

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

in this vein, instead of filling his diary with rather stupid and petty attacks on churches as "steeple-houses," and on church-people as either hypocrites or deluded creatures, he would have left a more permanent contribution to religious literature. Still, historically, he was a stimulus, and it is worth while to ask whether his message may not have some permanent elements of value.

* * * * *

A correspondent writes kindly: "*Reddite ergo omnibus debita . . . cui honorem, honorem.* In the January issue of the *EXPOSITOR* (p. 23) Dr. Robinson refers with real appreciation to the late Rev. C. L. Marson's *The Psalms at Work*, but unintentionally gives the impression that Marson followed Prothero, whereas the opposite was the case. In the quaint preface to the fourth edition of his book, Mr. Marson, apologising for the delay (it was published in 1909), refers to 'another author' who 'by a daring piece of free trade has incorporated almost the whole of the second edition into a work of his own and cried it freely before the public.'" Another slight correction may be offered, apropos of Professor Stevenson's allusion to Dr. Peake's book on *The Bible*, in the June issue (p. 410). The publishers, Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton, report, I am glad to say, that it is not "out of print" (price 7s. 6d.) This may reassure those who have expressed their disappointment that a work of this rank was inaccessible.

"TEN" TREATISES ON THE "TEN" COMMANDMENTS.

So much of the best work on the Decalogue is to be found in articles in magazines and in dictionaries that it would not be well to make "books" the main subject of this paper. The short Bibliography which follows illustrates and justifies this statement.

(A Bibliography containing twenty entries, German and Dutch, is given by W. Nowack in the *Baudissin-festschrift* (1918), p. 381. I am indebted to Nowack for several of the entries given below.)

- (a) Philo, *de Decalogo*.
Josephus, *Archæologia*, III. V. §§ 4-8 (ed. Niese III. §§ 89-101).
- (b) Augustine, *Quæstiones de Exodo*, LXXI. (vol. xxviii. Part 3, pp. 135-140, ed. J. Zycha, Vienna Corpus).
Catechismus ex decreto Concilii Tridentini ad Parochos (1566). Pars 3^a, *De Dei præceptis in Decalogo contentis*. (Contains much interesting casuistical matter.)
A. Kuenen, *Religion of Israel* (E.T. 1874), vol. i. pp. 282-290.
- (c) C. G. Montefiore, "Recent Criticism upon Moses and the Pentateuchal Narratives of the Decalogue" in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, iii. 251-291 (Jan. 1891).
J. Wellhausen, *Composition des Hexateuch*^s (1899), *Nachträge*, pp. 329-335.
B. D. Eerdmans, "Oorsprong en Beteekenis van de 'Tien Woorden'" (Dutch, 1903) in *Theol. Tijdschrift*, xxxvii. 19-35.
- (d) Eduard König and Rabbi E. G. Hirsch, "Decalogue," in *Jewish Encyclopedia* (1903), iv. 492-496.
- (e) Stanley A. Cook, "A pre-Massoretic Biblical Papyrus" in *Proceedings of the Society for Biblical Archæology* for Jan. 14, 1903. An early Hebrew text of the Ten Commandments.
- (f) E. Kautzsch, "Religion of Israel," in the extra volume (1904) of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, pp. 633-4 (on the Decalogue).
J. C. Matthes (Amsterdam), "Der Decalog," in *ZATW* (1904), xxiv. 17-41.
W. Emery Barnes, "The Ten Words of Exodus xxxiv.," in *Journal of Theological Studies* (1905), vi. 557.
- (g) B. D. Eerdmans, *Alttestamentliche Studien* (German, 1910), iii. 85-91; 131-146.
- (h) J. E. McFadyen, "Mosaic Origin of the Decalogue," seven articles in the *EXPOSITOR* for Feb.-May and July-September, 1916, under the following headings:
"The Ritual Decalogue" (see Exod. xxxiv.);
"Egyptian and Babylonian Parallels to the Ethical Decalogue" (Exod. xx. 1-17);
"The Original Form of the Decalogue";
"Can the Original Form of the Decalogue be Mosaic?";
"The Fourth Commandment";
"The Second Commandment ('the real crux')";
"The Relation of the Decalogue to Prophecy";
"The Decalogue and Individualism";
"The Unique Distinction of the Decalogue."

