

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

4-15-1937

Alleged Anachronisms in the Pentateuch

Eugene Bertermann

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_bertermanne@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bertermann, Eugene, "Alleged Anachronisms in the Pentateuch" (1937). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 11.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/11>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

ALLEGED ANACHRONISMS IN THE PENTATEUCH

A Thesis presented to the
Faculty of Concordia Theological Seminary

in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Bachelor of Divinity

by

Eugene Rudolf Bertermann

Concordia Seminary
April 15, 1937

26493

Approved by

H. L. Lutz

52286

BV
4070
C69
B3
1937
v.6
c.2

52286

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction page 1

Genesis 12, 6 and 13, 7 page 4

Genesis 12, 8 page 8

Genesis 13, 18 page 10

Genesis 14, 14 page 14

Genesis 22, 2 page 19

Genesis 34, 7 page 23

Genesis 36, 31 page 25

Genesis 40, 15 page 33

Exodus 16, 35 page 36

Exodus 16, 36 page 40

Exodus 30, 13 page 43

Gift
Author
7-26-37

Leviticus 19, 24-27	page 45
Numbers 21, 1-3	page 48
Numbers 21, 14	page 51
Numbers 32, 41	page 57
Deuteronomy 1, 1	page 62
Deuteronomy 2, 12	page 66
Deuteronomy 3, 11	page 69
Deuteronomy 3, 14	page 72
Deuteronomy 17, 14-15	page 77
Deuteronomy 34	page 84
Edomites, Moabites, and Philistines .	page 87
Conclusion	page 91
Bibliography	

ALLEGED ANACHRONISMS IN THE PENTATEUCH

In any discussion of the authenticity of the Pentateuch, a consideration of the postmosaica, the alleged instances of anachronism in the writings of Moses, must occupy a prominent place. For if in the Pentateuch itself there were to be found traces and phrases that spoke against its authenticity, we would in the face of such powerful proof have to view with suspicion any positive historical grounds that might be adduced in its favor. On the other hand, if it were found that the passages advanced as containing anachronisms could be explained in the author's favor, we could cheerfully, ceteris paribus, oppose even a considerable number of historical grounds that seem to speak against the authenticity of the Pentateuch. The force of the argument based on the presence or absence of postmosaica becomes all the more evident in view of the wealth of subject matter and the length of the period of time covered in these chapters. It seems unlikely that a pseudo-Moses, be he an individual or a group of men, should in the course of so comprehensive a work not leave traces of later authorship.

The history of Pentateuchal criticism shows that the importance of the postmosaica has long been widely recognized. On these alone Rabbi Aben Ezra based his doubts of the integrity of the Pentateuch. In the seventeenth century Peyrerius, Spinoza, and Hobbes again advanced only the postmosaica in their attacks on the Pentateuch, although we

suspect that they were motivated ultimately by more sinister motives than a desire to find out the truth in these passages of Moses. Clericus goes a step farther and acknowledges the validity of two arguments against the Pentateuch, that of style, as well as the anachronisms. But even he is ready to concede: "Non ita solutu facilia sunt omnia argumenta, quae ex variis locis Pentateuchi ducuntur." Carpzov likewise deals almost exclusively with the alleged anachronisms.

Although later criticism found many more reasons against the authenticity of the Pentateuch, the postmosaica were by no means forgotten. Vater listed four groups of anachronisms: cases in which the later name of a city occurs very early; cases in which explanatory phrases which we would not expect of Moses are added to a statement or name; cases in which the reader is told that something exists "unto this day"; and passages which presuppose matters not known until after the time of Moses. Bertholdt, De Wette, Hartmann and Bohlen follow Vater substantially.

Modern criticism has considerably enlarged the term "anachronism" and condemns everything which does not conform to certain set, dogmatic prejudices of the individual critic. Vatke, for example, views with suspicion any passage which is out of harmony with his particular type of Religionsgeschichte.

The defenders of the Pentateuch try in most cases to show that the arguments advanced by the higher critics are not compelling and conclusive. But unfortunately some of them have felt it necessary to assume interpolations in the

sacred text. Witsius found four such cases; Clericus increased the number considerably. Eichhorn goes the farthest of all and believes that whole chapters have been inserted. We hold that the assumption of an instance of interpolation is hazardous at best and must be used very cautiously, even in cases where the alleged anachronism rests on only two or three words. The Pentateuch was the holy book of the Jewish nation, and it seems unlikely that any one would be permitted to augment or alter its text. Then, too, if we assume interpolations in the case of difficulties in time, we must, to be logical and consistent, assume them also in other cases where time is not involved, and it is only very rarely that such types of interpolations are urged. It is best to proceed cautiously and hesitatingly in assuming the presence of interpolations. It can be shown, we believe, that in the very great majority of cases there are good and sufficient reasons that will prove an attacked text authentic without recourse to the theory of interpolation.

After these few words of introduction we proceed to a discussion of the individual passages.

GENESIS 12, 6 AND 13, 7

"And Abram passed through the land until the place of Sichen, unto the plain of Moreh. And the Canaanite was then in the land." - "And there was strife between the herdmen of Abram's cattle and the herdmen of Lot's cattle: and the Canaanite and the Perizzite dwelled then in the land."

It cannot be denied that these passages imply that there was a time when the nations mentioned were not in the land. This implied time must clearly have been the age subsequent to the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites. - Thus do the arguments of modern higher critics run in their discussions of these passages: they add the thesis that logic forces us to conclude that these words ascribed to Moses must have been written at a time when the Canaanites and the Perizzites were no longer in Palestine, in days long after the death of Moses. Thus Strack claims: "Dies 'damals' fuehrt mit Sicherheit in die Zeit nach der Eroberung des Landes."¹⁾ Bleek joins him to assert with respect to Genesis 12, 6:

Ein Schriftsteller im mosaischen Zeitalter h"utte, auch wenn er diese goettliche Verheissung ueber den zukuenftigen Besitz des Landes durch die Israeliten vor Augen gehabt h"utte, doch gar keine Veranlassung haben koennen, diese Bemerkung hier auf solche Weise einzuschalten, zu einer Zeit, wo dieser Zustand, dasz die Kanaaniter im Lande wohnten, noch fort dauerte und dies allen Israeliten hinreichend bekannt war. Die Bemerkung ist nur natuerlich, wenn sie gemacht ist zu einer Zeit, wo jenes Verhaeltnis nicht mehr bestand, also nach der Besitznahme des Landes durch die Israeliten.

1) Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 26.

In a discussion of Genesis 13, 7 he adds:

Die Erzählung, so wie sie hier lautet, wurde erst in einer Zeit niedergeschrieben, wo diese Voelkerschaften nicht mehr im Lande wohnten.¹⁾

Voltaire, Reuss, Kuenen, Wellhausen, Sellin, Cornill, Baumgaertel join in the long ranks of those who find in these passages an instance of anachronism. A careful study will reveal the fact that all these theories are open to a number of basic objections.

1. These critics virtually inject the word still into the text and read: "The Canaanite was then still in the land." "The Canaanite and the Perizzite dwelled then still in the land." We could with equal justice inject the word already, as indeed some critics do. The true and correct interpretation is one which needs no additions, for the Hebrew \uparrow $\&$ means simply then or at that time. It is so translated by Gesenius, who refers to one of these passages, and it is so translated elsewhere.

2. If there is really a contrast with a later age when the Canaanite and the Perizzite had disappeared from Israel, at what time are we to fix this age? As a matter of fact, the Canaanites continued in the country even after the conquest, for it is expressly stated that they continued to dwell "in Mount Lebanon, from Mount Baal-hermon unto the entering in of Hamath" (Judges 3, 3); and that after the conquest "the children of Israel dwelt among the Canaanites, Hittites, and Amorites, and Perizzites, and Hivites, and

1) Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 210.

Jebusites" (Judges 3, 5). Even as late as the time of our Savior we meet references to Canaanites, (Matthew 15, 22). As soon as we look at the facts in the case, we find that the principles of the critics consistently applied soon lead us into the time after the canon had been closed.

3. All of this discussion would seem to give the impression that $\uparrow \text{X}$ as it is used in the extant Hebrew of the Old Testament quite generally implies the definition "then still" rather than simply "then". But this is by no means the case, as a study of the passages listed in Gesenius, Handwoerterbuch, indicates. Of all the passages referring to past time listed, only one comes into direct question: Joshua 14, 11: "As my strength was then, so is my strength now." But here the $\uparrow \text{X}$ stands in direct contrast to $\uparrow \text{S} \downarrow \text{Y}$, "now". In most cases there is clearly no reference at all to the present time. Cp. Exodus 15, 15: "Da erschraaken die Fuersten Edom." In the case of this verse, a contrast with the present time would be unintelligible. See also 1 Kings 8, 12: "Then spake Solomon, The Lord said that He would dwell in the thick darkness." Psalm 89, 20 (19): "Then Thou spakest in vision to Thy holy one."

These passages may be very satisfactorily explained if we interpret $\uparrow \text{X}$ in its primary, literal sense. These words merely state that the Canaanites and the Perizzites were in the land in the days of Abraham, without any reference or allusion to that fact that there was a time when they were not in the land. Such an explanation does not, as some have tried to show, render the "then" super-

fluous or ignore it to all practical purposes, but points out that its use calls attention to the fact that between the time of Abram and the days of Moses a period of about six hundred years intervened. - And if we then ask why any mention is made at all of the presence of the heathen nations in the land, we answer by pointing to the context involved. There is a contrast between the present and the future, between the conditions as they obtained at that time and as they had been promised to Abraham in the glorious prophecies which the Lord had given him. Abraham, the bearer of the promise, had arrived in Canaan as a stranger and foreigner, to discover that the land of promise was already inhabited and that he could call no part of it his own. At this point the Lord appears to him and says: "Unto thy seed will I give this land," v. 7. And Abraham believes the promise of the Lord, all outward appearances to the contrary notwithstanding, and shows his faith by building an altar to the Lord who had appeared unto him. The New Testament comments on the heroic faith of Abraham in Hebrews 11, 8-9: "By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went. By faith he sojourned in a land of promise, as in a strange country." - In a similar manner we can explain the inclusion of the reference to the heathen nations in Genesis 13, 7.

GENESIS 12, 8

"And he removed from thence unto a mountain on the east of Bethel, and pitched his tent, having Bethel on the west, and Hai on the east: and there he builded an altar unto the Lord, who had appeared unto him."

Vater, quoted by Hengstenberg, remarks:

Vorzueglich deutlich belegt der Name Bethel den Gebrauch eines nachmosaischen Namens. Sehr oft ist dieser Name genannt; schon Genesis 12, 8 wohnt Abraham bei der Stadt Bethel. Genesis 28, 19; 35, 15 gibt Jakob dem Orte, da nach 28, 19 die Stadt vorher Lus geheissen, den Namen Bethel. Gleichwohl hiesz der Ort noch zur Zeit von Jos. 18, 13 Lus, wie diese Stelle deutlich lehrt.¹⁾

The seeming anachronism will disappear if we examine the passage closely. In Genesis 35, 15 Jacob gives the name Bethel not to the city, but to the place where he had seen the angels of God ascending and descending. As a matter of fact, in Joshua 16, 2: "And goeth out from Bethel to Luz," the two locations are distinguished from another. His descendants later applied the name Bethel also to the city itself, Genesis 35, 6: "So Jacob came to Luz, which is in the land of Canaan, that is, Bethel, he and all the people that were with him." As far as the Canaanite inhabitants were concerned, of course, the name of the city was Luz before as well as after the advent of the Israelites. It was only after Israel had permanently conquered the city that the name Luz was displaced entirely.

1) Authentic des Pentateuchs, II, 200.

The fact that the name Bethel was known in earlier times becomes clear from the record which describes the naming of the city formerly called Luz. There is no event at the time with which we can connect the name Bethel. It must, it appears, refer to the event recorded in the Book of Genesis.

The fact that the people of later times were mindful of the events that had taken place at Bethel and attached to that location a certain hallowed atmosphere is evident from the great amount of attention they paid it. It was at Bethel, for example, that the ark of the covenant was placed while the men of Israel went out to battle against Benjamin, (Genesis 20, 18). It was at Bethel that a meeting of all Israel was held after the close of the campaign against Benjamin. In Amos 4, 4 Bethel is mentioned as being hallowed by events which had taken place there many years before. Jeroboam, at the outset of the period of the divided kingdom, chose Bethel as one of the cities of Israel in which to erect a sanctuary. If the associations that connected themselves about the location of Bethel lived in the memory of the people for so long a time, it is not unreasonable to expect that they would survive the comparatively few years that elapsed between the event of Genesis 12, 8 and the time when the locality and the city became a permanent possession of Israel.

GENESIS 13, 18

An anachronism is claimed in the reference to the city of Hebron. It is mentioned as existing in the time of Abraham. The references to it are as follows: Genesis 13, 18: "Then Abram removed his tent, and came and dwelt in the plain of Mamre, which is in Hebron, and built there an altar unto the Lord." Genesis 23, 2: "And Sarah died in Kirjath-arba; the same is Hebron in the land of Canaan." Genesis 23, 19: "And after this, Abraham buried Sarah his wife in the cave of the field of Machpelah before Mamre: the same is Hebron in the land of Canaan." Genesis 35, 27: "And Jacob came unto Isaac his father unto Mamre, unto the city of Arbah, which is Hebron, where Abraham and Isaac sojourned." Numbers 13, 22: "And they (the spies) ascended by the south, and came unto Hebron; where Ahiman, Sheshai, and Talmai, the children of Anak, were. (Now Hebron was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt)." Joshua 14, 15: "And the name of Hebron before was Kirjath-arba; which Arba was a great man among the Anakims."

