

to say with Savonarola, "Separated from the Church Militant, but *not* from the Church Triumphant," we know not. We can only hope earnestly that such was the case, and that the troubled, weary heart found rest at the feet of the great High Priest, whose heart of love can be "touched by the infirmities" of His erring children.

In taking leave of this group of talented and earnest men, we must feel that their history affords no plea for the Church to which they belonged, whose pitiless rule drove one to the verge of unbelief and blighted his life hopes, and led the other to bury rare powers under a monk's cowl. But while we thank God for our clearer light, let us not forget the deeper responsibility it lays on us, of showing that we have been truly "made free" through Christ by "glorifying Him in our bodies and spirits, that are His."

E. J. WHATELY.



#### ART. IV.—THE KINGDOM OF ALL-ISRAEL.

*The Kingdom of All-Israel: its History, Literature, and Worship.* By JAMES SIME, M.A., F.R.S.E. Pp. 620. Nisbet and Co., 1883.

**T**HIS is a very opportune and a really valuable book. It is the story of the kingdom of all-Israel as it existed and was known in its most prosperous days. This history the writer has examined and scrutinised on the same principles that have been applied in verifying the history of Greece and Rome; namely, the comparison of the history with the literature and the due attention to the technicalities of words and phrases. In studying the Biblical records the observance of these principles is of paramount and indispensable importance; for if the date of the historical records is uncertain or questionable, that of various portions of the literature is undisputed, as, for instance, Hosea, Micah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the like; and the evidence which may be drawn from these is conclusive with regard to the facts that they imply. For example: no man in his senses can doubt that Hosea must have had our actual Book of Genesis before him when he alluded as he did to certain incidents in the personal history of Jacob. No critic would be warranted in surmising that the history was suggested by the hints found in the prophecy. There must have been a depository in which the record of the incidents was preserved, and that record must have been familiar alike to the prophet and his readers.

This is a conclusion of no less certainty than one that is mathematically demonstrable; and therefore we may be sure

that whatever else is true, this cannot be other than true. No theory can avail to establish conclusions which are inconsistent with this fact. It is impossible that Genesis can be later than Hosea; and, so far as its integrity is involved in the existence of these parts, its existence as a whole is carried with the proof of the existence of the parts. No theory of disintegration can stand which is inconsistent with this evidence of acquaintance with particular parts of it.

It is this kind of argument which is urged with so much effect by Mr. Sime in his extremely well-written and highly interesting and readable book. He shows that the record of the history of all-Israel, which is unquestionably authoritative, and is, at all events, our only source of information, is continually bearing spontaneous and unpremeditated testimony in a hundred ways to the recognised existence of documents which must have been no less authoritative when that history was recorded, and, so far as the record is trustworthy, when it took place. This kind of evidence is absolutely beyond the reach of any fabricator, for the simple reason that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred it could never be discovered, and therefore the labour of so fabricating would be utterly lost.

"The history in Samuel," says Mr. Sime, "is unintelligible if the Book of Deuteronomy was not from the first a household book in Hebrew homes." This may be said to be, in a great measure, his thesis; and a most important one it is, for if that Book is not the work of Moses, which it professes to be, then the idea of a *special* divinely communicated written revelation must come to an end. Everything else in the Old Testament must be confessedly subjective if the revelation ostensibly given in Deuteronomy is not real. If Deuteronomy is authentic, then it is certainly genuine; and if it is genuine, then is Moses as truly the mediator of the first covenant as Christ was of the second. But if Deuteronomy is not genuine, then it is hard to see how, except in a very shadowy way, he was a mediator at all. Attacks are frequently made upon the genuineness of the books of Scripture because that is the point on which, from lack of evidence, it is most easy to make assertions and to build theories, and because, in nine cases out of ten, it is not perceived that in attacking the genuineness of these books their authenticity is undermined.

