at least 24 consonants, and every one of them has the proper writing in our Hebrew Bibles. In fact, Hadad (הדר), and Ethbaal (אתבעל) are spelled more correctly in the Hebrew text than they are in the Assyrian records.⁷²

Again, there are at least six kings of Israel and four of Judah whose names are found in the Assyrian records, to wit: Omri (עמרי), Ahab (אהאב), Jehu (יהוא), Menahem (מנחם), Pekah (פקח), Hoshea (הושע), Azariah (עזריה), Ahaz (אחז), Hezekiah (חזקיהו), and Menasseh (מנשה). By comparing the Assyrian renditions of the letters it will be found that the whole 41 are written in our Hebrew Bibles in a manner corresponding to the transliteration of the Assyrian texts.

Thus we find that in 120 cases of transliteration from Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian and Moabite into Hebrew and in 41 cases of the opposite, or 161 in all, the evidence shows that for 2300 to 3900 years the text of the proper names in the Hebrew Bible has been transmitted with the most minute accuracy. That the original scribes should have written them with such close conformity to correct philological principles is a wonderful proof of their thorough care and scholarship. That they should have been transmitted by copyists through so many centuries is a phenomenon unequalled in the history of literature.

For neither the assailants nor the defenders of the biblical text should assume for one moment that either this accurate rendition or this correct transmission of proper names is an easy or usual thing. And as some of my readers may not have experience in investigating such matters, attention may be called to the names of the kings of Egypt as given in Manetho and on the Egyptian monuments. Manetho was a high priest of the idol-temples in Egypt in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, i.e. about 280 B. C. He wrote a work on the dynasties of Egyptian kings, of which frag-

⁷² For a detailed discussion of the evidence see KAT and Lidzbarski's *Epigraphik*.

ments have been preserved in the works of Josephus, Eusebius, and others. Of the kings of the 31 dynasties, he gives 140 names from 22 dynasties. Of these, 49 appear on the monuments in a form in which every consonant of Manetho's spelling may possibly be recognized, and 28 more may be recognized in part. The other 54 are unrecognizable in any single syllable. If it be true that Manetho himself copied these lists from the original records—and the fact that he is substantially correct in 54 cases corroborates the statement,—the hundreds of variations and corruptions in the fifty or more unrecognizable names must be due either to his fault in copying or to the mistakes of the transmitters of his text.

Another example of the difficulty of transmitting proper names is to be found in the life of Alexander by the Pseudo-Callisthenes. Concerning this work the late President Woolsey of Yale College has truly said, that in the Greek manuscripts and in the versions “proper names assume different forms at will,” and there is “an amazing difference in the proper names.” “A daughter-in-law of queen Candace is called Harpussa by B. and C., Matersa by A, and Margie by V.” “In the list of combatants in the games the Syriac has nine names like the Greek and Latin authorities, but they are all so much altered that two or three only have any resemblance.”⁷³

Thus analogical evidence as well as the evidence of the documents forces us to the conclusion that the spelling of the proper names of the kings must go back to original sources; and if the original sources were in the hands of the composers of the documents, the probability is that since the composers are correct in the spelling of the names of the kings they are correct also in the sayings and deeds which they record concerning these kings. And this we find in general to be true where the Hebrew documents and the

⁷³ See for the evidence in full the article of President Woolsey entitled: Notice of a Life of Alexander the Great translated from the Syriac by Rev. Dr. Justin Perkins, New Haven, 1854, in Reprint from the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. IV, 359-440.

monuments both record the great deeds of the kings. Thus the Hebrew Scriptures mention the expedition of Shishak against Judah, and the Egyptian records at Thebes record the conquest of Judah by the same king. The Assyrian monuments speak of the wars of Tiglath-Pileser, Shalmaneser, Sargon, and Sennacherib; the Hebrew documents record the same events in their proper order and with the like results. Mesha says that he asserted his independence of Ahab; the Scriptures say that he rebelled against Israel. From the mouths of many witnesses—for in this case every consonant gives out a voice of testimony—the Hebrew documents are corroborated. The great kings come up from the south and the greater kings come down from the north, and the little kings of Tyre and Damascus and Moab and Israel and Judah meet them in the slash and clash of battle and the kings record their victories on the pyla of Thebes, on the cliffs of Behistun, on the stones of Moab, on the high built walls of their palaces and tombs; and the great kings and the small go alike the inevitable way of all flesh. But they did not live in vain. For their deeds and their very names speak out today in confirmation of the history of that little, oft conquered, nation whose God was Jehovah and whose oracles were the oracles of God.

8. The names of these kings—about forty in all—are the names of men who lived from about 2,000 to about 400 B. C., and yet they each and all appear in proper chronological order both with reference to the kings of the same country and with respect to the kings of other countries contemporary with them. No stronger evidence for the substantial accuracy of the Old Testament records could possibly be imagined than this collection of names of kings. It means that out of 56 kings of Egypt from Shishak to Darius II, and out of the numerous kings of Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Tyre, Damascus, Moab, Israel, and Judah, that ruled from 2,000 to 400 B. C., the writers of the Old Testament have put the names of the 40 or more, that are mentioned in records of two or more of the nations, in

their proper absolute and relative order of time and in their proper place. Any expert mathematician will tell you, that to do such a thing is practically impossible without a knowledge of the facts such as could be drawn alone from contemporary and reliable records. When we consider that there are nine distinct lines of kings in the countries mentioned, and that there are several hundred kings in all, and that the length of the reigns of the kings could be determined only from the most accurate records, the chance of anyone who did not have access to reliable sources to get a record as exact as that preserved for us in the Hebrew Scriptures would be so small that no mathematician on earth could calculate it.

9. The proper names and laws and customs of the time of Abraham are such as are met with in the extra-biblical records from the time of Hammurabi, of whom Abraham, according to Gen. xiv was a contemporary.⁷⁴

10. The proper names and customs of the story of Joseph harmonize with the time when Joseph is said to have been in Egypt.⁷⁵

11. The proper names of the Samaria ostraka and the names and events recorded on the Moabite stone agree with the biblical records of the time of Ahab.⁷⁶

12. Moreover, the kinds of foreign words embedded in the different documents of the Old Testament argue strongly for the genuineness and for the accurate transmission of this original text. Thus, the first chapters of Genesis contain proper and common names of Sumerian or Babylonian origin,⁷⁷ and the Pentateuch has many Egyptian words.⁷⁸ In the time of Solomon, whose mother had been the wife

⁷⁴ See my article in the *Bible Student* for 1904. In reading the article please bear in mind that the proof was never revised by the author.

⁷⁵ See Pinches: *The Old Testament*, etc. p. 249-267.

⁷⁶ See Lyon in *Harvard Review* for 1911, p. 136.

⁷⁷ E.g. Adam, Abel, Abraham, Arioch; and תהום, בהן (= Sumerian ba-ru(?)), אר, בנה (in sense of "form").

⁷⁸ E.g. Ramases, Pithom, On, Potiphar, Asenath; זפת, תכה, גמא, סין, סוף.

of Uriah the Hittite and whose commerce included products from all countries, and whose empire extended from the Euphrates to the borders of Egypt, we find in the narrative, words of Hittite, Indian and Assyrian origin.⁷⁹ In the documents from the 8th to the 6th century we find predominantly foreign words of Syrian, Assyrian and Babylonian character.⁸⁰ And in the records from the 6th century to the end we find Babylonian, Persian, and a few Greek words.⁸¹

13. The Old Testament documents claim that records were written by Moses,⁸² by Joshua,⁸³ by Deborah,⁸⁴ by a young man of Succoth,⁸⁵ by Samuel,⁸⁶ by David,⁸⁷ and either by, or in the days of, all the kings of Israel and Judah from Solomon to Zedekiah. For thousands of years before the time of Moses, the Egyptians on the southward of Palestine and the Babylonians on the east had been writing documents similar in form and content to those found in the Pentateuch. For thousands of years before Moses, the Babylonians had been making expeditions and carrying their culture to the coasts of the Mediterranean. For hundreds of years before his time, kings of Egypt had been raiding Palestine, and her merchants

⁷⁹ Thus, פתגם and פירס have their nearest analogies in Armenian, the closest of the Indo-Europeans to the ancient Hittites (See Meyer in *Encyclopedia Britannica*, art. "Persia"). The names for apes and elephants (I. Kings xi. 22) are of Indian origin הַב = *iba* (Burnouf *Sanskrit Dict.* p. 89), קפּי = *Kapi*, (*id.* p. 140). And זבל, פּחח, סנ and סנ came from the Assyro-Babylonian (or from the Sumerian through the Babylonian).

⁸⁰ *E.g.* Hazael, Benhadad, Tiglath-Pileser, Merodach-Baladan, Bel, Nebo, Tartan, Rabshakeh.

⁸¹ *E.g.* Zerubbabel, Sheshbazzar, Sanballat, and many names of officers, offices, and things.

⁸² Thus, JE in Ex. xvii. 14, xxxii. 32, xxiv. 12, xxxiv. 17; D in Deut. x. 4, iv. 13, v. 19, x. 2, xxviii. 61, xxxi. 9, 22; P in Num. xxxiii. 2, Ex. xxxix. 30.

⁸³ Josh. viii. 32, xviii. 4, xxiv. 26.

⁸⁴ Jud. v. 14.

⁸⁵ Judges viii. 14.

⁸⁶ 1 Sam. x. 25.

⁸⁷ 2 Sam. xi. 14, 15.

and travellers had been frequenting her ports and inland cities and leaving the records of their transactions in their tales and autobiographies. The Tel-el-Amarna letters, written from every part of Palestine and Syria, show that writing in cuneiform was practised everywhere in these countries 200 years before the time of Moses. And the tablets from Taanach, Gezer, and elsewhere show that such writings were still made as late as 600 B. C. Various documents in Phenician, Aramaic, Hittite, Cypriote, Cretan, Moabite, Minaean, Sabeen, and Hebrew, from 1000 B. C. to 400 B. C., show that during all this period documents of various kinds were in use among the nations of Western Asia in, and on every side of, Palestine. The character of the documents shows also that there must have been a general diffusion among the people of the ability to read and write. In view of all these facts, the *sang froid* with which these modern Germans and their followers affirm that writings could not have been produced among the Hebrews till 800 or 900 B.C. passes belief. Against the express and reiterated statements of the biblical records that writing was in use among the Hebrews from Moses downward, supported as these statements are by all the direct evidence of the documents of all the surrounding nations, they set up their *opinion*—an opinion that receives no support from the documents, until they have been arbitrarily amended and interpreted in order to bring them into harmony with the *a priori* opinions which on the face of them the documents themselves clearly condemn.

That the Hebrew of the text may have been written as early as the time of the Exodus is proven, (1) by the Hebrew words embedded in the Tel-el-Amarna Letters; (2) by the proper names in the Egyptian lists of places conquered in Palestine; and (3) by the proper names of the Hammurabi period.⁸⁸

⁸⁸ Böhl, *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe*; W. Max Müller, *Die Palästinaliste Thutmosis III*; Clay, *Light on the OT from Babylon*. p. 147; and Ranke, *Early Babylonian Personal Names*.

II. EVIDENCE FROM ANALOGY

The testimony supplied by the history of the transmission of the text of other ancient documents, supported as it is by what we know of the transmission of the text of the Old Testament for the last 2000 years, justifies the presumption that the copies of the Old Testament text existent 2000 years ago had in like manner been transmitted from their originals. Thus—

1. The fragments of classical writers found in the papyri of Egypt when compared with modern printed editions based on manuscripts, many of which are not a thousand years old show that, with few important variations, the classical authors have been correctly transmitted for 2000 to 2500 years. In the fragments of 150 lines from Homer in the papyri from Oxyrynchus, the Fayum and Hibeh, edited by Grenfell, Hunt, and others, many lines are exactly the same as in the edition of Munro Allen. Most of the variants are merely slight such as adding *n*, or putting *e* for *ei*. In the two fragments of Herodotus, from the end of the 3rd century A. D., published in the Oxyrynchus Papyri, there is no variant from Dietsch's edition, though there are a few minor variations from Stein's edition.

2. The building inscriptions of Nabunaid refer to the fact that certain temples had been built by Hammurabi, who reigned over Babylon 1500 years before his time, saying that he had found the *temens* or foundation stones of Hammurabi. In the copies of records of Hammurabi which were made about 650 B. C. for the library of Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria, and preserved in Nineveh, mention is made of the founding of these temples.⁸⁹

⁸⁹ See the *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* III, II, 91 and King's *Letters of Hammurabi*, p. 181-3. An inscription of Hammurabi in Sumerian says among other things: "When Shamash gave unto him Shumer and Accad to rule and entrusted their sceptre to his hands, then did (Hammurabi) build for Shamash, the lord who is the protector of his life, the temple Ebabbar, his beloved temple, in Larsam, the city of his rule." (King: *Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, p. 182.) In another inscription we read: "Hammurabi, the mighty king, the king of Babylon, king of the four quarters of the world. hath built Ebabbar, the

3. The library of Ashurbanipal at Ninevah had thousands of documents that were copies of originals going back hundreds, and in some cases thousands, of years before his time.⁹⁰

4. Some parts of the Egyptian Book of the Dead were in use in the same form for nearly 4000 years.⁹¹

5. Scores of duplicates and triplicates among the Assyrian, Babylonian, and Egyptian, documents show that from 2000 B.C. down to the year 400 B. C. copies of documents were often made with absolute exactness and generally with substantial accuracy.⁹²

6. The variants in these duplicates show clearly, however, that differences of spelling, enumeration, and even omissions and additions, etc., are no proof in themselves of a difference in either age or authorship.⁹³ Examples of the

temple of Shamash in the city of Larsam" (*id.* 183). Referring to this temple Nabunaid says, that in his tenth year Shamash commanded him to restore Ebarra. He says that he found the *temen* and plan of the temple inscribed with the name of Hammurabi, "the old-time king who, 700 years before Burnaburiash, Ebarra and its Zikurat upon the old *temen* had built to Shamash. (KB. III. II. o. Col. I. 54. II. 1-60, 1-32.)

⁹⁰ See Dennefeld: *Babylonisch-assyrische Geburts-omina*, p. 9. 3, on the Entstehungszeit, Entstehungs-und Ueberlieferungsart des Originalwerkes; also, Hunger: *Beckenwahrsagung bei den Babyloniern und Assyriern*, II. 503 f.

⁹¹ A tradition as old as the twelfth dynasty says that chapter XXX B of the *Book of the Dead* was discovered by Herutataf the son of Khufu in the reign of Menkaura, a king of the fourth dynasty. It was cut in hieroglyphics and set under the feet of Thoth. This prayer was still recited by the Egyptians in the Ptolemaic period and so must have been in use for about four thousand years. See Budge: "*The Literature of the Egyptians*, p. 50."

⁹² Three of these duplicates may be seen in Strassmaier's *Inschriften von Cyrus* and 14 in his *Inschriften von Nebuchadonosor*. See also VASD. The five quadrilingual inscriptions of Darius on steles placed along the Suez canal were duplicates, as were also his Egyptian inscriptions at El Khergeh. (See TSBA. V. 293 and *Recueil de Travaux* VII. 1, IX. 131, XI. 160).

⁹³ This appears most clearly and frequently from the various originals of the Behistun inscriptions as they appear in the four recensions of which we possess one each in whole or in part in the Persian, Susian, Babylonian, and Aramaic. These differences will be discussed

different ways of spelling will be seen in the lists of Thothmes III at Karnak. Thirty-five variants occur in 119 names.^{93a} In the 17 lines of tablet no. 321 of Strassmaier's *Inschriften von Cyrus* the duplicate copy gives eight variants; one supplies an erosion, one an omission, one an explanation, three are corrections, and two fuller writings. One of the best exhibitions of duplicates and triplicates will be found in Dennefeld's *Geburts-Omina*. An intelligent study of this masterly work might well be made a pro-paedeutic to the study of textual criticism, illustrating as it does from numerous contemporary documents all kinds of copyists' mistakes due to sight and sound.

