JOURNAL OF

THE TRANSACTIONS

OF

The Victoria Institute

OR

Philosophical Society of Great Britain

VOL. LXXII

1940

LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY
THE INSTITUTE, 1, CENTRAL BUILDINGS, WESTMINSTER, W.C.1

833RD ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL, WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, on MONDAY, MARCH 4TH, 1940. AT 4.30 P.M.

LT.-COL. F. A. MOLONY, O.B.E., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the Meeting of May 22nd, 1939, were read, confirmed and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the following elections :— As Fellow :—Principal S. T. Stamart Martins, F.R.S.A., F.R.G.S.; as Associates :—The Rev. G. B. Molefe, M.A., the Rev. L. L. Morris, B.Sc., Th.L.

The CHAIRMAN then called upon J. H. Taylor, Esq., B.A., to read Chief Rabbi Hertz's paper entitled "Deuteronomy, its Antiquity and Mosaic Authorship" (being the Dr. A. T. Schofield Memorial Paper, 1940).

The Meeting was then thrown open to discussion, in which the following took part :—Dr. Barcroft Anderson, Rev. A. W. Payne, Rev. W. A. Wordsworth and Mr. Sidney Collett.

Written communications were received from the Rev. Principal Curr and Colonel A. H. Van Straubenzee.

DEUTERONOMY: ITS ANTIQUITY AND MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP.

By CHIEF RABBI J. H. HERTZ, Ph.D., D.Litt.

1. DEUTERONOMY AND THE RELIGIOUS REVIVAL UNDER KING JOSIAH (621 B.C. E.).

KING JOSIAH was the grandson of idolatrous King Manasseh, whose reign of fifty-five years was the longest in the annals of the Jewish people, and the darkest. Manasseh was swayed by a fanatical hatred for the Faith of his fathers. He nearly succeeded in uprooting True Religion in Israel, and flooded the land with obscene and gruesome idolatries. The Temple itself did not escape profanation: the sacred Altar was desecrated; the Ark was removed from out of the Holy of Holies; and new shrines were erected for

various weird cults. His years were one long reign of terror to the loyal minority who attempted to withstand the tide of religious barbarism.

No wonder that when, two years after the death of Manasseh, Josiah, a child of eight, came to the throne, the sacred books and teachings of Israel's Faith had been all but forgotten. However, in the group of influential persons responsible for the education and policy of the young king, there was a strong revulsion of feeling from the apostasy of the previous two generations, and a sincere yearning for a return to the historical Jewish national worship. It was, no doubt, due to the fact of having grown to manhood under such influences that Josiah decided in the eighteenth year of his reign to repair the Temple, which had been permitted under his predecessors to fall into a shameful state of neglect. In the course of this restoration of the Temple, a discovery was made that was to prove of far-reaching importance for the spiritual revival of Israel. Under the accumulated rubbish and ruins of the decayed Temple walls, Hilkiah, the High Priest, came upon a scroll which he handed to the King's scribe with the words, " I have found the book of the law in the house of the Lord ". Shaphan, the scribe, brought the scroll to King Josiah, saying :

> " Hilkiah, the priest, hath delivered me a book. And Shaphan read it before the king. And it came to pass, when the king had heard the words of the book of the law, that he rent his clothes. And the king commanded Hilkiah, the priest . . . and Shaphan, the scribe . . . saying, Go ye, inquire of the Lord for me, and for the people, and for all Judah, concerning the words of this book that is found ; for great is the wrath of the Lord that is kindled against us, because our fathers have not hearkened unto the words of this book to do according unto all that which is written concerning us " (2 Kings xxii, 3–14).

The following questions arise in connection with this narrative.

(*a*) What is here meant by " the book of the law " ?

Jewish and non-Jewish tradition and opinion hold that the scroll brought to the king was the Book of Deuteronomy. Some interpret Hilkiah's words (" I have found *the* book of the law ! ") to mean that he had found the autograph copy of Deuteronomy.

Hence the extraordinary interest of all concerned in the discovery of this Book of the Law, and the effect of such discovery on the conscience of the king.

