

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

Science, then, leaves the question entirely open, without the least unfavorable balance of presumption, to whatever positive proofs religion may bring forward, drawn from faith in the power, wisdom, and goodness of God. It is in the arguments furnished by a consideration of the only worthy conceivable action of an Infinite, Holy, and Perfect Father dealing with his conscious children that faith derives its best guarantees of a life beyond the grave.

ARTICLE IV.

PROPOSED RECONSTRUCTION OF THE PENTATEUCH.

BY PROF. EDWIN C. BISSELL, D.D., HARTFORD, CT.

IV.—DEUTERONOMY AND THE RELATED CODES.

THE subject of the relation of the Pentateuchal codes was considered, in a number of important particulars, in the preceding article. In the present one it will be concluded; the special point of view, however, being the code of Deuteronomy (chaps. xii.—xxvi.), which will be compared with those associated with it as far as the legislation covers common ground. A matter of no less importance in the criticism—the laws of Deuteronomy which are original with that book, and the question of the harmony of Deuteronomy with itself and its historic surroundings—must be reserved for later treatment.

1. *Destruction of Idols and of Heathen Shrines in Canaan.*—The code of laws found in Deuteronomy is consistently introduced (xii. 1) with the words: “These are the statutes and judgments which ye shall observe and keep in the land which the Lord God of thy fathers giveth thee as a possession.” And the first requirement is no less so (vs. 2–4): “Thou shalt utterly destroy all places where the nations whom thou drivest out serve their gods,” etc. It is something to which attention had been already repeatedly called in the preliminary history (iv. 15–19; vii. 5, 25, 26), and to which the present code also, under another form, reverts in this and a

subsequent chapter (xii. 29, 30; xx. 18). Such a requirement, moreover, was naturally to be expected when the essential character of the Israelitic religion is considered as contrasted with that of the Canaanites. And that it is found in all phases of the Pentateuchal legislation will not surprise us when we reflect on the extreme difficulties that, notwithstanding, always attended its execution, even down to the Exile (Judg. ii. 2; viii. 24-27; xviii. 11 f.; 1 Kings xii. 25 f.). The Deuteronomic form is somewhat more pictorial and detailed, but is no more emphatic than that of the Book of the Covenant (Ex. xxiii. 24; cf. vs. 33; xxxiv. 12-17), or that of the middle books (Num. xxxiii. 51, 52), and covers in general the same ground. We have alone in Deuteronomy and Exodus an allusion to the peculiar image of Astarte (אֲשֵׁרָה, אֲשֵׁרָה), falsely rendered "groves" in the common version, and in Numbers certain forms of idolatry are mentioned which do not appear in the other books (מַצֵּבֹת, cf. Lev. xxvi. 1; בַּמִּזְבֵּחַ צִלְעֵי מַסֶּכֶת). But as the former does not indicate a kind of false religion prevalent only in the earlier times, so the latter just as little are evidence of a later origin for the literature containing them. The "Bamoth" of Numbers (cf. Lev. xxvi. 30) are no doubt included in the more circumstantial description of Deuteronomy: "All the places wherein the nations served their gods, upon the high mountains and upon the hills." And while the word מַצֵּבֹת is not unknown to other biblical books (Prov. xviii. 11; xxv. 11), the thought expressed by it here in connection with אֲבֶן, whether it be that of an engraved stone or of an image made of stone, can only suggest the rudest forms of idolatry, which would hardly have been first introduced at the time of the Exile. Here, then, while we find the three codes differing, it is without disharmony. Each has its peculiar characteristics, and gives, in its own way, the one charge against the idolatry of Canaan; but evidences of conflict or of widely diverse circumstances of time and place there are none.

2. *The Worship of Moloch.*—Moloch (called also Molech, Milcom, Malcom, in the Bible) was a fire-god, allied to

Baal, and the tutelary divinity of the Ammonites. This people, as such, are first mentioned in Deuteronomy (ii. 20 ; cf. Gen. xix. 38), and continued to exist as a distinct nation down to the time of the Maccabees (1 Macc. v. 6). In just what the worship of Moloch consisted is not altogether clear. But the weight of authority inclines to the view that children, having first been put to death, were actually consumed by fire in his honor.¹ Now, of the several codes, that of Exodus has nothing to say of this special form of idolatry. Deuteronomy refers to it twice (xii. 31 ; xviii. 10) ; in the first instance, however, only in the form of an allusion to a horrible and apparently well-known custom of the heathen, without prohibiting it. In the second case, it is prohibited, but in the most general terms, and as subordinate to another and the principal matter. In neither case is the name of the god, which must have been familiar (cf. Amos v. 26), so much as mentioned. In the middle books, on the other hand (Lev. xviii. 21 ; xx. 2-5), the law appears in definite shape, and the name of the god is made particularly prominent, being found in both passages, and three times repeated in the longer one. Under such circumstances, it cannot be doubtful which form of the law is original ; or better, which is the law, and which the warning that is based upon it. That of Leviticus is presupposed in Deuteronomy. As a statute, the latter would be quite too indefinite without the other ; in fact, it would be unintelligible.

It may be noted, also, in passing, that we have here in Leviticus itself an example of the repetition of a law in an enlarged form — a proceeding which the later critics find so difficult to understand, in the case of separate Pentateuchal books, on the supposition that they all originated in the Mosaic period. It is assumed that this Levitical legislation belongs to one, and that a late, period. Why, then, this iteration within the space of two chapters ? It is not to be overlooked that with the Hebrew there was no stronger form of emphasis than just such a repetition. In this case, there-

¹ Cf. Dillmann, *Com. ad loc.*, and Schrader *s. v.* in *Riehms Handwörterbuch*.

fore, as in others, it was with them no literary defect to repeat a law which was to be modified or amended, or to repeat a law without essential change to which special importance was attached; its importance was thereby only the more enhanced.

We find, moreover, in one of these passages (Lev. xx. 4, 5), the possibility intimated in the very law itself that it might not be executed, and provision made for such a contingency. With what propriety, then, can the failure to execute a Pentateuchal law be considered as conclusive evidence of the non-existence of that law?

And still further, there is abundant evidence that the present law, whether first promulgated in Moses' time or in Josiah's time, was at no time fully obeyed, up to the period of the Captivity, and even later (1 Kings xi. 5; 2 Kings iii. 27; xvi. 3; Isa. xxx. 33; Jer. vii. 31; Zeph. i. 5).

