THE question of the origin of the Ten Commandments, like a great many other Old Testament questions, is a very vexed one, and widely different views have been held by different scholars. Common has been the ascription to the period of the prophets,\(^2\) or even to the exilic age,\(^3\) and the denial of any real

\(^1\) A lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on Wednesday, the 14th of February, 1951.


connexion between Moses and the Decalogue. Nevertheless, not a few scholars have continued to accept the Mosaic origin of this code of conduct, and in the last generation there has been a growing tendency to recognise that it may go back to Moses. 

1 Cf. K. Budde, *Religion of Israel to the Exile*, 1899, p. 32, where it is maintained that if the Decalogue were of Mosaic origin, 'hardly anything could have remained for the prophets to do'.


It should be added that in most of these cases no more than the possibility of Mosaic origin is maintained, though some go beyond this to varying degrees of probability. Other writers who do not exclude a Mosaic origin are Oesterley and Robinson, *Hebrew Religion: its Origin and Development*, 2nd ed., 1937, p. 168,
To this view I have more than once announced my adhesion. The statement of a conclusion, however, is of less significance than the weight of the arguments that sustain it, and in the present lecture I wish to review the main outlines of the problem, and to show why I think all probability is in favour of this view. It will be observed at the outset that I claim only probability and not certainty for this view, though I think it has a high degree of probability.

In Exod. xx. 1-17 we have the most familiar form of the Decalogue. This is generally believed to have belonged to the Elohistic, or E, document of the Pentateuch, that has commonly been dated in the eighth century B.C.—though, of course, the scholars who put the origin of the Decalogue later than this must hold that it is a later insertion in that document, or bring the document itself down to a later date. Into this last question I cannot enter here, but must be content to say that I see no reason to come down later than circa 750 B.C. for the document E, and A. Bentzen, Introduction to the Old Testament, ii, 1949, p. 55, while S. Spiegel, Harvard Theological Review, xxvii, 1934, pp. 140 ff., allows that the Decalogue is older than the ministry of Hosea. In some of the cases mentioned above certain commands are excluded from the original Code. Thus, H. Schmidt (loc. cit., pp. 105 ff.) eliminates the fourth and fifth commandments, and divides the first to make up the number, while Powis Smith (op. cit., p. 7 n.) finds it necessary to exclude the second commandment if the Mosaic origin of the rest is to be found possible (cf. T. J. Meek, Journal of the American Oriental Society, Iviii, 1938, pp. 126 f., for a criticism of this). Similarly L. W. Batten, in Hastings' Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, iv, 1911, pp. 513 ff., allows the Decalogue to be in substance Mosaic, with the exception of the second and possibly the first commandments. O. Procksch, Theologie des Alten Testaments, 1950, p. 58, rejects Schmidt's view as improbable.


3 Hölscher brings the E document down to the middle of the sixth century B.C. Cf. Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religion, p. 102.
and while I think there are evident traces of a later hand in the present text of the Decalogue, I do not think the whole passage is a later insertion.\(^1\) Much attention has been paid in recent years to older sources on which the compilers of the main documents of the Pentateuch rested, and from which they quoted, and I hope to show reasons for the view that the Decalogue goes back far beyond the time of the compiler of the E document, so that it could well have been embodied in his work from an older source.

In Deut. v. 6-21 we find the Decalogue again, but while there is a general similarity, and in large part equation of the terms, there are some significant differences.\(^2\) The most familiar and notable of these is in the fourth commandment,\(^3\) where, apart from other slight variations, we find the commandment reinforced in Exodus with the words: 'For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath

\(^1\) The fact that the Decalogue does not fit smoothly into its present place may be due to the fact that it was incorporated from an older source. The compiler of E may just as reasonably be supposed to have been responsible for this as a later redactor. S. Mowinckel, Le Décalogue, p. 18, observes that 'la plupart des critiques voient dans Ex. xx les conditions de l'alliance imposées à Israël selon E'. Amongst recent writers who have held that the Decalogue belonged originally to E are A. Gampert, loc. cit., p. 191, and W. Rudolph, in Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments (B.Z.A.W. lxvi), ed. by J. Hempel, 1936, p. 43. Rudolph has more recently proposed the view that this Decalogue once belonged to J and stood in Exod. xxxiv before it was transferred to its present position (cf. Der "Elohist" von Exodus bis Josua (B.Z.A.W. lxviii), 1938, pp. 60 f., 276).


\(^3\) The division of the Decalogue cannot here be discussed, and for the present purpose that adopted normally in the Anglican Church will be employed.
day and hallowed it', while in Deuteronomy it is reinforced with the words: 'And thou shalt remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and the Lord thy God brought thee out thence by a mighty hand and a stretched out arm: therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day'.

Here we notice that the addition in Deuteronomy is in the characteristic style of the book of Deuteronomy, while the addition in Exodus rests on the first Creation story. This latter is commonly assigned to the document P, or the Priestly Code, which is the latest of the Pentateuchal sources. It is improbable that a later hand than the Deuteronomist's made the addition in Deuteronomy in the style of Deuteronomy, and we seem justified therefore in saying that the Decalogue was either first composed by the author of Deuteronomy, or it antedated his time and was here reinforced by him in terms of his characteristic thought. As against the first of these alternatives, however, we

1 Of other differences between the text of Exod. xx and Deut. v we may note the following: the fourth commandment begins 'Remember the sabbath day' in Exodus and 'Observe the sabbath day' in Deuteronomy, while the latter makes the additions 'as the Lord thy God commanded thee', 'nor thine ox, nor thine ass', and 'that thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou'; in the fifth commandment Deuteronomy adds 'as the Lord thy God commanded thee', and 'that it may be well with thee'; in the ninth commandment a different word is used for 'false' in the two versions; in the tenth commandment Deuteronomy reverses the order of 'house' and 'wife' and uses a different word for the second 'covet' of the Exodus text, adding also 'his field'. Cf. S. R. Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, 9th ed., 1913, pp. 33 f.; C. A. Briggs, The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch, 1897, pp. 181 ff.

2 Cf. 'thou shalt remember' with Deut. vii. 18, viii. 2, 18, ix. 7, xvi. 3, xxiv. 9, xxv. 17, and the whole phrase 'thou shalt remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt' with Deut. xv. 15, xvi. 12, xxiv. 18, 22; 'with a mighty hand and a stretched out arm' with Deut. iv. 34, vi. 21, vii. 8, 19, ix. 26, 29, xi. 2, xxvi. 8; and 'as the Lord thy God commanded thee' with Deut. i. 19, ii. 37, iv. 5, 33, v. 12, 15, 16, 29, vi. 1, 20, xiii. 6, xx. 17. Similarly the additions mentioned in the preceding note find their parallels in idea and word elsewhere in Deuteronomy.

3 Cf. Gen. ii. 2 f.

4 So R. H. Kennett, The Church of Israel, 1933, p. 49; S. A. Cook, ibid., p. xliii n.; R. H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 229 (either the author of the D code or the Deuteronomists of 550 B.C., but preferably the former). H. Fuchs, Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, xxiv, 1904, pp. 139 f., held that the second commandment could hardly be from the author of Deuteronomy, but should be attributed to a Deuteronomist of the exilic period.
note that the terms of the Decalogue as a whole are not characteristic of the style or thought of Deuteronomy, and in particular the sabbath is not mentioned elsewhere in this book. Hence there is no reason to suppose that the Deuteronomist invented the Decalogue, and we may reasonably conclude that it is older than his time. As to the date of the compilation of Deuteronomy, there is again much difference of opinion, but the most probable view, and the one still most widely held, is that it was composed in the seventh century B.C. I myself should put it in the early part of the century, in the reign of Manasseh. This would rule out an exilic date for the origin of the Decalogue, though it would still leave it just possible that Mowinckel was right in

1 Individual phrases in the Decalogue in its forms both in Exodus and in Deuteronomy have been noted as probably bearing the stamp of Deuteronomy. Cf. C. A. Briggs, *The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch*, pp. 186 f.; Carpenter and Harford, *The Composition of the Hexateuch*, p. 224; G. A. Smith, *Deuteronomy*, p. 82; R. H. Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 229. All of these phrases mark what are probably expansions of the original form of the Decalogue, and not the original form itself. They could have been added in Exodus under the influence of the Deuteronomic expansion just as easily as the addition that shows the influence of P.

suggesting that the disciples of Isaiah were responsible for the formulation of this code of conduct. 1 If the composition of Deuteronomy is rightly assigned to the early part of the reign of Manasseh, however, this would mean that the Decalogue was practically contemporary with the composition of Deuteronomy.

That the Decalogue is older than either its Deuteronomic form or its form in Exodus may be reinforced by another consideration. 2 In both passages it is treated as authoritative, and peculiarly fundamental to Israel’s religion. If either of the present forms of the fourth commandment were so accepted before the other was composed, it is improbable that so notable a change would have been made in the other version. It is probable, therefore, that the original commands, to which particular sanctity would attach, are to be sought in the common elements of the two forms, so that in each case the reinforcement is not an alteration of something that belonged to the sacred text, but a parenetic addition. The original commands were therefore probably all short, as most of those in the second half still are. This is, of course, no new suggestion, but one that has long been generally accepted. 3 Since the addition to the fourth commandment in Exodus seems to depend on the late document P, it

---


2 A. Bentzen, Introduction to the Old Testament, ii. p. 53, thinks the fact that its teaching on retribution does not agree with that of Deuteronomy (cf. Deut. xxiv. 16) indicates that the Decalogue is older than D. G. A. Smith, Deuteronomy, p. 84, thinks it is older than both E and D, while W. Rudolph, in Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments, p. 43, goes farther and pronounces it older than J and E.

