

“ The author’s object in making this computation is to show from how small a quantity of seed so rich a harvest was produced. For this object it was perfectly indifferent to him whether the numbers were 40, 50, 60, or 70. The contrast between these numbers and the hundreds of thousands remain the same. The author, who must be judged by the standard of a sacred historian, not of a writer of statistics, could hence follow his theological principle, which recommended to him the choice of the number seventy. Seven is the signature of the covenant between God and Israel. By fixing on the covenant number the author intimated that the increase was the covenant blessing.”

In short, the sacred historian is emancipated from every duty by which other historians are supposed to be bound, and his standard enables him to play fast and loose with words, facts, and figures. If the contrast was the only thing of moment, it would have been far more impressive, even on his own theological principle, if he had represented the seed by the covenant number seven and the harvest by seven millions.

The difficulties connected with the gathering of the assembly or the congregation before the door of the tabernacle are more striking. That these words are meant to denote the whole body of the people there can be no question, and the attempts to limit their meaning in some passages to the chief men or the elders are desperate. The passover was to be killed by the whole assembly of the congregation ; the whole congregation or mass of the people murmur against Moses and Aaron, and reproach them with bringing the whole assembly into the wilderness to kill them with hunger. In the story of Korah the congregation is pointedly distinguished from the elders. In Joshua it includes the women, the little ones, and the strangers conversant among them ; and these certainly would not all be exempted from the plague which breaks

out in the congregation. Of this mighty body the 603,550 Israelitish warriors formed only a part; and this vast mass is invited or commanded to assemble before the door of the tabernacle—in other words, within the court. But the width of the tabernacle was 18 feet, its length 34, while the court was about 180 feet long and 90 broad. The latter, when thronged, might have held some 5,000 people; but if merely the adult males of the people had stood nine abreast in front of the tabernacle door (and more could not have stood in a space 18 feet in width), they would have formed a line of nearly twenty miles. Moses, again, and Joshua address the whole assembly of the people; but what human voice could make itself heard by a multitude of three millions? In the same way, allowing four square yards only for each person, we find that their camp must have covered more than 1,650 acres. According to the Levitical direction, the priest was to carry away daily the refuse of all the sacrifices to a spot outside this camp; and even if it be allowed that he might do the work by deputy, the difficulty remains much where it was for, in truth, from the numbers given, the camp, according to the commentator Thomas Scott, must have formed a movable city of twelve miles square. From this huge space the people were every day to carry out their rubbish, and into it they must bring their daily supplies water and fuel, after first cutting down the latter where they found it. The supposition, as the Bishop remarks, involves an absurdity; and it is a mere gratuitous and useless assumption, if we say that the narrative in its original form related the exodus of a scanty troop with a few women and children, for whose numbers the tabernacle described in the record might amply suffice. The question is then shifted to the date of the description of the tabernacle and of the laws relating to it; and if these belong to a comparatively late age of Jewish history, their historical character vanishes. In

any case no trust whatever can be placed in the alleged numbers of the Israelites at the time of their departure out of Egypt.

It is even more astonishing to find this people, who fled out of the land of bondage in haste, "taking their dough before it was leavened, their kneading-troughs being bound up in their clothes upon their shoulders," provided soon afterwards with tents, with armour, and with weapons. A Levitical precept refers to their having dwelt in booths on coming out of Egypt; but there is not, the Bishop remarks, the slightest indication in the story that they ever did live in booths, nor is it conceivable when they could have done so.<sup>1</sup> Where were the boughs and bushes needed for this purpose to be found? But if they used tents, then at the very least 200,000 would be needed for a population of two millions. Where did they get these tents? Had they been provided in expectation of marching, when their request was merely to be allowed to go three days' journey into the wilderness? They had not lived in tents in Egypt, for they were to strike the blood of the Paschal lamb on the two side-posts and on the lintel or upper door-post of their houses. How, again, were these tents carried? Their own backs were sufficiently burdened with the dough and the kneading-troughs, together with the grain needed for the first month's use, for they had no manna given to them until the fifteenth day of the second month after their departing out of the land of Egypt. The cattle might, indeed, have been used for this purpose; and a single ox might perhaps carry four *canvas* tents of the lightest modern make. He could hardly bear more than one heavy tent made of skins; and thus 200,000 oxen would have been needed for the wants of the Israelites. But "oxen are not usually trained to carry goods upon their backs as pack-oxen, and will by no means do so if untrained."

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part I. p. 45.

We thus find ourselves plunged into a narrative which is honeycombed with impossibilities; and each step does little more than reveal fresh difficulties or fresh marvels. The down-trodden victims of Pharaoh's taskmasters, who had crouched in abject fear beneath the driver's lash, suddenly appear as a nation with an armed force of more than 600,000 warriors. They are harnessed, and amply provided with weapons. If they had this armour and these weapons in Egypt, how had they been kept down, and how had they allowed themselves to be kept down? According to Herodotus the whole caste of all the warriors in Egypt numbered only 160,000 fighting men. If all these had gone out against the Israelites, if all had been drowned in the Red Sea, if, when dead, they had retained their weapons in their grasp, and if their armour and their weapons had all come into the hands of the fugitives, not less than 440,000 Israelite warriors would still have been without weapons or armour. Some orthodox critics have not been ashamed of resorting to the grotesque supposition that the Israelites borrowed both weapons and armour from their enemies on the night of the Exodus; but if they came out from the country known to us as Egypt, they came from a land where only the warrior caste was armed. But these men would belong to Pharaoh's army, and the surrender of all their arms would, as we have seen, leave very much more than half the Israelites unarmed. By this ludicrous supposition the Israelites, or at least 160,000 of them, would be armed, and their enemies absolutely defenceless. Yet the latter pursue, and the former cry out in panic terror, "sore afraid."

"If, then," the Bishop urged, "the historical veracity of this part of the Pentateuch is to be maintained, we must believe that 600,000 armed men (though it is inconceivable how they obtained their arms) had, by reason of their long servitude, become so debased and inhuman in their

cowardice (and yet they fought bravely enough with Amalek a month afterwards) that they could not strike a single blow for their wives and children, if not for their own lives and liberties, but could only weakly wail and murmur against Moses, saying, 'It had been better for us to serve the Egyptians than that we should die in the wilderness.'"

The difficulties connected with the institution of the Passover are of a still more serious kind, for we are now dealing with injunctions which are said to come from Jehovah Himself. We have here some passages which cannot on any supposition be made to match with the rest of the story. We have special charges about the choosing of the lamb, and other rites spreading over many days, and at the same time we have the repeated declaration that the first announcement relating to the Passover was made on the day preceding the night in which the Egyptian firstborn were destroyed. We have, therefore, to see what the narrative really implies.

"Moses called for all the elders of Israel. We must suppose, then, that the elders lived somewhere near at hand. But where did the two millions live? And how could the order to keep the Passover have been conveyed with its minutest particulars to *each individual household* in this vast community in one day, rather in twelve hours, since Moses received the command on the very same day on which they were to kill the Passover at even, Exodus xii. 6?"

"It must be observed that it was absolutely necessary that the notice should be distinctly given to each separate family. For it was a matter of life and death. Upon the due performance of the Divine command it depended whether Jehovah should 'stride across' the threshold, and protect the house from the angel of death, or not. And yet the whole matter was perfectly new to them. The specific directions—about choosing the lamb, killing it at even, sprinkling its blood, and eating it with unleavened bread,

'not raw, nor sodden at all with water, but roast with fire, with loins girded, their shoes on their feet, and their staff in their hand,'—were now for the first time communicated to Moses, by him to the elders, and by them to the people. These directions, therefore, could not have been conveyed by any mere *sign*, intimating that they were now to carry into execution something about which they had been informed before."<sup>1</sup>

There would, however, be no great difficulty in conveying the information to the Hebrews (due time being allowed for the purpose), even if they lived in a city as large as London. But in this case twelve hours alone are allotted for this task, for the bringing together of the lambs for the Passover, and for the gigantic work of borrowing (as it is termed), which was to precede the rite. To make this borrowing the easier, we may, if we please, assume not only (as we are told) that they were living in the midst of the Egyptians, but that the latter, hating the mad folly of their king, had a friendly feeling, and even a deep respect, for the Israelites; that many of them lodged with Israelite householders; and (as Hengstenberg supposes) that these lodgers were persons of good property, who would give from their abundance gold and silver ornaments and clothes. In this way we may account for the Hebrews possessing not a little raiment and jewelry; but we can do so only on the hypothesis that under the guise of borrowing they were robbing and pillaging not their enemies but their friends. The difficulty of the supposition that the latter would be thus eager to lend to a people who were in the wild excitement of instant departure is one of which critics like Hengstenberg seem to think it needless to take any notice.

But the Hebrews were not living together with the Egyptians. They were owners of vast herds and flocks which they must have been tending over a wide extent of country. If we

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part I. p. 56.

take the numbers of the Pentateuch, at least 150,000 male lambs would be wanted for that first Passover, and this according to the experience of sheep masters in Australia and Natal implies a flock of 2,000,000 sheep and lambs of all ages, of which two only could be supported by each acre of land. But even if five sheep be allowed to each acre, the Israelites would have required 400,000 acres of grazing land for their sheep alone, and, it may be, a larger space still for their oxen. They would, therefore, be scattered over an area equal to that of the counties of Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire together. To all these people, then, so scattered, the warning to keep the Passover within twelve hours had to be conveyed, and with it the strict injunction that no one was to go out at the door of his house until the morning! But they were not allowed to obey this injunction even if they had willed to do so, for at midnight came from Moses the order for instant departure to families who had only just been told that they were not to think of stirring from their houses before daybreak.