3. *Destruction of Canaanitish Cities.*—With a regulation peculiar to itself concerning other cities on which war should be made (xx. 10–15), the Deuteronomic code combines, also, rules of warfare to be observed in the case of the cities of Canaan (xiii. 13–19; xx. 15–18, 19, 20; cf. vii. 1–6). In this particular, however, it had been anticipated by the previous books (Ex. xxiii. 23, 24, 27–33; xxxiv. 12–16; Num. xxxiii. 50–56), and while repeating for substance the injunctions there laid down, directly refers to them in the words, “As the Lord thy God hath commanded thee.” It might be claimed, it is true, that this citation is only of the Book of the Covenant. But there is nothing gained by excluding the passage in Numbers. It contains nothing new or peculiar of any sort by which a later origin could be predicated for it. The Deuteronomic law, moreover, plainly distinguishes in its introduction between a new and an old element in itself. “Thus shalt thou do unto all the cities very far off from thee, which are not of these nations here [Note the correspondence with the supposed situation of Moses]. But of the cities of these peoples thou shalt save alive nothing that breathes, as the Lord thy God hath com-

manded thee" (vs. 15-17). The sweeping form of the command, too, agrees better with Numbers than with Exodus, where a gradual driving out is in view. "By little and little I will drive them out from before thee, until thou be increased and inherit the land" (Ex. xxiii. 30). And it may be remarked, incidentally, that this law, in any of its three forms, would be an anachronism in any period of Israelitish history subsequent to the time of David.

4. *Forbidden Mourning Customs.*—At Deut. xiv. 1, 2, we find heathenish mourning customs forbidden, such as shaving the head and cutting the flesh. The motive assigned is that Israel is a holy people to the Lord their God, and has been chosen by him for a peculiar possession from all the peoples of the earth. Parallel passages are only found in Leviticus (xix. 27, 28; xxi. 5, the latter for the priests), and they show no essential differences, certainly none that indicate a later origin. There is nothing, indeed, to stand in the way of the traditional view, that the Deuteronomic law here is a repetition of the Levitical, and that both belong to the earliest period. On the contrary, it is strongly supported by the marked hortatory and rhetorical character of the former, nicely harmonizing, as it does, with the supposed circumstances of its promulgation. We find, moreover, in this connection a striking disproof of the position that the code of Deuteronomy originated in Josiah's time. The prophet Jeremiah began his work in the eleventh year of this king's reign. And yet we discover numerous passages (vii. 29; xvi. 6, 7; xli. 5; xlvi. 5; xlviii. 37) in his prophecy where the mourning customs—here so emphatically forbidden—are recognized as fully in vogue, and the prophet's attitude towards them is by no means such as it must necessarily have been if they had been the product of his own age, or, much more (as some suppose), of his own pen. It is simply one instance, of many, where a Pentateuchal law had so far fallen into disuse that even a true prophet can seem to act in almost total unconsciousness of it.

5. *Food as Clean and Unclean.*—The long passage, Deut.

xiv. 3-20, treats of the various kinds of food which the Israelites were forbidden or allowed to eat, and there is every reason for believing that it is based on the still longer passage, Lev. xi. 1-21, 22-43, where alone in the Pentateuch, outside of Deuteronomy, this most important topic of the ceremonial law is dealt with. Such a conclusion is forced upon us not alone by the minute dependence of the Deuteronomic form of the law, in the matter of arrangement and language, on that of Leviticus, but also, and especially, by its noteworthy variations. For example, Deuteronomy, instead of saying with Leviticus, simply, that all quadrupeds that divide the hoof and chew the cud may be used as food, proceeds to specify, as well it might on the entrance into Canaan, a number of varieties under this head. And then, secondly, while faithfully enumerating the three classes — quadrupeds, fishes, and fowls — of Leviticus prohibited as food, it omits to mention a fourth class, reptiles, eight species of which are forbidden in the other code. And still further, it passes over in silence a list of insects, including locusts, that in Leviticus are allowed as food. Now, both the additions and omission are significant, being precisely such as might most naturally have been expected under the circumstances. In Canaan, into which the sons of Israel are just now passing, the quadrupeds particularly named in Deuteronomy are those which would be their main dependence for food. On the other hand, the reptiles prohibited in Leviticus, but passed over in Deuteronomy, are such as in their new home, they would have neither occasion nor desire to eat. While the several varieties of locusts allowed to be eaten by the Levitical legislation (xi. 22, 23), and the following details (vs. 24-43), are apparently left unnoticed in Deuteronomy for the reason given by Riehm,¹ because the latter contents itself with calling attention, to this extent, to the express provisions of the old law. Indeed, the enlargement in Leviticus is devoted merely to an explanation of what is meant by אֲרֵבֵי חַיִּים, forbidden in both codes. At least the practice of

¹ Gesetzgebung Mosis, etc., p. 56.

John the Baptist (*Matt.* iii. 4) shows that the omission in Deuteronomy to cite locusts as permitted food was not understood as an interdiction of them.

But this is not all. A singular textual variation already alluded to sets, as it would seem, almost beyond the shadow of a doubt the dependence of the Deuteronomic form of the law on the other. In the Levitical code (*vs.* 14), according to the common version, the following species of unclean birds are named, "the vulture and the kite, after its kind." In Deuteronomy (*vs.* 13) these become, "And the glede, and the kite, and the vulture, after its kind." If, now, we place the original words of both codes, as they appear in the present text, side by side, we shall see how the discrepacy was possible and most likely arose.

(*Lev.*) וַאֲדֻמָּוֹת וְאֶדְמֵי אֵשׁ לְמִינֵיהֶן

(*Deut.*) וְתִיָּא וְאֶדְמֵי אֵשׁ וְתִיָּא לְמִינֵיהֶן

A copyist read in Deuteronomy *וַאֲדֻמָּוֹת* for *וְתִיָּא* a most natural and not infrequent mistake; and then he, or some one else, added *וְתִיָּא* in its phonetic form (*תִיָּא*), since being found in Leviticus, this species could not be properly omitted here. The Targum and the Vulgate agree, indeed, with the present text of Deuteronomy. But the Samaritan Pentateuch and the LXX, as well as four Hebrews *mss.* cited by Kennicott, read in harmony with Leviticus, *אֲדֻמָּוֹת*, as the first species, instead of *וְתִיָּא*, and it seems reasonably certain that this was the original text of both codes. Dillmann¹ and Delitzsch² think that there should be no doubt of it.

6. *Animals eaten to be Properly Slaughtered.*—With the law just noticed there fitly connects itself this one forbidding as food the flesh of animals accidentally killed, or dying a natural death. It is really the old Noachian precept (*Gen.* ix. 4) in another form, which forbade eating the blood with the flesh (*cf. Deut.* xii. 16, 24; xv. 23), and which was held by the Jews of later times to be binding on all proselytes (*cf. Acts* xv. 20, 29; xxi. 25). The present enactment is found in each of the three codes, but with considerable difference of

¹ *Comm.*, *ad loc.* ² *Zeitschrift für Kirchliche Wissenschaft, etc.*, 1880, p. 6.
Vol. XLI. No. 161. 10

detail. The differences will be best displayed by placing the several codes side by side.

