

CHAPTER XII

MOSES AND DEUTERONOMY

THE preceding chapters have exposed the weakness of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis and the difficulty of finding a suitable date or probable author for the book of Deuteronomy within the limits of the seventh century BC. Simultaneously, arguments have been accumulating in favour of the pre-monarchic character of the laws and of the narrative setting in which they are found.

As to Robertson's hypothesis that Deuteronomy is a compilation of Mosaic laws and traditions made by Samuel, there is not sufficient evidence for this either in the book itself or in tradition. We are driven back to the invasion period and to Moses himself.

Recent years have witnessed a growing tendency to recognize in Moses the real founder of the Hebrew religion. H. H. Rowley justly says, 'Whoever compiled the Pentateuch clearly believed that the period of Moses was of supreme importance to Israel as being the period which saw the creation of the nation, and the foundation of its religion and its institutions.'¹ This belief is, moreover, shared by other scholars of eminence and it has become common to speak of the 'Mosaic religion' as something perfectly historical.²

Not only so, but this religion is in essence that which is found in the Pentateuch, for that is the source from which our knowledge of Moses and his teaching is derived.

To quote W. F. Albright, 'To Albrecht Alt we owe recognition of an extremely important fact: that there is an element in both civil and cultic legislation of the Torah which was specifically Israelite and which went back to the beginnings of Israel—in other words, it was specifically Mosaic. This element is the apodictic

¹ *Growth*, p. 16.

² G. W. Anderson, *OTMS*, pp. 289–291. 'The time of Moses was theologically normative', Bentzen, *Introduction*, II, p. 78. So also A. Lods speaks of 'the creation of a people by the founding of a national religion', as being 'the work of Moses' (*Israel*, ET, London, 1932, p. 311).

legislation which we know best from the Ten Commandments, consisting of short injunctions, mostly couched in the imperative form: "Thou shalt (not)!"'¹ We saw in Chapter VI that the same can be said of many of the 'casuistic' laws, or judgments. This adds to the probability that the Israelites possessed a written law before they entered Canaan. These things, viewed in the light of Dt. xxxi. 9, justify the expectation that the legislation will exhibit traces of Moses' own authorship.²

The present chapter, therefore, is devoted in the first instance to a re-examination of chapters xii–xxvi to see whether there are features in the laws themselves, and in their presentation, which correspond so closely with the life and character of Moses, as these are portrayed in the books of Exodus and Numbers, as to indicate their Mosaic origin.

There is nothing to determine whether chapters v–xi were written down at the same time as the statutes and judgments which follow. Nevertheless, the connection between this section and the laws is close; and there is sufficient unity of thought and expression in chapters v–xxvi to warrant the belief that, if the laws show signs of Moses' influence, the preceding discourse also may represent his speech.

For this reason the examination will not be limited, though mainly directed, to the legislation.

THE LAW: ITS BACKGROUND

Various points mark the law as having been delivered to those about to occupy the land, and not to those who have been settled there for ages.

It is explicit in xii. 10, 'when ye go over Jordan', and xviii. 9, 'when ye are come into the land', and implicit throughout. The campaign against the former inhabitants has still to be fought (xx. 17).

The remembrance of the bondage in Egypt recurs frequently, and is treated as a recent experience, in the living memory of

¹ *The Biblical Period*, p. 12. The reference is to A. Alt, *Ursprünge des Israelitischen Rechts*, Leipzig, 1934.

² For other indications of a connection between Deuteronomy and the life of Moses see Chapter IV.

some.¹ There is a vigour also in the command 'Remember what Amalek did unto thee by the way . . .' (xxv. 17), to account for which requires a real connection with the recent past. It comes most naturally from the lips of Moses, the upholding of whose hands (Ex. xvii. 11, 12) must have been an unforgettable experience.

The reason given in xxiii. 4 for the exclusion of the Ammonite and the Moabite from membership in the congregation, 'because they met you not with bread and water by the way', also takes a form which makes their action appear to be not long past.

Again, whereas the election of Israel and the covenant in Horeb are always referred to as past events, the inheritance of the land is always regarded as future. We see the people in a stage similar to that depicted in Deborah's song; there is a national consciousness and a national religion, but as yet there is no central political organization.

The discourses, the law and the parenthesis attached to them, are all precisely suitable to the time and place described in Dt. iv. 44-49.