W. Nowack, “Der erste Dekalog,” in the *Baudissin-festschrift* (1918), Beihefte 33 of *ZATW*, pp. 381-397.

(i) R. H. Charles, *The Decalogue* (Warburton Lectures 1919-1923). Edinburgh, 1923.

Beside the usual Commentaries may be specially mentioned the following:—A. H. McNeile, *Exodus* (1908, Westminster Commentaries) *in loco* and Introduction LVI.-LXIV.; S. R. Driver, *Exodus* (1911, Cambridge Bible) *in loco* and Appendix II., “Date of the Decalogue.”

(a) PHILO AND JOSEPHUS.

What Josephus tells us is hardly worthy of notice except in two particulars. He lays stress on the statement that all the people, men, women and children, heard at Sinai God discoursing to them. Secondly, he declares that it is not lawful to publish the text of the Decalogue. Accordingly he confines himself to a brief summary of the contents. (I have not found in my reading any confirmation of this second statement of Josephus.)

Philo is greater and more interesting, but somewhat in love with symbolism. He tells us of the excellence of the number Ten. He indignantly repudiates (*ἀπαρνε*) the suggestion that the Father of All revealed the Decalogue by making Himself audible (*φωνῆς τρεβλον*); “God is not as man, needing a mouth.” On the form in the singular, “Thou shalt not kill,” etc., he remarks that the man who is obedient to God is equivalent to (*ισοτιμος*) a whole populous nation. On the Fifth commandment he says that the nature of parents is akin both to the immortal and the mortal essence. Further, while the first four commandments have respect to the Divine and the immortal, the last five have respect to the Human and mortal. So the command to honour parents coming at the end of the First Table fitly connects it with the Second. One other of Philo’s sayings may be noted. “Why are no penalties attached for the breach of these commands?” Because God is a Lord who is

simply good, the author of good things only, but of no evil at all.

(b) FROM ST. AUGUSTINE TO DR. W. NOWACK.

It is a far cry from St. Augustine's *Quæstiones de Exodo* to Professor McFadyen in the *EXPOSITOR* or to Dr. Nowack in the *Festschrift*. The acute mind of the African Father asked questions somewhat different from those which are raised by modern men. Some numerical Typology must needs enter into his commenting. How, he asks, are the *decem præcepta* to be divided? Certainly between our duty to God and our duty to man. Some, he says, reckon the first *four* commandments under the first head, and the remaining *six* under the second. In substance Augustine agrees with them, but in the numbering he has a view of his own. Commandments i.-iv., he holds, are rather to be numbered as i.-iii., for commandments i. and ii. are really one, so that the "Sabbath" commandment with St. Augustine becomes the Third. "Trinitatem videntur illa quæ ad deum pertinent insinuare diligentius intuentibus."

The commandments which follow, beginning with that of Obedience to parents, are reckoned by St. Augustine as *seven* in number, the Tenth counting as *two*. "Concupiscentia . . . uxoris alienæ et concupiscentia domus . . . in peccando differunt," he writes. The Tenth commandment (it is to be noted) forms two *Sedarim* ("sections") even in MT both of Exodus xx. and of Deuteronomy v.

St. Augustine's other questions are of matter, not of form. He is at pains to show that the command, *Thou shalt not covet*, is not covered by the two commandments, *Thou shalt not steal*, and *Thou shalt not commit adultery*. A man may desire to sin, and yet abstain through fear of the immediate consequences. Such a man has broken the Tenth Commandment. Again, Augustine, while he con-

fesses that he cannot prove the point, urges that our Seventh Commandment condemns under the name of adultery all fornication also. Of the Eighth, he says, answering in advance some modern criticisms of this commandment, “Non rapinam permisit qui furtum prohibuit.” In other words, the prohibition applies to the rich oppressor as well as to the poor pilferer. The Sixth, according to St. Augustine, does not apply “quando occidi aliquem deus iubet”; he is probably thinking of the order to exterminate the Canaanites. Finally, against the vice of lying the Father quotes Psalm v. 7, “perdis omnes qui loquuntur mendacium,” but he hesitates to say that a lie which does not hurt one’s neighbour is a breach of the Ninth commandment.