Ex. xxii. 30.	Lev. xvii. 15.	Deut. xiv. 21.
<p>"Flesh <i>torn in the field</i> ye shall not eat; ye shall cast it to the dogs."</p>	<p>"Every soul that eats of a <i>carcase</i> (נבלה), or what was <i>torn of wild beasts</i>, be he citizen or stranger . . . shall be <i>unclean until the evening</i>."</p>	<p>"Ye shall not eat of a <i>carcase</i> (נבלה), to the stranger who is in thy gates thou shalt give it, that he may eat it; or thou mayest sell it to the foreigner."</p>

One thing strikes us at once on looking at these laws, and is very instructive as it respects the form of the Pentateuchal legislation as a whole, that, while the same general principle underlies them all, there has not been the least apparent effort made to bring them into a merely formal, literary harmony. They seem to have been confidently entrusted, just as they are, not only to the good sense, but to the good will of contemporaries and of posterity. Moreover, their very diversity of form, like the costumes of strange peoples mingled together in the same city, often enables us the better to localize them and assign them their true place in the history of Israel. In the present case there is nothing strange in the fact that the more technical and concise Levitical code, followed here by Deuteronomy, should use the term "carcase" instead of the circumlocution of Exodus, or that it should otherwise repeat, as not overlooking it, the prohibition in its original form. Again, it is not singular, but quite in keeping with the circumstances, that the law in its Levitical shape, as applicable especially to life in camp, should put both citizens and strangers under the same rule; while the Deuteronomic, looking toward changed conditions in Palestine, takes on a considerably milder form as it respects the latter. In fact, the permission to sell the carcasses of fallen animals to "foreigners" would have been without special pertinence during the forty years' wanderings. Such a class was then almost entirely wanting; while the stranger (גֵר), belonging to a wholly different category, was necessarily subjected, as we have seen, to Israelitish laws. And, further, it is natural and fully answers to supposed historical relations, that in

Leviticus, the law for the priest alone excepted (xxii. 8), there should be a letting up in the severity of the restrictions imposed in the matter before us, with clear reference, again, to the difficulty of obtaining food of any sort during the long sojourn in the wilderness; while in both the earliest and latest forms of the law, no such contingency being directly in view, the prohibition is absolute. For it is clear that mere ceremonial uncleanness, from which one might be freed by simple ablutions in water, and lasting only until evening, could not have been regarded as a complete interdiction. And, finally, it is natural to find the more developed form of the law in Deuteronomy, rather than in Exodus. It is true that both alike are of the nature of prohibitions, but it is only this one of all the codes, that makes the distinction between Israelites and strangers. This shows a growth in the sentiment that the people of God were to be a holy people.

7. *The Sabbatic Year.*—The term “Sabbatic Year” is found only in Leviticus; but there is no doubt that the same thing is referred to in all the three constituent parts of the legislation (Ex. xxiii. 9–11; Lev. xxv. 1–7; Deut. xv. 1–11). That of Exodus could not, indeed, be properly understood, might be open to a wholly false interpretation, without the limitations offered by the code of the middle books. And that of Deuteronomy is no less dependent, being really a result of experience in the practical workings of the law. For the temporary release of a poor debtor had come to be demanded from the circumstance that during the Sabbatic year he was naturally less able to meet any indebtedness which he might have incurred. To say, with some, that the code in Exodus recognizes no absolute period of rest for the whole people and land at once is to overlook the context (vs. 12), where the obligatory universal rest of the Sabbath directly appears as the norm of the new regulation. It is true that the Levitical code positively enjoins rest on the seventh year, while that of Exodus does so only constructively; nevertheless, it does it. The command to sow the fields six years, taken in connection with the fact that one might not harvest

crops on the seventh year, might be considered an indirect, but no less a real injunction to desist from agricultural pursuits during that year. As thus considered, the three forms of the law nicely fit together, like so many mutually dependent pieces of a mechanism. To substitute one for the other, or to regard them as representing a slow development, the form in Leviticus being the final outcome, is clearly impossible. The close relation of Deuteronomy to Exodus here is shown by the unusual word *שש*, occurring in both, and in the entire Pentateuch only found in these sections; while to the code of Leviticus it holds, as we have already intimated, the relevancy of a by-law, intended to guard against a possible evil consequence of the original enactment. It may be observed, moreover, incidentally, that the tithe enjoined for every third year (Deut. xiv. 28, 29), seems to presuppose the institution of the Sabbatic year as such. Otherwise, there would be needful a double system of reckoning, one on the basis of seven years, with respect to the year of release, and one on the basis of three years, with respect to the tithe. Now, the two exactly harmonize in the cycle of seven years, the special tithe falling on the third and sixth, and there being none at all on the seventh year.

8. *Release of Hebrew Servants.*—Associated with the Sabbatic year and the law concerning the release of debtors we find an enactment relating to the discharge of Hebrew servants. As a rule such service was in repayment of debts, the meeting of which was otherwise impossible. Each of the three codes takes cognizance of the matter, devoting to it nearly the same amount of space, but in other respects having many points of divergence, though all are within the bounds of perfect harmony (Ex. xxi. 2-6; Lev. xxv. 39-46; Deut. xv. 12-18). It is with these divergences that we have here principally to do. Exodus, for example, speaks only of Hebrew men as servants; so, too, Leviticus. But Deuteronomy specifies also women of the nation, who, in a similar way, and for a similar reason, may have sold themselves into bondage to their Hebrew brethren. The first code, again, enjoins

that after six years of service — having no direct reference however, to the Sabbatic year — these bondmen are to go free. As they came, so are they to go; that is, without compensation from their masters. With this — excepting only a new period of release to be hereafter noted — Leviticus agrees. Deuteronomy, however, as in the former case, has an important addition. Exactly as they came they are not to go. They are to be set free, but not sent away empty. They are to be loaded down (פְּרִיָּהוּ) with gifts from the flock, the threshing-floor, and wine-press, in remembrance of the fact of a once common bondage in Egypt. The first code, still further, commands that in case a Hebrew servant elects to remain permanently in the service of the Hebrew master, a contract to that effect may be made, slave and master appearing before the Lord (i.e. the priest or judge who represented him), and the master there, against the post of the door, boring with an awl the ear of his slave as a symbol of his servitude. Of this Leviticus has nothing, another limitation already hinted at, the year of jubilee, being in view. And Deuteronomy, properly enough, from its new point of observation, changes it in so far as that it does not require, in the ceremony described, appearing “before the Lord.” It might be performed, in the case of men-servants and maid-servants alike, at the owner’s house. Now, thus far, excepting only the provision respecting the year of jubilee, whose relations to the present law remain to be considered, there is nothing that requires any disturbance of the relative position of the codes, as fixed by tradition and history. There is only the natural expansion in Deuteronomy which its whole spirit and the alleged circumstances of its origin might have led us to expect.

But as yet we have failed to notice a peculiarity of Leviticus besides its introduction of the year of jubilee, which, according to some, shows a development beyond the plane of Deuteronomy. It forbids in the most emphatic language treating the Hebrew brother as a slave (vs. 39, 42, 45). It is not for a moment to be forgotten that he is still a “brother

of the children of Israel." I have called this a peculiarity of Leviticus. It is so *only in outward form*. The spirit of it appears just as clearly in Deuteronomy, and the form in which it is there clothed is not one whit less striking or impressive. He is to be enriched with presents on the ground of a common brotherhood and a former common thralldom in Egypt. The author of Deuteronomy, with the passage in Leviticus before his eyes, might, indeed, have consciously and deliberately chosen so to express himself, putting thus in the concrete and in the form of an illustration what is there abstractly enjoined.