THE LAW: ITS CHARACTER

1. The laws of Deuteronomy are *primitive*, suitable for the time when Israel first became a nation; they must be considered 'insufficient and defective'² if viewed in relation to the needs of the seventh century BC. They are to be executed by judges (xvi. 18), priests (xvii. 9), elders or 'the men of the city' (xxi. 1-9), not by the king (contrast 2 Ki. xv. 3, 4); Yahweh Himself leads the people to battle as in the days of Joshua.

2. The law is *optimistic*. The life of Moses reveals an invincible optimism based upon Yahweh's promise to the fathers, the wonders in Egypt, the people's deliverance and the covenant in Horeb. This is reflected in the legislation: the laws of warfare expect victory (xx. 13, xxi. 10), an enlargement of territory is anticipated (xii. 20) and provided for (xix. 8) and a glorious future expected for the whole nation, not for a faithful remnant only (xxvi. 19). The laws are based upon the conception that

¹ See pp. 28f.

² Westphal, *The Law and the Prophets*, p. 306.

Israel is the people of God, which rests on the covenant in Horeb; hence obedience is looked for; it was otherwise with the prophets, who looked back on a broken covenant and called for repentance.¹

3. The introduction of the *name of Yahweh* into old Semitic laws may reasonably be attributed to Moses,² whether they be found in Exodus or Deuteronomy. Attention to this has already been called in Chapter VI (p. 81).

4. There is a combination of *severity and tenderness* which is characteristically Mosaic. Moses was capable of swift and drastic action (Ex. ii. 12, xxxii. 27) but displayed tenderness also, whether to Jethro's daughters in distress (Ex. ii. 17) or to his own followers (Ex. xxxii. 32).

The law likewise can be severe, sometimes more so than the older codes (e.g. Dt. xxiv. 7; see p. 77), and the death penalty could be enforced without pity (xix. 13). But it shows tender feeling also for the poor slave (xxiv. 14), for the fatherless and widow (xxiv. 17), and even for a mother bird (xxii. 6).

5. The laws are issued with a tone of *authority* which seems to proceed from a great leader. The prophets plead, but this author commands. This colours the whole legislation, and is explicit in the repeated phrase, 'which I command thee this day' (xiii. 18, xv. 5, xix. 9; cf. Ex. xxxiv. 11).

The priests are to be held in the highest honour (xvii. 12), but the speaker commanded even them (xxiv. 8).

Such a combination of qualities can scarcely be due to accident, nor does it wear the appearance of design. Many will agree with Hertz's statement that in Deuteronomy 'Moses' speech shines as well as his face'.³

THE LAW AND MONOTHEISM

Among the Mosaic features of the law must be included its monotheistic outlook. The time has gone by when men could accept Wellhausen's scheme, according to which the faith of Israel went through the successive stages of animism, polytheism

¹ Von Rad, *Gottesvolk*, pp. 12ff.

² Cf. P. Volz, 'Die allgemeine Jahwereligion hat ihre Anfänge vor Mose. Die Quelle des intensiven Jahwestroms aber ist Mose', *Mose*, Tübingen, 1907, p. 65.

³ *Deuteronomy*, p. 2.

and henotheism, so reaching monotheism in the prophetic period. Its place has been taken by serious discussion whether the religion of Moses can be strictly described as 'monotheism'. W. F. Albright and G. E. Wright maintain that this is a correct description; H. H. Rowley prefers to call it implicit or incipient monotheism which contained the seeds of the pure monotheism proclaimed by the great prophets.¹

What concerns us here is not the terms used, but that these writers all agree that, by whatsoever name it is called, Moses' belief in the one God lay at the very foundation of Israel's faith. As G. E. Wright truly says, the religion of Israel suddenly appears in history making a radical break with the surrounding polytheism, a phenomenon that requires explanation. He adds, 'there can be no doubt that the fundamental elements of this faith were established *early* in Israel's history, which means that we are led to Sinai and to the work of Moses, like unto whom there did not arise a prophet in Israel (Dt. xxxiv. 10)'.²

When going through Dt. xii-xxvi the attentive reader can hardly fail to be struck by the resemblance between the manner in which its monotheism (if that be the right term) is expressed, and the experiences and words of Moses as recorded in the earlier books of the Pentateuch.