Neither is it accidental that the rediscovery of Deuteronomy in Josiah's day coincided with the rebuilding of the Jerusalem Sanctuary. Throughout the Ancient East, books of religious law and sacred documents were deposited in temples at their erection, and were often found when the buildings were repaired. Naville, the renowned Egyptologist, instances from the Egyptian *Book of the Dead* an exact parallel to the Hilkiah incident. He further adduces evidence that this custom was known and observed in Palestine at the time of Solomon. In that case, the copy of the Book of Deuteronomy in question would at least date from that reign. It had been immured in a foundation wall when the Temple was first built. In the process of repair at the command of Josiah, either the workmen must have come upon a foundation deposit, or the book must have fallen out from a crevice; and the High Priest picked it up among the rubbish. In view of this general Eastern custom, and especially of the Egyptian parallel, "there is no longer any justification for seeing any mystery or mystification in the incident of the finding of the Book of the Law by Hilkiah, the High Priest" (Jirku).

(*b*) How are we to explain the behaviour of the king?

The behaviour of the king—he is stirred to the depths of his being by the message of the book, and yet that message is new to him—is easy of explanation. Though during the half-century and longer of the royal apostasy the public reading of the Torah had been interrupted, and though the book itself had disappeared or had been destroyed by the idolatrous priests, men still knew of the existence of such a book, and had sufficient idea of its contents to be able to recognise it when the old Temple copy was suddenly brought to light. But so little were its contents *common knowledge* that, on its first reading, the king was struck with terror at its solemn prediction of the evils which would overtake a sinful Israel.

Ancient and mediæval history records several instances of codes of law or sacred documents disappearing, and of their rediscovery generations, and even centuries, later. Such, for example, was the fate that overtook the code of Charlemagne in the ninth century. The general neglect of the Scriptures

in the age before the Reformation also furnishes a partial illustration of the disappearance of Deuteronomy; even as the recovery, at the time of the Renaissance, of the original Hebrew text of the Bible for the Western peoples is a parallel to its re-emergence under Josiah. In our own day, wherever the extirpation of religion is part of the State policy, as in Soviet Russia, we can quite imagine men and women who may have a superficial knowledge of the observances and beliefs of Judaism, but who had never read, or heard, of Deuteronomy, or any other Scripture.

2. Doubts in Regard to the Discovery of Deuteronomy.

Nothing could be simpler than the above explanation of the finding of the scroll of Deuteronomy during the repair of the Temple. Bible critics think otherwise. For over 150 years, they have declared that Deuteronomy, the Book of the Farewell Orations of Moses, was not the work of the Lawgiver, but was a spurious production written *during the generation of Josiah.* Some of them maintain, further, that this spurious work was hidden in the Temple with the intention that it should be brought to light, reach the king, and influence him in a definite way.

Not a word of all this appears in 2 Kings xxii, which describes the finding of the Book of the Law in the Temple; and there is nothing in that account that can justifiably serve as a basis for so strange a hypothesis. Hilkiah speaks of "*the* book of the law", *i.e.*, the well-known Torah. He could not have used such a phrase—it would not have been understood—if it were not known that such a book had been in existence before. It is clear that the finding of the book was regarded as the discovery of an old lost Scripture, a book of the Law of Moses. It was this fact alone which gave it authority. The king, when the book had been read to him, rent his garments, and sent to inquire of the Lord what it portended for him and his people, for "great is the wrath of the Lord that is kindled against us because our fathers have not hearkened unto the words of this book". The king was thus convinced of the Divine character of the book, and also of its existence in the time of his forefathers. Not a whisper of doubt as to the Mosaic origin of the book is heard on any side, not from priests whose revenues it seriously interfered with, nor from prophets on many of whom it bore hardly less severely. Moreover, the critics are not agreed on the questions whether the author belonged to the prophetic circle or to the priestly class;

whether the book was the work of one man, or of a " school " ; whether it was produced in the time of Josiah, Manasseh, Hezekiah, or even earlier ; whether some portion of the book was Mosaic, or none of it ; and whether it even *claimed* to be a work of Moses, or it made no such claim.

It was the English deists of the sixteenth century who first set afloat the theory that Deuteronomy was an essential forgery of the subtle priest, Hilkiah. That theory will not bear serious examination. Surely this crafty ecclesiastic would not have invented laws (Deuteronomy xviii, 6) which seriously infringed the vested privileges of the Jerusalem priesthood—unless we are to attribute to him a height of folly that would be psychologically inexplicable. In our generation, W. Robertson Smith, Dillmann, Driver and many others have repudiated this absurd theory.