But how is to be explained the provision of Leviticus that a Hebrew servant is to remain with his master till the year of jubilee? Is it not a clear contradiction of that which speaks of a term of six years and of the so-called perpetual servitude of the other codes? By no means. It simply offers still another limitation to the principal injunction of the code, showing, in fact, *how it was related* to the year of jubilee. The observance of such a year had been independently enjoined (Lev. xxv.). And it was to forestall possible conflict, not to precipitate it, that the matter is here treated. The law respecting six years of service is not repealed, but so far modified, as well as that of otherwise life-long servitude, as that both kinds of service should terminate with the year of jubilee. To suppose that the Levitical code was meant to stand by itself, as a later form of the other two, is to be guilty of the absurdity of supposing that any one in that later period could be capable, in the face of his own appeal for brotherly consideration and leniency, of condemning a Hebrew servant, willing or not, to serve out the whole period, long or short, that preceded the year of jubilee. Hence the only reasonable conclusion is, that these different forms of the law, as in other cases, were simply meant to supplement, and not to obstruct or supersede one another.

9. *Animal Sacrifices to be Faultless*.—The Deuteronomic code (xvii. 1; cf. xv. 21) like the Levitical (xxii. 19-27) allows for sacrifice only such animals as are absolutely with-

out blemish. The same general term is used in the original of both codes for blemish (מִיָּם); but the Levitical alone gives anything like a detailed list of defects to be reckoned under that category. How either priest or layman could have determined what, in the eye of the law, constituted a blemish without some such guide as is furnished by the legislation of the middle books of the Pentateuch, it is not easy to see. Deuteronomy furnishes only a hint in that direction, and in its almost studied generalization (כָּל מִיָּם רֵעַ and כָּל הַבֵּר רֵעַ) seems clearly to presuppose information as obtainable from other sources. Malachi (i. 8) is the first of the prophets to refer definitely to the subject, and it is in such a way as to give anything but encouragement to the theory of a post-exilic origin of the law in Leviticus.

10. *Oppression of the Poor and Strangers.*—A series of enactments enjoining kind treatment of the poor and strangers appears in each of the several codes. All are of like tenor. That of Exodus (xxii. 21–24) treats of the stranger, the widow, and fatherless; to mishandle or afflict them is to expose one's self to the severest visitations of the divine judgments. Leviticus (xix. 13, 33, 34) and Deuteronomy alike (xxiv. 14, 15; cf. xvi. 19, 20) direct the attention particularly to hired servants, whether citizens or strangers: their wages are to be promptly paid, and they are to be in nowise oppressed. Both the latter codes are remarkable for the motives given for obedience. The former says (vs. 33): "The stranger that dwelleth with you shall be as one born among you; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt." The latter (vs. 15): "For he is poor, and setteth his heart upon it [the money due]; lest he cry against thee to the Lord, and it be a sin unto thee." There is nothing here to show that the Levitical law is a later development, but rather the reverse. It alone of the three glances backward to the land of Egypt. Yet this must be looked upon as simply fortuitous. The three forms of the law are all from one period, and only serve to enforce by repetition and the urging of different incentives the same obligation of tenderness toward the weak and helpless.

11. *Number of Witnesses in Capital Cases.* — The Deuteronomic law relating to idolatry (xvii. 2-7; xiii. 1-19) is, in general, but an expansion of the brief regulation of the Book of the Covenant (Ex. xxii. 19). It has one important specification, however, in which it covers ground common to that of the middle books. In Numbers (xxxv. 30) it is forbidden to put to death one charged with murder on the testimony of a single witness; there must be witnesses. In Deuteronomy (xvii. 6; cf. xix. 15), on the other hand, the number of witnesses declared to be necessary in such cases is fixed expressly at two or three; and, still further, it is made binding on these witnesses, in the execution of the sentence, to raise their own hands first against the criminal. Can it be considered in any sense probable that this legislation in Numbers originated after that of Deuteronomy, especially in view of the uniform Jewish practice, which was undoubtedly based on Deuteronomy (John viii. 17; Acts vii. 58; Heb. x. 28)? In the introduction to the Additions to Daniel¹ it is shown to be likely that the Book of Susanna had for its real object a reform in the method of conducting legal processes, and especially to correct abuses springing from the dominance of the principle that two witnesses were sufficient to convict of the most heinous offences.

12. *Magical Arts and Divination.* — There was nothing more common among all the peoples of antiquity, including the inhabitants of Canaan and adjacent lands, than the practice of magic in some of its numerous forms. Ancient Egypt abounded in it, and the monuments of Assyria and Babylon show that these nations, in their religious, social, and even political life, were no less under its influence. And as one of the most subtle and fascinating forms of idolatry, it was natural that the Mosaic law should take cognizance of it, and denounce the severest penalties against it. In this particular all the codes agree; there is not one of them that does not adjudge so gross a violation of its fundamental principles as worthy of death (Ex. xxii. 17; Lev. xix. 26, 31; xx. 6, 27;

¹ Old Testament Apocrypha, New York, 1880, p. 447.

cf. Num. xxiii. 23; Deut. xviii. 9-14). But there is a marked gradation in the fulness and emphasis with which the several books characterize this sin. Exodus speaks only of the female magician (מכשפה); Leviticus and Numbers of five other sorts; while Deuteronomy combines in its list all of them together under their technical names (having the masculine מכשף, however), adds to them three other kinds not found in the parallel accounts, and puts the sin on a level with the offering of human sacrifices. There is but one conclusion to be drawn from such a fact, and it is far enough from agreeing with that theory of gradual development for these laws, with Leviticus and Numbers at its crown, that has sprung up in our times. And the history of the matter as it appears in the Hebrew literature is quite as irreconcilable a factor in such a theory. Centuries previous to the time when, according to our critics, the code of Deuteronomy began to have force, during the reign of Israel's first king (1 Sam. xv. 23; xxviii. 7-9), we already find its severe penalties executed against this crime; and long after the supposed post-exilian introduction of the Levitical legislation it still continues to flourish, and remains a prominent sin of the intractable people of the Exodus down to the Christian era (Zech. x. 2; Mal. iii. 25).¹

13. *Cities of Refuge*. — No less prevalent than superstition and idolatry among the peoples with whom Israel had to do was the immemorial practice of blood-revenge. The Shemitic races, it is well known, were particularly given to it, and are so to this day. To what terrible excesses it naturally led, since retaliation in its turn provoked retaliation, what wild feuds arose among families, which could only be suppressed by their total extermination, may readily be conceived; in fact, is matter of history, sacred, as well as profane. This terrible custom, now, the Mosaic laws aimed not to do away with, for it was founded in a natural and proper sentiment of justice, but to restrict and regulate in keeping with the spirit of all its institutions. Murder was a crime against