We are not, in these incidents, dealing with marvels, miracles, and prodigies; but we are entangled in a perfect network of impossibilities. In an hour or two from the time of receiving the midnight order a population of two millions starts, without leaving one behind, together with all their flocks, herds, and goods.

“Remembering as I do,” writes the Bishop, “the confusion in my own household of thirty or forty persons when once we were obliged to fly at dead of night—having been roused from our beds by a false alarm that an invading Zulu force had entered the colony, had evaded the English troops sent to meet them, and was making its way direct for our station, killing right and left as it came along—I do not hesitate to declare this statement to be utterly incredible and impossible. Were an English village of (say) two thousand people to be called suddenly to retreat in this way, with old people

young children, and infants, what indescribable distress there would be! But what shall be said of a thousand times as many? And what of the sick and infirm, or the women in recent or in imminent child-birth, in a population like that of London, where the births are 264 a day, or about one every five minutes?

“But this,” he adds, “is but a very small part of the difficulty. We are required to believe that in one single day the order to start was communicated suddenly, at midnight, to every single family of every town and village, throughout a tract of country as large as Hertfordshire, but ten times as thickly peopled; that in obedience to such orders, having first ‘borrowed’ very largely from their Egyptian neighbours in all directions (though, if we are to assume Egyptians occupying the same territory with the Hebrews, the extent of it must be very much increased), they then came in from all parts of the land of Goshen to Rameses, bringing with them the sick and infirm, the young and the aged; further, that, since receiving the summons, they had sent out to gather in all their flocks and herds, spread over so wide a district, and had driven them also to Rameses; and lastly, that, having done all this, since they were roused at midnight, they were started again from Rameses that very same day, and marched on to Succoth, not leaving a single sick or infirm person, a single woman in child-birth, or even ‘a single hoof’ behind them.”<sup>1</sup>

Such in all strictness is the Exodus story. Kurtz felt and admitted it to be in many respects impossible, although of its extravagant absurdity he says nothing. He, an orthodox critic, writing to uphold the historical accuracy and veracity of the Pentateuch, cannot bring himself to believe that they all meet at Rameses, many of them merely to retrace their steps. Although the narrative says plainly, “the children of Israel journeyed from Rameses to Succoth, about six hundred thousand [warriors] on foot,” he insists that some only started

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part I. p. 62.



from Rameses, the rest joining them on their road. The tale speaks of a distance of about sixty miles traversed in three days. Kurtz remarks :—

“ Others may believe it, if they please. But I cannot believe that such a procession as we have described could keep up a journey of seventeen or twenty miles a day for three days running. Even if they only *travelled* three days, it would certainly be necessary to assume, as Tischendorf does, that there were periods of rest of longer duration—that is, actual days of rest between the three marching days. But had there been any such days, it can scarcely be supposed that a narrative so minute would have failed to notice them. But we have next to imagine this mighty throng moving through the open desert ; let it be granted, as some have supposed, in a wide body, fifty men abreast. These, with only a yard between each rank, would form a column more than twenty-two miles long, and thus, far from starting at one and the same hour from Rameses or from Succoth, the last of the body could not have stirred till the first had advanced that distance, ‘more than two days’ journey for such a mixed company as this.’ ”<sup>1</sup>

So speaking, we leave out of sight the flocks and herds, the first of which might eat, while their followers would certainly trample down, such grass or herbage as might be found. How then were these two millions of sheep and cattle sustained on the march from Rameses to the Red Sea ? But let Kurtz have the full benefit of the supposition that most of them joined the company after the Hebrews had left Rameses. Even this, as the Bishop remarks with irresistible logic, would not affect the difficulty of so many miles of people marching with so many miles of sheep and oxen.

“ It would only throw it on to a further stage of the journey. For when, on the third day, they turned aside and ‘en-

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part I. p. 64.

camped by the sea,' what then did this enormous multitude of cattle feed upon?"

How, again, were they fed when they had crossed to the other side? The people, we are told, were supplied with manna, and might also be sustained by their flocks and herds; but for the latter there was no extraordinary provision, and they were thus left to live on such fodder as they could find in the wilderness, and this for the long space of forty years. The story precludes the notion that they were scattered over indefinite tracts of country. The people had to keep together for self-defence; and the flocks, if scattered, must have been guarded by large bodies of armed men. Much has been said of changes of climate, caused by disappearance of vegetation, in the Sinaitic peninsula; but such notions are not countenanced by the old record. The story describes the region generally as being then, what it is now, "a waste howling wilderness," a land of "fiery serpents, scorpions, and drought," where there was "no water to drink."

Fully aware of the difficulties thus encountered on both sides of the question, Dr. Stanley admitted that the maintenance of the Israelites during their long wanderings could not be accounted for by a reference to miracles.

"Except the manna, the quails, and the three interventions with regard to water, none such," he said, "are mentioned in the Mosaic history; and if we have no warrant to take away, we have no warrant to add."

But, again, he would not allow that such difficulties furnished a proof of the unhistorical character of the narrative; and he appealed to Ewald in support of his conclusion that

"the general truth of the wanderings in the wilderness is an essential preliminary to the whole of the subsequent history of Israel."

The Bishop replied that, though Ewald had asserted, he

had failed to show, this ; that the story of the Exodus is as much out of harmony with some parts of the later history as it is in harmony with others, and that it is at the least possible that the latter also may turn out to be unhistorical. Dr. Stanley fell back, further, on a supposed spread of the Hebrews "far and wide through the whole peninsula," and "on the constant means of support from their own flocks and herds." The latter point may be admitted, the real question being how the cattle were supported, the narrative saying nothing about any dispersal of the people, and distinctly implying that they had to keep together everywhere. He adduced the further fact that a population nearly, if not quite, equal to the whole permanent population of the peninsula, passes yearly through the desert on the way to and from Mecca. But the caravan of pilgrims numbers about five thousand, and carries ample stores on the backs of camels. The Hebrew population numbered two millions, and had hurried out of Egypt without "having prepared for themselves any victual," and had no means of carrying food, if they had it.<sup>1</sup> The caravan passes through with all practicable speed: the Hebrews remained a year in one most desolate spot, and spent forty years in wandering through other parts of the desert. They were encumbered with vast herds, needing daily supplies of water: the caravan hurries along with camels which can go for days without drinking. The reference to some climatic changes in the peninsula is, as we have seen, still more desperate. Whatever change there may have been, the story of the Exodus speaks of it as being then, what it is now, "an evil place," without fruits, without crops, without water. Groves of acacia-trees may have disappeared in the wadys or winter-torrent courses, and the lessening or concentration of the rainfall may have contracted somewhat the scanty area of grass ; but the differ-

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part I. p. 71.

ence would be inappreciable, when the question affects the sustenance of millions. The monks of St. Catharine have created a paradise of flowers, fruit, and grass. But the paradise extends over some four or five acres, and has been the work of centuries; and the attempt to explain the sustenance of a mighty multitude at a moment's notice on the stony soil of the plain beneath Sinai by the results of unremitting labour applied to a small garden is absurd. It is more to the purpose to refer to the Amalekites. There is no proof that they *lived* in the Sinaitic desert, which Jeremiah describes as "a land that no man passed through and where no man dwelt." There is, indeed, the ruined city of Petra; but Petra is in an oasis, not in the wilderness. As he approached it, Stanley found that he had "suddenly left the desert."

"Instead of the absolute nakedness of the Sinaitic valleys, we found ourselves walking on grass sprinkled with flowers, and the level platforms on each side were filled with sprouting corn."

But compared with the population of the Israelites that of Petra was nothing. That a writer so able and earnest as Stanley would say all that could be said to uphold the general trustworthiness of the Mosaic narrative, we may be sure; but he was too candid to withhold the confession that, though these considerations might mitigate the force of the difficulty, they failed to solve it. To how slight an extent they even mitigate it, it can scarcely be necessary to say. Nor need we dwell on the ridiculous supposition that near the populous Mount Seir they must come into intercourse with rich nations and tribes who would supply them easily with all the necessaries of life. The tribes would at the outside be numbered by a few thousands; and we have to picture to ourselves one or two myriads supplying the needs of millions. The cattle must be thought of almost more than the people, who, though

they might in part live on their flocks, could not buy grass or other food for them. Such hypotheses may be indefinitely multiplied; but every hypothesis will do violence more or less to plain statements of the narrative. There remains another difficulty. The Israelites were under Sinai for nearly a year, and they kept the second Passover there in the first month of their ecclesiastical year, March-April, when the weather is bitterly cold. Whence did the people at this time obtain fuel, not merely for their daily cooking, but also for warmth? and how, under such circumstances, were the cattle saved from cold and starvation?