The questions which claim the attention of a modern scholar are more numerous and more difficult to solve than those which St. Augustine answered. They include the following :

(1) Is there a rival Decalogue, one of a ritual character, in Exodus xxxiv. 10-28 ?

(2) If the moral Decalogue be the only true one, does Exodus xx. 2-17 or Deuteronomy v. 6-18 (6-21, E.V.) give the more original text ?

(3) Does a third form, older and quite brief, underlie these two texts ?

(4) Does this brief form go back to Moses, or are only seven Commandments Mosaic ?

(5) Is the word “Ten” in Exodus xxxiv. 28 and Deuteronomy iv. 13 to be understood in the strict numerical sense ? Or, does the phrase, “The Ten Words” mean simply “The Few Words” (“the Moral Shorter Catechism”) ?

(6) If the Decalogue is post-Mosaic, is its composition to be attributed to the influence of the Prophets of the eighth century, and is it to be dated in the seventh century B.C. ?

(7) Two additional questions are: (a) What is the meaning of the Third Commandment? (b) What is the meaning of the word "covet" (Heb. כָּוַח) in the Tenth Commandment?

(c) C. G. MONTEFIORE ON KUENEN AND WELLHAUSEN.

This interesting essay ("Recent Criticism upon Moses") was published in January 1891, when the reputations of Kuenen and Wellhausen were at their height. Substantially it is an article on the Decalogue. It is divided into two parts. The second, the less important, is concerned with the literary history of Exodus xix.-xxiv. and of Exodus xxxiv., the former including the "moral" Decalogue (xx. 2-17), the latter its "ritual" rival (xxxiv. 10-28). Montefiore holds that we shall never come to a satisfactory literary analysis of these passages. Herein he is to be followed rather than Kuenen or Wellhausen, who, though in general agreement in critical sympathies, failed to agree in their analysis of Exodus xix.-xxiv., xxxiv. Both indeed changed their own minds over this difficult analysis.

The more important part of Montefiore's article deals with the place of the Decalogue in the history of Israelite religion. He begins with a consideration of the views of Kuenen in the *Religion of Israel*. In this early work Kuenen accepted the Mosaic origin of the Ten Words in their original form, reckoning the opening exordium as the first Word, and omitting as an interpolation the reference to image worship in the Second. So he writes, "The great merit of Moses lies in the fact that he connected the religious idea with the moral life. Yahveh comes before His people with moral demands and commandments." But if the religion of Moses had already reached an ethical level, how are we to account for the low religious ideas of Jephthah in *Judges* or of David in the book of *Samuel*? Kuenen

answered that Moses was able to interpret his higher conception of the nature of Yahveh only to a few chosen spirits. Later, however, in the Hibbert Lectures (III.) Kuenen took a different position: the ethical conception of Yahveh's being was claimed as the creation of the canonical prophets of the eighth century.

Wellhausen's account of the beginning of Israelite religion is more open to criticism than Kuenen's in the *Religion of Israel*. "The religious starting point," Wellhausen writes, "of the history of Israel was remarkable, not for its novelty, but for its normal character. In all ancient peoples there exists a relation between God and the affairs of the nation, and religion is employed as a motive for law and customary morality; in none, however, did the relation exist, or was the motive employed, in such purity and power as in Israel." On this Montefiore pertinently asks, "Now what influences were there to develop the religion of Amos and of the author of Exodus xx. out of the religion of Deborah and of David?" And he adds, "Between the pre-prophetic religion of Israel, as [Wellhausen] conceives it, and the religious teaching of Amos there yawns a chasm which all the charm and brilliancy of [Wellhausen's] narrative has not been able to bridge over." So Montefiore refuses to follow him, when the brilliant German maintains the view that the "ritual" Decalogue of Exodus xxxiv. 10-28 (J) is far more ancient than the moral Decalogue of Exodus xx. 2-17 (E). We may gather rather that Montefiore believes that our familiar Ten Commandments have their true root and origin in the creative teaching of Moses. "No one," he writes, "would assert that the religion of Moses equalled the religion of Amos in moral consistency and spiritual depth. But what our rough analysis of the latest criticism seems to prove is that every element in the religion of the eighth century prophets has its true

root and origin in the creative teaching of the founder."