Even less convincing, but far more shocking to the moral sense, is the attempt to find the forger among the Prophets. A pioneer of the nineteenth-century Bible criticism in England, Bishop Colenso, thinks it likely that Jeremiah was the falsifier. " What the inner voice ordered him to do," Colenso has the shamelessness to write, " he would do without hesitation, as by direct command of God, and all considerations of morality or immorality would not be entertained ". Verily, there are some things that do not deserve to be refuted : they should be exorcised.

It is refreshing to turn to the words of Rudolf Kittel, written in 1925 : " There is no real evidence to prove that a pious or impious deceit was practised on Josiah. The assumption of forgery may be one of those hypotheses which, once set up, is so often repeated that finally every one believes it has been proven. Then one seems ultra-conservative and unscientific not to believe it. Who, nowadays, would take upon himself the odium of being behind the times ? "

3. Internal Evidence as to the Antiquity of Deuteronomy.

The internal evidence against the late composition of Deuteronomy, and *for* its Mosaic authorship, is overwhelming. The book and the history of Josiah's times do not fit each other. To take a few examples. In the reign of Josiah, or in that of his immediate predecessors, the injunction to exterminate the Canaanites (xx, 16–18) and the Amalekites (xxv, 17–19), who

had long since disappeared, would have been as utterly out of date as a royal proclamation in Great Britain at the present day ordering the expulsion of the Danes (W. H. Green). And how can a code belong to the time of Josiah, that, while it provides for the possible selection of a king in the future, nowhere implies an actual monarchical government? It furthermore regulates that the king must not "cause the people to return to Egypt," as they seemed ready to do on every grievance in the days of Moses (Num. xiv, 4), but which no one ever dreamed of doing after they were fairly established in Canaan. Again, Israel is treated in its unbroken unity as a nation. *One* Israel is spoken of. There is not the slightest hint of the great secession of the Ten Tribes that had rent Israel in twain. Lastly, in a book assumed to be specially produced to effect reformation in *worship*, how are we to explain the presence of such laws as regulate birds' nests or parapets upon a roof? Or, for that matter, what relevancy is there, for such a purpose, in Moses' historical retrospect? "As part of the work of Moses, all is clear; place it in a later age, all is confusion" (Wiener).

4. Centralisation of Worship.

How is it that the above considerations have made no impression upon the mass of the critics?

The reason is as follows: the assumption that Deuteronomy is a product of Josiah's age is the basis of the theory on which the critics have built their whole reconstruction of Bible history and religion. That theory—viz., *the Centralisation of Worship in ancient Israel*—they have raised to a *dogma*, which it is in their opinion sheer heresy to question. Till the time of Josiah, they tell us, the ancient Israelite could sacrifice at any place he desired; numberless local shrines, "high places," dotted the land; and, though there was a good deal of pagan revelry, natural piety was a living thing among the people. But with the appearance of Deuteronomy the local cults were uprooted, religion was separated from "life", and worship was centred in Jerusalem. There arose the idea of a Church; religion was now contained in a book; and it became an object of study, a theology. All these things, we are told, flowed from the centralisation of worship: and such centralisation was the result exclusively of the finding of Deuteronomy in the days of Josiah.

What is the truth in regard to centralisation of worship, and these claims of the Wellhausen school of Bible critics ?

Briefly, not a single one of the critical claims in connection with their dogma of centralisation is in agreement with the historical facts. Centralisation of worship did *not* originate in the age of Josiah ; it was *not* the dominant motive of his reformation ; neither was there any freedom of indiscriminate sacrifice before his day.

(*a*) *Centralisation of worship did not originate in the age of Josiah.* One need not be a great Bible scholar to know that four hundred years before Josiah, the splendid *Temple of Solomon* was built on Mount Zion. That Temple was built by " a levy out of all Israel " (1 Kings v, 13) ; and for its dedication Solomon assembles " the elders of Israel and all the heads of the tribes " (viii, 1). It is the central shrine of the whole House of Israel. (Wellhausen says, " this view of Solomon's Temple is unhistorical," because no king after Solomon is left uncensured for having tolerated the continuance of " the high places." It is the old familiar argument that the Law could not have existed, because it can be shown that it was broken ! According to such logic, there could never have been any Prohibition Law in America).

