Nothing could be a greater contrast to this mysticism than the accounts given by "ancient authors" of the early Christian commemorations of the Last Supper in Western Asia and in Africa. In Pliny's letter to Trajan about 112 A.D. (the genuineness of which Renan admits[1]) we read a non-Christian account of the practices of the Christians of Pontus on the Black Sea shores:

"That they were wont, on a stated day, to meet together before it was light, and to sing an hymn to Christ as to God, and to oblige themselves by an oath" [or sacrament] "not to do anything that was bad . . . after which it was their custom to depart, and to meet again at a common but innocent meal: which they left off upon that edict which I published at your command, and wherein I had forbidden any such conventicles. These examinations made me think it necessary to inquire by torments what the truth was, which I did of two maidservants called *deaconesses*,[2] but yet I found nothing more."

CHARLES CONDER, Major R.E.

(To be continued.)

ART. III.—RECENT CRITICISM OF THE PENTATEUCH AND ITS RESULTS.

IN the February number of the *Church Sunday School Magazine* there is a review of Mr. Spencer's able work, "Did Moses Write the Pentateuch after all?" The review states that though there is much in that volume well worthy of attention, and that it is calculated to make men pause before accepting all the conclusions of the negative criticism, it does not "face the principal argument" of the critics, "that the historical books give a picture of life in Israel which is inconsistent with the existence of a law so full and detailed as that of Leviticus." The writer of the review very justly regards Professor Robertson Smith's book as by far the ablest statement of this view of the Jewish history. He appears to have been "reassured," and to wish others to be reassured, against the "assumed hostility" of this representation of the actual

---

the faithful were to become immortal. Professor Darmesteter ("Sacred Books of the East," iv., p. lxix.) says: "Homa, the Indian Soma, is an intoxicating plant, the juice of which is drunk by the faithful for their own benefit and for the benefit of their gods." It is evidently to this mystic rite that Justin Martyr refers. The sacred bread, *Darun*, forms part of the offerings of the same rite (Haug, p. 241).

[1] "Les Évangiles," p. 476.

[2] "Ancillæ quæ ministræ dicibantur." Tertullian refers to this letter, "Apologeticus," 2.

state of the case "to the Christian faith." As I believe that it would be a serious blow to the influence of the Bible over Christian England if this kind of teaching were to gain a footing in our Sunday-schools, I propose briefly to examine it in these pages. The question I wish to discuss is, How far have we reason to believe that full and detailed regulations for life and worship existed in Israel from its first settlement in the Promised Land? The chief reason why I should deprecate the diffusion of such teaching I have already given in the pages of the CHURCHMAN and elsewhere. It is that it places the Old Testament before us as an inaccurate and untrustworthy record of God's dealings with mankind, and that if the Old Testament come to be regarded as inaccurate and untrustworthy on the precise point on which all its value depends, the moral influence of its teaching is gone.

I would ask, then, Has sufficient reason been given for this contention on the part of the critics? My first argument to the contrary will be drawn from the secular history of England. We all know that from the Penitential of Theodore downwards a "full and detailed" ecclesiastical system has been in existence in England down to the present day. How many traces have we of the existence of such a system in the secular history of this country? The Reformation period excepted, how many references, for instance, do you find to the Canon Law, to the observance of Sunday, to the reception of the Sacrament of Holy Communion, to the fasts or festivals of the Church, or to the existence of the Bible, in a book like Mr. Green's "History of the English People," or even in such minute narratives as those of Professor Freeman or Lord Macaulay? In order to obtain a proper idea of the life of the people of England, religious as well as secular, we must place our ecclesiastical histories side by side with our secular histories. The Jews have done this in their books of Kings and Chronicles. Yet the books of Chronicles are now rejected with the utmost scorn by the negative critics, ostensibly because they contain details not mentioned in Kings, really, however, as De Wette frankly admits, because the books of Chronicles emphatically contradict their most cherished theories. And this brings us to a second consideration of very great importance. The history of Israel, even on its secular side, *does* contain continual references to the Mosaic Law, as contained in Leviticus and the other books, as being in force, but the negative critics do not scruple to expunge the passages in the historical books which support this assertion. That Professor Robertson Smith's statement of their opinions is able, and in tone reverent, I have no desire to deny. But as an instance of his method of dealing with the facts, I may mention that he has no hesitation in

declaring the story of the altar of witness in Joshua xxii. to be a post-exilic addition. We have a right, I think, to take exception to such a way of dealing with the narrative as arbitrary and unfair in itself. But it is open to special objection in the case of this particular passage. For if the earlier Jews really "knew nothing," to use a favourite phrase of the critics, of the worship at the One Sanctuary prescribed in the Law as it now stands, the narrative in question is not a mere fable, but a deliberate invention of later date, introduced on purpose to support the priestly party in their efforts to set up an exclusive worship at Jerusalem.