The authenticity of the books of Scripture—that is to say, their truth as narratives of fact—is so very deep-rooted in the belief or the prejudices of mankind, that it requires considerable boldness to attack it directly; therefore the attack is made on the side of genuineness, because it is not commonly perceived that to attack the one is to undermine the other. It is easier to say that Deuteronomy is not genuine than it is

to say that Moses was an impostor. Many will patiently listen to the one assertion who would indignantly reject the other. But if Deuteronomy be not genuine, what guarantee can we have for the authenticity of its facts? Nay, seeing that we cannot tell *when* it was written by many centuries, are there not a hundred chances to one against its being authentic? Whereas, if the book is the genuine record of the man who professes to write it, then we must decide furthermore upon his personal truth or falsehood, and most certainly it becomes proportionately difficult to decide that he is not speaking the truth, if indeed it is he who speaks. It is thus, in like manner, that not seldom the authenticity of the facts of Scripture—say, for example, the Gospels—is really bound up with and involved in the truth with which the books are ascribed to their traditional authors. If St. John wrote the fourth Gospel, we have small reason to doubt his facts; if he did not write it, we have as little reason to accept with confidence what has been fictitiously recorded with the lustre and authority of his name. It is therefore an easy method of dealing a back-handed but effectual blow at the reality of the facts of Scripture, to scatter broadcast and without scruple insinuations against the genuineness of its various parts.

Now if it can be shown—and it seems to us that Mr. Sime has gone far in showing—that the history of Samuel as recorded is a witness of the existence and the knowledge of Deuteronomy at the time it was written, then in proportion as that history is trustworthy, we have the strongest possible confirmation of the genuineness and truth of Deuteronomy; for in the interval between Moses and Samuel there is no one whom it would be worth anyone's while to suggest as the author: and therefore to neutralise the combined force derived from the mutual interdependence of Deuteronomy and Samuel, it would be needful to assume that Samuel was written with a view to support Deuteronomy, or that both were framed and fabricated with a view to support and confirm each other; neither of which suppositions can be entertained for a moment.

As an instance of the critical discernment of the writer may be quoted the following (p. 27). After saying that it was customary to anoint kings in Egypt, he continues:

A more effectual plan was adopted to secure a king's respect for Law (in Deuteronomy): "He shall make him a copy of this law; and it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life." Although, then, Deuteronomy was not the source from which the idea of anointing came, the propriety or necessity of the custom found a lodgment in Hebrew thought at an early period. Jotham, the son of Gideon, about two centuries after the conquest, and Hannah, the mother of Samuel, a century later still, are witnesses to the existence of the phrase

in their day. It may have been a traditional saying, handed down among the Hebrews in anticipation of the time when the law of the king, embodied in the popular law-book, should be realized in the nation's history. That it is not found in the Book of Deuteronomy is a clear indication of the great age of that book compared with the parable of Jotham or the anointing of Saul.

This is surely a point which has been too much overlooked, and which is of intrinsic and undeniable importance. All through the Pentateuch there is abundant mention of anointing, but it is invariably in connection with the priesthood, or the temple and its furniture. There is no hint of the anointing of kings. But no sooner do we come to the king as a fact and reality, than the idea of anointing is paramount and inseparable from his office and person, and the only two hints at the notion are these in the history of Jotham and the prayer of Hannah. Critics may indulge their passion for theory as they please, and may insist upon the late date of the Pentateuch and upon its composite nature; but here, as a matter of fact which it is impossible to ignore, and assuredly very difficult to explain, while it nevertheless asks loudly for explanation, is a characteristic feature which declares as clearly as it is possible to do that the books of the law and the historical books are as widely separate in time as they were totally distinct in origin. No fabricator would have been justified in leaving on the surface of his narrative so glaring an inconsistency between books upon any supposition intended to be so interdependent as the Pentateuch and the historical books.

The early history of the election of Saul is then worked out with great fulness of detail, and all the minutest touches and indications of the narrative are elaborated and set in their true relation and light, so that the story reads with all the freshness and vividness of novelty; and it is remarkable, in the course of doing this, how the presence of Deuteronomy is detected presiding like a conscience over the actions of Samuel, and that to a degree which was not suspected, so that "out of 100 verses in the story as told in Samuel, nearly one half borrow the words and thoughts of Deuteronomy."