This nation with its vast mass of 600,000 warriors had been told that their mission was to displace the tribes of Canaan; but before they emerged from the desert they received a Divine assurance that hornets should drive out these tribes before them; that the work of expulsion should be done gradually, till the increase in their own numbers should enable them to inherit the land, the reason for not expelling them in a single year being the fear that otherwise the land might become desolate and the beasts of the field multiply against the new comers. But, according to the Pentateuch story, the inheritance of the twelve tribes, east and west of Jordan, covered about seven millions of acres. The acreage of Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex, is about half this quantity, and their population in 1851 was somewhat under 1,150,000—not greater, therefore, in proportion than that of the Israelites on their entering Canaan, without reckoning the Canaanites, who are described as seven nations, greater and mightier than Israel itself.

“Surely,” remarks the Bishop, “it cannot be said that these three eastern counties, with their flourishing towns . . . are in any danger of their lying ‘desolate,’ with the beasts of the field multiplying against the human inhabitants.”<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part I. p. 83.

But the colony of Natal has an extent of 18,000 square miles, with a population, black and white included, which in 1861-62 did not greatly exceed 150,000. The numbers are scanty, and the land could bear vastly more; but the human inhabitants thirty years ago were well able to hold their ground against the beasts of the field, few of which could now be seen, while lions, elephants, and other species which had once abounded in the country, have long since disappeared.

“Natal, in fact, should have a population of three millions, in order to be compared for density of population with the land of Canaan, according to the story, after the entrance of the Israelites, without reckoning the old inhabitants.”

The truth is that, without going further, we are dealing with records, which, regarded strictly as historical narratives, are wholly worthless. Whatever moral and spiritual beauty they may exhibit, whatever righteous lessons or warnings they may enforce, remains unaffected by the investigation; but the authority of the book as a history is reduced to a level not much higher than that of the beautiful apologue of Prodikos which describes the trial and testing of the youthful Herakles by Kakia and Arete. But although we have ample grounds already for setting down the narratives of the Pentateuch generally as untrustworthy, the perplexities connected with these stories are far from having been fully enumerated. Thus for the huge total of two million Israelites all the first-born males from a month old and upwards are given as 2,273, and these are distinctly named as firstborns on the mother's side, the proportion to the whole number of males being as 1 to 42.

“In other words, the number of boys in every family must have been on the average forty-two, and each woman who became a mother must have been the mother of this number of sons.”

It is scarcely worth while to go through the attempts at reconciliation or explanation offered for statements which imply that there were only 60,000 child-bearing women to 600,000 men, so that only one man in ten could have a wife and children. Of orthodox critics some urge the prevalence, others the rarity, of polygamy, as helping us to account for these assertions. But the inquiry sends us now further afield. That the period of 430 years assigned for the sojourning or pilgrimage of the children of Israel is to be reckoned from the time of the covenant made with Abraham there can be no doubt. The time spent in Egypt after the descent of Jacob and his family would thus be 215 years. This conclusion removes some astounding perplexities, for, if we take the 430 years as the actual sojourn in Egypt,

“Moses, who was eighty years old at the time of the Exodus, must have been born 350 years after the migration into Egypt, when his mother . . . must have been at the very least 256 years old.”<sup>1</sup>

The shorter period is more in harmony with the narrative, which, as a rule, gives the contemporaries of Moses and Aaron as descendants in the third, and those of Joshua and Eleazar as descendants in the fourth, generation from some one of the sons or grandsons of Jacob, who went down with him into Egypt. But the comment involved in these statements on the value of other parts of the narrative is amazing indeed. The twelve sons of Jacob are said to have had between them fifty-three sons, or an average of four and a half to each.

“Let us suppose,” the Bishop writes, “that they increased in this way from generation to generation. Then in the first generation, that of Kohath, there would be fifty-four males; in the second, that of Amram, 243; in the third, that of Moses and Aaron, 1,094; and in the fourth, that of Joshua

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part I. p. 93.

and Eleazar, 4,923: that is to say, instead of 600,000 warriors in the prime of life, there could not have been 5,000. Further, if the numbers of all the males in the four generations be added together (which supposes that they were all living at the time of the Exodus), they would only amount to 6,311. If we even add to them the numbers of the fifth generation, 22,154, who would be mostly children, the sum total of males of all generations could not, according to these data, have exceeded 28,465, instead of being 1,000,000."<sup>1</sup>

A further examination of the genealogical records reveals still greater extravagance. In Genesis xlv. 23, Dan is spoken of as having one son. In Numbers xxiii. 42, the sons of Dan consist of only one family. Dan, therefore, had no more sons born to him in Egypt. He would thus in the fourth generation have had twenty-seven warriors descended from him; but in Numbers ii. 26, they are given as 62,700, and in xxvi. 43, as 64,000. Yet more, these descendants of the one son of Dan are represented as nearly double the number of the ten sons of Benjamin. The factors relating to the family of Levi give similar results. How are they to be dealt with? The problem is one of hopeless difficulty, and the efforts to solve it are not less desperate. Kurtz insists that Abraham and those who came after him all had hundreds, if not thousands, of servants, who, as being circumcised, were reckoned as his family, and that in Egypt his own immediate descendants intermarried with these servants. But with all such hypotheses the narrative of the Pentateuch is altogether in conflict. Nothing is said of this multitude of dependents as going down with Jacob into Egypt. Jacob has none such when he meets with his brother Esau. If he had possessed them, would he have sent his darling son Joseph, at seventeen years of age, to wander alone and unattended in search of his brothers? His brothers, again, are mentioned as feeding their flocks unattended; and

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part I. p. 103.



indeed the presence of bands of servants would have been highly inconvenient for the execution of their designs against Joseph. Nothing is said of servants accompanying the sons of Jacob when they go to buy corn in Egypt. On the contrary, each man has his ass, and when they find their money in their sacks, their fear is that Joseph will confiscate their beasts, but they make no mention of any servants. They had, moreover, eleven asses, and eleven sacks ; and the contents of these sacks would have yielded but scanty support for many starving thousands. The comments and explanations which deal with these perplexities are vain attempts to tear down the walls of a prison-house with the bare hand.

These difficulties of inconsistency, downright contradiction, and impossibility, are interwoven with the whole texture of the Pentateuch records. The Levitical legislation, purporting to be drawn up specially for the people during their sojourn in the desert, assumes that they are to be numbered by millions. But the entrance to the tabernacle is, as we have seen, so narrow that scarcely nine men could stand abreast in front of it ; and the number of the priests, after the death of Nadab and Abihu, is only three. For each birth there was to be a burnt-offering and a sin-offering ; and as the births for such a population would be 250 daily, 500 sacrifices would have to be offered up each day on this account alone. The rules show that scarcely less than five minutes could be allowed for each sacrifice ; and if these offerings were taken separately, they would occupy not a single day of twelve hours, but forty-two hours consecutively. The notion of many simultaneous offerings receives no countenance from the statements of the Pentateuch, and there was but one altar, about nine feet square, on which, therefore, not many victims could be placed together. These victims might be lambs or pigeons ; and the latter are permitted as a lighter and easier offering for the poor to bring during their sojourn in the wilderness. "They are, therefore,

spoken of as being in abundance, as being within the reach of every one, in the wilderness under Sinai.”<sup>1</sup> It is absolutely impossible to resist the conclusion that these enactments were framed at some time when, and some place where, it would really be a boon to the poor to allow them to offer pigeons instead of lambs ; but the time was not that of the sojourn in the desert, nor was the place the peninsula of Sinai. Doves, indeed, are supposed to be birds of the wilderness ; but the wilderness is, probably, that of Judah, not the stony wastes of Arabia. If, however, by such pleas we fancy for a moment that we have escaped, or at least lessened, one difficulty, it is only to find ourselves face to face with another. The priests were enjoined to eat the sin-offerings in the most holy place. There were but three of them, and the number of the offerings would be 264 daily. Each, therefore, would have to devour eighty-eight pigeons every day. To the priests also belong the first-born of all cattle ; and these would be reckoned by hundreds of thousands yearly. What were three priests to do with such an inheritance ? The requirements on their powers during the feast of the Passover were on a scale vastly more gigantic. At the second Passover, under Sinai, 150,000 lambs were killed, it would seem, between the two evenings ; that is, between the setting of the sun and the closing in of actual night. In other words, in about two hours each priest had to sprinkle the blood of 50,000 lambs, at the rate of 400 lambs every minute. But where were these animals slain ? The court of the tabernacle, when thronged most densely, would not have held more than 5000 people ; and how then

“are we to conceive 150,000 lambs being killed within it by at least 150,000 people, at the rate of 1,250 lambs a minute ?”<sup>2</sup>

Any slight reduction, based on the calculation that a lamb

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part I. p. 125.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 132.

may have sufficed for twenty people, instead of for eight or ten, has no appreciable effect on the difficulty. The amount of slaughtering and sprinkling to be done remains an absolute impossibility. Kurtz tries to get out of the snare by saying that "the place which Jehovah shall choose to place His Name there" means not the sanctuary but the city or camp, within which the sanctuary was situated—in other words, that, so long as they were anywhere within the limits of this city or camp, each father of a family might offer the lamb for his household within his own tent. But the narrative of the Pentateuch gives no warrant for any such supposition; and in the Book of Leviticus it is expressly commanded that all burnt-offerings, peace-offerings, sin-offerings, trespass-offerings, shall be killed "at the *door of the tabernacle* of the congregation, and the blood be sprinkled *upon the altar* round about."