But, it is contended, we have evidence that the Law of Moses as it now stands was not obeyed, and that therefore its provisions were unknown. The non-observance of a law, however, is not quite the same thing as its non-existence. Poaching, for instance, is a practice by no means uncommon among ourselves. It would be a very unsafe line of argument, however, to infer from this fact the non-existence of the Game Laws. We shall probably be told that the convictions recorded in our annals as having been obtained under their operation is a sufficient evidence of their existence. We reply, Not at all, on the principles of the negative criticism, for accounts given of such convictions may be the additions of a later writer whose desire it was to see the Game Laws enforced in his own time. Until, therefore, the negative criticism has been accepted as an adequate method of dealing with the history of our own country, we may be justified in a little wholesome scepticism as to its infallibility in the case of Jewish history, and may regard the denunciations of the worship at the high places with which the Jewish histories teem, from beginning to end, as a conclusive demonstration that the prohibition was at least contemporaneous with the conquest of Canaan.

I desire to give a brief *résumé* of the contents of the Book of Leviticus, and illustrate them by the history. I am at least warranted in contending that until stronger proof is forthcoming than has yet been given that the history has been deliberately re-written from the point of view of the later enactments, the Sunday-school teacher is justified in asserting that the Book of Leviticus was known and acted upon from the earliest period of Israel's existence as a nation. On two points, however, outside the limits of that book, a few words may not be out of place. Of the One Sanctuary we have frequent mention in the Sacred Volume. It meets us in Judges, in the story of the outrage at Gibeah, in the history of Samuel and Eli, in the history of the capture of the Ark, of its return to Israelitish territory, of its solemn enthronization in Jerusalem by David, of his preparations for a magnificent temple for

its reception, and of the hallowing of that temple as the acknowledged centre of Israelitish worship in the days of Solomon. The Psalms also are full of such references. And on all ordinary canons of criticism they must be allowed as evidence that the religious customs to which they refer were recognised among the Jews. But we are now told that the Psalms are not the expression of the religious life of Israel as a nation, but an outburst of enthusiasm or fanaticism, it is not clear which, in the days of the Maccabees. What produced that outburst of patriotic and religious enthusiasm, if Israel in its palmiest days had no definite religion and no expressions of religious feelings, we are not told. But we must leave the rehabilitation of the Psalms to the many scholars who are fully qualified to achieve it.

The case of the Sabbath must also be taken into account. With the exception of the Books of Chronicles, the observance of the Sabbath is never mentioned in the historical books save in 1 Kings iv. 23 and xvi. 18. What evidence have we, on critical principles, that these passages are not post-exilic additions? And yet nearly all the most advanced critics allow that the Ten Commandments must be ascribed to Moses. What is more surprising still is that no mention of Sabbaths occurs in the Psalter. And a further point must not be lost sight of. The more thoroughly the destructive criticism is accepted in regard to the Psalter, the more significant, on their principles, does this fact become. On those principles the institution of the Sabbath must be referred to a period later than that of the Maccabees.

The Book of Leviticus begins with regulations for the burnt-offering, the meat-offering, or *minchah*, the peace-offering, the sin and trespass offerings. We can hardly expect a minute description of the prescribed ritual in the historical books, any more than we expect a recital of the rubrics in the Prayer-Book when attendance at our Church services is mentioned in English history. But we shall find frequent reference made to all these various offerings in the historical books.

To say nothing of the occurrence of the phrase "burnt-offering" in Genesis, we find Jephthah and Manoah quite acquainted with the expression, though it certainly must be admitted that they ventured to offer such an offering themselves. We find Samuel offering a burnt-offering (1 Sam. vii. 9), and Saul admitting (1 Sam. xiii. 12) that as a layman he had no right to perform such a ceremony.[1] The meat-offering is mentioned in the Books of Joshua, Judges and Kings. Solomon,