Thus in Joshua the statement is made that the former name of Hebron was Kirjath-arba; but it is designated as Hebron in the time of Abraham and the time of the spies. The inference of some of the critics is that Kirjath-arba was not called Hebron until it was given to Joshua by Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, 1 Chronicles 2, 42, and that all the references to Kirjath-arba as Hebron must have been written after the conquest and division of Canaan, hence not by Moses.

Our answer to the charge of anachronism in these passages of the Pentateuch runs along these lines:

1. The critics themselves are not unified or agreed in their attacks on the passages which contain the name "Hebron". Koenig, who quite apodictically assumes anachronisms in many similar cases, here remarks:

Hebron kann nicht bestimmt als nachmosaisch bezeichnet werden, weil nicht angegeben ist, wann jener Name den aelteren Kirjath-arba, Jos. 14, 15; 15, 13; Richt. 1, 10 verdraengt hat, und weil Calebs Nachkomme Hebron, 1 Chron. 2, 42 ebenso gut seinen Namen von der Stadt, wie diese von ihm haben kann.¹⁾

2. The writer of the Pentateuch shows too close an acquaintance with the city of Hebron - Kirjath-arba and its history to make it seem at all likely that he should err in so obvious a point. Consider the detailed reference to the three sons of Anak: Ahiman, Sheshai, and Talmi, as well as the detail given in: "Now Hebron was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt." It seems inconceivable that a man who works as accurately as these indications betray should commit such a grave blunder as to misdate the names of the city.

3. All the indications given in the text indicate that Kirjath-arba is the later name. The city got this name from Arba the giant. Now there are no traces in the Bible of any giants in or about Hebron in the days of the patriarchs, in spite of the fact that frequent mention is made of the

1) Einleitung, p. 160; quoted in Fuerbringer, Die neuere Pentateuchkritik, Lehre und Wehre, vol. 50, p. 158.

district, particularly in connection with Abraham. In the later books of the Old Testament, especially in Joshua and Judges, the giants are mentioned almost every time the city or its environs are alluded to. - On the other hand, the name Hebron appears to have no special connection with the time of Joshua, as we would expect it to have if it had originated at that time and not merely been readopted.

4. This seems to be the solution of the problem:

Hebron, as all indications in the text show, was the original name of the city. To this Kirjath-arba was later added for a time, this second name being dropped again at the time of the conquest and division of Canaan, as related in Joshua.

And once again there is archaeological evidence to attest the reliability and truthfulness of the sacred Scriptures. Quite recently it has been demonstrated that a century before the exodus Palestine was a province of the Egyptian empire, and that cities and places with which we are so familiar in the Scriptures: Jerusalem, Megiddo, Taanach, Gibeah, Kishon, Hebron, and nearly all the rest were all well-known to the officials of the Egyptian government¹⁾. Note that Hebron is one of the places twice mentioned in the Egyptian monuments: "the spring of Hebron" is listed in the conquests of Rameses II and spoken of as being at war with Rameses III. It is thus in evidence that in the

1) MacDill, The Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch, quoting Brugsch-Bey, Egypt under the Pharaohs, chs. 8 and 11, and Sayce, Higher Criticism and the Monuments, pp. 52, 53, 176, 186.

century preceding the exodus there was in Palestine a town famous for its springs, called Hebron, a place of sufficient importance to be named among the conquests of the greatest of Egyptian kings. Therefore there can be no anachronism in references made to this place in Genesis. The writer of Genesis calls it Hebron, though he says that in his time it was also called Kirjath-arba. He intimates, however, that Hebron was the better and more well-known name, for when he speaks of the building of the town he calls it Hebron, not Kirjath-arba, and whenever he uses the latter name he informs his readers that he means Hebron (Genesis 23, 2; 35, 27).

GENESIS 14, 14

"And when Abram heard that his brother (Lot) was taken captive (by the four kings Amraphel, Arioch, Chedorlaomer, and Tidal), he armed his trained servants, born in his own house, three hundred and eighteen, and pursued them unto Dan. And he divided himself against them, he and his servants, by night, and smote them, and pursued them unto Hobah, which is on the left hand of Damascus."

Deuteronomy 34, 1 it is reported that Moses on mount Nebo very shortly before his death saw "all the land of Gilead, unto Dan."¹) Now the critics object that this passage presents an instance of anachronism and that these sections of the Pentateuch must be considered post-mosaic because we are first told in the time of Joshua, after the death of Moses: "The children of Dan went up to fight against Leshem, and took it, and smote it with the edge of the sword, and possessed it, and dwelt therein, and called Leshem Dan, after the name of Dan their father" (Joshua 19, 47). The children of Dan "came unto Laish, unto a people that were at quiet and secure: and they smote them with the edge of the sword, and burnt the city with fire. And there was no deliverer, because it was far from Zidon and they had no business with any man; and it was in the valley that lieth by Bethrehob. And they built a city, and dwelt therein. And they called the name of the city Dan, after the name of Dan their father, who was born unto Israel: howbeit the name of the city was Laish at the first" (Judges 18, 27-29).

1) See the following pages for a more detailed discussion of this last chapter of the Pentateuch.

There is a difficulty here only if we assume that the same city of Dan is meant in both instances. But the identity of the Dan of Genesis 14, 14 and Deuteronomy 34, 1, and the Dan-Leshem or Laish of Joshua 19, 47 and Judges 18, 29 is by no means as self-evident as Strack supposes when he in pointing out an "anachronism" in this passage asserts: "Diesen Namen erhielt die Stadt Lajisch oder Leschem erst nach ihrer Eroberung durch die Daniten."¹⁾ There are several reasons which speak in favor of the explanation which finds in these passages reference to two cities called Dan.

1. First of all, attention may be called to 2 Samuel 24, 6, where in a description of the census which David took it is stated: "Then came they (Joab and the captains of the host) to Gilead, and to the land of Tahtim-hodshi (Luther: ins Niederland Hodsi); and they came to Dan-jaan, and about to Zidon." It is to be noted that at no time is Dan-Laish called Jaan or referred to with that suffix. The suffix Jaan is all the more striking since the famous city of Dan-Laish is twice referred to in this very same chapter by the simple and unadorned name Dan, 2 Samuel 24, 2. 15. It seems quite likely that, as Hengstenberg, Keil, and Green have assumed, there is in the suffix Jaan a reference to a second city of Dan, clearly distinguished from Dan-Laish, the city ordinarily meant when just Dan is used.

1) Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 25ff.

2. Then, the geographical identification seems to indicate that two cities of Dan are referred to. According to Judges 18, 28 Dan-Laish lay in the valley of Beth-rehob, at the center fork of the Jordan, accordingly in no sense of the term on any road leading from the valley of the Jordan to Damascus. - But we are told that the four kings whom Abraham pursued, according to Genesis 14, 14, from Dan fled to Damascus, v. 15. It seems more appropriate, therefore, that we identify this Dan, according to Deuteronomy 34, 1 in Gilead, with the Dan-Jaan of 2 Samuel 24, 6 and locate it in northern Perea, southwest of Damascus.

3. Although it seems a bit unusual that two cities located close to each other should bear the same name, this is by no means unprecedented or unparalleled. Thus there were, for example, two villages of Bethsaida in the vicinity of the sea of Gennesareth, one on the western shore of that sea and the other at the point where the Jordan entered the sea, on the eastern bank of the river itself. In the province of Saxony there were at one time nine villages called Naundorf, besides others that bore the same name, but varied in its spelling (Nauendorf). Compare also the Gilgals of the Bible.

Significant is the testimony of Josephus in this connection. In speaking of Dan-Laish, he remarks: *περὶ Δάνου οὕτως γὰρ ἡ ἑτέρα Ἰορδάνου προεαγορεύεται πηγή.* And in another passage of the same work he adds: *ἢδε ἔστε πρὸς τῆς πηγῆς τοῦ μικροῦ Ἰορδάνου.* →

1) Antiquities, I, 10, 1.
2) VIII, 8, 4.

Moeller adds in his Einleitung: "Dieses Dan passt bei dem besten Willen in seiner geographischen Lage nicht zu dem dort beschriebenen Zug."¹⁾

4. We call attention to the fact that the context in which this alleged anachronism appears is highly reliable. It contains many references to antiquity which reveal a surprisingly accurate knowledge of the names and the historical events of that period. It would be very hard to conceive that a passage as accurate and reliable as Genesis 14 would contain an evident blunder. Moeller remarks: "Genesis 14 zeigt sich ja geographisch wie historisch aufs vorzueglichste orientiert, was von der Kritik infolge der Entdeckungen mehr und mehr anerkannt wird."²⁾

Thus it is possible to find for this passage an explanation, the possibility and credibility of which can scarcely be attacked. Nevertheless we must take notice of the fact that although in general the text of the Old Testament has been transmitted to us without changes, it is entirely possible that a later copyist may have inserted an intentional "correction". For this reason Green³⁾ remarks in connection with his discussion of this problem: "If the Dan of later times was meant, the strong probability is that the older name was in the original text, and in the

1) P. 41ff.

2) Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 41ff.

3) The Unity of the Book of Genesis, p. 202; quoted in Fuerbringer, loc. cit., 160.

course of transcription one more familiar was substituted for it." However he adds: "The proofs of Mosaic authorship are too numerous and strong to be outweighed by a triviality like this." In the case of the New Testament even conservative critics assume quite a number of intentional changes of this nature. Compare the variant readings: $\beta\eta\ \delta\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\ \delta\epsilon$ and $\beta\eta\ \delta\alpha\beta\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}$.

GENESIS 22, 2

When critics read in Genesis 22, 2 that God tells Abraham: "Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I shall tell thee of," and note that the name Moriah is not mentioned again until 2 Chronicles 3, 1: "Then Solomon began to build the house of the Lord at Jerusalem in Mount Moriah, where the Lord appeared unto David his father," they conclude that Genesis in this verse presents an anachronism and charge that according to the chronicler the name Moriah was unknown until the time of David, Zion being the usual designation for the locality until David's day.

One school of interpreters is inclined to solve the difficulty by assuming that two entirely different places are meant in Genesis 22, 2 and 2 Chronicles 3, 1: a Moriah near Shechem which in Genesis 12, 6; Deuteronomy 11, 20; and Judges 7, 1 is called Moreh, and then the Moriah on which the temple of Solomon was constructed. Such a solution seems unlikely, in view of the following reasons.

1. The location of the two places corresponds very well. Abraham reaches Moriah on the third day after he had left Beersheba. To cover the actual distance from Beersheba to the modern site of Jerusalem requires about fourteen hours, or about as much as one could in such a period of time cover in hilly country with laden pack animals.

2. The identity of names speaks in favor of the identity of the two locations. While it cannot be denied that proper names may be repeated, still it is more natural and frequent to assume that a name consistently refers to one location.

3. In the third place, there is a theological reason which, however, may not be universally recognized as cogent. It would seem unusual that while many localities in Israel were hallowed by memories of the patriarchs, the later chief sanctuary of all Israel should enjoy no such association with antiquity. And when we do find some traces of such traditions associating themselves with the name Moriah, we are inclined to look into them more closely. Moeller concedes the force of this argument when he writes: "Theologisch sich auch beide Erzählungen nicht beziehungslos zu einander."¹⁾

While we hold to the identity of the two Moriahs, we emphatically disagree with the conclusion which higher criticism draws in connection with this passage. And we do so for the following reasons:

1. The analytic critics almost universally pronounce the chronicler to be untrustworthy as an historian, but here one of his incidental statements is confidently brought forward to prove a chronological inaccuracy in Genesis.

1) Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 41.

2. The statement in Chronicles shows only that Mount Moriah was chosen as the site of the Temple because David had sacrificed there, and not that the name began to be used in David's time.

3. It is evident that there was a "mount of God" (Genesis 22, 14) in Palestine long before the time of Moses. In the list of Palestinian cities conquered by Thotmes III is the name Har-el, which has been identified with the geographical position of Jerusalem, as Professor Sayce has shown in his recent work.¹⁾ It is thus proved that more than two centuries before the exodus there was a mountain called "the mount of God" in the region of Jerusalem, corresponding to the Mount Moriah of Genesis.

4. The varying usage of the terms Zion and Moriah can well be explained in the light of the varying course of Jewish history. It is quite natural that the name Moriah, having grown out of the occurrence in the life of Abraham recorded in Genesis 22, should be restricted in its usage to the family of the patriarchs. Now if the Jews at the time of the Conquest had under Joshua immediately conquered permanently also this hill, then the name Moriah would soon have become the common designation, as did Beersheba, Bethel, Gilead, Mahanaim, Penuel, Hebron. In the case of all these names, the radical changes that took place in the land at that time combined with the religious zeal of the people to

1) Higher Criticism and the Monuments, p. 186-187; quoted in MacDill, The Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch, p. 43.

bring about a rapid change and substitute almost overnight the holy Hebrew designations for the pagan terms. Mount Zion however remained in the possession of the Jebusites until the reign of David (2 Samuel 4, 7), and in the course of time the children of Israel became used to their name Zion. When the hill then came into the permanent possession of Israel, they hesitated to attempt to displace a name that had become so firmly rooted, although every one knew very well that Zion was the Moriah of Sacred Writ. It was only after the return from the exile that the accompanying radical changes of that period brought the name Moriah into its own, not by displacing Zion but by applying the designation to a single part of that hill, the part on which the Temple was built.

GENESIS 34, 7

"And the sons of Jacob came out of the field when they heard it: and the men were grieved, and they were very wroth, because he had wrought folly in Israel in lying with Jacob's daughter; which things ought not to be done."

