

by such as pervert and distort even the simplest of English. It is these that have shown themselves to be the division mongers that Rom. 16:17,18 so strongly condemns." (In a letter written Dec. 22, 1961)

9. Dr. Franz Pieper in his *Christian Dogmatics* Vol. 1, p. 147, quotes Luther as saying: "It is certain that whoever does not rightly believe one article or refuses to accept it (after he has been admonished and instructed), certainly believes none sincerely and in true faith. And whoever is so presumptuous as to dare to contradict God or call Him a liar in one word (of Scripture), and does this wilfully, persisting in it, though he has been admonished and instructed once or twice, he is ready (and he does it, too) to deny God and accuse Him of lying in all His words. There are no two ways about it: either all and everything is believed, truly and fully, or nothing is believed. The Holy Ghost (who wrote all of Scripture, St. L. III: 1890) cannot be separated or divided, so that we would be free to teach and believe one article as true and another as false. This does not apply to the weak, who are ready to receive instruction and do not offer stubborn opposition." (St. L. XX: 1781.)

#### READERS' COMMENTS concerning the first edition of this essay:

"It is indeed an excellently written tract. Your simple style together with mastery of the subject reminds me much of our good Dr. Pieper. I hope you can get enough support . . . to give it the widest distribution. It would be fine if it could go to all our pastors."

—A pastor from the Mid-West

"Hurriedly I read Brother Goetjen's second essay 'Orthodoxy versus Neo-Orthodoxy as it concerns doctrinal Discipline.' I was delighted - overjoyed. It is of the same calibre as the foregoing essay . . . . He can write plainly and simply, and yet with a reasonableness and cogency of argument and persuasion that must unarm the adversary. I like the attitude, the pastoral concern in which he writes, that of a Christian pleading with his fellow-Christian . . . . More power to him, I would say, more Holy Spirit to him, through whose mighty operations alone we can hope to win the erring brother and the adversary."

—A pastor from Wisconsin.

" . . . I was thrilled with the excellent material you are putting out. It even restored within me some hope that Missouri just might get well after all! . . . May God bless your efforts . . . . Please send all your material to each family in our congregation. Note our enclosed mailing list." —A West Coast layman and chairman of the Board of Elders of his congregation.

WISCONSIN LUTHERAN SEMINARY  
Library  
6633 W. WARTBURG CIRCLE  
MEQUON, WISCONSIN 53092

## Where's Moses? Part I

BY E. P. SCHULZE

"Where's Moses? — is a Moses to be found?

You'll seek him vainly in the bull-rushes,

While I in vain touch cymbals."

(E. B. B. Browning)

The critics have looked for him in Pentateuch, too, and have not found him, or, for the most part, more than mere traces of him. Perhaps this is so because they have not found much of God there in the first place. They have plucked the bush of its blackberries while

" . . . only he who sees takes off his shoes."

Denial of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch was born in paganism. The Platonic philosopher Celsus negated it in his *Logos Alethes* as early as 178 of our era. Though his book was lost, and in spite of the reply of Origen in his *Kata Kelsou* (248), the opinion that Moses might not have been the author of what has been ascribed to him survived and met some degree of acceptance in the medieval period.

This anti-Mosaic view was nurtured in modern skepticism. The English deistic philosopher Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) not only denied miracles and revelation but also attacked the doctrine that Moses wrote the books which bear his name. In his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* the excommunicated Jewish rationalistic philosopher Benedict de Spinoza (1632-1677) fought the time-honored Judeo-Christian view of revelation. He held that Ezra might have written the works credited to Moses.

The evil seed began to germinate under the solicitous attention of scholars who for the most part were at least nominally Christian.

Richard Simon (1638-1712), a Roman Catholic priest who has been called the "Father of Higher Criticism," questioned the Mosaic origin of the first five books of the Bible "to show that Protestants had no assured principles for their religion."