[1] It is a question whether such offerings as these were not expressly permitted on extraordinary occasions at places other than the One

in the latter book, is described as offering the meat-offering at the consecration of the temple, together with burnt-offerings and peace-offerings. But we hear of all these offerings at a far earlier date than this. The children of Israel deny that they have the slightest intention of offering burnt-offerings or meat-offerings on the altar of witness on the other side of Jordan (Josh. xxii. 29). They speak, moreover, of these offerings as offered at the One Sanctuary. We find them mentioned again in Judg. xx. 26, xxi. 4.[1] As we have seen, an attempt is made to represent these histories as of later date than the Exile. But we have at least a right to ask for *proof* of this assertion. Even so able a writer and thinker as Professor Robertson Smith has no right to impose a dogma of this kind upon the Universal Church as his own authority, or even on the authority of ten or twelve other scholars and thinkers as eminent as himself. I have seen the assertion made repeatedly by critics of repute. But I have never seen anything in the slightest degree approaching to a proof of it. It depends on the theory that the Levitical law in its present shape was published subsequent to the Exile. But then that theory in its turn depends to a considerable extent upon the assumption that this passage is a later interpolation into the narrative. This would seem to be a conspicuous instance of a process described by Wellhausen as "attempting to hoist one's self into the air by one's own waistband." But to return. We find mention of peace-offerings (as well as burnt-offerings) in 1 Sam. x. 8 and in 2 Sam. vi. 17. In the latter case David is said to offer them. But he probably only caused them to be offered in the legitimate way. Such at least is the account in Chronicles, where we have in 1 Chron. xvi. 1 the words "they" offered, whereas in verse 2 David is himself said to offer the sacrifices on the principle *qui facit per alium, facit per se.* Amos (v. 22) mentions all three of these offerings, and Amos is one of the prophets whose early date is not disputed. The sin and trespass-offering is not expressly mentioned (save in Ps. xl. 6) until the return from the Captivity. But the word for sin-offering is identical with that for sin. I have no space for the discussion of the question whether the word translated "sin" should sometimes be trans-

---

Sanctuary. It is only in the course of the ordinary and prescribed worship that it can be shown to have been forbidden. We may observe how this narrative confirms the account in Chronicles of the reason why Uzziah was stricken with leprosy.

[1] As a proof of the difficulties which beset the critical theories, we may observe that Judg. xix.-xxi. is regarded as a later insertion after the law was fully developed. But in that case why are we told that the Israelites built an altar on which to offer their peace-offerings?

lated "sin-*offering*." But in 2 Kings xii. 16 we find a distinct reference to both. So Isaiah (liii. 10) speaks of the life of the Redeemer as a trespass-offering. There is nothing in the character and contents of Leviticus to support the supposition that the sin and trespass offerings were later additions to the Law, and the narrative in 1 Sam. vi., as well as the constitution of man's nature, suggests the idea that some provision for the atonement of sin was likely to be the first and most elementary provision of all in a religious ritual. Moreover, in the mediæval Church there was a ceremony entitled doing penance which was frequently enforced upon offenders. It would be interesting to trace the number of allusions to this practice in the ordinary historical manuals of this or any other European country. The next provisions relate to the consecration of the priests. We are not likely to meet with these in the after-history. Then we come (chapter xi.) to distinctions of food. There is no mention of these regulations in the history, save in Gen. viii. But we find mention made of the distinctions as existing in his day by Hosea, one of the prophets whose early date is not disputed (chapter ix. 3, 4). Isa. lxv. 4, lxvi. 3, 17 will be rejected, because the latter part of Isaiah is regarded with some degree of probability as having been written during the Exile. But it must be remembered that even this rests upon nothing stronger than probable inference. The proof we are offered of it is certainly not equivalent to a mathematical demonstration. We find similar regulations in regard to food, it is true, in Deuteronomy. But the "second Isaiah" quotes the regulations in *Leviticus* (*cf.* Lev. xi. 29; Isa. lxvi. 17). As the question is not one which admits of rigid demonstration either way, we may ask ourselves which is the simpler and more natural hypothesis: that these regulations were imposed upon the children of Israel before their entrance into the Promised Land, and that their fuller and stricter form is to be found in the ritual-book of the priests, or that they were invented by the Deuteronomist in the time of Manasseh, completed some time between that epoch and the Exile, and published for the first time after the return from the Captivity.[1] The next chapter (chapter xii.) contains regulations for the purification of women after childbirth. We are about as likely to meet with these in the history of the Jews as we are to meet with a mention of the Churching Service in the history of England. But we do find allusions to similar regulations prescribed in Lev. xv., in 1 Sam. xx. 26, and in 2 Sam. xi. 4.