3 There is substantial agreement amongst scholars as to the probable form of the original commandments. It has been noted above that H. Schmidt eliminates the fourth and fifth commands and divides the first to yield a series of commands of a common form. A. Jirku, Das weltliche Recht im Alten Testament, 1927, pp. 150 ff., similarly thinks all the commands were of a common form, but holds that there were originally fewer than ten. K. Rabast, Das apodiktische Recht im Deuteronomium und im Heiligkeitgesetz, 1949, pp. 34 ff., casts the fourth and fifth commands in the form ‘Thou shalt do no work on the sabbath’ and ‘Thou shalt not curse thy father and mother’, and imports the command ‘Thou shalt not worship them’ to follow the prohibition of images. The number ten is then maintained by making ‘I am the Lord thy God; Thou shalt have no other god beside me’ into the preamble. In giving a negative
is probable that the Decalogue once stood in shorter form in Exodus than it now has. Even in its original form in Exodus, it may have been somewhat expanded from its first form, so that the maintenance of the Mosaic origin of the Decalogue does not extend to every word of either of the present forms, or even of the common portions, but only to the substance of the commands.

In Ex. xxxiv. 14-28 we have a further table of commandments, terminating with the words: ‘And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments’.1


1 It is frequently held that the words ‘the ten commandments’ are an addition to the text. So, e.g. J. A. Bewer, The Literature of the Old Testament in its Historical Development, 1922, p. 41. It is nevertheless commonly held that this chapter contains another Decalogue. W. Rudolph, Der ‘Elohist’ von Exodus bis Josua, 1938, p. 59 n., says ‘the ten commandments’ cannot be a gloss, but he thinks the Decalogue of Exod. xx once stood in this chapter. In modern times Goethe was the first to recognise a Decalogue in Exod. xxxiv, in his Zwo wichtige bisher unerörterte Fragen, 1773 (cf. Weimar edition, xxxviii, 1896, pp. 175 ff.), but he was anticipated long earlier by a Greek writer of the fifth century (cf. E. Nestle, ‘Ein Vorganger Goethe’s über den zweiten Dekalog’, in Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, xxiv, 1904, pp. 134 f.) Various other Decalogues have been added to these two in modern times. Thus Morgenstern, Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, iii, pp. 506 ff., detects no less than five. Of these the first is that contained in Exod. xxxiv, which he associates with the reform of Asa and dates 899 B.C. (cf. The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch (reprinted from Hebrew Union College Annual, iv), 1927, pp. 98 ff.; Amos Studies, i (reprinted from Heb. Un. Coll. Ann., xi, xii-xiii, xv), 1941, pp. 236 ff.; Heb. Un. Coll. Ann., xxi, 1948, pp. 378, 474 ff.); the second is contained in Exod. xx. 23-26, xxxiii. 10-19, which he ascribes to the time of Jehu’s revolution in the northern kingdom (on this see below); the third is the Decalogue of Exod. xx and Deut. v, which he assigns to the time of Hezekiah or Josiah; the fourth is contained in Lev. xix. 2-18, which he dates in post-exilic times (cf. C. H. Cornill, in Studien zur semitischen Philologie und Religionsgeschichte (Wellhausen Festschrift), ed. by K. Marti (B.Z.A.W. xxvii), 1914, pp. 112 f.; N. Messel, Det Gamle Testamente (Michelet-Mowinckel-Messel), i, p. 238; S. Mowinckel, in Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, N.F. xiv, 1937, pp. 218 ff.); and the fifth is contained in Deut. xxvii. 15-26, and assigned to the fifth century
Within these verses we find twelve, or perhaps thirteen, commandments, however, instead of ten, and scholars differ in their views as to which were the original ten and which were the

b.c. (cf. S. Mowinckel, Psalmstudien, v, pp. 107 ff.; E. Sellin, Introduction to the Old Testament, pp. 46 ff., 7th German ed., pp. 29 ff., 8th German ed., rev. by L. Rost, p. 43). H. Gressmann, Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung und Prophetic Israels (S.A.T., II. i), 1910, pp. 234 ff., distinguishes three Decalogues, corresponding to the first, third and fifth of Morgenstern's, and R. B. Y. Scott, The Relevance of the Prophets, 1944, p. 59, four corresponding to the first, third, fourth and fifth of Morgenstern's, and suggests that they were the forms preserved at various sanctuaries. L. B. Paton, 'The Original Form of the Book of the Covenant', in Journal of Biblical Literature, xii, 1893, pp. 79 ff., found no less than ten decalogues in the Book of the Covenant, each divided symmetrically into two tables of five laws each.

1 These are:

1. Thou shalt worship no other god (vs. 14);
2. Thou shalt make thee no molten gods (vs. 17);
3. The feast of unleavened bread thou shalt keep (vs. 18);
4. All that openeth the womb is mine (vs. 19);
5. None shall appear before me empty (vs. 20);
6. Six days shalt thou work, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest (vs. 21);
7. Thou shalt observe the feast of weeks, and the feast of ingathering at the year's end (vs. 22)—possibly two commands;
8. Three times in the year shall all thy males appear before the Lord (vs. 23);
9. Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread (vs. 25);
10. The sacrifice of the feast of the passover shall not be left over unto the morning (vs. 25);
11. The first of the first fruits of thy ground thou shalt bring unto the house of the Lord thy God (vs. 26);
12. Thou shalt not see thee a kid in its mother's milk (vs. 26).

additions. Any precise determination of this question need not concern us here, since it is not this Decalogue which we are primarily studying. It is generally held to stand in the oldest


2 Of the twelve (or thirteen, if No. 7 is regarded as two) commands set out above (p. 89, n. 1), the following eliminations to reduce to ten are made by the scholars named in the preceding note: 5, 6, and 8 by Wellhausen, Addis, G. L. Robinson, and Holzinger; 3, 6, and 8 by Cornill and *La Bible du Centenaire* (both also reading for No. 5: 'All the firstborn of thy sons thou shalt redeem', vs. 20); 6 and 8 by Smend; 4, 5, and 8 by Stade; 2 and 5 by Goethe; 2, 5, and 8 by Kennett; 5 and 8 by Kent and Winnett; 3, 5, 8, and 11 by Morgenstern (who reduces the total to eight; more recently, however, he recognises that it was originally a Decalogue and eliminates, 5, 8, and 11, but adds as a separate command: 'in ploughing time and in harvest thou shalt rest'. Cf. *Hebrew Union College Annual*, xxvi, 1948, p. 476); 8 and 10 by Köhler; 7 and 8 by Powis Smith (who reads No. 5 as *La Bible du Centenaire*); 4, 5, and 6 by Holscher; 5 and 6 by Eissfeldt; 1 and 6 by McNeile; 5 and 7 by H. P. Smith; 3 and 5 by Baentsch; 3 and 7 by Beer, Berry, Mowinckel and Gray. For further older varieties of eliminations, cf. A. C. Knudson, *loc. cit.*, p. 87. The wide varieties of opinion are manifest, and it is not without reason that C. F. Burney says: 'The variations in the form in which the code is presented to us as a code of ten commandments are nearly as numerous as the critics who attempted to cope with the problem.
source of the Pentateuch, a source which is older than the E source, therefore, or the D source, with which we have been so far concerned. Here, then, we have evidence of a Decalogue going back very far into the pre-exilic period, for this early document is commonly dated in the middle of the ninth century B.C. It is here, however, that we find ourselves in the heart of our problem. For this Decalogue, however we delimit its ten terms, appears to be a much more primitive document than the other Decalogue which we are considering. Some of its terms are closely similar to those of the other Decalogue in substance. There is the insistence that Yahweh alone shall be served, and that idols must not be tolerated. There is the law of the Sabbath: 'Six days shalt thou work, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest: in ploughing time and in harvest thou shalt rest'. But here we find none of the ethical commandments which are

and to find its solution (Journal of Theological Studies, ix, 1908, p. 332). In my view the last of the above cited opinions is the most probable. The three festivals mentioned in 3 and 7 are all agricultural festivals, likely to have been added to a nomadic code to adapt it to settled life. It is improbable that 8 would have been added after the three occasions had been separately specified, when it could only refer to them, whereas it is not improbable than an unspecified three occasions going back to nomadic times should have been later increased by the addition of agricultural festivals, and then interpreted in terms of them.

