

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

ment and public institutions as we close our places of business, and to discourage every kind of Sunday opening which involves the Sunday labour of others, and which tends to break down the Sunday-closing principle, or which is inconsistent with the sacred duties of the day of holy rest.

With the Saturday half-holiday almost universal ; with the shortened hours of labour, when millions of our people leave their daily work at five, six and seven o'clock in the evening ; with our museums and galleries, concert-rooms, public libraries, and reading-rooms lighted with electricity, and opened till ten or eleven at night on week days ; with our beautiful parks in all parts of London open as public thoroughfares on Sundays and on week-days ; with books and papers so cheap that the poorest can become owners of works of every description for a few pence ; with the daily increasing privileges of the toiling classes ; with their improved homes springing up in all directions ; with cheap education on six days, with the marvellously cheap excursions from Saturday to Monday to seaside resorts, and the summer holidays and Bank holidays enjoyed by all sections of the people—surely with all these and many other advantages on week-days there can be no need to trespass on the day of rest with concerts, news-rooms, museums, or exhibitions. Quiet bodily and mental rest, quiet walks, quiet reading at home, quiet intercourse with the wife and children, with brothers and sisters, quiet worship in the house of God, the quiet study of the Book of God—these are the legitimate, the beneficial and proper duties and recreations of the day of holy rest ; and those who are breaking down the Sunday closing principle for Sunday amusements, those who are rooting up the defences which protect the Sunday as a day of national rest, those who are blunting the national conscience as to the religious character and duties of the Sunday, are inflicting an incalculable injury on one of the most blessed privileges which our people at present enjoy, and are helping to change the Lord's Day into a day of toil and injurious excitement.

CHARLES HILL, Secretary,

Working Men's Lord's Day Rest Association.

13, Bedford Row, London, W.C.



ART III.—THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE CRITICS.

THE following paper does not profess to bring before our readers the technical and more abstruse features of the controversy which has gathered during the past few years around the Old Testament Scriptures. Such a disquisition is

only intelligible to the philologist, the critical historian, or the ethnologist; but a hope is entertained that these few pages will furnish some matter of interest to that larger class of religious people who are endowed with sound common-sense and an enlightened judgment concerning the Word of God—that *Magna Charta* of our heavenly citizenship. The processes of critical investigation have not been ignored, and the results have been duly weighed. Interpreting and popularizing difficult subjects is one of the characteristics of our day, and it may be that the grouping together of some of the most leading questions in this controversy will present the matters under dispute with a convenient brevity, and help towards their solution in a satisfactory way.

A monstrous assault is beleaguering our fortress, more subtle, deeper, and more dangerous, and more widely diffused, and more difficult to deal with, than any previous attack that the Church of God has been hitherto summoned to resist. It is not the coarse Philistianism of Paine and his followers, nor the sneering satire of Voltaire and his school; but the research of linguists and the rationalism of critics, or rather conjecturists, now challenge of us a surrender of our citadel, and the capitulation of the ancient stronghold of our Zion. The whole movement is negative and destructive of the foundations of our faith, or if any refuge is offered to the ejected tenants of orthodoxy, it is but a lath and plaster patchwork of Socinian sentiment.

Now what is really the true state of things around us? No falsely-called charity must be allowed to hoodwink our perceptive faculties. Nor can any compromise be effected, or any condonation of heresy be exercised, because there is no bridging over the gulf, no reconciling the old and the new, and this for the plainest of all reasons: they are diametrically opposed both in origin and in object. The orthodox acceptance of Holy Scripture is based upon the faith that religion, both in its essence and form, has come to us *ab extra, from without* ourselves; in a word, from God. The modern school holds that religion is the outcome of the human mind—it springs up *ab intra, from within*. It is an evolution improving in its stages as it advances along the ages; indeed, the faiths of the world are like the animals in Darwin's theory, struggling for the "survival of the fittest." It is not the mind of God made known unto men, but men group together their wishes and their wants generation after generation, and of this compound of human conveniences and necessities they make a god and fall down and worship it. Revelation, as the Church of Israel and the Church of Christ have received and understood it, is unhistorical, unproved, impossible. The heathen designed and shaped their gods, and the people of

