

THE  
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

---

ARTICLE I.

PROPHETIC TESTIMONY TO THE PENTATEUCH.

BY THE REV. HENRY HAYMAN, D.D., ALDINGHAM, ULVERSTON, ENGLAND.

III.

HAVING re-established their harmony, I now recur to the primary and fundamental covenant ideas. Prophetic testimony is unanimous on behalf of the great pillar principles, the greater commandments, and weightier matters of the law,<sup>1</sup> and thus prepares the way for New Testament teaching. But it does not therefore imply the neglect or the non-obligation of the secondary precepts. Jehovah by the prophets tells his people, "You withhold what I require, viz., those weightier matters, and therefore what you offer I reject, viz., those secondary compliances. Let us now see how far these last are noticed. Hosea (viii. 13) is very brief and pointed: As for the sacrifices of mine offerings, they sacrifice flesh, and eat. Jehovah accepteth not. At that moment he remembers their sin. "Their sacrifices shall be as mourners' bread; all that eat shall be polluted," i. e., the taint of spiritual death, for lack of that higher obedience, is in them, and pollutes the worshipper. There is, I think, a reference implied here to Deut. xxvi. 14, where the "eating of bread

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xxii. 38; Mark xii. 30; Matt. xxiii. 23.

in mourning" is to be expressly disavowed by those who keep the feast. He adds, "Their bread shall not come into the house of Jehovah," an allusion probably to the "shew-bread" of Levitical ordinance. This "bread for their own desire"—so he stigmatizes it—re-appears later (xiii. 6), with fuller emphasis: "They were filled and their heart was exalted." But here the standpoint is in the past, and in the reference in verses 4 and 5 to "the wilderness, the land of great drought," we have an index to the Pentateuch. So that, when he presently adds, "therefore they have forgotten me," we see a direct reproduction of the warnings of Deut. viii. 13, 14, verified in fact. Amos rebukes (ii. 7) domestic incest, such as is forbidden under a curse in Lev. xviii. 8, 15, Deut. xxvii. 20, coupled with some aggravation, "to profane my holy name," which stands in Lev. xviii. 21. The very ministers of the altar live and profit by the breaches of the law. The garments left in pledge, to be restored at sundown (Ex. xxii. 26), are kept by them in defiance of it. They "eat (Hos. iv. 8) the sin of the people," and in the very "house of God drink the wine of fines" (Amos ii. 8). Some simoniacal commutations of sin offerings or trespass dues seem here alluded to. In Amos iv. 4, 5 some special items of observance appear, "sacrifices every morning, tithes every three years (or days), thank offerings of leavened bread, freewill offerings published and proclaimed" (after the fashion perhaps of the later trumpet-sounding Pharisees, Matt. vi. 2). All these, which would be proper at Jerusalem, are transferred in the popular cult to shrines at Bethel and Gilgal. But all are combined with oppression, extortion, luxurious sumptuousness, corruption, and perversion of justice (Amos v. 10-12). Therefore burnt offering and meal offering, peace offering and prime victims, psalmody and musical services—all copied more or less from the Jerusalem ritual—are alike condemned as worthless and vile (ver. 22, 23), because "judgment" was "turned into gall and the

fruit of righteousness into wormwood" (vi. 12; cf. v. 7). The outlines of offerings and services are obviously those of the Pentateuch with Davidic additions. We must understand a caricature of the Jerusalem directory adapted to the cult of the calf, etc. But Levitical features peep through all. The prophet knows of no other offerings than those classified in the earlier chapters of Leviticus. It seems rather strange that such passages should stand confronted with a charge that these prophets were ignorant of the Pentateuchal law. But Amos iv. 4, 5 is worthy of a yet closer study. "Morning sacrifice" is too well known to need Levitical citation. "Tithes every three *years*"—if that be the right interpretation, refers us to "the third year, the year of the tithing" (Deut. xxvi. 12), almost as clearly as if that source had been cited. It is possible, however, that the word which literally rendered would be "days," not "years,"<sup>1</sup> may be meant to be taken literally; as though some punctilious overdoing of legal requirements were sarcastically aimed at by the prophet. But this of course does not diminish the weight of his attestation to the law's injunctions as practised. But we are next met by a more remarkable, because somewhat recondite, point of agreement with them; in the words "offer a thank offering of leaven (*quametz*)," i. e. of leavened bread. Now leaven was excluded Levitically from all stated offerings except the pentecostal loaves, and from all occasional ones, with the one exception of the thank offering (Lev. xxiii. 17; vii. 13): "With cakes of leavened bread he shall offer, . . . with the sacrifice of his peace offerings *for thanksgiving*." The last word here is the same as that used by Amos, viz., *today*, and the word