This is generally called the J source. Within that source various strata are often distinguished, and by some scholars this Decalogue is attributed to the later of them. Morgenstern distinguished a K, or Kenite, source, older than the J source, and ascribed this Decalogue to that earliest of all the sources. Similarly N. Messel, loc. cit., p. 186, says that this is the oldest known form of the Decalogue. G. F. Moore, in Encyclopaedia Biblica, ii, 1901, col. 1446, says it is certainly older than its setting, and holds that 'we may safely assume that this collection of sacred laws was made at a Judaean sanctuary, and that it represents the ancient usage of the region'. O. Eissfeldt, who like Morgenstern distinguished an older source than J, does not attribute this Decalogue to that older source, but to J (cf. Hexateuch-Synopse, pp. 158* f.). Not a few scholars, however, hold that this Decalogue is late and secondary, and declare it rather a collection of fragments from the Book of the Covenant than a Decalogue at all. Cf. B. D. Eerdmans, Alttestamentliche Studien, iii, 1910, pp. 85 ff.; R. H. Pfeiffer, Journal of Biblical Literature, xliii, 1924, pp. 294 ff., and Introduction to the Old Testament, pp. 224 f.; P. Heinisch, Das Buch Exodus (H.S.A. Tes.), 1934, p. 243; A. Alt, Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts, p. 52 n.; W. Rudolph, Der "Elohist" von Exodus bis Josua, p. 59; F. V. Winnett, The Mosaic Tradition, p. 54; E. Robertson, The Old Testament Problem, 1950, p. 94.

Morgenstern dates it at the beginning of the ninth century.
characteristic of the other Decalogue, no injunction to honour parents, or prohibition of murder, adultery, theft, false witness, or covetousness. Instead we find purely ritual commands: ‘All that openeth the womb is mine. . . . Three times in the year shall all thy males appear before the Lord . . . Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread . . . Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother’s milk.’ A recent writer has maintained that this Decalogue was composed by the compiler of the Priestly Code,¹ and earlier writers had noted that the interest in ritual is characteristic of the late, as well as of the early, period.² Here it is to be observed that if the compiler of P had created a Decalogue, its expansion to twelve or thirteen commands would have to be put even later. Moreover, while the compiler of the Priestly Code was certainly interested in ritual, he was also interested in the ethical principles for which the prophets had stood, and it is very unlikely that he would have stripped the Ethical Decalogue of its ethical content in order to create this. Further, the fact that in Exod. xx we find the Ethical Decalogue with the expansion showing the influence of P, to which reference has been made, is evidence that the circles interested in the Priestly Code had not ceased to be interested in that Decalogue. Yet again, the whole flavour of this table is primitive, and its ritual interest does not carry the stamp of P. The addition to the fourth commandment of the other Decalogue in the form it has in Exod. xx does bear the stamp of P, and by the same token we must decline to find the hand of P here.

If, however, we recognise the table of Exod. xxxiv to be primitive in form and early in date, are we not forced to date the Decalogue of Exod. xx and Deut. v, in its original form, much later? If Israel already had the higher Decalogue, is it conceivable that it would ever have been superseded by this lower form?

¹ Cf. Winnett, op. cit., pp. 30 ff. In Winnett’s view the original Mosaic Decalogue is embedded in the Book of the Covenant in Exod. xx. 23-26, xxiii, 10-19. This was displaced by P to make way for his modification of D’s Decalogue, and distributed to its present position. Surprisingly enough, Winnett holds that P then created the Decalogue of Exod. xxxiv, which is merely a modified collection of the one he had displaced and distributed.

If the Ethical Decalogue really went back to Moses, whose authority would have sufficed to replace it by the Ritual Decalogue? While we must beware of supposing that religious development is always in a straight line from the lower to the higher, I would agree that there is much force in these questions. The fallacy of the argument lies, however, in its assumption of a single line of tradition and of development in Israelite religion. Where that assumption is made it is pointed out that even this Ritual Decalogue, in its present form, would appear to presuppose residence in Canaan, and therefore to be post-Mosaic. There are references to ploughing and harvesting, to first fruits of the ground, and to agricultural festivals. These belong to the life of a settled people, and not to a company of nomads. Yet if this primitive table is post-Mosaic, we seem to be forced down to an even later time for the more developed ethical table.

Here many things call for notice. In the first place, it is possible that the expansion from ten to twelve or thirteen commandments may have been due to the adaptation of the ritual code of a nomadic people to settled conditions. The change from a ritual to an ethical code would not come about of itself; the change from a nomadic code to an agricultural one would tend to be determined by new conditions. For the one change a leader of prophetic personality would be required; for the other adaptation to changed conditions alone would be required.

1 In the same way it is frequently emphasised that some of the terms of the Decalogue of Exod. xx presuppose settled conditions. Cf., e.g., Matthes, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, xxiv, 1904, pp. 20 ff. Here it is to be noted, however, that the terms which are used for this purpose belong to what are commonly regarded as the expansions of the original Decalogue. They are therefore invalid as evidence concerning its original form. Matthes (p. 24) anticipates that this answer will be given, but dismisses it. The recognition of expansions in the Decalogue is not dictated by the wish to get rid of these references, however, but by the clear evidence of the comparison of the text in Exodus with that in Deuteronomy that there have been some expansions, and the probability that the commands of the first table were short, like those of the second.

2 So, e.g., R. Smend, *op. cit.*, p. 43 n., and W. E. Addis, *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, i, col. 1051, argue that the Decalogue of Exod. xxxiv is post-Mosaic, and (Smend, p. 284; Addis, col. 1050) that the Decalogue of Exod. xx must be later than that of Exod. xxxiv.

3 It is here that I find the reason for the eliminations of the secondary elements which I have noted above.
A nomadic people that came to settle amongst an agricultural people would tend to take over practices, as well as occupations, from its neighbours, and to add them to its own traditions and relate them to its own religion. Hence the Ritual Decalogue probably runs back to the pre-Settlement period for its original form. It may even go back to the pre-Settlement period for some of its agricultural references. For it has to be remembered that a nomadic people may grow some crops during a temporary settlement in a district, and the Biblical tradition records a sojourn of no less than thirty eight years at Kadesh.¹

Again we may observe that both the Ritual and the Ethical Decalogue are related to the worship of Yahweh. It would therefore seem that it was characteristic of the worship of this God to have a code of ten fundamental laws even before the time of the Settlement of Israel in Canaan. There is reason to believe, therefore, that a Decalogue of some kind existed as early as the time of Moses. This still leaves open the question whether it was the primitive Decalogue which Moses could have given to Israel, or whether it could have been the higher one; it leaves open also the relation of the one to the other.

T. H. Robinson has said: 'Whether these commandments'—i.e. the familiar Ten Commandments—are the work of Moses or not, they do represent very fairly the general moral standard which we may ascribe to Israel in the days preceding the Settlement. There are two matters which are vital to the existence of a pastoral clan, that which finds expression in the laws of marriage and that which is covered by the law of murder.'² This very general consideration would seem to make possible the ascription of the Decalogue to Moses, but to diminish its significance. For if the ethical standards on which it insists are but those which are common to tribes whose life is passed in given conditions, Moses could be dispensed with in their formulation. It is, of course, true that the sanctity of marriage and of life is widely recognised amongst men, and often the most primitive tribes will have the most rigid codes on these things.

The prohibition of stealing may be less important in their eyes, and false witness may rank much lower in the scale of sins, while covetousness may not be reckoned a sin at all. The Ethical Decalogue deserves that name because it is so much wider in its ethical demands than might be expected merely in view of the social conditions of the time, and because it penetrates beneath action to its spring in motive.

It is difficult to suppose that Moses gave Israel both the Ritual Decalogue and the Ethical. That he could have given ritual and moral commands would occasion no surprise, but the overlap between the two lists makes it hard to believe that the same leader issued both as complementary lists. One would appear to have been composed to replace the other. If, then, we have said there is reason to suppose that the Ritual Decalogue existed before the Settlement in Canaan, does this not mean that the more significant Ten Commandments must be denied to Moses? If both are related to the worship of Yahweh, and both cannot be ascribed to Moses, can we not at most credit him with the one which points so much more clearly to his age and reserve the other for the prophetic period, when ethical principles were so strongly insisted on?

Without for one moment minimising the greatness of the eighth century prophets, or their ethical teaching of the corollaries of Yahwism, I would observe that Yahwism did not begin to be ethical in the eighth century B.C. About the beginning of the tenth century we find Nathan rebuking David for his adultery with Bath-sheba, when the law: 'Thou shalt not commit adultery' was already presupposed, and was regarded as authoritative for a king no less than for his subjects. When later Naboth was judicially murdered with the help of false witnesses set up by a queen, we again find courageous prophetic denunciation expressing ethical teaching. In both of these cases we have prophets of Yahweh, speaking in the name of their God, and declaring the ethical implications of Israel's religion. They were not standing for the rights of man, but for the will of God, for in their view man's rights were sacred because they rested on the will of God. Neither prophet spoke as though he were enunciating some new principle, which the kings might
be excused for not knowing before. The sting of their rebuke was in their appeal to the conscience of the kings, and to standards which ought to have been recognised. Surely there is no need to come down to the eighth century before there is reason to suspect the existence of anything but a ritual code.¹

We must now turn to examine the origins of the worship of Yahweh. It is sometimes thought that the Bible teaches that the name was first revealed to Moses. This is nowhere stated in the Bible. It is stated that at the call of Moses at the Burning Bush he asked the God who commissioned him to go into Egypt in Whose name he should present himself to Israel, and the name Yahweh was then given to him.² It is not said that this was the first time the name was known amongst men. It is not even said that Moses had never heard the name before. Again, in Exod. vi. 2 f. we read that God spake to Moses and said: 'I am Yahweh: and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as El Shaddai, but by my name Yahweh I was not known to them.' It is not said that the name Yahweh was unknown to men, but that the patriarchs did not worship.