Israel conceived, also, their ideal. The great God, the one Maker of heaven and earth, was the birth of the Hebrew brain, and is to be accepted as the true God solely on the ground of supplying the best theory of Deity, and the most satisfactory to the demands of the human intellect. Prediction, a foreknowledge and foretelling of the future, is beyond the powers of mankind. The examples relied on as proofs of the possession of such a faculty were either shrewd guesses, idealistic conceptions of later years transferred to previous periods, or, more generally, were committed to writing after the events had occurred; they were history and not prophecy, not proofs, therefore, of the truth of the writers, but of their dishonesty. Miraculous interpositions are soluble into myths with which all histories begin, and the shape and form in which such supposed occurrences have been transmitted to us are merely the vestments of allegory or dramatic fable. The moral lessons, however, speaking generally, are good, and the verifying faculty and the ever-improving conscience of the race will, as the ages roll on, eliminate what still remains erroneous, and correct what is faulty, and introduce what is felt to be necessary. But what is to be said of our blessed Lord and His authority? Does not His testimony set a certain seal to many points which otherwise, it might be conceded by some, were doubtful and dark? The answer to this question is marked with an awful evasiveness. When speaking of Old Testament history our Lord is not to be regarded as a critic. He spoke of things as they were accepted by the Jews of His day; it was not His purpose to rectify such statements, even if it was in His power. A citation of an edict as a revelation of God made to Moses, or of a Psalm, as David's, in which the authorship is the point of the argument (see Ps. cx., and Matt. xxii. 43 and parallel places), does not prove necessarily that these Scriptures were veritably the writings of the Lawgiver or the Psalmist. These teachers would persuade us that our Lord's knowledge was limited, because He took on Him our nature, and in so doing "He emptied Himself;" see Phil. ii. 7. What is the teaching of this passage? In this word, "He emptied Himself," we pass from the pre-incarnate to the incarnate state of Christ; the first part of the paragraph, in which it stands, finds its echo in the "though He was rich," and the second in "for your sake He became poor;" of 2 Cor. viii. 9. As the "form of God" is the recognisable side of the Divine essence or intrinsic reality, it must be the visible tokens of this state that the Lord divested Himself of; the indwelling essence of Deity He could not lay aside, as this was His own very Self, the core and centre of His Being. Such an interpretation as severing Himself, though only for a time, from this, would negative the whole testimony of Scripture on this doctrine,

and nullify the Incarnation. Hence the stripping or emptying of Self must be the deposition during the days of His humiliation of the *insignia* of Deity, such as the visible glory which attended Him in all the embassies which He had discharged, the fiery light that illumined the "pillar," and enveloped the "bush," and the unapproachable glory that dazzled the seers; of these the robes of royalty, the equipments of Deity, that pronounced Him Divine, He bared Himself and assumed the disguise of humanity, the earth-clothes of flesh and blood. There is another passage of which use is made to deteriorate the attributes of our incarnate Lord. "Jesus was advancing in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man," Luke ii. 52. In investigating the mystery of the union of the Divine and human Natures in the Person of the Lord, we must be careful not to run, on the one hand, into the Apollinarian heresy which taught that the Divine "Word" was in our Lord in the place of the human "spirit," or intellect, for He took on Him perfect humanity, which consists of body, soul, and spirit; and, on the other hand, we must avoid the more common error and danger of degrading the Lord to the level of ordinary men. It must be remembered that the purpose of the Incarnation was to reveal the Father to mankind; all, therefore, in the teaching of our Lord must be connected with the making known the Father to us; in all arguments and expositions of Scripture, therefore, we have not the instruction of man to man, but the Word imparting to man the things entrusted to Him by the Father for that end. Wisdom and understanding and knowledge are frequent expressions in Holy Writ, but are by no means the same, though this text is often quoted as though the first and the last were identical. Wisdom is the attribute or faculty of discerning right; understanding or comprehension is the exercise of that faculty, and knowledge is the result of such use; the advance in wisdom and stature can only mean the growth of the youthful Jesus in mental and bodily powers, and this passage teaches us nothing concerning the infinitude or limitation of His knowledge as the Word made flesh. The assertion that the Lord knew not the day or hour of the Second Advent (Mark xiv. 32) is, without doubt, mysterious, but one text of Scripture should not be taken alone nor expounded at variance with the rest of the Bible. Our Lord divulged the signs of the times, and fixed the date "immediately" after an event that was to take place, and still to this day continues unfulfilled (Matt. xxiv. 29). The non-knowledge must, therefore, be interpreted in the sense that it was not given Him by the Father to reveal this secret to His disciples or the world, for from the above and like passages it is equally clear that there is a sense in which He

did know the times and the seasons as being one with the Father.