Here may be appropriately noted two of Montefiore's dicta in his latest book, *The Old Testament and After*, London, 1923. "The six ethical commands of the Decalogue do with much tact single out six of the great ethical pillars upon which society rests. We honour and value them for their literal meaning. . . . But beyond the literal meaning they stand in our minds and hearts for what they have been made to include . . . Jesus and the Rabbis made murder include anger; Jesus and the Rabbis made adultery include lustful desire. And we, following in their footsteps, can make stealing include much at which our ancestors would, perhaps, stare." "The date of the Decalogue is disputed, and even if it be (as I am inclined to believe it is) pre-prophetic, it was the prophet's work which gave it special place and dignity. The author of Deuteronomy v. was the product of prophecy."

(d) E. KÖNIG AND E. G. HIRSCH.

The article in *The Jewish Encyclopedia* is interesting as the joint production of a Christian and a Jew. "Exodus on the whole presents an earlier text than Deuteronomy." On the other hand in the prohibition of idolatry the "laxer wording" of Deuteronomy has the priority in time. Again, in the Fourth commandment "the introduction of the theological motive in Exodus, where Deuteronomy has the historical-economic," suggests the higher antiquity of the Deuteronomic form.

Saadiah ascribed verbal inspiration to the Deuteronomic Decalogue and to that of Exodus equally. While Exodus presents the reading of "the first tables," Deuteronomy contains that of the second (Exod. xxxiv. 1). Aben Ezra (on Exod. xx. 1) dissents from him, and says

that the variants are of the nature of linguistic differences.

The Midrashic statement (given in *Mechilta* and elsewhere) is that both versions of the Decalogue were spoken (by miracle) on Sinai at one and the same time.

The Feast of Weeks (Pentecost) is observed among the Jews as the day of the giving of the Commandments. On that occasion the Decalogue is recited in the Synagogue according to the supralinear accentuation. On other days the ordinary accentuation is followed.

(A further article in the *Encyclopedia*, “The Decalogue in Jewish Theology” by Hirsch, contains much interesting matter.)

(e) STANLEY A. COOK.

Dr. Cook’s paper in the *P.S.B.A.* is important as a very careful description of the Nash papyrus. Even if the text of the papyrus prove to be no more than a school exercise, its age gives it real importance. Moreover it is interesting that (like Rom. xiii. 9) it transposes the Sixth and Seventh commandments, and has some other variations from M.T. Dr. Cook gives a full palæographical account of the fragments and adds a photograph of them, which is taken from a skilful drawing by Prof. Burkitt. (The fragments themselves, owing to their condition, could not be successfully photographed.) The photograph is reproduced in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* to illustrate E. König’s article, DECALOGUE.

(f) E. KAUTZSCH.

The contribution of E. KAUTZSCH (Professor at Halle) to the subject, though brief, is of importance because of the ripe scholarship and general good judgment of the writer. He devotes rather more than two columns to a discussion of the question whether the Decalogue can be attributed to Moses. At one time it was supposed that

the "unanimity of the tradition" obliged us to accept the Decalogue as Mosaic. The Elohist in Exodus xx. and the Deuteronomist in Deuteronomy v. agreed in attributing the same text of the Ten Commandments—apart from a few variants—to Israel's great Lawgiver. But such a statement of the case was impugned from two directions. Some, e.g., B. Baentsch in Nowack's *Handkommentar* (Exodus), maintained that the Decalogue in Exodus xx. is taken from Deuteronomy v., and consequently that the Deuteronomist is the sole authority for its Mosaic origin. On the other hand the poet Goethe urged as early as 1773 that another tradition—coming from J—testified to a totally different form of the Decalogue, preserved in Exodus xxxiv. 10–26. This latter form, owing to its character, is sometimes called the "ritual" Decalogue to distinguish it from the "moral" Decalogue given in Exodus xx. 2–17. Goethe's view has been accepted by many modern scholars, though Kautzsch rejects it. Next Kautzsch, believing that Exodus xx. 2–17 (= Deut. v. 6–21, E.V.) is "the" Decalogue, asks whether it can in any form be traced back to Moses. Such a form must have been very brief. The contrast between the length of the first five commandments (146 words) and the second five (26 words) suggests the conclusion that the reasons given for obedience in the first five are a later addition. In such a shortened form two difficulties of Mosaic authorship are removed, i.e., *first*, the general Deuteronomic colouring vanishes, and *secondly*, the great difference of motive urged in the Fourth commandment is lost likewise.