¹ Cf. Hamburger, s. v. "Zauberei" in *Reäl-Encyc. für Bibel und Talmud*.

society, indeed, but a greater crime against God. He would avenge. The man-slayer should be his instrument, and no longer self-appointed and self-moved. At the same time there must be scrupulous care exercised. It was only the guilty who should suffer. Provision should be made not only that fathers should not be put to death for sons and sons for fathers (Deut. xxiv. 16), but to rescue the involuntary homicide himself from the hands of offended relatives while their "blood was hot." This was the real occasion for the cities of refuge. And the three codes present the matter much as we might expect them to do on the supposition that they appear in chronological order, and that all of them originated within the Mosaic period. The Book of the Covenant (Ex. xxi. 13) recognizes the necessity for a law on the subject, and announces that some place will be provided to which one accidentally taking the life of another may flee and be safe. In the fuller legislation of the Book of Numbers (xxxv. 1-38), in natural connection with instructions concerning the Levitical cities, such provision is duly made, and a sufficient number of conveniently situated asylums of this sort appointed. In Deuteronomy (iv. 41-43) we find Moses, in harmony with the law of the middle books, designating three cities of refuge on the eastern side of the Jordan; and subsequently, Joshua (Josh. xxi. 13, 21, 27) selecting the other three called for by the statutes on the western side. The Deuteronomic code (xix. 1-13; cf. xxiv. 16), evidently presupposing what Moses is recorded as doing previously (iv. 41-43), is much of the nature of a commentary on the law in Numbers. It makes still more explicit by illustration what class of persons might find domicile within the refuge-cities (vs. 4, 5), gives comprehensive though brief directions for rendering the cities easily accessible, and, what is most important of all for our investigations, adds the concession that, on certain conditions, three cities more, making nine in all, may be used for this purpose. The conditions are, that the people prove obedient and faithful — which, unhappily, they do not — and their boundaries are ultimately enlarged to the extent promised to Abraham

(Gen. xv. 18). In this provision for additional cities found in Deuteronomy critics of the Wellhausen school profess to find a special stumbling-block. They do not see how it is possible that such a concession could have been made in Deuteronomy, if it be the latest form of the law, in the face of the allotment of six cities for that purpose in Numbers. It is only, however, because they are unwilling to acknowledge that Moses was equally concerned in both codes. If it be granted, as it should be, that he was fully competent (always, of course, under divine direction) to modify as circumstances might demand his own earlier regulations, the difficulty at once disappears. On the other hand, from their own point of view, we do not see how the difficulty is made any less serious by supposing that the legislation of Numbers, if it followed long after that of Deuteronomy, would venture so to counterwork established and ostensibly Mosaic institutions as to ordain that three of its six cities of refuge should be on the eastern side, and three on the western side of the Jordan, when the Deuteronomic *code* (xix. 7-9), taken by itself, as it is assumed it should be, allows but three cities altogether for such a purpose, or six on the western side on conditions that were never actually complied with. No one can fail to see that this horn of the dilemma is fully as embarrassing as the other.

14. *Bearing False Witness.*—In addition to the regulation already considered concerning the number of witnesses needful to establish capital offences, there is another in the Pentateuch relating to the bearing of false witness. Its first appearance is in the Decalogue itself, and then again in the same Book of the Covenant (Ex. xxiii. 1, 3), forming what Ewald and others name a “pentade,” that is a law having five separate injunctions, all sustaining a relation more or less close with a central theme. The “pentade” here, however, is somewhat arbitrarily made up, and might be considerably enlarged by adding the prohibitions recorded or implied in vs. 6, 8, immediately following. The same topic is taken up in Leviticus (xix. 11, 15, 16), but in a very general way,

covering in the main the same ground, but with no greater fulness, and much less definiteness, than Exodus. It is not till we come to Deuteronomy (xix. 16, 21) that we find anything like detail. Here directions are given concerning what is to be done to test the matter whether a witness be true or false; and in case he is proved false, what penalty is to be visited upon him. The other two codes seem, certainly, to be before the legislator of Deuteronomy, and his direct object to supplement them. And of the last two, if one's judgment is to be based solely on the laws in form and substance as they now appear, there could be no reason for assigning a later date to that of Leviticus.

15. *Rights of Inheritance.* — The unwritten law of inheritance in Israel was that the eldest legitimate son should be his father's heir, receiving a double portion of all his possessions, the father's special blessing, and all other rights and privileges appertaining to the proper head of the family. This law is recognized by incidental allusions in the history and the codes, but is nowhere made the subject of an enactment, except in the way of restriction or supplement. Deuteronomy, for example, provides against the possible partiality of a father for the first-born son of a favorite wife, (xxi. 15–17), prohibiting his making him his heir in preference to the real first-born; while Numbers (xxvii. 1 ff.; xxxvi.; cf. Josh. xvii. 3 f.) provides for the case where there are no children save daughters, constituting them equal heirs of their father's estate, on the understanding that they marry within their own tribe. In the same connection, it is shown what is to be done if there are no children at all. The second case is an exceedingly interesting one, from the fact that it is special legislation, and arose, in its original form, from an actual appeal to Moses on the part of the daughters of a man who had died leaving no son. Moreover, it was subsequently amended because of a similar direct appeal to the lawgiver in view of certain difficulties expected to arise under it if it were left as first drafted. It is quite probable that the legislation in Deuteronomy was the result of a similar though unrecorded

emergency. Such instances, in fact, serve to account, in some measure, for the journal-like character of a large portion of the Pentateuchal laws. So-called discrepancies are often nothing more or less than amendments called forth by altered circumstances, or revision suggested by further thought. In the case before us there is certainly no just occasion for predicating a later date for the law in its Levitical form. We see, indeed, the very circumstance of the history that called it forth passing before our eyes. And incidentally, attention may be called to the fact that the Deuteronomic code at this point makes use of the otherwise unused expression of Jacob in his address to Reuben, found in a document usually ascribed to the second Elohist (cf. with Deut. xxi. 17; Gen. xlix. 3, רֵאשִׁית אֵינִי).

16. *The Property of a Brother Israelite.* — In Deut. xxii. 1-4 we have the command to restore the straying animal of a brother, or anything else he may have lost. And added to this is another of similar import, to the effect that help is to be given in case the animal of a brother falls under its burden. It is altogether but a somewhat changed reproduction of a passage in Exodus (xxiii. 4, 5), which, however, contains the thought that this brother whose animal is astray or in trouble is one with whom the person addressed is not on friendly terms. Still, the epithet "brother" used in Deuteronomy may be understood as comprehending the special case mentioned in Exodus, together with all others of a similar character; while this form of the code alone extends the rule to anything which might be lost (אֲבִירָה, only used elsewhere in Ex. xxii. 18 and in the codes of the middle books; Lev. v. 22, 23). Considering, moreover, the secondary character of the legislation in Deuteronomy, it is remarkable to what extent its language differs from that of Exodus, while expressing the same general thought (נִזְבָּה for קִים, רֵבֶץ for נֶסֶל, חֲזִירָה for נִירָה).