This is a digression, and we must catch up the thread that is broken off. The mode in which some teachers would limit the knowledge of Jesus by emphasizing His humanity, entirely ignores the indwelling Deity, as they seem to hold that our Lord's opinion on any critical or historical question, that is, in His interpretation of the Old Testament, is not to be valued above that of an ordinary Jew standing by His side. The tendency of these teachers, therefore, appears to be a recrudescence of Nestorianism. In their system it would seem that Jesus was born as other men—hence the virulence with which Isa. vii. 14 has been attacked in their writings, and, alas! defaced even in the Revised Version, and thrown into complete disagreement with the quotation in Matt. i. 23—but He grew into being a God. His teaching, his utterances, His moral standard were so holy and elevated (His miracles are ignored) that He must be recognised as Divine. His death, however, was not sacrificial; atonement and satisfaction are banished from their theological dictionary. His resurrection is more than doubtful, and at all events it is safer and more scientific to speak of man's moral rising up unto righteousness than of a Christ "who died and rose and revived." Such is a plain unvarnished statement of the tenets held by the advanced representatives of this modern movement—we do not say that all who have been affected by it have gone to the same lengths, but all are on the same road. The premises adopted must lead to one conclusion if pushed on, though many hesitate and stop before they reach the final precipice. How, then, can the old and the new agree? If the foundations are proved to rest on the sand of fable and fancy, how can the superstructure stand? If the corner-stone be a lie, how can the edifice be truth?

But the writers with whom we join issue exclaim, "All this is mere declamation. The orthodox claim an *a priori* reverence for the Scriptures, an unquestioned acceptance of all the contents of the Bible, a submergence of the reasoning faculty in man, and a hushing of all critical inquiry when examining the archives of the Hebrew people—this is their postulate before entering on a discussion of the origin, nature, and validity of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and this postulate we refuse to grant—we receive and test the Bible as we would any other ancient literary relic that may have been preserved to our times—we produce facts which we gather from its pages in history, in language and in composition, and these facts must be accounted for; our contest is for truth, and not for upholding a bygone superstition."

The Tübingen assault upon the New Testament presented

much the same features some years ago; and the leaders of that school threw out a similar challenge; the gauntlet was taken up on their own terms, and the result in their utter defeat is now a matter of world-wide notoriety. In that controversy men at large were more familiar with all the circumstances, the writings of the apostles and evangelists were much nearer our own time, there was a considerable amount of contemporaneous and immediately succeeding literature, so that witnesses of unimpeachable credibility, both as to time and truth, could be subpoenaed and heard in court; but the transfer of the attack to the remoter ground and the more distant age of the Old Testament increases the difficulties of the defenders of the faith—inasmuch as, with the exception of some Egyptian papyri and Assyrian tablets, there are no witnesses of the same period to substantiate or refute any arguments that may be advanced on either side. Still there are evidences to be produced, which must either be accepted or accounted for, and testimonies and traditions which appeal to men of common-sense, who see not with the prejudiced eye of the partisan, but with the judicial eye of everyday experience and practical knowledge of men and things.

Now, when we stand still in the midst of the realm of religion and look around us, what do we see as things which are undeniably visible and palpable? We see the Jew, the Church, the Sacraments, and the Bible which accounts for the existence of these phenomena. With reference to the first of these—the Jew—there is no question about his nationality, his creed, his countenance and physiological characteristics. To ascribe his everlastingness, his survival with all his peculiarities through all the storms and tempests of persecution, to a natural tenacity, to his own voluntary isolation, and the unique type of his religious rites and customs, or to various other causes, constitutional or adopted, is only in a most unscientific way to appeal to secondary means, and to ignore the radical and primary cause which is enunciated in the Bible that this people, both in their belief and unbelief, are witnesses for God and His revelation, and that they shall not be reckoned among the nations. Such a method of accounting for patent facts, which is a strange burlesque on the word "Rationalism," is like saying that a stone falls because it falls, or a bird flies because it flies, ignoring the laws of gravitation and hydrostatical and dynamical forces. We cannot separate the Jew from his Book, which records his past, describes his present, and professes to reveal his future. To tear away the English from the statutes of our constitution would be a task of ineptitude; but how much more so to attempt to divorce those whom God has so unquestionably joined together, that when viewed in parallel lines