The words that Yahweh used in the primary revelation at the Bush (Ex. iii. 6-15) are unmistakably echoed in the brief liturgy of Dt. xxvi. 5-9. The likeness is too detailed to be accidental. Of the expressions there used, 'the LORD God of your fathers' and the gift of the land also find a place at the very beginning of the legislation (xii. 1).³

The exodus from Egypt was another great experience in Moses' life; and corresponding to it we find the phrase 'the LORD thy God which brought you out of the land of Egypt' introduced into the texture of laws so diverse as the procedure for the punishment of apostasy (xiii. 5, 10), the passover law (xvi. 1), the words on going out to battle (xx. 1) and the offering of firstfruits (xxvi. 8).

¹ *The Rediscovery of the Old Testament*, London, 1940. p. 88; also *The Antiquity of Israelite Monotheism*, ET, lxi, 1950, pp. 333-338.

² *The Old Testament against its Environment*, p. 29.

³ See pp. 43f.

Then came the revelation in Horeb and the covenant between Yahweh and Israel, reflected in the specially Deuteronomic title 'Yahweh thy God'.

In Horeb the people heard His voice and received His commandments; so in Deuteronomy they are required to obey His voice and keep His commandments (xiii. 5, xv. 4, xviii. 16, xx. 17, xxvi. 16).

As Yahweh fought for Israel against the Egyptians (Ex. xiv. 14), so will He fight for them whenever they go out to battle (Dt. xx. 1). As it was known that He was 'among them' in the wilderness (Nu. xiv. 14, xvi. 3), so in Dt. xxiii. 14 He walks in their camp; as in Egypt He went forth with their army (Ex. xiv. 14), so He will again (Dt. xx. 4).

The theology of the Deuteronomic legislation is thus simple and unsophisticated; it shows no advance upon that of Moses and **no** difference from it. The same cannot be said of the theological outlook of Isaiah or his successors.

THE LAW: THE PERSONAL ELEMENT

Throughout chapters xii-xxvi Moses' name is absent, yet it is clearly assumed that he is the speaker. This is the more striking since his name is repeated no fewer than thirty-eight times in the narrative portions. His personality shines through, not only in the character of the law as noticed above, but by the intrusion here and there of the first person, especially in the phrase 'I command thee', sometimes with the addition of 'this day'.¹

This is particularly the case in the remarkable passage xviii. 15-18, with its reference to the people's memory of Horeb in verse 16. We can well imagine this intrusion, with its promise, coming from the mouth of Moses; but otherwise it loses much of its point. It is not easy to conceive of it as a device of the reformer, or to see how it could serve his purpose. We may mention also the special care for the Levites, the members of his own tribe (xii. 18, 19, xiv. 29).

The personal element again obtrudes itself, quite unexpectedly, in xxiv. 8. 'Take heed in the plague of leprosy that thou observe diligently and do according to all that the priests the Levites shall

¹ xii. 11, 14, 21, 28, 32, xiii. 18, xv. 5, 11, 18, xix. 7, 9, xxiv. 18, 22.

teach you, as I commanded them . . .' The emergence of the first person in verse 8 is uncalled for if not Mosaic.

Then comes, 'Remember what the LORD thy God did unto Miriam, by the way after that ye were come forth out of Egypt.'¹ How exceedingly natural that Moses should call to mind his own sister's folly and punishment; how strange if inserted by one intent on the reform of the cult. Note the contrast in Micah vi. 4, where Miriam is introduced with Aaron as sharing in Moses' leadership.

THE LAW: ITS PHRASING

The characteristic phrases used in Deuteronomy were considered in Chapter II. Of the forty-three expressions selected by von Rad all but two² are reproduced in the legislation. Some of them were shown to have a vital connection with Moses' calling, with the covenant in Horeb, with God's choice of Israel to be His people, and with the entry into Palestine. Yahuda, in his *Language of the Pentateuch in its relation to Egyptian*, claims to find many Egyptian ideas embedded in Deuteronomy, as in other parts of the Pentateuch. Whilst not all of these can be granted, neither can all be dismissed.

Incidents also, which must have deeply impressed Moses, unexpectedly intrude into the law, such as the dastardly attack of the Amalekites (xxv. 17), and the hiring of Balaam to curse (xxiii. 4). Taken together, these things justify the belief that 'a legislative nucleus dates back to Moses, and was committed to writing at that time';³ and, perhaps, more than a nucleus.