<sup>1</sup> A yearly course of days is often to be understood where the Hebrew has merely "days," or "the days." So (Judg. xvii. 10) Micah offers his Levite "ten pieces of silver for *the days*," and Hannah (1 Sam. ii. 19) brought the little coat "from the days to the days at the offering of the sacrifice of the days;" in all which passages a yearly sense is preferred by the Authorized Version and the Revised Version.

for leaven, *quametz*, as there. Here then, side by side with two broader and better known usages of the law, we have one comparatively minute and rare. This shows, not only that the recondite *technique* of the personal cult, as well as the more general aspects of the law, was known to the prophet; but that the same knowledge was sufficiently public for him to found this popular diatribe upon it. And this confirms, if confirmation were needed, the view taken above of Hos. viii. 12, that the multiplication of copies would practically add nothing to that knowledge. To pass on: in Lev. xix. 35, 36, we have a precise and explicit statute against falsified weights and measures, forbidding "unrighteousness in meteyard, in weight, or in measure;" and requiring "just balances, just weights," etc. Deuteronomy (xxv. 13-15) repeats the precept with equal amplitude of detail. On the breaches of these very precepts, Amos dwells with sarcastic emphasis,—“making the ephah small and the shekel great . . . balances of deceit;” and Micah echoes him, “. . . wicked balances . . . bag of deceitful weights” (Amos viii. 5; Mic. vi. 3), the “bag” being a feature also of Deuteronomy. See also Hos. xii. 7, where “balances of deceit” are rebuked.

But apart from precise statutes and their breaches, as such, the historical references made by these prophets to the earlier, especially the Pentateuchal history, call for special notice. I doubt whether in any equal bulk of prophetic writings, early or late, such copious evidence of familiarity with the facts of those earlier records is to be found.

These references begin at the Fall (Gen. iii.), referred to Hos. vi. 6, include (xi. 8) the overthrow of the cities of the Arabah, naming Admah and Zeboim, the smaller, as well as Sodom and Gomorrah, the greater.<sup>1</sup> The numerical greatness of Israel's increase is expressed by the image of pa-

<sup>1</sup> See Gen. x. 19 and Amos iv. 11, where the escape of Lot is the obvious source of the vivid phrase, “a brand plucked out of the burning;” cf. Gen. xix. 24 *seq.*; Deut. xix. 23.

triarchal promise, "as the sand of the sea, which cannot be numbered or measured" (Hos. i. 10; Gen. xxxii. 12; cf. xxii. 17). Various incidents of Jacob's eventful life are briefly reviewed; his "taking his brother by the heel," his "having power with God, yea . . . over the angel and prevailing,"—following Genesis here with literal exactness, his "finding God at Bethel," his flight to Aram, "serving for a wife and keeping sheep," are all enumerated by Hosea (xii. 3, 12). These facts are too well known for references to Genesis to be required. But among them stands one less obvious reference to the mission of Moses; to whom Jehovah, declaring his name, says, "This is my memorial" (Ex. iii. 15); echoed thus by the prophet, "The God of hosts; Jehovah is his memorial" (Hos. xii. 5). Again, "they shall go with their flocks and their herds to seek Jehovah," seems literally taken from Moses' words to Pharaoh (Hos. v. 6; cf. Ex. x. 9). In Hos. xiii. 4 the august declaration which prefaces the Decalogue is reproduced (Ex. xx. 2, 3). In chapter iv. 10, "They shall eat, but not have enough" (so Mic. vi. 14), is exactly coincident with Lev. xxvi. 26, the person only being changed.<sup>1</sup> In Hos. iv. 4, "they that strive with the priest" is a curious although seemingly casual phrase. "They that strive" is in Hebrew the participle of the same verb whence the "Meribah" of Num. xx. 2, 3 is derived. And when we read there, "The people assembled against Moses and Aaron, and . . . strove with Moses," and "these are the waters of Meribah, because the children of Israel strove," etc. (ver. 13), there can be little doubt,—I will not say that the allusion was deliberate,—but that the prophet's mind was so saturated with his Pentateuchal studies, that he unconsciously reproduced phrases founded on their text. A verbal coincidence, due perhaps to the same cause, is found in Amos vi. 1, where

<sup>1</sup>The same phrase, with others added and intermixed, is found also in Isa. ix. 20.

“chief of the nations” recalls the same phrase used by Balaam of Amalek in Num. xxiv. 20.<sup>1</sup> Look next at Hos. xiii. 6, “. . . in the wilderness, in the land of *great drought*.” This last phrase renders one word in the Hebrew, a word of extreme rarity.<sup>2</sup> It seems to paraphrase the expression of Deut. viii. 15, “that great wilderness, with . . . scorpions and *drought without water*.” This paraphrase is put beyond a doubt, when we find that Hosea proceeds at once to quote the immediately previous context of the verse, viz., verses 13 and 14, “Lest when thou hast eaten and art full, . . . then thy heart be lifted up, and thou forget Jehovah.” Hosea, speaking as Jehovah, says, “They were filled, and their heart was lifted<sup>3</sup> up, and therefore they forgat me.”

