

THE  
BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

---

OCTOBER, 1834.

---

No. IV.

---

*J. S. Alexander*  
ART. I.—*Guerike's Manual of Church History.\**

THE rapidity with which this work was sold, is a sufficient proof that it was wanted. The German press teems, it is true, with valuable books in this department, nor are there wanting in that language convenient manuals for the use of students. But research is continually adding to the stock of knowledge; and the favourable change, which has occurred of late years, in the religious views of many, has created a necessity for a compendious work, which should not only furnish the results of recent investigation, but present them in a form consistent with evangelical belief. This task Professor Guerike has undertaken in the work to which we now invite the attention of our readers. He is *Professor Extraordinarius* of theology in the University of Halle, and is well known as a strenuous adherent to the creed of Luther, but at the same time as an humble and devoted Christian. Some of our readers may perhaps recollect him, as the author of a life of Francke, which was reviewed in a former volume of this work,† and from which the late lamented Rezeau Brown

\* *Handbuch der Allgemeinen kirchengeschichte.* Von H. E. Ferd. Guerike. a. o. Professor der Theologie zu Halle. Halle, 1833. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 1120.

† See *Bib. Rep.* for July 1830.

*See Herge's Tenberg's  
Genuineness of the Pentateuch  
Vol. I, p. 394 ff*

ART. V.—*Wolf's Anti-Homeric Theory, as applied to the Pentateuch.*

IT was in 1795 that the accomplished humourist, Frederic Augustus Wolf, published his famous *Prolegomena to Homer*.\* With a critical boldness, not to say effrontery, before unknown, he there assailed the genuineness, unity, and alleged antiquity of the Homeric writings; and as he afterwards sought to prove, that some of Cicero's orations were mere declamatory exercises by a later rhetorician, so now he pretended to demonstrate, that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were the patch-work product of a score of rhapsodists.

The *Prolegomena* produced a great sensation. The paradox was brilliant, and its very impudence ensured applause. After a few feeble efforts, on the part of older scholars, to suppress the infant heresy, it spread like wild-fire. Wolf took rank as the first philologist of the age, and even some of those who had opposed him tried to share his glory, by pretending to priority of invention. Among these was old Heyne, one of his teachers at Göttingen, who had excluded him from his lectures on Pindar, as an incorrigible idler, and was rewarded for the same with Wolf's perpetual contempt. In a short time after the *Prolegomena* appeared, men were ashamed to be suspected of believing in the exploded personality of Homer.

Had this phrenetic affection of the German mind been strictly a monomania, little mischief would have followed. But as Wolf's conclusions were deduced, with logical parade, from historical premises, and backed by a terrible array of learning, it was not long before the same artillery was turned upon other objects. Under the pretence of levelling the strong holds of prejudice, one venerable relic of antiquity after another was exposed to these assaults; and though the superstructure did not always fall, the foundations were always shaken. The general confidence in

themselves with the epitome of the latter. Other authorities have been named in the margin. To these we may add as sources of fact or corroboration, the historical works of Schroeck (Part 15,) J. G. Walch, Mosheim, Guericke, Buddeus, A. Turretine, Staudlin, Twisten, J. Scott, &c. also the *Conversations-Lexikon*, Gerberon's *Histoire Generale de Jansenisme*.—There are few portions of Mosheim's works, as improved by Dr. Murdock, which are so complete in the accumulation of authorities as that which concerns the subject of this paper. The exact title of Leydecker's work is subjoined: *Melchioris Leydeckeri de Historia Jansenismi libri sex, quibus de Cornelii Jansenii Vita et Morte, necnon de ipsius et sequacium dogmatibus disseritur*. Utrecht, 1695. 8vo. pp. 667.

\* See a biographical Sketch of Wolf in the *Conversations-Lexikon*, and from that in the *Encyclopaedia Americana*.

history began to be impaired, and skeptical criticism became the order of the day.

But even this extension of Wolf's doctrines was innocuous, compared with that which followed. The lights of classical literature and profane history were for a time eclipsed; but while the 'sure word of prophecy' continued to shine, it relieved the gloom of the surrounding darkness; nor was it till a mad attempt was made to quench the lamp of life with Wolf's extinguisher, that the darkness became visible.