Nor can it be said that in the eighth century B.C. the rights of property in books was not recognised, for as Mr. Sime well says: "Sargon, the great king of Assyria, 707 B.C., has left a testimony which might make the advocates of this theory blush. The last words of the long annals of his reign are: 'Whoever shall alter my writings and my name, may Assur, the great God, throw down his sword; may he exterminate in this land his name and his offspring, and may he never pardon him this sin!' Dishonesty and forgery in writings were

esteemed as discreditable in Sargon's days as in ours—perhaps more so."

To mention another instance, Samuel's well-known words: "To obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." The burning of the fat by the priests is not the only reference to the law in these six Hebrew words, important though it is in its bearing on the existence of Leviticus at that time; "fat of rams" is found elsewhere only in the song (Deut. xxxii. 14), "with fat of lambs and of rams." "It is impossible to get rid of these and other coincidences of phrase as accidental. They are nerves of life running through the history and giving feeling to every part. If they be taken away the history is left of its life. It becomes a machine wound up to go through certain movements, but destitute of the living action which marks this narrative" (p. 91).

Mr. Sime's remarks on p. 112 may be taken as rightly characterising much of the criticism which has found so much favour of late. Speaking of Bleek's "Introduction," with regard to his reasoning on Leviticus—"a conglomerate of a most elastic nature"—he says:

"Perhaps" occurs thrice in them; "probably," twice; "probable," twice; "very probable," twice; "likely," twice; "it may be maintained with certainty," once; "this may be certainly assumed," once; "we cannot analyse this book in detail with any certainty, but I think it tolerably certain," once. And no fewer than nine lines contain a hearty condemnation of De Wette's view that "the various parts of Leviticus were added gradually by different compilers." "This supposition," he says, "is quite inadmissible, and has been tacitly retracted, even by De Wette himself." Here then are thirteen "probables" in about seventy lines. For any practical purpose the reasoning is absolutely worthless; a "probable" every five or six lines may prove a writer's inability to make up his mind; it can never lead to definite and sure results.

With reference to the gap in the history which is conspicuous in the Book of Numbers, which is put forth as a mere indication of late origin, Mr. Sime remarks, p. 115: "If the writer of the Book of Numbers considered it necessary to bury in oblivion the events of the thirty-eight years, he only did what every other writer would have done. The Hebrews had had their chance, and had thrown it away. Politically, they were dead men in the eye of the historian. Even their children did not receive the rite of circumcision, the seal of the covenant; civil death had passed over the camp of Israel (Josh. v. 5). A generation would elapse before they would sleep in their graves; but to renew their lives, their doings, their hopes, would have been a barren waste—a record of a race that had been effaced from the world. Lightning had struck the stock of the tree. A young shoot was

growing up: thirty-eight years would be required before the blasted trunk would decay, and the young shoot attain to its usual vigorous growth. Moses refused to write the history of that lightning-struck stock. The thread of the narrative could only be resumed when the chance which the parent stock had thrown away should be again given to its brother offspring. Most justly, therefore, does the chasm exist, for the men whose deeds would have been recorded were dead men in the eye of the law, condemned to lifelong imprisonment in that wilderness peninsula. The long gap, instead of being a proof of unreality in the history, proves, on the contrary, a deliberate design in the author." By putting ourselves in the author's place, says Mr. Sime, and viewing things as he may be thought to have viewed them, we are more likely to get at the real truth of this story, than by heaping "perhaps," or "probable," and "very probable," on "most likely," till we raise a scaffolding high as the heaven, but with foundations on a quicksand.