This is one of the less prominent instances of alleged anachronism in the Pentateuch. Strack, Cornill, Koenig, and Kuenen omit all mention of it. Dillmann is one of the few who find here an inaccuracy; he writes: "Ziemlich naiv wendet der Verfasser diese spaete Redeweise auf die Patriarchenzeit an, wo es kein Volk Israel gab."¹⁾ Skinner remarks: "'In Israel' is an anachronism."²⁾

There is no valid reason why the sacred writer could not have used the name Israel in this verse of Genesis. The name of the patriarch Jacob had already been changed into Israel. At this time he was the head of a large and influential group of people which later grew into a nation. The term $\begin{matrix} \aleph & \chi & \eta & \omega & \rho & \iota \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{matrix}$ $\begin{matrix} \eta & \zeta & \iota & \eta \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{matrix}$ $\begin{matrix} \eta & \omega & \gamma \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{matrix}$ is later used in the records of the law of Moses, Deuteronomy 22, 21; see also Joshua 7, 15. Why should Moses not be able to use a term which he later used in codifying the law of Israel? This, then, would be the first instance in which the name Israel is used by metonymy to designate a people.

1) Moeller, Die Echtheit und Einheit des Fuenfbuches Mose, p. 98.
2) Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis, p. 419.

But there is another possibility, that of taking Israel in its original individual sense. The name Israel connotes a special and intimate relation with Jehovah ("Gotteskaempfer"), and since this name is used, in striking contrast to the Jacob found in the same verse, its use casts a deeper shadow upon the enormity of the guilt of Shechem. In spite of the close connection between Jacob and Jehovah, Shechem transgresses against him. We then translate not: "He had wrought folly in Israel," but "against Israel," "Er hat eine Torheit begangen an Israel." This is a common and accepted meaning of the preposition an and fits in very well with the context of genesis 34.

GENESIS 36, 31

"And these are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel."

It is maintained that the writer of this passage must have lived after the establishment of the monarchy among the Israelites - at least four hundred years after Moses. Such is the ground taken by Voltaire, Paine, Reuss, and Wellhausen. Strack asserts confidently: "Hier ist die Koenigsherrschaft in Israel vorausgesetzt."¹⁾ Bleek asserts: "Auch von dieser Stelle wird kein Unbefangener zu behaupten wagen, dass Moses oder ein Schriftsteller im mosaischen Alter sie habe schreiben koennen. Sie setzt wenigstens das Zeitalter von Saul voraus."²⁾ Higher critics, among them Luther in the ranks of those who find in the passage an instance of anachronism. For Luther writes in his commentary on Genesis:

Es wird aber gefragt: Ob diese Fuersten oder Koenige vor oder nach Mose gewesen sind? Wo sie nach Mose gewesen sind, so hat er dieses ja nicht schreiben koennen, sondern diesen Zusatz hat ein anderer gemacht, wie das letzte Stueck im fuenften Buche Mose. Denn er hat ja von sich selber nicht gesagt 5 Mose 34, 10: "Und es stand hinfert kein Prophet in Israel auf, wie Mose, den der Herr erkannt haette von Angesicht." Item, andere Dinge mehr, so daselbst vom Grabe Moses erzahlt werden. Es waere denn, dass du sagen wolltest, dass er solches durch einen prophetischen Geist geweissagt haette.³⁾

-
- 1) Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 25f.
 - 2) Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 211.
 - 3) Saint Louis Edition, II, 1010.

The Bible tells us that there were kings in Edom at the time of Moses, for in Numbers 20, 14 we read: "Moses sent messengers from Kadesh unto the king of Edom." Compare also Judges 11, 17, where we are told that "Israel sent messengers unto the king of Edom, saying, Let me, I pray thee, pass through thy land: but the king of Edom would not hearken thereto." Edom had not only dukes (Exodus 15, 15), but also kings, as did the Midianites (Numbers 31, 8). Now there are listed eight kings which are alleged to have reigned before the time when Saul acceded to the throne of Israel. Bleek: "Es kommt noch dazu, dass ... wir vermuten muessen, dass die in der folgenden Liste aufgefuehrten edomitischen Koenige einer nach dem anderen regiert haben bis gegen die Zeit hin, wo das Volk Israel unter Koenige kam."¹) Even if we admit that the king of Edom who lived at the time of Moses and to whom he sent the message spoken of in Judges 11, 17 was the very first of this list of eight kings of Edom, these kings would have reigned unusually long. For from the death of Moses until the election of King Saul a period four hundred year intervened (1 Kings 6, 1), and the seven successors of the first king of Edom would thus have reigned more than fifty years each. This seems all the more unlikely in view of the fact that these were not hereditary, but elective kings, as Genesis 36, 31 shows, and these would first accede to the throne

1) Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 211.

after they had attained a more mature age than is the case in an hereditary monarchy. Already these considerations make it seem improbable that these eight kings of Edom reigned after the date usually assigned to Moses.

But it is not even certain that the ruler mentioned in Numbers 20, 14 as being a contemporary of Moses was the first king of his people. We conclude that from the fact that reference is made to "the king's high way," 𐤀𐤃𐤁𐤁 𐤁𐤅𐤁, "die Landstrasze," "die gebahnte Strasze," (Numbers 20, 17). It seems as though the kingdom of the Edomites has already existed for some time. This harmonizes well with the power and the warlike attitude of the people apparent in their brusque statement: "Thou shalt not go through," (Numbers 20, 20) and the comment of the sacred writer: "And Edom came out with much people, and with a strong hand." - We are confirmed in our supposition by the list of kings found in the passage under discussion, Genesis 36, 31ff. There this comment is added to the name of the fourth king, Hadad: "Who smote Midian in the field of Moab," (Genesis 36, 35). This appears to have happened before rather than after Moses. For at the time of Moses Midian was indeed allied with Moab and lived close at hand (Numbers 22, 4. 7), but soon Israel camped "at the plains of Moab, which are by Jordan near Jericho." After the conquest Israel always lived very near to this region and in the days of the kings these plains were even a part of Israelitish territory, so that it would hardly be expected that they would furnish

a battleground for Midian and Edom at this time. After the time of Gideon the Moabites disappear from history. - It therefore seems incorrect to identify the Hadad of Genesis 36, 35 with the Hadad of 1 Kings 11, 14, as some critics assume; for Hadad in Genesis is an elected king, while the contemporary of Solomon is "of the king's seed," or the son of a king (1 Kings 11, 14, 17). It is not said that he ever became king; it appears from the context that he was only a pretender to the throne. Then, too, the time does not fit; he certainly was not a king in Edom "before there reigned any king over the children of Israel," for he was a contemporary of Solomon, according to the plain statement of the text.

We have stated that according to the biblical text it seems very likely that at least some of these eight kings of Edom reigned before Moses. We proceed a step farther to show that it seems very likely that all eight of them preceded the time of Moses.

Is it not striking that Genesis 36 should in the case of the last king mentioned record not only his city and possibly his father, as is done at the mention of each of his predecessors, but also the name of his wife, his mother-in-law, and even the name of her mother? And is it not likewise striking that although in the case of each of his predecessors it is said: "And he died," there is no record of the death of Hadar until 1 Chronicles 1, 51, written very late: "Hadad (=Hadar) died also"? We conclude

that the reason for the omission of any mention of Hadar's death is that he was still living at the time that the record was written. It is likely that he was the king of Edom with whom Moses dealt in his attempt to obtain permission to travel through the country of Edom (Numbers 20, 14ff.).

That eight kings should have reigned in Edom before the time of Moses also fits in very well chronologically. According to Genesis 15, 13 and Exodus 12, 40 the time that intervened between the death of Jacob (the date of Esau's death is not known) and the exodus amounts to four hundred years, while four hundred and fifty years would bring us to the sending of the delegation to the king of Edom. If we now allow two hundred years for the eight electoral kings, which is ample time, especially in view of the fact that the eighth, Hadar, is still living at the time of Moses, there still are two hundred and fifty years for the growth and development of the family of Esau, living in Seir already before the death of Isaac, into the nation of Edom.

One more difficulty remains to be solved: Moses writes: "Before there reigned any king over the children of Israel." What is the purpose of this remark at this place? Can these words be explained in any other way than by the assumption that there were already kings in Israel at the time that they were written? We could, with Hengstenberg, refer to the amazing ability which great leaders of men have had to

forecast the course of events and assert that Moses was here making a prediction of future Israelitish history.¹⁾ But it seems better to explain the occurrence of these words in the light of the promise given to Israel that the nation should in future days have a king. In the chapter immediately preceding the verse under discussion God had told Jacob: "I am God Almighty; be fruitful and multiply; a nation and a company of nations shall be of thee, and kings shall come out of thy loins," (Genesis 35, 11), immediately after which promise follow the genealogies of Jacob and Esau. Already Abraham had received the promise: "Kings shall come out of thee," (Genesis 17, 6) and of Sarah it had been foretold: "She shall be a mother of nations; kings of people shall be of her," (Genesis 17, 16). In Deuteronomy 17, 14 Moses prophecies that after the conquest and occupation of Palestine Israel will say: "I will set a king over me, like as all the nations that are about me," and for that reason he in the following verses gives the law regarding the kings. In view

1) Hengstenberg, Authentic des Pentateuchs, II, 204 lists several of the predictions of Bengel: "Man gebe nur Acht, ob nicht der Koenig in Frankreich noch Kaiser wird." - "Die deutschen Bisthuemer und Abteien werden sekularisiert werden." - "Die lateinische Sprache wird nicht mehr lange so gaenge und gebe bleiben, wie sie heutiges Tages ist. Ueberhaupt wird die Literatur bald eine andere und neue werden." - "Die Lehre vom inneren Worte wird noch erschrecklich viel Unheil anrichten, wenn einmal die Philosophen anfangen werden, sich ihrer zu bedienen. Sie werden, um menschlich zu reden, den Kern ohne Butzen, Huelse und Schale haben wollen, d.i. Christum ohne die Bibel, und werden so aus dem Subtilsten in das Groebste fortschreiten, ohne zu wissen, wie es ihnen geht."

of all these prophecies Genesis 36, 31 merely expresses the thought that Edom became a monarchy earlier than did Israel. Even Koenig, who with much certainty regards this passage as an anachronism, admits: "Wenn das sicher waere, ... dasz dem Abraham und Jakob Koenige als Nachkommen verheiszen worden waeren, Genesis 17, 6. 16; 35, 11, dann koennte auch Genesis 36, 31 von Koenigen Israels vor deren Existenz geredet worden sein."¹⁾

Significant are the words of Calvin in connection with the words "before there reigned any king over the children of Israel":

Memoria tenendum est, quod paulo ante diximus, subito excellere reprobos, ut statim concidant, sicut herba testorum, quae radice caret, praecocem habet vigorem, sed citius arescit. Duobus filiis Isaac promissa fuerat haec dignitas, quod oriundi essent ab ipse reges: priores incipiunt regnare Idumaei: ita videtur deterior esse Israelitarum conditio. Sed tandem successus temporis docuit, quanto melius sit humi repando altas agere radices, quam preposteram excellentiam momento acquirere, quae statim evanescat.²⁾

But what about Luther's statement with respect to this passage? Does he not give up the authenticity of the Pentateuch? He does, it is true, admit the possibility that these Edomite kings may have lived after Moses and that their names were interpolated by a later writer into the

1) Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 160.

2) Hengstenberg, Beitrage zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament, III, 203.

text of Genesis 36. We cannot deny the theoretical possibility of such an explanation, especially in the case of a genealogy, although it seems unlikely in view of the preceding explanation. But we cannot hold that by admitting this possibility Luther gave up the authenticity of the Pentateuch. That never even entered his mind, as a closer examination of his writings will bear out.¹⁾

1) See Lehre und Wehre, 49, 291ff.

GENESIS 40, 15

"For indeed I was stolen away out of the land of the Hebrews."

Analytic critics hold that Palestine was not called the land of the Hebrews until after the conquest of Canaan, and that therefore Moses could not have written this passage. Strack coolly assumes the anachronism without proof.¹⁾ Sellin remarks: "Erst seit Josua moeglich."²⁾ Driver, in the Westminster Commentary series, adds this note to the words "the land of the Hebrews": " - an anachronism for 'the land of Canaan'."³⁾ Skinner claims: "'The land of the Hebrews' - this expression is an anachronism in the patriarchal history."⁴⁾ Dillmann, Cornill, Kuenen, Rupprecht, join their ranks and likewise assume the presence of an anachronism in Genesis 40, 15.

The word "Hebrews" is used variously in the Old Testament. It is used (a) by men of other nations as a designation for the descendants of Abraham: Genesis 39, 14. 17; 41, 12; Exodus 1, 16; 2, 6; 1 Samuel 4, 6; (b) in conversations with non-Israelites as a designation for the descendants of Abraham: Genesis 40, 15; Exodus 1, 19; etc.; (c) in contrast to the names of other peoples: Genesis 43, 32; Exodus ;, 15; 2, 11. 13; 21, 2; Deuteronomy 15, 12; 1 Samuel 13, 3. -

-
- 1) Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 25ff.
 - 2) Moeller, Echtheit und Einheit der fuef Buecher Mosis, p. 96.
 - 3) The Book of Genesis, p. 338.
 - 4) Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis, p. 463.

If we examine the genealogical origin of the nation of the Hebrews, as it is listed in Genesis 10 we see that it is traced back to Shem, the son of Noah, and that although Peleg is the son of Eber mentioned in the genealogical list of Genesis 11, it is to his brother Joktan that all thirteen tribes descended from Eber trace their origin.