It was not to be expected that the new devices, which had won such loud applause from classical philologists, would be suffered to lie unemployed by biblical empirics. The reign of piety in Germany was over. The simple, manly faith of the Reformers was forgotten; the pietism of Spener and his followers was extinct; and even formal orthodoxy was already out of vogue. Theologians had begun to court the phantom of renown by a display of spurious liberality. It was thought to be a proof of lofty spirit and unfettered intellect, to make large concessions in favour of infidelity, and to cavil at the Scriptures, even *ex cathedra*. The system of theology had been thrown into a chaos by the ingenious inconsistencies of John Solomon Semler. The current of opinion among youthful theologians had received a fatal bias from the lukewarm latitudinarianism of John David Michaelis. And the elements thus engendered had begun to be compounded into a coherent mass of infidelity, by the genius and learning of John Godfrey Eichhorn.

Still there was something wanted to consummate the catastrophe. Still it was apparent, that the Bible could not lose a tittle of its historical authority, without a revolution in the principles of criticism. So long as the classics held their place, the Scriptures held theirs too. If Homer wrote the *Iliad*, Moses wrote the Pentateuch. The chain of evidence was longer, but the links were just alike; or, the difference, if any, was in favour of the Bible. This obvious analogy marred the enemies' design; and though Semler's medley of discordant doubts, Michaelis' series of treacherous concessions, and Eichhorn's attempts to demonstrate falsehood, were continually spreading a thick mist around the subject, yet whenever sunshine got the better for a moment, the landmarks of the old world were distinctly visible, the monuments of Greece and Rome were still on terra firma, and as for the word of God, its defence was still the munition of rocks.

In such a juncture, it may well be supposed, that the shock which Wolf's invention gave to established principles, in matters of criticism, was welcome to many of the enemies of truth.

That the revolution had begun on classical and not on biblical ground, was a favourable circumstance; for it removed the appearance of its having been occasioned by hostility to the Scriptures. A new and specious theory was ready to their hands, and nothing more was wanted than a skilful application of it.

The ignoble praise of opening this assault upon the Scriptures, with a train of borrowed ordnance, belongs, we think, to Vater, who, in his Commentary on the Pentateuch, attempted to apply the arguments which Wolf had forged for Homer. The primary object was to prove from history, that the Pentateuch could not have been written in the time of Moses; and the particular field from which the proofs were gathered, was the history of the art of writing. Let us snatch some samples of this precious reasoning from its merited oblivion, for the purpose of showing how men will sometimes labour to believe a falsehood, rather than be contented with a simple obvious truth. Of skeptical critics, it may be said with emphasis, that they strain at a gnat and swallow a camel.

It is but just, however, to observe, that this critical hoax was far from gaining universal countenance or credence. It was too irrational for rationalists themselves. No one withstood it more decidedly than Eichhorn, who is above all suspicion of prejudice in favour of the Scriptures. Bertholdt, another theological free-thinker, declares that nothing but a strong desire to make the books of Moses spurious, could have led to the assertion of such doctrines. Most of the later assailants of the Pentateuch are compelled, by their own critical canons, to recognise some passages, at least, as the work of Moses: this cuts them off from any direct appeal to the Wolfish theory, which, even on its own ground, that of classical criticism, has fallen into contempt.\* But the spirit of Wolf's reasoning still prevails, and the exploded imposture itself has been partially revived by Hartmann, of Rostock, in his late work on the Pentateuch. This absurd attempt to set the bones of a demolished sophism, has had the effect of calling forth to the defence of truth and Scripture, a redoubted champion, one who may compete with the first scholars of Germany, in point of erudition, and surpasses most of them in sobriety of judgment and an earnest love of truth. We refer to Professor Hengstenberg, whose excellent *Christologie* will shortly be completed, after which his attention will probably be given to a work upon the Pentateuch, for which he has

\* For a refutation of Wolf's arguments founded on the history of the art of writing, see Nitzsch's *Historia Homeri*.

been long preparing, and for which he is pre-eminently qualified. Our strong desire to see such a work from such an author, is enhanced by a sort of foretaste, which he has afforded, in an article running through several numbers of a literary journal, edited at Halle by Professor Tholuck.\* The first division of that article discusses the Wolfish theory, as applied by Vater and Hartmann to the Pentateuch, and is an admirable specimen of critical ratiocination. It is condensed, perspicuous, and conclusive. The substance of his argument we shall here endeavour to lay before our readers, with some change in the arrangement, and without servile adherence to the terms of the original.