as a parable and its interpretation light at once leaps out of the darkness, and sends its rays backward into the past and forward into the future, but when dissevered there stands forth before our eyes a people unlike all the rest of the world, whose history, past and present (to say nothing of the future), is an enigma without a clue, a public puzzle, and a world-wide perplexity? Now, the Jew is the legitimate inheritor of the Old Testament Scriptures. His forefathers, who were prophets and priests, were the authors of those books, and their posterity cling to their heritage with the greatest tenacity. Is their unbroken testimony handed down from father to son to be esteemed of no weight in the world? It may, however, be advanced that the Jews differ entirely from Christians in the interpretation of these oracles. True! but, on the other hand, they both value the text itself with equal honour; and is not this very dissidence overruled to furnish a powerful testimony? If the Jew and the Christian were at one in their exposition of the ancient Scriptures, would not the charge of connivance be at once advanced both in the framing and the interpretation of the text? But the antagonism between the Synagogue and the Church has secured the text from any tampering on the part of either litigant. The question, however, of the difference between the Jew and the Christian is not fairly stated. Critically speaking, there is really but little difference, though the results of the disagreement, we admit, have been disastrous. To state the question with all possible brevity, there are two lines of prophetic enunciation: the one sets forth the coming Redeemer as a sufferer, and the other as a king. The Christian believes that both lines meet in the same personage, but describe different periods in His redemptive work. The Jew holds that the roll of suffering predicts the experiences of the people, and that the prophecies of universal rule are to be applied to the Messiah, hence their refusal of the crucified and expectation still of a coming king. But what concerns our present controversy most in this connection is this: If the law and prophets and psalms are the product of a late age, and are not the genuine and authentic writings which they profess to be, how and where did the Jews get hold of their Messianic hope? How did the Samaritans (John iv. 25)? This hope, to say the least, must have existed in the days when the LXX. was translated, and further back still, when the Targums were brought into use. How could such an expectation be based upon books which, according to the advanced school of criticism, were only just composed, and whose false pretensions must have been fully known? This new theology is critically unhistorical; it gives no satisfactory reason for the existence and ubiquity of the one great hope of Israel.

In close proximity with the Jew—indeed, from the bosom of the Synagogue—arose the Christian Church. Our Blessed Lord, according to the flesh, was of the family of David and of the seed of Abraham. The apostles and evangelists and the first-fruits of the Church were of the stock of Israel. Upon their olive-tree were engrafted branches from the wild olive, and Jew and Gentile became one in Christ and heirs of the promise made to Abraham. This Holy Catholic Church, composed of both Jews and Gentiles, received the Old Testament Scriptures from the former. The faith of the early generations of Christians in these lively oracles is well known, and needs no more than a passing mention. The Saviour Himself, among other arguments, grounded His acceptance upon the authority of the prophetic Scriptures. Let any man of ordinary common-sense and average intellect read the New Testament, and he cannot fail to see that predictive prophecy was not only the creed of Christ, but one of the strongest of His claims, a pillar in the temple of evidence. The evangelists often call attention to the fact that such and such things took place that the Scriptures should be fulfilled. The apostolic writings abound in the same appeals to antiquity. The succeeding generations of the primitive Church constantly brought forward the enunciations of prophecy as proof positive of the truth of their religion, and such testimony was never questioned, except by a Celsus, a Porphyry, or a Julian, till these latter days. Now, in these witnesses we have a line of continuity extending from the remote past to the present, and the chain of evidence is supported midway by the authority of Christ Himself. The early Christians, it may be urged, were not a critical generation. This may be true in a sense; but men do not surrender all earthly happiness and even life itself unless they have some good grounds for so doing. A man may be well acquainted with a fact, who could not define and explain all the conditions of its existence. But the following generation was a highly critical one, when it examined the traditions of each Church as to the doctrines taught by apostolic founders, and tested the testimony of the various books which claimed an authority in the Church; and some would tell us that they revised the text of Scripture with great care. However this may be, they were no mean critics who framed and settled the canon of Scripture. With all our exact knowledge in the nineteenth century, it is very doubtful whether we could perform the same task with equal accuracy. They had a knowledge of things which we have not, and testimony was before them that has died away since their day, and the Scriptures of the Old Testament passed muster with them; and this widespread and unanimous agreement, after necessary debate in some cases, must be historically accounted for. The concord on the subject of the Scriptures

of the Old Testament between Jews and Christians presents a problem that calls for a solution. The two parties had at an early date become so prejudiced against each other, and so mutually hostile and hated, and yet they both appealed to the same authority to furnish proof of their doctrines. This difficulty must be adjusted and a satisfactory explanation found, which is not done by these recent theorists. Indeed, the only answer that seems to be possible is that the early Christians were convinced upon sufficient evidence that the ancient Scriptures were what they professed to be, the genuine and authentic oracles of God.