¹ Cf. A. Clamer, *La Sainte Bible*, ed. by Pirot and Clamer, ii, 1946, p. 551 b:

‘N'est-ce pas au nom des antiques prohibitions du Decalogue que le prophète Nathan reproche à David son adulte et son meurtre, et que le prophète Élie menace d’un terrible châtiment le roi Achab pour avoir tué et volé ?’ References to the Decalogue are commonly found in Hos. iv. 2 and Jer. vii. 9, the former of which stands on the lips of a prophet who antedated the Decalogue in the opinion of many scholars, and the latter of which stands on the lips of a prophet who lived earlier than some others date the Decalogue. Hosea says 'There is nought but swearing and breaking faith, and killing, and stealing, and committing adultery; they break out, and blood toucheth blood.' B. Duhm, *Die Theologie der Propheten*, 1875, p. 141, saw here an echo of the Decalogue, and so J. P. Peters, *The Religion of the Hebrews*, 1923, p. 102, and G. Ostborn, *Tôrâ in the Old Testament*, 1945, p. 140. I. G. Matthews, *The Religious Pilgrimage of Israel*, 1947, p. 128 n., asks if this was the basis of a later formulation in the Decalogue. Jeremiah says: 'Will ye steal, murder, and commit adultery, and swear falsely, and burn incense unto Baal, and walk after other gods whom ye have not known ?' It is hard to suppose that new principles were here being enunciated by either Hosea or Jeremiah, for all of these offences had found prophetic condemnation before their day. The reference to the Sabbath in Jer. xvii. 19-27 is by most scholars rejected from the genuine Jeremianic material in the book. W. E. Barnes, 'Prophecy and the Sabbath', in *Journal of Theological Studies*, xxix, 1923, pp. 386 ff., argues, however, for its genuineness.

² Exod. iii. 13 ff.
God by this name. On the other hand there are passages in the Bible which state quite definitely that God was worshipped by the name Yahweh before the days of Moses. Here I am not thinking of passages which stand in direct contradiction of Exod. vi. 2 f., such as those in which God is represented as saying to the patriarchs 'I am Yahweh', in direct disagreement with the statement that He was not known to them by this name.¹ I am thinking of such a passage as Gen. iv. 26, where it is said explicitly that in the days of Seth, the son of Adam, men began to call on the name of Yahweh. Even earlier in the same chapter we read that the name of Yahweh was on the lips of Eve when she gave birth to Cain, and when Cain was driven forth he bore the sign of Yahweh upon him. Nowhere is it said that with Moses this name was first heard amongst men. It is said that to the Israelites in Egypt it would be a new name for their God.

It has long been held very widely that Yahweh was the God whom the father-in-law of Moses served as priest.² This is not directly stated in the Bible, and can at most be said to be a probable view.³ There are many scholars who reject

¹ Gen. xv. 7, xxviii. 13.
² That the divine name Yahweh antedated the revelation to Moses is supported by his mother's name, Jochebed. This appears to be compounded with the divine name Yahweh. Doubt has been thrown on this (cf. G. B. Gray, Hebrew Proper Names, 1896, p. 156, and M. Noth, Die israelitischen Personennamen, 1928, p. 111), and the name has been regarded as of doubtful authenticity since we find it only in the late source P (so J. M. Powis Smith, in American Journal of Semitic Languages, xxxv, 1918-1919, p. 15; against this, however, cf. T. J. Meek, Hebrew Origins, 2nd ed., 1950, p. 97). I find no reason to doubt the authenticity of the name, or to explain away its form, and think it indicates that in the ancestry of Moses there was a Yahweh-worshipping strain on his mother's side. When Moses was forced to flee from Egypt, it would be most natural for him to flee to his mother's kindred, as Jacob did before him. His mother's name, therefore, offers support rather than embarrassment to the view that the father-in-law of Moses was a priest of Yahweh. For an explanation of the way Moses could have come to have a mother in whose veins some Kenite blood ran, cf. my Schweich Lectures, From Joseph to Joshua, 1950, pp. 159 f.
it, but to those who accept it—and amongst them I am to be numbered—it seems to offer the clue to the understanding of not a little in the Old Testament. It makes sense of the statements that Yahweh was worshipped from the beginning of time but that He was not worshipped under that name by the patriarchs. It also offers an explanation as to how the southern and the central tribes of Israel all came to worship Yahweh. That the Israelites came into Palestine in at least two waves of incursion, only one of which was under the leadership of Moses and Joshua, is widely agreed amongst scholars, even though there is disagreement as to the order and date of the incursions. The view which seems to me most probable, and for which I have argued at length, places the entry of a group of tribes from the south long before the time of Moses, and holds that while most of these remained continuously in the land thereafter, a small group of them was dislodged from the Shechem area and went into Egypt. Later they came out under the leadership of Moses and after his death were led by Joshua into Central Palestine. The leading elements of this group were now the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, which had been formed during the sojourn in Egypt. If this view is correct, then we could understand how Moses could bring to this group the divine name


2 Cf. From Joseph to Joshua, pp. 149 ff.

3 Ibid., pp. 109 ff.
Yahweh, which was hitherto unknown to them as the name of their God and why this group in their traditions should say that the name Yahweh was not the name under which God was worshipped in Israel before the days of Moses. We are then left with the problem of explaining how the other group, that was not led by Moses, came to worship Yahweh. Here we observe that associated with Judah were Kenite groups that were akin to the father-in-law of Moses. If these were Yahweh-worshipping groups, we could understand how the worship of Yahweh could spread gradually from them throughout the whole of the associated tribes, until all were Yahweh-worshipping, but without the memory of a particular moment when the worship began in a dramatic experience of consecration. This association of tribes became absorbed into the Kenite worship, and consequently accepted the Kenite tradition that the worship of Yahweh had been practised from time immemorial. Hence in the southern traditions the beginning of the worship of God under this name is not ascribed to Moses, but pushed back to the beginning of time. From the tribe into which Moses married the name of Yahweh could have come to both southern and central groups of tribes at different times and in different ways, and the differences of the ways is reflected in the difference of their traditions.

I have already said that there seems reason to believe that some form of Decalogue was associated with the worship of Yahweh as far back as it is known. We now note that the primitive Decalogue of Exod. xxxiv was preserved for us in the traditions of the southern group, and it is probable that this represents the ancient Decalogue of the Kenites, save in so far as it has been modified by the conditions of settled life, and that the southern tribes took it over from their Kenite associates as they took over their religion. Here no great prophetic personality brought about the adoption of the new religion, and no ever-memorable experience was associated with it. Hence it was taken over at the primitive level.

The group of tribes that was led by Moses, however, came to its Yahwism very differently. In the name of Yahweh Moses

1 Cf. the view of Morgenstern, The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch, pp. 54 ff.
went to them in Egypt and told them that Yahweh could deliver
them. By His power he led them out. They then went to
the sacred mount, where they solemnly pledged themselves in
the Covenant to the God Who had so signally delivered them.
Here we do not have the gradual permeation of the group of
tribes by the worship of Yahweh, but a solemn act of collective
consecration, which could naturally give rise to the tradition of
a definite historic moment when the worship of Yahweh under
that name began in Israel. More important than the name of
the deity is the character of the religion, and there is every
reason to think that Moses gave a new character to Yahwism
as compared with Kenite Yahwism. The change from the
primitive Decalogue to the Ethical Decalogue is most naturally
to be associated with some great prophetic personality, and Moses
would supply the personality, and the circumstances of the time
the occasion, better than any other individual or time of which
we have knowledge. Inevitably the worship of Yahweh would
have a significance for Israel that it had never had for the Kenites.\(^1\)
Yahweh had delivered them, and by His deliverance sealed His
choice of them for Himself. In His compassion for Israel
oppressed in Egypt He had given a revelation of His character,
and had entered into her experience and her history, so that she
worshipped Him not because she was subject to the influence of
neighbouring people, but because He had sought and rescued
her. At such a moment a new character might well be given
to\(^1\)Yahwism and express itself in a new Decalogue, higher and

\(^1\) Cf. K. Budde, *Religion of Israel to the Exile*, pp. 35 ff.; K. Marti, *The Reli-
igion of the Old Testament*, tr. by G. A. Bieneman, 1914, p. 62; Oesterley
that Israel's religion was a religion of choice, in contrast to Kenite religion. T. J.
Meek, *Hebrew Origins*, 2nd ed., 1950, counters this with a reference to 'plenty
of examples of the phenomenon with peoples other than the Hebrews'. As
this is presented as a reply to me also, I may refer to *From Joseph to Joshua*
pp. 158 f. note, where I endorse Meek's criticism of Budde, but add, 'Here it
was not Israel's spontaneous choice of Yahweh, but Israel's response to His
choice of her and deliverance of her.' Of this phenomenon I am not aware
that plenty of examples can be adduced. As J. Meinhold, *Einführung in das
Alte Testament*, 3rd ed., p. 59, observes: 'Wichtiger als die Frage, woher der
Kult stammte, ist die, was Moses aus ihm machte.' On the view which I have
presented, Moses gave a new quality to Yahwism, and did not merely mediate
it to Israel at the Kenite level.
richer than the old one of the Kenites. I have already said that the Ten Commandments are generally believed to have been incorporated in the E document of the Pentateuch, which came from Ephraimite Israel, and therefore from the group which Moses led. It would therefore be wholly consistent with this if Moses delivered this Decalogue to the tribes he led, still retaining some of the provisions of the old Decalogue, but replacing others by the higher demands in the realm of conduct instead of ritual.\(^1\)