7. Hundreds of bilingual inscriptions containing the original Sumerian with its Assyrian translations some made in the time of Hammurabi and some in the time of Ashurbanipal, as well as the four recensions of the Behistun inscriptions, known to us, show that the kinds of variations that we find between the Hebrew text and its versions are to be found in them. As it does not impair the general veracity of the former, so neither does it do so for the Hebrew.⁹⁴

8. If the original documents of the duplicates of the more fully when we come to consider the book of Chronicles. Here attention is called merely to the fact that the Babylonian copy of the Aramaic varies frequently from its original in the enumerations, and that the Babylonian and Aramaic recensions are much shorter than the Persian and Susian. (See my review of the Sachau *Papyrus* in this REVIEW. for 1914.)

^{93a} See plates in W. Max Müller's *Die Palästinaliste Thothmes III*.

⁹⁴ More than 2000 interlinear texts are mentioned in Bezold's *Catalogue of the Cuneiform Texts in the Kouyunjik collection of the British Museum*. Good examples are published in *The Seven Tablets of Creation* by Prof. L. W. King, pp. 130-139, 180. On page 217 of this same work will be found an example of a work in Sumerian containing word for word explanations in Assyrian. Hundreds of such texts have been found in the library of Kuyunjik (See Bezold's *Catalogue* pp. 2010, 2092-2103). One of the most interesting of these bilingual inscriptions is by *Samsuiluna*, successor of Hammurabi, of which there are two copies of the Sumerian original and two copies of the Babylonian version, with slight variants in both originals and versions, (See King: *The Letters of Hammurabi*, p. 198 f).

Old Testament (making about one fifth of the whole) were written in cuneiform script, most of the variations between them could be paralleled by the variations in the translations of the Assyrian from the Sumerian.⁹⁵

III. THE AD HOMINEM ARGUMENT

But the strongest argument against the critics from the textual point of view is the childlike simplicity with which they appeal to that part of the text which happens to suit their particular theory of Old Testament history, literature or religion. After having, in order to prove this theory, cast out, without one item of evidence to support them, hundreds of words from the *prima facie* text of the documents, they proceed to point and interpret what remains with as much assurance as if they had really proven beyond all controversy that what they had arbitrarily cast out was false and with as much presumption as if they had actually proven that what they have retained is true. What would a court do with a plaintiff that desired to have a document admitted as evidence in support of his side of the case, after the same plaintiff had charged that the document was neither genuine, authentic, nor historical? Would the court not demand at least that the plaintiff should prove beyond controversy that the parts of the documents that the plaintiff desired to introduce as evidence were reliable, as claimed? And since in almost every instance of such claim the critics are unable to produce any proof—simply because no such proof exists,—is it not obvious that they must be debarred from introducing as evidence the parts that support their side, as long at least as they insist on denying the evidence of the parts that support the defense? In short,

⁹⁵ *E.g.* the numerous synonyms in the parallel passages of Kings and Chronicles may be compared to the rendering of *DIM*, in the creation tablets, by *ba-ni*, *ba-na-at*, *ip-še-it*, and *e-pu-uš*, and *BA-RU* by *e-pu-uš*, and *ib-ta-ni*. See the *Creation of the World by Marduk in Kings Seven Tablets of Creation*, I. 130-139. On this subject the author of this article read a paper at the International Congress of Orientalists in St. Louis in 1904. He hopes to be able to publish this paper at an early date.

no argument can be made against that part of the text of the Old Testament which upholds the *prima facie* evidence of the documents, which will not overthrow in a much greater degree the text that the critics attempt to establish.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In view of this mass of evidence, analogy and admission, the following conclusions seem to be justified: 1. The traditional text has in its favor in the case of the most important of the documents the claim to have been in its original form written by, or for, certain definite persons and to have been written in the places and at the times mentioned; and the possibility of their having been written as claimed is supported by the outside evidence that writing was then in vogue, that the literary forms in which the text is written were then known, that the Hebrew language was then in use, that scribes and copyists were then existent, that the contents are in harmony with what is *known* of the times when they claim to have been written.

2. The proof that the copies of the original documents have been handed down with substantial correctness for more than 2000 years cannot be denied. That the copies in existence 2000 years ago had been in like manner handed down from the originals is not merely possible, but is rendered probable by the analogies of Babylonian documents now existing of which we have both originals and copies, thousands of years apart, and of scores of papyri which show when compared with our modern editions of the classics that only minor changes of the text have taken place in more than 2000 years and especially by the scientific and demonstrable accuracy with which the proper spelling of the names of kings and of the numerous foreign terms embedded in the Hebrew text have been transmitted to us.⁹⁵

⁹⁵ By substantial as used in the above statements we mean that the text of the Old Testament and of the other documents have been changed only in respect to those accidental matters which necessarily accompany the transmission of all texts where originals have not been

3. From the above given array of evidence and especially from the fact that the destructive critics themselves make use of the traditional text in support of every theory which they have broached, the conclusion is irresistible that the *textus receptus* must be accepted in its *prima facie* consonantal form as correct and reliable in all cases where there is no irrefragable weight of outside evidence against it.

4. In view of the thoroughly established fact that the vowel signs were not added to the consonantal text till about 600 A.D., and that the vowel letters were subject to change as late as the latest manuscripts, it results that all arguments based on specific pointings must be abandoned, unless the pointings can be proven from outside evidence to be correct.⁹⁶

5. In view of the exactness with which the proper names of persons and places have been transmitted for 4000 years and their general agreement in the parallel passages, the presumption is, that the names for God, also, have been rightly transmitted. This presumption lays the burden of proof upon the critics, who, in order to establish their theory, arbitrarily and without any direct evidence in their favor, throw out *Elohim* from every place where it occurs in Gen. ii. 3-iv, and *Jehovah* from many passages in other parts.⁹⁷

preserved and which consequently exist merely in copies or copies of copies. Such changes may be called *minor* in that they do not seriously affect the doctrines of the documents nor the general impression and evident veracity of their statements as to geography, chronology, and other historical matters.

⁹⁶ Thus, Wellhausen's view in his *History of Israel*, p. 389, that *zakar* "male" was in earlier times *zakur* and that *zakur* must be substituted for *zakar* in Ex. xxxiv. 9, Deut. xv. 19, and 1 K. xi. 15 seq., and *zakar* read in all so-called later documents, is purely subjective and without any possible objective evidence in its favor. So, also, the pointing of אָכַר in Ecc. iii. 6 represents merely the exegesis of the Massorites and not necessarily the intention of the original writer. (LOT. 474). Objection to the arguments for the late date of Deuteronomy based on the use of *nathan* and *'asa* in ii. 12, would be sufficiently met by pointing *nothen* and *'ose*.

⁹⁷ The unjustifiable procedure of the critics with regard to the names of God is further shown by the analogy of the Koran, where we find

the same variety in the use of the words for Lord and God that we meet with in the Pentateuch. This statement is based on a comparative concordance of *Allaha* and *rab*, which I have prepared. It shows that some Suras use neither, some one or the other, and some both; and this in all the kinds of variations that are found in the Pentateuch.

Finally, the analogy of the transmission of texts as shown among the Egyptians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Persians, Greeks, and Arabs, shows that there is a presumption against the theory of the critics that the Hexateuch is the result of the work of seventeen or more authors and redactors, combining in an inexplicable and inextricable confusion, three or four parallel accounts and four, or more, recensions of laws representing widely different periods of time and development.⁹⁸

Princeton.

ROBERT DICK WILSON.

(To be continued)

⁹⁸ The analogy of the great historical work of Herodotus and of great works of fiction like *Don Quixote*, or Victor Hugo's *Don Caesar*, is convincing that duplicates such as are found in the Pentateuch are true to life. The biographies, also, of Thothmes III and Tiglath Pileser I and Alexander and Caesar are as full of similar events as are those of Abraham and Moses. Caesar's accounts of his two voyages to Britain and of his two bridges over the Rhine are beautiful examples of them. Alexander was always consulting his *mantis*. "Lives of great men all remind us."

JUL 26 1919
THEOLOGICAL SEMIN

The Princeton Theological Review

JULY, 1919

THE CRISES OF CHRISTIANITY AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE

*As oppositions of contraries lend beauty to language,
so the beauty of the course of the world is achieved
by the opposition of contraries, arranged as it were by an*

Christianity is at a crisis. This does not mean that she is decreasing numerically. Over 570,000,000² persons avow themselves Christians. Neither does it mean that she is calling in her outposts. Every considerable country is being occupied by the missionaries of the cross. Nor yet does it mean that at home she is losing interest in social progress. As never before sociology is her study and philanthropy her passion.

What is meant is that while developing her philanthropy, she is detaching it from the church and even from Christ. A constantly growing number of Christians are advocating and are themselves supporting "welfare work" which is intentionally and often ostentatiously non-religious. What could be more suggestive, more alarming? The bouquet of roses is both beautiful and fragrant. In a day or two, however, its perfume will have gone and its beauty will have departed. It must be so with flowers that have been picked from the living bush. Can it be otherwise with social or charitable movements which have separated themselves from Christ, even if they have not in terms repudiated him? At best they are but flowers that have been picked.

Again, the crisis of Christianity appears in this, that while her missionaries are multiplying, their gospel, it would seem, here and there, little by little, is being depleted and emasculated. Such is the warning that has been coming to us

¹ *City of God*, I. xi. c. 18.

SCIENTIFIC BIBLICAL CRITICISM

ARTICLE II

In the April number of this REVIEW, an attempt was made to apply the laws of evidence to the attacks upon the genuineness of the Pentateuch and upon the integrity of the text of the Old Testament. In this article the same method of procedure will be employed in defending the *prima facie* claims of the books of the Old Testament along the lines of grammar, vocabulary, and history.

D. THE GRAMMAR

Passing from the text to the grammar we find that in this line of attack upon the Scriptures, the latest evidence is also against the critics.

THE ABSTRACT FORMATIONS IN *ûth*, *ôn* AND *ân*

In one of the standard introductions to the Old Testament¹ the assertion is made that the use of "the frequent abstract formations in *ûth*, *ôn* and *ân*" in the book of Ecclesiastes is among the proofs "so absolutely convincing and irrefutable" of the late date of the work, "that as Delitzsch exclaims: 'If the book of Koheleth be as old as Solomon, then there can be no history of the Hebrew language.'" Since Prof. Cornill here cites Delitzsch as his authority, let us rule Cornill out of count as giving hearsay evidence and address ourselves to what Delitzsch says.² He was one of the greatest Hebrew scholars of his generation, and fifty years ago his testimony on a matter concerning the history of the Hebrew language was as good as possible. But a history of the Hebrew language was in his time not possible. Gesenius, Ewald, Delitzsch, Keil, and all those brilliant scholars of the nineteenth century are as much behind the times to-day as expert witnesses, as Professor Langley in Aeronautics, or a surgeon of the Civil War in comparison

¹ Cornill, *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the O. T.*, p. 449.

² In his *Commentary to Ecclesiastes* (1875).

with a professor in Johns Hopkins. For since Delitzsch wrote the above, the Tel-el-Amarna Letters, the works of Hammurabi, the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus, of the Zadokite Fragments, and of the Samaria Ostraka, the Sendschirli inscriptions, the Aramaic papyri and endorsements, and thousands of Egyptian, Babylonian, Assyrian, Phenician, Aramaic, Palmyrene, Nabatean, Hebrew, and other documents throwing light on the Old Testament and its language have been discovered. These documents prove that the old-time alleged histories of the Hebrew language were largely subjective; and that the presence of words with endings *ûth*, *ôn*, and *ân*, is no indication of the age in which a document was written.

Thus as to *ûth*, we have abundant evidence to show that it was common in every one of the four great Semitic families of languages except Arabic.³

For example, in Assyrio-Babylonian, there are three of them in the seven creation tablets,⁴ six in the letters and inscriptions of Hammurabi,⁵ thirteen in the Code of Hammurabi,⁶ thirteen in Dennefeld's omen tablets,⁷ fifteen in the Amarna letters,⁸ eighteen to twenty in the inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser I,⁹ two in the incantations published by Thompson,¹⁰ and ten in the astrological tablets of the same editor.¹¹ These inscriptions cover the period from 2000 B.C. to about 625 B.C.

In the pre-Christian Aramaic we have five words with this ending in the Sendschirli inscriptions from north Syria of

³ Wright in his *Arabic Grammar* gives four examples of forms of words with this ending. See Vol. I, p. 111.

⁴ King, *The Seven Tablets of Creation*, pp. 252, 254, 262.

⁵ King, *The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, 259-296.

⁶ R. F. Harper, *The Code of Hammurabi*, 147-191.

⁷ *Babylonish-Assyrische Geburts-Omina*, 220-232.

⁸ Winckler, *Tel-el-Amarna Letters*, 1-34.

⁹ Lotz, *Die Inschrift Tiglath-pileser's I*, pp. 204-218.

¹⁰ *The Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia*, II, 165-179.

¹¹ *The Reports of the Magicians and Astrologers of Nineveh and Babylon*, II, 113-152.

about the year 725.¹² The Aramaic portions of Daniel and Ezra each have four and the Sachau Papyri four or five.

In the Old Testament we find from 41 to 55 forms.¹³ These forms are found in every one of the twenty-four books of the Hebrew canon except Ruth and Lamentations. Unfortunately for the argument that the ending denotes lateness, nine of these words occur in Isaiah, eighteen Jeremiah, seven in Proverbs, seven in Samuel-Kings, one in Hosea and one in Amos, two in Ezekiel, two in Deuteronomy, two in H and four in JE. Of the documents that some or all critics place after the captivity, Ezra has two words ending in *ûth*, Nehemiah three, Chronicles three, Haggai one, Daniel one, Job one, Psalms five, P two, Esther one, and Ecclesiastes five or six.¹⁴ Joel, Jonah, Malachi, Ruth, the Song of Songs, Lamentations, and the parts of Zechariah, Proverbs and Isaiah, placed by the critics in post-captivity times have no words with this ending.¹⁵

Proverbs xxx and xxxi, according to Dr. Driver, "doubtless of post-exilic origin,"^{15a} have no words ending in *ûth*. In the documents claimed as post-exilic by the critics, the only words with this ending, not occurring in exilic or pre-exilic documents, and found in documents alleged by any one to be from the Maccabean times are ילדות (Ps. cx. 3)¹⁶ and התחברו (Dan. xi. 23).

¹² מלכו, כברו, זכרו, ארהו, אנרו.

¹³ Fifty-five, if we count the forms in *ûth* from verbs whose third radical was *waw* or *yodh*.

¹⁴ Of these words the only ones not found in the documents which the critics place before the exile are עברות (Ezra and Nehemiah), התחברות (Dan. xi. 23), חלמות (Job vi. 6), אילות (Ps. cx. 3; Ecc. xi. 9, 10), מלאכות (Ps. lxxiii. 28, and Haggai i. 3), and שחרות, סכלות, הוללות, and שפלות in Ecclesiastes.

¹⁵ The words ending in *ûth* in Is. xl-lx occur in xli. 12, xlix. 19, l. 1, 3 and liv. 4. All of these passages are put by Duhamel and Cheyne in the original work of Deutero-Isaiah (LOT, p. 245).

^{15a} LOT, p. 406.

¹⁶ Cheyne puts this psalm in Maccabean times. Christ according to Matt. xx. 44, Mark xii. 36 and Luke xx. 42 and Peter according to Acts ii. 34, ascribe it to David in terms as explicit as language can employ. Matt. xxii. 44 introduces the citation from Psalm cx. 1 by

Ecclesiasticus (180 B.C.) has four words in *ûth* not occurring in Biblical Hebrew¹⁷ and the Zadokite Fragments (40 A.D.) have two,¹⁸ Ecclesiastes has six words in *ûth*, of which four do not occur elsewhere in the Old Testament.¹⁹

It is evident, therefore, that this ending is no proof of the date of a Hebrew document, nor in fact of a document in Babylonian, Assyrian, or Aramaic. The ending simply denotes *abstract* terms. In the account which Bar Hebraeus gives of the life of Mohammed, he has but one abstract ending in the account of his active career and seven in the account of his doctrine.²⁰

So in the Bible the books treating of concrete events, whether early or late, have but one or two of these words;²¹ whereas those treating of more abstract ideas have more words with this ending whatever the date.²² JE, the earliest part of the Pentateuch, according to the critics, has four words ending in *ûth*,²³ whereas P, the latest part, has only two.²⁴

That Hebrew nouns ending in *n* (*nûn*), *i.e.*, the forms in saying: How then doth David in spirit call him Lord? Mark xii. 36 says: For David himself said by the Holy Ghost. Luke xx. 42 says: David himself saith in the Book of Psalms. Lastly, in Acts ii. 34 Peter, in his great sermon on the day of Pentecost says: For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, etc. Reader, what think ye of Christ? Whose son is he? What think ye of the Holy Ghost? Was Peter filled with Him? (Acts ii. 4.)