THE DECALOGUE

Scholars have puzzled over the two forms of the Decalogue in Ex. xx and Dt. v, have taken opposite sides as to which is the earlier, and offered diverse reasons for the changes made. It is

¹ It has been objected that the latter clause indicates a late writer since the incident occurred after the departure from Horeb (Nu. xii. 1). We are inclined to draw exactly the opposite inference. A writer relying on JE would not have expressed himself thus; but for Moses, that was surely on the way from Egypt to Moab, where he was speaking.

² Those numbered b (3) and c (6).

³ Robertson, *OTP*, p. 77.

clear that both accounts look upon the 'Ten Words'¹ as divine; if therefore the author of Deuteronomy relied upon the JE document, the changes made are difficult to explain, especially in view of his own warning in Dt. xii. 29-32 against any alteration whatever.

Why should he, at that later period, omit the old reason for the Sabbath and substitute another; and why should he make the other changes, some so insignificant?

On the other hand if we accept the modern view² that the ten words which were written on the tables consisted only of the brief initial sentences,³ and if the additions represent Moses' expansions of these on two separate occasions, no difficulty arises concerning them.

The Decalogue lays down the basis of religion and morality: it is to love God and one's neighbour (Dt. vi. 4; Mk. xii. 30, 31); the discourse which follows is an enforcement of these duties, which looks both backward and forward.

REMINISCENCES: THEIR FORM

When chapters i-xxvi are considered as one whole the number and character of the reminiscences they contain is a striking feature.

The mode of their occurrence is frequently quite incidental, such as the frequent references to Egypt and the reference to Miriam, noted above.

They convey the impression that they proceed from an *old* man. Those who attain to an age of threescore and ten years understand how memories of long ago or of the recent past jostle one another in the mind and come out irrespective of chronological order. Such a one, thinking back, could easily address the people at one time as if they all had shared the experiences of Egypt, whilst at another he would speak as if all would enter Canaan.⁴

How like an old man, too, to set great store by experience (vii. 17-19), to rebuke the people for disobedience as if they were

¹ Ex. xxxiv. 28; Dt. iv. 13, x. 4.

² Cf. Robertson, *OTP*, pp. 90ff.

³ Martin Buber makes the interesting suggestion that Moses regarded *himself* as 'the finger of God' which wrote them: *Moses*, p. 140.

⁴ See also p. 29.

children, and to display his anxiety that his younger hearers should 'remember' and 'not forget' his words, when he should be no longer there to guide (iv. 9, vi. 7).

There are also signs that the speaker has known the responsibility of leadership. He remembers the 'ways' by which they travelled, the turnings, and the treatment they received, the difficult crossings and the places where water was obtainable for the cattle.

There are names of events, all of which stirred Moses' feelings deeply, the tempting (Massah), striving (Meribah), destruction (Hormah), the burning (Taberah), the graves of lust (Kibroth-hattaavah) and the chastisement (Moscrab). Is this combination of words pure accident, or is it not more probable that these are the names which Moses attached to the events?

It is significant that Moses is never praised until we get to xxxiv. 10.

REMINISCENCES: THEIR EXTENT

Many of these have already been noticed; here attention is called to their cumulative effect.

They cover the whole period of Moses' life, and never transgress that limit; some details are not recorded elsewhere, and there are not a few graphic touches. Here is the list.

1. *Life in Egypt*. Here Jacob became a nation (xxvi. 2-7), dwelt 'in the midst of another nation' (iv. 34), suffered hard bondage and was delivered. The speaker remembers a 'garden of herbs' artificially watered (xi. 10), and 'horses' (xvii. 17).

2. The *burning bush*, though not actually mentioned, accounts for many phrases (see pp. 30f.). Moses possessed a 'remarkable conviction that his God was almighty and paramount, that he would deliver the Hebrews and make them his people: its origin lies in an inward illumination, which tradition, and perhaps Moses himself first, depicted in the form of the vision of the burning bush.'¹

3. The *signs and wonders* in Egypt,² the terror they inspired, the

¹ Lods, *Israel*, ET, p. 325.

² iv. 34, vi. 22, vii. 19, xxvi. 2, 3.

plagues which fell on Pharaoh (vii. 18), his household (vi. 22) and his land (xxix. 2).