Nor do we move more freely when we pass from the region of ceremonial enactments to incidents of the popular history. We have seen that the enormous numbers of the Israelites are made up from different sets of factors, all of which yield as nearly as possible the same results. The factors, therefore, have been as deliberately framed as the totals; and we cannot, then, take these totals as mere Eastern superlatives, as we certainly may when we are told that David slew 40,000 Syrian horsemen; or that Pekah slew in one day 120,000 "sons of valour" of the kingdom of Judah; or that the men of Judah, fighting with Jeroboam II., smote down of his warriors 500,000 chosen men. The Bishop is thus more than justified in saying—he was bound to say—that these numbers were woven as a thread into the whole story of the Exodus, and cannot be taken out without tearing the whole fabric to pieces. He was justified also in expressing thankfulness "that we are no longer obliged to believe, as a matter of fact, of vital consequence to our eternal hope, the story of the

Midianitish war.”<sup>1</sup> The obligation had sprung simply from the hypothesis or assumption of the perfect veracity of the Mosaic history ; with the fall of the hypothesis the supposed duty fades away.

A few minds might, it is true, put aside the obligation as imaginary and unreal ; but the idea that there was such an obligation had exercised a most injurious influence on many. It had led Bishop Butler to urge that particular acts, which would otherwise be in the highest degree immoral, ceased to be immoral under a Divine commission to do them. It had led Dr. Arnold to regard robbery, pillage, burning, and massacre, as a merciful recompense to the Canaanites, who would be swept away to make room for tribes who are described as being not much, if at all, better than they. It had led to gross blasphemies against the Divine Nature, which was represented as sanctioning in one age or country that which was condemned or prohibited in another. But all these curious pleadings vanish into air when we really look into the story and there find

“ that 12,000 Israelites slew all the males of the Midianites, took captive all the females and children, seized all their cattle and flocks (72,000 oxen, 61,000 asses, 675,000 sheep) and all their goods, and burnt all their cities and all their goodly castles, without the loss of one single man, and then by command of Moses butchered in cold blood all the women and children ”

with the exception of 32,000 girls who were kept as prizes for the conquerors. This alone is enough to show that we are reading a narrative whose veracity may be put much on the

<sup>1</sup> In a despatch dated November 16, 1878, Sir Bartle Frere urged as a plea for the raids and incroachments of the Boers against the Zulus that the former had “ a sincere belief in the Divine authority for what they did,” based upon “ the old commands which they found in parts of their Bible to exterminate the Gentiles and take their lands in possession.”

same level with that of the story of Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves ; and it becomes a superfluous, as it is assuredly a loathsome, task, when we turn to calculate the numbers thus slaughtered, and find that they amount to 48,000 women and (say) 20,000 boys, and that to these must be added a like number of men put to death, all this being done by 12,000 Israelites, who must, further, have carried off 100,000 captives, eight at least to each man, and driven before them at the same time 808,000 head of cattle. In dealing with horrors, as compared with which the tragedy of Cawnpore sinks into nothing, it is satisfactory to find that the chronology of the campaign is as impossible as are its incidents. Aaron died, we are told, on the first day of the fifth month of the fortieth year of the wanderings, the year also of the Midianitish expedition. During the month of mourning which followed his death nothing was done. For the war in which they then engaged with the Midianitish king Arad another month probably must be allowed, and a fortnight at least for the journey from Mount Hor, by the way of the Red Sea, to compass the land of Edom, when they were plagued with fiery serpents and Moses set up a serpent of brass. The nine encampments next mentioned must have taken up another month, while another must be allowed for the crushing of the Amorite king Sihon and the destruction of all his cities. Scarcely less than a fortnight would have been taken up with spying out Jaazer and driving thence the Amorites, and another month for the destruction of Og, king of Bashan, with all his cities and all his people, *not one* being left alive. This computation brings us to the first day of the eleventh month, the very day on which Moses is said to have addressed the people in the plains of Moab. But into this period must be, further, crowded the following events : the march to the plains of Moab, the journeys and prophesyings of Balaam, the sojourn of Israel in Shittim with its attendant debauchery, the death

of 24,000 by the plague, the second numbering, and the Midianitish war.

The picture revealed to us by this examination of the Mosaic narrative is, indeed, astonishing, and furnishes a marvellous comment on the words which the Bishop cites from its orthodox defender Havernick.

“If the Pentateuch would fully maintain its right to the position which it claims as the work of Moses and the commencement of the sacred records of the covenant people, it must fulfil the requisition of showing itself to be a work *historically true*—containing a history which shall vindicate itself by critical examination, as maintaining invariably the character of perfect truth in reference to the assumed period of its composition.”

Instead of this, we find a series of incidents absolutely impossible in themselves, a series of narratives which contradict or exclude each other, and a reckoning of population in which several sets of factors have been very deliberately framed to suit certain preconceived totals. We have, further, a history which, professing to tell us of wanderings spread over forty years, is absolutely silent about thirty-seven of those years, and thus leads us to think that the forty years are as little to be depended on as the numbers, armour, and weapons of the 600,000 warriors who march from Rameses. In this mighty labyrinth of contradictions and impossibilities nothing has been said as to the suspicions which must attach to the ages reached by patriarchs and others. We have no warrant whatever for the fancy that the duration of human life has diminished or that it ever was greater than it is now; and this suspicion throws additional uncertainty over not merely a part, but the whole, of the history. There is, lastly, the obscurity attaching to the whole of the Egyptian sojourn. Where or what was Goshen? It lay far away to the east of

the river, and formed the best or fat of the land ; but in the country known to us as Egypt, the only fertile part is the strip affected by the annual inundations. This strip has no pasture ; and the Israelites were strictly herdsmen. From Herodotus it would seem that the region commonly known as Goshen was in his time, and had always been, little better than a salt marsh. The Misraim of the Pentateuch is a country of horses and horsemen : Egypt had none. The former had lions : the latter had none. In the former the tillage is described as that of laborious hand work with artificial irrigation : in Egypt the work was done by the river. The contrast might be carried much further ; and perhaps at the worst it may show only that the compilers of the narrative were but little acquainted with the country which they were professing to describe. But we may fairly suspect that there are difficulties in quarters where we may be least disposed to look for them, and all of them force us to the same conclusion that throughout the narrative of the Pentateuch we have no firm standing-ground.

But the very discrepancies which run through these books, as they have come down to us, are of themselves conclusive evidence that the books are not the work of one hand. It is, quite impossible that one and the same man should at the same time write off a story which describes in parts the doings of a scanty band, and in others the doings of an immense multitude or even nation. The 600,000 warriors, implying a population of at least two millions, were not called into being by the man who speaks of a clan or tribe with three priests, a tabernacle with a length and breadth of only a few feet, and a court capable of accommodating, when most densely thronged, only some four or five thousand persons. If then the books, as we now have them, are composite, it is quite certain that the story which speaks of the Hebrews in Egypt as a very small society of slaves must be

much older than the record which represents them as a mighty people. It becomes, therefore, not less certain that, whatever portions may be the writing of Moses, he had nothing to do with the more pretentious descriptions ; in other words, that he can have been concerned at the most with a very small portion of the Pentateuch. Were it otherwise, we should have to charge him with deliberate falsification in the numbering of the tribes and in all the records which are affected by this numbering. On the other hand, if he had nothing to do with these later additions, all that we need necessarily to conclude is that the original narrative, whatever it may have been, was not regarded by the later compilers as possessing a character too sacred to allow of their meddling with it. In their hands the earlier traditions have undergone a treatment precisely corresponding to that of the old Greek or Roman traditions which have been moulded into the narratives of Herodotus or Livy.

The contradictions in the story of the Pentateuch lead, therefore, directly to questions of authorship ; and to these the Bishop had to address himself in the second and the subsequent portions of his work. There surely can be no need even to state that no one, having finished one account of any incident or event, would go on without the break of a line to give another and a totally different account of the same event. Yet this is just what we find in the first two chapters of the Book of Genesis—in other words, in the two accounts of the Creation. On almost every point the two narratives contradict each other. In the first, the earth emerges from the waters, and is therefore saturated with moisture : in the second, the whole face of the ground is dry and needs to be moistened. In the first, the birds and beasts are created before man : in the second, man comes before the birds and beasts. In the first, all fowls that fly are made out of the waters : in the second, they are made out of the ground.



In the first, man is created in the image of God : in the second, he is made of the dust of the ground and is merely animated with the breath of life ; and only after his disobedience God is represented as saying, "The man has become as one of us, to know good and evil." In the first, man is made lord of the whole earth : in the second, he is merely placed in the garden to dress and to keep it. But more particularly, in the first, man and woman are created together,

"as the closing and completing work of the whole Creation—created also, it is evidently implied, in the same kind of way, to be the complement of one another. In the second, the beasts and birds are created *between* the man and the woman. First, the man is made, of the dust of the ground : he is placed *by himself* in the garden, charged with a solemn command, and threatened with a curse if he breaks it ; then the beasts and birds are made, and the man gives names to them ; and lastly, after all this, the woman is made, out of one of his ribs, but merely as a helpmate for the man." <sup>1</sup>

Two narratives in more pointed antagonism could scarcely be found anywhere. They cannot, therefore, come from the same hand. But on looking further we see that in the first narrative the Creator is always spoken of by the name Elohim, in the second always as Jehovah-Elohim, except in one passage only, iii. 1, 3, 8, where the writer seems to abstain, for some reason, from placing the name "Jehovah" in the mouth of the serpent.