17. *Kindness to Animals.* — In harmony with the fourth commandment, which enjoins rest for animals as well as man, we find in Deuteronomy (xxii. 6, 7) the command not to destroy a bird and its young or eggs at the same time.

Doubtless the purpose of the law was partly economic; but the special motive urged, "that it may be well with thee," shows that higher considerations also ruled (cf. Ex. xxiii. 19; xxxiv. 26; Deut. xiv. 21; xxv. 4). It seems to be but another specification, or illustration, under the law given in Leviticus (xxii. 28) which prohibits the killing of an animal and its young, "whether it be a cow or ewe," both in one day. There is no evidence whatever that the Deuteronomic law antedates the Levitical. The one looks simply toward the open fields and ordinary life; the other, towards the sanctuary and its sacrifices.

18. *Mixing Diverse Things.*—The law in Deuteronomy against sowing a field with diverse seed, ploughing with an ox and an ass yoked together, wearing garments of mingled woollen and linen, and forbidding one sex to wear the clothing of the other (xxii. 5, 9–11) is, as it would appear, but an enlargement of that of Leviticus (xix. 19), two of the particulars being precisely the same, and the unlike one in the latter code—that cattle of diverse kinds shall not be allowed to gender together—not being of such a nature as to suggest priestly improvements of a later date. The peculiar dual form (מִלְאֵי) is found only in these two places. The same is true of the word טַבָּט, which is explained in the more popular code as meaning a material made up of woollen and linen. Deuteronomy speaks of "vineyard," in place of "field" found in Leviticus; but it is an unimportant variation. The motive urged in Deuteronomy for not sowing with diverse seeds is worthy of notice (לְפָנֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ), "lest it be made holy," that is, be confiscated to feed the priests and Levites of the sanctuary (cf. Lev. vi. 11).

19. *Fringes on the Garment.*—In the Book of Numbers (xv. 37–41) Moses is represented as enjoining upon the Israelites, in the name of the Lord, that they should wear fringes (צִיצִית) on the borders of their garments (בְּגָדֵיהֶם), and that these fringes be ornamented with a ribbon of blue (פָּתֹל חֲכֹלֵי), the whole to be a memorial of what God had done for them and of their duty to him. In Deuteronomy (xxii. 12) the

word "borders" is changed to "four borders," for "garments" we have "upper garment" (מִטְּהָרָה, cf. Ex. xxii. 26), and the fringes themselves, instead of צִיצִית (found only here and in Ezek. viii. 3) are called גְּדִילֵת (cf. 1 Kings vii. 17). All the changes seem to be in the interest of clearness and definiteness. The employment of צִיצִית (from צִיץ, to bloom) in Ezekiel has no bearing on its use here, as it is there used for quite a different thing, the forelock. The Deuteronomic name, which is derived from the process of manufacturing גָּרַל, to twist), is surely an improvement, for such a code, over the more technical designation of Numbers, being a common word, and having the same meaning in Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, and Arabic.

20. *Sins against Chastity.* — The only law against unchastity in the Book of the Covenant is contained in the two injunctions (Ex. xxii. 16, 18), the one relating to the seduction of a bondmaid who is a virgin, the other to lying carnally with a beast as with mankind. Leviticus devotes to the subject a series of enactments, extending, altogether, over more than thirty verses (xviii. 6–30; xx. 10–26). The legislation of Deuteronomy is largely special (xxii. 13–29; xxiii. 1), having nothing in common with Leviticus except a command concerning adultery in its narrower sense (vs. 22; cf. Lev. xviii. 20; xx. 10), which it defines and punishes in the same way; and the one concerning the seduction of a virgin (vs. 28, 29; cf. Lev. xix. 20–22), which, however, it considerably enlarges, and makes cover three distinct cases, all of them different from the one adduced in Leviticus. Of the two codes, taken simply by themselves, the priority of date would naturally fall to the form in Leviticus, that of Deuteronomy being of too limited a character to stand by itself, and its enactments, as we have intimated, of the nature of amendments. Attention, moreover, may well be called to the fact that in xxiii. 1 of the passage in Deuteronomy the law of incest as found in Leviticus (xvii. 7 ff.) seems to be recalled, and renewed by a repetition of the first enactment of it. "The lawgiver had together with the one chief instance of

incest the others, which were almost equally criminal, in mind, as the anathemas (Deut. xxvii. 20, 22, 23) show.¹

21. *Cleanliness in Camp*.—True to its historical background, Deuteronomy has a number of laws relating to methods of conducting warfare upon the inhabitants of Canaan and the adjacent countries. As was to be expected, they are all, to a large extent, peculiar to it; and the present one has been selected for special remark only because, in its principal features, certain laws of the books immediately preceding are so clearly reflected in it (with Deut. xxiii. 10–15, cf. respectively, Lev. xv. 1–33; xviii. 19; xx. 18; Num. v. 1–4; xxxi. 19–24). The particular uncleanness specified in vs. 10, 11 of Deuteronomy is provided for in the same way in the other code (Lev. xv. 16, 17; cf. Num. v. 2), and the same degree of ceremonial impurity is imputed to it. That of vs. 12, 13, while special in its character, is wholly of one spirit with that of the Book of Numbers. And so, too, the motive assigned for what is required in the people's code is fully up to the standard of that of the priests': "Sanctify yourselves, therefore, and be ye holy; for I the Lord am holy" (Deut. xxiii. 15; cf. Lev. xx. 7). And this is not an unimportant circumstance in view of current theories of development in this particular direction.

22. *Prostitution*.—The code of the middle books forbids male prostitution, otherwise known as sodomy, in the following terms: "Thou shalt not lie with mankind as with womankind; it is an abomination" (Lev. xviii. 22); and female prostitution with equal explicitness in the following chapter (xix. 29). Deuteronomy combines the two enactments in one (xxiii. 18, 19), using a technical term for prostitute (קִישָׁתוּ) first employed in Genesis (xxxviii. 21 f.), but frequently found in the later historical and other books (1 Kings xiv. 24; xv. 12; xxii. 47; 2 Kings xxiii. 7; Job xxxvi. 14; Hos. iv. 14). It also adds to it an injunction, perhaps suggested by this very term as used by Phœnician and Canaanitish neighbors, to the effect that money obtained

¹ So Delitzsch, *Ibid*, p. 446.

by such means "for any vow" was in no case to be brought into the house of the Lord. There is every indication that Deuteronomy represents the latest form of the law. The expression "house of the Lord," otherwise strange to the book, occurs in Exodus (xxiii. 19), and is no proof that the temple was already built. The epithet "dog" (זב) applied to the male prostitute, is as remarkable for its literary precision as for its exalted moral tone.

23. *Usury*.—Demanding interest for what was loaned to Israelitish brethren is forbidden in each of the three forms of the Pentateuchal law (Ex. xxii. 24; Lev. xxv. 35-37; Deut. xxiii. 20, 21); but they are by no means simple repetitions of one another. Each furnishes something peculiar to itself.