¹⁷ תמהות and נברות, בהלות, אכלו.

¹⁸ עשרות and עריות.

¹⁹ שפלות and שחרות, סכלות, הוללות. The other two are מלכו and ילדות.

²⁰ See the *Chronicon Syriacum*, Paris, 1890, pp. 97-99.

²¹ Josh. two, Jud. one, 1 Sa. two, 2 Sa. two, 1 K. two, 2 K. two, 1 Ch. two, 2 Ch. three, Ezra two, Neh. three, Dan. one.

²² Thus, Prov. has seven, Is. nine, Jer. eight, Ecc. six, (Ecclus. eleven).

²³ מלכות and אלמנות, כברות, ערות.

²⁴ ערות found also in JE. and מלכו in Jos. xiii. 21, 27, 30, 31 a word found also in Hos. i. 4, 1 Sam. xv. 28, 2 Sam. xvi. 3, and Jer. xxvi. 1. The opinion of Delitzsch was probably founded on the numerous occurrences of this ending in the version of Onkelos, where there are sixty, or sixty-one nouns with this ending (see Brederick's *Konkordanz*).

ôn and *ân*, should be considered late is even less justifiable than in the case of *ûth*. For there are about 140 of such nouns in Hebrew occurring in all ages of the literature; and they are found, also, in Babylonian, Assyrian and Arabic, as well as in New Hebrew and Aramaic. Besides in many cases, as in שלחן, the nouns cannot have been derived from the Aramaic, simply because they have been found in no Aramaic dialect of any age.²⁵

THE USE OF THE HEBREW TENSES

Leaving the morphology and coming to the syntax, we find that here also the critics of the Old Testament cannot support their charges by the evidence. The charge that the *Hebrew perfect forms* of the verb employed in Ex. xv and Deut. i, show that these chapters were written after the conquest of Canaan, breaks down when we learn that Hebrew perfects are often equivalent to English future perfects, or even to an emphatic future.^{25a}

Again it is charged that the frequent use of *wau conjunctive with the perfect* in Ecclesiastes is a proof that the book is one of the latest in the Old Testament. The discovery of the Hebrew of Ben Sira has broken the force of this argument; for we find that in it the *wau* conversive is used with the imperfect 120 times and 33 times with the perfect as against only 5 examples of *wau* conjunctive with the perfect. Moreover, the Zadokite Fragments have *wau* conversive with the imperfect 85 times and with the perfect 35 times, as against *wau* conjunctive 16 times with the imperfect and only 3 times with the perfect.

Again the critics have failed to explain how the use of this construction in Ecclesiastes can be due to the *time* when the work was written in view of the fact that Daniel which they put at about the same time has about 200 cases of *wau* conversive with the imperfect and 75 with the perfect, and only about 5 of *wau* conjunctive with the perfect. Again, if

²⁵ For a further discussion of these endings see p. 425f.

^{25a} Called in Hebrew grammars the perfect of certainty.

the use is due to the time, why is it that it is found only in Ecclesiastes and not in the Maccabean(?) psalms and the numerous other documents which the critics assert to be late? Again, how explain its presence twice in Judges v which many critics consider to be the earliest document in the Old Testament; or that the perfect occurs with *wau* conjunctive in Num. xxiii, xxiv seven times, to two times with *wau* conversive? It will not do to attempt to invalidate this explicit testimony of Ben Sira, the Zadokite Fragments, Daniel, and the writings alleged by the critics themselves to be from definite periods by saying that it is impossible otherwise to bring some of the uses of Ecclesiastes within the period of some critic's definition of what were the limits of use in good Hebrew for the perfect with *wau* conjunctive; for the probability certainly is that whoever wrote Ecclesiastes knew more about those limits than any of our modern Teutonic, or even Jewish, professors. Shades of Jean Paul, Carlyle, and Walt Whitman! Ye could not have written in the 19th century, for no other mortals wrote like you.

THE SYNTAX OF THE NUMERALS

Whatever may be the explanation of the Priestly Document's use of the phrase "a hundred of" instead of "a hundred,"²⁶ it is certainly no indication of the *age* of the document nor of an authorship different from that of J, E, D, and H.

Starting out with the thesis that "statistical data besides genealogies are a conspicuous feature" in the narrative of P,²⁷ the critics in order to sustain their thesis violently and without any evidence ascribe nearly all of the passages containing the word for "hundred" to P, with the result that the word occurs according to their claims 49 times in P, and only 5 times in E, twice each in J and D and once in H. Of these 59 cases, one in J, three in E, one in D and one in

²⁶ *I.e.*, of the use of the *construct*, (מאת) instead of the *absolute* (מאה).

²⁷ LOT, 127.

P occur before *wau*, where the use of the construct state would be of course impossible. Ruling these out as having no bearing on the discussion, we have remaining 48 cases in P, two in E, and one each in D, H, and J. The example in H where **מאת** is found before **מכם** is accounted for by the fact that the genitival relationship would have meant "your hundred" instead of "a hundred of you." The case in J (Gen. xxvi. 12) cannot indicate the age of the document, since the same phrase occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament.²⁸ Of the two cases assigned to E, the one in Josh. xxiv. 32 is a citation from Gen. xxxiii. 19. This verse is one of four (Gen. xxxiii. 18, 19, 20 and xxxiv. 1) which the critics, without any support from manuscripts or versions, or elsewhere, arbitrarily divide up into six different portions. The word **קשיטה** which occurs here and in the citation in Josh. xxiv. 32 is found nowhere else except in Job xlii. 11. In combination with the word for hundred it occurs only in Gen. xxxiii 19 and in the citation of it in Josh. xxiv. 32. The only instance remaining outside of P is that in Deut. xxii. 19 where it speaks of "one hundred (pieces of) silver." This is paralleled exactly only in Jud. xvi. 5.²⁹

Of the forty-eight cases where the word "hundred" is used in P, 22 have **מאה** and 26 **מאת**. Of the former, four may be ruled out (Ex. xxvii. 9, 18, xxxviii. 9, 11) because they are followed by the preposition **ב** and one (Ex. xxvii. 11) because it is followed by an accusative of specification, and one, (Num. vii. 86) because it stands at the end of the sentence. Of the remaining sixteen, thirteen stand absolutely, the term for shekels having been omitted; so that only three cases are left where the common genitival construction (with **מאת**) might have been used. In one of these (Num. ii. 24) we find the circumlocution for the geni-

²⁸ That is, followed by **שערים**, the phrase meaning "a hundred fold." The only analogy to this is in 2 Sa. xxiv. 3 (parallel to 2 Ch. xxi. 3) "a hundred times"; but in these passages **פעמים** is used.

²⁹ In Jud. xvii. 2 we have an example similar to that in Deut. xxii. 19 except that the definite article is used before the word for silver. In Neh. v. 11 the word **מאת** is used before the noun for silver accompanied by the definite article.

tive by means of the preposition ל. This leaves Gen. xvii. 17 and xxiii. 1 as the only other places in P where מאת could possibly have been used instead of מאה. In both of these cases it is used before the noun שנה, which is remarkable because P usually (17 times in all)³⁰ employs מאת before שנה. P also has מאת three times before כנה (talent),³¹ four times before אלף (thousand),³² twice before יום (day), and once before ארץ.³³

Outside of P, מאה before the noun is found in Josh. one time, Jud. four, J one, E two, D one, 1 Sam. two, 2 Sam. four, 1 Kgs. five, 2 Kgs. four, Is. two, Ek. ten, 1 Chr. six, 2 Chron. four, Ezra two, Es. three, *i.e.*, twenty-four times in the literature preceding the exile, twelve in Isaiah (2nd part) and Ezekiel, and fifteen in the post-exilic books.³⁴ מאת is used only three times in the post-exilic books.³⁵

The extra-biblical evidence is as follows:

The Mesha inscription in Moabitic, which is a form of Hebrew, has the phrase, "a hundred of cattle," (מאת בקרין). The date of this inscription is the early part of the 9th century B.C. The Siloah inscription from about

³⁰ Gen. v. 3, 6, 18, 25, 28, xi. 10, 25, xxi. 5, xxv. 7, 17, xxxv. 28, xlvi. 9, 28, Ex. vi. 16, 18, 20 and Num. xxxiii. 39.

³¹ Ex. xxxviii. 25, 27² (twice with the article). As to the use of כנה we find it as early as 2 Sam. xii. 30, 1 Kings ix. 14, 28, x. 10, 14, xvi. 24, xx. 39, 2 Kings v. 5, 22, 23², xv. 19, xviii. 14², xxxiii. 33², and as late as 1 Chron. xix. 6, xx. 2, xxii. 14², xxix. 4², 7⁴, 2 Chron. iii. 8, iv. 17, viii. 18, ix. 9, 13, xxv. 6, 9, xxvii. 5, xxxvi. 3, Ezra viii. 26², Es. iii. 9. With מאה it is used in 1 Kings ix. 14, x. 10, 2 Kings xxiii. 33, 2 Chron. xxvii. 5, xxxvi. 3.

³² Num. ii. 9, 16, 24, 31. Before אלף we find מאה 1 Kings xx. 29, 2 Kings iii. 4², 1 Chron. v. 21, xxi. 5, xxii. 14, xxix. 7, 2 Chron. xxv. 6.

³³ Gen. vii. 24, viii. 3, Ex. xxxviii. 27.

³⁴ מאה is used elsewhere as follows: before רכב (2 Sam. viii. 4, 1 Chron. xviii. 4), פעמים (2 Sam. xxiv. 3, 1 Chron. xxi. 3), אמה (1 Kings vii. 2, Ek. xl. 19, 23, 27, 47², xli. 13², 14, 15, xlii. 8), נביאים (1 Kings xviii. 4), איש (1 Kings xviii. 13, 2 Kings iv. 43, Jud. vii. 19, xx. 35), שנה (Isaiah lxv. 20²), כנה (Jud. xvi. 5, xvii. 2 [with article]), De. xxii. 19, צמיקים (1 Sam. xxv. 18, 2 Sam. xvi. 1), צאן (1 Kings v. 3), מדינה (Es. i. 1, viii. 9, ix. 30), ערלות (1 Sa. xviii. 25, 2 Sa. iii. 14), שערים (Gen. xxvi. 12 (J)), and קשיטה (Gen. xxxiii. 19, Jos. xix. 32 (E)).

³⁵ Neh. v. 11, 2 Chr. xxv. 9, Es. i. 4.

700 B.C. has the phrase "a hundred of cubit" (מאת אמה).³⁶ Unfortunately neither construction is found in *Ben Sira*, nor in the *Zadokite Fragments*. In the Egyptian *Pyramid Texts* the numeral preceded the noun; but in the records of about 1530 to 1050 B.C. the numeral is put before the noun in the genitival construction.³⁷ In the *Tel-el-Amarna Letters*, *me-at* (= מאת) occurs twice; once in 25.10 before *eru* "copper" and once in 19.39 before *lim* "thousand."³⁸ We thus see that the earliest Hebrew records and the Egyptian and Babylonian documents nearest to the time of the Exodus support the prevalent use of מאת as we find it in P.

But neither do the critics have support in the later Semitic documents for their theory that the use of מאת before the noun indicates lateness for the document in which it occurs. In Syriac the numeral stands in apposition either before or after that which is numbered.³⁹ The Biblical Aramaic and the inscriptions and papyri afford no examples affecting the question.⁴⁰ The New Hebrew follows the biblical usages.⁴¹

From all the above testimony it is evident that there is no basis in the use of the word for "hundred" for concluding that P may not have been written by Moses.

THE EXPRESSION : — THE KING

The charge is made that the Hebrew of Daniel "resembles not the Hebrew of Ezekiel or even of Haggai or Zechariah but that of the age *subsequent to Nehemiah*." One of the alleged proofs of the charge is that in Dan. i. 21 and viii. 1 the name of the king *precedes* the title. That

³⁶ See Lidzbarski, *Nordsemitische Epigraphik*, pp. 106, 114, 416, 439.

³⁷ Erman, *Aegypten*, 63, and *Aegyptische Grammatik*, § 142, 122-126.

³⁸ Winckler, *Tel-el-Amarna Letters*, pp. 48, 80.

³⁹ See examples in Nöldeke, *Syriac Grammar*, § 237.

⁴⁰ מאת is used three times in the *Sachau Papyrus*, but always as a noun in the sense of the Roman "century," or company of a hundred men.

⁴¹ Siegfried u. Strack, *Neuhebräische Grammatik*, § 73.

this order is a proof of lateness in Daniel is affirmed in the words: "So often in post-exilic writings, the older Hebrew has nearly always the order (דוד) הַמֶּלֶךְ."⁴² The following tables will give the number of times the orders "the king ——" and "—— the king" are used in the books written before or after 550 B.C.

	Before 550 B.C.			After 550 B.C.	
	The king ——	—— the king		The king ——	—— the king
1 Sam.	1	1	1 Chron.	4	9
2 Sam.	10	2	2 Chron.	15	9
1 Kings	29	2	Ezra	2	2
2 Kings	14	2	Neh.	0	2
Isaiah	6	0	Hag.	0	2
Jeremiah	10	2	Zech.	0	1
Ezekiel	1	0	Est.	9	0
	—	—	Dan.	0	2
Total	61	9	Total	30	27

Since 12 of the citations from Chronicles are in parallel passages in Samuel-Kings, the 30 instances of the phrase "the king ——" in the later writings may be reduced to 18; so that the proportion will be: "The king ——" 61 to 18, "—— the king" 9 to 27. The evidence therefore, that the order "—— the king" is often used in post-exilic writings and that the order "the king ——" is "nearly always used in the older Hebrew" amounts to a mathematical demonstration. But a demonstration of what? Why, of the minute historical accuracy of Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah, Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, and of the unassailable character of the sacred scriptures. For mark you, the early writings before 550 B.C. follow the Egyptian order "the king ——,"⁴³ and the later writings follow the Babylonian and Persian order "—— the king."⁴⁴ In Hag. i. 1, 15, Zech. vii. 1, Ezra vii. 7, viii. 1, Neh. ii. 1 v. 14 and Dan. i. 21, viii. 1, we have exact copies of the Persian and Babylonian order.

⁴² LOT, 506.

⁴³ See the scores of examples in my article on "The Titles of Kings in Antiquity" in this REVIEW for October 1904 and January 1905.

⁴⁴ See the numerous examples given in the articles just referred to. For the Persian Kings cf. especially *Sachau Denkschrift* (Berlin 1912) and this REVIEW for January, 1917.

Again, it is a matter of wonder that the author of the "Literature of the Old Testament" should have used this particular testimony to prove that Daniel did not resemble Haggai and Zechariah but was "subsequent to Nehemiah"; for the books of Haggai, Zechariah, Ezra and Nehemiah all use the exact phrase which is produced as evidence that Daniel is later than they. Besides, the critics have not produced a single example from the Hebrew literature which they place in the age subsequent to Nehemiah to show that the form "—— the king" was used by the Jews subsequently to Nehemiah. Neither Ben Sira nor the Zadokite Fragments have it;⁴⁵ nor does it occur in Isaiah xxiv-xxvii, Jonah, Joel, Ecclesiastes, nor in any of the psalms, nor in the book of Proverbs, nor in Job. Nor in this case can the critics resort to the subterfuge of asserting that Daniel is late because the passages in Ezra and Nehemiah in which the phrase occurs are insertions into the genuine works of Nehemiah; for unfortunately for them, the phrase in every case appears in the parts of Ezra and Nehemiah which they themselves admit to be genuine.⁴⁶

Reader, if the most plausible, and probably the most scholarly, of all that school of modern critics that delight to assail the integrity of the scriptural narratives and to use so frequently the modest appellation, "all scholars are agreed," will make such palpable blunders in a matter as to which there is abundant evidence to show that the Scriptures are right, what dependence will you place on him when he steps beyond the bounds of knowledge into the dim regions of conjecture and fancy? If, when we can get abundant evidence, the documents of the Bible stand the test of genuine-

⁴⁵ The nearest to it is the phrase "Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon" in the Zadokite Fragments, p. 1, 6.