Contradictions of the same kind may be seen in the accounts of the Deluge. In the one, two of every sort of beasts, birds, cattle, creeping things, are to enter the ark : in the other, the number two is confined to unclean beasts, while all other creatures are to be taken by sevens. But here too we find that the former account exhibits only

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part II. p. 172.

Elohim; the other has Jehovah as well as Elohim, though not the compound form Jehovah-Elohim. We thus have, at least, two writers, the Elohist and the Jehovist, of whom the former is manifestly the older. The noting of these facts leads us to mark, further, certain peculiarities of these writers. Thus the Elohist uses the expression *El Shaddai*, "Almighty God," which the Jehovist never employs. The latter repeatedly uses *Israel* as a personal name for *Jacob*: the Elohist never. So, again, where the Elohist speaks of *Padan* or *Padan-Aram*, the later writer speaks always of *Aram-Naharaim*. That the Elohist document, as compared with the later additions, is one of very considerable antiquity, we may most reasonably infer; but it is certain that it was not regarded by the later writer, or writers, with any exaggerated or superstitious reverence. They dealt with it, manifestly, as they pleased. What, then, is the ultimate conclusion? Clearly this, at least, that *Moses* was not the later of these two writers. But is *Moses* himself an historical character? In great likelihood, yes. Traditions relating to his career as a deliverer of his countrymen out of captivity recorded, beyond doubt, the profound impression made on the national mind by the circumstances of that deliverance,<sup>1</sup> and we may well believe that the lessons taught by that simple narrative may have been to the full as striking, instructive, and edifying as any of those which *Mr. Maurice* found, or thought that he found, in the *Pentateuch* as it has come down to us.

But there is no lack of other signs which point to a later age than that of the *Exodus* for the composition of some parts, at least, of the *Pentateuch*. Before a sanctuary exists, we hear (*Exodus xxx. 13, &c.*) of the "shekel of the sanctuary." A mighty strong west wind—in the original Hebrew, a wind of the sea, that is of the *Mediterranean Sea*—takes away the locusts from *Egypt*, and casts them into the *Red*

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part II. p. 185.

Sea ; but the Mediterranean Sea winds would blow, not over the land of Egypt, but across Canaan. Hence this passage was written by some one settled in the latter country, and therefore not by Moses. In Deuteronomy xi. 29, 30, Moses speaks of the Canaanites which dwell in the champaign over against Gilgal beside the plains of Moreh ; but according to the Book of Joshua the name Gilgal was not given to the place till the people had been circumcised after entering the land of Canaan.<sup>1</sup> The same remark applies to the name Dan as a local designation ; and from the Book of Judges we learn that the name was given at a time when there was no king in Israel. These words were, therefore, written by some one living after the establishment of the monarchy ; and therefore the passage in the Book of Joshua which relates the changing of the name of the city of Laish into Dan was not written by Joshua. So in Genesis xxxvi. 31, mention is made of kings that reigned in Edom, before the reign of any king in Israel. This passage, therefore, could not have been written at the earliest before the days of Saul. In the first of the books which bear the name of Samuel, ix. 9, we are told that the person then called Roeh, a "seer," had in earlier times been known as Nabi, or prophet. But in the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua, the word Nabi alone occurs, Roeh being never found. Therefore, if the statement in the Book of Samuel be correct, these books cannot have been brought into their present shape before the days of Samuel. For the marvel of the sun standing still over Gibeon and the moon over Ajalon, Joshua x. 13 is said to refer to the book of Jasher. Is it possible that Joshua could appeal to another book as testimony for an event in which he himself was primarily and personally concerned ? But the injunction of David to teach the men of Judah the use of the bow is also referred to the book of Jasher. Therefore the passage in Joshua referring to

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part II. p. 200.

this book was written not earlier than the reign of David. In the Book of Numbers (xxi. 13-15) is a curious passage informing us that Arnon is the border of Moab, between Moab and the Amorites, and referring to the book of the wars of Jehovah for what he did in the Red Sea and in the brook of Arnon. But the information about Arnon as the border of Moab would have been notorious for those for whom Moses was writing;<sup>1</sup> and the song referred to, evidently as an ancient one, could only just have been composed, since it refers to events which had happened, according to the story, only a few days before. This passage, therefore, was not written during the life-time of Moses.

The Bishop has thus clearly shown the history of the Pentateuch to be an impossible narrative, and exhibited unmistakably its composite character. The two accounts of the Creation and the Flood cannot have come from the same writer at the same time; nor is it conceivable that a leader and lawgiver, such as Moses is represented to have been, can have put together an artificial chronology, and invented a series of factors, inconsistent with each other, yet all yielding the same impossible total for the Israelites of the Exodus. Nor must it be forgotten that, for the position assumed by the more pronounced Bibliolaters who poured out the vials of their wrath upon the Bishop of Natal, the proving of a single contradiction or inconsistency is as fatal as the proving of a hundred. But, instead of occurring in units or in tens, they are as thick as autumn leaves in Vallombrosa. Historians writing in a later age can seldom play faultlessly the part of a contemporary eye-witness and chronicler. Some writer in Genesis (xii. 6, xiii. 7) is careful to state that the Canaanite and the Perizzite were then in the land; another in Deuteronomy reminds the reader that Moses declared the law in the land of Moab on the other side Jordan—both showing thus

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part II. p. 205.

that they lived and wrote after the expulsion or destruction of the Canaanites, and after their settlement on the west side of Jordan. Another in Leviticus (xviii. 28), writing according to the story during the sojourn in the wilderness, warns his countrymen so to live that the land may not spue them out as it had spued out the natives which were before them. The name of the city of Kirjath-Arba was changed to Hebron after the conquest by Caleb in the days of Joshua ; yet the author of the Pentateuch (Genesis xiii. 18) is acquainted with its later name. The blessing of the tribes by Moses is one of the most striking and not least important passages of the Book of Deuteronomy : yet it is introduced by a notice which cannot have been written by Moses himself, and which tends at the least to throw a doubt on the genuineness of the blessing itself.

Had the Bishop proposed to himself a work of destruction only, his task would have been at this point ended. He had shown that, as a history, the Pentateuch was untrustworthy from beginning to end, and that throughout it bristled with impossibilities. He had shown that a legislation which is set forth as applying to the wanderings in the desert must have been put together long after the settlement in Canaan. He had shown still more that frightful massacres done in cold blood under the alleged sanction and command of God Himself are historically impossible, and had their origin either in the extravagances of popular tradition or in the imagination of the compiler.

Thus far he had been moving on sure ground. The inconsistencies cannot be explained away : the contradictions cannot be removed, and therefore the superstition which worships the letter of the Bible rests absolutely upon nothing, and is, in fact, a wild and absurd dream. But the Bishop could not rest here. He was not bound to show how the Pentateuch assumed the shape in which it has come down

---

to us ; yet, if the task were practicable, it would bring before us an instructive chapter in the history of the human mind. He felt, therefore, that he ought to see whether these books, when compared with other portions of the Old Testament, might not reveal the secret of their composition ; but he was conscious at the same time that he was entering now on the field of conjecture, in which the conclusions reached must remain in greater or less degree matters of opinion.

## CHAPTER XI.

### THE PENTATEUCH: ITS COMPOSITION.

ON this portion of his task, the Bishop entered with cheerfulness as well as with energy; and on the whole the lapse of a quarter of a century has justified his confidence. The foundation of the inquiry was laid in the distinction traced between the Elohist and Jehovist writers of the Pentateuch. The matter contributed by the former amounted, as he believed, to about one half of the Book of Genesis, a small part of Exodus, still less of Numbers, a very small portion of Deuteronomy, and about the same of Joshua.<sup>1</sup> Now, it is perfectly clear that if in these portions of the Pentateuch the word used for God is Elohim, and that this word is adhered to until we reach the narrative of a special revelation of the name Jehovah, the writer of these portions must be older than other writers to whom this name is familiar. This special revelation we have in the third and sixth chapters of the Book of Exodus. The declaration that to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, God had made himself known under the name of El Shaddai, but that by the name Jehovah he was not known to them, cannot, he insisted, be explained to say

“anything else than this—that the name Jehovah was not known at all to the Patriarchs, but was now for the first

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part II. p. 228.

time revealed as the name by which the God of Israel would be henceforth distinguished from all other gods.”<sup>1</sup>

Of this, it is not too much to say, there can be no question. But it is astonishing to find that the declaration is not borne out by the record.

“We come at once,” the Bishop remarks, “on the contradictory fact that the name Jehovah is repeatedly used in the earlier parts of the story.”

It is used not merely in relating events which the writer might describe under forms familiar to himself and to his hearers.

“It is put into the mouths of the Patriarchs themselves. It is known to Eve, to Lamech, and to Noah; to Sarai, Rebekah, Leah, Rachel; to Laban and Bethuel; even to heathens, as to Abimelech, the Philistine king of Gerar; and, generally, we are told that as early as the time of Enos, the son of Seth, ‘then began men to call upon the name of Jehovah,’ though the name was already known to Eve, according to the narrative, more than two centuries before.”