The argument of Wolf, carried out to its full extent, and rigidly applied, would involve a flat denial, that writing was in use at all, so early as the time of Moses. This is a pitch of hardihood too bold for the assailants of the Pentateuch. Vater admits, that alphabetic writing was probably in use among the contemporaries of Moses; and Hartmann goes so far as to acknowledge, that the Phenicians were in possession of the art *long before* the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt.† For these concessions they deserve no praise, since they merely confess what is testified with one voice by all antiquity. The tradition of all nations agrees in referring the invention of this art to the first beginning of the human race. The Phenicians ascribed it to Thaut;‡ the Chaldeans, as Berosus tells us, to Oannes; the Egyptians to Thot, or Memnon, or Hermes; all which goes to prove, that the invention of the art lay beyond the earliest period of authentic history. Well might Pliny, therefore, after citing some of these testimonies, add: *ex quo apparet aeternus litterarum usus.*§ It was about the time of Moses, that Phenician emigrants, personified in history under the name of Cadmus, brought writing into Greece.||

The anti-mosaic argument, modified as it must be by so ample a concession, takes this form: Alphabetic writing was known to the Phenicians in the days of Moses; but the Israelites had been slaves in Egypt for above four hundred years, and cannot therefore be supposed to have enjoyed the same advantage.

\* Litterarischer Anzeiger für christliche Theologie und Wissenschaft überhaupt. 1833. Nos. 32, 33, 38, 39, 40, 44, 45.

† Vater, p. 542. Hartmann, p. 615.

‡ Sanchoniathon in Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* 1. 9. We retain the authorities cited in the German article, for the sake of such as may be disposed to investigate the subject for themselves.

§ Hist. Nat. VII. 5, 6.

|| Ewald, in his *Hebrew Grammar*, (p. 19) undertakes to prove, from the names of the letters, that the art of writing was far more ancient than the time of Moses. On the other side, see an article by Hupfeld, in the journal called *Hermes*, xxxi. 1. pp. 7, 8.

To this we answer by demanding, who can show that Jacob was not in possession of the art, when he descended into Egypt? True, it is not mentioned in the book of Genesis. But this, at furthest, only proves that it was not known to Abraham. For the only case in which we could expect it to be mentioned, is his negotiation with the sons of Heth.

So much for the negative. But we have positive ground for a presumption, that the art was known before the time of Moses, in the fact that there were officers called *Shoterim* among the children of Israel.\* That this word primarily and properly means *writers*, is the judgment of the best modern critics,† and is proved by Professor Hengstenberg, beyond the reach of cavil or objection. He exposes the false reasoning and philology of Vater, who maintains that the original sense is *overseers, inspectors*. It is evident that the latter sense is easily deducible from that of *scribe* or *writer*, while an inverted derivation is impossible. The argument is strengthened by the analogy of the Arabic, in which the root denotes to *write*, and a remote derivative means an *overseer* or *manager*. Coincident precisely is the important testimony of the ancient versions, the word being rendered *scribes* both in the Septuagint and Peshito. No critical question of the least dubiety could be more satisfactorily and completely solved. For the minute details we must refer the learned reader to the original article.

As for any doubt about the acquisition of the art at so remote a period, let it be remembered that the ancient Hebrews were by no means slow or reluctant to adopt the improvements of their cultivated neighbours. Judah had a signet ring,‡ Joseph a dress of curious fabric,§ and many other examples of the same kind might be furnished. It is clear then, to say the least, that *the possession of the art of writing by the Israelites, before their descent to Egypt, cannot be disproved.*

But the advocates of truth can afford to make concessions, and to meet the enemy on his own ground. In condescension to the adversary's weakness, let us admit *pro forma*, that the Israelites were strangers to the art of writing when they entered Egypt. Why may they not have learned it there? Are we to be told, too, that the Egyptians could not write?

\* Exod. v. 6. and elsewhere.

† Gesenius, for example, in his latest Hebrew Lexicon, defines the word in question: "Proprie *scriba*; dein, quoniam ars scribendi antiquissimo tempore maxime rei forensi adhibetatur, *magistratus, praefectus populi.*" Lex. Man. Heb. & Chald. p. 997.

‡ Gen. xxxviii. 17.

§ Gen. xxxvii. 3.