And for centuries before Solomon there was the Central Sanctuary *at Shiloh.* We are told of " all the Israelites coming hither " (1 Samuel, ii, 15) ; and that the presiding priest represented " all the tribes of Israel ".

But even centuries before Shiloh, we have the *Sanctuary at Sinai.* Hypercritics have, in obedience to their programme, denied its existence. However, the study of comparative religions and their sacred structures has rendered their position absurd. Kittel's considered opinion is : " It is part of the knowledge which has been confirmed in recent times, that in Moses' day and during the Desert wanderings there was a sacred tent (Tent of Meeting), which was the religious centre of the congregation in the Desert ".

(*b*) *Centralisation of worship was not the dominant motive in Josiah's reformation.* Josiah's reformation from beginning to end was a crusade against the idolatry which had flooded the land, the Jerusalem sanctuary included ; and the " high places " were put down as part of this stern suppression of all idolatrous practices. Of a movement for centralisation of worship as such,

the narrative gives not a single hint. The whole condition of Jerusalem and Judah, as described in 2 Kings xxiii, was in flagrant violation of far more fundamental statutes than that of the central sanctuary in Deuteronomy. And it cannot be repeated with sufficient emphasis that there *are* far more fundamental laws in Deuteronomy than this law concerning the sanctuary. It has its place in chapter xii, and recurs in the regulations for feasts, tithing, and priestly duty; but it is quite incorrect to say that this is the one grand idea which inspires the book.

(*c*) There was *no* freedom of indiscriminate altar-building in early Israel. The alleged legitimacy, before the reformation of Josiah, of sacrificing wherever one desired, is based upon a wrong interpretation of Exodus xx, 21 (in English Bibles, xx, 24). "An altar of earth thou shalt make unto Me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt-offerings and thy peace offerings, thy sheep and thine oxen; in every place where I cause My name to be remembered I will come unto thee and I will bless thee". This law does *not* authorise worship "at the altars of earth and unhewn stone in all corners of the land", as claimed by W. Robertson Smith and those of his school. The law does not speak of "altars," but only of "an altar"; and that altar was to be erected "in whatever place I record My name"; *i.e.*, in any place sanctified by a special revelation of God. There is here nothing that conflicts with the command concerning centralisation of worship in Deut. xii. There we have the general rule of worship at the central sanctuary; but that general rule does not forbid that, under proper Divine authority, exceptional sacrifices might be offered elsewhere. The clearest proof of this is that Deuteronomy itself orders the building of an altar on Mount Ebal, precisely in the manner of Exodus xx, 21. Critics unanimously assign Exodus xx, 21, to what they call "the Book of the Covenant", which they deem to be many centuries older than Josiah. But the "Book of the Covenant" has the same ideal of centralisation as Deuteronomy! It takes for granted a central shrine, and prescribes that three times in the year all males shall present themselves there before the Lord (Exodus xxiii, 17).

Not all critics have remained blind to the true facts regarding the alleged lateness of the law of centralisation summarised above. From the very first the hollowness of the critical hypothesis was recognised by Sayce (Oxford), Hoffmann (Berlin), Naville

(Geneva), Robertson (Glasgow) and W. H. Green (Princeton). Their protests were disregarded, but new recruits were found in Hommel, Dahse, Wiener, Moeller, Orr, Jacob and many others. In recent years, several outstanding scholars—Max Löhr, Th. Oesterreicher, W. Staerk—have come to realise that especially this fundamental pillar of the Bible critical view has proved a delusion and a snare. In 1924, W. Staerk wrote: "For over 100 years Old Testament studies have been under the spell of this hypothesis (*i.e.*, centralisation of worship), which in its results has been fatal to the proper understanding of Israel's religion".

5. The Unity and Mosaicity of Deuteronomy.

No book of the Bible bears on its face a stronger impress of unity—unity of thought, language, style and spirit—than Deuteronomy. And there is no reason to doubt that the various discourses proceed from one hand, and that the same hand was responsible for the code of laws. The alleged discrepancies between some of its statements and those in the other books of the Pentateuch are largely the result of what Franz Delitzsch called "hunting for contradictions". These alleged differences between the historical accounts in the earlier books and the rhetorical presentation of the same matter in the farewell addresses of the dying Lawgiver, are all of them capable of a natural explanation.