⁴⁶ Thus Ezra vii. 7, viii. 1 are in the so-called second section of Ezra embracing chapters vii-x as to which Dr. Driver says: "there is no reason to doubt" that it "is throughout either written by Ezra or based upon materials left by him" (LOT, 549). The phrase occurs in Neh. ii. 1, v. 14. Dr. Driver says: "Neh. i. 1-vii. 73^a is an excerpt to all appearances unaltered, from the memoirs of Nehemiah" (LOT, 550).

ness and veracity, and the charges of the critics are proven false, upon what ground of common sense or law of evidence, are we to be induced to believe that these documents are false or forged when charges absolutely unsupported by evidence are made against them?

THE INFINITIVE WITH \beth AND \daleth

One more charge of the critics in the sphere of syntax will be considered because it covers several books and because it is reiterated in LOT.⁴⁷ It is that Daniel's and the Chronicler's use of the infinitive with the prepositions \beth and \daleth indicates a date subsequent to Nehemiah. Two specifications are made; first, that this type of sentence is rare in the earlier books, and secondly, that the earlier books place the infinitive clause later in the sentence. Two witnesses only need to be called to answer these assertions. First, Ezekiel. He wrote between 592 and 570 B.C.⁴⁸ and his prophecies were "arranged evidently by his own hands."⁴⁹ His book is the one document of the Old Testament that the critics accept in its entirety, their theories being built largely upon it. Now, in this book there are 49 instances where \beth alone is used with the infinitive in the early part of the sentence, just as in Daniel and Chronicles, let alone those where \daleth is used.⁵⁰ Since Ezekiel was written before 570 B.C., thirty-five years before Daniel is supposed to have written, why is the use of the phrase seven times⁵¹ by Daniel a sign of a date subsequent to Nehemiah? The second witness we shall call is Ben Sira, who wrote about 180 B.C., just about sixteen years before the month of June 164 B.C., when the critics assume that Daniel was written. In the 62

⁴⁷ *E.g.* pp. 506, 538.

⁴⁸ LOT, 278.

⁴⁹ *Id.* 296.

⁵⁰ To wit, i. 17², 18, 19², 21³, 24, 25, iii. 18, 20, 27, v. 16, x. 16², 17², xii. 15, xv. 5, xvi. 34, xviii. 24, 26, xx. 31², xxi. 34, xxiii. 37, xxiv. 24, xxvi. 15, 19, 27, 33, xxviii. 25, xxix. 7, xxxii. 15, xxxiii. 8, 13, 14, 18, 19, 33, xxxviii. 14, xlii. 14, xliii. 8, xliv. 19, xlvi. 10², xlvii. 3, 7.

⁵¹ To wit, viii. 8, 23, x. 9, xi. 4 and xii. 7.

pages of the Hebrew as it is found in Smend's edition (57 in Strack's) we have but six sure examples of this usage, as compared with seven in the 10 pages of the Hebrew of Daniel, and forty-nine in the 85 pages of Ezekiel. That is, Ben Sira has about 10 per cent of one example per page as against 60 for Ezekiel and 70 for Daniel.⁵²

E. THE VOCABULARY

Leaving the region of what we call grammar, and coming into the sphere of rhetoric, we find that the critics of the Old Testament are in the habit of determining the date of documents and the sources and divisions and evolutions of literary works on the basis of diction, style, ideas, and aim. To this method no objection can justly be made, provided that we put the four items together and do not divorce them as is too often done. Besides, we must place them in the proper logical order of aim, ideas, style, and diction. For it is manifest that an author's aim or purpose in writing a given document will determine for him the ideas, reasons, and illustrations, which he uses to attain his purpose. It is no less evident that his style and diction will be influenced largely by the aim and ideas. In criticizing a literary work, therefore, the aim of the writer is to be considered first of all; then, the ideas, or reasons that he gives to reach his aim; and lastly, the method, style, and diction which he uses. When the author clearly announces his purpose as Thucydides does in his *History*, or Luke in his *Gospel*, or Milton in *Paradise Lost*, we are relieved of the labor of discovering this purpose for ourselves and are left free to discuss the method, reasons, and illustrations by which he attempts to fulfil his purpose; and also, the style, the diction and phraseology, which he employs.

⁵² These two witnesses should be sufficient to convince anyone that the charges in LOT about the infinitive and ׁ is false. However, if anyone is yet unconvinced, I have made a complete concordance of all the examples of the uses of the infinitive with ׁ and ׁ that are found in the Old Testament. There are more than 400 with ׁ and 250 with ׁ.

This long excursus has been deemed necessary because in the literary criticism of the Old Testament the discussion has too often become confined to one or the other of the above points, instead of considering them all together; and especially because it is frequently argued that a difference of style and diction implies a difference of authorship and date, whereas it may imply simply a difference of aim and ideas. The diction and style of some of Milton's poems and letters and of his *Christian Doctrine* are so different from those of *Paradise Lost* and the *Areopagitica*, that, if his aim is left out of consideration, we might infer a difference of authorship. Walt Whitman and Longfellow differ so much in style that we might infer a different age. In doing so, we would be following the method of the destructive literary critics of the Old Testament. For, as we shall proceed to show, they often infer a difference of authorship or age, from a difference of diction or style, without due consideration of the fact that these differences may be due to difference of aim and ideas. In confirmation of this statement, attention is called to the long list of words and phrases given in LOT⁵³ to show that the Pentateuch was written by many different authors and at many different times; and to the list⁵⁴ given to show that Jonah, Daniel, and Chronicles were written at a much later date than the apparent aim of the books would imply, or the ideas demand.

Before leaving generalities and coming to particulars, it may be well to make a few remarks about the aims and ideas of a literary work. *First*, as to aim, it must be kept in mind that an author may have a general aim including his whole work and a particular aim for each part of the general work; just as in an army the purpose of the whole is to defeat the enemy and the general staff makes out a plan of campaign and coordinates all the parts of the service to this end, while each branch of the service, infantry, artillery, aeroplane, engineers, and commissary, has its particu-

⁵³ Pp. 99-102, 131-135.

⁵⁴ LOT, 322, 506-7, 535-540.

lar staff and purpose. Thus, the main purpose of Milton's works was to maintain the sovereignty of God and the liberty of man; "to justify the ways of God to man," and to defend "the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely, according to conscience."

So the purpose of the Old Testament is to teach the uniqueness, sovereignty, justice and holiness of God and the holiness of his people to be attained through faith and obedience, repentance, atonement, and love; and the aim of every part of the Old Testament is to subserve the purpose of the whole. Keeping this great purpose in view, we can see how every part of every book conduces to the purpose of the whole; and how the different ideas of the prophets and historians and poets and wise men, expressed in various styles and dictions, all illumine and concenter to the attainment of the one great end.

Secondly, let it be remembered that while the purpose of every part of a work should conduce to the purpose of the whole, it is not true that the special purpose of every part should be the same as that of every other part. *Paradise Lost* has a different purpose from the *Areopagitica*; *The Christian Doctrine* from *The State Papers*; the sonnets on the Waldenses and on his own blindness from those on Cromwell and on those

That bawl for freedom in their senseless mood,
And still revolt when truth would set them free.

So, also, in the books of Scripture, the purpose of the Psalter is to afford us a book of prayers and praises;⁵⁵ but each psalm has a special purpose of its own, and that purpose is attained by an appropriate array of ideas clothed in a suitable style and verbiage. Like the gardens of Versailles, the general plan is one, but the plans of the different beds are many and the gorgeous effect of the whole is produced by the harmonious arrangement of the various flowers, the mingling and blending of the colors, the contrasts of light and shadow, the long allées, the pendant branches of the

⁵⁵ תהלים or תפלים.

trees, the fountains and statues, the palaces of man and the atmosphere and vaulted heavens and glaring sun.

Thirdly, the ideas and reasons given to attain the end in view will be as varied as the imagination of the author can suggest. This seems so obvious that it will surprise some of our readers to know that critics actually allege against the genuineness of parts of the Bible that they contain new ideas and reveal a tone different from what we find elsewhere in the author's works. Thus: "modern critics agree generally in the opinion that this prophecy [*i.e.*, Is. xxiv-xxvii] is not Isaiah's; and chiefly for the following reasons: 1. It lacks a suitable occasion in Isaiah's age"—a reason which means simply that the critics know of none. 2. "The literary treatment is in many respects unlike Isaiah's." 3. "There are features in the representation and contents of the prophecy which seem to spring out of a different (and later) vein of thought from Isaiah's"⁵⁶ So, also, Micah vi, vii are assigned to a different author from chs. i-v because they are said to have "a different tone and manner," and because, as Kuenen remarks, "the author does not carry on, or develop lines of thought contained in chs. i-v."⁵⁷ Parts of Zephaniah are doubted because they are thought to express the ideas and hopes of a later age."⁵⁸ Several passages in Hosea are held to be a later addition because they are "thought to express ideas alien to Hosea's historical or theological position."⁵⁹ Now, these and all such opinions are absolutely worthless as evidence. In fact they are not evidence at all in a legal sense; for they have in their favor no reasons resulting from investigations. For the fifty-five years of Manasseh in whose reign Ewald would place Micah vi, vii we have a record of but eighteen verses. For the life and circumstances of Isaiah, we have but a few chapters in Kings. Of Hosea's life we know only what he tells us and

⁵⁶ LOT, 219, 220.

⁵⁷ *Id.* 333.

⁵⁸ *Id.* 342.

⁵⁹ *Id.* 306.

of Zephaniah's we know nothing, except that he lived "in the days of Josiah the son of Ammon king of Judah."⁶⁰ And so for critics who deny even the additional information supplied by the book of Chronicles and the reliability of the headings to express opinions as to what the prophets may have thought or as to what the events and circumstances of their lives may have been, is simply absurd. It is not even as good as hearsay evidence. It is pure imaginings. The critic who puts such opinions forth as evidence is no better than a witness who would testify that an accused was guilty because of his race, or religion, or looks. It involves, also, on his part a presumptuousness, or self-conceit, which borders on megalomania, a disease from which Caesars and Kaisers do not alone suffer.

The reader will please pardon the indefiniteness of the above discussion. Witnesses we can cross-examine, documents we can investigate; but when a critic, or alleged expert, gives opinions based on opinions and not on reasons derived from experiments and investigation of objective facts, we can only have him ruled out of court, and request the judge to quash the indictment. Leaving, therefore, these aerial heights of speculation, in which one man is as much of an expert as another, or in his own estimation a little better, let us come down to the objective, obvious facts of earth and let us consider and test the testimony of the documents involved in the words and phrases contained in them.

WORDS ALLEGED TO BE LATE

We are prepared to maintain that a large part of the words that are produced as evidence of the late date of documents containing them cannot themselves be proved to be late. For, first, no one can maintain that because a word occurs in a late document the word itself is therefore late; for in this case, if a late document was the only survival of a once numerous body of literature, every word

⁶⁰ Zeph. i. 1.

in it would be late; which is absurd. Nor, secondly, can one maintain that a document is late merely because it contains words which do not occur in earlier ones, which are known to us. Every new find of Egyptian Aramaic papyri gives us words not known before except, if at all, in documents written hundreds of years later. Nor, thirdly, is a word to be considered as evidence of the lateness of a document in which it occurs simply because it occurs again in documents known to be late, such as the Hebrew parts of the Talmud. And yet, this is frequently affirmed by the critics. Thus LOT mentions about twenty of such words to prove that Daniel and Jonah are later by centuries than the times of which they treat. In this Dr. Driver was simply following in the footsteps of the German scholars who preceded him. It may be considered a sufficient answer to such alleged proofs to affirm (what anyone with a Hebrew concordance can confirm for himself) that Daniel, Jonah, Joel, and the Psalter, and other documents of the Old Testament have no larger percentage of such words than those which they assign to an early date, and that Is. xxiv-xxvii and Psalm lxxix, which they consider to be among the latest parts of their respective books are distinguished from most of the other parts of the Old Testament by having no such words at all. Finally, it is obvious that a kind of proof that will prove almost everything to be late, and especially the parts considered late to be early, is absurd and inadmissible as evidence in a case designed to prove that some documents are later than others because they contain words of this kind. For it is certain that if all are late, then none are early—a conclusion which would overthrow the position of all critics, radical as well as conservative; and since this conclusion is desired and maintained by none, it must be dismissed as *absurd*.

In proof, however, that such words are found in every book, and in almost every part of every book, of the Old Testament we subjoin the following tables. These

tables are based on special concordances of every book and of every part of every book of the Old Testament, prepared by and now in the possession of the writer of this article. In accordance with the laws of evidence, that "witnesses must give evidence of facts," that "an expert may state general facts which are the result of scientific knowledge, and that an expert may give an account of experiments [hence, also, of investigations] performed by him for the purpose of forming his opinion,"⁶¹ it may add force and clearness to the evidence about to be presented, if an account is first given of the way in which the facts upon which the tables are based were collected. One whole summer was spent in gathering from a Hebrew concordance all the words in the Old Testament that occur there five times or less, giving also the places where the words occur. A second summer sufficed for making from this general concordance a special concordance for each book. In the third summer, special concordances were made for J, E, D, H, and P, for each of the five books of the Psalter and for each of the psalms; for each of the parts of Proverbs, and of the alleged parts of Isaiah, Micah, Zechariah, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah; and for such parts as Gen. xiv and the poems contained in Gen. xlix, Ex. xv, Deut. xxxii, xxxiii and Judges v. Then, each of the words of this kind was sought for in the Aramaic and in the Hebrew of the post-biblical Jewish writers. The evidence of the facts collected is manifest, and we think, conclusive. Intelligent readers scarcely need to be reminded that according to the Law of Evidence, no man, be he layman or professor,—though he excel Plato and Kant in philosophy, Bopp and Müller in philology, Blackstone and Stephens in law, Darwin and Edison in science, Homer and Milton in literature,—has the special knowledge of an expert in this particular department of science that will enable him to contradict with glib tongue and condescending superciliousness the facts here presented and the evidence derived from the facts. In all fairness, has not a defender

⁶¹ Stephen, *The Law of Evidence*, pp. 100, 103, 112.

of the Bible the right to demand that expert evidence in its favor should be met, if it can be met, by expert evidence on the part of its assailants? And no one can be called an expert as to the matter now under discussion who has not in his possession the concordances and dictionaries that will enable him to get first hand information on the subject; and, further, who has not by his own investigations qualified himself to give the scientific, first hand testimony that is required of any person whose opinion is offered before his skill is deemed "sufficient to entitle him to be considered as an expert."⁶²

A study of these percentages should convince everyone that the presence of such words in a document is no proof of its relative lateness.⁶³

	Number of words occur- ring in in O.T. five times or less	Per- cent- age of these words in Talmud		Number of words occur- ring in in O.T. five times or less	Per- cent- age of these words in Talmud
Proverbs xxxi 1-9	0	00.0	Micah iii.	15	33.3
Zecharia iii	0	00.0	Proverbs x-xxii. 16	80	33.8
Isaiah xxiv-xxvii	0	00.0	Proverbs xxii. 17-		
Obadiah	7	14.3	xxiv	30	36.7
Isaiah xxxvi-ix	7	14.3	Sam.-Kings	356	37.2
Judges-Ruth	107	15.8	Habakkuk	34	38.2
Nahum	36	16.7	Joel	28	39.3
Ezra i-vi	6	16.7	Jonah	15	40.0
Micah ii	11	18.2	Hosea	65	41.5
Isaiah xxxiv-v	5	20.0	Jehovist (J)	162	44.4
Isaiah xiii-xiv	10	22.2	Zephaniah	31	45.2
Isaiah (1st pt.)	121	22.3	Amos	50	46.0
Malachi	13	23.1	Eolhist (E)	119	48.7
Ezekiel	335	24.9	Proverbs xxxi. 10-31	6	50.0
Lamentation	56	25.0	Holiness Code (H)	48	50.0
Haggai	4	25.0	Chronicles	144	51.5
Ezra vii-x	8	25.0	Proverbs xxv-xxix	52	51.9
Zechariah ii	16	25.0	Esther	57	52.6
Isaiah xl-lxvi	62	25.8	Priest Code (P)	192	3.1
Proverbs i-ix	69	27.5	Deuteronomist		
Daniel	47	29.8	(D)	154	53.2
Zecharia i	22	30.8	Proverbs xxx	15	53.5
Zecharia iii	12	30.8	Song of Songs	99	54.6
Micah i	22	31.8	Nehemiah	48	56.3
Job	374	31.0	Ecclesiastes	77	57.1
Jeremiah	278	32.1	Memoirs of Nehe-		
Psalms	514	33.1	miah	27	59.3

⁶² Stephen, *op. cit.*, pp. 104, 105.