#### EARLY DOCUMENTARY THEORIES

Early in the eighteenth century be-

gan the rise of the so-called documentary theories. Thus H. B. Witter in 1711 maintained that there were two accounts of creation in Genesis, distinguishable by the divine names used in them, and a Roman Catholic physician, Jean d'Astruc (1684-1766), developed this idea into a theory that Genesis is composed of two primary documents identifiable by their employment of the divine names Elohim and Jehovah. His hypothesis did not, however, deny at least editorship to Moses but merely held that he had access to earlier documents and put them together.

Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (1752-1827) built upon the foundation laid by d'Astruc, applying the theory to the entire Pentateuch. Though at first he followed d'Astruc in maintaining Moses' editorship, in the final edition of his *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* he concluded that while some of the material in the five books may date back to Moses most of it is a compilation of sources from a later time. He identified these sources as E (for Elohim) and J (for Jehovah).

#### FRAGMENT AND SUPPLEMENT HYPOTHESES

About the same period the Scottish Catholic Alex Geddes (1737-1802) evolved the so-called fragment hypothesis which sought to prove that the Pentateuch is composed of fragmentary materials some of which go back to Moses or even beyond him but which were not compiled until long after his time. Another theory which was popular for a while was the "supplement hypothesis" of Heinrich Georg August Ewald (1803-1875) which postulated an original document called *Grundschrift*, some centuries later than Moses, to which additions were made from time to time. Though to some extent revived in our own day the fragment and supplement hypotheses rather quickly went into eclipse, and the nineteenth century was the heyday of what we know as the documentary theories.

#### GRAF-WELLHAUSEN

As early as 1798 K. D. Ilgen held that the Elohist source was composite and denominated the respective parts as E and E2. Herman Hupfield (1796-

1866) followed him in this view. Now at last it was time to add to the documentary theory the presupposition of the fragment hypothesis that Deuteronomy was of late origin. Hupfeld therefore named his documents in supposed chronological order as E or P (priestly), E2, J and D) Deuteronomy).

The documentary theory was further elaborated by K. H. Graf (1866) and Julius Wellhausen (1876). Known as the Graf-Wellhausen Theory, their system of surmises may be described as a development hypothesis, for it presupposed an evolution of religious thought.

Basic to the Graf-Wellhausen theory is a thoroughly naturalistic *Weltanschauung*. It is presumed that religion was an evolutionary development beginning with fetishism and proceeding through polytheism and henotheism to a final monotheism. There is, of course, nothing in Scripture nor in sound ethnology to support such a view.

Arguments employed to encourage the plausibility of the documentary theories are the alleged presence of two accounts of creation in Genesis, the differences between the levitical and the deuteronomic laws, the occurrence of Chaldean expressions which are said to indicate a late date, the varying styles and disparity in vocabulary.

### ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE THEORIES

The contentions of the higher critics are met on their own ground by pointing out that so-called primitive and evolving religion is really a corruption of an original monotheism; that there is but one account of creation in the Bible, namely the general overview in Genesis 1 and the more specific account of various aspects in Genesis 2, that (besides other significant differences in view point) the levitical laws were for the wilderness and the deuteronomic, more specifically, for the promised land, that Aramaisms are accounted for by the circumstance that Abraham may have been an Aramean and that Jacob had

spent much time in Aram; that differences in style are accounted for by the varying nature of the subject matter or its purpose; and that vocabulary will vary in the same writer according to his materials and mood.

As to language, there is hardly any early Hebrew available outside the Bible. Of what little there is, we cannot always say for certain how much of it is dialect. Moreover, the Ras Shamra tablets have shown that some words previously regarded as late are really early and that Aramaisms are no evidence of late date. That writing was common in the time of Moses need, of course, no longer be argued.

Proof for the evolution of religious thought is simply manufactured out of the flimsiest materials. Thus the First Commandment has been said to smell of henotheism because it says, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Such contentions require no serious refutation.