In recent decades, attention has been called to the fact that in some portions of Deuteronomy Israel is addressed in the singular (collectively) and in other portions in the plural; and it is urged that this is evidence of dual authorship. Anyone who is familiar with the Prophetic writings knows that the singular and the plural constantly interchange.

As to the Mosaic authorship, the discoveries, since the beginning of this century, of the ancient Semitic codes confirm the antiquity of Deuteronomy. Thus, when King Amaziah punished his father's murderers, he refrained from having their families killed with them (2 Kings xiv, 6), because the Law of Moses (Deut. xxiv, 16) forbade such procedure. To-day, we know that the old Hittite law of the fifteenth pre-Christian century—contemporaneous with Moses—contains this same

principle. Furthermore, the law concerning the rape of a betrothed or married woman in Deuteronomy has striking similarities to the law on the subject in the Hammurabi, the Hittite, and the Assyrian Codes. What reason, therefore, is there to assume that these laws of Deuteronomy are later than the Mosaic period ? Paul Volz, who—together with Benno Jacob and Umberto Cassuto—has recently dealt a staggering blow to the Documentary Theory by demolishing all proof for the so-called Elohist source, has once again recorded his conviction that, on the strictly scientific evidence now available, Moses must have been a genius of the first order, a supreme Lawgiver who shaped an inchoate human mass into a great spiritual nation. Can we deny such a genius the ability to deliver his farewell discourses ? " When we carefully examine the arguments that have been collected in the work of more than a century of criticism, we find that not a shadow of a case can be made against the authenticity of the Mosaic speeches " (Wiener). The same holds true in reference to the code of laws. Max Löhr and W. Staerk see no valid reason why the Deuteronomic legislation should not be Mosaic. And they are not the only scholars who have come to see the force of Dean Milman's words : " If there are difficulties in connection with the Mosaic date of Deuteronomy, endeavour to assign Deuteronomy to any other period in the Jewish annals, and judge whether difficulties do not accumulate twentyfold ".

Die-hard adherents of the Wellhausen school of Pentateuch criticism may derive what comfort they may from the following two concluding selections. The first is : " Speaking for all branches of science, we may say that a hypothesis which has stood for half a century has done its duty. Measured by this standard, Wellhausen's theory is as good as the best. However, there is increasing evidence that it has had its day ; and that those scholars who, from the first, expressed serious doubts of it, are right " (Kittel).

The other selection cuts at the root of the whole method of deciding historical questions merely by so-called literary tests. It reads as follows : " Must there not be something essentially illusory in a method which never gives or can give any independent proofs of its conclusions ; and which too leads each new set of inquirers to reject what their next predecessors had been thought to have most clearly established ? " (Speaker's Commentary).

Discussion.

The Chairman (Lt.-Col. Molony) said that all were extremely sorry that Chief Rabbi Hertz was prevented by ill-health from reading his paper, which his Secretary, Mr. Taylor, had kindly consented to do.

He referred to the fact that, in 1898 and 1899, Dr. Hertz had taken the British side, though he was not British born, or had resided in England. But he had lived in Johannesburg, the centre of the trouble, and was well versed in the rights of the quarrel.

The Chairman remarked that Jews are even more interested in defending the Old Testament than Christians are, and, having concentrated their studies upon it, probably know more about it than we do, and that he was sure that the Chief Rabbi's paper would be listened to with close attention.

At the conclusion of the reading, the Chairman remarked on the wonderful eloquence of the orations in Deuteronomy, a natural eloquence plainly due to the very deep feelings of the speaker, rather than to invention. Thus it is reasonable to attribute them to Moses, who loved his people and dreaded the trouble which he foresaw would fall upon them if they lapsed into idolatry. He concluded by proposing a very hearty vote of thanks to the author, which was passed with acclamation.

Before presenting the Schofield Memorial award to the Chief Rabbi's representative, the Chairman remarked that Dr. Schofield was a very distinguished medical man, specialising on cases with a mental side, that he had contributed not less than nine papers to the Victoria Institute, besides many to religious periodicals. He was lovable and loved, and his relatives had been wise and generous in founding this memorial.