⁶³ In explanation of these tables it may be said that they are pre-

THE ALLEGED ARAMAISMS

Exception is to be taken to the way in which the critics use the presence of Aramaisms in a document as a proof of its age; and also to their habit of assuming that words are Aramaisms, without presenting any proof in favor of their assumption. Now, an Aramaism in a Hebrew document must be defined as an Aramaic word which the writer of the Hebrew document has used to denote a thing, or to express a thought, either because there was no Hebrew word that he could equally well employ, or because he was himself strongly under Aramaic influence, or because he wanted to show off his acquaintance with foreign tongues; just as recent English writers use *hinterland* in describing the part of Africa lying back of the coast, or as Mr. Rider Haggard uses *trek* and *laager* in his novels whose scene is in South Africa; or as Carlyle uses many German words and phrases in his writings and even copies the style of Jean Paul Friedrich Richter; or as the debaters in the British Parliament used to interlard their speeches, or Montaigne and the writers in the *Spectator* their essays, with Latin. With such analogies before them, it is easy to see how the commentators of the eighteenth century fell into the habit of calling every infrequent word in the Hebrew Bible, whose root and form are common in Aramaic, by the name of Aramaism. It was simply their naïve way of camouflaging their ignorance with the appearance of knowledge. If they had said merely that this word which occurs only here in the Hebrew of the Old Testament is found frequently in Aramaic, they would in most cases have been exactly right. But when they inferred that because it was frequent in Aramaic and infrequent in Hebrew it was of Aramaic origin and a loan-

—
pared with special reference to the critical analysis of the O.T. Thus the Pentateuch is arranged according to the documents, J, E, D, H and P; and the Proverbs are divided into seven portions (following LOT). The first column of the tables gives for each book or part of a book the number of words occurring five times or less in the Old Testament that are found in it; and the second column the percentage of these words that are to be found in the same sense in the Hebrew of the Talmud.

word in Hebrew, they indulged in a *non-sequitur*, as we shall now attempt to show.

THE CONSONANTAL CHANGES.—In the Semitic group of languages there are three great families, which may be designated as the Hebrew, the Arabic and the Aramaic. In these great families the radical sounds, ' , *h*, *b*, *m*, *p*, *g*, *k*, *q*, *l*, *n* and *r* are usually written uniformly with corresponding signs, *i.e.*, Hebrew *b* corresponds to Arabic *b*, and both to Aramaic *b*, and *h* (*ch*), *w*, and *y*, correspond commonly in Hebrew and Aramaic. In preformatives and sufformatives Hebrew *h* is ' in the others; and in sufformatives Hebrew *m* is *n*. In the other eight (or nine, counting *ḥ*) radical sounds, however, certain regular changes occur, and seem to differentiate the three families. These changes may be illustrated by the following table, which is based upon a collection of all the roots in the Hebrew Old Testament containing one or more of these eight radicals and upon a comparison of their roots in Arabic and Aramaic. There are 731 such roots in Hebrew which have corresponding roots in both Arabic and Aramaic. The numbers to the right show how often each correspondence is found in the roots of the Old Testament Hebrew.⁶⁴

Hebrew	Arabic	Aramaic	Number of Roots	Hebrew	Arabic	Aramaic	Number of Roots
<i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	100	<i>s</i>	<i>sh</i>	<i>s</i>	5
<i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>t</i>	1	<i>s</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>s</i>	45
<i>d</i>	<i>dh</i>	<i>d</i>	10	<i>s</i>	<i>ṣ</i>	<i>s</i>	7
<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	71	<i>ṣ</i>	<i>ṣ</i>	<i>ṣ</i>	36
<i>t</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>t</i>	2	<i>ṣ</i>	<i>ṣ</i>	<i>ṣ</i>	1
<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	2	<i>ṣ</i>	<i>ṣ</i>	<i>z</i>	1
<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	42	<i>ṣ</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>ṣ</i>	3
<i>t</i>	<i>th</i>	<i>t</i>	5(?)	<i>ṣ</i>	<i>ḏ</i>	<i>ṣ</i>	10
<i>sh</i>	<i>th</i>	<i>t</i>	18	<i>ṣ</i>	<i>ḏ</i>	<i>ṣ</i>	11
<i>sh</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	4	<i>ṣ</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i>	1
<i>sh</i>	<i>ṣ</i>	<i>sh</i>	83	<i>ṣ</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>t</i>	9
<i>sh</i>	<i>sh</i>	<i>sh</i>	5 or 6(?)	<i>z</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>z</i>	54
<i>sh</i>	<i>ṣ</i>	<i>s</i>	1	<i>z</i>	<i>dh</i>	<i>d</i>	18
<i>ṣ</i>	<i>sh</i>	<i>s</i>	29	'	'	'	110
<i>ṣ</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>s</i>	5	'	<i>ḡ</i>	'	26
				'	<i>ṣ, ḏ</i>	'	0 ⁶⁵

⁶⁴ For the Hebrew and Aramaic *s* = *ṣ*, ' = *y*, *ṣ* = *ṣ*, *sh* = *ṣ*, *ṣ* = *ṣ*. For the Arabic, the English equivalents as given in Wright's *Arabic Grammar* have been used.

These three families have obviously, according to the above table, certain laws of consonantal change resembling Grimm's law in the Indo-European languages. Thus, when a Hebrew root has the radical consonant *sh* (\dot{s}) it is generally \dot{s} in Arabic; and in this case should be *sh* in Aramaic. Sometimes, however, the Hebrew *sh* corresponds to an Arabic *th*; and in this case the Aramaic is *t*. A *t* in Hebrew would be represented by a *t* in Arabic and by a *t* in Aramaic. These three series of changes are all common or regular and no proof of *borrowing* can be derived from the consonants themselves where these series exist. If, however, we have *t* in Hebrew, *th* in Arabic and *t* in Aramaic, the Hebrew word would probably be derived from the Aramaic, since the Hebrew form should according to rule have *sh*. Or, if we had *sh* in Hebrew, *t* in Arabic and *t* in Aramaic, the Arabic has probably been derived from the Aramaic.

Observing, then, the exceptions to the regular changes, we find that there are four or five roots or words in the Old Testament Hebrew that may have been derived from the Aramaic, to wit, נָדַר *nadar*, עֵתֶר *athar*, טָלַל *tillel* (Neh. iii. 15), בְּרוֹת *beroth* (Cant. i. 17), and מְדִיבַת *medibath* (Lev. xxvi. 26).

1. As far as נָדַר, "to vow", is concerned, the fact that its root and its derivative noun for "vow" are found in Isaiah twice, Proverbs three times, Judges four times, Samuel seven times, eleven times in Deuteronomy and sixty-four times elsewhere in the Old Testament Hebrew, shows that if this irregularity indicates an Aramaic origin, it indicates also that Aramaic words were taken over into Hebrew as early as the time of the composition of Proverbs, Isaiah, Deuteronomy and the sources of Judges and Samuel.

2. עֵתֶר occurs only in Proverbs and Ezekiel.

3. טָלַל which is found only in Neh. iii. 15 is admitted to be to all appearances an Aramaism. Since, according to the critics, it is in the Memoirs of Nehemiah, it must have been used by the author as early as the fifth century B.C.

4. *ברות* for the more usual *ברוש* may not be an Aramaism, but a peculiarity of the Hebrew dialect of North Israel, where, to quote Dr. Driver (LOT 449), "there is reason to suppose that the language spoken differed dialectically from that of Judah", and "approximated to the neighboring dialect of Phoenicia".

5. As to the *מדיבת* in Lev. xxvi. 16, it is the wont of the critics to assume that *מדיב* is the Hiphil participle of a verb *דיב* which occurs in Aramaic, as the equivalent of the Hebrew *זוב* "to flow." In our opinion, however, it is better to take it to be the Hiphil participle of *דיאב* "to be weak", and for the following reasons:

(1) *זוב* is used in Lev. xx. 24, xxii. 4, both passages as well as xxvi. 16 belonging to what the critics call the Law of Holiness. The verb and its derivatives are found also, in P thirty-four or more times, in Deuteronomy six times, in J in Ex. iii. 8, xiii. 5, in E in Ex. iii. 17, and in JE in Ex. xxxiii. 3. Why should the writers of H, or the various *later* redactors have used two methods of spelling?

(2) *זוב* is used of the flowing of various issues and of milk and honey, but is never employed with *soul*, nor in any but a physical sense except perhaps in Lam. iv. 9; but even there it probably refers to the flowing of the blood of the slain.

(3) None of the Aramaic versions, except possibly the Syriac, render Lev. xxvi. 16 as if they considered the participle to come from a verb "to flow."⁶⁵

(4) *דאבון* in Deut. xxviii. 65 is rendered by Onkelos

⁶⁵ The best discussions of the characteristics of the different Semitic families will be found in Wright's *Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*; Zimmern, *Vergleichende Grammatik der Semitischen Sprachen*; Brockelmann, *Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*; and Driver, in an appendix to his work *On the Tenses in Hebrew*.

⁶⁶ Onkelos has *מפחת*, Jonathan *מסייפא*, the Samaritan *מריבא*, the Peshitto *מריבא*. In this word which is of infrequent occurrence in Syriac, it is probable that the *א* has been changed to *י*. Compare Nöldeke's *Syriac Grammar* § 33B.

and Jonathan by מַפְחַת, Samaritan דַּבְּאוֹת, and Syriac דְּוִיבָא, showing that the Hebrew scholars who made these versions considered the Hebrew word in Deut. xxviii. 65 to have the same root as the word in Lev. xxvi. 16.

(5) דָּאָב in Jer. xxxi. 12, 25, is rendered in the Targum by יִצָּף "to be vexed" and a derivative in Job. xli. 14 by דָּאָבוֹן.

(6) The Aramaic of the Talmud confuses the two verbs דָּוָב and דָּאָב.⁶⁷

(7) The א is frequently omitted in the Hebrew and Aramaic forms and manuscripts.⁶⁸

For these reasons we feel justified in refusing to admit that the מְדִיבַת of Lev. xxvi. 16 can be used as proof that there is an Aramaism in H. The critics are at liberty to make the most out of the presence of one good case in the memoirs of Nehemiah (Neh. iii. 15), which was written at a time when the Jews of Elephantine, Samaria, Jerusalem, Susa, and Ecbatana, all used the Aramaic as the language of business and correspondence. The wonder is that there should be only one sure instance of an Aramaism in Hebrew, to be proven by the variations of the consonants out of a total of 731 possibilities.

The importance of this conclusion is apparent when we consider that it affects all of the forty-two words which Prof. Giesebrecht⁶⁹ claims to be Aramaisms occurring in the single part of the Hexateuch called P (*i.e.*, the priestly codex), and also every one of the twenty-seven words gathered together in LOT⁷⁰ as indications of the date of the Song of Songs.

THE NOUN FORMATIONS.—But not only in the region of consonantal changes does the attempt of the critics to prove

⁶⁷ Dalman, *Aram.-Neu-Heb. Wörterbuch*, p. 84.

⁶⁸ Nöldeke, *Syriac Grammar*, 32, 33, 35; Gesenius, *Hebrew Grammar*, § 7 g; Siegfried, *Lehrbuch der neuheb. Sprache*, § 14; Wright, *Comparative Grammar*, pp. 44-47.

⁶⁹ ZATW. I.

⁷⁰ Page 448.

their theories as to Aramaisms utterly break down, when a scientific investigation of the alleged evidence is made; it fails as certainly in the attempt to prove them by an appeal to the evidence of the *forms* of the words. We have already said that the noun forms ending in *n*⁷¹ are found in all of the Semitic languages at all stages of their development and that the forms ending with *ûth* are numerous in Assyrian and Hebrew as well as in Aramaic.⁷² The forms in *ûth* have already been sufficiently discussed above.⁷³

The Nouns in *ôn* and *ân*.—As to the forms in *n*, the following remarks may be added to what has been said.⁷⁴ Exclusive of proper names, about one hundred and forty nouns ending in *n* are found in Biblical Hebrew. Sixty-three of these are met with in the Pentateuch. Of the sixty-three, the Targum of Onkelos renders twelve by the same nouns ending in *n*, and fifty-one by other nouns, most of them not ending in *n*. Onkelos, however, contains sixty-three nouns ending in *n*. It will thus be seen that where the subject-matter is exactly the same, the Hebrew original and the Aramaic version have exactly the same number of words ending in *n*. Judging from this fact, it is left to our readers to determine, if they can, whether the ending *n* is more characteristic of Aramaic than of Hebrew.

Again, in the case of the twelve words out of the sixty-three where they agree, is it more likely that the original Hebrew borrowed from, or was influenced by the Aramaic version, or *vice versa*, especially in view of the fact that according to the critics themselves, the version was not written for from 500 to 1000 years after the original?

As might be inferred from the example of the usage of words with the ending *n* in the Pentateuch, it will be found that in the best specimens of Aramaic literature the number of nouns with this ending varies with the kind of lit-

⁷¹ Page 404.

⁷² Page 402.

⁷³ Page 402f.

⁷⁴ Page 404.

erature. Thus in *Joshua the Stylite*, we find that in the first four chapters, where the dedication occurs, there are nineteen words of this kind; whereas in certain chapters of the purely narrative parts, such as xix, lxiv and lxv, no word with this ending is found, and even long chapters like xxi and xxii have but one each, and xxiii and lxvi but three each. In Bar Hebraeus, also, we find but two nouns of this kind in the narrative of the crusaders' first conquest of Jerusalem, one of them a word similar to one found in the Hebrew glosses of the Tel-el-Amarna Letters.⁷⁵

Notwithstanding these general considerations and this common use of nouns with the ending *n* in Hebrew documents, the critics are wont to argue that certain parts of the Old Testament are late because they contain nouns of this kind. The most glaring example of the argument is that the presence of a number of such words in Ecclesiastes is due to Aramaic influence, the assumptions being made that many of the words in Ecclesiastes with this ending are Aramaisms, and that the mere use of Aramaisms indicates a late date. In answer to these assumptions three statements of fact and evidence may be made.

1. In general, it may be said that the number of different words of this kind in Ecclesiastes is small compared with what we find in Aramaic documents of a like character. For in twelve chapters, or ten pages, of Ecclesiastes, there are but seventeen words all told of this class, whereas in the first four pages of *Joshua the Stylite* there are nineteen. Yet in the ten pages of *Joshua the Stylite* from 63 to 73 inclusive, there are but twelve as against thirty-four in the first ten pages, showing that the number of such words varies in Aramaic as well as in Hebrew in accordance with the subject treated of. It seems clear that the relatively large number of these words in *n* in Ecclesiastes as compared with other Old Testament books is due to the character of the subject-matter rather than to the lateness of the time of composition.

⁷⁵ *I.e.* אחרון. Cp. *aḥruna* in the letter of Biridiya to the King of Egypt (Winckler, 196, line 10).

Further, it is a noteworthy fact, not mentioned by the critics, that of the 140 words in the Old Testament ending in *n*, only 26 are found in Syriac. Of these 26, six are said in Brockelmann's *Lexicon* to have been derived by the Syrians from the Hebrew, and eight more are found in either Babylonian or Arabic, or both; thus reducing to twelve the number of words which could possibly be derived by the Hebrews from the Syriac. But—

2. Of the twelve words remaining, seven occur in Ecclesiastes. As to these, the following facts rule out the supposition that the Hebrew could have derived them from the Aramaic:

(1) Not one of them is found in any Aramaic document written before 200 A.D. The latest date given by any critic for Ecclesiastes is about 100 B.C.