Not at all, says Hartmann, but the only sort of writing which they could have learned in Egypt, was totally unfit for the notation of their language, and consequently useless. That is to say, if we understand his argument, the writing used in Egypt was hieroglyphical, whereas that of the Pentateuch is alphabetical. Every thing, therefore, which merely goes to prove, that there was an art of writing known to the Egyptians, is nothing to the purpose.\*

This argument assumes as certain what is still a matter of dispute among the learned. The old doctrine was, that all the most ancient nations had the same alphabet. The classical writers all proceed upon this supposition, though they differ so widely with respect to the country where the art was first invented. Tychsen was the first who asserted, that the Egyptains had no alphabetic writing till they received it from the Phenicians, in the days of Psammetichus.† He was fully confuted by Zoega, who defended the antiquity of alphabetic writing, even among the Egyptians, and its original identity with that of other nations.‡ Jomard and Champollion have since essayed to prove, that the ancient Egyptains had no writing that was purely alphabetical, and that the common writing, which Herodotus calls *demotic*, and Clement, of Alexandria, *epistolographic*, was nothing more than the hieroglyphic writing, in a state of transition to the alphabetic form.§ But this assertion rests entirely on the very questionable assumption, that one part of the triple inscription on the Rosetta stone,|| is in the *demotic* character, and not rather in a corrupted sort of hieroglyphics. Creuzer and Heeren¶ simply state the authorities, and decline a decision, while Spohn and Seiffarth, relying on a passage in Plutarch's *Isis and Osiris*,\*\* undertake to justify the old opinion, and to show that the *demotic* character consisted of the twenty-two Phenician letters.

We make this statement simply to show that Hartmann has, without sufficient evidence, assumed the fact on which his reasoning rests, to wit, that the Egyptians had no alphabetic writing when the Israelites resided there. We do not mean, however, to assume the contrary. We choose rather to allow him the advantage he affects, and to show, that even after this concession, we are still on higher ground.

\* Hartmann, p. 587.

† Tychsen und Heeren's *Bibliothek fur alte Litteratur und Kunst*. VI. pp. 15. 42.

‡ Zoega *de obeliscis*. p. 567.

§ See Jomard's opinion stated, in Creuzer's *Comm. Herod.* p. 376, &c.

|| See the article *Hieroglyphics* in the *Encyclopaedia Americana*. vol. VI. p. 314.

¶ Heeren's *Ideen* IV. p. 14.

\*\* P. 374.

Be it so, then, (though without a jot of proof) that the Egyptians had no alphabetic writing, and that therefore the Israelites could not have acquired the art from them. May they not have learned it from some other people of Semitic origin and Semitic language, while they lived in Egypt? Be it remembered, that the existence of the art among some of the posterity of Shem, as for example the Phenicians, is explicitly admitted by Hartmann himself. Now, if these kindred nations had the art, may not the Hebrews have acquired it from them, while they abode in Egypt?

Hartmann answers in the negative, alleging as a reason, that the Hebrews, during this part of their history, had no intercourse with other nations of the Semitic family. This assertion rests upon the common notion, that Egypt was inaccessible to strangers, a notion which, in modern times, has undergone no little limitation and correction. How far it is from being true in reference to an earlier age, is evident from what we read in Genesis, of the Midianitish caravan which sold Joseph into Egypt, as well as from the fact, that in the case of extensive famine, Egypt was the granary of the adjacent countries. The same thing is clear from the readiness with which the king of Egypt received Joseph's family. And this historical testimony is strikingly confirmed by the language of the country which contains so many Phenician elements, and those so essential and inseparable, that the supposition of a close connexion between Egypt and Phenicia in the earliest times, is not to be avoided.\*

From these proofs, it is clear enough, that the Hebrews might have come into contact with other Semitic nations, even in Egypt itself. It is also capable of proof, that such an intercourse might have existed without the Egyptian bounds. The territory inhabited by the Israelites in Egypt was contiguous to that of tribes whose language was Semitic; and that there was nothing to prevent their passing the frontier, appears from the incidental statement in the Chronicles, respecting Hebrew settlers in Arabia.† Moses surely did nothing unusual, when he removed to Midian, and then returned to Egypt. In addition to these facts, we need only hint at the procession into Canaan on the occasion of Jacob's burial. It may indeed be stated, in general terms, that among the nations of the remotest antiquity, even such as were farther apart than those in question, there was much more active intercourse than is commonly supposed.

\* Professor Hengstenberg refers to an article by Hug, in Ersch and Gruber's *Encyclopedia*, vol. III. p. 35.