Mr. Sidney Collett, acting as Chairman for Col. Molony for the discussion, said: With regard to the two records of the Ten Commandments, the first is recorded in Exodus xx, 1–17. The tables of stone, on which they were written, Moses broke when he saw the golden calf and the people worshipping it. Doubtless he kept an accurate copy. *This version was based on Creation* (cf. Fourth Commandment). The second set of tables which God told Moses to make and on which God Himself again wrote the Ten Com-

mandments (Deut. v, 6–21) are somewhat different, in the fact that, *as will be seen from the Fourth Commandment, the latter was based on the people's redemption from Egypt under the blood of the Pascal Lamb*, and seeing that *God Himself wrote both the accounts* with His own finger (Exodus xxxi, 18, and Exodus xxxiv, 1 and 28), there was evidently a *special design* in the *changed wording of the Fourth Commandment*, and in this there was probably a dim forecast of the *change of day from the seventh day*, which was strictly the Law, to the *Eighth Day*, or as we call it and as it is called in the New Testament, the *First Day* of *the Week* (Acts xx, 7, and 1 Cor. xvi, 2). It is also interesting to note that in Scripture *eight is the number for Christ*, as six is the number for man. *Whose resurrection completed the work of God's saving grace* for man whose Law he had broken. So that what to the careless eye of the critic is a mistake is in reality in perfect keeping with the beautiful design of the Bible.

Dr. J. BARCROFT ANDERSON said : It is a pleasure to have listened to the condemnation by Dr. Hertz of the modern theologians he has named, men who made it their life-work to reject their Creator's written word. I regret Dr. Hertz did not also find time to criticise the famous originator of our Hebrew dictionaries, Gesenius.

The question Dr. Hertz has raised, as to what was the Torah, is one deserving of our study. I understand my Hebrew Bible to include under that title the continuous record of the books of Moses, Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings. This one volume, I understand, to have been the Jasher book named in Joshua x, 13 and 2nd Samuel i. 18. I understand the word Jasher to mean living up over, i.e., over every created thing the Creator has created. It gives us words He spoke before the solid matter of this earth was raised above sea level, words exclusively divine. Later the Adam whom He created was allowed to add to that language the names of animals and of birds. It must have been after he had heard the Creator's sentence upon the Nahash, that Adam gave that word to be the name for snakes.

I understand Moses to have stated to the Levites who carried the ark, that the place of the book of which he was only the amanuensis (Ezra. vii, 6) was to be permanently at the side of the ark (Deut. xxxi, 26). We know the care the Creator, the God of Israel,

took of his ark when He allowed the Philistines to have it. We know what happened to Uzziah the king when he entered the Temple without divine permission. The Hebrew words in 2 Kings xxi, 4, 7, which our translators have rendered as meaning within the Temple, are not the words elsewhere used for an unequivocal "within." I understand them to imply only that the heathen image and altars of Manasseh were BY or NEAR the Temple. I find in Scripture a record of but one defilement of the interior of the Creator's dwelling (Daniel xi, 31) in Jerusalem, a crime for which there is no forgiveness. Daniel ix, 27, reads: "Desolator is causing to strengthen covenant to many one seven, and half the seven he is causing to cease sacrifice and gift and down to canopy abominations. And until completion and decreed thing is pouring itself out upon desolating one." Therefore, I would presume, it was beside the ark Hilkiah found the Torah.

I understand Nehemiah viii, 2, to state that this was the book Ezra then read to the Congregation, and am convinced that the original Torah was in the second Temple till shortly before that Temple was swept away by the princely people who came and destroyed the city (Daniel ix, 26).

As to that upon which Moses wrote, I note that the Jews who made the Greek translation of Jeremiah xxxvi describe the roll of a book by words each of which implies papyrus. Bublos is the Greek name for papyrus. We know that the Israelites carried with them into the wilderness the spoils of Egypt, everything they thought worth while carrying away, and must surely have taken some of the best papyrus. In saying this I realise we have not been told of what the book was made, unless I am correct in understanding the Hebrew word translated book, also implies papyrus.

I incline to the opinion that the word, translated roll, implies a source of information rather than the substance upon which the information is recorded.

The Rev. W. A. WORDSWORTH expressed interest in the Chief Rabbi's emphasis on *the* Book of the Law, as he had supposed that in Hebrew it was not possible to distinguish between *the* and *a* Book of the Law. He wished it were possible the hear the Chief Rabbi's explanation of this point in Hebrew. He also suggested that Lore represented the meaning of Torah better than law.

Written Communications.