Thus by taking verses 5 and 6 of Hosea xiii. together, we find what is substantially a quotation with its parts transposed. The prophet no doubt quoted from memory and his deviation from exactness is quite natural. “I sent before thee Moses, Aaron, and Miriam,” says Micah, speaking as Jehovah to Israel (vi. 4). These three names (save in the genealogical fragment of the Aaronic house, Num. xxxvi. 59) are mentioned together only here and in the account of Num. xii. 1-4. “Moses, Aaron, and Miriam” are there called out together, that Moses' authority may be vindicated. The two latter claim there, that “Jehovah has spoken also by them,” and in verse 6 this gift of prophecy to them seems admitted. Of course the reference may be to Moses and Aaron in the liberation of the Exodus, and to Miriam as leader of the choir of women in Ex. xv. 20, 21. But the reference seems to be more extensive than this isolated act of hers,

<sup>1</sup> The word in Hosea, transliterated, is *Meribee*; or, prefixed with “as,” *kimeribee*.

<sup>2</sup> Gesenius's Lexicon, *s. v.*, refers it to an Arabic word expressing dryness and heat.

<sup>3</sup> The Authorized Version and the Revised Version both render the Hebrew verb by “exalted;” but, being precisely the same as in Deuteronomy, it should have been rendered in Hosea as there, to show the identity.

and to point therefore rather to the attempted co-ordination with Moses in Numbers xii.

The reference to the rites of Baal-Peor (Hos. ix. 10) carries us again to Num. xxv. 1-3. "They came to Baal-Peor" is the prophet's expression. "Israel joined himself to Baal-Peor," is that of the narrative. "They consecrated themselves to the shameful thing" (the idol), says the prophet. "The people bowed down to their [the Moabites'] gods," says the narrative. They "became abominable," adds the prophet; which sufficiently reflects the "whoredom," etc., of the narrative. I think that we have here the remembrance of a document, not the mere tradition of a fact. It is possible that the words of Hosea (xiii. 1), "When he" (Ephraim) "offended in Baal, he died," may allude more briefly to the same events; although the more recent Baal worship since Ahab's time may be there rather in his mind. But the words "he died," seem to point to some execution judicially done on the idolaters, such as that of Num. xxv. 4, 5, and the ensuing pestilence (ver. 8, 9, 18). But if any choose to refer this to the execution done by Jehu on the Baal worshippers, I admit that this also is possible. Nor should I have adduced this brief and obscure allusion of Hos. xiii. 1 but for the larger and clearer one of chapter ix. 10, with which it seems likely to be connected. And this, in fact, should be taken as a rule in estimating these less obvious prophetic allusions. Where we have a series of events in history and another series of allusions in prophecy, and some of the latter to the former are obvious and clear; these latter produce a probability in favor of the more obscure allusions being similarly related, which every fair mind will recognize.

In Hos. v. 10 [Heb. 9] we read, "The princes of Judah are as *removers of the landmark*. I will pour out my wrath upon them." The phrase italicized is the same as in Deut. xxvii. 17 (cf. also xix. 14), "Cursed is he that removeth his neighbor's landmark." The prophet does not tax them

with the specific offence, but says they are *as* those who commit it. This can only mean that they are "cursed," and therefore must expect the divine wrath. But what an enigma would the prophet have uttered here, if the curse on the remover of the landmark had not been popularly and even proverbially familiar to his hearers! Such an indirect attestation gains force from its indirectness, and suggests that the text of Deuteronomy had become a household word.

In Amos iv. 10 we read, "I have sent among you the pestilence after the manner of Egypt; your young men I have slain with the sword, with the captivity of your horses." The first clause seems a reminiscence of Deut. vii. 15; xxviii. 27 (cf. Ex. xv. 26). The same prophet in chapter ix. 13, "The ploughman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed," seems to reproduce this imagery of plenty from Lev. xxvi. 5, "threshing shall reach unto the vintage, and vintage . . . unto sowing time."

Micah vi. 5 *seq.* records a reply of Balaam to an inquiry of Balak, including a phrase which closely reflects the words of Moses to Israel in Deut. x. 12, "What doth Jehovah ask of thee, but to fear Jehovah thy God, to walk in all his ways and to love him?" Balaam's words are, "What doth Jehovah require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly," etc. The episode of this question and answer is external wholly to the record of Balaam's visit in Num. xxii.-xxiv., but is so far consonant with it, as that Balak there seeks to supplant Israel in Jehovah's favor, here he inquires how to win that favor for himself. It also confirms that view of Balaam, external as he was to Israel, having those relations with Jehovah which form so singular an element in his office and function, as represented in the book of Numbers.

But there is, before we pass on, a local point worth mentioning. "From Shittim unto Gilgal" in verse 5 cannot refer to any spot occupied by either Balaam or Balak.