### SYSTEMATIC BEWILDERMENT

The theories about the Pentateuch are almost incredibly numerous. In *The Pulpit Commentary* H. L. Hastings years ago listed 76 that appeared in the years from 1850 to 1880 alone. For Genesis there were 16; for Exodus, 13; for Leviticus, 22; for Numbers, 8; for Deuteronomy, 17. How many theories on the Pentateuch have there been altogether? Who knows? It matters very little. One by one they disappear into the stacks to gather dust and poison bookworms.

Here then we have a veritable Babel of ramshackle structures, labyrinthine as the home of the Minotaur, speciously impressive at first glance, yet without foundation except in the sinking sands of human speculation. Pondering them, one may be reminded that philosophy has been defined as a way of bewildering oneself systematically. "Made in Germany" is no guarantee of their validity. The evidence is subjective, not even plausibly circumstantial, and altogether of such a nature that it would be laughed out of court by any respectable justice of the peace.

## Where's Moses? Part II

BY E. P. SCHULZE

Allis in *The Five Books of Moses* well says that "the basic question for the student of the Old Testament is his attitude toward the supernatural." Christians will accept the statements of

Scripture concerning its own divine origin. It will be interesting to see what the Bible itself has to say on the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

## THE PENTATEUCH'S OWN

### TESTIMONY

The Pentateuch itself hints at its Mosaic origin. In Exodus 17:14 we read that after the defeat of Amalek "the Lord said unto Moses, 'Write this for a memorial in a book'." Exodus 24:4: "Moses wrote all the words of the Lord" which he had heard on Sinai (Ex. 19:3-24:2). Exodus 34:27: Concerning the Decalog "the Lord said unto Moses, 'Write thou these words'." Exodus 34:28: Moses "wrote upon the tablets the words of the covenant, the ten commandments." Numbers 33:2: Of the journeys of the children of Israel, "Moses wrote their goings out according to their journeys by the commandment of the Lord." These travels are detailed in Numbers 33:3-49.

In the case of Deuteronomy, of the supposed lateness of which much has been made, we have, happily, far more than intimations to indicate that it is not to be assigned to Josiah's time and that Moses was indeed its author, for in the very first verse of its first chapter we are told, "These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel on this side Jordan, in the wilderness, in the plain over against the Red sea, between Paran and Tophel and Laban and Hazereth and Dizahab. Again, four verses later: "On this side Jordan, in the land of Moab, began Moses to declare this law." It was there, before the conquest, that "Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests the sons of Levi, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and unto all the elders of Israel" (Deut. 31:9). "And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, 'Take this book of the law and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God'" (Deut. 31:24-26). Sin the Song of Moses was mentioned (Deut. 31:22) just before Moses finished writing the book and delivered it to the priests it seems likely that it was, as indeed its whole tenor shows, regarded as part of the deuteronomic law and was therefore included in the copy which Moses handed to the priests for safe-keeping in the ark. The song is given in Deuteronomy 32:1-43, and immediately after its recording Moses was commanded to climb Mount Nebo to behold the land of Canaan and die. Philo and Josephus held that Moses recorded his own demise. Some Christian scholars believe otherwise. It would seem, indeed, that the book was put into the ark (31:25-26) before the account of

Moses' death was written, but believers in verbal inspiration will, of course, not find it incredible that Moses could have written about his own death and burial.

### JOSHUA TO MALACHI

Books of the Old Testament from Joshua to Malachi emphatically confirm the Mosaic authorship of all the Pentateuch with the possible exception of Genesis, the attestation of which we may safely leave to our Lord himself.

There are several references to Deuteronomy in Joshua, where "the book of the law of Moses" is twice mentioned (8:31 and 23:6) and the recording of "a copy of the law of Moses" upon the stones of the altar is cited (8:32).

