

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

is the same; and it is given us in the words of our Lord Himself:

"Yet a little while is the light with you; walk while ye have the light, lest darkness come upon you."

ROBERT C. JENKINS.

---

## ART. II.—INSPIRATION.<sup>1</sup>

ONE of the mental tendencies of the age is to minimize the supernatural. In no region of thought do we see this tendency more manifest than in present-day views of inspiration. I see English Churchmen, of great scholarship, of profound research, of untiring industry, and, I must add, of earnest piety, coming under this influence. As we study their writings we are reminded of a forest, whose trees, by their bent, show the quarter of the prevailing wind. We have not to discuss on this occasion the question of a revelation. "The idea of a written revelation may be said to be logically involved in the notion of a living God." John Stuart Mill writes: "On the hypothesis of a God who made the world, the probability of His communicating Himself is inevitable." If God speaks to man He must speak through man. "God inspires," says Dr. Fairbairn in his "Christ and Modern Theology" (p. 496), "man reveals; inspiration is the process by which God gives; revelation is the mode or form, word-character or institution in which man embodies what he has received." The Bible has, therefore, a human side, as well as a Divine. The relationship between the two is the question which is agitating the Church to-day. In the limits of a paper necessarily brief, I must state at once that my object is to meet certain conclusions of the Higher Critics with reference to the Pentateuch, its Mosaic authorship, and its historic accuracy. I shrink from the task, but if I can safeguard the mind of any younger brother from any hasty conclusions—if from the imperfect consideration of a fragment of a great subject I can stimulate him as regards the question of inspiration to "ask" as he has never done before "for the old paths where," I believe, "is the good way"—I shall be thankful indeed. I venture to tell him my own experience after a somewhat careful study of the subject. I find in my mind, on the one side, a rectification of some traditional beliefs; and, on the other, a realization, such as I never had before, that "every Scripture" (*πᾶσα γραφή*), whether historic

---

<sup>1</sup> A paper read before the Yorkshire Evangelical Union, at the Victoria Hall, York, Friday, June 22, 1894.

or prophetic, is "given by inspiration of God." If our anchors begin to drag from their moorings we may make shipwreck of our faith. The mind of man, created to lean upon the unseen, demands an infallible "rule of faith." Let a man lose the sense of the Divine authority of the Word, and he either wanders into the morass of scepticism or seeks rest in a Church which professes the infallibility which the constitution of man's moral nature demands.

"Modern theology," says Bishop Ellicott in his "Christus Comprobator" (p. 71), "leaves the earlier formative and fundamental periods of the history of Israel almost completely without a literature, in order that it may concentrate all the productive energies of the nation in the age of Ezra." Professor Sanday, in his Bampton Lectures (p. 227), says that "the critical school would assign the change from the oral to the written Scriptures to two moments in Jewish history: (1) the moment at which the prophets of action made way for the writing prophets, *i. e.*, according to the current view when Amos and Hosea succeeded to Elijah and Elisha, in the middle of the eighth century; and (2) the promulgation of the Deuteronomic law by Josiah, 621 B.C." Professor Ryle, in his book on the "Canon of the Old Testament" (chap. ii.), writes: "It is not until the year 625 B.C., the eighteenth year of the reign of King Josiah, that the history of Israel presents us with the first instance of a book which was regarded by all—king, priests, prophets, and people alike—as invested not only with sanctity, but also with supreme authority in all matters of religious conduct." I will take one sentence from Wellhausen, in which he assigns a reason for this late period of authoritative writings. He says that it "hardly admits of any other answer than that" a "non-literary had developed into a literary age." We must consider this statement. The culture of the East, in which the earliest periods of Israel shared, has been proved to be literary from the remotest epoch. I need not remind you of the disintombed libraries of Assyria and Babylonia. I keep to Palestine and Egypt, the cradles of the Jewish people. The Siloam inscription discovered in 1880, if not of the age of Hezekiah, near that age, proves, from the formation of its letters, that the Jews were accustomed to write with the pen. The inscription is pure Biblical Hebrew. Professor Sayce, who is to the Higher Critics what Balaam was to Israel, says ("Higher Criticism and the Monuments," p. 380) that the Siloam inscription proves "that the Hebrew spoken in Jerusalem before the exile" is identical "with that of our Old Testament books. At the time when the inscription was written the Hebrew language was already that which is embodied in the Biblical text." Recent discoveries prove

that Moses lived about 1290 B.C. Professor Driver states that the discovery of the "Book of the Law" by Hilkiah in the temple was 621 B.C. The interval, therefore, between Moses and Josiah is under 700 years. The question arises, Is there a probability of a language remaining unchanged, as a comparison of the Book of Jeremiah with the Book of Deuteronomy, if of the age of Moses, would indicate? The late Bishop of Bath and Wells answers: the Latin of Plautus is the same as the Latin of Gregory the Great, 800 years afterwards, and the Greek of Thucydides is the same as that of Procopius, a thousand years later. I turn to the East, where all things are conservative, and a great Arabic scholar tells us that the Arabic spoken at Mecca to-day is precisely the same Arabic as that of the Qurân, twelve centuries before. The comparison of the papyri rolls is still more striking. At an interval of 1,000 years there is not even the slightest change in grammar. "You will see, then," says the Bishop, in his admirable little book on "The Chronicles" (p. 39), "that there is not the slightest improbability in the Hebrew of the Pentateuch being really the Hebrew of the Mosaic age."