In a chapter on "The Literature and Worship of the People," the writer shows with great clearness (for the appreciation of which, however, the reader is referred to the work itself) that the ritual at Shiloh was the same as the ritual in the wilderness; that the sacrifices were the same in both cases, and regulated by the same laws; that it was the same with the offering of incense and the law of the feasts: and if from the narrative in Samuel it is right to infer that Elkanah went to Shiloh "only once a year," so also we may infer of Joseph and Mary that they "went to Jerusalem every year at the Feast of the Passover" only; that the furniture of the temple in Shiloh was the same as the furniture of the Mosaic tabernacle; that the garments of the high priest were the same at Shiloh and Nob as in the wilderness; that the names used for them, *me'il* and *ephod*, were specific as well as ordinary; and that the law of Moses was the same at Shiloh as in the Pentateuch. While, therefore, on the first blush of the thing it seems as though there were a great blank between the history of Samuel and the Pentateuch, on closer examination it is found that the indications of acquaintance with, and observance of, the Mosaic law, are minute and numerous, and since from their very nature they are unobtrusive and not immediately detected, their value as evidence of the existence of the law book is greatly increased thereby. Indeed, it becomes impossible to resist the inference which can alone be drawn from it.

The work of Mr. Sime is the most complete and satisfactory work of the kind that has appeared since Dr. W. Smith's first volume (when are the others to follow?) on the Pentateuch;

and it must be borne in mind that a few clear cases of proof, such as those here given, cause a whole mass of theory and conjecture to kick the beam.

Space does not allow us to do more than commend the remainder of the book to the attention of the reader, with the exception of the thirteenth chapter on the antiquity of Deuteronomy, which calls for more detailed notice. With regard to the fifth book of Moses, scholarship and criticism must be poor faculties if they cannot combine to make it something less than doubtful whether it is a work of the fifteenth century before Christ or of the eighth. But there are certain features which are plain to ordinary people, if not to critics and scholars, and about which the public at large are as competent to judge as the most learned. For instance, it is a significant fact to start with, that Deuteronomy is full of Egypt, but knows nothing of Assyria, though the latter in the age of Hezekiah must have been of all-absorbing interest. Again, there is no mention of Jerusalem in the book, as there might have been if it was written when Hezekiah was attempting to put down the high places, and to make his capital the only seat of ritual worship. For the writer makes mention of Ebal and Gerizim in such a way as to make them eclipse every other region in the land, as the Samaritans in the Lord's time naturally believed they did. The town of Shechem, according to this designation, was the central point of Palestine, and the national capital of the country. According to this writer, therefore, an importance is assigned to the whole neighbourhood which went far to defeat the purpose he had in view, if, as the theory supposes, that purpose was to write of Zion in the age of Hezekiah as the only place of acceptable sacrifice. Moreover, Ebal and Gerizim were then in a kingdom far from friendly to Judah. The command to build an altar on Ebal is intelligible if given before the people crossed the Jordan; it is unintelligible if not promulgated till many centuries after the conquest. While, however, to people who had spent their youth in Egypt the words of Deuteronomy—full of remembrances of Egypt—were as fresh as the spring grass, to people who knew the land only by report, and had never been in it, they were as withered as the grass of the desert under an autumn sun. The language would have been as much out of place in Hezekiah's reign as appeals to Englishmen would be in our own Queen's, reminding them of the pleasant fields and clear skies left by their Norman forefathers seven or eight centuries ago. And yet, at the same time, had the lessons of kindness to the stranger based on the recollection of Egyptian bondage been parables or frauds enforced for the first time eight centuries after the Exodus, the book could

not have been received with the reverence shown by the chiefs of the land. The king rent his clothes, we are told. "Great is the wrath of the Lord that is kindled against us," he said, and Huldah the prophetess assured him that his eyes should not see all the evil that was coming on Jerusalem and Judah. Unless the story of the book, as told in its own pages, is true, we are plunged in a further sea of hypocrisy and deceit, of which not only the unknown romancer was guilty, but the king, and the prophet, and the priest must have been themselves accessories or dupes. Then comes the absence of the horse, as an animal known to the writer of Deuteronomy. The dislike of it or the fear of it (Deut. xx. 1; xiv. 4, 7) is easily explained, if the book was written when it professes to have been; but in the days when Isaiah said, "their land is full of horses, neither is there any end of their chariots," it is incredible. No part of the Mosaic narrative gives the slightest hint of horses being in use for any purpose among the Hebrews; but in the days of Solomon the price of a horse was from £17 to £18 of our money. Only on the supposition that the writer of the book was living among a people who had no horses in their camp is this silence intelligible; and before the time of David the horse was unknown as a domestic animal among the Hebrews.