But it may still be asked, Is it possible that so fully developed an ethical system stands at the head of the whole development of Israel's religion? To this enquiry Kautzsch answers that the use of the Commandments in the instruction of our childhood blinds us to their real

character. Their standpoint is not the high ethical one which we commonly attribute to them. Their original meaning referred to rights rather than morals. The Seventh commandment, for instance, Kautzsch tells us, had a non-ethical aspect: it forbids *not* impurity, but interference with the rights of a husband. So there is no valid reason for refusing to attribute a concise form of the Decalogue to Moses, but for the prohibition of the *use of images*. Did some other Commandment stand once in the place of this? or were there originally *seven* commandments only and not ten? Kautzsch refuses to give a decisive answer. Some rudimentary form of the Decalogue (apart from the prohibition of images) may possibly be Mosaic.¹

(g) B. D. EERDMANS.

Eerdmans is well known for the severity with which he has criticised the usual analysis which divides Genesis between P, E, and J. He has certainly shown a healthy independence in his study of the Old Testament; and not least in his treatment of the Decalogue. He starts from the position that Exodus xx. 1-17 does not form part of the original tradition in Exodus. What signs then does the passage itself afford of its origin? Eerdmans reminds us first how strongly Deuteronomic is the language of the passage. But it was not composed by the Deuteronomist. This appears at once from the true text of Exodus xx. 5, 6 (= Deut. v. 9, 10). The two qualifying words לְשׂוֹנְאֵי "of them that hate me" (E.V.) and לְאוֹהְבֵי, "of them that love me," come awkwardly into the text, and can best be explained as glosses introduced by the Deutero-

¹ I call attention to my own paper in the *J.T.S.* because it suggests that "Ten" in the title "Ten Commandments" is to be taken as a "round" number. Both in Exod. xx. and in Exod. xxxiv. there is some uncertainty in making out just the number "Ten," neither less nor more.

nomist in order to soften expressions which were strongly opposed to his own gentler spirit. JEHOVAH is described as "visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, upon the third generation, and upon the fourth." But it is written in Deuteronomy vii. 10, "[JEHOVAH] will repay him that hateth Him *in his own person* (אֵל פָּנָיו)," and in Deuteronomy xxiv. 16 occurs the precept, "The children shall not be put to death for the fathers." So the Deuteronomist added לְשֵׁנָהּ to the text of the commandment to modify its original harshness, לְשֵׁנָהּ being a qualification of the *children*, not of the fathers: JEHOVAH will visit iniquity upon the descendants, if the descendants show themselves haters of the LORD. So it appears that the Deuteronomist did not himself compose the Commandments, but glossed a text which he found already enjoying a position of authority.

On the Fourth commandment Eerdmans argues that D may have been acquainted with the sanction for Sabbath observance given in Exodus xx. 11. D is conscious at least that the Sabbath-command is pre-Sinaitic, for he adds the words, "as JEHOVAH thy God commanded thee" (Deut. v. 12). (The Fifth commandment receives the same addition, but then D may very well have regarded the Fifth also as pre-Sinaitic, and even primitive.) Accordingly Eerdmans is not convinced that the original Sabbath-commandment was of no great length ("sehr kurz"). The "pre-Deuteronomic" text, according to Eerdmans, consisted of Exodus xx. 2a, 3, 5 (without לְשֵׁנָהּ), 6a, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17a.