EXODUS.	LEVITICUS.	DEUTERONOMY.
<p>"If thou lend money to one of my people among you, thou shalt not be to him as one exacting interest; thou shalt not charge him with interest."</p>	<p>"And if thy brother have grown poor... or the stranger (זר) and sojourner with thee, thou shalt relieve him. Thou shalt not take interest from him or increase. Thy money thou shalt not give him for interest, nor thy food for increase. I am the Lord your God."</p>	<p>"Thou shalt not exact interest of thy brother, interest for money, interest for food, interest for anything for which one might exact interest. Of the foreigner (זר) thou mayest exact it, but of thy brother thou shalt not exact it, in order that the Lord thy God may bless thee."</p>

In Exodus the poor Israelite is spoken of as one of God's people, and this thought supplies the place of the motives urged in the other laws. In Leviticus, not only is interest for money loaned prohibited, but for food. In Deuteronomy this is extended to anything loaned. Leviticus enjoins that its provisions shall be applied to strangers (proselytes) and sojourners who are casually dwelling among the Israelites. Deuteronomy adds, in harmony with its special outlook, that from *foreigners*, interest for anything loaned may be legally received; that is, from Phœnician, Canaanitish, and other professional traders with whom they may have dealings. It is plain that there is no call here for any adjustment; the sacred laws are completely self-adjusting. They nicely fit

and complement one another, and the three taken together form one harmonious whole. The question of conflict, or of development in the line of Exodus, Deuteronomy, Leviticus, with a space of centuries between the separate codes, cannot for a moment be entertained.

24. *Vows*.—The Pentateuchal legislation neither imposed vows nor treated them as particularly meritorious. They might be wholly ignored without sin (Deut. xxiii. 22). And this attitude was to have been expected; since it is what God requires, and not what one voluntarily takes upon himself, that these laws make it their object to prescribe and enact. Still the subject could not be wholly overlooked; for vows had in all times and countries a great deal to do with the religious life as popularly understood and practised. Hence the Mosaic laws undertake to regulate the matter in harmony with their own fundamental principles. If, for example, one had actually made a vow, it must be fulfilled at the exact time and in the manner originally assumed (Num. xxx. 3; Deut. xxiii. 22, 23; Judges xi. 30 ff.). Everything of which a person had the proper disposal, that is, which did not already come under the head of appointed offerings, it was presupposed in the law might be voluntarily devoted to God, and it does not accordingly refer to the matter except, as we have already seen, by forbidding that the gains of prostitution shall be brought into the house of the Lord (Deut. xxiii. 18). And such an exception gives just the local coloring to this phase of the legislation which its supposed circumstances admit, and* serves also to display its true relation to the others in this matter. It is the middle books that have the most to say concerning vows (Lev. vii., xxii., xxiii., xxvii.; Num. vi., xv., xxix., and especially xxx.). What is said in the people's code (Deut. xii. 6, 11, 17, 26; xxiii. 22 f.) is to be looked upon less in the light of any attempt to lay down rules, with the exception just noticed, and more as designed to impress an important principle underlying all vows, that what had been once vowed could never be recalled (cf. its כִּרְחִיר נִיר, and מִצַּא שְׂפִירָה with Num. xxx. 3, 6, 7,

13). It is true that in the degeneracy of the later Judaism an ever greater stress came to be laid on self-imposed duties and restraints (Mal. i. 14; Matt. xv. 5; Mark vii. 9), and it might therefore be claimed that the minute injunctions of the middle books reflect the spirit of a post-exilic Israel. But when it is considered that nothing at all is said of vows in the laws of Exodus, and that what is said in Deuteronomy is of a hortatory, or a purely emendatory character, the legislation of the middle books seems to be positively demanded to meet the requirements of so fixed and wide-spread a custom of the earliest periods and one so ethical in its bearings.

25. *Pledges*.—Deuteronomy treats the matter of pledges given for loans, relatively, at considerable length (xxiv. 6, 10–13, 17, 18), and altogether from its uniformly merciful and humane point of view. In form, what it has to say is evidently based on Exodus (xxii. 25, 26), whose provisions, or more properly illustrations, it simply enlarges. Neither form of the law has anything to say about the pledging of land, which first came into use after the time of Nehemiah (Neh. v. 3); and the same is true of the code of the middle books, which is silent on the entire subject.

26. *Man-stealing*.—The law concerning man-stealing is also limited to the same two codes. In the first form of the law (Ex. xxi. 16) the matter is not confined to the stealing of Hebrews alone; and if the one stolen were either found in the thief's hands, that is, as a slave, or had been sold by him, the thief was to be put to death. In the second form (Deut. xxiv. 7), the matter *is confined* to the stealing of Hebrews, and the thief is to be put to death if he *be found stealing or selling* one of his brethren. The law in Deuteronomy is either a milder form of the other, or to be understood as putting a proper interpretation upon the other.

27. *Leprosy*.—Delitzsch¹ has laid down the safe principle that where there are "in Deuteronomy references to the laws which are fully codified by the Elohist, these laws, as well as those of the Book of the Covenant, are to be looked upon as

¹ *Zeitschrift für Kirchliche Wissenschaft, etc.*, 1880, p. 446.

antedating Deuteronomy." "That this," he goes on to say, "is true of the law of Leviticus relating to the leprosy we think we have shown in our first article.¹ The impressive exhortation, Deut. xxiv. 8, to hold one's self obedient, in case of the leprosy, to the directions of the Levitical priests, which themselves, in turn, rest on divine instructions (כִּאֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתָם; cf. with this the expression referring to the law of the Sabbath, vs. 12), presupposes the existence of such special norms, products of divine revelation, as stand recorded in Lev. xiii., xiv." It is not easy to see how this conclusion of Delitzsch can be avoided. The Book of the Covenant does not take up the subject. Deuteronomy refers explicitly to instructions somewhere given to the priests concerning it. They are found in full in Leviticus, and found nowhere else. The allusion to Miriam in Deut. xxiv. 9 is incidental, and is made, apparently, for the sake of warning, lest one expose himself by disobedience to the danger of the leprosy. It should not be used so to limit the preceding verse as to make it teach that if the people are not submissive *to the priests* they will be liable to attacks from this dreadful disease. It was not against the priests, but against Moses that Miriam and Aaron, himself the head of the priesthood, had shown a rebellious spirit. And the rendering of vs. 8, which even Schultz and Keil favor: "Take heed against the plague of the leprosy by observing and doing according to all the Levitical priests," etc., is not only grammatically less to be recommended, but introduces by the but-end an incongruous thought into the context. It is possible, indeed, that the reference is to Miriam's exclusion from camp, and solely to that, showing that the strictest rules were enforced even in her case, and hence should be in that of all others.

28. *Gleaning*.—Of the law in Leviticus in behalf of the poor (xix. 10), that the corners of the fields and the gleanings as well of vineyards as grainfields are to be left for them, Dillmann² remarks that its age is witnessed to not only by its form, but by its repetition in xxiii. 22, and in Deut. xxiv.

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-10.