The case for the Mosaic origin of the familiar Ten Commandments does not end here, however. For we may next observe that an ethical Decalogue is in harmony with the whole character of the bond between Israel and God which Moses mediated.\(^2\) Yahweh had chosen Israel and delivered her from Egypt; Israel in response committed herself in loyalty and obedience to Him. That is the essence of Israel's Covenant with God. It rested on her recognition of what God had done and on her gratitude to Him for His mercy. From God's side the basis of the Covenant was unmerited grace; from Israel's side it was her gratitude. There was thus an ethical strand in the very establishment of the religion of Israel through Moses, since gratitude is essentially an ethical emotion. Other emotions, such as fear or grief or joy or anger, have no inherently ethical quality. But gratitude for blessings received is an emotion men ought always to feel, and it is the response to a moral obligation which rests upon them. It is therefore wholly consonant with the conditions of the time that the fundamental demands of the

\(^1\) It is entirely consistent with this view that we find most of the old Kenite Decalogue distributed in the Book of the Covenant, as above noted. For if Moses gave a new Decalogue to express the new character of the religion he established in Israel, the old would still be remembered, and its ritual demands were not necessarily repudiated.

\(^2\) Cf. S. R. Driver, *Exodus*, pp. 414 f., where Driver observes: 'If the religion of Moses had not differed, in some distinctive feature, from the ordinary religions of antiquity, it is impossible to understand why, when the Israelites entered Canaan, and intermingled . . . with the native Canaanites, it was not merged and absorbed in their religion', and quotes C. G. Montefiore, *Lectures on the . . . Religion . . . of the Ancient Hebrews* (Hibbert Lectures), 2nd ed., 1893, p. 46: 'That successful resistance to Canaanite polytheism . . . would surely not have been possible unless the Yahweh whom Moses taught differed from the Canaanite deities, not only in his numerical uniqueness, but in his higher and more consistent ethical character.'
religion established through Moses should be couched in ethical terms, and far more likely that in such a moment and through such a man this great advance should be made than that it should just happen somehow by itself at some unknown time and in some unknown way.

It is necessary to study some of the evidence which has been adduced in favour of a later origin, however, before we can be satisfied with this conclusion. Much attention is directed to the second commandment. This reads: ‘Thou shalt not make unto thee a graven image.’ The purpose of the command is clearly to forbid the making of any image of Yahweh to be worshipped by Israel, or to be the symbol whereby He should be visibly represented. Yet there is ample evidence that images of various kinds were found in Israel long after the time of Moses. Gideon is said to have made an ephod, which became a snare to him and led all Israel astray. From the materials with which it was made it would appear to have been some form of image.


2 A. J. Wensinck, loc. cit., maintains that the intention of the prohibition was to forbid the making of images of any living creatures, since that would be to usurp God’s creative function.

3 It has been noted above that Powis Smith excludes this command from the original Decalogue.

4 Judges viii. 27.

Even more explicit is the statement that Micah's mother used the silver which her son stole from her and returned to her to make 'a graven image and a molten image', which was later transferred to the sanctuary of Dan and kept by the grandson of Moses.\(^1\) In the house of David was some image which was laid

\[^{1}\text{Judges xvii. 3 f. Here it is to be noted that whereas vs. 4 says the silver was used to make 'a graven image and a molten image', the following verse says Micah made 'an ephod and teraphim'. It is by no means certain, however, that we should equate these (cf. xviii. 14, 17, 18, 20). That there is here a breach of either the first or the second command, if the Decalogue was already given,}\]
in his bed and covered over so as to deceive the men who carried it to Saul into thinking that they were carrying David. This must have been more or less comparable with a man in size and weight. The curious can quickly find other examples to prove quite conclusively that images continued to be found in Israel for a very long time. There is no direct evidence, however, is clear, and it is often emphasised that the shrine to which the symbols were taken was kept by Jonathan, the grandson of Moses (Judges xviii. 30). This does not prove that Jonathan must have been loyal to his grandfather’s teaching. It is certain that neither Micah nor Jonathan betrays any consciousness of wrongdoing. But conscience is not a valid standard of law. The men of Ophrah were not conscious of wrongdoing in worshipping at a Baal altar, but when Gideon broke it down (Judges vi. 25 ff.) he gave evidence of a recognition that Yahweh and Baal were not one, and that therefore the worship of Baal was not legitimate for Israel.

1 Sam. xix. 13 ff.

2 Cf. P. Dhorme, Les Livres de Samuel, 1910, p. 174 : ' D’après ce passage il est clair que les teraphim avaient, dans certains cas, une forme humaine, ce qui explique la confusion '. G. Hoffmann and H. Gressmann, ' Teraphim, Masken und Winkorakel in Ägypten und Vorderasien ', in Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, xl, 1922, pp. 75 ff., maintain that the teraphim were human images that gave oracular responses by winking. Morgenstern, op. cit., p. 120, notes that ephod and teraphim were commonly associated together, and holds that the ephod was the tent-shrine and the teraphim the idols within it. On the other hand, W. F. Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, 2nd ed., 1946, p. 114, denies that any idol is here referred to, and proposes (p. 207) to understand the term to mean ' old rags '. This seems very improbable. In Gen. xxxi. 19, the teraphim that Rachel stole were certainly idols (cf. vs. 32), and in the light of Nuzu evidence that the possession of such idols ensured the succession to the father-in-law’s property (cf. C. H. Gordon, Revue Biblique, xlv, 1935, pp. 35 f., and Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, No. 66, April 1937, p. 26) it seems now probable that the reason for Rachel’s theft can be understood. Morgenstern (op. cit., pp. 125 f. note) suggests that Michal’s teraphim were similarly symbols which ensured for her husband the title to succeed Saul on the throne. I find no reason to doubt that the teraphim were images of some kind, probably associated with the giving of oracles (cf. C. F. Burney, The Book of Judges, pp. 420 f.), though there is no evidence that they were intended to be images of Yahweh or to be worshipped. They do not seem, therefore, to involve any necessary breach of the Ten Commandments. On the teraphim cf. E. Sellin, ' Efod und Terafim ', in Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society, xiv, 1934, pp. 1 ff. and ' Zu Efod und Terafim ', in Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, N.F. xiv, 1937, pp. 296 ff., and W. E. Barnes, ‘ Teraphim ’, in Journal of Theological Studies, xxx, 1929, pp. 17 ff.

3 Cf. Judges iii. 19, 2 Kings xxi. 7; 1 Sam. xxi. 9. It is common also to quote Hos. iii. 4 as evidence that the prophet regarded ephod and teraphim as unobjectionable. This is no necessary inference from the verse, however. All it says is that the people will be deprived of the things they most value, king and
that any of these images which I have mentioned were images of Yahweh,¹ and G. E. Wright has recently called attention to the singular fact that while large numbers of figurines of a female deity have been found in Palestinian excavations, so far no image of a male deity has been turned up.²

To all this it may be replied that when Jeroboam 'made Israel to sin' by making the shrines of Bethel and Dan royal shrines for the northern kingdom, he is said to have made the bull calves and set them up in the shrines. It is commonly held that these were divine symbols, representing Yahweh, and that they were a direct breach of the second commandment, if that commandment already existed.³ But what of it? The fact that a commandment is ignored or broken is no evidence cult, so that they may be brought to a sense of their need of God. Yet even if the verse did imply that ephod and teraphim were unobjectionable in the eyes of Hosea, it would still not bring the slightest evidence that they were either images of Yahweh, or thought by Hosea to be entitled to worship.

¹ The probability is greatest in the case of Micah's image, since the story seems to imply that Micah and his mother were loyal to Yahweh as their God.

² Cf. The Old Testament against its Environment, 1950, p. 23: 'In the vast mass of debris dug out of Israelite towns there is yet to be found an image of a male deity.' Cf. W. F. Albright, op. cit., p. 114. J. E. McFadyen, The Expositor, 8th series, xii, 1916, p. 44 n. says: 'Sellin, however, may be right in accounting for the paucity of images discovered in the course of excavation by the fact that those made of the precious metals would naturally be carried away by the enemy as booty.'