The question now arises: Could not Joseph in his conversations with the Egyptians speak of the land of the Hebrews? If we consider the position of esteem and respect which Abraham enjoyed in the land of Canaan, there seems to be not the slightest reason why this should not be the case. Abraham already, many years before, made such an impression upon the children of Heth that they called him "a mighty prince," ("ein Fuerst Gottes," אֲדֹנָי גִּבּוֹר), (Genesis 23, 6). The Amorites Mamre, Eshcol, and Aner seek his favor and support in time of war (Genesis 14, 13), as do also Abimelech the Philistine and Phichol the chief captain of his host (Genesis 21, 22f.). Similar events occur at the time of Isaac (Genesis 26, 13. 26). The power of Abraham is acknowledged by the king of Sodom (Genesis 14, 21) and by Melchizedek, king of Salem (Genesis 14, 18).¹⁾ Those whom he must call his enemies are forced to dread his might (Genesis 14, 15). According to Genesis 34 the sons of Abraham captured Shechem. For generations the "Hebrews"

1) See Hebrews, chapter 7 in this connection.

had lived in the land of Canaan and had by no means been without influence. It can therefore well be understood that not only Potiphar's wife speaks of "the Hebrew" (Genesis 39, 14. 17), but that he himself calls Palestine "the land of the Hebrews."

Under the circumstances, Joseph's calling Canaan the land or country of the Hebrews was both natural and proper. What else could he have called it? Had he called it Canaan or the land of the Canaanites, the Egyptians would have regarded him as a Canaanite. If he had named it Palestine or the land of the Philistines, the Egyptians would have regarded him as a Philistine. But he was a Hebrew. His great grandfather had been a mighty prince and was universally known as Abraham the Hebrew. This name was transmitted to his descendants. Pentateuchal history shows that in Egypt they were called not Israelites, nor Jews, but Hebrews. Thus the Egyptians knew and named them (Genesis 40, 15; 41, 12; Exodus 1, 15-16. 19; 2, 6-7. 11. 13; 7, 16; 9, 1. 13). In speaking, then, of Palestine to an Egyptian it was both natural and proper that Joseph should designate it as the land or country of the Hebrews, or the country in which the Hebrews had lived. Canaan was theirs because they had lived in it and because by divine promise they were again to live in it, just as people in general call the country in which they live their own, whether they possess any real estate in it or not.

EXODUS 16, 35

"And the children of Israel did eat manna forty years, until they came to a land inhabited; they did eat manna until they came to the borders of the land of Canaan."

Inasmuch as it is stated in the Book of Joshua that the manna ceased after the Israelites had crossed the Jordan, (Joshua 5, 12) and since Moses died before that event, it is maintained that the writer of Exodus 16, 35 must have lived after the crossing of the Jordan and after the death of Moses. Paine and Reuss are the most prominent critics that make use of this argument. Voltaire appears to have overlooked it. Reuss states: "We have here a prime subject of doubt (Ce n'est là qu'un premier sujet de douter) ... It is, in effect, affirmed (Joshua 5, 13) that the rain of manna ceased five days after the passage of the Jordan, that is to say, more than six weeks after the death of Moses."¹⁾

The argument of the higher critics is not conclusive, and a careful examination of the passage will show that there is no instance of anachronism in the biblical text as it stands.

This entire chapter is the locus classicus for the manna of the desert. It is very natural that Moses should, as every historian would do, insert remarks and information about the manna of the desert which strictly speaking pertain to a later date. It is no proof of inaccuracy or untrustworthiness that things which took place at the very close

1) MacDill, Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch, p. 46.

of the journeying are mentioned in Exodus. In history, especially in Bible history, events are not always related in their chronological order; nor does a departure from the chronological order create doubt or suspicion, except in the minds of analytic critics and skeptics.

Exodus 16, 35 is by no means an isolated instance of such a procedure. Moses himself quite frequently departs from the chronological order. Thus when he in chapter five of Genesis gives the lives of the patriarchs from Adam to Noah, he lists everything concerning each individual in successive verses, even though their death may have actually occurred at a much later point in the succeeding narrative. Again, when in 1 Samuel 17, 54 we are told of the victory of David over Goliath, the sacred writer immediately adds the note that David carried the giant's head to Jerusalem, an event which took place several years later. Also writers of the New Testament can be cited in this connection. Luke, for example, combines with the story of the first appearance of John the Baptist an account of his later imprisonment (Luke 2, 19), even though the latter event took place several years later. Compare Matthew 11, 2 and Mark 6, 16.

Furthermore, if we read the words of Exodus 16, 35 exactly as they stand, we find that the passage does not speak of the cessation of the manna at all. It merely states that the Israelites ate manna for forty years and that they

ate it till they came to an inhabited country - the borders of Canaan. There is not a word about the cessation of the manna, nor of the Israelites' ceasing to eat it. The declaration that the Israelites ate manna till they came to the borders of Canaan may seem to imply that they ceased, and the objector, of course, supposes that they ceased to eat manna at that time because they could not get it; and he further supposes that they could not get it because it ceased to fall. But there is not a word of all this in the text. It affirms merely that the Israelites ate manna until they came to the borders of Canaan; but this does not necessarily imply that they ceased to eat it.

Our interpretation is entirely consistent with the Hebrew usage of the term used in Exodus 16, 35 וַיִּפֹּט . The words here read: $\text{וַיִּפֹּט יְהוָה מַנְּחֵם לְיִשְׂרָאֵל בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא}$. They only tell us the point of time at which the manna still continued to fall, not the time at which it ceased to fall, making no assertion concerning later events or conditions. Compare 2 Samuel 6, 23: "Therefore Michal the daughter of Saul had no child unto the day of her death," $\text{וְלֹא יָלְדָה מִיכָל בְּתוּלַת יָמֶיהָ}$. This passage would make no sense if we were to permit ourselves to draw conclusions of later events on the basis of the . In Jeremiah 1, 3 we are told that Jeremiah prophesied in "the days of Jehoiakim, the son of Josiah king of Judah, unto the end ($\text{וְעַד הַיּוֹם הַהוּא}$) of the eleventh year of Zedekiah, the son of Josiah king of Judah." Since the subsequent chapters show that Jeremiah continued to work also after the

eleventh year of Zedekiah, it is incorrect to conclude that
7 y necessarily indicates the terminus ad quem. Hengstenberg
remarks in this connection:

Dies liegt so sehr in der Natur der Sache, dass es sich in allen Sprachen findet und finden muss. Wer denkt zum Beispiel im Deutschen daran, dass jemand, von dem gesagt wird, er habe sein Jubilaecum erlebt, notwendig in demselben Jahr gestorben sein muesse? Oder, dass man jemand, dadurch dass man ihm Lebewohl wuenscht bis auf Wiedersehen, fuer die Folgezeit Uebel anwuensche? 1) -

The words of Joshua 5, 11-12 almost seem to be a literal continuation of Exodus 16, 35, after an interruption of dozens of chapters: "And they did eat of the old corn of the land on the morrow. ... And the manna ceased on the morrow after they had eaten of the old corn of the land; neither had the children of Israel manna any more: but they did eat of the fruit of the land of Canaan that year."

Though, then, the manna ceased after the crossing of the Jordan and six weeks after the death of Moses, there is nothing in this passage that might not have been written by him. The utter silence of the author of this passage concerning the crossing of the Jordan, the entrance into Canaan, and the actual cessation of the manna suggests that he died before these events took place.

1) Beitraege zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament, I, 67.

EXODUS 16, 36

"Now an omer is the tenth part of an ephah."

This passage has been advanced as an instance of anachronism in the Pentateuch much less frequently than those discussed at greater length, but it appears frequently enough to warrant its inclusion in a list of discussions of Pentateuchal "anachronisms". Strack lists it as being under suspicion, although he gives no reasons for his position.¹⁾ Vater had already preceded him by many years when he stated: "Diese Erklärung ist auffallend wenn sie nicht durch Zeitveränderungen nothwendig geworden war."²⁾ - Critics claim that verse 36 comes from a later date, when the use of the omer as a measure had been discontinued and it would be necessary for the writer of Exodus to add an explanatory note as to the exact signification of the term.

A solution to the difficulty was first proposed by J. D. Michaelis, who suggested that omer was not a measure at all in the strict sense of the term, but "catini sive poculi parvi genus omnium minimum." He then adds these words of explanation: "Proprie ergo nomen poculi fuit, quale secum gestare solent Orientales per deserta iter facientes, ad hauriendam si quam rivus vel fons offeret aquam. Hoc in poculo, alia vasa non habentes, et mannam collegerunt Israelitae."³⁾ Kanne arrived at the same conclusion,

1) Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 25ff.

2) Hengstenberg, Authentie des Pentateuchs, II, p. 211.

3) Hengstenberg, Authentie des Pentateuchs, II, p. 212.

altogether independent of Michaelis. He stated it this way: The omer was a small cup or pitcher that had approximately the same size in various parts of Israel.

There is an Arabic root designating just such a small container from which the name omer could be derived. But on the strength of that evidence alone we would not be justified in deviating from the traditional translation. More cogent, it seems, is the following argument. The word omer is used in verses 16, 18, 22, and 23 of the sixteenth chapter of Exodus. At the very close of that same chapter comes the verse under discussion, telling all readers the exact relation of this omer to the well-known ephah of that day. Otherwise the word never is used, neither in the other chapters of the Pentateuch nor in the Old Testament as a whole. This could hardly be the case if the omer were a measure of grain. We should expect to find other references to it in other parts of the Old Testament. - If it be objected that this is pure coincidence, we point to the consideration that there is a measure of exactly the same size as the omer mentioned many times in the Pentateuch, but not called the omer. In the case of some passages (Leviticus 5, 11; Numbers 5, 15; 28, 5) it is simply called "the tenth part of an ephah." Much more often (over twenty times in the Pentateuch) it is referred to as תֵּיבָה . If omer were the name of a measure of grain, we would expect its name to be given.

This, then, seems to be the solution: It is unlikely that every Jewish family had in its possession one of the larger Hebrew measures. (An ephah was very nearly the size of our bushel). But each family would need a smaller container for daily household use. And while these smaller containers were approximately the same size in almost all Israel, it would be but natural that this was not always the case. So it is by no means unusual that the sacred writer explains the size of the omer by comparing it with a fixed quantity, the ephah, over whose unvarying size the government watched.

EXODUS 30, 13

"This they shall give, every one that passeth among them that are numbered, half a shekel after the shekel of the sanctuary: (A shekel is twenty gerahs:) an half shekel shall be the offering of the Lord."

This passage again is one of those against which objection is not raised as frequently as those discussed at greater length. Still Strack lists Exodus 30, 13 among the doubtful verses of the Pentateuch and remarks in connection with it: "Diese Bezeichnung setzt voraus, dass das Heiligtum mit seinem Kultus schon laengere Zeit bestand."¹⁾ But he fails to list any reason for his position.

The term shekel of the sanctuary occurs quite frequently in the middle books of the Pentateuch.²⁾ Three times its exact weight is explained (Exodus 30, 13; Leviticus 27, 25; Numbers 3, 47). Keil suggests that this term designates "einen Sekel, der an das Heiligtum zu entrichten ist, ... einen urspruenglichen, vollwichtigen Sekel im Unterschied von dem Sekel des taeglichen Verkehrs, der geringeres Gewicht hatte,"³⁾ and this seems to be the solution. Already in the time of the patriarchs the half-shekel is mentioned as being a current measure of weight, according to which gold was evaluated. Since the word shekel in and of itself

1) Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 25ff.

2) See Exodus 30, 24; 38, 24-26; Leviticus 5, 15.

3) Biblischer Kommentar ueber Genesis und Exodus, second edition, p. 542.

designates no certain and fixed weight, we assume that at that time already there were silver coins in existence which were called shekels and were used in everyday commerce. In order to prevent misunderstanding, we may well imagine that the term shekel of the sanctuary was used to designate a coin of fixed weight and definite value.

LEVITICUS 18, 24-27

"Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things: for in all these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you: and the land is defiled: therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants. Ye therefore shall keep my statutes and my judgments, and shall not commit any of your abominations; neither any of your own nation, nor any stranger that sojourneth among you: (for all these abominations have the men of the land done, which were before you, and the land is defiled."

It is primarily Koenig who attacks this passage. He states: "Viele Momente dieser Verse (hauptsaechlich auch noch: ich suchte heim; der Fremdling, der unter euch weilt; sie haben getan) machen es sicher, dasz der Erzaehler in der nachmosaischen Zeit stand und bei seiner Darstellung der mosaischen Periode unwillkuerlich von seiner tatsaechlichen Gegenwart die Ausdruckweise verlieh."¹⁾ Cornill joins him, although Sellin, Strack, and Kuenen make no reference to it in their discussion of the postmosaica.

We begin by pointing out the presence in this passage of the old form $\{ \aleph \aleph \}$, used for $\pi \{ \aleph \aleph \}$. This older form occurs throughout the Pentateuch²⁾ and serves as fine

1) Moeller, Echtheit und Einheit des Fuenfbuches Mosis, p. 109.

2) Cp. Genesis 19, 8, 25; 26, 3; Deuteronomy 4, 42; 7, 22; 19, 11.

testimony to the antiquity of the language employed. Then we point out that Leviticus 18, 24: "In all these things the nations are defiled which I cast out before you," really is to be translated: "which I am casting out before you," ($\text{אֲנִי מְטַהֵר אֶת הָאֲרָצָה לְפָנֶיךָ } \text{ וְאֶת הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי מְטַהֵר לְפָנֶיךָ}$). This verse, as well as 20, 23, where אֲנִי מְטַהֵר occurs again, definitely places the entire subject matter into the period of Moses and the conquest. Thus the difficulty alleged to inhere in verse 24 will disappear.

The time being thus definitely established as the Mosaic age, we point out that the verb used in verse 28: "as it spued out the nations which were before you," ($\text{וְהִטְהַרְתָּ אֶת הָאֲרָצָה}$), may very well be a participle active Qal, exactly parallel to the אֲנִי מְטַהֵר of verse 24. This verse need not, accordingly, refer to an age later than Moses.