† 1 Chr. v.



We have now, we think, made out that there were sources enough from which the Hebrews might have drawn a knowledge of the art of writing. "But," says Hartmann, "they were a rude, uncultivated, race of shepherds, separated from the remaining population of the country. How could they be expected to adopt an art, for which they had no use?"\*

Admit for a moment, that the Hebrews were in the alleged condition, that circumstance alone could determine nothing, unless we were wholly destitute of historical data, and were left to argue simply from conjecture. The same course of reasoning would disprove the introduction of writing into Greece, at a time when the inhabitants were yet uncivilized. It would also disprove the notorious fact, that the Goths were indebted for the alphabet to Ulphilas. There is indeed a difference between the first invention, and the mere appropriation of an invented art. The latter is far from being beyond the capacity and necessities of an uncultivated people, so far, that when there is positive proof of its having taken place, better cause must needs be shown before we set that proof aside.

But our compassion yields too much to the unlucky sophist. The fact which we have admitted is a factitious one. The Hebrews were in no such condition as the adversary affirms. Their very position for four centuries in the midst of the most cultivated nation of antiquity, forbids the supposition that no influence was exercised at all by that nation on a people so susceptible of improvement, as the history of the Hebrews shows them to have been.

The fact is, that a large proportion of the Israelites had, before the time of Moses, left the pastoral mode of life, and mingled with the Egyptians on the friendliest footing, as inhabitants of towns. This is undeniably evident from Exodus, iii. 20—22, xi. 1—3, xii. 35, 36. According to the first of these passages, it was not unusual for an Israelitish landlord to have Egyptian lodgers. This proves the intercourse between the two nations. And as to our other proposition, that a great part of the Hebrews had exchanged the nomadic life for agriculture, it is very evident from Deuteronomy, xi. 10, where Egypt is described as a country which the Israelites had sown and watered with the bucket, "as a garden of herbs."

Does not all this show how easily Egyptian refinement might have been imparted to the Hebrews? It is vain to urge as an objection, that shepherds were an abomination to the Egyptians, as recorded in Genesis xlvi. 34. Not foreigners, as such, were

\* Hartmann, p. 590.

an abomination to them, nor even shepherds, who had settled habitations. What they disliked was the wandering or nomadic mode of life, which, as Heeren says, must have been in opposition to the designs and policy of the ruling *caste*.\* We need not wonder, therefore, if we find the arts and artificial products of the refined Egyptians in use among the Hebrews at the time of Moses, such as the finest Egyptian stuffs, various sorts of dressed leather, the art of casting and beating metals, and that of polishing and engraving precious stones. Indeed, a due attention to these facts will make it plain, that the Hebrews stood upon a higher point of culture in the time of Moses than in the days of the Judges, so that Hartmann makes a laughable mistake when he asserts, that the art of writing must have been introduced under the Judges, because the Mosaic age was not yet ripe for it! The force of the argument is just the other way. If writing was in use in so uncivilized a period, (comparatively speaking) as the period of the Judges, how much more in the enlightened age of Moses. That it was in use at the time of the Judges, is an admitted point. And that it was not a rare accomplishment peculiar to a few, may be inferred from Judges viii. 14, where one taken at random from among the people was found capable of writing.

We have now to meet the adverse argument in another form. Even supposing that the art of writing was not wholly unknown among the Hebrews, at the time of Moses, it is contended, that it was not in familiar, ordinary use; and that, according to historical analogy, there must have been a period of considerable length between the first introduction of the art and its application to the composition of books, or to any thing beyond the simple necessary uses of society, or to give it in the language of its advocates—"There is in the Pentateuch no trace at all of the art of writing having been employed in common life, at the time of Moses. We must therefore stick to the analogy of other nations, which shows, that the commencement of *authorship* is separated by long intervals of time from that of *writing*: and that nations must have been long acquainted with the art of writing, and accustomed to use it for necessary purposes, before they begin to use it for any other, or to write more than they must write."†

Admitting, for the moment, this alleged analogy, we dispute the broad assertion with respect to the diffusion of the art of writing in the days of Moses. It needs, at least, a great deal

\* Heeren's Ideen, p. 150. See also Creuzer's Comm. Herod. p. 282, &c.