The law of the central altar (Deut. xii. 1-32) and the law of the king (Deut. xvii. 14-20) are the two great stumbling-blocks to modern critics. A central altar is held to be in flat contradiction to the history as it unfolded itself in the seven centuries from Moses to Hezekiah. But those who refuse to recognise in the central altar of Solomon the revival of a thing which once existed in Israel, but had ceased for a season, explain a lesser difficulty by shutting their eyes on others much greater. All through the Books of Samuel there are traces of acquaintance with this law; and if it is borne in mind that not every time mention is made of a popular feast or sacrifice is a priestly or atoning sacrifice necessarily meant, much difficulty is obviated. When Absalom slew cattle and sheep for his guests and partisans at Hebron, or Adonijah his brother at a later period at Zohelath, it does not follow that they were the peace-offerings or atoning sacrifices of the temple service. Absalom was not acting the part of a prince; he was aping the king in entertaining at a coronation feast the crowds who were flocking to his support. But there is no proof that Hebron, any more than Zohelath, was a local sanctuary or a centre of priestly worship.

We must conclude our notice of Mr. Sime's very able work, which we cordially recommend, and for which we heartily thank him, with the following quotation on the law of the king (p. 459):



The law of the king, given in Deuteronomy, was not forgotten in after-time. It comes to the front in Gideon's judgeship as a living thing, thought over, talked about among the people, and ready to be acted on. But Gideon refuses the honour. He does not condemn the people for making an unlawful request. He merely puts the kingship aside as an honour he would not take, but not as an honour which his countrymen had no right to offer. The law continued to be talked of among the people. They felt they were entitled to do as they had done in offering him the throne. They felt also that they were entitled to offer it to his family. At least, as soon as Gideon died, his court and eldest son expected to see supreme power bestowed on his brothers, while he himself, as unworthily born, would be shut out. By murdering all of them except Jotham, he seized, or thought to seize, the prize which his father put aside when it was offered as a free gift. Undoubtedly the minds of men were then familiar with the idea of a king for Israel. Although it came to the surface only in the days of Gideon and Samuel, it lay deep in the nation's heart, and may have burst forth in other cases. Of this we have ground for suspicion in the song of Hannah, more than fifty years before the choice of Saul: "The adversaries of the Lord shall be broken to pieces; out of heaven shall He thunder upon them. The Lord shall judge the ends of the earth; the Lord shall give strength unto His king, and exalt the horn of His anointed" (1 Sam. ii. 10). Instead of regarding these words as an utterance of the nation's deepest feelings, modern thinkers take the superficial view that they could not have been spoken by a poet unless a king had been then ruling in Israel. On the supposition that Hannah, like the elders in her son's old age, was only expressing the people's deep yearnings for a champion to deliver them from priestly vileness within and foreign thralldom without, there would be room for poetry such as breathes in her song, while it is difficult to see what she or they had to do with a king sitting on his throne. Hope gilded the future in her eyes with a coming glory, in contrast to the baseness which she saw around her in Eli's sons, and in the incapacity of the national chiefs. A king on his throne in actual life is seldom known to have inspired the people with these hopes. Since, then, Hannah's song was about half-way, in point of time, between Gideon's judgeship and the choice of Saul, a bridge is thus found existing across the gulf of centuries, from Gideon's death to the beginning of Saul's reign. The idea of a king ruling over the land never was dead among the Hebrews. Specially in times of trouble and discontent would it come to the surface; possibly it came up in their history many more times than are recorded in their books. We have, therefore, safe ground to go on in declining to regard the idea as new in Samuel's judgeship; at least, he was well aware that the people had the will of Jehovah on their side, for, in his view of the case, they were only rejecting himself as judge. Until it was pointed out to him, he never imagined that they were rejecting Jehovah as their king.

STANLEY LEATHES, D.D.