Once more, among the evidences that corroborate our faith in the authority of the Old Testament Scriptures are "the Sacraments which Christ has ordained in His Church: Baptism and the Supper of the Lord." No historian will venture to call in question the use of these ordinances in and ever since the earliest days of the Christian era; no rational man can hesitate to admit that they were appointed by Jesus of Nazareth; but we may go further back: our Lord adopted, but did not altogether originate, these holy rites; He found certain practices in existence, and He recognised and remodelled them. Baptism, the Jews tell us; is as old as Moses, and St. Paul authenticates that tradition in 1 Cor. x. 2. Indeed, there is little doubt that it really originated with the deliverance at the Deluge, when "few, that is eight, souls were saved by water" (1 Pet. iii. 21). Here, at least, is a presumable argument which binds together the earliest and the latest Scriptures, and accounts for the perpetuity of the ordinance. The Lord's Supper presents even clearer evidence. Christ calls His death His "exodus" (Luke ix. 31), and the Last Supper He identifies with the Passover (Luke xxii. 15). And the words of institution, "This *do* for My memorial," are an echo of the institution of the Passover, "All the congregation of Israel shall *do* it," Ex. xii. 47 (see Heb.). Without dwelling upon the details of this rite, which prove the same intimate relationship, how can we honestly explain our Lord's references and regulations concerning this Sacrament if the Book of Exodus was, comparatively speaking, a modern production in His day, or a merely idealistic ante-dating of rites and customs of recent origin and growth? A more consistent explanation of the questions which have been started concerning the relations between the Old and New Testaments than that given by Neologian critics must be forthcoming. No straightforward man can accept such miserable shifts and subterfuges as have been proposed to save the attributes and even the character of our blessed Lord; and we venture to think that no theory will ever be devised or be more conclusive than that which has been handed down as the belief of the Patriarchs and prophets of the

Old Testament, the teaching of Christ Himself and His Apostles, and the creed of the Church Catholic in all generations. The origin, the existence, the perpetuity, and the peculiarities of these three witnesses demand that a reason should be rendered for them, and no sufficient answer can be found except in the Book which professes to preserve the dealings of God with His chosen people; the Bible is the sole index and interpreter of these problems of antiquity; if this record is not true, if this testimony is invalid, we are utterly in the dark concerning the rise and origin of our religion, both in its doctrines and its ritual. Our creed is a mere gourd or a mushroom, the growth of a night. Yet what an influence has this faith had upon the nations of the earth! what fruits has it generated! how it has tamed the fierce and nerved the weak! what patience it has wrought in suffering humanity! what martyrs it has reared! what benefactors it has bred! how it has made the wilderness to blossom as the rose, and transformed the habitations of cruelty into the garden of the Lord! Strange to say that a faith in Moses and the prophets, and in Him of whom they testified, should have wrought such miracles upon our race in all ages, and yet be the outcome of a myth, and the ripened fruit of a primitive delusion or pre-historical falsehood; and yet such must be the case if the creed of Israel and of Christendom cannot face the scrutiny of the sceptic, and the analysis of the rationalist. If the dynamite of speculation and science, falsely so called, can succeed in lifting this Rock, all revealed religion must come down with a crash. Christianity, notwithstanding the evasive and plausible patronage of mere sentimentalists, cannot live on suspended in the air. If the foundations are found to be false, her testimony cannot be proved to be true; if her pedigree presents a flaw, what right has she to the inheritance of the ages? The battle is not one of mere opinions on unimportant and non-vital points, nor is it the collision of parties inside the walls of Zion, nor the on-rush of sects against an historical Church, her authority, her status or her emoluments; but the very life and existence of Christianity itself are at stake. If the enemy should prevail (which God forbid!) even for a time, for we may be entering on the valley of the death-shadow and the dark reign of Antichrist, nothing can be left but the dust and *débris* of natural morality—a mere human estimate of right and wrong—a Christless expediency of the advisable and the unadvisable in the place of the law-bands of Sinai and the love-bands of Calvary.