The Rev. Principal H. S. Curr wrote: It has been said with considerable truth that the date of Deuteronomy is the key to the date of the Pentateuch. If it can be proved that the centralisation of the cultus, which is specially enjoined in Deuteronomy xii, is no older than the reign of Josiah, then it seems necessary to accept the view of modern critical scholarship that the book, while incorporating a certain amount of very ancient material, which may be as old as Moses himself, is really the work of the prophetic movement which had regained popularity and power in Josiah's reign during the latter part of the seventh century B.C., about eight or nine hundred years after the Exodus. It is not my purpose to traverse again the ground which has been so adequately covered by the learned author of this paper. My purpose is to call attention to an argument which should still further strengthen his case.

I refer to the fact that none of the five books, comprised in the Pentateuch, is so definitely and frequently assigned to Moses as Deuteronomy. It purports to be the record of three addresses given by the great law-giver to the Israelites as they were encamped in the plains of Moab before the passage of the Jordan, and the invasion of Canaan. There is a certain amount of supplementary matter, but, in the main, these speeches form the substance of the book. In passing, a word might be said regarding their literary splendour and profound piety. Indeed, Deuteronomy is often regarded by Christian scholars as bearing the same relation to the Pentateuch as the Fourth Gospel does to the Synoptics. The point on which I wish to insist is that the author or authors, whoever they were, and whenever they put the book together, seemed to be very anxious to impress every reader with its Mosaic origin. So successful have they been in this attempt that, for many centuries, it was universally held that Moses was its actual author.

The question naturally arises as to why the compilers of the book should have been so desirous of associating it in the minds of their readers with Moses. The answer of modern critical scholarship would be that such a step was necessary to gain credence and authority, but such an admission defeats itself. It conclusively proves that, at the date when Deuteronomy was prepared, there

was widespread belief in the fact that Moses was the father and founder of Hebrew legislation. To such an extent was that the case that no novelty stood the slightest chance of acceptance unless it could claim a Mosaic origin. There is always fire where there is smoke and, as one of my professors was accustomed to say, where there is much smoke there must be much fire. It would appear, therefore, that some explanation must be found for the manifest anxiety of the authors of Deuteronomy to create the impression that it was the actual work of the man with whose name it has been so long associated. There must have been a very ancient and authoritative tradition abroad that Moses was the fountain of Israelitish law. On any theory of late date, there must have been something to be gained by connecting this book of law with the name of Moses. The reply of modern scholarship is, of course, that these verses which ascribe the book to Moses are similar to the modern constitutional practice of issuing proclamations in the name of the sovereign instead of the cabinet or parliament, who are really responsible. But that very practice is a reminder of days, long since gone, when legislation was the work of the ruler, since he was an absolute monarch. There is an excellent historical reason for the use of the king's name in legislation. The point of the present argument is that there must also be an excellent historical reason for the use of Moses' name in Deuteronomy (*e.g.*, i, 1 ; v, 1 ; xxvii, 1 ; xxix, 2 ; xxxi, 24–26).

Colonel A. H. VAN STRAUBENZEE wrote: Our Lord often used the book of Deuteronomy when on earth. In the Book of Revelation (xv, 4) we read regarding a section of the Redeemed who were seen in heaven by the writer, and we are told they sing the " song of Moses " the servant of God. This song contains a rehearsal of the history of the whole nation in its relation to God. This hymn is introduced in Deut. xxxi, 19: " Now therefore write ye this song for you and teach it the children of Israel ; put it in their mouths ' that this song may be a witness for me ' against the children of Israel." All the stages of Israel's history receive the Divine description and verdict, and it would be quite impossible for any forger, at any period of the Old Testament,

or since, to make out such an accurate prophetic chart. The following passages will serve as illustrations :—

The Song of Moses (Deut. xxxii, 1–43).

God's perfect work and righteous ways (verses 1–6).

The Period of the Pentateuch (ver. 7–14).

(1) Israel's Evil Return for God's Goodness.

(Period of Historical Books);

Verses 15–19. " But Jeshurun (put for the ideal Israel) waxed fat and contemned (God). Thou art waxed fat, thou art grown thick, thou art become sleek; then he forsook God (in respect of worship) who made him and lightly esteemed the Rock of his salvation.

They provoked Him to jealousy
with foreign gods
with abominations (idols)
they provoked Him to anger.