We next come to the directions concerning leprosy. We

[1] These regulations were known to Ezekiel (iv. 14, xxii. 26, xliv. 31), and some such to Manoah and his wife (Judg. xiii. 4, 7, 14).

find these regulations in force among the Israelites in 2 Kings vii. 3, but not in Syria at the same period (2 Kings v. 1). There is an allusion to them in 2 Sam. iii. 29. Gehazi departs from the presence of Elisha when smitten with leprosy (2 Kings v. 27). And Azariah, or Uzziah, when stricken with that disease, was compelled to dwell apart (2 Kings xv. 5), and did not exercise his regal functions from that day forward. The ritual of the Day of Atonement is not mentioned in the history, either before or after the Exile. But, then, no more do we read in our ordinary English history of the observance of Good Friday, although we know that for many centuries it has been most religiously observed, with special and very significant ceremonies. We find the Day of Atonement referred to elsewhere in Scripture only in the Epistle to the Hebrews. But the writer of that Epistle evidently "knows nothing" of the later origin of this observance. He regards it as an integral portion of the Mosaic Law. And the result of his profound study and analysis of the principles of that law entitles his opinion to at least as much respect as those of the modern school of critics, who have devoted themselves rather to a study of the form than of the spirit of a very remarkable set of enactments. The first portion of chapter xvii., so far from being obviously post-exilic, seems to belong exclusively to the period of the forty years' wanderings, and to have become impossible after the conquest of Canaan. The prohibition of eating the flesh with the blood was known to Saul (1 Sam. xiv. 33). With the command to eat torn flesh we have already dealt.

Chapters xviii. and xx. might possibly be two different versions of the same group of laws. But as they do not differ on any important points, each of them might have been a genuine and original expression of the principles of Mosaic legislation. These principles in relation to marriage are definite and intelligible. They are twofold. They enact first that no one shall contract a marriage with a person near of kin to them; and next that affinity involves nearness of kin as much as consanguinity. This great principle—setting revelation altogether apart—postulates a man far-sighted enough to have discerned its value, and strong enough to have enforced it. It is in advance of us even in the last decade of the nineteenth century of the Christian era. But its value in upholding the sanctity of the marriage tie will be perceived by moralists, and its usefulness from a political and social point of view will not be denied by physiologists. There is, it may be added, no possibility that a principle so strenuously resisted even in our own day could or was likely to have been inculcated upon the Jewish nation by anyone but its founder.

The domestic history of Israel comes very little before us in the sacred page, but the outrage offered by Amnon to Tamar can hardly be explained except by the impossibility of marriage between them. Tamar's pleading that the king "would not withhold" her from Amnon may have been a mere subterfuge in order to escape from her brother's hands; or it may have been the expression of a belief that the king would not scruple, under the circumstances, to sanction an unlawful tie; or, again, Tamar may have been ignorant of the exact provisions of the law. But the fact that no attempt was made to repair the wrong—that it could only be avenged by the murder of him who committed it—is a pretty clear proof that a marriage law of the kind described existed in Israel in David's day. The prohibition of polygamy in Lev. xviii. 18 was undoubtedly transgressed by the kings, and even by men in the position of Elkanah. But it appears to have been the rule in Israel, though by no means strictly enforced, just as it has been the rule of the Church since Christianity arose, and yet was grossly infringed by a devout son of the Church such as Charlemagne.

The moral rules in chapter xix. appear to have been recognised throughout the Old Testament. Uprightness and fairness in business transactions with other men, care of the poor and needy, the fatherless and widow and the stranger in the land, were the acknowledged principles of Israelite life. Boaz evidently bases his conduct upon them. The first Isaiah (i. 17) and Micah (vi. 8) have evidently such statutes before them. Hosea (ii. 18-20; iv. 1-6; vi. 6; viii. 1, 12; xiv. 9) clearly regards such provisions as those contained in this chapter as part of the original law given to the Israelites and not kept by them. So does Amos (ii. 4, 7; v. 12, 15, 22; viii. 5; *cf.* Lev. xix. 35). It is impossible to trace out these laws fully in the after-history in the course of a brief paper such as this, but we may point out that chapter xix. 31 was a regulation clearly in existence in the time of Saul, and enforced by him (1 Sam. xxviii. 3, 9, 10).