Since according to the statement of verse 24 (אֲנִי מְטַהֵר) the Canaanite is still present in the land, and the time is thus established, there is no reason why we may not translate the verbs of verse 25 as indicating a logical rather than a temporal sequence. The verse would then read, in context: "Defile not yourselves in any of these things, ... so that the land is defiled, and I visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomit out her inhabitants." It is entirely natural and usual that three verbs in the Imperfect, with their corresponding waw consecutives ($\text{וְלֹא תִטְהַרְתֶּם וְלֹא תִטְהַרְתֶּם וְלֹא תִטְהַרְתֶּם}$) should indicate logical rather than temporal sequence.

The impression made by this threat would be all the more vivid in the minds of the people just at this time because it had in part already come to fulfillment in the case of the heathen in the land of Canaan.

A study of the text of the Pentateuch will reveal the fact that the term "stranger" is quite a common word and should occasion no surprise at this point of the narrative. It is found Exodus 12, 48; 22, 20; 23, 9; Leviticus 16, 29; 17, 8; 19, 33; Numbers 9, 14; 15, 14; Deuteronomy 10, 19; etc. Frequent also is the phrase: "the stranger who is within thy gates": Exodus 20, 10; Deuteronomy 5, 14; 14, 21; 24, 14. Exodus 12, 38 and Numbers 11, 4 tell us that there was a "mixed multitude" that followed Israel out of Egypt, and Deuteronomy 29, 11 speaks of the "stranger that is in thy camp, from the hewer of thy wood unto the drawer of thy water." Combine with the frequent occurrence of this and similar terms the consideration that Moses was here writing also for posterity and the Jews of all times to come, and the inclusion of the term "stranger" at this point should occasion no surprise.

NUMBERS 21, 1-3

"And when king Arad the Canaanite, which dwelt in the south, heard tell that Israel came by way of the spies; then he fought against Israel, and took some of them prisoners. And Israel vowed a vow unto the Lord, and said, If thou wilt indeed deliver this people into my hand, then I will utterly destroy their cities. And the Lord hearkened to the voice of Israel, and delivered up the Canaanites; and they utterly destroyed them and their cities: and he called the name of the place Hormah." -

This same city of Hormah is referred to in Numbers 14, 45: "Then the Amalekites came down, and the Canaanites which dwelt in that hill, and smote them, and discomfited them, even unto Hormah," and in Deuteronomy 1, 44: "And the Amorites, which dwelt in that mountain, came out against you, and chased you, as bees do, and destroyed you in Seir, even unto Hormah." Higher critics claim that these passages are anachronisms, because the name of that city during the time of Moses was Zephath and it first received the name Hormah in Judges 1, 17: "And Judas went out with Simeon his brother, and they slew the Canaanites that inhabited Zephath, and utterly destroyed it. And the name of the city was called Hormah." Strack lists the two latter passages containing the name Hormah as anachronisms and remarks: "Numeri 14, 25 und Deuteronomium 1, 44 steht dieser Name, dessen

Entstehung in spaetere Zeit faellt, siehe Richter 1, 17, proleptisch fuer Zephath."1)

The problem supposed to be contained in these passages will become clear if we consider the geography of the region involved. The southern boundary of Palestine consists of a chain of precipitous and almost impenetrable mountains. In the Pentateuch (Deuteronomy 1, 7. 19. 20. 41. 42) these hills are called "the mountain of the Amorites." The city Hormah-Zephath, according to Numbers 14, 45 quoted above, lay on the Palestinian side of the chain.

The situation, then, in the passage under discussion is this: Israel battling against the Amalekites and the Canaanites who dwelt in these mountains was able to defeat them up to and including the city of Hormah-Zephath. Their attempt to penetrate into the mountains was not successful; the Canaanites and the Amalekites came down out of the mountains and repulsed them to Hormah, which city according to Deuteronomy 1, 44 really belonged to Seir and not to Canaan in the strict sense of the term.

Even if, then, Israel was later able to capture Hormah-Zephath and exile its inhabitants, its chief purpose was still unattained. The power of king Arad was untouched, since his boundary was impenetrable. Therefore, according to Numbers 33, 40-41, Israel departed eastward in an attempt to circumvent the mountains.

1) Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 25ff.

This, then, being the case, that Israel left the region of Hormah-Zephath, and that the power of king Arad remained untouched, it can very well be understood, even without the reference in the Book of Judges, that the name of the city would soon change back to Zephath and that it would remain for a later day to restore Hormah. Joshua indeed penetrated into this territory, and the king of Hormah is listed as one of his captives (Joshua 12, 14). But it does not seem as though he captured the city; if he did, it was only for a time. It was not until the tribe of Simeon, to whom the city was allotted, together with Judah, sent an expedition into south Palestine that the city became the permanent property of Israel and Zephath became Hormah permanently. The fact that Simeon thus changed the name shows how vividly the people recalled the events of Moses' day and is not a contradiction of the Pentateuch but rather a substantiation of its statements.

There remains one difficulty: The city is called Hormah in Numbers 14, 45, while the event which gave it this name is first recorded in Numbers 21, 1-3. This seems to be an intentional and significant prolepsis, pointing, as Hengstenberg remarks "darauf, dass beide Begebenheiten unter derselben Idee standen, der Ort schon durch das Gericht ueber das Haus Gottes geheiligt worden war, ehe er von dem Gerichte ueber die Welt seinen Namen erhielt. Die nominelle Prolepsis weist hin auf die reelle."1)

1) Authenticie des Pentateuchs, II, 223.

NUMBERS 21, 14

"Wherefore it is said in the book of the wars of the Lord, what he did in the Red Sea, and in the brooks of Arnon." - "Daher spricht man in dem Buch von den Streiten des Herrn: Das Vaheb in Suphah und die Baeche am Arnon."

Higher criticism objects to this passage on two scores:

1. It claims that a book of this nature would hardly be possible at the time of Moses, since the victories of the people of God, with the sole exception of the victory over the Amalekites, had just begun a few months before. 2. It believes that it would be altogether unthinkable that a very recent book should be cited in proof of the geographical assertion made in the preceding verse: "Arnon is the border of Moab, between Moab and the Amorites." - Spinoza and Vater are among the early critics to attack this passage. Voltaire says of it: "How could Moses quote the wars of the Lord, when these wars and lost books were subsequent to his time?"¹⁾ Reuss affirms that the wars of the Lord began only in the last years of the life of Moses, and that materials could have been furnished only for such a book while the Israelites were still far from Jordan. Strack, while conceding that the portion quoted from the book of the wars of the Lord is of ancient date, believes that the section of the Pentateuch in which it is quoted is neither written by Moses nor

1) Dictionnaire Philosophique, Vol. IV, p. 65; quoted in MacDill, The Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch, p. 35ff.

of the text itself. $\text{ל} \overline{\text{ל}}$ seems to be a nomen proprium because it is unusual to have the letter ל in first position in classical Hebrew.¹⁾ The $\overline{\text{ל}} \overline{\text{ל}} \overline{\text{ל}}$ has its parallel in Nahum 1, 3: "The Lord hath His way in the whirlwinds and in the storm, $\overline{\text{ל}} \overline{\text{ל}} \overline{\text{ל}}$, and the clouds are the dust of His feet." According to this interpretation Numbers 21, 14 is the confession of the Jewish people, acknowledging all that God has done for them. By virtue of His Presence in their midst they can move forward relentlessly and irresistibly. All that opposes them, He overthrows.

We turn to the first objection, the claim that such a book could not have existed in the time of Moses. The denial of the existence of the book on the grounds that the wars of the Lord had not yet taken place furnishes an example of the ignoring of Jewish history. There were many wars before the Israelites came to Jordan.

1. There was the war at the Red Sea, where the Lord did all the fighting and where, after the fighting was over, Israel sang songs in honor of the conqueror: "The Lord is a man of war" (Exodus 15, 3); "Sing ye to the Lord, for He hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and the rider hath He thrown into the sea," (Exodus 15, 21). Here was material for the book of the wars of the Lord.

1) Compare the identification of $\overline{\text{ל}}$ in Ezekiel 27, 19 as a location in Arabia.

2. Then there was the war of the Amalekites, which took place less than three months after the exodus. Joshua led the Israelites in battle. Moses, together with Aaron and Hur sat on the top of a hill. Aaron and Hur held up the arms of Moses to grant the victory to Israel, until Amalek was discomfited (Exodus 17, 8-13). Here was material for the book of the wars of the Lord.

3. After this came the war against Hormah, where a southern tribe of Canaanites made an attack on the Israelites and captured some of them. The tide of war was first against the Israelites, but after Israel had made a vow unto the Lord, He gave them the victory and in the end destroyed their assailants and their cities (Numbers 21, 1-3). Here was material for the book of the wars of the Lord.

4. The fourth attack was with Sihon, the king of the Amorites, who made an attack on the Israelites. But they smote him and his people and took their cities and lands. (Numbers 21, 21-30).

5. After this Og, the king of Bashan, and all his people went out to Edrei to battle against Israel. With the help of the Lord they smote him and his people, and took possession of his country (Numbers 21, 33-35). Again, more material for the book of the wars of the Lord.

6. The sixth war was with the Midianites. In accordance with the direction of Moses, twelve thousand Hebrew warriors went against them, slew all the males, burnt all their cities and castles, and took many captives and flocks and herds (Numbers 31, 1-47).

Then, too, we must remember that according to the Biblical usage the concept "wars of the Lord" is much wider than appears in English. This becomes clear if we consider a few passages: "The Lord shall fight for you, and ye shall hold your peace," (Exodus 14, 14), spoken very shortly before Moses lifted up his rod and divided the Red Sea so that Israel could pass through safely. "For the Lord fighteth for them against the Egyptians" (14, 25). "The Lord is a man of war: the Lord is His name. Pharaoh's chariots and his host hath he cast into the sea: his chosen captains also are drowned in the Red sea" (Exodus 15, 3-4). Compare also the language used in Exodus 12, 41. 51 and Numbers 33, 1. For when we are told that Israel marched toward Canaan $\Pi \Omega \times \underline{1} \underline{y} - \underline{3} \underline{y}$, "with their armies", the idea lies in the background that the Lord precedes them as leader of those armies. Thus the concept "wars of the Lord" includes not only actual military victories, but everything by which the Lord cared for His people in the wilderness, as, for example, the finding of the well in verse 16 of this chapter.

There was, accordingly, abundant material for the preparation of a "book of the wars of the Lord." It is true that some of the wars took place near the end of the life of Moses, but not all were that late. Perhaps Moses was the author of the book of the wars of the Lord. It appears that

he was divinely recognized to be the most suitable person to write such a book (Exodus 17, 14). At all events, it is shown that the wars of the Lord began before Israel was fairly out of Egypt. Exodus 17, 14, immediately after the victory over Amalek and three months after the Exodus Moses is commanded to "write this for a memorial in a book, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua." In those three months, forty years before the death of Moses, two famous wars, the Egyptian and the Amalekite wars had been finished and were already celebrated in song and history. The contention, then, that a book of the wars of the Lord could have been written only after the death of Moses is groundless.

NUMBERS 32, 41

"And Jair the son of Manasseh went and took the small towns thereof, and called them Havoth-jair." - "Jair, the son of Manasseh took all the country of Argob unto the coasts of Geshuri and Maachathi and called them after his own name, Bashan-havoth-jair, unto this day." (Deuteronomy 3, 14).

Higher critics compare these two passages from the Pentateuch with the statement given in Judges 10, 3-4: "And after him (in the list of the Judges) arose Jair, a Gileadite, and judged Israel twenty and two years. And he had thirty sons that rode on thirty ass colts, and they had thirty cities, which are called Havoth-jair unto this day, which are in the land of Gilead." The contention is that the cities which received the name Havoth-jair in the time of the judges are represented in the Pentateuch as having been thus named in the time of Moses, - a clear case of anachronism, since the author of the Pentateuch transposed into the Mosaic age a man who really lived much later. Among the first of the critics to attack this passage was Vater. Strack also lists Numbers 32, 41 in his suspected passages, but gives no reason for his opinion.¹⁾ Bleek states:

Halten wir uns aber auch an die Darstellung des Pentateuchs, so wuerde diese Besitznahme der Gegend durch den Jair und folglich auch die Benennung derselben nach seinem Namen erst in die allerletzte Zeit von

1) Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 25ff.

Moses Leben fallen koennen, und auf keinen Fall hatte Moses dies hier auf eine solche Weise anfuehren koennen: "er nannte Basan nach seinem Namen Doerfer Jairs bis auf diesen Tag." Dieses setzt notwendig voraus, dasz seit dieser Namengebung bereits eine geraume Zeit abgelaufen war.¹⁾

If we grant for the time being that one of the passages, either that of Judges or that of the Pentateuch, must be given up, we would in the face of powerful evidence be forced to declare ourselves in favor of the passage in Numbers. The reasons are as follows:

1. Already the name $\text{גַּי} \text{אֶרֶץ}$ points to an early age, as does also the use of $\text{אֶרֶץ} \text{אֲשֶׁר} \text{בְּאֶרֶץ}$ (Deuteronomy 4, 13-14), a term used later only once, in a poetical section (Zephaniah 2, 5-6) in the sense of "region, land."

$\text{גַּי} \text{אֶרֶץ}$ is closely connected with $\text{אֶרֶץ} \text{אֲשֶׁר}$, Eve; though originally a proper name, this term later became a nomen proprium for certain specific cities. It is equal to the $\text{אֶרֶץ} \text{אֲשֶׁר}$ in $\text{אֶרֶץ} \text{אֲשֶׁר} \text{בְּאֶרֶץ}$ found in 2 Samuel 23, 13. (In 1 Chronicles 11, 15: $\text{אֶרֶץ} \text{אֲשֶׁר} \text{בְּאֶרֶץ}$).