(2) Since the Aramaic literature in which any of the words occur was written by Jews who had adopted Aramaic, it is more reasonable to suppose that the Jewish writers of Aramaic documents borrowed from their own literary and native language, than that early Hebrew writers borrowed from the Aramaic. At least, there is no evidence that these words existed in early Aramaic.

(3) The forms of יתרון and חסרון have an *u* in the first syllable in Aramaic and an *i* in Hebrew.

(4) שלטון, it is true, is found only in Ecclesiastes viii. 4, 8; but its root occurs in Babylonian as well as in Hebrew and Arabic, and the form occurs in Arabic as well as Syriac.

(5) קנין is found in Onkelos and Syriac; but in Hebrew it occurs in Prov. iv. 7 in a passage which the critics put among the earliest parts of the Old Testament. Besides, to call it late in the Hebrew language, we would have to prove that Gen. xxxi. 18, xxxiv. 23, xxxvi. 6, Lev. xxii. 11, Jos. xiv. 4 and Ezek. xxxviii. 12, 13, where it occurs also, are late.

(6) רעיון is found only in Eccl. i. 17, ii. 22, iv. 16,

but it is singular that, if it meant the same here as in Aramaic, the Syriac version should render it by צבין in ii. 22 and by טירפא in i. 17 and iv. 16 and the Aramaic Targum in all three cases by תבירות.

The corresponding word in Syriac is rendered by Brockelmann by *cogitatio, fictio, consilium* and *voluntas*; in Dalman by *Gesinnung, Gedanke*. Must the writer of Ecclesiastes have borrowed the Aramaic form and have given it a different meaning? Why not rather suppose that he found the word already in Hebrew, formed regularly from the good old Hebrew root רעה, as פדיון from פדה and נאיון from נאה?

(7) Finally כשרון is the worst specimen of evidence of all. To be sure, it happens that in the Hebrew of the Old Testament it is used in Ecclesiastes alone; but how it can be said to have been derived by the writer from the Aramaic passes belief when we observe that the word has not been found in any Aramaic document of any dialect or time.

3. Even if it could be proven that certain words in a Hebrew document had been derived from the Aramaic, it would not determine the date of the Hebrew document; because the latest evidence from the extra-biblical inscriptions, as well as the Old Testament itself, goes to show that the Hebrews and Arameans were closely associated from a time long precedent to that at which the critics claim that the oldest documents of the Old Testament were written.⁷⁶

THE MEANINGS OF NOUNS

Lastly, when we leave the region of sounds and forms and enter that of sense and meaning, we find that here also the critics make assertions with regard to the derivation and borrowing of words which are demonstrably contrary to the facts. In cases such as טלל (*tīllet*, Neh. iii. 15), it is easy to show the probability that the word is an Aramaism, because the proper letter for the first radical should

⁷⁶ Thus the *Ahlamu*, a tribe of Arameans are mentioned in one of the Amarna Letters (Winckler, 291, line 6, 8).

have been *š*, not *t*, if the word had the probable original Hebrew form of writing and sound. In cases such as התחברות (Dan. xi. 23), it is easy to suppose an Aramaism, because the form is common in Aramaic and is met with but once besides in the Old Testament Hebrew. But when we come to words which have no indication (*indicia*) either in sound or form that they are of Aramaic origin, we often find the critics simply asserting as a fact that a word is an Aramaism without producing any proofs whatever to support the assertion.

Thus DeWette-Schrader⁷⁷ speak of פשר, בטל, טנה and כתל as Aramaic, and a proof of the late date of Ecclesiastes and of the Song of Songs. They give no proof except the fact that the words are found in Aramaic. The evidence from this fact is nullified by the discovery that all four words are found in Babylonian, and all but the last one, in Arabic with exactly the same sound, form, and meaning which is characteristic of the Hebrew.

Again, Dr. Driver in LOT mentions among the words in Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs "having usually affinities with the Aramaic,"⁷⁸ אמן, שלט, תקן, ש, פשר, יצא, בטל, שש, שלהבת. Every one of these words is found with appropriate sound, form and meaning, in the Babylonian language and in documents long antedating the time of the captivity. In fact, אמן (master-workman) and שלהבת are so distinctively Babylonian in form and sense that there can be no doubt that Aramaic as well as Hebrew derived them from the Babylonian.

We leave it to our readers to decide whether it is more probable that the Hebrews derived these, and all such, words from the Babylonian (if indeed most of them are not primitive Semitic) documents, which at least antedated the Hebrew documents, rather than from the Aramaic whose earliest use of the words so far as shown in writing, is in general from 300 to 1000 years later than the time of the com-

⁷⁷ *Einleitung*, pp. 543, 561.

⁷⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 440, 474.

pilation of the Hebrew, even if with the critics we put Ecclesiastes as late as 100 B.C.

THE USE OF SYNONYMS

We object to the assumption that the prevalent use of one synonym in one document and of another synonym in a second document is proof of difference of age or authorship. A fine discrimination in the use of synonymous expressions is a proof rather of the superior rhetorical ability of one author than of an indiscriminate use of words by many authors. Yet the critics indulge themselves in elaborate collections of synonymous terms which they put forth as indisputable proof of difference of author and date.

Thus, פדה, "to redeem", is said to be used by D in the same sense as גאל by P. A closer study reveals the fact that in Babylonian, Arabic, and Aramaic, as well as in Hebrew, the first of these verbs is used primarily and predominantly for the redemption from captivity; whereas גאל is a verb found only in Hebrew and used specifically to describe certain duties of the next of kin, such as vengeance for blood, marrying the widow of a deceased kinsman, and others, including also the redemption from captivity. In some passages of the Pentateuch, as well as of the prophets, it is difficult for us to see why one should be used rather than the other; but generally it may be said that the next of kin (*gô'êl*) performs his duty toward his captive kinsman (*gā'ûl*) by buying him back (פדה) *i.e.*, paying the ransom money. Either verb might rightly be used, therefore, in speaking of the redemption; for the redeemer only truly *ga-als* when he *pādās*, his captive kinsman, and when he does one duty he does the other also. Any author of any age might have used either verb to denote this act of redeeming on the part of a kinsman, and there is no passage in the Pentateuch where either verb is used which could not as well have been written by the same author as all the other passages containing either.

DISTINCTIONS IN USAGE

We object to a word being considered as an evidence of age when no other word in the language could have expressed the exact meaning as well as the one employed. Thus גיל in Dan. i. 10, is said to indicate a date in the second century B.C. rather than the sixth. The only reason for this given in LOT⁷⁹ is that in the use of this word the Hebrew of Daniel resembles the Hebrew "of the age *subsequent to Nehemiah*," since it is used "also in Samaritan and Talmudic." We have already shown⁸⁰ that such resemblances for *hapax legomena* are found in every book of the Old Testament and not specifically in Daniel. It might be asked, also, why if it characterizes the age subsequent to Nehemiah, it is not found in Ecclesiasticus or the Zadokite Fragments. Or, if we press the argument, why then does it not prove that Daniel was written after the Zadokite Fragments, *i.e.*, after 40 A.D.? Of course, the critics will say that the writers of these books had no occasion to use the word, since they do not refer to any such band, or company of men as Daniel and his three companions. And they are right; but the same is true of all the writers of the other Old Testament books, and Daniel shows his linguistic ability in that to express a new idea, or a conception different from that employed by others, he has made use of a different word. For, we would like to ask the critics, what word is there in Hebrew that would so well convey the exact thought represented by *gil*? The words for generation⁸¹ would hardly suit, nor would the ordinary words for band or company.⁸² For the author means to say just what he does say, that Daniel and his companions were brought up, or reared, with other youths of about

⁷⁹ Page 506, 10.

⁸⁰ Page 417f.

⁸¹ גיל and תולדה.

⁸² חבל in 1 Sa. x. 5, 10, used of the company of prophets and in Ps. cxix. 61 of the wicked; or חבר as used in Hos. vi. 9 of the priests, are the best possible words. But these could not be translated by *age*, in such phrases as "about your age."

the same age. Of course they were of the same generation and perhaps of the same race and company and station in society, but the particular statement made in Dan. i. 10 is that they were of about the same number of years of age. How else could the critics have said it better and more clearly? And how do we know that Moses, or David, or Isaiah, or Jeremiah, would not have used the same word, if they had wanted to express the same idea? Let the critics tell us how *they* would have done it, if they had been writing in the sixth century B.C. Let them cease to cite the traditional authority (*sic!*) of DeWitte-Schrader and other *German* scholars and think out some way of bettering this "rotten" (*verderbte*) Hebrew.⁸³ As an interested onlooker, we expect to see them confounded in all their attempts to beat Daniel at writing Hebrew. In fact, with all his difficult passages, we think him fine—much better in fact than anything in the Hebrew line of literature that either his German or English detractors can themselves produce.

OTHER PECULIARITIES OF STYLE OR DICTION

We object to considering a word or phrase recurrent in one document as being in itself a proof of a particular age. Kipling's "that is another story" might have been written any time in the last five hundred years. So "I am Jehovah" might have been written at any time from Abraham to Christ.

Nor is the fact that certain words occur in one document and certain other words in another to be taken as constituting proof of different authors for the two documents. Milton uses scores of words in his *Areopagitica* which are never found in any of his poetical works. He employs hundreds of words and phrases in some of his works that are not found in others of his works.⁸⁴ Why may Moses and Isa-

⁸³ *Der verderbte Charakter des Idiomes in den hebraisch concipierten Abschnitten* is cited by De Wette-Schrader (*Einleitung*, p. 499) in favor of the late date of Daniel.

⁸⁴ Thus on pages 94-97 of *The Areopagitica* (Bohn's edition of the

iah not have done the same? The fact of the variations of words and idioms is one thing, the reasons for the variations are another thing. That certain words for "create" and "make" are used in Gen. i and certain others in Gen. ii is a fact; but if this proves different authors, how about the thirty-two words which are found in the Koran to express the same idea? Are we to conjure up a dozen or more authors of the Koran to account for the variations in the vocabulary? We promise as Christians to nurture or train our children; but we speak of rearing, raising, educating, teaching, or bringing them up. In some churches, they "take up a collection"; in others, they "make an offering." Differences of word and idiom are not so much indications of difference in age and author as they are of difference in subject-matter, fecundity of conception, and fertility of expression. One great writer will use a larger vocabulary and more idioms than twenty men with small knowledge and less language.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we claim that the assaults upon the integrity and trustworthiness of the Old Testament along the line of language have utterly failed. The critics have not succeeded in a single line of attack in showing that the diction and style of any part of the Old Testament are not in harmony with the ideas and aims of writers who lived at, or near, the time when the events occurred that are recorded in the various documents. In every case, it seems clear that the language suits the age at which the *prima facie* evidence of the document indicates that it was written. We boldly challenge these Goliaths of ex-cathedra theories to come down into the field of ordinary concordances, dictionaries,

Prose Works of Milton, Vol. II) he uses 73 words not found at all in his poetical works. There are 584 *hapax legomena* in Milton's poetical works beginning with the letter *a* alone. See the *Lexicon to the English Poetical Works of John Milton*, by Laura E. Lockwood, Ph.D., a work much to be commended for study to those who would engage in the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament.

and literature, and fight a fight to the finish on the level ground of the facts and the evidence.

F. THE HISTORY

Finally, let us review the framework of Old Testament history as a whole and see how it stands the tests which modern scientific research has brought to bear upon it. Can a man of scientific attainments still place any reliance upon the chronological, geographical and other historical statements of the books of the Old Testament canon? Or, has the light from Egypt and Babylon dispelled as a baseless fabric of a vision of the night that which was formerly considered to be a real structure of historic fact?

THE CHRONOLOGY

Let us look at the chronology of the Bible, beginning with the time of Abraham.

1. In the four great systems of biblical chronology prepared from the biblical statements alone, before anything definite was known in the fields of Egyptian and Babylonian archaeology, Hales puts the time of Abram's leaving Haran at 2078 B.C., Jackson at 2023, Petavius at 1961 and Ussher at 1921. Since Gen. xiv places Abraham in the time of Hammurabi, it is fair to ask when the Assyriologists date the reign of the latter. Jeremias puts him at about 2000 B.C.,⁸⁵ Clay at about 2100 B.C.⁸⁶ It will thus be seen that the date of Abraham as deduced from the facts provided by the biblical text alone has been confirmed in a wonderful way by the evidence derived from Babylonian sources.

2. The relative date of Shishak, king of Egypt, corresponds to that of Rehoboam and is certainly to be placed somewhere in the tenth century B.C.^{86a}

3. The relative dates of the kings of Israel and Judah be-

⁸⁵ *The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East*, I. 322.

⁸⁶ *Light on the Old Testament from Babylon*, 130.

^{86a} See Jeremias *op. cit.* II, 204 f.

tween the division of the kingdom and the fall of Samaria, as given in the Bible correspond in general with what we find on the Assyrian monuments.

4. The relative dates of the kings of Assyria and Egypt as given on the monuments of their respective countries correspond with what we find in the Old Testament books.

5. The relative dates of the Babylonian kings Nebuchadnezzar, Evil-merodach and Belshazzar agree in the biblical and monumental accounts. The order is correct in whatever sense Belshazzar may have been king.

6. The relative dates of the Cyrus of Ezra, the Darius of Haggai and Zechariah, and the Xerxes and Artaxerxes of Ezra are certainly correct; notwithstanding the difficulties in explaining the passage in Ezra iv.

It is thus apparent that the general scheme of chronology which underlies the history recorded in the Old Testament is abundantly justified by the assured results of modern research. As to the apparently conflicting statements of the present Hebrew text, it must be remembered that many of them are doubtless occasioned by the inevitable corruptions in the text, arising from the practical impossibility of transcribing numerical data with accuracy. No one knows how numbers were denoted in the original Hebrew documents. It is known that the Egyptians, Babylonians, Phenicians, Arameans, Nabateans and Palmyrenes, denoted numbers by a system of notation signs. The earliest example of the use of a letter of the alphabet in a Semitic document to denote a number is in the Egypto-Aramaic inscriptions where *b* seems to be used for *two* and *t* for *nine*.⁸⁷ A double system of numerical signs and letters seems to have existed among the Syrians till the ninth century A.D.⁸⁸ Sometimes the signs were given and the number written also in full as in the Sendschirli inscriptions.⁸⁹ In the Mesha and Siloah

⁸⁷ Sachau, *Aramaische Papyrus u. Ostraka*, p. 276, and Sayce-Cowley *in loco*.

⁸⁸ Sachau, *id.*

⁸⁹ Lidzbarski, *Nordsemitische Epigraphik*, p. 198.

inscriptions the numbers are written in full.⁹⁰ In the Sachau papyri they are commonly denoted by signs.

A comparison of the Aramaic recension of the Behistun inscription with the Babylonian shows numerous variations in the numerical statements. Since these variations can hardly have been intentional, they show how easy it was to originate variations in manuscripts when there was no special purpose in being accurate. It made little difference to anyone whether the army of Darius killed or took alive a few more or less in a given battle. And certainly, these variations afford no proof of late date or of lack of genuineness or authenticity on the part of the various recensions of Darius' great inscription.

So, also, with the variations in the texts and manuscripts of the Old Testament, we must not exaggerate the importance of the difference in numerical statements, as if such difference argued in general against the veracity or genuineness of the original documents. In view of the numerous variations in the contemporaneous, or almost contemporaneous, recensions of the Behistun inscription, we should rather be astonished that the numerical statements of the Old Testament have been handed down with such marvelous comparative accuracy, as that we can reconstruct from the chronological data a framework of Chronology which harmonizes so closely with that revealed by the monuments.

THE GEOGRAPHY

The geographical statements of the Old Testament are also marvelously in harmony with the evidence presented by the documents of Egypt and Babylon.

1. Thus, the names of nations and cities mentioned in the history of Abraham are in general such as are known from the inscriptions to have been existent at the time of Hammurabi,⁹¹ or such as may have existed in his time,⁹²

⁹⁰ *Id.*

⁹¹ Such as Egypt, Elam, Larsa, Babylon and Ur.