† Vater, p. 534.

of limitation. Inferior officers would not have been called *Shoterim* or scribes, if writing was a confined monopoly. Moses would not have spoken of God's *book of life*, unless written lists and muster-rolls had been long familiar. It is this alone which gives the figure all its force. The seventy elders are called *the Written* or *Enrolled*.\* The curses denounced upon the adulteress were to be reduced to writing.† It was usual to put inscriptions upon doorposts.‡ A man who put away his wife had to give her a writing of divorcement.§ Vater and Hartmann, it is true, deny that this enactment belongs to the Mosaic age. But why? Simply because they take for granted what they ought to prove, that the Hebrews were uncivilized and ignorant of writing. A high cultivation of the art, as well as a wide diffusion of it, is implied in the directions with respect to the inscription of the names of the tribes upon precious stones, and engraving upon other hard materials. To the same point go the passages where Moses is said to have recorded a law or an event. Nor was it at a much later date that Joshua sent three men to *write* or describe the land.|| To all this add, that one of the Canaanitish cities, afterwards called Debir, bore the name of *Kirjath-sepher*, which the Septuagint renders Πόλις Γραμμάτων.¶

These proofs are so numerous, yet so undesigned and casual, so strongly confirmed by all that we know about the refinement of the people in other respects, and so entirely consistent with the known condition of the arts in Egypt,\*\* that we must either admit that the art of writing was a common thing in the days of Moses, or reject the Pentateuch entirely as a historical authority. This last, however, we have no right to do, even on the supposition that these books were written in a later age. If we do reject them, it is plain that nothing can be argued either one way or the other, as to the fact in question, except by such as are disposed to argue at random.

But strong as the testimony is, in favour of a general acquaintance with the art of writing in the days of Moses, we can afford to yield the point, as we have yielded many others no less tenable, in order to evince the strength of our own cause, and our adversaries' weakness. Suppose, if you please, that this accom-

\* Num. xi. 26.

† Num. v. 23.

‡ Deut. vi. 9. xi. 20.

§ Deut. xxiv. 1—4.

|| Jos. xviii. 4.

¶ See Bertholdt's Researches with respect to the art of writing, in his *Theologische Wissenschafts Kunde*. Vol. I. p. 87.

\*\* Hartmann's assertion, (p. 636) that in Egypt none except the priests were in possession of the art of writing, is so palpably false, that it deserves no refutation.

plishment was not a universal or a very common one. What then? Let a rationalist answer. "Whether," says Bertholdt, "the whole Pentateuch proceeded, just as it is, from the hand of Moses, or whether certain legislative passages alone were penned by him, these passages or the whole five books were evidently written, not for the purpose of being read by every body, but of being read to them in a public way, a practice commenced by Moses himself.\* It was sufficient for this purpose, that a few besides himself should be acquainted with writing, and he would naturally introduce the plan of requiring the High Priests, the chiefs of the tribes, the elders, and the judges, to make this acquisition, in order to conduct ecclesiastical and civil affairs, according to his laws."

Thus it appears, that even on the lowest supposition which the skeptic would reduce it to, there is nothing in our assertions at all at variance with historical analogy, even as that analogy is stated by the assailants of the Pentateuch. Let us, however, look more closely at the analogy itself, and see what it is built upon. Those who make use of it, appeal in its behalf to the case of the Greeks and Romans. It so happens, however, that the latest results of the researches about Homer, render this analogy extremely doubtful, if they do not quite reverse it. But even if it were as strong as ever it was thought to be, history furnishes other cases far more striking, which lean just the other way. We might refer to the tradition of Phenicia and Egypt, which places the commencement, not of *writing* merely, but of composition, authorship, book-making, in the remotest antiquity. The Egyptians ascribed written laws to their earliest king, in which they are supported by internal evidence.† That composition began there very early, all accounts agree.‡ The Phenician tradition, preserved by Sanconiathon, makes the inventor of the alphabet to have been also the first author,§ and Sanconiathon himself belongs to a period not far removed from that of Moses.||

Should these analogies, however, be objected to, as of a date anterior to authentic history, we have others which are quite beyond the reach of such a scruple. Ulphilas gave an alphabet to the Goths while yet wholly uncivilized, and with it a translation of the Holy Scriptures.¶ The same thing occurred among

\* Exod. xxiv. 7.

† Diodorus Siculus. I. 106. Heeren's *Ideen*, p. 347.

‡ The proofs are given by Zoega *de Obeliscis*, p. 501, &c.