Attempts have of course been made to reconcile these discrepancies; and in the effort Kurtz can bring himself to say:—

“It is not expressly said that the name Jehovah was unknown before the time of Moses, but merely that in the Patriarchal age God had not revealed the fulness and depths of His Nature to which that name particularly belonged.”

But it *is* expressly said, “By my name Jehovah I was *not* known to them.” Even the learned Jewish critic and commentator Kalisch can speak of the following as the “only possible” explanation:—

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part II. p. 230



“My name Jehovah has not been understood and comprehended by the Patriarchs in its essence and depth, although it was even in their time occasionally mentioned.”

It is mentioned, not occasionally only, but constantly, and in phrases which imply as full a connotation as any in the Book of Exodus. “Abraham believed in Jehovah, and He counted it to him for righteousness.” “I am Jehovah, the God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac; the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it,” &c. “And Jacob vowed a vow, If God will be with me, then shall Jehovah be my God.” But wherever, throughout the Book of Genesis, this name is put into the mouth of any one, the writer is the Jehovist.

“In fact, the Elohist never uses the name Jehovah in his narrative till after he has explained its origin,” and he “represents the name as having been first announced to Moses and the Israelites at the time of the Exodus. . . . The Jehovist uses it freely all along; and, without giving any account of its first introduction, he puts it in the mouth of Eve. . . . The question now to be considered is, which of these two writers gives the true account? Or, rather, is *either* statement correct? Does not the very existence of this discrepancy suggest the possibility of neither version being the right one? May it not be possible that the Elohist wrote at a time when the word was quite new and fresh-coined; when it had only just been introduced, perhaps by himself, as the *national* personal name for the Divine Being, with the view of drawing more distinctly the line of demarcation between the people of Israel—now first gathered under a king, and no longer living in scattered, separate tribes—and the idolatrous nations around them? May not the Elohist writer, wishing to enforce the adoption of this strange name, have composed for the purpose this portion of the Mosaic story; while the later Jehovist—writing when the name, though not perhaps even yet in

every-day use, was beginning to be more generally known, and was, at all events, familiar to himself—uses it freely from the first ; without perceiving, or at least *without feeling very strongly*, the contradiction thereby imported into the narrative.”<sup>1</sup>

Without going further, the evidence already adduced seems to show that the name could scarcely have originated in the way described in the sixth chapter of Exodus ; and it is indisputable that, whenever or by whomsoever it may have been introduced, it was not regarded as a sound so sacred that it could not be used or uttered. That is quite a late superstition ; and when this extravagant notion had taken root, the word practically went out of use ; but in all the earlier ages of the Hebrew history both Jehovah and Elohim were freely employed in the composition of proper names. The question of the introduction, or, rather, of the origin, of this name is of great interest, and, not less, of great moment. It may be part of the Hebrew verb “to be,” “probably the third person present, or the same tense of the Hiphil form.” But, if it be so, then it is a pure Semitic word, and the name is proved to be the inheritance of all tribes speaking Semitic dialects, and notably of all Canaanites and Phœnicians. Accordingly we find the name in common use among those tribes, and taken over from them by the Greeks, in many of whose mythologies Semitic names have been largely embodied, and so ingeniously transformed that the borrowing is not at first sight perceptible. But Melikertes is Melkarth, Adonis is Adonai, Athamas is Tammuz, Palaimon is Baal-Hamon ; and with scarcely less certainty Jehovah, Jahve, is not only the Iau of cuneiform inscriptions, but the Iakchos of the Dionysiac mysteries. At the time of writing the Second Part of his work on the Pentateuch, the Bishop had concluded that Samuel was the first to

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part II. p. 262.

form and introduce the name,<sup>1</sup> perhaps in imitation of some Egyptian name of the Deity which may have reached his ears. Later on, in his examination of the *New Bible Commentary*, he regards its connexion with the Greek substantive verb as established; and if the account of its introduction cannot be accepted as historical, the partial displacing of the name Elohim for that of Jehovah or Jahveh is precisely parallel to the displacement of the Vedic Varuna by Dyaus, and of Dyaus again by Indra. But the existence of the sixth chapter of Exodus as part of the distinctively Elohist narrative in which that name has been used proves conclusively that there were reasons for giving a solemn sanction to the substitution of the new name; and the name, so introduced, was carried back by the later Jehovistic writers to the very earliest times. Some have affected to feel astonishment at the possibility of their doing this without perceiving the contradiction which they were introducing between their own statements and those of the Elohist. The answer lies in the frank admission that they should have seen it; and the author of the Jehovistic narratives of the Creation and the Deluge, or the revisers who pieced the Elohist and Jehovistic narratives together, ought to have seen that they were going in the teeth of the Elohist story. But they have not seen it. So, too, the immense body of devout readers of the Bible in later ages and in our own day ought to have seen these "obvious discrepancies." But they have not. It is no less wonderful that the Ptolemaic system of astronomy should have held its ground, although Aristarchus of Samos had set forth a heliocentric system differing inappreciably from that of Copernicus and Newton. But so it was. We cannot reason back from the discernment of the critical eye to dulness of vision which looks only for edification.<sup>2</sup>

These, however, are not the only difficulties connected with

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part II. p. 339.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 265.

the alleged Mosaic introduction of the name Jehovah. From this time the word is employed in the historical books as the ruling name for God, and is clearly exhibited as the name by which the God of Israel would be especially and commonly known to His people. But in this case it would be found in common, if not in altogether exclusive, use, in those books which do not deal with history. Instead of this, we find it used very rarely, if at all, by

“most eminent writers, who must have been familiar with the name and must have used it, if it was really common in those days,”<sup>1</sup>

and of these writers the most noteworthy are the authors of the Psalms, which in the Hebrew are divided into five books, and of which seventy-three are ascribed by their titles to David. Of the fourteen Psalms which have inscriptions referring to events in his life, eight are said to have reference to events in his earlier years ; and six of them (the remaining two will be dealt with presently) exhibit the name Elohim forty times, and Jehovah six times. Surely the Bishop is justified in holding it to be inconceivable that such a man as David should during a large portion of his life have been writing Psalms in which the name Jehovah is hardly ever, sometimes never, employed, if the story of the giving of the name be historical, or if it was known to him that this name was first revealed to Moses by God Himself, as the name by which He chose to be addressed, the proper name of the God of Israel, “This is My name for ever ; and this is My memorial unto all generations.” If in addition to these six Psalms we take the other twelve of the Second Book which are ascribed to David, we find Elohim occurring in them seven times, on an average, to Jehovah once, and in nine to the exclusion of Jehovah altogether.<sup>2</sup> The phenomena of the

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part II. p. 268.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 277.

sixty-eighth Psalm are still more significant. That it belongs to David's age, and not to any earlier one, is clear from the mention of the hill in which Elohim desires to dwell for ever, of the temple at Jerusalem, of the sanctuary, of the holy places, while its martial tone seems to prove that it cannot be brought down to the days of Solomon, and the expressions which speak of Judah and Benjamin as joined with the princes of Zebulon and Naphthali point not less clearly to a time anterior to the division of the kingdom.

“ This Psalm contains Elohim thirty-one times, and Adonai, lord, seven times, as well as the ancient name Shaddai once, while Jehovah appears only twice and Jah twice.”<sup>1</sup>

But the emphatic way in which this name Jah or Jehovah is introduced in the fourth verse, seems to force on us the conclusion that it was only then for the first time coming into use, instead of having been employed generally for nearly half a millennium. Further yet, the Psalm opens with the very words which are said to have been used by Moses to greet the ark when it set forward on its march, the only difference being that in the Book of Numbers the name is Jehovah, in the Psalm it is Elohim ; and surely the Psalmist could never have made this change had he drawn “ his language from so sacred a book as the Pentateuch, according to the ordinary view, must have been.”<sup>2</sup> But if the passage from Numbers was written after the Psalm, and at a time when the name Jehovah had come into common use, we can readily understand, and discern, the motive of the adaptation. The Psalm is, further, instructive as to the form in which the popular traditions of ancient events in Jewish history were still found—the dropping heavens, the clouds dropping water, the trembling of Sinai, and, still more, the flight of the armed warriors and bowmen of Ephraim, of which the Pentateuch

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part II. p. 292.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 293.

seems to have preserved no record, unless the passage in Deuteronomy i. 44, is taken to refer to it. The whole Psalm is, indeed, a magnificent poem. By Hupfeld it is described as "the most spirited, lively, and powerful," by Ewald as "the grandest, most splendid, most artistic," of the whole series. But if it be such, it becomes "almost incredible that its author . . . should have been willing to borrow two sentences from two ancient documents."<sup>1</sup> In short, the Psalm belongs manifestly to the time of the removal of the ark to Mount Zion, the only time which, according to Hupfeld, suits certain of its features. It must, therefore, be regarded, in De Wette's words, as "among the oldest relics of Hebrew poetry, and of the highest originality;" but on this very ground its evidence against the historical trustworthiness of the story in Exodus becomes the stronger. What, then, is to be said of the two Psalms, xxxiv. and cxlii. (out of the eight already mentioned), which are said to have been composed by David at a time long preceding the transference of the ark to Jerusalem, in which, together, the name Jehovah is used nineteen times, Elohim not once? Of these two Psalms the former is ascribed to the time of his expulsion from Gath by Achish; yet its tone, as Hengstenberg notices, is singularly quiet, and we have here the alphabetical arrangement which occurs only in those Psalms which are not called forth by particular occasions, but framed for the purpose of edifying others. But if the title be inaccurate, we have no reason for ascribing the Psalm to David at all. It is in all likelihood the composition of an old man who bids children approach and learn from him the fear of Jehovah. But we have, the Bishop adds,

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part II. p. 297. The Bishop remarks that "both these passages are in close connexion with the context, and have all the appearance of being part of the original effusion," the conclusion being "in fact, that the Psalm was in all probability written *first*, and the passages in question copied from it by the later writers."