In I Kings 2:3 David charged Solomon to walk in the ways of the Lord, to keep his statutes, his commandments and his judgments, "as it is written in the law of Moses." In II Kings 14:6 (II Chron. 25:4) we read that Amaziah would not slay the children of the murderers of his father, "according to that which is written in the law of Moses" (Deut. 24:16). In II Kings 23:25 we are told that there was no king like Josiah, who turned to the Lord with all his heart and soul and might "according to all the law of Moses." All these references are evidently to Deuteronomy, a copy of which each king was to write for himself and was required to read in it every day (Deut. 17:18-19).

References to various books of the Pentateuch are found in II Chronicles. There we are informed (23:18) that Jehoiada appointed the burnt offering to be performed "as it is written in the law of Moses." This could refer either to Exodus (29) or Numbers (28) or both. In Hezekiah's reign, and again in Josiah's, there was a notable Passover. In the first (II Chron. 30:16) the priests and the levites stood in their places "according to the law of Moses." In the second (35:12) these functionaries performed certain ceremonies "as it is written in the law of Moses." The allusion in each case would appear to be Leviticus (1). God (33:8) encouraged the Jews to do "according to the whole law and the statutes and the ordinances by the hand of Moses." This might mean Exodus and Leviticus and Numbers in addition to Deuteronomy. Hilkiah the priest (34:14) "found a book of the law of the Lord given by Moses." Without being as positive as higher critics like to be, one may safely guess that this was Deuteronomy. Why did Josiah say, "Great is the wrath of the Lord . . . because our fathers have not

kept the word of the Lord, to do after all that is written in this book"? Was he thinking of the curses from Mt. Ebal (Deut. 27:15-26) and those detailed at greater length in the discourse that follows (28:15-68)?

Ezra and Nehemiah have passages that are enlightening as to the Mosaic authorship. Ezra (3:2) speaks of "the altars . . . to offer burnt offerings . . . as it is written in the law of Moses the man of God." The type of these altars is described in Exodus 20:24-25. He mentions (6:18) the divisions of the priests and the courses of the levites, "as it is written in the book of Moses." This alludes to Numbers 3:6-10; 8:24-26. Ezra (7:6) "was a ready scribe in the law of Moses." Nehemiah (8:2) tells us that Ezra read to the people "the book of the law of Moses." Since he read and explained for six hours (8:3), this could hardly have been a fragment, and that it was indeed a considerable work is attested by the fact that he continued reading for seven days (8:18). It may well have been everything from Genesis to Deuteronomy, the whole Torah, or at all events Leviticus to Deuteronomy. Specific mention is made (8:14) of the Feast of Tabernacles, an item that must have been taken from Leviticus (23). This, apparently was read on the second day, and that in turn would indicate that the reading may have begun with Leviticus. That Genesis and Exodus were known, however, is apparent from the exhortation in Nehemiah 9, where some of the principle events of those books are detailed. One need hardly add that Ezra was not the man to invent such things.

Daniel (9:11) alludes to "the oath that is written in the law of Moses," which seems to mean the curses from Mt. Ebal (Deut. 27). Again (9:13) he says, "As it is written in the law of Moses all this evil is come upon us," and this may hark back to the predictions of Deuteronomy 28, particularly verses 36 and 37. Malachi says (4:4), "Remember the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded thee in Horeb, with the statutes and the judgments," and this means not only the Ten Commandments but much more.

#### EVANGELISTS AND APOSTLES

Evangelists and Apostles proclaim the Mosaic Pentateuch. Luke (2:22) speaks of the purification of Mary "according to the law of Moses." This law is found in Leviticus 12. The same writer (Acts 28:23) says that at Rome Paul persuaded the Jews concerning Jesus "both out of the law of Moses and out of the prophets." John forth-

rightly says in his Gospel (1:17), "The law was given by Moses," and in Revelation (15:3) he remarks that the saints "sing the song of Moses the servant of God" (Ex. 15:1-19); Deut. 32:1-43). Paul has the Torah in mind as he writes (II Cor. 3:15), "When Moses is read, the veil is upon their faces." In Acts (13:39) he speaks of "the law of Moses" and (26:22) of things "which the prophets and Moses did say should come." He quotes Deuteronomy (32:21) when he writes (Rom. 10:19), "Moses saith, 'I will provoke you to jealousy by them that are no people, and by a foolish nation I will anger you.'" He cites the same book (25:4) when he writes (I Cor. 9:9), "It is written in the law of Moses, 'Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn'."