4. The *passover* instituted in the month Abib (xvi. 1), the departure 'in haste' and 'by night' (xvi. 3, 6), and the destruction of Pharaoh's army in the Red Sea 'unto this day' (xi. 4).

5. The proving at *Massah*,¹ and the attack by *Amalek* (xxv. 17-19), the cowardly nature of which is mentioned only here.

6. The *burden of judgment* (Dt. i. 9-18; cf. Ex. xviii. 13-26); and the *words of Yahweh* (Ex. xix. 4, 5; cf. Dt. xxxii. 11, vii. 16, xiv. 2, xxvi. 18).

7. The *covenant in Horeb*,² the *ten words*, and the *ark of acacia wood* (x. 1-3).

8. The incident of the *golden calf* (iv. 15-17, ix. 11-21). Moses' prayer for Aaron (ix. 20). The words 'stamped it' and 'the brook that descended out of the mount' are peculiar to Deuteronomy.

9. The *forty years in the wilderness* (viii. 2, 19, xi. 5), 'great and terrible' (i. 19), where were 'fiery serpents and scorpions' (viii. 15, the latter only here), the manna (viii. 3, 16), the water from the 'rock of flint' (viii. 15f.), and the divine care (ii. 7, viii. 3f.); the judgment on Dathan and Abiram (xi. 6).

10. The stay in *Kadesh-barnea* (i. 19-46), the pillar of fire, the pitching of the tents (33) and the mission of the twelve spies (23).

11. The *long journey round Edom, Moab and Ammon* (chapters i-iii).

12. *Sihon, Og and Balaam* (chapters iii, iv. 47-49, xxiii. 3-5).

13. '*Unto this place*' (ix. 7, xi. 5). So the long wilderness journey comes to an end.

The terminal point of the journey is described in Dt. iii. 29 as 'the valley over against Beth-peor', here mentioned for the first time. In Nu. xxv. 1 the place reached is called Shittim, and in the itinerary (xxxiii. 49) the last stage is described as Abel-shittim in the plains of Moab. Why then a new name? The answer is found in the sad story of Nu. xxv which tells how the people sacrificed to Baal-peor (3, 18), whose temple (Beth-peor, temple of Peor) stood opposite their camp. Moses could not forget that.

¹ vi. 16, viii. 3, 16, ix. 22.

² iv. 11ff., v. 2ff., vi. 22f., ix. 7-x. 5.

This is a long and formidable list,¹ when compared with the sparse references to be found in the prophetic writings. There is nothing to compare with this amount of detail in any of the speeches recorded in the historical books and much less than this would have sufficed to provide the law with a 'Mosaic setting'. Like those personalia which follow, these reminiscences contribute nothing to a programme of reform.

AARON, ELEAZAR, CALEB, JOSHUA

Of Moses' relations and contemporaries six are mentioned in Deuteronomy by name. In the legislation are two of these, Balaam² (xxiii. 5) and Miriam³ (xxiv. 9). In the Holiness Code various laws are communicated to Aaron (Lv. xviii. 1); in Deuteronomy Aaron is referred to only in connection with his sins, a phenomenon indicative of the antiquity of the record.⁴ The story of the golden calf is told graphically enough in Ex. xxxii, and no less so here, but the two accounts differ in wording and substance. Deuteronomy was not therefore borrowing from JE; rather the memory seems to spring spontaneously out of the words 'thou are a stiffnecked people' in Dt. ix. 6 (cf. Ex. xxxii. 9; Dt. xxxi. 27).

In Dt. ix. 20 we light upon the words, 'the LORD was very angry to have destroyed him, and I prayed for Aaron also the same time'. In Exodus it is related that Moses prayed for the people, but nothing is said about his prayer for Aaron. Why should a late writer introduce this? Yet nothing could be more true to nature if Moses were the speaker. We have here another link with real life.

The next reference to Aaron is in the puzzling parenthesis of x. 6, 7, which has already been noticed.⁵ With this may be joined xxxii. 50, which also records Aaron's death, an event which must have left an indelible impression on his brother's mind, seeing that they were both involved in the same 'trespass' (51).

The various references to Aaron's death in Nu. xx. 22-29, xxxiii. 38, 39, Dt. x. 6 and xxxii. 50, 51 supplement one another;

¹ Not all found in JE; see Appendix to Chapter vi.

² See p. 111 above.