They sacrificed unto demons, which were no God to gods whom they knew not, to new gods that came up of late, whom your fathers trembled at; of the Rock that begat thee thou art unmindful, and hast forgotten God that gave thee birth. And Jehovah saw it and abhorred them, because of the provocation produced by the conduct of His People."

(2) Period of Minor Prophets, esp. Hosea.

(When Israel are Lo-Ammi (not God's people).)

Verse 20. " And He said, I will hide my face from them, I will see what their end shall be (xxxi, 17) for they are a very perverse generation, children in whom is no faithfulness."

(3) God's Provocation of Israel.

(Period of the Acts.)

Verse 21. " They have moved me to jealousy with that which is not God; they have provoked me to anger with their vanities; And I will move them to jealousy with those that are not a people; I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation." (Rom. x, 19 and xi, 11.)

(4) The Great Tribulation.

(Destruction of Jerusalem).

Verses 22–25. " For a fire is kindled in Mine anger, and burneth into the lowest sheol and devoureth the earth with its increase,

and setteth on fire the foundations of the mountains. I will heap mischiefs upon them; I will spend Mine arrows upon them; they shall be wasted with hunger, and devoured with fever, and bitter destruction and the teeth of beasts will I send upon them with the poison of crawling things of the dust; without shall the sword bereave, and in the chambers terror; it shall destroy both young man and virgin, the suckling with the man of grey hairs."

(5) Israel's Present History.

(*a*) (God's Reflections on the Scattering.)

Verses 26–33. "I said I would disperse them afar, I would make the remembrance of them to cease from among men; were it not that I feared the provocation of the enemy, lest their adversaries should judge amiss, lest they should say, our hand is exalted, and Jehovah hath not done all this. For they are a nation void of deliberation, neither is there any understanding in them. O that they were wise, that they understood this, that they would consider their latter end! How should one chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight (see Lev. xxvi, 8) except their Rock had sold them, and Jehovah had delivered them up? For their rock is not as our Rock, even our enemies themselves being judges. For their vine is of the vine of Sodom, and of the fields of Gomorrah; their grapes are grapes of gall, their clusters are bitter, their wine is the poison of serpents, and the cruel venom of asps."

(*b*) God's reflections on their evil return for His goodness—their helpless condition moving Him to pity.

Verses 33–38.

"Is not this laid up in store with Me?
Sealed up among my treasures?
Vengeance is Mine and recompense,
At the time when their foot shall slip;
For the day of their calamity is at hand;
And the things that are to come upon them shall make haste,
For Jehovah will vindicate His People;
And repent Himself for His servants; when He seeth
that their power is gone, and there is none remaining shut up or left at large.

And He will say, Where are their gods, the rock in which they took refuge; which did eat the fat of their sacrifices, and drank the wine of their drink offering? Let them rise up and help you, let them be your protection."

(6) Recall of Nation and Destruction of Enemies.

Verses 39–42. "See now that I, even I, am He; And there is no god with Me; I kill, and I make alive; I wound and I heal; and there is none that can deliver out of My hand. For I swear to Heaven and say, as I live for ever, if I whet my glittering sword, and Mine hand take hold on retribution; I will render vengeance to Mine adversaries, and will recompense them that hate Me. I will make Mine arrows drunk with blood and My sword shall devour flesh. With the blood of the slain and the captives, with (the flesh) of the Chief leader of the enemy." (See Rev. xix, 17–21.)

(7) Milennial Kingdom.

Verse 43.

"Rejoice O ye Nations with His people
For He will avenge the blood of His servants,
And will render vengeance to His adversaries
And will make expiation for His Land for His people."

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I deeply regret my inability to have read my paper in person, and I take this opportunity of thanking the Victoria Institute for the honour they have done me by awarding me the Schofield Memorial Prize.

I have carefully perused the abstracts of the discussion on my paper, and note with deep satisfaction that there was general agreement with my main thesis.

In regard to the question asked by the Rev. W. A. Wordsworth, M.A., I would state that a clear distinction can be made in Hebrew between "*a* book of the Law" and "*this* Book of the Law."

The argument put forward by the Rev. Principal H. S. Curr is both interesting and noteworthy.

The remainder of the discussion, while of deep interest, did not *directly* deal with the antiquity and Mosaic authoriship of Deuteronomy; and, therefore, calls for no comment from me.