³ This is by no means certain, however. H. T. Obbink, Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, N.F. vi, 1929, pp. 267 f., argued that the bull calves were but the pedestals, corresponding to the bulls on which Hadad stood. Here, however, they were empty, in contrast to those of Hadad, showing that Yahweh was a God who was not to be represented by an image. Cf. W. Eichrodt, Theologie des Alten Testaments, 3rd ed., i, 1948, p. 50; J. Hempel, Gott und Mensch im Alten Testament, 2nd ed., 1936, pp. 265 f., and Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, N.F. xvi, 1939, pp. 77; W. F. Albright, Journal of Biblical Literature, Ivii, 1938, p. xviii and From the Stone Age to Christianity, 2nd ed., 1946, pp. 228 ff. This seems to me to be the probable view, though in the text above I have conceded the more common view, as I prefer not to exploit doubtful evidence in the interests of my case. For 1 Kings xiv. 9 represents Jeroboam as having made 'other gods and molten images'. Cf. further O. Eissfeldt, 'Lade und Stierbild', in Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, N.F. xvii, 1940-1941, pp. 190 ff., for the view that the bulls were small transportable objects like one depicted at Mari. With this contrast the view of L. Waterman, American Journal of Semitic Languages, xxxi, 1914-1915, pp. 229 ff., where it is held that they were 'bull colossi'.
that it is unknown, or that it has not been promulgated.\footnote{Cf. W. P. Paterson, in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, i, p. 581b; S. R. Driver, Exodus, p. 416; W. R. Harper, Amos and Hosea, p. lxii; A. Weiser, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 93 (2nd ed., p. 95).} There is, alas! much adultery and much theft in the modern world, but no one dreams of concluding that the Ten Commandments have not yet been written. Jeroboam is condemned for his act not alone by the later conscience of the compilers of the books of Kings, but by his contemporaries. Even the prophet Ahijah, who had stirred him to take the lead in the Disruption was dissatisfied with him and turned against him.\footnote{Cf. 1 Kings xiv. The chapter bears the marks of the Deuteronomic editor's style, and we cannot rely on its terms, therefore, as evidence of Ahijah's words. But there is no reason to suppose that the editor invented the whole chapter, or to doubt that Jeroboam sent his wife in disguise to Ahijah (vs. 1). This carries its testimony to some breach between Ahijah and Jeroboam, therefore, and it is most probable that it arose out of the king's religious policy.} There is not the slightest reason to suppose that this is a later invention. Clearly, therefore, we must not lightly conclude that the acts of Jeroboam accorded with the religious standards so far as they were known in his day. All through the unsettled period of the Conquest and the Judges there had been considerable declension in innumerable ways from the level of the days of Moses, and in many ways standards had become neglected and forgotten, save by the faithful few. There cannot be many students of the Old Testament who will not recognise that in the post-Settlement period the Israelites adopted Canaanite religious customs, and worshipped other gods besides Yahweh. Yet there can be little doubt that Moses demanded of Israel the worship of Yahweh alone. This is quite independent of the much discussed question as to whether Moses was a monotheist.\footnote{On this cf. my article 'The Antiquity of Israelite Monotheism', in Expository Times, lxi, 1949-1950, pp. 333 ff., in which I argue that while Moses was not a speculative monotheist he was more than a henotheist, and that when we penetrate beneath labels, which cannot be made to fit the case with any precision, we find the seeds of monotheism in his work. Cf. E. Sjöberg, Svensk exegetisk årsbok, xiv, 1949, p. 11: 'Yahweh was already from the beginning of a type which made possible a development in the direction of prophetic monotheism'. Cf. T. K. Cheyne, Expositor, 4th series, v, 1892, p. 109: 'My own historical sense emphatically requires that from the very beginning there should have been the germ of the advanced "ethical montheism" of the prophets.'} Whether he recognised the existence of other gods or not, there can be no reason to
doubt that he denied their legitimacy for Israel, and that the first commandment faithfully represents the standard set before Israel. But if this could be broken without causing us to doubt that it had been given, how can we argue that the breach of the second command shows that it could not have been given? 1

By Gressmann it has been held that the Ark contained an image of Yahweh. 2 If this could be proved, it would be quite fatal to my thesis. For it would be hard to suppose that Moses forbade the making of an image of Yahweh, and yet himself had one prepared to be the most sacred symbol of Israel's faith. There is, however, no evidence that the Ark contained an image of Yahweh. 3 That the Ark was itself a symbol of His presence is sure enough. When it was taken on to the battle-field, friend and foe were ready to interpret its presence as the guarantee of His presence. 4 But that does not prove that it contained an image, of which there is no trace of a suggestion in the Biblical accounts. While there is ample evidence of images in Israel, there is none that an image of Yahweh was anything but a contravention of the law of His faith, and none that any image of

1 Whether the breach of a command implies ignorance of it depends on who commits the breach, and how it is recorded. When Elijah complains that the queen has broken down Yahweh altars, and himself rebuilds an altar on Carmel, there is reason to presume that he was unaware of a law of a single sanctuary. It is often held that the fact that Elijah and Elisha do not condemn the bull calves of Bethel and Dan is similar evidence that they cannot have been aware of the prohibition of images. The two cases are not parallel, however. In the first place, the urgent question in that age was whether Yahwism was to survive at all, rather than in what form Yahweh was to be worshipped. In the second place, we must not prejudge the issue as to whether the bull calves were thought to be images of Yahweh or not. In the third place, we cannot argue from silence, since we cannot be sure that we have the whole teaching of these prophets preserved. In the case of the law of the single sanctuary we rely on positive evidence, and not on silence. That no major emphasis of Elijah can have been directed against the bull calves may be agreed; but that he approved of them cannot be established.


3 Cf. J. Morgenstern, Hebrew Union College Annual, v, 1928, pp. 117 f.; R. Kittel, The Religion of the People of Israel, E. Tr. by R. C. Micklem, 1925, p. 58 n. In The Ark, the Ephod, and the "Tent of Meeting", pp. 94 f., Morgenstern maintains that the Ark originally contained a sacred stone, or two sacred stones, or images, which were later transformed into the two tablets of the Decalogue (p. 107).

4 Cf. 1 Sam. iv. 5 f.
Yahweh ever stood in the shrine of Shiloh or in the Jerusalem Temple.\(^1\) It is perfectly true that idolatrous symbols were found from time to time in the Temple, and there is condemnation of those who made them and used them; but there is no evidence that the Temple contained an image of Yahweh, or that if it had it would not have been a violation of one of the fundamental laws of Yahwism.

Indeed, it is probable that so far as this commandment is concerned, it is even more ancient than the time of Moses.\(^2\) For it will be remembered that this is common to the Ritual Decalogue of Exod. xxxiv and the familiar Decalogue of Exod. xx. It therefore seems to have been characteristic of Yahwism so far back as it can be traced, whether amongst Kenites or amongst Israelites.\(^3\) It is to be noted, however, that the terms are not identical in the two Decalogues. The primitive Ritual Decalogue forbids the making of any molten image,\(^4\) while that of Exod. xx forbids the making of any graven image.\(^5\) The intention of both was surely to prohibit the making of any image of Yahweh at all. We cannot for a moment suppose that the one Decalogue prohibited a molten image but permitted a graven image, while the other Decalogue prohibited a graven image but permitted a molten image.\(^6\) This is at once clear when we remember that

\(^{1}\) Cf. E. Sellin, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, E. Tr., p. 41 (7th German ed., p. 26; 8th ed., rev. by L. Rost, p. 40): 'The absence of any images which is so indubitably attested as regards the sanctuaries of Shiloh and Jerusalem must, after all, have had some reason.'

\(^{2}\) It has been frequently pointed out that in the stories of the patriarchs there are no references to any idols which they worshipped. So S. R. Driver, *Exodus*, pp. 415 ff.; J. E. McFadyen, *loc. cit.*, xii, 1916, p. 43; E. König, *Das Deuteronomium*, p. 94.

\(^{3}\) It may be noted further that Exod. xx. 23 says: 'gods of silver, or gods of gold, ye shall not make unto you'. This text stands in E, whether the Decalogue of Exod. xx originally stood in E or not, and it belongs to that other ancient Decalogue, which so many scholars have detected, which is now distributed in the Book of the Covenant. Both J and E therefore seem to have maintained a prohibition of images, quite apart from the prohibition of the familiar Decalogue.

\(^{4}\) Exod. xxxiv. 17.

\(^{5}\) Exod. xx. 4.

\(^{6}\) E. Kautsch, in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, Extra vol., p. 641b, says: 'such a carved image appears to have been for long regarded as unobjectionable, whereas the molten image is already prohibited in the Jahwistic section of which Ex. xxxiv. 17 forms a part'. It seems to me inappropriate to approach
the story of the Golden Calf stands in the E document, which also carries the Ten Commandments. In that story the making of a molten image is condemned. I am not here concerned with the common view that this is an aetiological story reflecting Jeroboam's bull calves back into the past. Whether the story is history or aetiology, it equally proclaims the condemnation of the compilers of the E document of molten images, as well as of the graven images which are prohibited in their Decalogue. In any case, no objection to the antiquity of the Ten Commandments can be based on the later existence of graven or molten images in Israel, since it is generally agreed that the Ritual Decalogue of Exod. xxxiv was already in existence at a time when molten images, such as it prohibited, were still to be found.

It is sometimes claimed that the inclusion of a Sabbath law in the Decalogue is an indication of post-Mosaic date. Into the highly involved and much debated questions of the origin of the Sabbath it is impossible to go here. In pre-exilic texts the Decalogue as we should approach a modern legal document, where every possible variety of term must be expressed. It is probable that the list of terms in the tenth commandment is a later expansion to guard against the possible exemption from its prohibition of coveting any possible possession of one's neighbour. In that case the original command was content to use a single term, though it can hardly be supposed that it permitted the coveting of all that is expressed by the others. In the same way here a single term for 'image' sufficed and the limiting of the meaning to the specific term seems alien to its spirit. Cf. E. Sellin, Introduction to the Old Testament, E. Tr., p. 45 (7th German ed., pp. 28 f.; 8th German ed., rev. by L. Rost, p. 42): "Particularly naïve is the assertion that Ex. 20 must be later than Ex. 34, because in the latter passage only molten images, whereas in the other images of all kinds, are forbidden, for if molten images are an offence against the Deity, carved images or those in plastic material can certainly be no less so'.