On the Tenth commandment Eerdmans raises an interesting discussion on the meaning of "covet" (חָמַד). "To covet" meant with the Israelite, "to covet *and* to take steps to obtain." Thus in Exodus xxxiv. 24 the promise is made, that when the Israelite is absent from his land

on a visit to the sanctuary, “No one shall covet (חמד) thy land.” The Tenth word was not taken into the series of the Commandments because of a mere feeling, but because of the act bound up with the feeling.

Equally interesting is Eerdmans’ criticism of the suggestion that the Ten Words are a summary of the moral teaching of the Prophets of the eighth century. He remarks truly enough that the *Hauptmerkmal*, the chief note, of the prophetic teaching is absent from the Decalogue. The prophets preached that the rich should not oppress the poor, but on the contrary that mercy and judgment should be shown to them. Of this teaching there is no trace in the Decalogue. Eerdmans’ final conclusion on the date of the Ten Words is cautiously expressed as follows : “The refusal to assign the Decalogue to the Mosaic age does not appear to be justified (*berechtigt*).” Even the Second commandment may be Mosaic. Exodus xx. 4 is an interpolation which breaks the close connexion between verses 3 and 5. Verse 5 forbids nothing but worship paid to “other gods” set up in JEHOVAH’S presence, i.e., in His sanctuary. Worship paid to household gods (*teraphim*) is not forbidden. So the prohibition of Exodus xx. 5 may have been known to David and Michal (1 Sam. xix. 13) and to Hosea (Hos. iii. 4) without arousing any religious scruple in them. This view is ingenious, but not to be hastily rejected.

Finally Eerdmans raises the question, whether the last five commandments have an absolute or a relative application? He has no hesitation in rejecting the first alternative. The Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth commandments were not recognised as absolute commands by any Old Testament Prophet or Priest. Samuel, in the name of JEHOVAH, commanded Saul to put the Amalekites, man, woman, and child, to the sword. The law of Deuteronomy

allows an Israelite to make spoil of women and children in war (Deut. xx. 14 ; xxi. 10-13). It is difficult to reconcile this last permission with any belief in the absolute authority of the Eighth commandment.

(h) PROF. MCFADYEN.

Extremely interesting is the series of articles contributed by Prof. J. E. MCFADYEN to the EXPOSITOR. The first appeared in February, 1916. Dr. McFadyen will have nothing to do with the plausible attempt which has been made to secure a very early and possibly Mosaic origin for the "ritual" Decalogue. "Most improbable" is his verdict. Legislation, he points out, accompanies and does not anticipate experience ; so the ritual Decalogue finds its most natural place after Israel's occupation and settlement of Canaan. The later reputation of Moses as Israel's greatest prophet (Deut. xxxiv. 10) would be hard to explain, if his supreme achievement had been to devise such a ritual Decalogue. When, moreover, it is claimed that emphasis on ritual points to an early date, it is to be remembered that such emphasis is a characteristic of the later literature, Ezekiel, P, Ezra and Chronicles.

McFadyen next points out that the "ethical" Decalogue is not so deeply ethical that it must be placed at a late stage in the religious development of Israel. It is not "a practically exhaustive compendium of human duty." On the whole it is negative rather than positive : it does not rise to the height of the precept, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (Lev. xix. 18). The writer then proceeds to point out that centuries before Moses moral obligations similar to those of the Decalogue were recognised in the religious literatures of Egypt and Babylon.

McFadyen next clears from the path a lion which Prof. Matthes of Amsterdam placed there. Matthes in *ZATW*

(1904, pp. 17–41) denied that there ever was a shorter form of the Decalogue. But if, says McFadyen, the longer form is primary, “then we cannot claim an earlier date for the Decalogue than the seventh century, as Deuteronomic influence is obvious in more than one commandment.” But McFadyen “with practically no hesitation” rejects Matthes’s position.