Shittim, or Abel-shittim (meadow of acacias), is the last march-station recorded in the Pentateuch (Num. xxii. 1; xxv. 1; xxxiii. 49), and there the book of Joshua opens. There *was* an intervening stage close to Jordan, but its name is not recorded. Between Shittim and Gilgal no station is known (Josh. iii. 1; iv. 19). Thus this local note seems to mean, "in the last stage from the wilderness to Canaan," and gives a confirmation at once to the Pentateuch and to Joshua.

Mic. vi. 15, "Thou shalt sow, but thou shalt not reap; . . . tread the olives, *but not anoint thee with oil*; and the vintage, but *shalt not drink the wine*," reads like a condensed recollection of Deut. xxviii. 38-40, the italicised phrases being identical. In Amos ix. 14 the phrases of the curse (Deut. xxviii. 39), or some of them, seem adopted into a blessing, "They shall plant vineyards, and drink the wine," etc. And the confirmation which these prophets thus give to one another suggests that they drew from the same source.

To the book of Joshua there is but one reference, viz., to the narrative of Achan and "the valley of Achor," as a scene of judicial proceedings (Hos. ii. 15; cf. Josh. vii. 21, 26). To the book of Judges there seem to be two that are obscure and one that is explicit. "After thee, Benjamin" (Hos. v. 8), the war cry of that small but valiant tribe (cf. Judg. v. 14); and "They (Ephraim) have . . . corrupted themselves as in the days of Gibeah" (Hos. ix. 9). When we turn to chapter x. 9, we find the obscurity of this brief reference removed: "Israel sinned from the days of Gibeah; there they stood that the battle against the children of iniquity should not overtake them in Gibeah." The reference to the facts recorded in Judg. xx., xxi., is here unmistakable. The facts, however, might be known by tradition, as of course might the war cry of a tribe; there is nothing which directly suggests a literary knowledge of the book.

In Hos. xiii. 10, 11, we find the familiar facts of Saul's history referred to,—a king demanded by the people, the choice of the king, and his removal "in my wrath" (1 Sam. viii., ix., xv.). But in chapter x. 5 we have the idolatrous priests mourning over their desolated shrine, "for the *glory* thereof, because it is *departed*." This closely reflects 1 Sam. iv. 21, 22, where the shrine of Shiloh is the one rifled, and the fatherless infant receives the name "I-chabod" because "the glory was departed from Israel." The phrase is here identical, and the facts are analogous.

Similarly Micah repeats from David's dirge in 2 Sam. i. 20 the phrase, "Tell it not in Gath." The phrase may of course have become proverbially current, but there is no proof that it was so. Certainly there was no popularity attaching to Saul's memory to make it so. And there are various passages in the dirge of greater beauty or significance, which one might have expected to survive in quotation somewhere, had that ode become popular for its own sake. I think the probability is in favor of this portion of early history being known in a literary form to the prophet. Similarly in Mic. v. 8, 9 the thought closely, the language approximately, follows the blessing of Jacob upon Judah (Gen. xlix. 5, 6). And in chapter v. 13 the threats against various idolatrous *insignia* reflect, as mentioned above, the terms of the charge for their extermination, given in the Pentateuchal passages cited above.

#### IV.

The last special topic which I touch upon in connection with this group of prophets is their testimony to the Levitical festive seasons; and to maintain the continuity of the subject I will cite a few other prophets in illustration. Here it will be convenient to quote, first, Num. x. 10. There, with the command to "make two trumpets of silver" (ver. 2), is combined an enumeration of their chief occasions of

use; the last of which is, "In the day of your gladness . . . your set feast, and in the beginning of your months, ye shall blow with," etc. Again, in Num. xxix. 6 we read, "beside the burnt offering of the new moon,"<sup>1</sup> which shows that every new moon, not that only of the seventh month, treated of in verse 1, claimed similar festive observance. I turn next to Lev. xxiii. 2 *seq.*, where the subject is "the set feasts of Jehovah,"<sup>2</sup> whence we gather that one point of that observance was the cessation from toil (ver. 2, 4, 37, 44). Notice also, in Lev. xxiii. 4, "assemblies" ("convocations," R. V.), "which she shall proclaim in their set time, and (ver. 36) celebration,"<sup>3</sup> found also in the closely cognate texts Num. xxix. 35; Deut. xvi. 8. This last relates to the passover as "a celebration to Jehovah, . . . do no work." So far the Pentateuch; from which I turn to the prophets (Hos. ii. 11 [Heb. 13]; Amos viii. 5; Isa. i. 13, 14; and xxx. 29). Hosea says, "I will put a stop to all her mirth, . . . feasts, . . . new moons, . . . sabbaths, and all her set feasts." Amos quotes indignantly the profane inquiry, "When will the new moon be gone that we may sell corn, and the sabbath that we may set forth wheat?" showing that the cessation was thoroughly understood but grudgingly conceded. Isaiah says, "New moon and sabbath, the proclaiming the assembly, . . . vanity and celebration, new moons and set feasts, my soul detests." The same prophet

<sup>1</sup> So R. V. rightly, for A. V. "of the month."