But before proceeding to the heart of our subject, there are some who remind us of mistakes that have been made by the Church in former ages that bid us call to mind such episodes in ecclesiastical history as the struggles of Galileo with a pre-

judiced priesthood, and that nearer our own times the advances in the science of geology and in the mysteries of biogenesis should whisper a word of warning in the ears of the orthodox, lest they should lay claim to too much, and in their greedy grasping should lose all. But the reply is ready. We do not alter one word in Holy Writ any more than the scientists alter one stratum of deposit or one tittle of the law that governs life. Is there not some confusion in men's minds between the finding out of a fact and the making of a fact? People so often speak of some new discovery as though the thing discovered was there and then made or created, and that, too, almost by the talents of the inventor, instead of being regarded as a secret long ago existing, though hitherto concealed, and now brought to light. The laws, for instance, of stellar and planetary bodies have existed and ruled from the furthest depths of the ages; and the discovery of those laws is only the finding out of the fact, not the making of it. The same may be said of the study of the earth, on which we live and move and have our being; all the wonders that have been evolved by the examinations of the strata that with their warp and woof have woven the vestment that surrounds the globe were not created by their discovery, but discovered because they were created. It is often charged against the theologian that he changes the interpretation of the Scriptures as new disclosures are made by science. True; but are not the two cases parallel? The man of science has, at the commencement of his studies, accepted certain facts or theories with reference to the laws or elements of matter; a new theory is advanced, it is analyzed, tested, and found to be a fact; does he not in consequence alter, modify, or even cancel his former opinions? Yet the laws themselves that govern matter are the same, and the matter itself is, and has been, the same from the beginning—unchanged and unchangeable. So the Word of God is, and remains the same from the day that its various oracles were revealed and registered; but fresh discoveries are made as time goes on, and old interpretations or translations are found to be imperfect or erroneous, and new ones take their place, yet the original text is subject to no alteration; the truth was there from the beginning, but it had not been unsealed and divulged; the glory was there, but the cloud had not gone up. The interpreters of former days may be surpassed by their posterity, and the mistakes of the former corrected by the latter; but all that can be said is that Galileo in his day, as the geologists in our own, called attention to certain truths which have led theologians and linguists to examine the text of Scripture, and they have found that there is no mistake in the text, but in the ordinarily received interpretation of the text. The challenge has been, and is still being, made by the theologian to the

scientist to show that the facts (not the theories and guesses), unquestionably and finally proven, are contrary to the statements of the Bible and the meaning which the text can fairly bear; and we can safely say that such a proof is not yet forthcoming. Former battles have been contested on the arena of the exposition, but this conflict centres in the text itself. The text is charged with being a patchwork of human invention, true neither as to authorship nor authenticity, but only to be received and revered as the best outcome of the best minds according to their lights in their diverse generations. It is here that we join issue.

We must now introduce our readers to the storming and the defence of our citadel. In so doing, our endeavour will be to furnish a very brief sketch of the history of the controversy. Many intermediate stages will be passed by, and many important names will be unnoticed; the main points only will demand our attention. The first assault advanced against the Old Testament Scriptures may be relegated to the early Gnostics, who, strange to say, though not a party in the Church, but rather a cancer or tumour that fastened on the body of the Church, have transmitted the mischief of their teaching in more ways than one, like blood-poisoning, to after-generations, and the ill results are ever and anon coming to the surface. The Gnostics taught that the Old Testament had no connection with the New, that they had separate authors, that the God of the one was not the God of the other, and that the Old Testament was contrary to the New. Here were the seeds of multiform error, to develop growth in future times. However this may be, the first definite germ of the present controversy is traceable to *Aben-Ezra* in the twelfth century. He is well known as one of the greatest of Jewish commentators. He was not what we should properly call a Rationalist, but he uttered unguarded sayings, and just as in the case of *Augustine* respecting the adoration of angels in the early Church, and *Luther* respecting the inspiration of certain books at the Reformation period, the unwise sayings of the wise are oftentimes more productive of error in after-ages than their better utterances are of good. The ill-disposed will always quote authority which will command respect, though the chance-word may be opposed to the whole tenor of their teaching.