1 Exod. xxxii.

1 Cf. Am. viii. 5; Hos. ii. 13 (EV. 11); Isa. i. 13; 2 Kings iv. 23.


4 Cf. R. Smend, *Lehrbuch der alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte*, 2nd ed., p. 160, B. Stade, *op. cit.*, i, p. 177, W. E. Addis, *The Documents of the Hexateuch*, i, 1892, pp. 139 f. note, where it is maintained that the seventh day Sabbath cannot come from the wilderness period, but implies the settled life of agriculture. J. N. Schofield, *The Religious Background of the Bible*, p. 144, says there is no reason to believe that even so late as Jeremiah the prophets would have included...
therefore, that the very name Sabbath has had a history, and it may not always have the same meaning wherever we meet it.\(^1\) We have also to reckon with the possibility that what was meant by keeping the Sabbath and refraining from work would not be defined in all ages with the same precision and rigidity.\(^2\) All terms have their meaning modified in course of time. What we understand by the seventh commandment is not identical with what an Israelite understood. By adultery we mean any disloyalty to the marriage bond on either side, but in Israelite thought there was only adultery where a married woman was concerned.\(^3\) For a married man to have relations with a woman not his wife was not regarded as adultery, unless she were another man's wife. It could, of course, be regarded as reprehensible, as many Sabbath observance as a commandment of God. T. J. Meek, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, xxxiii, 1914, p. 204, says that the weekly Sabbath could not possibly have been earlier than the Settlement in Canaan. On the other hand, E. Sellin, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, E. Tr., p. 41 (7th German ed., p. 26; 8th German ed., rev. by L. Rost, p. 40), thinks this command points directly to the desert as its place of origin. A. Weiser, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 93 (2nd ed., p. 95), says it cannot be proved that the Sabbath was not observed in the wilderness.

\(^1\) H. and K. Lewy, 'The Origin of the Week and the Oldest West Asiatic Calendar', in *Hebrew Union College Annual*, xvii, 1942-1943, pp. 1 ff., argue that the seven day week developed out of a fifty day unit in the time of Ezra. It is difficult to believe that all the clear Biblical references to a seven day week are so late as this. S. Langdon (*Babylonian Menologies and the Semitic Calendars*, 1935, p. 96) holds that the Hebrews borrowed the name Sabbath through a complete misunderstanding of the Babylonian calendar.

\(^2\) Cf. S. R. Driver, *Exodus*, p. 415: 'We do not know how much cessation of work was at this early period prescribed for the sabbath'; K. Budde, *Journal of Theological Studies*, xxx, 1929, p. 6: 'It is obvious that the command to abstain from work was adapted to changing conditions of life, and therefore that in the course of centuries the Sabbath rest constantly assumed a new aspect'; E. Robertson, *The Old Testament Problem*, 1950, p. 91: 'No definition was given of work'. Robertson adds that only three kinds of labour which come within the Sabbath ban are specified in the Pentateuch: the kindling of fire (Ex. xxxv. 2), the going out of one's place (Ex. xvi. 29), and the gathering of faggots (Num. xv. 32-36).

\(^3\) Cf. I. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, 1st series, 1917, p. 73: 'In Jewish law adultery was the intercourse of a married woman with any man other than her husband. Though his conduct was severely reprobated, and at all events in later centuries gave his wife a right to claim a divorce, a man was not regarded as guilty of adultery unless he had intercourse with a married woman other than his wife.'
sexual offences other than adultery were regarded. When we use the seventh commandment to-day, therefore, we read into it a greater fullness of meaning than it appears to have carried originally. We must therefore beware of concluding too readily that the Sabbath always meant the same, or that keeping the Sabbath always meant the same.

It is quite clear that in the present context of Exod. xx, however, the Sabbath means a weekly day of rest for the injunction to ' remember the sabbath day to keep it holy ', is followed by the expansion —so it is commonly held— ' Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work; but the seventh day is a sabbath unto the Lord thy God '. Similarly in the statement of the Ten Commandments which stands in Deut. v we find the same words. If, however, the original form of this command were short, and it simply read, as most scholars assume: ' Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy ', it might well have been undefined in respect of the recurrence of the Sabbath. While I would agree that the command was originally short, I am not persuaded that the words I have just quoted were the form it had.

For here, once more, it is to be observed that this provision for the observance of the Sabbath stands also in the Ritual Decalogue of Exod. xxxiv. It is curious that the commandments which have aroused most doubt are those whose antiquity is the most strongly attested, since they are in both of these forms of the Decalogue. They stand in the one which is admittedly very primitive in its character, to whatever date

---

1 Exod. xxxiv. 21. Cf. Exod. xxiii. 12: ' Six days thou shalt do thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest '. The law of the weekly Sabbath stands therefore in both J and E, as well as in the present form of the Decalogue of Exod. xx and Deut. v. Cf. W. W. Cannon, ' The Weekly Sabbath ', in Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, N.F. viii, 1931, pp. 325 f. Further, Exod. xvi. 29 f. gives evidence of a weekly Sabbath. There is little agreement here as to the date or the document to which it should be assigned. O. Eissfeldt, Hexateuch-Synopse, p. 141* assigns it to L, which is the earliest of his sources. Similarly, B. Baentsch, Exodus-Leviticus, p. 155, A. Dillmann, Exodus-Leviticus, p. 191, and S. R. Driver, Exodus, p. 151, assign it to J, which is the earliest of their sources. G. Beer, Exodus, p. 88, assigns it to the earlier strand of J, and C. A. Simpson, The Early Traditions of Israel, 1948, pp. 548 f., to the later strand of J. Many other scholars, however, assign these verses to P, and J. Morgenstern, Hebrew Union College Annual, x, pp. 87 f. note to P2.
it should be ascribed. This would certainly suggest that a Sabbath law was integral to Yahwism from a very early date. As to its frequency and its observance, it may be noted that the Ritual Decalogue makes it clear that it refers to one day in seven. This is not reserved for a second sentence of interpretation as in the other Decalogue, but is the primary form of the injunction: ‘Six days shalt thou work, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest’. It would therefore appear than in the familiar

1 It has been noted above that many scholars delete the Sabbath command from Exod. xxxiv. These include Wellhausen, Addis, Smend, G. L. Robinson, Cornill, McNeile, Holzinger, Hölscher, Eissfeldt, and La Bible du Centenaire. As the deletion rests on the view that the weekly Sabbath was a late development, it offers no support to that view. It is difficult to suppose that late hands not only expanded the text of Exod. xx and Deut. v in this sense, but made gratuitous additions to Exod. xxxiv. 21 and Exod. xxiii. 12, where there was nothing in the context to demand it. The addition to the old Decalogue before the time of J of agricultural festivals which had become accepted is a much more natural hypothesis.

2 B. D. Eerdmans, 'Der Sabbath', in Vom Alten Testament (Marti Festschrift), 1925, pp. 79 f. (cf. The Religion of Israel, 1945, p. 29) advanced the view that the Sabbath was a Kenite observance before the days of Moses, and this view gained the adhesion of K. Budde, Journal of Theological Studies, xxx, 1929, pp. 11 ff. J. Meinhold criticised this view in Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, N.F. vii, 1930, pp. 134 ff., and Budde replied, ibid., pp. 144 f. Eerdmans bases himself on Exod. xxxv. 2 f., where the kindling of fire on the Sabbath is forbidden. The Kenites are held to be the smiths (cf. Gen. iv. 21 f.; on this question cf. W. F. Albright, The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible, 1932, p. 206, and Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, 2nd ed., 1946, pp. 98 f.) whose fire was not kindled on this day. That this is very hazardous must be agreed, though it is certainly possible (cf. E. G. Kraeling, American Journal of Semitic Languages, xlix, 1932-1933, p. 219, where it is held that the evidence for a Kenite origin of the Sabbath is extremely weak). Mr. J. M. Allegro calls my attention to some curious verbal connexions between Exod. xxxv. 3 and the cryptic oracle on the Kenites in Num. xxiv. 21 f., which do not appear in the English translation; but again this passage is too difficult to be relied on with any confidence, and I prefer to rely rather on the considerations referred to above. On Num. xxiv. 21 f. cf. Albright, Journal of Biblical Literature, liii, 1944, p. 226, which seems to me an improvement on previous discussions, though I am doubtful if the original meaning has yet been penetrated. It should be added that M. Buber, Moses, 1949, p. 80, also maintains that the weekly Sabbath is pre-Mosaic, but without bringing it into association with the Kenites. N. H. Tur-Sinai (Tortzynker), Bibliotheca Orientalis, viii, 1951, pp. 14 ff., denies any derivation of the Biblical Sabbath from the Babylonian calendar, and maintains that it was a distinctly Israelite institution.