<sup>2</sup> From among these, the ordinary new moon is singularly blank in the text as it stands. But I suspect the words, "of the seventh month" in verse 24, are an interpolation, borrowed by some editor from Num. xxix. 1, in order to bring the two passages into literal unison—a resource which we find so commonly adopted in the New Testament. Omitting these words, Lev. xxiii. 24 reads, "Speak, . . . saying, in the first day of the month shall ye have a Sabbath, a memorial of trumpet blowing," etc. Thus we should obtain Levitical sanction for the ordinary new moon, which was a highly popular observance (see 1 Sam. xx. 5, 18; 2 Kings iv. 23; Isa. lxvi. 23; Ezek. xlvi. 1) and for its trumpet-blowing ceremony (Ps. lxxxi. 3).

<sup>3</sup> So I venture to render the Hebrew *azareth*, for which the Revised Version gives "solemn assembly" in Lev. xxiii. 36, and "solemn meeting" in Isa. i.

in chapter xxx. 29 has a popular allusion to the passover; his "joy of heart" answers to the "day of gladness" of Num. x. 10, his "going with a pipe" may well be the response of the laity to the priestly trumpet. This latter is directly attested by Joel (ii. 15), "Blow the trumpet in Zion, sanctify a fast, call a celebration" (R. V. "solemn assembly"); matching exactly Num. x. 10, "In your solemn days . . . ye shall blow with the trumpet." Jeremiah's appeal (Jer. iv. 5), "Blow ye the trumpet in the land, cry aloud, . . . assemble yourselves and let us go into the fenced cities," is made with a different purpose; but see the previous context of Numbers, *l. c.*, "If ye go to war in your land against the enemy, . . . ye shall blow an alarm," etc. (ver. 9). Here then we have some leading instances of festive and solemn days, as prescribed in the middle Pentateuch duly recognized. But here I notice a more characteristic allusion than any of these previous ones of the festive kind. Hosea says (xii. 9 [Heb. 10]), "I am thy God from the land of Egypt; I will yet again make thee dwell in tents as *in the days of the solemn feast.*" This last phrase must point to one of the solemn festive seasons appointed at the period of the Exodus. Had the word "tents" here been "booths," it would exactly have suited the Feast of Tabernacles.<sup>1</sup> But we know from Neh. viii. 14 *seq.* that the peculiar ritualistic feature of the "booths" had been omitted since the time of Joshua. The prophet had therefore never seen it duly celebrated. This would account for the inaccuracy of his phrase. No other "solemn feast" required any special temporary dwelling, but he knew there was one which did. The chronicler says (2 Chron. viii. 13) that Solomon observed this feast, but he probably means only in respect of its stated sacrifices. We may assume that in the northern kingdom, with which Hosea seems here to deal, it

<sup>1</sup> This word *mo'ed* is the technical one in all the passages above referred to, regulating the "solemn feasts" of Israel.

was entirely neglected,<sup>1</sup> and that the tradition had waxed dim. The restoration of festive worship in this its most neglected item, implies the restoration of it as a whole; and, as the passage is one not of penalty but of promise, this is probably its meaning. But Hosea's knowledge could not be derived from the facts, and was therefore presumably derived from the law. And this is further confirmed by Lev. xxiii. 42, 43, where the clause directing this festival closes with the words, "I made the children of Israel to dwell in booths, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt; I am Jehovah your God." The prophet, quoting *memoriter*, condenses the two last clauses into one, and transposes the first to follow them. But as the booths had never been before his eyes, the word "tents" (in commemoration of which indeed the "booths" originated) slips from him most naturally. The two are in idea so far akin that the LXX. often uses the same term *ἐν σκηναῖς* for both alike.<sup>2</sup> The slip which he makes in terminology is itself a more effective confirmation of a venerable law, either wholly or to a great extent in abeyance, than if he had quoted with exactness, and further confirms the statement of Neh. viii. 14.

We find, then, this special recognition of one festival, besides a generic recognition of the entire class, and a good deal of the phraseology descriptive of those observances reproduced, including several terms apparently technical. Keeping in view the evidence we found in favor of a written Torah, these passages suggest a documentary knowledge on the part of the writers. No doubt custom and tradition would vastly assist the people's receptiveness of the prophet's words. But the question is, Would they account for the

<sup>1</sup> Jeroboam appointed a feast "on the fifteenth day of the eighth month, like unto the feast which is in Judah" (1 Kings xii. 32). The Feast of Tabernacles was due on the fifteenth of the *seventh* month (Lev. xxiii. 34).