§ Eusebius. *Praep. Evang.* I. 9.

¶ Bertholdt's *Theolog. Wissenschafts Kunde*, p. 71.

¶ See Zahn's *Ulphilas*, p. 21.

the Ethiopians. But the most conclusive analogy of all is, that writing began among the Koreish, in Arabia, according to all testimony, a few years before Mohammed, and yet the Koran was reduced at once to writing from beginning to end!\* So much for the doctrine, that the art of writing must be long in use, before it is applied to composition.

We dismiss this part of the subject by directing the attention of the reader to the fact, that Moses had the strongest motives to adopt the surest means, however difficult or rare, of perpetuating and securing from corruption, his inspired communications. He knew too well the want of harmony between his stern enactments and the heart of man, to rely for their observance, or prolonged existence, on the capricious fluctuations of tradition. What could be done he would do, however difficult he might have found it, to secure his object by a resort to writing. In point of fact it was not difficult at all.

But we have not yet quite dispatched the Wolfish theory. There is another ground on which it plants its batteries to assail the Pentateuch. We are told, that it could not have been written by Moses, because in his days there were no convenient materials for writing. Be it so. What then? The Koran, a much larger book than the Pentateuch, was written piecemeal on bits of leather or parchment, and even on palm leaves, white smooth stones, and bones.† This shows that the possession of *convenient* materials is by no means essential to the making of a book.

We say, be it so; but it is not so. The way in which it is attempted to demonstrate that materials were wanting, cannot fail to excite either laughter or indignation. Vater and Hartmann both deny that paper, byssus, or the skins of beasts, were then in use. Let us look at the matter a little. The preparation of paper from the papyrus-plant is a very simple process, requiring certainly as little art as the manufacture of the ark in which the infant Moses floated upon the Nile, and which was made of the same material. Nor is there even the appearance of a reason for assigning to this invention a later date than the Mosaic age. Varro's assertion‡ that it originated in the age of Alexander, is on all hands regarded as erroneous. It may even be refuted from Herodotus.§ The art is spoken of as having been in use much earlier, by

\* See de Saey's history of writing among the Arabs, in the *Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions et des Belles Lettres*, vol. 50. p. 307.

† See de Saey's article already cited. *Memories de l'Academie des Inscr.* vol. 50. p. 307.

‡ Plinii. *Hist. Nat.* XIII. 11.

§ V. 58.

Cassius Nemina.\* “At what time,” says the judicious Zoega, “the Egyptians began to write on sheets made of the bark of the papyrus, is wholly unknown, and I think it labour lost to undertake to ascertain it by conjecture.”† “Though it is impossible,” says Heeren, “to determine the date of the invention; it can no longer be doubted, that the preparation of the papyrus from plants was very early in use, since so many rolls of papyrus have been found in the catacombs of Thebes.” These leave no doubt, that the literature of Egypt was far richer than was formerly supposed.

Byssus is expressly mentioned in Genesis,‡ and the usage of embalming presupposes its existence. The garments of the priests, and the covering of the tabernacle were composed of this material. Now it scarcely needs proof, that if such a substance were in use at all, it would be used for writing in the absence of a better. And accordingly we find, that in other nations, not connected with the Egyptians, *libri lintei* were in common use. Hartmann says, indeed, that this material was unknown in the time of Moses, and that Vater has proved it. But how can that be proved for which there is not even the appearance of historical evidence? All that Vater himself undertook to show, was, that there were no proofs in favour of the use of cloth for writing at so remote a period. Positive historical evidence there is not, either on one side or the other. It is sufficient for our argument to show the possibility and probability of such a use; which has been done.

We come now to skins. There is reason to believe, that this material would have been preferred, supposing several known. The sacred books which were designed for all successive generations, would of course be inscribed upon the most durable of those substances which could conveniently be used. This is probable in itself, and is confirmed by the analogy of the ten commandments graven in stone. It is not on record what material was used either in the oldest or the latest books of Scripture. By far the most probable opinion is, that leather was employed. That it was used for this purpose in the days of Moses, appears very probable from Numbers, v. 23. There the priest is directed to record the curse against the adulteress in a book, and to wash out the writing with the water of bitterness. This presupposes a material for writing so strong, as not to go to pieces when dipped in water, which is not true of paper; yet of such a nature, that

\* *Plin. H. N. XIII.*

† *De Obeliscis*, p. 550.