² *Com. ad loc.*

19-22. In the last passage the gleanings of olive-trees and sheaves forgotten in the harvesting are also included among the perquisites of "strangers, the fatherless and widow." It was a goodly land upon which the people looked over from the steppes of Moab. What wonder that the heart grew generous in view of it?

29. *Just Weights and Measures.*—As it has just occurred, and not infrequently occurred, so here, we find Deuteronomy doing little more than simply repeating a regulation of Leviticus (xix. 35, 36, cf. Deut. xxv. 13-16) in a slightly altered form. The language of the latter (on מִשְׁרֵר on cf. Dillmann),¹ betrays no sign of a later age, and still less does the motive which is urged as an incentive, the fact that God had brought them from the land of Egypt. The style of Deuteronomy is more popular (אֵבֶן — אֵבֶן, אֵשָׁה — אֵשָׁה), it has fewer specifications than Leviticus, but it is one with it in spirit and conveys essentially the same message. The motive it offers, as over against that of the parallel code, is strikingly appropriate to the alleged circumstances of its origin: "In order that thy days may be prolonged in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee" (cf. iv. 26, 40; v. 16, 30; vi. 2; xi. 9; xvii. 20; xxii. 7; xxv. 19; xxviii. 8; xxx. 16; xxxi. 13).

This concludes our investigation concerning the chronological order of the Pentateuchal codes as determined by matters in which they cover common ground. And it cannot but be plain to those who have followed the discussion in the last two papers, that if there are some laws in the middle books of such a nature that it would be impossible to determine, if taken simply by themselves, whether they chronologically preceded or followed Deuteronomy, this number is exceedingly small. A very large proportion of them, according to all fair rules of internal evidence, and tested by these only, appear as fixed, original sources. And we are quite certain that a thorough examination of the many independent regulations of the several codes would but serve to confirm this conclusion and fully justify the Mosaic tradition which from the first has covered and hallowed them all.

¹ Ibid.

RELATED PASSAGES IN THE PENTATEUCHAL CODES.

Subject.	Deuteronomy.	Exodus.	Leviticus and Numbers.
1 Introductory,	12: 1 (see Hebrew text throughout).		
2 Destruction of idols, etc.,	12: 2-4, 29, 30; 4: 15-19; 7: 5, 25, 26; 20: 18.	23: 24, 25; 34: 12-17; cf. 23: 13.	N. 33: 51, 52
3 Centralization of worship,	12: 5-23; cf. 28: 2 ff.	20: 24, 25; 34: 23-26	L. 17: 1 ff. <i>et passim</i> .
4 Worship of Moloch,	12: 31; cf. 18: 10	...	L. 18: 21; 20: 2-5
5 Seduction to idolatry,	13: 1-19; 16: 21-23		
6 Destruction of Canaan- itish cities.	13: 13-19; 20: 15-18	23: 23, 24, 27-33; 34: 12-16	N. 33: 50-56.
7 Forbidden mourning cus- toms.	14: 1, 2	...	L. 19: 27, 28; 21: 5
8 Food as clean and unclean,	14: 8, 20	...	L. 11: 1-21, 22-43
9 Animals eaten to be properly slain,	14: 21	22: 30	L. 17: 15
10 Offerings,	14: 22-29; cf. 12: 17-19; 15: 19-23; 26: 12-19.	22: 29; 23: 18, 19a; 34: 19, 20, 25, 26a.	N. 18: 21-32 <i>et passim</i> .
11 Sabbatic Year,	15: 1-11	28: 9-11	L. 25: 1-7
12 Release of Hebrew ser- vants.	15: 12-18	21: 2-6	L. 25: 39-46
13 Sacrifices to be faultless,	15: 19-23; 17: 1	...	L. 22: 19-27
14 The feasts.	16: 1-17	23: 14-17; 34: 21-23,	L. 23: 4 ff.; N.
15 Judges and Officers,	16: 18-20; 19: 8-18		28: 11 ff.
16 Oppression of the poor,	16: 19, 20; 24: 14, 15	22: 21-24	L. 19: 33, 34
17 Punishment of Hebrew idolaters.	17: 2-6; cf. 4: 19	22: 19.	
18 Witnesses needful,	17: 6, 7; cf. 19: 15, 16	...	N. 35: 30
19 The king,	17: 14-20		
20 Priests and Levites,	18: 1-8	...	L. 7: 8-10; 10: 14 15; N. 18: 8-20.
21 Magical arts, etc.,	18: 9-14	22: 17	L. 19: 26, 31; 20: 6, 27; N. 23: 23.
22 The prophet,	18: 15-23		N. 35: 1-84
23 Cities of refuge,	19: 1-18; cf. 4: 41-43; 23: 16.	21: 13	
24 Removing landmark,	19: 14		
25 False witness,	19: 15-21	23: 1-3	L. 19: 12, 15, 16
26 Preparation for battle,	20: 1-9; 24: 5		
27 Hostile cities,	20: 10-14, 19, 20		
28 Purification for murder,	21: 1-9		
29 Female captives,	21: 10-14		
30 Right of inheritance,	21: 15-17	...	N. 27: 1 ff.; ch. 36
31 Disobedient son,	21: 18-21		
32 Hanging,	21: 22-23		
33 Property of a brother Israelite.	22: 1-4	23: 4, 5	
34 Kindness to animals.	22: 6, 7; cf. 14: 21; 25: 4	23: 19 b; 34: 26 b	L. 22: 23
35 Regard for human life,	22: 8		
36 Mixing of diverse things,	22: 6, 9-11		L. 19: 19
37 Fringes,	24: 12	...	N. 15: 37-41
38 Charge of unchastity,	22: 18-21		
39 Sin against chastity,	22: 22-29, 28: 1	22: 16, 18	L. 18: 6-30; 20: 10-26.
40 Persons shut out of the Congregation.	23: 2-9		
41 Cleanliness of the camp,	23: 10-15	...	L. 15: 1-33; N. 5: 1-4 <i>et passim</i> .
42 Fugitive slave,	23: 16, 17		L. 19: 22; 19: 29
43 Prostitution,	23: 18, 19	...	L. 25: 35-37
44 Usury,	23: 20, 21	22: 24	L. chs. 7, 22, 23, 27; N. chs. 6, 15, 29, 30.
45 Vows,	23: 22-24; cf. 12: 6, 11, 17, 25.	...	
46 Divorce,	24: 1-4		
47 Hedges,	24: 6, 10-13, 17, 18	22: 25, 26	
48 Man-stealing,	24: 7	21: 16	
49 Leprosy,	24: 8, 9	...	L. chs. 18, 14
50 Gleaning,	24: 10-22	...	L. 19: 9, 10; 23: 22.
51 Forty stripes,	25: 1-3		
52 Levirate marriage,	25: 6-10		
53 Punishment of simony	25: 11, 12		
54 Just weights and measures	25: 13-18	...	L. 19: 35, 36
55 Amalek,	25: 17-19		
56 Offering of first-fruits, etc.	26: 1-19		