<sup>2</sup> So in Ex. xxxiii. 8; Num. xvi. 26; Deut. xix. 8, *σκηνή* represents "tents," in other places other words, often *σκός*.

language employed? I think the coincidences are too many and too curious to be so accounted for. Assume such a documentary basis as the Pentateuch would form, pre-existing, but everywhere incompletely, until Ezra's redaction; and the allusions contained in the prophetic rebukes are easy and natural. They exactly suit that knowledge gained by snatches, and those powerful impressions, from weighty words treasured up in the memory, under precarious opportunities of study, which such a pre-existence supposes. They are closely analogous to those glimpses and snatches of Homer which we recognize in Archilochus, Tyrtaeus, and other early poets;<sup>1</sup> before the recension, which tradition ascribes to the Pisistratid family, at Athens, had gathered the Homeric text into a tangible and accessible *corpus*. There is not anywhere in the prophets a quotation at once direct, exact, and extensive. But the coincidences of fact and of language are just such as one might expect from men who had mentally absorbed the spirit of older documents, with a partial and casual knowledge of their letter, but retained their own entire freedom of expression.

But here of course, as elsewhere, the theory is ready to hand, that the Jewish priesthood in Babylon cooked up their *ex post facto* Pentateuch, with these prophetic morsels, *particulis undique desectis*, to give it an antiquarian flavor. But there is no evidence that the books of prophecy had that authority in the Babylonian period which would be implied in a canon of Scripture constructed even partially out of them. We know that it was only comparatively late that they were read in the synagogues of the post-Ezraic period. And again, it seems certain that a priestly committee, supposed to have lost originative power,<sup>2</sup> and going to the prophetic writings in quest of a resemblance to the antique,

<sup>1</sup> See Preface to vol. ii. of the present writer's edition of the *Odyssey*.

<sup>2</sup> This lack of originality is strongly insisted upon by Wellhausen, *History of Israel* (Engl. transl.), p. 361.

would have been at once more copiously and more exactly reproductive than the result shows in fact.

On the other hand, a traditional knowledge, on the prophets' part, of the facts of national history, and a traditional practice of certain rites under priestly guidance, are far from sufficing to account for the above phenomena of coincidences in language. The theory can never be made to cover the manifest facts.

We may say, then, that in this group of prophets, the recognition of a written law is manifest, and that many prescribed observances were known to them which coincide or largely agree with those of the Pentateuch as known since; also, that considerable familiarity with the language of the same is shown. They attest that the moral and religious state of the two kingdoms, the northern one especially, was corrupt and abominable, but that sacrificial and other religious functions, festivals and other solemn days, having a representative correspondence with those of our Pentateuch, were to a great extent performed and observed, although at idolatrous or illicit shrines. That this last breach of "Levitical routine" is denounced by these prophets unsparingly, in the cases of Samaria, Dan, Bethel, Gilgal, etc., we have clearly seen, especially in Amos v. 4, 5, "Seek me and . . . live: but seek not Bethel," etc. That there was a Presence in which was life, and that at Bethel, etc., it was *not* to be found, is expressed. That it was to be sought elsewhere is implied. The time had not yet come for that elevated spirituality, which wholly dissociates the divine from the local element. It remains, then, that Zion and Jerusalem, although profanely outraged by gross idolatry, had yet, from the standpoint of locality, an indefeasible claim. Thus Jehovah "utters his voice from Jerusalem": "Out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of Jehovah from Jerusalem" (Amos i. 2; Mic. iv. 2); although the same prophet witnesses, to those who "build up Zion with blood and Jerusalem with

iniquity," that "Zion for their sake shall be ploughed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps" (Mic. iii. 10-12). The burden of prophecy is, therefore, as has been shown, that Levitical details were largely kept, but amidst abominations of depravity and profligacy, which extended to those details the contagion of that divine abhorrence which they called forth.

I say above a "representative correspondence," because the monarchy had, no doubt, in various grave items overruled and set at naught, especially in the northern kingdom, much of Mosaic institute. We must allow, also, for gradual additions, by competent authority, since Moses' time.

I may now glance illustratively at a few other prophetic utterances, taking first into view the closing triad of the Old Testament.

Zechariah (vii. 2 *seq.*) tells us of a deputation from Bethel inquiring of the priests on a point of ceremonial observance—the "fast" and mourning solemnity of "the fifth month." Before it should seem the priests had time to answer, the prophet interposes. True to his spiritual mission, albeit a priest, he turns their regard from outward observance to inward self-inspection. "Your fasting," he says, speaking as Jehovah, "was not unto me," but, like your eating and drinking, "for yourselves;" and reverts at once to the standpoint of "the former prophets," and preaches again, as they had preached, the great maxims of personal righteousness in deed and in thought. "Execute true judgment, show mercy and compassion every man to his brother; oppress not . . . nor imagine evil . . . in your heart."