Carlstadt, who flourished in the beginning of the sixteenth century, at once the colleague and the rival of *Luther*, was the first openly and definitely to deny that *Moses* was the author of the books that bear his name. The name of *Hobbes* is painfully familiar to the English ear; he appears on the page of our history as a leader and standard-bearer in the ranks of the

assailants of the Bible. His life was a long one, chiefly embraced by the seventeenth century. Among other errors, he taught the non-Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

About the same period lived Benedict de Spinoza, a Portuguese Jew, a Cartesian philosopher, and the founder of modern Pantheism. His system and his personal history are alike well known. By emphasizing what he esteemed to be difficulties and contradictions in the Mosaic writings, he concluded that Moses was author only of certain portions of the Pentateuch, and that the collection as it now stands was the work probably of Ezra, certainly of some late redactor. In addition to this, he denied the possibility of miracle, of prophecy, and, in short, of a Divine revelation altogether. He may thus be regarded, as the lineal ancestor of the Rationalists of our own day. It was not, however, till the middle of the eighteenth century that these sporadic attacks assumed an exact and categorical form—they were more carpings against, than criticisms of, the sacred text. This unenviable task was undertaken by Astruc, who was a Roman Catholic by creed and a physician by profession. It had been pointed out that the names of God, Elohim (God) and Jehovah (Lord), are distinct in use in the first book of the Pentateuch and the first five chapters of Exodus. This feature this writer worked out into a system. He inferred that these names were characteristic of diverse authorship and separate traditions. His discoveries did not stop here, but viewing, it may be presumed, the Pentateuch in the light of a patient, by a peculiarly fine diagnosis he detected *ten* other minor sources which Moses made use of in the compilation of his work. This was the origin of the system which has been called the *Documentary Hypothesis*. Once started a novel theory, and, like a false report, "it gathers strength as it goes." In the early part of this century Vater and Hartmann introduced a "rider" to the above theory, which is called the *Fragmentary Hypothesis*. This holds that the Pentateuch is a combination of loose pieces patched together at random, just as, some critics tell us, was the Rhapsodic origin of Homer's "Iliad"; but this dream in turn gave way to the *Supplementary Hypothesis*—that the Elohist author framed the basis of the work, and the Jehovist added glosses and notes of his own, and then moulded his own and his predecessors' performances into one whole; but this system, again, has been subdivided into countless branches by a phalanx of writers. We select a few. De Wette attributes the first four books to the Elohist and Jehovist, but Deuteronomy to an author distinct from both. Stähelin asserts the identity of the Jehovist and Deuteronomist. Hupfeld traces three authors in Genesis—a senior and a junior Elohist, as well as a Jehovist, and holds that the latter was ignorant of

the existence of the others. But Ewald outstripped his fellows; and it is as marvellous as it is melancholy to see a man of deep and extensive attainments so lacking in common-sense, as if such a variety of sources could have existed without some tradition.

This critic recognises seven authors in the Pentateuch and Joshua—The book of the wars of the Lord; a biography of Moses; the book of the covenant, written in the time of Samson; the book of origins, in the reign of Solomon; a first prophetic writer, in the time of Elijah; a second, somewhat later; and a third, after Joel. In addition to these, the writer of Deuteronomy belonged to the age of Manasseh, and the blessing of Moses was penned in the days of Jeremiah. But even these extravagant theories are not final. Graf postdates the fundamental document to the period after the return from the Babylonish captivity. All the rest are merely additions, so that the laws of Israel, moral and ceremonial, are the inventions of a comparatively modern period. This at last brings us to, the theory that dominates in our own day, which is giving so much sorrow and anxiety to the orthodox members of the Church, and so much occasion of triumph in our science-lecture-halls, and among the free-thinking and infidel crowds that clap their hands with delight to find professors of theology in our universities beating out arguments for their ribald use on the anvil of criticism. How true are the words, "The leaders of the people cause them to err!" Graf's views, mentioned above, have been adopted in the main by Kuenen and Wellhausen. Their works have been translated, and are having a considerable circulation in our country, and some of the more advanced of the Rationalistic school are greedily adopting their system. A brief sketch of this theory is here necessary: The Old Testament was divided by the Jews into three parts—the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms—the last-named being called the "Writings," or the Hagiographa. The "Law" comprises the five books of Moses; the "Prophets" contain Joshua, Judges, the books known to us as Samuel and Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets; the "Psalms" embrace the Psalter, Proverbs, Job, the Song, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and the two books of the Chronicles. This classification was endorsed by our Lord, at all events substantially, when He opened the understanding of His disciples at Emmaus after His resurrection, and told them that "all things must be fulfilled which were written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning Him" (Luke xxiv. 44). We have always been accustomed to believe that this arrangement sets forth, at least roughly, the chronological order of the books;