2. The genealogy of Jair as it is given in 1 Chronicles 2, 21 places Jair directly into the Mosaic age. Jair and Zelophehad are both grandsons of Machir, the former through a daughter of Machir who married Hezron, a man of Judah, and gave birth to Segub the father of Jair, the latter in direct male succession (Numbers 27, 1). Zelophehad, we are told, died during the wanderings in the wilderness, a man of advanced years, for he left grown children. It would be very difficult to imagine Jair living all the way into the days of the judges.

1) Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 214.

3. Entirely independent of the Pentateuch we have a testimony to its accuracy in Joshua 19, 34, where we find a reference to "Judah upon Jordan toward the sunrising." What are we to have in mind when we read these words? According to the genealogy in Chronicles Jair was of the tribe of Manasseh through his mother, but of Judah through his father. Generally he was spoken of as being of Manasseh, possibly because his father was illegitimate (Judges 11, 1-2), or because his inheritance lay separated from that land of the tribe of Judah, or possibly for some reason of which we are not aware at this time. If now there is according to the testimony of the book of Joshua a "Judah upon Jordan toward the sunrising" already at the time of the division of the land east of Jordan, we must place Jair, to whose presence there the statement of the book of Joshua refers, into the age of Moses. As a matter of fact, if there ever was a "Judah upon Jordan toward the sunrising," we must arrive at the same result. For since no changes were made later in the land assigned to each tribe, the people of cisjordanic Judah must have taken possession in the time of Moses.

4. The presence of a Jair in the days of Moses is substantiated by the direct testimony of Joshua 13, 30-31: "And their coast was from Mahanaim, all Bashan, and all the towns of Jair, which are in Bashan, threescore cities: And half Gilead, and Ashtaroth, and Edrei, cities of the kingdom

of Og in Bashan, were pertaining unto the children of Machir the son of Manasseh, even to the one half of the children of Machir by their families." Here the Havoth-jair are mentioned as being present at the time that Moses divided the land east of Jordan.

It has been shown that if these passages must be understood as being in conflict with each other, we would have to accept the passage in the Pentateuch as being the correct one. But it can be shown that there is really no such contradiction and that Judges 10, 34, far from contradicting Moses, substantiates Numbers and Deuteronomy.

The presence of two Jairs in one and the same region, both ruling over cities, would cause us concern only then, if they were totally unrelated to one another. But it can be shown that the one passage here stands in a causal relation to the other and leads up to it. It is not at all uncommon that the names of illustrious ancestors, especially if they are names of honor (Jair means "der Glaenzende, der Herrliche") will be applied to descendants. This may be done in the hope that children so named will show the same traits as did their illustrious forbear, or that they will reflect distinction and glory upon the family name, or for various reasons. In our day this tendency must restrict itself to the first names of people, but in the Mosaic age it could enjoy free exercise in the entire range of personal names. People took abundant advantage of this

privilege, especially if there was close connection between the various branches of a family. Thus, for example, the relatives of Zechariah thought it preposterous that that priest of the Lord should choose a name not known already in his family (Luke 1, 61) - A striking example of this practise is present in Judges 10, 1, where we read of "Tola the son of Puah." Both names have already occurred in Genesis 46, 13: "And the sons of Issachar: Tola and Phuvah." As the existence of Tola and Puah in the days of the judges is a proof for the existence of Tola and Phuvah in the days of the patriarchs, so the mention of Jair in Judges 10 is a substantiation of the correctness of Numbers and Deuteronomy.

There remains only the problem: According to Judges the Havoth-jair were named after the judge Jair, while according to the Pentateuch they derived their name from the Mosaic Jair. We can well imagine that through the work and activity of the second Jair, who possessed the traits and characteristics of the first, the name Havoth-jair again came into its own after having become a nomen vanum, since the memory of the people no longer had any direct recollections of the first Jair. Thus there need be no charges of anachronism against these passages of the Pentateuch.

DEUTERONOMY 1, 1

"These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel on this side Jordan in the wilderness, in the plain over against the Red Sea, between Paran, and Tophel, and Laban, and Hazeroth, and Dizahab."

The phrase used in the Hebrew for "on this side Jordan" is $\text{לְעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן}$. See also 1, 5; 3, 8; 4, 41. 46. 47. 49. There can be no doubt that these passages speak of the land east of Jordan. The critics now claim that Moses could not have written these words, for he had never been across the Jordan into the land properly called Palestine, but had only set foot on the land east of the Jordan, Perea. Therefore he would not be able to refer to the latter country as being "across the Jordan." The phrase $\text{לְעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן}$, the critics claim, thus presupposes an author who lived after the death of Moses and crossed the Jordan with the rest of the people of Israel. Aben Ezra first called attention to this difficulty. Nikolaus de Lyra and Spinoza followed in his footsteps. In more recent times Strack lists Deuteronomy 1, 1 as one of the anachronisms which he has found.¹⁾ Bleek remarks: "Offenbar geschrieben von einem, der sich diesseits des Jordan befand, also erst nach dem Tode des Moses und nach der Besitznahme des Landes Kanaan durch die Israeliten."²⁾

1) Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 25ff.

2) Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 213.

First of all, it can be shown that Moses used the phrase $\text{לְעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן}$ also of the country west of the Jordan. In Deuteronomy 3, 20, after he has spoken in v. 8 of the country east of the Jordan, Moses tells the children of Reuben and Gad living there that they should leave their women and their cattle in the cities and proceed as an army before their brethren "until the Lord have given rest to your brethren, as well as unto you, and until they also possess the land which the Lord your God has given them beyond Jordan." So also in verse twenty five of the same chapter and in 11, 30. In fact, there is one case where in the same verse the identical phrase, $\text{לְעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן}$, is used first of the western bank and then of the eastern bank of the Jordan. Numbers 32, 19 the same Gadites and Reubenites say to Moses: "For we will not inherit with them on yonder side Jordan ($\text{לְעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן}$), or forward; because our inheritance is fallen to us on this side Jordan ($\text{לְעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן}$) eastward." These passages show clearly that the Hebrew phrase may designate either the land west or east of the Jordan. This follows from the etymological significance of the term. The Hebrew word really means "Uebergang", "crossing", and it is by virtue of this root meaning that the phrase $\text{לְעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן}$ or $\text{לְעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן}$ means the land on the other side of Jordan and may refer either to the western or eastern bank.

But is not all this very confusing? We answer: It is not, if you keep the basic conception in mind. לְיָמֵינוּ , לְיָמֵי הַיּוֹם , לְיָמֵי הַבָּיִת always mean "on the other side", but these words may at times be used from different viewpoints, either according to the simple, objective geographical meaning or according to the subjective position of the speaker or writer. This can, of course, only take place at a time when the objective geographical designations have not been fixed as yet, and that is the case in the Book of Joshua. At the time Israel did not as yet have a firm hold upon Canaan. Although Moses in general follows the objective usage of the language and identifies "across Jordan" as the country east of that river, he can and does make use of the freedom to speak of the land west of the Jordan as being "across Jordan", as it in fact is when viewed from the standpoint of the writer. It is only after Palestine proper had been permanently conquered by Israel that the term "beyond Jordan" became the standard widely used name for Perea.

There are abundant examples of similar occurrences, so that the explanation offered in the case of Deuteronomy 1, 1 is by no means an isolated example. In Nehemiah 2, 7 Nehemiah in Persia asks the King of Persia for letters to the governors לְיָמֵינוּ לְיָמֵי הַיּוֹם , and in verse 9 of the same chapter he relates that he came to the governors לְיָמֵינוּ לְיָמֵי הַיּוֹם , although he at the time was on the same side of Jordan as they. Portugal speaks of a region Traz os Montes. The former kingdom

by?
2
fulm.

har =
hatis | ?

DEUTERONOMY 2, 12

"The Horims also dwelt in Seir beforetime; but the children of Esau succeeded them, when they had destroyed them from before them, and dwelt in their stead; as Israel did unto the land of his possession, which the Lord gave unto them."

Analytic critics claim that this passage refers to the occupation of Canaan as an accomplished fact and therefore could not have been written by Moses. Sellin says: "Erst nach der Okkupation denkbar."¹⁾ Bleek remarks: "Auch dieses setzt deutlich eine Zeit voraus, wo die Israeliten sich bereits in Besitz des Landes gesetzt und daraus die dasselbe bewohnenden Voelker vertrieben hatten, also eine Zeit nach Moses."²⁾ Cornill, Kuenen, Baumgaertel, and Koenig likewise reject this passage as being postmosaic. Strack omits it altogether from his list of suspected passages.

Moeller suggests that the phrase "as Israel did unto the land of his possession" be taken prophetically:

Die Erfuellung dieser goettlichen Verheissung an Israel ist eine so feste, unumstoeszliche Sache, dasz sie Deuteronomium 2, 12 durch das perfectum propheticum ausgedrueckt wird. Die Besetzung ist eine schon so gut wie geschehene Tatsache, wofuer sich aus den prophetischen Schriften zahllose Analogien beibringen lassen.³⁾

-
- 1) Moeller, Die Echtheit und Einheit der fuenf Buecher Mosis, p. 106.
 - 2) Einleitung in Das Alte Testament, p. 212.
 - 3) Echtheit und Einheit der fuenf Buecher Mosis, p. 108.

We cannot deny that this explanation is theoretically possible. But we need not bind ourselves to it, since there are several glorious conquests made before the death of Moses to which the words of Deuteronomy 2, 12 could well refer. First of all, the Israelites had destroyed the Amorites, taken their land and dwelt in their cities and villages, (Numbers 21, 23-31). Next, they destroyed Og, the king of Bashan, and his people. The record states that they left none of his sons or his people alive, and possessed his land (Numbers 21, 33-35). The subjugation of the *Midianite* Canaanites furnished a third example of conquest and spoliation. Israel made war upon them, killed the men, took the women and children captive, burnt the cities and castles, and seized the cattle, sheep, and goods, (Numbers 31, 1-12). By the time of Moses' death all east Palestine had been subdued, and with his consent and under his direction had been divided among the two and a half tribes. During the last two years of Moses' life the south Canaanites, the Amorites, and Midianites were destroyed; King Arad, King Sihon, King Og, and five kings of Midian were slain, their armies annihilated, their cities burned, their goods plundered, and their lands (except those of the Midianites) seized, divided, and held as permanent possessions. In this way was treated the whole transjordanic region. In view of these facts Moses might well say orally as well as in writing: "As Israel did unto the land of his possession, which the Lord gave unto them."

The translation of the King James version: "As Israel did ($\pi \dot{\psi} \dot{\psi}$) unto the land of his possession" offers some opportunity for misunderstanding. The key lies in the words of Deuteronomy 3, 21-22: "Thine eyes have seen all that the Lord your God hath done ($\pi \dot{\psi} \dot{\psi}$) unto these two kings: so shall the Lord do unto all the kingdoms whither thou passest. Ye shall not fear them, for the Lord your God, He shall fight for you." Really we would expect the same phraseology in Deuteronomy 2, 12: "hath done and shall do." The future is viewed as being so firmly rooted in the past that beginning and end are comprehended into one phrase. The preterite in Deuteronomy 2, 12 is only partly prophetic. It refers at one and the same time to the future and to the past conquest of the transjordan country. - The very use of such a term, incidentally, is an argument in favor of the authenticity of this passage. A later writer would be very careful to inject nothing into a passage which, like Deuteronomy 2, is to comfort and console Israel that could stir up even a shadow of doubt in the minds of the people.

DEUTERONOMY 3, 11

"For only Og king of Bashan remained of the remnant of giants; behold, his bedstead was a bedstead of iron; is it not in Rabbath of the children of Ammon? nine cubits was the length thereof, and four cubits the breadth of it, after the cubit of a man."

This passage has been attacked from the very beginning: critics claim that though Og, the giant king was killed in the last year of Moses' life, in this passage his bedstead is referred to as a thing of antiquity, and that therefore the passage must have been written long after Mosaic times. Already Spinoza attacked it; he was followed by Peyrerius, Geddes, and Vater. Strack comments on this passage: "Von Og, dem Koenig Basans, und seinem eisernen Bett hat Moses im vierzigsten Jahr des Auszugs schwerlich so wie Deuteronomium 3, 11 gesprochen, da seine Hoerer diesen Koenig in demselben Jahr besiegt und getoetet hatten."¹⁾ Bleek says: "Die Besiegung des riesenhaften Koenigs ... wuerde danach ins vierzigste Jahr des Zuges fallen, wenige Monate vor dem Tod des Moses. Da aber hatte Moses sicher nicht so bald nachher sich ueber den Sarg dieses Koenigs auf solche Weise ausdruecken koennen, wie hier geschieht; es wird hier davon offenbar wie von einer noch erhaltenen Antiquitaet gesprochen."²⁾

1) Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 25ff.
2) Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 214.

The basis of the argument in the case is wholly imaginary. There is not one word in the passage to indicate that the iron bedstead had been a very old one, or that Og had been a long time dead. Even the formula "unto this day" is not to be found here. The only thing mentioned as extraordinary is the size of the bedstead, and this is adduced merely to prove that Og was truly a giant. For anything that is said in this passage, the bedstead may not have been a year older than when its gigantic owner last lay upon it. Its antiquity is wholly an achievement of the critical imagination.

But, we ask: Did not the contemporaries of Moses already know that Og was really a giant? If it is doubtful whether many of the contemporaries of Moses were very well acquainted with this giant's extraordinary size, that in itself would justify the inclusion of this remark. But Moses tells us very definitely that he is not writing merely for his contemporaries, but for the generations to come. Exodus 17, 14: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial in a book, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua." Deuteronomy 31, 26: "Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee. For I know thy rebellion and thy stiff neck: behold, while I am yet alive with you this day, ye have been rebellious against the Lord; and how much more after my death?" .. And if one were

to object that Moses should write only that which pertained to his contemporaries, why impugn just this one phrase? Why not attack the whole story of the wars against Sihon and Og, who lived at the very time of Moses?