⁹² Such as Harran, Damaskus, and Beer-sheba.

or whose existence in his time cannot be denied on the ground of any evidence we possess,⁹³ or such as may well have been substituted for older names in order to make the narration intelligible to the readers of later times.⁹⁴ This last alternative, which affords the only real or supposed difficulty with regard to the possibility of the historical character of the narrative, would be obviated if we suppose that the account of Abraham's life was originally written in cuneiform; because in that system of writing the signs might be read in different ways. For example, the name of the city of Babylon was written in Sumerian *Ka-dingir-ra-ki* or *E-ki*, or *Din-tir-ki*, or it was written in Babylonian as *ma-hazu Ba-bi-li*. In all four cases the Babylonian scribes of the time of Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus must have pronounced the name as *Babili*, though an ignorant reader might have spelled out the three first groups of signs as *Ka-dingir-ra-ki* or *E-ki* or *Din-tir-ki* respectively, these being doubtless the earlier designations of the place in Sumerian, before the Semitic conquerors appeared on the scene. So Laish may have been written with the signs *la* and *ish* in cuneiform and might be read as Laish, or after the conquest by the Danites as Dan. As for *Pelishtim* (Philistines), we may compare the Sumerian *nim-ma-ki*, the equivalent in the Babylonian recension of the Behistun inscription of the Persian *uvaga* and of the Susian *haltamti* (or *hutamti*) and of the more usual Babylonian *E-lam-mat*.⁹⁵ Weissbach correctly transliterates the Sumerian signs *nim-ma* by the Babylonian word *elamtu*. So the signs rendered by *Pelishtim* in our Hebrew Bibles may originally have denoted another name. That is, the sign for the land or city often remained the same, but the denotation of the signs changed. The examples of this in the cuneiform documents are so numerous that, if it could be proven that the names Dan and Pelishtim did not exist in the time of Abraham, we

⁹³ Such as Hebron.

⁹⁴ Such as Dan and Philistia.

⁹⁵ See Weissbach, *Die Keilinschriften der Achaemeniden*, p. 143.

would be amply justified in supposing that in the documents written in that time they were denoted by signs that could afterwards be properly read by the Hebrews in two different ways.

2. That the names of cities and nations mentioned in Gen. x suit the time of Moses better than any other time was fully discussed in an article of the present writer in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for 1884. If we add the fact of the probable double reading of cuneiform signs to what was then written, the conclusions of that article will be corroborated and no reasonable doubt can longer be entertained that the genealogies of Gen. x harmonize with the state of geographical science in the time of Rameses II. This well known method of double reading might explain also such difficult words as *Casluhim* and *Naphtuhim*—words that have hitherto baffled the interpreters of all schools at whatever time they place the date of the composition of Gen. x.

3. The discovery of Pithom and Rameses has established forever the firm foundation of the account of the Exodus.⁹⁶

4. The appropriate manner, both as to time and place, with which the proper names of cities and countries are used in the Old Testament defies all hostile criticism directed against the genuineness of the narratives. The marvelous way in which such countries, nations, and cities as Elam, the Hittites, the old Babylonians, the Assyrians, the Egyptians and Ethiopians, the Moabites, and the Edomites; Tyre, Sidon, Damascus, Hamath, Separad, and scores of other names of places, are brought into the biblical narrative, each in its proper place and time, and generally with the very spelling as accurate as could be expected, is beyond comparison in any ancient document. In view of the fact that the biblical records have stood the test of extra-biblical evidence in scores of cases where its testimony is clear and indisputable, it is inadmissible to claim that the biblical documents are wrong, either when there is no evidence on the

⁹⁶ See Naville, *The Store-Cities of the Exodus*.

monuments,⁹⁷ or whenever we with our limited knowledge of the facts and circumstances cannot explain satisfactorily the location and collocation of the name.⁹⁸

5. Another fact that must always be kept in mind in discussing the Old Testament is this: It was from the beginning according to its own testimony meant to be a book for the people and not for antiquarians and scholars merely⁹⁹ Hence, we can well believe that as the designation of certain places changed, the text of the Bible was often changed accordingly. This would account for such possible changes as *Dan* and *Pelishtim*; just as we might and do speak of Constantinople as having been from the time of the glory of Greece the busy center of commercial activity and of New York Bay as having been entered by Henry Hudson,¹⁰⁰ or of Columbus or Cabot as having discovered America (a name probably not given to the continent till 1507).¹⁰¹ That we are not without warrant for this supposition is shown by the following facts:

(1) The bi-lingual Babylonian inscriptions are full of these two-fold designations of the same place or country.

(2) The triple-inscription of Behistun and the Aramaic translation of the same often give us four different names for the same country.¹⁰²

(3) The Elephantine of the Greeks was *Yeb* (יב) in Egyptian, and *Syene* (סון) in Aramaic, though we find both of the last two names together in the *Sachau Papyrus* I, 6, 7.

⁹⁷ As in the case of the Hivites, Girsashites, Magog, &c.

⁹⁸ As in the case of Tiras, Ashkenaz, Sabtah, and a few other names in Gen x.

⁹⁹ The law was to be read to the people (Deut. xxxi. 11) and according to Neh. viii. 8 it was explained (מפרש) to them.

¹⁰⁰ Scribner's *History of the United States*, I, p. xxx.

¹⁰¹ *Id.* I, 127 f.

¹⁰² Thus the Persian gives Armenia as *Armina*, the Susian as *Harminuya*, the Babylonian as *Uraštu* and the Aramaic as אררט. The name for Babylon is given as *Babirush* in the Persian, *Ba-pi-li* in the Susian, and in the Babylonian is written in two different ways, while on other inscriptions it is written in at least four additional ways.

(4) In the Old Testament itself two names are sometimes used for the same city or country.¹⁰³

(5) The Jewish translators of the Old Testament did not hesitate to render the proper names of places by terms which conveyed the proper location to the people for whose benefit the translation was made. Thus, the authors of the Greek Septuagint render Philistines by *Allophuloi*; Misraim and Ham by *Ægyptos*. The Targum of Onkelos gives different terms to more than twenty names of places, besides giving translations of the names of more than twenty others.¹⁰⁴ The Samaritan Targum has about one hundred and twenty proper names, mostly names of places and nations, that are given differently from what we find them in the Hebrew Massoretic text.¹⁰⁵ The Peshitto translation, also, used all of these liberties with the proper names.¹⁰⁶

From these analogies we are justified in concluding that the mere presence in documents of the Old Testament of certain geographical terms of later origin than the rest of the documents is not conclusive proof that the mass of the documents is as late as the terms so used. It may be simply an evidence of editing for the sake of making the documents intelligible to the persons for whom they were designed.¹⁰⁷

THE HISTORICAL DATA

As to the historic character of the Old Testament records

¹⁰³ Thus, מצרים and חם (for Egypt), Hebron and Kirjath-Arba, Salem and Jerusalem.

¹⁰⁴ See Brederik's *Konkordanz zum Targum Onkelos*.

¹⁰⁵ So, according to the concordance in my possession; some of these names are translations from Hebrew into Aramaic; some are the Greek equivalents of the Hebrew which have been taken over into the Aramaic.

¹⁰⁶ This is evident in a comparison of the proper names of Gen. x and xxi. Here we find Cappadocia for Caphtor, Sepharvaim for Sippar, Ain d' ebroye for 'yye ha'barim, Rametha for Pisgah.

¹⁰⁷ A good example of such editing is to be found in certain changes made in the King James' version in the Tercentenary Edition of the Oxford Press, where, for example, the word "prevent" of the 1611 editions has been changed to "anticipate," "go before," &c.

in general there are no reasonable grounds for doubting it. For,

1. The language in which the different documents are written corresponds with the claim of the documents as to the time and place in which they were written. The first chapters of Genesis are fullest of words derived from the Babylonian, as would be expected in records derived from Ur of the Chaldees. The records concerning the patriarchs who are said to have lived in Egypt are the ones containing the most words of Egyptian origin. The Assyrian and Babylonian words occurring in the documents from the eighth century downwards are mostly governmental terms and are such as would naturally be borrowed from the dominating races of the time. The Indo-European terms, whether Indian, Hittite, Medo-Persian, or Greek, appear in documents which were written in the times from Solomon onward, when the commercial and military relations of the Hebrews with the peoples speaking the languages from which the terms are borrowed would lead us to expect the influx of the new and foreign words to express the new ideas which they connote.

As to the Aramaic loan words, not one can be proven to be present in the Pentateuch, except in Gen. xxxi. 47, where the Hebrew *Gal'eed* (Gilead) is stated to have been called by Laban *Yegar-sa'dutha*, of which compound the second word is certainly Aramaic. The existence of tribes speaking Aramaic can be proven from the monuments as far back as the Tel-el-Amarna letters.¹⁰⁸

2. As we have seen above,¹⁰⁹ the names, the order, and the time of reigning of the different kings of the countries mentioned in the Old Testament harmonizes with what we find in the documents of Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, and other countries.¹¹⁰ A harmony is found, also, in the statements made as to the relative power of these kings and the extent of their dominions.

¹⁰⁸ See Kraeling, *Aram and Israel*.

¹⁰⁹ Page 224f.

¹¹⁰ See for Damaskus, the article by Professor John D. Davis in the April number of this REVIEW.

3. We have also shown in the last article and in the preceding part of this that the language, grammar and literary forms are suitable to the respective ages in which the documents claim to have been written.

4. The civil, criminal and constitutional laws also, both in their general character and in their literary forms, are in agreement with the times and circumstances when they are said to have been enunciated, or in use.¹¹¹ As to the ceremonial and ethical laws of the Old Testament, they are distinguished from those of all ancient peoples, especially by the fact that they are monotheistic and unicentral. That the ceremonial laws cannot have been derived from the other Semites is shown by the almost absolutely different vocabulary employed to express the acts and forms of religious service.¹¹² The vocabulary corroborates the statements of the records by showing that the Hebrew religion was of unique origin and of internal development.

5. That the Hebrew records which the critics assign to the post-Nehemiah period were written long before (as they purport to have been) is shown by the fact that the meanings of many of these terms were unknown when the earliest translations were made. Even at the time when the Septuagint was made, many meanings of Hebrew roots seem to have been unknown to them.¹¹³ This is shown by the frequent transliterations found in that version.¹¹⁴ It seems in-

¹¹¹ This statement is based on comparisons derived from the Code of Hammurabi and the laws of the Egyptians as gathered together in Révilloux's *Lois et Droits des Egyptiens*.

¹¹² See the author's articles on "Babylon and the Bible" in the *Pres. and Ref. Review* for 1902, and in *The Bible Student* for 1904. The dissimilarity in religious vocabulary which characterizes the Hebrew as compared with the Babylonian is apparent, also, as between the Hebrew on the one hand and the Phœnician and various Aramaic dialects on the other.

¹¹³ See my article on "Lost Meanings of Hebrew Roots," in *Pres. and Ref. Review*, for 1892.

¹¹⁴ That some of the headings of the Psalms are not rendered in the LXX would indicate that the songs, instruments, times or circumstances to which they refer had passed out of the memory and tradition of the Jews. If the headings had been inserted after the Greek

explicable, also that the different translators of the Pentateuch should have varied so much as they do in the rendition of many of the terms to denote animals, articles of clothing, drugs, implements, &c., if these parts had been written in post-captivity times, when Aramaic was spoken by many of the Jews and understood by all the educated among them.¹¹⁵

6. Many undesigned coincidences support the historicity of the Old Testament. One of the most remarkable of these is the mention of the horse first in the history of Joseph, coincident with the appearance of the animal in the history of Western Asia and Egypt. Another is the failure to mention the elephant. If a large part of the Old Testament was written in the Greek period, it is noteworthy that this animal, which constituted the main arm of the military service from the time of Alexander down to the time of the Romans should never be noticed even in the psalms which are alleged to be from Maccabean times. Especially is it noteworthy, when we find the elephant playing so prominent a part in the wars of the Maccabees.

7. As to the appropriateness of the proper names of persons with the times in which they are said to have lived, the following may be said:

(1) The names of persons in Genesis from Abraham to Joseph inclusive are in general such as the documents from the time of Hammurabi and from Egypt would lead us to

version was made, it is hard to see how the later Jews, who made the Targums and Talmuds, should not have understood their sense.

¹¹⁵ The versions show that the translators no longer understood exactly what animals were meant in the lists of Lev. xi and Deut. xiv. The first ten chapters of Leviticus show unaccountable variations in respect to all kinds of things. In the words used in the four Aramaic versions to translate the names of the twelve stones in the breastplate, there are but a few agreements among the versions either with one another or with the original Hebrew. Not one of the Hebrew words is found in Mandaean, only two or three in Syriac, two in Babylonian; and nine are not found in any Aramaic dialect. The technical vocabulary used to describe the tabernacle in Ex. xxvi f. is almost altogether different in the Hebrew and the Aramaic versions.

expect. Some of them have not as yet been found outside of the Scriptures, but in every case these exceptions have their parallels in form or sense in the documents of the pre-Mosaic age.¹¹⁶

(2) The names of persons from David to Ezra are entirely in harmony with the names to be expected and such as are found in the documents from Samaria, Moab, Assyria, and elsewhere.

(3) For the times between Joseph and David too little is known from extra-biblical documents to enable anyone to make a successful attack on the appropriateness of the names of persons mentioned in the Old Testament records.

8. Attacks upon the genuineness and authority of the history because it contains accounts of miracles will be made by those only who are unacquainted with ancient historic records. Whether what they thought to be miracles were really miracles, and wherein the miracles consisted, are proper subjects of investigation, but no one can successfully dispute that all ancient peoples believed in them and that all ancient records are full of accounts of them.¹¹⁷ In fact, so much is this the case that a historic record claiming to be ancient which contained no account of supposed miracles might justly be suspected of being a forgery of later times.

9. In like manner, he who rejects a document merely because it contains what purport to be apocalypses, or predictions, ignores the spirit, beliefs and practices of pre-Christian times. Whether a document is, or contains, a prediction and what the prediction means and whether and how it was fulfilled, are all proper subjects of investigation. But all ancient history reveals clearly that the nations believed sincerely in the possibility and in the fact of the revelation of the will of the God or gods whom they worshipped. None but a deist, or an atheist, will deny their possibility. Theists must admit that they may have occurred. Christians

¹¹⁶ See my article in the *Bible Student* for 1903.

¹¹⁷ See my article on "Jonah" and on "What does 'The Sun stood still' mean?" in this REVIEW for 1918.

will believe that the probability of their occurrence is involved in the mission of Jesus, the Word made flesh, through whom God in these latter days hath spoken unto us as in old times He spake through the prophets. Attacks upon Isaiah, Daniel and other books, because they abound in wonderful predictions, will have weight only with those who deny the fundamentals of Christianity. To one who believes in the Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and in the preparation of the world for his coming, the predictions of the Old Testament are but the glimmerings of rosy-fingered dawn before the full-orbed sun bursts forth as the light of a darkened world.

10. The objections made to the genuineness of certain parts of the Old Testament upon the ground that they contain ideas found in extra-biblical literature only in documents from an age later than the supposed date of the biblical document might be taken with seriousness if they were made by an atheist or deist, but when made by one who claims to be a theist and to believe in a revelation, and when they occur in what purports to be a revelation, they seem too puerile to be even considered with patience and equanimity. What! Must Jehovah have derived his ideas of the resurrection from the Persians? Whence then did they derive them? And what care I for their ideas more than for those of Plato, or Ingersoll, or Lodge, or Wells, or even my own? (May I be pardoned for the presumption of even assuming to know as much about such subjects as these aforesaid great men of the earth? I know nothing. They know nothing. Things that are equal to the same thing, &c.) And yet, the critics deny the authorship of Is. xxiv-xxvii by Isaiah, and assert that Daniel is later than the fifth century B.C., on the ground among others, that the future resurrection is predicted in these documents on the authority of God. Oh, mortal man, canst thou bind the cords of Orion, or set a bound to the wisdom and foreknowledge of the Almighty?¹¹⁸

¹¹⁸ Reader! Stop here and read Job xxxviii-xli.