but this is quite upset by the recent criticism. Of the Hagiographa, it is held now that by far the larger portion is post-exilic, and no part is demonstrably older than the Babylonish Captivity. No psalm, therefore, can claim the authorship of David or his choir. Of the prophetic literature, only a small fraction is later than the fall of the Hebrew kingdom; the historical books known as the "Earlier Prophets" date from a period subsequent to Jeconiah. As to the Law, the Pentateuch has always been regarded as the distinctive name of the five books of Moses, but now Joshua is classified with them, and the collection is called the Hexateuch. In this we have the Jehovistic or historical portion, which is clearly the oldest; then Deuteronomy, which belongs to the age in which it was discovered, and the priestly code or Elohist portion, which the critic charges with endeavouring to imitate the Mosaic period and to disguise its own date. This is a plain confession that the author intended to deceive his readers. Such is the way the critic disposes of internal evidence. When all these were grouped together at the return from the Babylonish Captivity, a preface was needed, and the cosmogony of Genesis was then struck off for the purpose, and set in front of the collection as an introduction to the rest; and all was edited and arranged in the year 444 B.C. Such is the last edition of German Rationalism which is embraced and taught by professors and principals to their pupils, and which is being largely accepted, condoned, or connived at by the Christian public, both clerical and lay.

After wading through this slough of despond, which goes by the grand name of the *Higher Criticism*, two things strike the mind: the amount of sheer guesswork and conjecture, the rearing of a vast but rickety structure on the slender basis of some passages in which difficulties could have been easily avoided by the writers or compilers, and which no one intending to perpetrate a literary forgery, or even a pious fraud, would have committed to writing—difficulties, also, that are for the most part capable of being explained or accounted for by the ordinary processes of simple and natural common-sense; and another feature is the variety of views entertained by these critics. Heretics and schismatics proverbially differ. After leaving the truth they always disagree with each other, so that the primitive error dissolves into multiplied ramifications, and the schism is comminuted into a hundred sects, which mutually exclude and eclipse each other. A champion of this school has recently asserted that the case is made out not so much by one, but by many arguments—the proof of the indictment is of a cumulative-character. We had always thought that a chain was no stronger than its weakest link, but this would lead us to believe that many weak arguments make one strong one, and that

a host of doubts make one certainty. The attack has really changed front: the objectors of our day have quitted the old ground; the questions raised by a Spinoza or an Astruc are now quite out of date. Cumulation in such a case is impossible; opinions that are mutually destructive cannot be cited to establish the same point. However, it may be well to review some of these objections, and attempt a refutation of some of the charges by selecting a few examples; though it must be remembered that, as no explanation is demanded of us, so no endeavour in this direction is sure of success or necessarily right.

F. TILNEY BASSETT.

(To be continued.)

ART. IV.—LATIN TRANSLATIONS OF THE BIBLE.

THERE can be no question that for a considerable period the Christian Church was a Greek-speaking Church. The Septuagint had quite superseded the Hebrew original text; the New Testament was entirely in Greek; in the Churches of Alexandria, Corinth and Antioch, Greek was the vernacular, and even at Rome there were sections of the community which spoke Greek. It is noteworthy that the works of the great Stoic philosophers, Epictetus and the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, have come down to us in the Greek language, notwithstanding that Cicero had shown that the refined Latin of the pre-Augustan age presented a sufficient vehicle for philosophic inquiry. The oldest non-Hellenic version was not the Latin, but the Peshito Syriac, a loving return of the Scriptures to a kindred dialect of the old Aramaic and Hebrew. No one, however, can read the Greek Testament without feeling that the penumbra of a Latin superior power overshadows it, just as in the modern literature of India the presence of English is felt in the ideas, the phraseology, and the word-store. Such words as "sicarius," "Prætorium," "membrana," "census," "Cæsar," "Colonia," "Niger," "Gaza," "libertinus," "rhetor," strike the reader in the same manner as an English expression in a Hindustani document. The current coins bore Latin names and Latin characters; one of the inscriptions on the Cross was in Latin. Still, even in the distant Church of Gaul, so far removed from direct Hellenic influences, where the people spoke a barbarous vernacular, Greek was for some period the recognised language of Christian authority; in Rome the literary use of Greek extended into the third century, and in the early days of the Roman Church Greek was the language of public worship.

Here let us stand aside for a moment and reflect upon another