The purpose of the reference to the size of Og's bed is to portray vividly the size of the vanquished enemy and the grace of God which enabled Israel to overcome him. The reference is put in the form of a question not to request information, but because the event was so well known that only a reference to it was needed to call it to the mind of the reader. Compare the parallel in Judges 6, 13: "Did not the Lord bring us up from Egypt?" and in Deuteronomy 11, 30: "Are they not (Mount Ebal and Mount Gerizim) on the other side Jordan, by the way where the sun goeth down, in the land of the Canaanites which dwell in the champaign over against Gilgal, beside the plains of Moreh?"

DEUTERONOMY 3, 14

"Unto this day."

The phrase "unto this day" is employed quite often in the Pentateuch, and it is cited by the higher critics to prove that many of the passages in which it is found cannot have been written in the time of Moses. They claim that the phrase suggests that a period of many years intervened between the age of Moses and the passages containing this formula. The following passage from Deuteronomy may serve as an example (3, 14): "Jair the son of Manasseh took all the country of Argob unto the coasts of Geshuri and Maachathi; and called them after his own name Bashan-havoth-jair, unto this day." It is claimed that the phrase "unto this day" here means that a long period of time elapsed previous to the time of the writer, and that if Moses lived only a short time after the event took place, he could not have been the author of this passage. Reuss says: "The formula always implies the notion of antiquity."¹⁾

A close examination of the usage of the phrase "unto this day" will show this notion to be altogether false. Genesis 19, 37-38: "Moab: the same is the father of the Moabites unto this day; ... Benammi: the same is the father of the children of Ammon unto this day." It can hardly be said that the main purpose of the phrase here is to connote

1) L'Histoire Sainte, Int. p. 130; quoted in MacDill, The Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch, p. 50

that Moab and Benammi have been fathers for a long time. Genesis 48, 15: "The God which fed me all my life long unto this day." Here "unto this day" refers to the present time. The past is indeed referred to, but is expressed by the words "all my life long." Numbers 22, 30: "Am I not thine ass, upon which thou hast ridden ever since I was thine unto this day?" The phrase "unto this day" cannot refer to antiquity or even to a long period; it was but a few years at best that the ass was in the possession of Balaam, and this fact is expressed by the words "ever since I was thine." Whether the ass spoke Hebrew or not makes no difference; we have the record in Hebrew, and there is no reason to assume that it is not good Hebrew usage. Joshua 22, 3: "Ye have not left your brethren these many days unto this day." The time here referred to is the period taken by the occupation of Canaan, about seven years. This period is covered by the phrase "these many years," while "unto this day" refers as usual to present time. 1 Samuel 29, 6. 8 Achish said to David: "I have not found evil in thee since the day of thy coming unto me unto this day." David answers: "What hast thou found in thy servant so long as I have been with thee unto this day?" The formula "unto this day" again means as much as "up to the present time," while the preceding time is again taken care of by other words. In this case the period so designated is only a year and four months, for that is the time David spent in the land of the Philistines (1 Samuel 27, 7). 1 Samuel 12, 2: "I have walked before you

from my childhood unto this day." Here once more not antiquity, not a long period, but a single lifetime is meant, and that is expressed by the phrase "from my childhood unto the present time."

430 It being thus established that the phrase "unto this day" does not in and of itself refer to a long period of time, and since between the events recorded in Genesis and the time of the death of Moses a period of at least thirty years, if not more, intervened, we can dismiss as invalid all charges of anachronism in the case of the occurrence of "unto this day" in the Book of Genesis. These are: 19, 37-38, quoted above; 22, 14: "As it is said to this day, In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen"; 26, 33: "Therefore the children of Israel eat not of the sinew which shrank, which is upon the hollow of the thigh, unto this day"; 35, 20: "That is the pillar of Rachel's grave unto this day"; 47, 26: "Joseph made it a law over the land of Egypt unto this day." We can here include the passage in Deuteronomy 2, 22: The sons of Esau "succeeded them (the Horims) and dwelt in their stead, even unto this day." Shorter still is the period of time involved in Deuteronomy 10, 8: "At that time the Lord separated the tribe of Levi, to bear the ark of the covenant of the Lord, to stand before the Lord to minister unto him, and to bless in his name, unto this day," but it is still long enough to allow the

phrase "unto this day" to seem appropriate. "Unto this day" does not occur in Exodus, Leviticus, or Numbers. There is one passage left, Deuteronomy 3, 14: "Jair the son of Manasseh took all the country of Argob unto the coasts of Geshuri and Maachathi; and called them after his own name Bashan-havoth-jair, unto this day."

1. First of all, we must establish the time at which the conquest of Argob took place. Numbers 32, 39-42 makes it seem as though the occupation of Machir and Jair took place only after the apportionment of the land on the east side of Jordan. But if we carefully consider Deuteronomy 3, 4-6: "And we took all his cities at that time, there was not a city which we took not from them, threescore cities, all the region of Argob, the kingdom of Og in Bashan," and compare it with the statements of 3, 14 quoted above, we conclude that the occupation of Israel and of Jair are simultaneous. It is thus apparent that the time intervening between the actual conquest of the region of Argob and its naming and the statement of 3, 14 is not as close as may appear at first glance.

2. We must take into consideration the character of the event in question, when determining whether a certain period of time is long or short. For certain events an objectively rather short period of time is quite long indeed, and vice versa. Now there are countless cases on record in which a name ascribed to a locality simply was not adopted. We have an instance of that in Numbers 32, 38, where Israel gave the name Nebo to a certain city, but that name was not able to

assert itself and displace the older designation. The crucial period in the introduction of a new name is the first few months; if these are safely weathered, the outlook is bright. Thus it is not out of place to record, even a few months after the introduction of a new name, that it was able to prevail. - Then, there is more than merely a name that is here to remain: the matter goes somewhat deeper. If the enemy had been able to snatch the region of Argob from Jair, or if Moses had not ratified his conquest, both his possession as well as its name would have vanished.

3. The matter becomes clearer if we consider the context in which this passage is placed. Deuteronomy very definitely begins a new section; the long title bears testimony to that fact. To this present, all that precedes, whether in the immediate or more distant past, forms a contrast and appears simply as "past". Our judgment of an occurrence of "unto this day" in Deuteronomy must differ considerably from that of an instance, for example, at the end of Numbers.

If of all the instances in which "unto this day" occurs in the Pentateuch only one, and that one only apparently, refers to a day later than Moses, we are justified in demanding much stronger proof before we accept the presence of anachronisms in the Pentateuch.

DEUTERONOMY 17, 14-15

"When thou art come to the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and shalt possess it, and shalt dwell therein, and shalt say, I will set a king over me, like as all the nations that are about me; thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose: one from among the brethren shalt thou set king over thee: thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, which is not thy brother."

Critics claim that when the proposal of the children in later days to set up a monarchy "displeased Samuel, ... and Samuel prayed unto the Lord," and the Lord then gave him the command: "Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee," (1 Samuel 8, 6-7) there is present a clear indication that the words ascribed to Moses in Deuteronomy 17, 14-15 were not known at the time of Samuel and consequently must have arisen later, very likely in the period of the monarchy. Sellin remarks: "Auch das Koenigsgesetz, Deuteronomium 17, 14-20, ist unbekannt nicht blosz 1 Samuelis 8, 7, sondern auch 10, 25"; and in another connection he states that this passage, "wenn mosaisch, das Benehmen Samuels 1 Samuelis 8, 6ff. und die Abfassung eines Koenigsgesetzes durch ihn 1 Samuelis 10, 25 ausschlieszen wuerde."1)

1) Moeller, Die Echtheit und Einheit der fuenf Buecher Mosis, p. 80.

Bleek states:

Das Koenigtum war in der urspruenglichen Anlage des theokratischen Staates der Israeliten nicht gegruendet; und, als es nachher eingefuehrt ward, erscheint es als etwas Fremdartiges und wider den Willen Jehovas Hinzukommendes, als etwas, durch dessen Begehren die Israeliten eine Verwerfung Jehovas, als ihres eigentlichen Koenigs aussprachen (1 Samuelis 8, 7). ... Immerhin erscheint die Annahme unnatuorlich, dasz Moses sollte Verordnungen erteilt haben fuer eine solche Regierungsweise, die mit den von ihm gegruendeten theokratischen Einrichtungen gar nicht im Zusammenhang stand und welche er selbst nicht wollte eingefuehrt wissen. Waere ein solches Gesetz als mosaisch vorhanden gewesen, so haette Samuel sich nicht so lange straeuben koennen, den Israeliten ihr Verlangen nach einem Koenige zu bewilligen; sie wuerden hoechstwahrscheinlich auch schon frueher, in der so vielfaeltig bedraengten Periode der Richter, nach einem Koenige Verlangen getragen und ihn ueber sich gesetzt haben.¹⁾

Strack, Kuenen, and Cornill omit all reference to the passage.

We advance first of all a series of internal reasons which speak for the antiquity of Deuteronomy 17. Already the introductory words: "When thou art come unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee," indicate that we are here dealing with a very old section; and even if nothing else be granted, this verse tells us at least that Deuteronomy wishes to be considered mosaic. Then, verse 16 of the same chapter of Deuteronomy speaks of horses: "But he shall not multiply horses to himself, nor cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that they might multiply horses, for the Lord hath said unto you, Ye shall henceforth return no more that way." The wish of ^{Moses} Samuel here expressed, that

1) Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 217.

"But the thing displeased Samuel," (7 17 17 17 17 17)

28 17 17 17 17 17). Verse 7: "And the Lord said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee,"

(17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17). Verse 9: "Now therefore hearken unto their voice." Verse 22: "And the Lord said unto Samuel, Hearken unto their voice." Chapter 12, verse 1: "And Samuel said unto all Israel, Behold, I have hearkened unto your voice in all that ye said unto me." - Note that the similarity of language goes hand in hand with a similarity in thought. In both cases a subjectively sinful action is declared as being, objectively considered, in harmony with the ultimate purpose of God.

Equally clear are the parallels of language existing between 1 Samuel 8, 5: "Now make us a king to judge us like all the nations," (17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17)

17 17 17 17 17 17), and the beginning words of the code of laws contained in Deuteronomy 17 itself: "Thou shalt say, I will set a king over me, like as all the nations that are about me," (17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17). - Parallel also are Deuteronomy 17, 15: "Thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose," and 1 Samuel 10, 24: "See ye him whom the Lord hath chosen," (17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17).

Following the order of the books of Samuel, we find also the following parallels: 1 Samuel 8, 7: "They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should

not reign over them," compared with Exodus 16, 8: "For that the Lord heareth your murmurings which ye murmur against Him: and what are we? your murmurings are not against us, but against the Lord." - 1 Samuel 9, 16: "I have looked upon My people, because their cry is come unto Me," compared with Exodus 2, 23: "Their cry came up unto God by reason of their bondage." - 1 Samuel 10, 25: "Then Samuel told the people the manner of the kingdom and wrote it in a book, and laid it up before the Lord," compared with Deuteronomy 18, 3: lit. "manner of the priests," and Numbers 17, 22: $\Pi \text{ } \overline{\text{J}} \text{ } \overline{\text{L}}$
 $\Pi \text{ } \overline{\text{Y}} \text{ } \overline{\text{N}}$ $\overline{\text{J}} \text{ } \overline{\text{D}} \text{ } \overline{\text{Z}}$. - 1 Samuel 12, 3: "Witness against me before the Lord, and before his anointed: whose ox have I taken? Or whom have I defrauded? whom have I oppressed? or of whose hand have I received any bribe to blind mine eyes therewith? and I will restore it unto you," compared with Numbers 16, 15: "And Moses was very wroth and said unto the Lord, Respect not thou their offering: I have not taken one ass from them, neither have I hurt one of them."

In addition, there are several passages of the Pentateuch in which warning is given against the very same sins which Samuel condemns in chapter eight, in the same words which Samuel employs: Leviticus 5, 23 (6, 4): "He shall restore that which he took violently away," $\text{P} \overline{\text{U}} \overline{\text{Y}} \text{ } \overline{\text{V}} \overline{\text{S}} \text{ } \text{P} \overline{\text{U}} \overline{\text{V}} \overline{\text{N}} \text{ } \overline{\text{N}} \overline{\text{S}}$; Numbers 35, 31: "Ye shall take no satisfaction for the life of a murderer ($\overline{\text{V}} \overline{\text{D}} \text{ } \overline{\text{C}}$ $\overline{\text{N}} \overline{\text{P}} \overline{\text{S}}$ $\overline{\text{S}} \text{ } \overline{\text{Z}}$), which is guilty of death: but he shall surely be put to death"; Leviticus 20, 4: "And if the people of the land do any ways hide their

did formerly, verse 10: "We have sinned, because we have forsaken the Lord"), Nay; but a king shall reign over us: when the Lord your God was your king."

It is interesting to note that this is the interpretation of older Lutheran dogmaticians and exegetes. Quenstedt says:

Non improbatur deo per se postulatio regis, multo minus status et officium regum ... ; sed ex accidenti, quia procedebat ex principio pessimo et coniuncta erat cum pessimis accidentibus, qualia sunt gentilitium, fastidium et contentus divinae ordinationis, temeraria audacia in nova regiminis forma praescribenda.¹⁾

1) theol. did. pol. p. IV, p. 426; quoted in Hengstenberg, Authenticité des Pentateuques, II, 253.