II. The most specious objection made to the Mosaic date and historical character of the Pentateuch is based upon the infrequent references to the laws, especially those of H and P, found in the books of Judges, Samuel and Kings; and further, upon the fact that the observances noted are often contrary to the requirements of the law. The force of this objection is broken by the following considerations, to wit: that the purpose of the books of Judges, Samuel and Kings, the critics themselves being witnesses, was not to give us a history of the religious institutions of Israel. "The stories of the deliverance of Israel represent only certain glorious moments in the history of these centuries,"¹¹⁹ "The subject of the book of Samuel is the creation of a united Israel by Samuel, Saul, and David."¹²⁰ With this purpose in mind the authors generally make allusions to the law and the religious institutions and observances only in so far as they affect the history of the kings and nations whose fortunes it is the aim of the author to describe and moralize upon. The rule of conduct for the people they rightly find in the codes of E and D and in the words of the prophets. On the other hand, the book of Chronicles was a history meant to confine itself "to matters still interesting to the theocracy of Zion, keeping Jerusalem and the temple in the foreground, and developing the divine pragmatism of the history, with reference, not so much to the prophetic word as to the fixed legislation of the Pentateuch (especially the Priests' Code), so that the whole narrative might be made to teach that Israel's glory lies in the observance of the divine law and ritual."¹²¹ Keeping in mind the difference in purpose on the part of the writer of Chronicles it is easy to understand his frequent references to the laws of H and P as well as to those of E and D. Judges, Samuel, and Kings give an epitome of the history of Israel primarily from the political and moral side; Chron-

¹¹⁹ G. F. Moore in *Enc. Bib.*, p. 2641.

¹²⁰ W. Robertson Smith and Ed. König in *Enc. Bib.*, p. 2664.

¹²¹ W. R. Smith and S. R. Driver in *Enc. Bib.*, p. 765.

icles, primarily from the legal and religious side. The conquest, the wars, the erection of the temple as the symbol of the unity of Israel, the division of the kingdom and the history of the two parts of it, and the final destruction of both kingdoms with the causes and manner thereof, constituted the subject matter of the prophetic history; the priestly writer on the other hand, gives the history of the kings and of the nations only as a background to his picture of the ecclesiastical and liturgical development of Israel based upon the prescriptions of the law of Moses. The prophetic writers dwell more upon the breaches of the laws, the priestly writer more upon the observance of them. In order to maintain their assertion that the laws of H and P are not mentioned in the history, the critics must and do deny the reliability of the history recorded in Chronicles. The force of their objection, therefore, depends upon the ability of the critics to establish the unhistorical character of the material facts recorded in the works of Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles in so far as they give information additional to, or in apparent conflict with what we find in the older books.

12. As to the conclusion of the radical critics that the books of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah are unreliable, the following may be said:

(1) It is based upon the assumption that the writers had as sources nothing but the present books of the Old Testament from Genesis to Kings inclusive, supplemented by certain post-exilic works which have long since perished. Since it is admitted by all that the earlier documents of the Old Testament, such as J, E, D, Samuel, Hosea, Amos and the sources of Kings, passed unscathed through the fire and destruction accompanying the fall of Samaria and Jerusalem, it cannot be assumed that other records also may not have been preserved. The Chronicler himself asserts that he had access to such sources, or at least to works derived from such sources.

No other writer of the Old Testament cites his authorities so frequently and so explicitly. That he recasts his material in his own style and language and with remarks and comments of his own, no more invalidates the reliability of his facts than do similar methods in the case of Gibbon, Prescott, and Mommsen. That he inserts his own notes and comments no more throws doubt on his citation of facts than is true in the case of the books of Kings.

Against the express statements of authorities given by the Chronicler, what evidence have the critics to produce? Nothing but conjectures. Nothing but surmises and opinions based on their own ignorance and the silence of other records. Are the critics going to maintain that many works of pre-captivity times did not survive the destruction of Jerusalem and afterwards perish? How then about the sources of Kings? Are they going to maintain that all the works ever written have been cited in the books older than Chronicles, that the *Book of Jasher* and the *Book of the Wars of Jehovah* are the only ones that have disappeared? How about the three thousand proverbs of Solomon and his songs a thousand and five? How about the records of the kings of Israel and Judah as to which it is said so often in Kings that the rest of the deeds of the kings were written in them? If, as Dr. Driver says,¹²² "it was not the Chronicler's intention to pervert the history," why should he have invented or perverted the sources from which he claims to get his information? The present-day critics, living just about 2300 years after the Chronicler wrote his books, may dispute about his statements and deny his facts, and even the existence of the documents which he cites; but most sensible men without preconceived opinions will probably agree with me that the Chronicler is more likely to have been right and to have told the truth, especially about the

¹²² LOT, 533.

records which he used, than any man to-day. The testimony of the Chronicler cannot be overthrown by the *opinion* of anyone now living.

(2) It is not fair to reject one or both of two apparently irreconcilable statements because *we* cannot explain them. Sometimes apparent difficulties can be removed by a change of the pointing or interpretation of the original Hebrew.¹²³ Sometimes the objections are based on an interpretation of the original which creates a discrepancy where none really exists.¹²⁴

(3) One of the most serious charges made against the Chronicler is that he exaggerates in his numerical statements. Thus, he makes the army of Jeroboam I to be 800,000 and that of Abijah 400,000; Zera with 1,000,000 men meets Asa with 580,000; and Jehoshaphat has an army of 1,160,000. If, however, this is an argument against the historicity of Chronicles, it may be used also against Samuel

¹²³ Thus וישב in I Kings xii. 2 may be pointed and read as "and he returned" or as "and he dwelt." מתי in 2 Kings xxiii. 30 may be rendered "dying" rather than "dead" and so be made to harmonize with 2 Chron. xxxv. 24, where it is said that Josiah died in Jerusalem.

¹²⁴ Thus, it is said that there is an inexplicable disagreement between the account of Athaliah's overthrow as given in 2 Kings xi. 4 f. and that given in 2 Chron. xxiii. 1 f. This assumed disagreement is based primarily upon the assumption that the *Kāri* (כרי) and runners of Kings could not have been Levites as Chronicles would seem to demand. Doubt, however, as to the meaning of *Kāri* is manifest, when we see that Gesenius, in his *Thesaurus* (671 b), gives four meanings as being upheld by various scholars, to which may be added several from the versions and one or two from recent scholars. If we connect it with the Assyrian *karu* "to cut," a synonym of *karatu*, it will be a synonym of כרתי and mean "executioner" like *ṭabbaḥ* in Gen. xxxix. 1. If we connect it with the Assyrian *kararu*, a synonym of *eteru* and *šuzubu* "to surround, either for protection or capture" (Muss-Arnolt 25 b), it might well mean "body-guard." The פלתי, so frequently used with כרתי, may be connected with the Assyrian *pultu*, *paštu* "sword." Compare Syriac *pusta* "ascia, securis." That runners might be Levites, and even priests, is shown by the fact that Ahimaaz, David's runner, was a son of Zadok the priest (2 Sam. xviii. 19 f.). Until the meaning of these terms has been fixed, we are justified merely in saying that some of the details of the account are not clear to us. This does not mean that they are not true.

and Kings; for the Philistines have 30,000 chariots (1 Sam. xiii. 5), David slew 40,000 horsemen of the Syrians in one battle (2 Sam. x. 18), Joab numbered 800,000 men of Israel and 500,000 of Judah (2 Sam. xxiv. 9), Solomon had 40,000 stalls of horses (1 Kings v. 6 [iv. 24]), Rehoboam had 180,000 chosen men which were warriors (1 Kings xii. 21), and the children of Israel slew 100,000 Syrians in one day (1 Kings xx. 29). And it cannot be maintained that the Chronicler exaggerated regularly the numbers as given in Kings, since in the seventeen cases where the numbers differ as between the two books, the text of Kings is greater in five and that of the Chronicler in twelve.¹²⁵

In view, then, of the fact that the prophetic history, as well as the priestly, contains these large enumerations, it seems best to maintain either that the enumerations are correct, or that they have been corrupted in the course of transmission. We are not so sure as some seem to be that they are not correct. We are not to look upon the armies of those days as composed of drilled troops like the Macedonian phalanxes, or the Roman legions, but as levies *en masse*, embracing all the people from about fourteen to twenty years of age and upward, a whole nation in arms. Every man was interested in the wars, because defeat meant death or captivity to all alike. Besides, they were fighting at their own doorsteps and for their hearths and homes. When we think of the enormous disciplined armies which single cities such as Nineveh, Damascus, Tyre, Ekron, Gaza, Sparta, and Rome, used to put into the field, we may well pause before affirming with such assurance as some do that the figures of the books of Kings and Chronicles are incredible. But, if some think they are incredible, let them remember that numbers, especially when denoted by a system of notation, are the hardest of all facts to transmit correctly. There is usually nothing in the context to preserve them from corruption. They may have been misread in the original sources or changed in the course of copying; but only those who have

never engaged in the study of manuscripts will indict a whole document simply because some of the numerical notations are beyond the possibility of being read with certainty or accepted as original.

(4) In order to prove the untrustworthiness of the Chronicler, an attempt is made to show that his work was not written till about 300 B.C. The first proof of this is said to be found in 1 Chron. iii. The text of this passage is admitted to vary so much that commentators are not sure whether six or thirteen generations are meant. According to Dr. Driver, the Hebrew text gives six generations from Zerubbabel onward. If we place him at 520 B.C. and count twenty years to a generation, this will bring us to 400 B.C., as the date of the book. Twenty years to a generation is a good Oriental average.¹²⁶

(5) Another proof of the lateness of the Chronicler is said to be the mention of Jaddua as High Priest in Neh. xii. 11, 22. It is assumed that this Jaddua is the same as the one mentioned by Josephus¹²⁷ as the High Priest who went out to meet Alexander when he went up to Jerusalem. Inasmuch as this expedition of Alexander is recorded by Josephus alone and said by the critics never to have occurred, and as the particular Jaddua who is said by Josephus to have met Alexander is mentioned nowhere else either by Josephus or by any other ancient writer, we fail to see the force of this argument. For, if Josephus invented the story about Alexander, he may have invented his Jaddua, too. But granting that there was a Jaddua at 336 B.C., or thereabout, we fail to see why he may not have been High Priest for seventy or even eighty years. Having had a great-grandfather who lived to be hale and hearty at 105, and a great-grandmother to be 99, and three great-uncles to be 94, 96 and 101 respectively, with about a dozen other relatives, no farther away than a great uncle, who lived to be from 75 to 92, and all *compos mentis*, and most active in

¹²⁶ See Assiyuti's *History of the Califs*, where generations are often only for 16 or 18 years.

¹²⁷ *Antiquities*, XI. viii, 4.

body till almost the end, the writer of this article can see nothing improbable in the Jaddua of Josephus having been the same as the Jaddua of Ezra.

(6) The newest weapon of proof, however, that has been forged against the historicity of the Chronicler is that which has been produced in the arsenal of Oxford by Drs. Driver and Gray. The great German critic Ewald asserted that it was both unnecessary and contrary to contemporary usage for the kings of Persia to be given the title, king of Persia, while as yet there were kings of Persia; and that consequently the Hebrew documents employing this title must have been written after kings of Persia had ceased to exist. If this were absolutely true, it would bring down to Greek times the composition of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah and Daniel, since they all contain the title. It is a sufficient answer to this assertion to say that eighteen different authors in nineteen different documents from Persian times use this title altogether thirty-eight different times, and of at least six different Persian kings; that it is used of Cyrus seven years before the conquest of Babylon in 539 B.C. and of Artaxerxes III about 365 B.C.; that it is used in Persian, Susian, Babylonian, Greek, Aramaic and Hebrew; that it was used in Media, Babylonia, Asia Minor, Greece, and Palestine, and according to Herodotus in Ethiopia; and that it is used in letters, dates and other like documents of the Scriptures just as it is used in the extra-biblical documents. Further, it has been shown that it was not common for authors of the Greek period to use the title.¹²⁸

G. RELIGION

Before closing this succinct review of the lines of defense of the Old Testament Scriptures, we must emphasize briefly the strongest bulwark of them all, the undeniable uniqueness and superlative clearness and importance of the religious ideas contained in them.

¹²⁸ See my articles in this REVIEW for 1904-5 and for 1917, and in the *Sachau Denkschrift*, Berlin, 1912.

A study of the religious systems of the Egyptians, Babylonians, and other ancient peoples, has revealed to us a groping after God, if haply they might find him; but nowhere among all the nations is it recorded that a clear apprehension of one living and true God—the creator and preserver, the guide, the judge, the savior, and the sanctifier of his people—was attained. Other religions are outward, concerned with words and deeds. Their sins are offenses or delinquencies, their substitutions are material equivalents, their atonements are physical purifications, their resurrection is a groundless expectation; their judgment is without mercy, their immortality consigns to darkness and dust, and a future life of joy is at best for the few and great. The Old Testament religion is essentially inward. It is the religion of the mind and heart, of love, joy, *faith*, hope, and salvation through the grace of God alone. How account for this religion? The prophets say it came from God. No other theory of its origin can account for its uniqueness and its results, its superiority and its influence. The prophets and their ideas are facts in evidence, which all the quibbling of the critics cannot impugn. The prophets say they had their ideas from God. If not, whence? If so, the greatest of all miracles has happened involving all the rest. For if God spake through the prophets, his revelations of his will could not have been bound by the shackles of time and circumstance. The prophets who spake for him spake not merely as the men of their own time, but as men of all time, as men who were spokesmen of Him who knows the end from the beginning, and has all power in heaven and on earth. The canon of the modern critical school that treats the prophets as the creatures of their time is antagonistic to this fundamental conception of the prophets' mission as it was enunciated by the prophets themselves. They say God spake *to* them and they spake *for* God. The critics say that they gave utterance to the spirit of the times (the *Zeitgeist*) and that they were limited by the time and place of their

birth. But, if this were all the source of their information, how then did it come, that not from the oracles of Thebes and Memphis, nor from the temples of Babylon, nor from the sacred precincts of Delphi, nor from the Sibyls and augurs of Rome, but from the deserts of Midian, and from the sheepfolds of Tekoa, and from the dungeons of Zedekiah, and from the lowly cots of captives on the banks of the Chebar and the Euphrates, came forth those magic words of hope and salvation and glory for a sin-cursed world that have made the desert hearts of all who heard them to rejoice and blossom like the rose in the sunlight of God's favor, in the revivifying atmosphere of his presence? God with us! This is the key to unlock the mysterious chambers of the Old Testament.

CONCLUSION

But the time has come to conclude this somewhat sketchy summary of evidence for the defense in the case of the critics against the Old Testament. We hope that the evidence adduced will be sufficient to convince those who have read the articles that the general reliability of the Old Testament documents has not been impaired. The literary forms are in harmony with what comparative literature would lead us to expect. The civil, criminal and constitutional laws agree with what the civilization of the ancient nations surrounding Palestine would presuppose; while the ceremonial, moral, and religious laws are differentiated from those of others by their genesis in a monotheistic belief and a divine revelation. The use of writing in the age of Moses and Abraham is admitted by all and the existence of the Hebrew language in the time of the Exodus is assured by the glosses of the Amarna letters, as well as by the proper names on the Egyptian and Babylonian monuments. The general correctness of the Hebrew text that has been transmitted to us is established beyond just grounds of controversy. The morphology, syntax, and meaning of the language of

the various books conform with what the face of the documents demands. The chronological and geographical statements are more accurate and reliable than those afforded by any other ancient documents; and the biographical and other historical narratives harmonize marvelously with the evidence afforded by extra-biblical documents.

We therefore, send this essay forth with the prayer that it may strengthen the faith of those who still believe in God and in Jesus Christ his Son. We need not and do not fear the truth about the Bible. We welcome all sincere and honest study of its origin, purpose and meaning. But is it too much to ask and hope that more of those who have been appointed by the Church to teach its history and its doctrines should devote their time and energies to the defense of its great and fundamental, unique and outstanding, facts and implications, rather than to the picking of flaws in the garments of the prophets and to the punching of holes in the robe of Christ's perfection? It may not be ours to remove all the difficulties, to harmonize all the apparent inconsistencies, to explain all the mysteries, and to solve all the problems of the Old Testament; but we can show at least, that we believe that Christ and the Apostles are more likely to be right than we, that the age-long judgment of the Church with respect to the Bible may after all be right, and that our business is to defend with all lawful means the citadel of faith rather than to join the hosts of the infidel in the assaults upon its walls.

Princeton.

ROBERT DICK WILSON.