In chapter xx. we find the prohibition against giving of seed to Molech so frequently denounced in the historical books, *e.g.*, 2 Kings xvii. 17 and xxiii. 10. The provision that the "adulterer and adulteress shall surely be put to death," a provision which we also find in Deut. xxii. 22, is the only explanation of David's otherwise incomprehensible treatment of his faithful servant Uriah. There seems no reason whatever for David's anxiety and dread, nor for the treacherous massacre even of a servant who had a right to regard himself as foully injured, save the certainty that the indignant husband would demand at the king's hand the enforcement of the last penalty of the

law against the partner of his guilt. The next two chapters contain regulations for the priesthood, which we are not likely to meet with in the subsequent history. The regulations for the three principal feasts are allowed to have been of early date even by those who maintain that Leviticus is a post-exilic book. The earlier regulations in chapter xxiv. relate to the priests; but the law of blasphemy (verse 16) was in existence in Israel in the days of Ahab, and was acted upon by him (1 Kings xxi. 10). The provisions for the redemption of property in Lev. xxv. 25 are scrupulously observed by Boaz (Ruth iii. 13; iv. 4-11). And though there is no ground whatever for supposing a narrative so simple and patriarchal in its character to be post-exilic, yet we may observe (iv. 7) that it makes reference to a ceremony in the process of the redemption, which was obsolete when the book was written. The only remaining fact with which we are confronted is that we have no evidence of the observance of the year of Jubilee, save a brief allusion to it as the "year of liberty" in Ezek. xlvi. 17. The absence of all reference to it in the subsequent books of Scripture, however, would prove too much, for it would tend to prove that no such provision was ever given, whereas we have it before us. And we may ask, At what period after Moses could so salutary a provision, presupposed, be it remembered, in the system of land distribution recorded in Joshua, have been introduced, and by whom? Can any moment be pointed out in the history of disorganization and oppression which followed on the conquest of Canaan, at which such an institution could have been successfully established? The glorious reigns of David and Solomon, it is true, shine out brightly by contrast with the surrounding darkness. But David, the founder of Israel's greatness, had enough to do in achieving that greatness. And Solomon the peaceful was hardly likely to jeopardize his prosperity by inaugurating a revolution. Morever, so far-reaching and sweeping a reform would have been a great event in the history, and would most certainly have called for some comment. Thus the absolute silence of the history, so far from being an evidence against the antiquity of the provision, seems on the contrary most strongly to support it.

We have now briefly glanced at the provisions in Leviticus, and we have found no ground whatever for the notion that they were evidently of a date long subsequent to the entrance of Israel into the Promised Land. So far from finding no notice whatever of them in the subsequent history, we find the greater part of them distinctly mentioned. With the criticism which does not scruple to remove from the narrative all allusions which conflict with the hypothesis no fair-minded man can have any sympathy, unless substantial reasons can be given,

altogether apart from the hypothesis, for a proceeding so violent and so arbitrary. We do not go so far as to assert that no additions whatever were made to the Levitical Code subsequent to its original promulgation. It may or may not have been so. There are difficulties on some points which may make the hypothesis of later additions, in one or two particular instances, a probable solution of the difficulty. But that is the very utmost that can be said. Nothing, however, which can be fairly called evidence has been adduced to show that the main provisions of the Levitical Law were not promulgated in the time of Moses. To tamper with historical documents in the interests of a theory, and then to appeal to the documents so tampered with in support of that theory, is not argument; it is mere assertion. It is contrary to every sound principle of historical investigation. We therefore conclude that any Sunday-school teacher has quite sufficient ground for teaching his pupils that the Levitical Code was the work of Moses, at least, until more weighty considerations are brought forward than have as yet been advanced to prove that it was not.

J. J. LIAS.

ART. IV.—CAIRD'S ESSAYS.[1]

Merito religioni philosophia donatur tanquam fidissima ancilla: cum altera voluntatem Dei, altera potestatem, manifestet.
BACON, "Novum Organum."

WIDELY as the exponents of modern thought differ in their answer to the deeper questions that beset this generation, we cannot doubt that all thoughtful men, whether scientists or theologians or philosophers, owe a lasting debt of gratitude to that *par nobile fratrum*,—Dr. John Caird, author of "An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion," and Professor E. Caird, author of those two goodly volumes entitled "The Critical Philosophy of Immanuel Kant." The stimulus to thought which the example and teaching of these two lights of Glasgow have aroused, may be compared to the effect which the life and writings of the late T. H. Green had upon the best thinkers of Oxford, before he was, alas! cut off in his prime and in the fulness of his powers. Of the few earnest Hegelians which England can boast of to-day, Professor Caird is the recognised champion and leader. It is, therefore, with feelings of unusual interest that we approach the task of commenting

[1] "Essays on Literature and Philosophy," by Professor Edward Caird. Maclehose and Sons, 1892. (In two volumes.)