To the same tenor is the contemporary teaching of Haggai (ii. 11 *seq.*), who puts questions of typical meaning to the priests concerning uncleanness, and obtains answers, which, by the way, correspond exactly with the rules of the books of Leviticus (vii. 19) and Numbers (xix. 11), although given, according to our new critical lights, over seventy years

before their existence was known.<sup>1</sup> But those answers he at once turns to the account of a moral lesson: "the people, and the nation, and every work of their hands," offerings included, are "unclean" in Jehovah's sight, for their criminal neglect of his sanctuary.<sup>2</sup>

Malachi, writing much later, when the Pentateuch, as a whole, is allowed an existence at last, is even more express and incisive. He rebukés the hypocritical tears which "cover the altar of Jehovah," the weeping and sighing there; while the gravest breaches of the oldest social law, that of man and wife, are popular and frequent: "Take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously against the wife of his youth." He threatens "the sorcerers, the adulterers, the perjurers, the oppressors of the hireling, and perverters of the stranger's right," with Jehovah's presence in near judgment. Although we are now under the shadow of the Pentateuch, the burden of prophetic warning is still the same—"mercy rather than sacrifice." He calls for tithes indeed, not, however, "on the ground of Levitical theory," but because the withholding them is a "robbery"—one directed against Jehovah himself. It is part of that general sin of profaneness, on other details of which he further enlarges, "Words stubborn against me, . . . vain to serve God, . . . the proud called happy, they that work wickedness built up." (Mal. ii. 13, 15; iii. 5, 8, 9, 13-15.)

In short, the tenor of prophecy, from first to last, is rather to wean the people from laying stress on Levitical observance than to inculcate it, to correct that universal tendency of substituting the outward for the inward, which un-

<sup>1</sup> Wellhausen, *al. sup.* pp. 405-407, says the completed Pentateuch "was published and introduced in the year 444 B. C., a century after the exile. . . . The man who made it the constitution of Judaism was the Babylonian priest and scribe, Ezra."

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that the whole purport of Haggai's brief prophecy seems to be, to stimulate the flagging zeal of the rebuilders of the temple. This governs and limits whatever teaching is to be found in him.

folded later into full-blown Pharisaism, but shows its germ in the early days of prophecy. And because the prophets thus insist on the one thing needful, and do not rebuke for defect that which was already showing signs of excess, their modern commentators draw the strange conclusion that they are witnesses against the existence of the Mosaic law and the current practice of its requirements.

Take any adequate bulk of prophecy where you will, and the same characteristic marks its teaching. Take, as an extreme case, Ezekiel, and assume, if you will, that the "Middle Pentateuch" was under incubation when he wrote. The fact makes no perceptible difference in his standard of the righteous man. We see that standard clearly in chapter xviii. 6 *seq.* It is partly affirmative, but more largely negative. His righteous man—

ver. 6.	has not eaten upon the mountains.	High-place worship excluded.
	“ not lifted up eyes to idols of . . . Israel,	Idolatry excluded.
	“ not defiled neighbor's wife,	Adultery excluded.
	“ not come near . . . woman in separation,	Unnatural uncleanness excluded.
7, 8.	diverse items of just dealing,	} justice and mercy included, with special reference to "My statutes," etc.
9.	almsgiving, administering public justice, forbearing usury, etc.	

It will be seen that they cover the same great general items as the previously examined early group. The few variations of detail arise from the difference between the prophet of a people now expiating their sins in captivity, and those who lift up the last warning voices to a nation steeped in guilt and on the eve of that judgment. And such as Ezekiel is here, he is throughout, in respect of what I may call his public teaching and the popular sins which he re-

bukes. He nowhere mentions Moses by name, nor hints at the existence of such a person, nowhere has any phrase resembling "as it is written in the law;" and although himself a priest, and the author of a singularly elaborate scheme of priestly duties, with temple-plan redrawn and territory redistributed, has not a word to say concerning tithes. Against idolatry, imaged as the vilest sexual debasement, he is, if possible, more intense, and certainly more diffuse, than his predecessors.<sup>1</sup>

I will conclude this section of my review of evidence, by adducing one or two points from the intermediate minor prophets of less certain date.<sup>2</sup> The prophecy of Joel circles round two or three great central subjects, while that of Jonah is concentrated on the mission to Nineveh, which he first seeks to evade and then repiningly fulfils. They both quote (Ex. xxxiv. 6), with the same slight development borrowed from an earlier passage, Jehovah's proclamation of his own character. I exhibit this side by side with their version of it:—

<p>"Jehovah, a God full of compassion and gracious, slow to anger and plenteous in mercy" (Ex. xxxiv. 6), "Jehovah repented of the evil which he thought to do" (Ex. xxxii. 14).<sup>3</sup></p>	<p>"Jehovah your God . . . is gracious and full of compassion, slow to anger and plenteous in mercy, and repenteth him of the evil" (Joel ii. 13). In Jonah iv. 2 the person only is changed.</p>
--	---

<sup>1</sup> See, especially, the episode of Obolah and Oholibah in chapter xxiii., and the denunciation of the apostate harlot (xvi. 2-45), the city which, "dwelling between Samaria and her daughters, and Sodom and her daughters," is more corrupt than they (*ib.* 46, 47, and *ad fin.*). On the specially politico-religious aspects of his future or ideal scheme of service, I will only say, at present, that it seems to occupy a position similar to that of the Republic of Plato in Greek philosophy. Reserving this portion, his polemic is singularly free from Levitical coloring.