‡ Translated *fine linen*, and in the margin, *silk*, Gen xli. 42.

the ink could be easily washed out, which is not true of *byssus*; and of such a form as to admit the name *Sepher*, which excludes wood, stone, and other hard materials, upon which, moreover, we find no trace of writing with ink. The *modus scribendi* implied in this passage, was the same that is fully described in Jerem. xxxvi. 4—23, which passage Hartmann falsely represents, as the first containing any reference to ink.

That the artificial preparation of skins was not unusual in the Mosaic age, is plain, from the description of the tabernacle, where several sorts are mentioned. In other countries also the use of skins for writing was very ancient. Herodotus relates, that the Ionians, from a very early period, had made use of skins as a substitute for paper. “The Ionians from ancient times have called books, *skins*, because of old, when books were scarce, they wrote on the skins of sheep and goats.”\* Here he evidently represents the skins of beasts as the primitive material for writing with the Ionians, among whom the commencement of the art of writing was long anterior to the time of Moses. He adds, “many of the barbarians also wrote upon such skins.” According to Diodorus, the Persian annals, from which Ctesias obtained his information were written upon skins† and the early mythologists ascribed a book to Jupiter, composed of skins, and containing a catalogue of the righteous and the wicked.‡

To all this Hartmann objects,§ that we cannot suppose the dressing of hides to have been practised by the Egyptians, who had so great a reverence for the brute creation, that even the touching of their skins would have made a priest unclean, and the trade of a tanner would have been thought a crime.

This objection rests upon an erroneous view of the worship of animals in Egypt. Among the larger domestic animals, the cow was the only one considered holy. The worship of the bull Apis extended only to an individual animal. Oxen were in common use for sacrifice and food.|| The regard to ceremonial purity among the Egyptian priests would be in point, if the preparation of the hides had been their business. But the priests were not the carriers. In the ancient documents lately discovered in Upper Egypt, tanners are mentioned as a particular class of workmen. This sets the question at rest whether hides were dressed in Egypt.¶

\* Herod. v. 58.

† Diodor. ii. 35.

‡ See Schiveighäuser on Herodotus, and Wesseling on Diodorus Siculus and Hemsterhus on Pollux, v. 57.

§ P. 367.

|| Heeren, p. 150, 363.

¶ Böckh's *Erklärung einer ägyptischen Urkunde*. p. 25. Heeren, p. 141.

Here Professor Hengstenberg concludes his argument, and we must say that we think it a triumphant one. We have given a sketch of it, not in the hope of doing it full justice, but in order to show, that the ingenuity and learning of the modern Germans is not entirely on the side of infidelity. Truth has always had its champions, even there; but for the most part they have not been able to cope with the assailants upon equal terms. The philological learning, and the dialectic subtilty employed by such men as Eichhorn and De Wette, took believers by surprise. The day seemed to be lost. The orthodox criticism of earlier times proceeded so much on the supposition of a belief in Christianity, that it was almost useless in this novel conflict. The weapons of war were to be formed anew. This threw the Christian party for a time behind their adversaries; and a whole generation of young Germans rose to manhood, with scarcely a doubt in favour of the Scriptures. But *tempora mutantur*. The time has come, when the foe is to be beaten on his chosen ground. His artillery is already turned against himself, and his defences totter. Professor Hengstenberg is showing to the world, that the modern improvements in philology and criticism, so far as they are real, all sustain the Bible, and that the deeper such researches go, the more resplendent does the lamp of life flame upward, while the taper of the skeptic is extinguished in its socket. The specimen which we have given of his ratiocination, while it exhibits all the erudition and acumen of the ablest rationalists, exhibits likewise what they always lack, consistency, sobriety, and candour.

We are happy to add that he is not alone. Besides many others who indirectly contribute to the same end, there is one distinguished scholar, who, without collusion, but with kindred spirit, is assaulting the same quarter of the enemies' entrenchments. This is John Leonard Hug, who has probably done more for the cause of truth, than any other Papist living. He has published dissertations on the art of writing, in relation to this controversy, which we have not seen. Rumour represents him to be now employed upon an introduction to the Old Testament, analogous to that which he has published to the New. We wish it may be no whit worse. When the leading principles asserted in his writings, free from adventitious weaknesses, shall come to be predominant among the theologians of his own sect and country, Germany will rejoice in the simultaneous downfall of Rationalism and Popery.