“a Psalm composed by David, according to the title, on this very occasion, Psalm lvi., and in a very different tone—one of anguish and fear quite suitable to it; and in this we have, as we might expect, Elohim nine times, Jehovah once.”<sup>1</sup>

In the other Psalm, likewise, we have nothing to fix it, as the title affirms, to the time of David’s sojourn in the cave of Adullam; but there is another Psalm, lvii., which seemingly was composed at this time, and this contains Elohim seven times, Jehovah not once; and it is surely most unlikely that

“on the very same occasion David should have written two Psalms, in one of which he never uses the word Jehovah, while in the other he never uses the word Elohim.”

The general conclusion can scarcely be withstood.

“It seems absolutely impossible that, while other persons (as the history teaches)—Eli, Samuel, Jonathan, . . . Naomi and Ruth, Boaz and his reapers, Hannah, Abigail, nay, even the heathen Philistines, were using freely the sacred name Jehovah, yet David himself used it so sparingly that in several of his Psalms it appears not at all. It is true, the *history* puts the word in David’s mouth much more frequently than Elohim—that is to say, the history represents David as using constantly the name Jehovah, and scarcely the name Elohim at all, *at the very time* when he was hiding in the wilderness, and writing, apparently, Psalm after Psalm in which Elohim occurs continually, and Jehovah scarcely at all.”<sup>2</sup>

But the sixty-eighth Psalm suggests a comparison with the song which bears the names of Deborah and Barak, a conjunction which seems of itself to show that it cannot be, as the title avers, “the unpremeditated effusion of the moment of triumph.” This song is thoroughly Jehovistic, and, if it be genuine, seems to render it inconceivable that

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part II. p. 298.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 328.

“David should have used [the name] so sparingly till a late period of his life ;”

but on the other hand there are signs pointing apparently to an early date. There is no mention of Judah, or of Levi, of the priesthood or of the sanctuary ; but the disarming of the Israelites refers seemingly to the times of Samuel and Saul, and some passages of the song are identical with others in the Psalm. It follows

“that either the Psalmist was acquainted with the song of Deborah and borrowed expressions from it, or that the writer of that song drew his ideas from the Psalms of David. . . . Which, then, of these two poems was first written? We reply, without hesitation, *the Psalm*. For it is far more probable that a later writer might change Elohim into Jehovah, than David change Jehovah, the covenant name of the God of Israel, into Elohim ; more especially in the last clause, in which he has actually written, ‘before Elohim, the Elohim of Israel,’ where the other has, ‘before Jehovah, the Elohim of Israel.’”

The general result of the whole inquiry thus far is that the earliest portions of the Pentateuch—in other words, the first scanty beginnings of it—were written four centuries at least after the supposed time of the Exodus. In the framing of this sketch it is in a high degree likely that Samuel may have taken the chief part ; but it is actually impossible that his narrative should be a mere invention of his own brain. The charges of fiction and pious fraud which, as some will have it, would thus be brought home to him, are ludicrous. We might with equal reason set down the early Greek and Roman traditions as the invention of Herodotus and Livy, or of the ruder chroniclers who may have preceded them. The discovery of the composite character of the Pentateuch is spoken of by Hupfeld as



“not only one of the most important, and most pregnant with consequences for the interpretation of the historical books of the Old Testament, or rather for their whole theology and history ; but it is also one of the most certain discoveries which have been made in the domain of criticism and the history of literature. Whatever the anti-critical party may bring forward to the contrary, it will maintain itself . . . . so long as there exists such a thing as criticism.”

This discovery, and therefore this fact, the Bishop adds,

“it becomes us as true men, and servants of the God of Truth, to recognise, whatever may be the consequences, however it may require us to modify our present views of the Mosaic system, or of Christianity itself.”<sup>1</sup>

The share of Samuel in the work may not be great, but it is none the less important ; and those portions of the first four books and of the Book of Joshua, which do not belong to him, or perhaps it should rather be said to the Elohist, were composed by one or more writers living

“in the latter days of David and in the early part of Solomon’s reign, with the exception of some interpolations, of which a few smaller ones occur in Genesis, but larger ones in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Joshua ; and these interpolations belong to the Deuteronomist, who may fairly be regarded as one of the most remarkable personages in all Jewish history.”

At the outset a comparison of his work with that of his predecessors forces on our notice the fact that, whereas in the earlier books the priests are invariably called the sons of Aaron, never the sons of Levi, in Deuteronomy they are always called sons of Levi or Levites, never the sons of Aaron ; and, in fact, in this book Levi, not Aaron, is mentioned as the root of the priestly office and dignity. Is it

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part II. p. 355.

conceivable that, in the inappreciable interval which separates the time of the Book of Numbers from that of the Book of Deuteronomy, Moses should have changed so completely,

“not only his tone and style, but his very phraseology, so as up to this point of time to have called the priests invariably by one particular designation, and then suddenly to drop it, and call them ever afterwards by another”?<sup>1</sup>

This fact connects itself with others. Not one of the prophets speaks of the priests as the sons of Aaron, and the first Jeroboam is censured not for making priests which were not of the sons of Aaron, but because he made priests which were not of the seed of Levi. It is, then, at once clear that the Deuteronomist and the prophets felt themselves in no way bound to abide by the statements or the terms of the first four books of the Pentateuch. A signal instance of this disregard occurs in the Deuteronomistic version of the fourth commandment, which gives a wholly different reason for the observance of the Sabbath, although both the Deuteronomist and the earlier writer profess to give the identical words spoken by Jehovah Himself at the very same point of time.

The Bishop concludes his summary of results obtained in his first two Parts with the assertion that the main conclusions are established beyond doubt, although

“as to the details we can only feel our way along with the utmost caution, with continued labour, and constantly repeated survey of the ground travelled over.”

Few fallacies are more widely spread, few more mischievous, than the notions which infer the general worthlessness of critical methods from differences of opinion among the critics. The fact of their differing is enough for their opponents; the subject-matter of their differences is prudently and carefully kept out of sight. This plan has been diligently followed in

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part II. p. 360.

almost all controversies—in those which are concerned with the age and authorship of the so-called Homeric poems, with the Greek and Roman myths and traditions, not less than with those which have gathered round the Hebrew Scriptures. Thus Mr. MacCaul would triumphantly dismiss as rubbish all the investigations of writers whose opinions were opposed to his own, on the ground that they were not unanimous.

“Hupfeld condemns Knobel. Ewald condemns Hupfeld and Knobel. Knobel condemns Ewald and Hupfeld. If Knobel’s criticism is correct, Hupfeld is worthless. If Ewald be right, the others must be deficient in critical acumen. They may all be wrong; but only one of the three can be right.”

He forgot, as the Bishop remarked, to draw attention to the fact that these critics are all agreed as to the main points, and differ only as to details.<sup>1</sup> Still less did he care to admit that the fact of their differing is a strong proof of their independence of each other and of the truth of that judgement in which they are all agreed. The argument may be turned with equal ease against those who maintain the ordinary view. Kurtz condemns Hengstenberg, and Hengstenberg condemns Kurtz.

The alarm felt as to the results of these investigations is perhaps not so deep as it was when the Bishop published his own thoughts about them. Certainly, it is not so widely spread. It is, therefore, the less necessary now to reproduce his earnest and cheering counsels to those who were charging him with robbing them of the Bible; but it is as necessary as it was then to mark their true charity and tenderness.

“It is not I,” he said, “who require you to abandon the ordinary notion of the Mosaic authorship and antiquity of the Pentateuch. It is the Truth itself which does so.”

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part II. p. 366

The internal evidence is absolutely conclusive against any idea of the inviolable sacredness of any part of the Hebrew Scriptures, down, at least, to the time of the Captivity. There is no sign of the Mosaic Law having been venerated, obeyed, or even known for many centuries after its alleged promulgation. The Decalogue is never quoted by any one of the psalmists and prophets. The Levites are mentioned only once in the Psalms, once in the late Isaiah, thrice in one chapter only of Jeremiah, and in no other of the prophets before the Captivity.

“Aaron is mentioned once only by all the prophets. Moses is named twice only before the Captivity, and referred to, though not named, in Hosea.”<sup>1</sup>

As to the main conclusion he had no hesitation.