³ See p. 170 above.

⁴ See Buber, *Moses*, p. 148.

⁵ See pp. 54, 157.

they are different, but not inconsistent. Mount Hor was the scene of his death, Moserah (or Moseroth) describes its character as a 'chastisement'. The analysis which ascribes Nu. xxxiii to a post-exilic source, and makes Dt. xxxii. 48-52 conform to this, may safely be neglected; the itinerary in Numbers is undoubtedly ancient.

In spite of the obscurity of Dt. x. 6-8 it clearly records a memory that Eleazar succeeded to the priest's office, to which the succession of Phinehas is recorded in Jos. xxiv. 33. There seems little reason to doubt these facts.

The appearance of Joshua with Moses in the narrative of chapter xxxi was commented upon in the previous chapter. There are further references to Joshua in the discourse which add more than a touch of realism to the relationship between them.

In the rehearsal (i. 23-43) of the story of the sending of the twelve spies¹ to search out the land in chapter i, the people's murmuring, and the names of Caleb and Joshua² are found in close association. Caleb comes first (i. 36) since he seems to have taken the lead in stilling the people; and the mention of Caleb's admission to the land of promise recalls to Moses' mind the bitter trial of his own exclusion. From that his thoughts travel at once to Yahweh's command to him to encourage Joshua 'which standeth before thee' to lead the people in (i. 37, 38).

In the previous narrative Joshua was known as the 'minister' of Moses;³ here the wording varies but the meaning is the same. What could be more true to life than this sequence of ideas?

The thought is similar in Dt. iii, where Joshua's name comes again. Moses has reminded the people of the recent victories over the Amorite kings (iii. 1-17) and the orders to the men of the two-and-a-half tribes to cross the Jordan with their brethren (18-20). Immediately he adds how he then encouraged Joshua not to fear (23, 24), which brings forth another outburst regarding his own exclusion, and his prayer, recorded in this place only, that the

¹ See Appendix to Chapter vi, p. 96. On the analysis of Nu. xiii, xiv see Chapter xi, p. 159, n. 4. There is no valid reason to doubt that Joshua was one of the twelve spies.

² Their names are also coupled together in the narrative of Nu. xxxii. 1-15, which S. R. Driver (*LOT*, pp. 68f.) ascribes in the main to JE. He attributes the inclusion of Joshua to a later insertion from P.

³ Ex. xxiv. 13, xxxiii. 11; Nu. xi. 28, xv.

punishment might be revoked. The same collocation of his own exclusion and Joshua's crossing over is repeated in xxxi. 2, 3; and how natural it is!

This introduces a third mention of Joshua, whom Moses had been told to 'charge' and 'strengthen'. Although Joshua was not lacking in courage, it was the place of his old leader both to command and encourage him; this is a recurring theme (Nu. xxvii. 18-23; Dt. iii. 21, 22, 28, xxxi. 7, 8, 14, 23).

It is here, in the contrast between the fate of Moses with that of Caleb and Joshua, that we can find the meaning of the words 'for your sakes (or, on your account)' which have puzzled the commentators (i. 37, iii. 26, iv. 21).

Whatever the exact nature of the sin which Aaron and Moses committed at Meribah-Kadesh (Dt. xxxii. 51), the meaning here seems to be that, when the sentence of exclusion was passed upon all the older generation because of the murmurings and rebellion, Caleb and Joshua alone were excepted (Nu. xiv. 30-32); Moses and Aaron suffered with their people.

In making this comparison between the Deuteronomic law and what is known of the life and character of Moses, the aim has been to collect the evidence and to let it speak for itself. It is now for the reader to judge whether the Mosaic features of the book could have been introduced by some reformer, were he priest, prophet or country Levite, working from old documents and traditions, in order to invest his collection of laws with a Mosaic dress. Is it probable that such an author would have succeeded in establishing a correspondence so natural, so close in manifold and minute particulars, and so profound? Or is it more reasonable to think that this result proceeds from a true historical connection between the book of the law and the man whose name it has always borne?

That is the simplest explanation of the facts, and perhaps after all it is the best. On every hand Deuteronomy is acknowledged to be a great book, which exerted great influence; should it not also have a great author? And who can fill that place so worthily as the old and tried leader who brought the Israelites out of Egypt, shared their experiences, gave them laws, and laid the foundations of their faith?