<sup>2</sup> Of course the period of "Jonah the son of Amittai" is defined in history by 2 Kings xiv. 25. The uncertainty referred to above, relates to the date of his book, which does not purport to be his work.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. 2 Sam. xxiv. 16; 1 Chron. xxi. 15; Jer. xxvi. 19; also, with the general purport, Ps. lxxxvi. 15.

Here, then, we have a condensation of two utterances in one, no doubt under the law of association which dominates the memory.

Besides this, Joel has a remarkable testimony to "the meal offering and drink offering," and to the straits to which the priests were reduced by their failure in the great drought, famine, etc., which he depicts. He says of these offerings, "They are cut off from the house of Jehovah," adding that "the priests, his ministers, mourn" (i. 9); and repeats it with greater emphasis (*ib.* 13; cf. also ii. 14). For these offerings, whether stated or occasional, as required by law, see Ex. xxix. 40-41; Num. vi. 15, 17; xv. 4, 5, 10, 24; and for the priests' right to them for sustenance, Num. xviii. 9.<sup>1</sup> Of Joel's trumpet signal to the solemn festival I have already spoken above.

To put briefly the several elements of the foregoing argument, and retrace their mutual relation, I will observe that,—

1. Certain facts, recorded or implied, meet us in the prophets, which accord with facts in the Pentateuchal history.
2. Certain established usages meet us in the prophets, which accord with injunctions or prohibitions in the Pentateuch.
3. The historical facts, and the injunctions, etc., of the Pentateuch as we have it, are mixed up together.
4. The allusions to historical fact and to usage which meet us in the prophets are similarly mixed up. This suggests that they are implicit references to such a mixed record.
5. Whatever presumption arises from facts being known, and usages being in force, which agree with *either* of

<sup>1</sup> The "meal offering" only is mentioned here, but no doubt the libation is to be understood as attending; see Num. xxix. *passim*, where the two are throughout co-ordinated.

these (historical or legal) parts of the Pentateuch, is heightened by our finding this mixed agreement with *both*. For,—

6. It is unlikely that the agreements under 1 should be accidental, and, again, that those under 2 should be so. And the combined unlikelihood of these multiplied by each other represents the unlikelihood that *both* should be so.

7. Some of the agreements under 2 relate to facts of a recondite and technical character; as those of high-place worship, solemn days observed, the use of special sacrificial or ritual items, e. g. incense, leaven, booths, etc.

8. This yields a presumption further increased in proportion to this character in the facts, in favor of a body of particular injunctions, such as we have in the present Pentateuch, being in force in the prophet's age.

9. We meet with a great deal of agreement of phraseology, short phrases which agree with others in the Pentateuch, or have the appearance of being condensed out of them. These agreements are too frequent to be accidental, and imply a documentary knowledge of such a text as that in which we verify them.

10. The result of this 9, taken in conjunction with the gradually increasing presumptions from 1 to 8, seems to establish with moral certainty the existence of a text approximately representing our present Pentateuch in the days of those prophets.

And here it seems proper to recur to my opening statement. The proofs adduced do not establish an antiquity necessarily much greater than the prophet's own age. I have supposed fifty years backwards from the close of the reign of Uzziah an adequate margin for this. But it seems absolutely impossible for a work at all resembling our Pentateuch to have then originated. For the early reign of Uzziah, in which this reckoning would land us, appears to have been wholly occupied with successful warlike expeditions from Edom, eastward, to Philistia, westward. And we

are then led backward by successive steps of a probability, which increases as we recede to the age of Moses.

I may observe, in conclusion, that nearly all Exodus after chapter xxiv., as well as many sections of its earlier portion, are disallowed as "priestly additions," by Nöldeke, Wellhausen, and others, whom I understand Professor R. Smith mainly to follow. Also, that all Deuteronomy, except chapters xii. to xxvii. inclusive, are similarly judged to be later accretions by Wellhausen; as of course, with considerable exceptions, are Leviticus and Numbers. It will be seen that the references to passages in the Pentateuch, claimed above as made by the prophets, extend impartially to all parts of it, or, if anything, those to the supposed accretive portions are more frequent than those to the rest.