The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews says (7:14) that of the tribe of Judah "Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood." He reports (10:28) that "he that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses" (Deut. 17:6). James (Acts 15:21) declares that "Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him." Peter (Acts 3:22) cites Moses as the author of Deuteronomy 18:15: "A prophet shall the Lord your God raise upon unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear." Stephen (Acts 7:37) echoes this.

#### WHAT JESUS SAID

Above all, our Lord and Savior set his seal to the Pentateuch as the work of Moses from Genesis to Deuteronomy. He vouched for him as the lawgiver when He said (Matt. 23:2), "The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat," and again when He inquired, "Did not Moses give you the law?" (John 7:19). He mentions (John 7:22) His giving of circumcision (Lev. 12:3). In allusion to the divorce question (Deut. 24:1) He asks (Mark 11:0:3), "What did Moses command you?" When the Pharisees (Mark 10:4:5) reminded Him that Moses had permitted divorce He replied, "For the hardness of your hearts Moses wrote you this precept." When the Sadducees said (Mark 12:19:27; cp. Luke 20:28:38), "Master, Moses wrote unto us, 'If a man's brother die,'" etc., Jesus confuted them by answering, "Have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush," etc. (Ex. 3:2-6). Upon the leper (Matt. 8:4; Mark 1:44; Luke 5:14) He enjoins "the gift which Moses commanded" (Lev. 14:3).

"Philip findeth Nathanael, and saith unto him, 'We have found Him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write.'" (John 1:45). That Moses pro-

phesied Christ was, of course, not merely the private opinion of the guileless but uninspired Israelite. St. Paul, in passages already cited, had said the same thing by inspiration of God the Holy Ghost, and our Lord Himself declared (John 5:46:47): "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me, for he wrote of Me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe My words?" "Beginning at Moses and all the prophets," to the disciples on the way to Emmaus our Lord "expounded to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself" (Luke 24:27). In such passages there is obvious reference to such Messianic prophecies of the Pentateuch as Genesis 3:15; 22:18; 26:4; 48:16; 49:10:18; Numbers 21:9; Deuteronomy 18:15. "For," He said, "all things must be fulfilled that were written in the law of Moses . . . concerning Me" (Luke 24:44). To the unbelieving Jews He said (John 5:45), "There is one that accuseth you, even Moses."

#### "IF THEY HEAR NOT MOSES" . . .

According to a sound hermeneutical principle, all statements of Holy Writ are to be understood in their natural and obvious sense, unless there are compelling reasons to understand them

otherwise, and such reasons, in the cases cited, do not exist. But not even the testimony of Christ will convince one who is not open to conviction. "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, through one rose from the dead" (Luke 16:31). Those, on the other hand, who subordinate the pride of intellect to the humility of faith will accept the statements of the Bible and of Christ, and they will not be put to shame. They know, from plain words, that Moses is not buried somewhere in the Pentateuch, under the accretions of centuries.

If you desire additional copies of this pamphlet please order from one of the following officers of the **Defenders of the Brief Statement**: President, 2986 Sherman Avenue, North Bend Oregon; Secretary, 525 11th Avenue, Eastside, Oregon; Treasurer, Box 265, Myrtle Point, Oregon. These pamphlets are offered free as long as funds are available. The cost to our organization of printing and mailing this tract amounts to approximately 6c per copy when ordered in quantities of 20 or more. Donations towards this cause will be gratefully received.