“It may be—rather it is, as I believe, undoubtedly—the fact that God Himself, by the power of the Truth, will take from us in this age the Bible as an idol, which we have set up against His will, to bow down to it and worship it. But while He takes it away thus with the one hand, does He not also restore it to us with the other? not to be put into the place of God, and served with idolatrous worship, but to be revered as a book, the best of books, the work of living men like ourselves—of men, I mean, in whose hearts the same human thoughts were stirring, the same hopes and fears were dwelling, the same Gracious Spirit was operating, three thousand years ago, as now.”<sup>2</sup>

But here the inquiry has brought us to a point at which the scene is shifted. A mass of evidence has shown that the Tetrateuch, or first four books which bear the name of Moses, contains passages which cannot have been written for many ages after the supposed time of his death. How is it with the fifth book? Have we any reason for thinking that this book

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part II. p. 375.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 381.

is more strictly and completely Mosaic than those which precede it? To a certain extent the question is simplified by the fact that it is beyond all doubt the work of one and the same hand, the exceptions being so small as to be insignificant. The introductory discourse is interrupted here and there with geographical and other details, which look like pieces of patch-work, and with remarks which treat events of the previous weeks as incidents of a long past age ; but otherwise the unity of the book remains unbroken, while in matter and in style it is as unlike any of the so-called Mosaic books as any two books on the same subject could possibly be. The other books are filled with long historical narratives, with directions for the construction of the sanctuary and its furniture, with the functions of priests and the ritual of the altar. But, lacking almost wholly all such details, the Book of Deuteronomy,

“almost from beginning to end, is one magnificent poem, or collection of poems, wholly devoted to enforcing, in tones of earnest and impassioned eloquence—now with the most persuasive and touching tenderness, now with the most impressive and terrible denunciations,—the paramount duties of morality and religion.”<sup>1</sup>

When Mr. Rawlinson speaks of “plainness, inartificiality, absence of rhetorical ornament, and occasional defective arrangement” as being the chief characteristics of the Pentateuch, he certainly cannot be speaking of the Book of Deuteronomy. What he says applies strictly to all the other books ; but it is precisely the contrast between the commonplace style of those books, and the “spirit and energy, the fire of holy zeal, the warmth of imagination,” running through the whole of Deuteronomy, which impels us irresistibly to the conclusion that it cannot be the work of the author or authors of

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part III. p. 393.

the Tetrateuch. It is of no use to plead as an argument for its Mosaic authorship that, as his long life's work drew towards its close, the guide and lawgiver of the Israelites may, while he stood on the verge of the unseen world, have risen to a higher discernment of spiritual realities and have been carried away by thoughts which found their natural expression in one unbroken strain of sublime and most earnest eloquence. It is useless, because all the other books of the Pentateuch contain a multitude of passages which could not have been written during the age of Moses, or for many generations later, and because the same remark applies to the Book of Deuteronomy also ; so that, although the substantial unity of that work is proof of its having come, with these exceptions, from one author, that author certainly was not Moses. In the other books the priests are always, as we have seen, styled the sons of Aaron, never the sons of Levi ; in Deuteronomy they are always the sons of Levi, never the sons of Aaron. It is impossible that any one author could on such a subject as this so completely change his form of expression in the interval of a few days, or weeks at most. Again, the Deuteronomist confines all sacrifices to one place ; the other books prescribe their being offered in all places where Jehovah records his name. The former, although enjoining the observance of the other three great feasts and the Passover, makes no mention of the feast of Trumpets, or of the Day of Atonement, although the directions in Numbers xxix. are said to have been laid down by Jehovah Himself only a few weeks before this address of Moses. There are, further, a number of sentiments, statements, and expressions, occurring repeatedly in Deuteronomy, which are found very rarely, many of them nowhere, in the rest of the Pentateuch, while many expressions common throughout the other books are never found in Deuteronomy. Thus the Bishop gives thirty-three expressions, each found on the average eight times in that book, but

not occurring even once in any of the other four books. Without going further, therefore, this fact at least is proved, that the author of Deuteronomy, whoever he may have been, was not concerned in writing the main portions of the rest of the Pentateuch.<sup>1</sup>

That he lived after the other writers is manifest from his references to passages in the story of the Exodus recorded in the other books, and especially to the laws about leprosy in Leviticus. If, then, the Elohistic and Jehovistic portions of the Pentateuch could not, as we have seen, have been written earlier than the days of Samuel, David, and Solomon, the Deuteronomist cannot have lived earlier, and may have lived later, than the time of Solomon. Are there, then, any others of the later books of the Old Testament which exhibit any striking agreement with the language and the spirit of the Book of Deuteronomy? If the latter speaks only of the priests the sons of Levi, never of the sons of Aaron, the same formula is invariably used by Jeremiah. Both Jeremiah and the Deuteronomist use the word *Torah* in the singular only, and apply it to the whole Law: both confine all sacrifices to the one place which the Lord chooses. Of twenty-three expressions, again, which occur on an average eight times each in Deuteronomy and never once in the Tetrateuch, all but six are found repeated more or less frequently in Jeremiah, and of these remaining six four are *partially* repeated.<sup>2</sup> Already, then, we have evidence enough to justify a suspicion, perhaps a strong suspicion, that the author of Deuteronomy and the author of the prophecies of Jeremiah was one and the same person.

But the history of the reign of Josiah brings before us an astonishing and mysterious event, which, if it occurred in the history of any other people of the ancient world, we should certainly submit to a very rigid scrutiny. The Book of the

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part III. pp. 404-6.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 411.

Law, we are told, was found in the House of Jehovah—a book either unknown or forgotten. Of its contents the king knew nothing, and it was evidently to him a new revelation, when he read in the ears of the people all the words of the Book of the Covenant which both king and people had all along been bound to keep but of which both had thus far lived in total ignorance. A multitude of questions come crowding upon us. The book was found in the Temple; but if it was written by Moses, where had it been lying during the interval of more than eight centuries? Not certainly in the ark itself. There the priest Hilkiah could not have found it, inasmuch as he dared not to look into it; and we have, further, the plain statement in the history (1 Kings viii. 9) that there was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone. Nor could it have been lying outside the ark, for then surely it would have been named among the things brought into the Temple by Solomon.

“At all events,” the Bishop adds, “it would have been well known to David and Solomon and other pious kings, as well as to the successive high priests, and we should not find them so regardless of so many of its plain precepts as the history shows them to have been, *e.g.* with respect to the worshipping on high places and the neglect of the due observance of the Passover.”<sup>1</sup>

But the book, further, itself gives the command, “Take the Book of the Law and place it beside the ark of the covenant of Jehovah your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee;” and the suspicion thus grows almost to certainty that the writing of the book, the placing it, and the finding it were pretty nearly contemporaneous events, and that if there was no king before Josiah who turned to Jehovah with all his heart and soul and might according to

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part III. p. 416.



*all* the Law of Moses, it must have been because there was no king before him who had ever seen this portion at least of the Pentateuch. No one probably will venture to say that the whole Pentateuch was now found, or that the whole could have been lost. It was clearly some book which could be read off at a single sitting. The scribe Shaphan read the whole of it to the king, and the king read the whole of it in the ears of the people. The whole Pentateuch certainly could not be read in a day ; but the book now found is called the Book of the Covenant ; and in Deuteronomy we read, "These are the words of the covenant which Jehovah commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel in the land of Moab."

But the whole narrative of the finding of the book shows that a searching reformation was needed, that there were some few at least who were determined to carry this reform, and that a resolute attempt was made to carry it out. The popular and national religion (whatever may have been that of David, or Solomon, or even of Hezekiah) had been thus far a gross, sensual, and cruel idolatry, under which familiar spirits and wizards found a shelter and a home, and the people abandoned themselves to images, idols, and all abominations. On this vast system of superstition the earnest and passionate denunciations of the prophets had made no real impression. Something more, therefore, must be done, if the social and political order of Judah was to be saved from the catastrophe which had swept away the kingdom of Israel. The Mosaic and Levitical codes, if known at all, were a dead letter ; or, rather, we have no warrant whatever for declaring that the main body of the people knew anything about them or had ever heard of their existence. But immediately after the discovery of the book a strong effort was made to put down the popular idolatry, and to celebrate a Passover as a means of bringing together the whole body

of the people. With singular and studied minuteness we are told that never from the days of the Judges that judged Israel, nor in all the days of the Kings of Israel, nor of the Kings of Judah, was such a Passover held as this of the eighteenth year of King Josiah. But not less astonishing than the discovery of the book is the fact that no such Passover, so far as we can see, was ever held again, even by Josiah ;

“nor is there the least indication that the other two feasts were kept by Josiah with similar solemnity in that same year.”<sup>1</sup>

What reason can be given for this fact except the further fact that the people were not prepared to accept the religion of the prophets, and that the zeal of the king himself had been cooled by his becoming acquainted with the real circumstances of the discovery? Anyhow, neither king nor people received anything more than a mere passing impression of the Divine authority of the law set forth in the Book of the Covenant. The latter, like the book of Exodus, insisted on the Divine command that all the males of the Jewish nation should appear thrice each year before Jehovah their Elohim ; and this command was never obeyed at all even by Josiah. From all these circumstances what conclusion is to be drawn? Five years only before the discovery of the Book of the Covenant Jeremiah had felt himself called to undertake the prophetic office ; and certainly no prophet had ever entered on his life's work with a deeper sense of responsibility, and a more overwhelming assurance that unless there were a change for the better, the fabric of Jewish society must speedily be overturned altogether. But what could he do? The prophets Joel, Hosea, Amos, Isaiah, Micah, had all spoken, and seemingly to little purpose.

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuch*, Part III. p. 419.