DEUTERONOMY 34

Already the homilies of Clement listed the last chapter of Deuteronomy, containing the story of Moses' death and the lamentation over his body, as a reason against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Bleek remarks in connection with his discussion of the postmosaica:

Josephus, Ant. IV, 8, 48 und Philo, De vita Mosis, III gehen zwar so weit, dass sie auch die Abfassung dieses Abschnittes dem Moses zuschreiben, der denselben im prophetischen Geiste niedergeschrieben habe, und dem sind auch manche andere gefolgt; doch halten bei weitem die meisten, welche sonst den ganzen Pentateuch dem Moses beilegen, dieses Kapitel fuer einen spaeteren Zusatz. ... Allein, dass dieser Abschnitt erst aus einer bedeutend spaeteren Zeit sein koenne, zeigen Ausdruecke wie v. 6: "Kein Mensch kennet sein Grabmal bis auf diesen Tag."¹⁾

Luther also expressed himself on this last chapter of the Pentateuch. In connection with a discussion of Genesis 36, 31 he remarks:

Diesen Zusatz hat ein anderer gemacht, wie das letzte Stueck im fuenften Buche Mose. Denn er hat ja von sich selber nicht gesagt 5 Mose 34, 10: "Und es stund hinfort kein Prophet in Israel auf wie Mose, den der Herr erkannt haette von Angesicht." Item, andere Dinge mehr, so daselbst vom Grabe Mosis erzaeht werden. Es waere denn, dass du sagen wolltest, dass er solches durch einen prophetischen Geist zuvor gesehen und geweissagt haette.²⁾

In discussing Deuteronomy 31 he states: "Und so beschliesst Moses seine Predigt in diesem Kapitel. Denn das 32. Kapitel enthaelt dieses Lied, das 33. Kapitel die Segenswuensche;

1) Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 215.

2) Saemtliche Werke, Saint Louis Edition, II, 1010.

das 34. Kapitel kann Moses nicht geschrieben haben."1)
He repeats this view when he takes up Deuteronomy 34 and says: "Dieses Kapitel hat Moses nicht geschrieben, sondern Josua oder Eleazar, es sei denn, du wolltest sagen, er habe seinen Tod, da er ihn ja vorher wusste, auf diese Weise beschrieben."2)

It is indeed true, as Luther admits, that Moses may have written this final chapter in prophecy, but it seems more likely that another prominent man, most likely Joshua (cp. Joshua 24, 26), or the priest Eleazar, son of Aaron, wrote chapter 34 and added it as an appendix. This admission is by no means an argument against the authenticity of the Pentateuch, for in the preceding chapters we are told clearly and definitely that Moses laid down his work and delivered the book of the law into the hands of the Levites (Deuteronomy 31, 9, 24ff.). After that follows a double appendix, the song of Moses and Joshua contained in chapter 32 and the farewell blessing of Moses contained in chapter 33. And then follows the account of Moses' death and burial, without any indication as to change of author, because that would appear self-evident from the preceding.

An interesting parallel from secular history lies in the work of John Sleidanus, Commentarius de statu religionis et reipublicae Carolo V. Caesare. Immediately after the report that Charles V. on September 15, 1556 laid down his office and sailed for Spain follow, without any paragraphing

1) III, 1614.

2) III, 1636

or any indication that there is a change of author, these words: "Octobris die ultimo Joannes Sleidanus J. U. L. vir et propter eximias animi dotes at singularem doctrinam omni laude dignus, Argentorati decessit, atque ibidem honorifice sepelitur." These words occur in all editions which carry the twenty-sixth volume, added to the collection of twenty-five in April 1555, recording the close of the history of Charles V until his resignation from office. "Ohne Zweifel," remarks Hengstenberg, "dachte der welcher diese Worte zufuegte, es sei unnoetig, dasz er sich von dem Verfasser unterscheide, weil da jeder wisse, dasz niemand selbst seinen Tod und sein Begrabnis erzaehlt."¹⁾

1) Authentic des Pentateuchs, I, lxxix f.

THE EDMITES, MOABITES, AND PHILISTINES

Beside the objections to specific passages of the Pentateuch, critics have advanced the charge of anachronism also against the general presentation of some of the heathen peoples mentioned in these first five books of the Bible. Edom, for example, has been said to be mentioned too early in the narrative. Von Bohlen says: "The Pentateuch contains many allusions to later events, more especially in those having reference to some of the neighboring nations, from which all the hostile fabrications of Genesis concerning the Phoenicians, the Edomites, the Moabites, and others would seem to have been subsequently derived."¹⁾

Recent archaeological discoveries have served to vindicate the authority and reliability of the Scriptures. The Egyptian papyrus Anastasia represents an officer of Seti Meremtah II of the nineteenth dynasty, about the time of the exodus, as saying in an official report to the government that the people of Edom desired to pasture their flocks in Goshen. They had thus early found their way clear across the Sinai peninsula, a fact which argues their number and importance at that early age.

Moab, too, was long unidentified. Indeed, up to very recent times this nation was unknown outside of the Bible, and doubt was cast upon its existence at so early a time as

1) Quoted in Kyle, The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism, p. 99.

its first mention in the Bible. But the Scripture has again been vindicated. The name Moab occurs in an inscription of Rameses II around the base of the third great statue west of the gateway of the north pylon of the temple of Luxor. The inscription records events which took place near the time of the exodus. The name Moab is identified beyond all question; comparatively few foreign names are so clearly and unmistakably written in Egyptian. An examination of the list of names in which it occurs and of the account of the expedition to which its subjugation is attributed clearly places Moab in Ruthen, the Egyptian name for Syria and Palestine and northern and western Arabia.¹⁾

Finally, critics have asserted that the Philistines are introduced into the narrative at too early a point. In treating Genesis 20, 2 Skinner speaks of "the anachronism which makes Abimelech a Philistine prince,"²⁾ and on another page of the same volume, in discussing Genesis 26, 6 he remarks: "The assumption that Gerar was a Philistine kingdom is an anachronism made in J but not in E."³⁾

We believe that it can be shown that the Philistines existed as a people early enough to vindicate the truth of the Biblical narrative.

The Table of Nations in Genesis 10 says that the sons of Ham were Cush and Mizraim and Phut and Canaan. The sons

1) Detailed information to be found in Melvin Grove Kyle, The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism, p. 99f.

2) A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis, p. 316.

3) P. 364.

of Mizraim are listed as Ludim and Anamim and Lehabim and Naphtuhim and Pathrusim and Casluhim (out of whom came Philistin) and Caphtorim. All of the versions and the first chapter of Chronicles agree with this reading. The next place in which the Philistines are mentioned is Amos 9, 7: "Have I not brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt? And the Philistines from Caphtor?" A similar thought is found in Jeremiah 47, 4: "The Lord will spoil the Philistines, the remnant of the country of Caphtor."

Where is Caphtor? In determining its location, we note first of all that the Cerethi were a branch of the Philistines. In Ezekiel 25, 16 the "Philistines" and the "Cherethims" and the "remnant of the sea coast" are mentioned. Here as in Zephaniah 2, 5 the LXX translates Kretes, the Cretans. In other places the Cherethites are coupled together with the Pelethites as a part of the body guard of early Hebrew kings. The latter is probably a modification of Pelishti, the ordinary word for Philistines, the ^u being omitted to produce a favorable harmony between the two names. The Semites were fond of such assonances. In three passages (2 Kings 11, 4, 19; 2 Samuel 20, 23) the usual term for Cherethite is supplanted by Kari, Carian. This is significant.

Now, the Egyptian records mention a region called Keftiu. This by deduction is associated with the island of Crete. The excavations at the palace of Knossos in the late Minoan age show a people very similar to those on the

Egyptian monuments pictured as coming from Keftiu. In addition, the Tel-el-Amarna tablets speak of Keftiu as a source of copper; Crete was rich in copper. The equation of Caphtor and Keftiu to Crete is the most favorable theory today, and the correspondence of consonants between Chere-thites and Cretans is striking. Crete was the center and apex of a civilization of which the Mycaenean age was the latest. After the name of Minos, a famous legendary king, the civilization of Crete has been divided into the early, middle, and late Minoan periods. When Knossos was sacked and destroyed, about 1400, this was the starting point of the spread of a debased Cretan culture all over Asia Minor. Among the people who moved in the ensuing Voelkerwanderung are those who are called Pulashti on the Egyptian inscriptions. Their geographical position shows that they are the future Philistines.

It is to be remembered that the body guard of the Hebrew kings was called Kari in three passages. The Carians lived in the southwest corner of Asia Minor and were connected, according to the testimony of Herodotus and Strabo, with Crete. On the basis of these facts Macalister concludes:

The Philistines were a people composed of several septs, derived from Crete and the southwest corner of Asia Minor. Their civilization probably was derived from Crete, and though there was a large Carian element in their composition, they may fairly have been said to be the people who imported with them to Palestine the memories and the traditions of the great age of Minos.¹⁾

1) The Philistines, their History and Civilization, chapter 1.

CONCLUSION

In most of the instances discussed on the preceding pages, the charge of anachronism is a direct corollary of the Documentary Hypothesis. Many of the difficulties for which modern critics demand an answer of any one who attempts to present a solution of the Pentateuchal problem are not essential difficulties at all, but only arise on the assumption that the Documentary Hypothesis is correct. Melvin Grove Kyle states in a discussion of this matter:

The Documentary Hypothesis creates many of the difficulties which it has to meet and demands that others shall meet it. In this the friends of the Graf-Wellhausen theory are like the advocates of the Ptolemaic theory of the solar system who should demand that the advocates of the Copernican theory meet all the difficulties that the Ptolemaic theory encounters, whereas a large portion of these difficulties were not in the problem of the solar system at all, but only arose on the assumption that the Ptolemaic theory with all its cycles and epicycles was correct. The Documentary Hypothesis does not very plausibly explain some seeming anachronisms and other historical difficulties of the Pentateuchal record, but it gets into more difficulty than it gets us out of. More anachronisms and other difficulties arise out of the assumption of the late date of the Pentateuch than are explained by it.¹⁾

Now, even if there were several passages in the Pentateuch which clearly and evidently were written after the time of Moses, this fact alone would not yet disprove the authenticity of the first five books of the Bible. There is so much testimony in favor of their genuineness

1) The Problem of the Pentateuch, p. 241.

that evidence must be very conclusive before it will be able to shake them. But the fact of the matter is that there has been, especially in recent years, an increasing reduction in the number of instances of alleged anachronisms that have been seriously set forth by higher criticism.

No longer do critics speak with the apodictical assurance of the rationalistic theologians of the past century when pointing out postmosaica in the Pentateuch. Partly this attitude may spring also from the realization that Christian apologetics has done its duty when it has pointed out that a certain difficulty can be explained "ohne Zwang".

A study of the postmosaica will, we feel sure, inculcate a deep and abiding respect for the inerrancy of the Bible, inspire a new and earnest conviction that its pages contain words of eternal truth, and instil a fervent, unswerving faith in the Scriptures that according to the promise of the Savior himself "cannot be broken".

The Christian a priori believes that there can be no "Post-Mosaica" in Pentateuch, since Christ acknowledges it as Scripture, the Word of God. This thought should have been brought out either in the Introduction or the Conclusion.

orig. text.
44 p 60.
P. 11
with ?
The Origin
History
how has
1. p. 175
take all
Bibliography
introduction
of Pentateuch
Bever, the
trustworthiness of the
Pentateuch
XII

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Bleek, Friedrich. Einleitung in das Alte Testament.
Sechste Auflage. Berlin: Verlag von Georg Reimer, 1893.
- Driver, S. R. The Book of Genesis. Twelfth edition.
London: Methuen and Company, 1911.
- Endemann, Past. emer. R. Beitraege zur Pentateuchkritik.
Braunschweig und Leipzig: Verlag von Hellmuth Wollerman, 1900.
- Griffiths, Reverend J. S. The Problem of Deuteronomy.
London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1911
- Hengstenberg, Ernst Wilhelm. Authentie des Pentateuchs,
Band I und II. Berlin: Ludwig Oehmigke, 1836.
- Hengstenberg, Ernst Wilhelm. Beitraege zur Einleitung in
das Alte Testament. Berlin: Ludwig Oehmigke, 1836.
- Kyle, Melvin Grove. The Problem of the Pentateuch.
Oberlin, Ohio: The Bibliotheca Sacra Company, 1920.
- Luther, Martin. Saemtliche Werke, Band II und III.
Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House.
- MacDill, D. The Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch.
Dayton, Ohio: W. J. Shuey Publishers, 1896.

Moeller, Wilhelm. Die Echtheit und Einheit der fuenf Buecher Mosis. Bad Salzufeln: Selbstverlag des Bibelbundes, 1931.

Moeller, Wilhelm. Einleitung in das Alte Testament.

Zwickau, Sachsen: Johannes Herrmann Verlag, 1934.

Neville, Edouard. Archaeology of the Old Testament.

London: Robert Scott, 1913.

Raven, John Howard. Old Testament Introduction, General and Special. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1910.

Rupprecht, Eduard. Das Raetsel des Fuenfbuches Mose und seine falsche Loesung. Guetersloh: Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann, 1894.

Skinner, John. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910.

Strack, Hermann L. Einleitung in das Alte Testament.

Muenchen: C. H. Beck-sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1895.

Periodicals

Dahse, Rev. Johannes. "Is the Documentary Theory Tenable?" Bibliotheca Sacra, April, 1914.

Finke, Rev. G. "Nachmosaisches in der Thora?" Theologische Zeitblaetter, Vol. LXX (1898), page 92.

Fuerbringer, Dr. L. "Die neuere Pentateuchkritik." Lehre und Wehre, Vol. I (1904), pp. 155-164; 208-214.

Magoun, Herbert W. "A Layman's View of the Critical Theory." Bibliotheca Sacra, January, 1913, p. 63.

Wiener, H. "The Postmosaica of Genesis." Bibliotheca Sacra, January, 1911.