But can the original (shorter) form be Mosaic? “The difficulties centre chiefly round the second, fourth, and tenth commandments.” Taking the Fourth first, McFadyen remarks truly, “The Sabbath may just as well be very early as very late. The Book of the Covenant and the ritual Decalogue, besides enjoining the observance of the seventh day (Exod. xxiii. 12; xxxiv. 21) also prescribed the observance of” the Three Yearly Feasts. But the non-mention of these feasts in the ethical Decalogue may point away to the nomadic days, when there was less reason for observing these feasts. McFadyen adds some interesting remarks on the possibly great antiquity of the Sabbath in Israel. He inclines to the view that the Fourth commandment originally had the short and negative form, “Thou shalt not do any work (כְּלָאֲכֹרָה) on the seventh day,” the term “Sabbath” not being used. The “work” would be chiefly *plowing* or *sowing* (cp. Exod. xxxiv. 21). Such a form would apply to Israel in the wilderness, for Israel, he urges rightly, was partly agricultural, and only semi-nomadic. Thus, in essence, the Fourth commandment may date back to Moses.

Dr. McFadyen acknowledges that the real difficulty in the way of Mosaic authorship lies in the Second commandment. “Acknowledged champions of the Jehovah worship,” we are told, practised image-worship. So McFadyen examines the instances put forward in support of this assertion—Ephod, Teraphim, Calf-worship, Ark, Brazen

Serpent, Moses' rod—and finds them wanting. His conclusion is, "There is good reason to believe that the official worship of Jahweh in the time of the Judges at Shiloh was imageless, and that an early protest was delivered against the calf-worship. There is therefore no adequate reason for denying, and there is some ground for affirming, that the prohibition of images enjoined by the Second commandment goes back to Moses."

McFadyen's concluding article is devoted to a consideration of the Unique Distinction of the Decalogue. He acknowledges the moral quality found in the Babylonian Shurpu texts and in the Egyptian Book of the Dead. But he gives the Ten Commandments a higher place than either of these. Is there "any real analogy between documents like these, on the one hand, which throw the moral and the ceremonial upon the same level of importance and, above all, which pre-suppose a world dominated by . . . demons whose power can be broken by magic; and the Decalogue on the other hand, with its sublime simplicity, its insistence upon morality as the inevitable issue . . . its stern refusal to recognise any supernatural presence but Jehovah's?" This is well put. Probably Dr. McFadyen's articles form, on the whole, the best treatment of the Decalogue which we possess in English.

(i) R. H. CHARLES.

Dr. Charles's book is divided into two parts, (1) a critical introduction discussing the text of the Commandments, (2) a full interpretation of them on the spiritual and ethical lines laid down in the New Testament. The main part of the work is in the form of sermons, and consequently full scope is given to the practical exposition of the commandments. Thus, under the Sixth commandment, several kinds of guilt are discussed, e.g., that of the man who

erects dangerous buildings, who sells dangerous commodities (e.g., alcohol), or who owns insanitary houses. The Eighth commandment is made to condemn the Unions which exact higher wages and then proceed to limit output. And so on. If there is nothing strikingly new in Dr. Charles's comment, there is much that is worthy of careful attention.

On the critical side Dr. Charles ventures far. The Decalogue, as we have it in Exodus xx. 2-17, has a long and intricate history. At the top of its genealogical tree stands the Mosaic Decalogue, each commandment consisting of one short clause (c. 1320-1300 B.C.) This form received some small additions in the Fourth, Tenth, and perhaps Third commandment before it was incorporated in E (c. 800-750 B.C.). From E two separate forms were developed. The earlier, found in Deuteronomy, received a large addition in the Second commandment (i.e. Deut. v. 8-10), in the Fourth (i.e. Deut. v. 15), and in the Fifth. The later form, now found in Exodus, took over several of these "Deuteronomic" additions in (about) the fifth century B.C. Next a mixture of these two forms arose in Egypt, to which the Hebrew archetype used by LXX. c. 300 B.C. was due. From a further mixture of this archetype with the "Exodus" text arose the text of the Nash papyrus.

W. EMEBY BARNES.

THE SECRET EXPERIENCES OF THE PROPHETS.¹

18. IN what precedes we have looked at the inward experiences of the prophets as all on one level. To prevent our picture showing distorted features, let us look at their *history*.

¹ By Professor Hermann Gunkel, being the second of three introductory essays in Prof. Hans Schmidt's *Die Grossen Propheten*, Göttingen, 1923.