3 Cf. also Exod. xxiii. 12. A. Dupont-Sommer (Sabbat et Parasceve à Éléphantine d’après des Ostraca araméens inédits, 1950, p. 18 n.) observes that
Ten Commandments the primary statement was 'Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work; but the seventh day is a sabbath unto the Lord thy God'. These words are identical in Exod. xx and Deut. v, whereas there is a variation of terms in the words that precede, 'Remember' in Exodus and 'Keep' in Deuteronomy. Since it is more likely that variation is to be found in the expansions than in the original form of the Ethical Decalogue, it is probable that from the beginning, in both the primitive and the Ethical Decalogues, the Sabbath was defined as a weekly day of rest from all avoidable labour. The injunction to keep it holy was added to make explicit what was implicit from the beginning, just as the expansions to the tenth commandment were added to make explicit what was implicit from the start. We may further observe that in the Ritual Decalogue we find the addition: 'in ploughing time and in harvest thou shalt rest'. This may be one of the additions made to apply the old-pre-Settlement Decalogue to agricultural conditions, making it clear that in times of the greatest strain its precepts must be observed.

Instead of finding the prohibition of images and the Sabbath law any embarrassment to the association of Moses with the Ten Commandments, I think the evidence would suggest that the noun Sabbath does not stand in Deut. xxxiv. 21 or Exod. xxiii. 12, and suggests that the observance of the seventh day as a day of rest may be older than the application of the word Sabbath to it. He thinks Sabbath may have originally denoted the day of the full moon and later have been used for the seventh day.

1 In the ninth commandment, there is a variation in what must undoubtedly have been the original commandment, and not an expansion. The expression for 'false witness' in Exod. xx. 16 is רָפָא לְעָנָה, whereas in Deut. v. 20 it is הוֹמָא לְעָנָה. Here, however, the variation is probably not a deliberate one, but goes back to a copyist in the time of the old script. The כ in the third Lachish Letter from the early sixth century (see Lachish I, 1938, Table facing p. 220) is closely similar to the כ shown in the table of alphabets given at the beginning of Gesenius-Kautzsch, Hebrew Grammar, E. Tr. by A. E. Cowley, 1910, as found in seals and on gems from the ninth to the fifth centuries B.C., while the כ on many of the ancient writings, if it became worn, could be mistaken for כ.

2 S. H. Hooke, The Origins of Early Semitic Ritual, 1938, pp. 58 f., thinks the abstention from work was originally limited to the periods of ploughing and harvest, but the form of the sentence suggests that this was an addition. Cf. K. Budde, Journal of Theological Studies, xxx, 1929, p. 8: 'It obviously does not mean, only in ploughing and harvest, but even in ploughing and harvest.'
both were essential to Yahwism even before the days of Moses, in the Kenite form in which it was known. It is hard to think of anyone whose authority could have imposed both of these on Israel between the days of Moses and the Disruption so firmly that they would persist in the Decalogues of both south and north.¹ Until the days of Saul Judah was largely cut off from the tribes of the central highlands, so that though there was coming and going between them, and a recognition that they were essentially one people, neither the political nor the religious life of the whole was centralised. After the Disruption of the kingdom, it is even harder to think of anyone whose authority would have sufficed to impose both of these commands upon the whole country. In the J and E documents we have the gathering and editing of traditions and customs rather than new codes of conduct put out under authority.²

One further consideration which has been advanced calls for notice. This is the absence of mention of circumcision in the Decalogue.³ This is advanced as an argument against those who assign the Decalogue to a date following the exile in Babylon. In such an age, it is said, it would have been important to ensure the separation of Jews from their neighbours by insistence on this rite, and we know that great importance was attached to it in the period of Judaism. It seems to me that this consideration can be pressed even farther, and the absence of any reference to circumcision will carry us back very far in the pre-exilic period.

Circumcision must have been practised in Israel from a very early time. The fact that all Israel's neighbours, with the exception of the Philistines, who invaded Palestine from the sea, practised this rite suggests that it was of very ancient origin,

¹ Cf. R. H. Charles, *The Decalogue*, p. xlvi, where it is maintained that before J and E the Ten Commandments were known in short form in the tenth century or earlier, and that 'if this is so, then there is no outstanding personality to whom this Decalogue can be ascribed other than Moses'.

² For discussions of the tenth commandment, which cannot be discussed here, cf. W. Herrmann, 'Das zehnte Gebot', in *Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte usw.*, pp. 69 ff. (reaching the conclusion that it is not easy to deny this command to Moses); W. J. Coates, 'Thou shalt not Covet', in *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, N.F. xi, 1934, pp. 238 ff.; B. Jacob, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, N.S. xiv, 1923-1924, pp. 166 ff.

and that Israel and her neighbours, all of whom, save the Philistines, came from one common cultural area, inherited the custom from the remote past. This does not mean that it was everywhere practised at the same age. It is generally believed that the obscure story in Exod. iv. 24-26 is somehow connected with the transfer of the rite from a puberty rite to an infancy rite in Israel.  

The fact remains that, at whatever age, this was practised by Israel and her neighbours, with the exception of the Philistines. In all the period of the conflict with the Philistines, emphasis is laid on this distinction between the uncircumcised Philistines and Israel. If any meaning is to be given to this emphasis, and if the history is to be understood, we must suppose that the practice of circumcision was regular and general throughout Israel in that age, just as much as in a later age. We may therefore argue that if the Decalogue found its origin so late as the appearance of the Philistines in Palestine, it might have been expected to contain an injunction on this matter just as much as in later times. It would seem to me to be probable that since neither form of the Decalogue contains any reference to it, both must go back to a time at which circumcision was the rule throughout the whole of the world in which the Israelites—or the Kenites—lived, and that it could not therefore be regarded as one of the distinctive things about Yahwism, to be included in its table of fundamental laws. This means that both the Kenite Decalogue and the new Mosaic Decalogue both go back to a time before the Philistines and the Israelites had come into contact with one another.

I may then summarise my argument in this way. The familiar Ten Commandments cannot be considered without relation to the Ritual Decalogue of Exod. xxxiv. On the other hand we cannot suppose that these two Decalogues stand in a

---

linear development, but rather that both go back to pre-Mosaic religion, which at some time forked off into two streams of development. The one stream continued at a primitive level until long after the time of Moses, and in the southern document so late as the ninth century B.C. it was content with such modifications of the Old Decalogue as were necessitated by changed conditions of life. This means that the religion of Yahwism had some form of Decalogue so far back as it can be traced. When Moses mediated Yahwism to the tribes he led, following on the Exodus from Egypt, there would thus necessarily be some Decalogue, whether it were still closely similar to the old Ritual Decalogue or not.

Approaching from the other end, we see that there is strong reason to believe that the Ten Commandments were in substance formulated before the preparation of the E document of the Pentateuch in the eighth century, or the preparation of Deuteronomy in the seventh century. From some source older than either it was incorporated in both, though probably from a form in which all the commands were terser than some now are. In both, either at the time of the incorporation or later, there was some expansion, but not affecting the vital substance of the commands.

The features common to the Ritual Decalogue and the Ethical Decalogue show that we need not come down to a late date for any of these. This means that the prohibition of images and the observance of the Sabbath probably go back to the pre-Mosaic age, while the non-mention of circumcision points to a time before any conflict with the Philistines had begun, and therefore to a time before the beginning of the twelfth century B.C.

On the other hand the features of the Ten Commandments which are divergent from those of the primitive Decalogue are not such as can be easily accounted for at any time between the period of Moses and the compilation of the document E; and the earlier prophets, even so early as the time of David, seem to appeal to a standard of conduct which included some of these provisions. All probability seems to point towards the time of Moses, therefore, as the likely time for this notable change from a primitive to an advanced Decalogue.
The personality of Moses and the greatness of the occasion would render intelligible the issue of a new Decalogue in keeping with the new character of Yahwism as it was mediated to Israel by Moses. The more ethical character of this Decalogue would seem to match the circumstances of the man and the occasion, and is rendered wholly credible at that time by the fact of the ethical basis in gratitude of Israel's Covenant with Yahweh, in response to its initiation in grace and deliverance by God.

It should therefore be clear that the belief that there was worship of Yahweh in the world before the time of Moses, as the Bible states clearly and unequivocally, does not diminish the stature of Moses in the least, and does not lessen the greatness of his mission to men. Nothing can be farther from the truth than to suppose that all that Moses did was to introduce Israel to Kenite worship. He gave an altogether new quality and character to the religion, established it in Israel on a basis that was unique amongst men, and set a new standard before his people. The originality of his work—or, as I should prefer to say, of the work wrought by God through him—remains unaffected, and of the unmatched significance of his work for the world, and of the fact that before the days of our Lord no other of equal stature arose, I am fully persuaded. Not the least significant element of his work was his giving to men this short code of conduct which is still enshrined in men's hearts, and which still soars high above the attainment of the vast majority of mankind. For the genius of Moses was shown not alone in the new which he set before men, but in the old which he picked up and retained, and men do not conform to the Ten Commandments when they refrain from adultery and from stealing, unless they also have no other gods before the Lord—and that involves their loyalty to Him—and honour His name and His day. Here, it should be added, it is not without significance that in both Exodus and Deuteronomy the spirit of the law is expressed not alone by the prohibition of work on the Sabbath, but by the injunction to keep it holy. To Moses, the man of God, we are indebted, and to God, through him, for this high standard which is set before men, and for all that it has wrought for the enrichment of life by its inspiration and its summons down all the ages.