I turn at once from the highest probabilities to ascertained facts. The marvellous discovery of the Tell-el-Amarna cuneiform tablets proves not only that the populations of Western Asia in the age of Moses were highly cultured and literary, but also that the Babylonian language was the medium of literary intercourse from the Nile to the Tigris and the Euphrates, just as Latin was the medium of communication in Europe in the Middle Ages, or the *Lingua Franca* in the time of the Crusades. The land of Canaan was included in this condition. Among these tablets are letters from Jerusalem and Lachish, from Gaza and Megiddo, from Tyre and from Sidon. We understand now more clearly than before why the early Canaanite name of Debir before its captivity by Othniel should be Kirjath-Sepher, "City of Book," and in Josh. xv. 49 Kirjath-Sannah, "the City of Instruction." In that early age there were scribes and schools of scribes not only in Jerusalem, but certainly in one, and most probably in many towns of Palestine. Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians; he probably studied these very records; one thing is certain, he had before him authentic documents. Take one instance: I select Melchisedek, because those of the school of Wellhausen have always spoken of him as a myth (I use the term in its technical sense). The facts stated about Melchisedek in Genesis are, as regards the historical books, a "single instance," as in the case of Sargon in Isaiah. We have in these tablets Ebed-Tob, who tells us that he was not appointed King of Jerusalem by any earthly potentate.

He says that his position did not come "from his father or his mother." He was King of Jerusalem because he was priest of its God. Here we have in these tablets the records of a king-priest. We have the reasons why he should be called King of Salem and not of Jerusalem. They prove that the description of Melchisedek in Genesis is in accordance with facts. They prove, above all, that the inhabitants of Canaan recorded events upon imperishable clay long before the time of Moses, or the entrance of Israel into the promised land. The objection to the Mosaic age of the Pentateuch—"that the Pentateuch betrays a much higher state of civilization than could have existed at so early an age"—falls pointless in our present-day knowledge of the high culture of Egypt in the earliest times—a land which stood far ahead of all contemporary nations, and was the leader of the civilization of the world—a land in which the Israelites went to school, so to speak, for more than two hundred years. In this literary culture Moses, their law-giver and prophet, stood pre-eminent.

2. I must at once, and very briefly, address myself to another fact which contravenes the views of the Higher Critics as to the late period of the Pentateuch. The records are those of a writer, or compiler, of the time—speaking generally, of one who was intimately and personally acquainted with the facts recorded. I would say in passing that in those historic portions where the writer of the Pentateuch was not contemporary he is evidently recording, under "selective inspiration," from documents, and not from oral tradition. We must all have noticed that impostors, when cross-questioned, always "come to grief" on minute details. The Tichborne Claimant was a notable instance. How is it that, in the minutest details, in points where mistakes could easily have been made, the records of Israel in Egypt are proved to be absolutely accurate? Time will only allow me to give one illustration out of hundreds. I will select one not found in the many books which prove the point before us. Until recent years it was believed that the Pharaohs of the Oppression and the Exodus lived at Memphis. We are told incidentally in the Book of Exodus that Pharaoh's daughter was in the habit of bathing in the Nile, by which Memphis was situated, and that the mother of Moses placed her infant in an ark of bulrushes among the flags of the river. The Nile at Memphis abounded in crocodiles—surely here we have a "slip!" We know now that Rameses II., the great oppressor of the Hebrews, removed his capital, as a matter of State policy, to Zoan, the ancient capital of the shepherd kings. He rebuilt the city, and called it after his own name. "And they (the Israelites) built for Pharaoh treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses." Here his son and successor Menephtah, the Pharaoh

of the Exodus, lived and reigned. Here Moses wrought his miracles. "Marvellous things did He (God) in the field of Zoan." It is an interesting fact that *the branch of the Nile on which Zoan was built is the only part of the river or its branches in which the crocodile was never found.* No one will ever persuade me that these narratives of the Pentateuch were written in a late period of the history of Israel. They were written by some Israelite who lived in Egypt at the time covered by the records. Strauss did not fail to perceive the force of this line of argument. He naïvely remarks, in his "Leben Jesu": "The books which describe the departure of the Israelites from Egypt and their wanderings through the wilderness bear the name of Moses, who, being their leader, would undoubtedly give a faithful history of these occurrences, unless he designed to deceive; and who, if his intimate connection with Deity described in these books be historically true, was eminently qualified by virtue of such connection to produce a credible history of the earlier periods." In this point I agree with Strauss rather than with the Higher Critics, who say that the Pentateuch was written partly in the days of Josiah, and partly in the post-exilic age in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. It is very significant that Ewald, who declares that Deuteronomy was written in the reign of Manasseh, is obliged to make his supposed author live in Egypt, to account for his remarkable acquaintance with Egyptian customs. I unhesitatingly declare my belief in the traditional view of the Jewish and Christian Churches.

I think that those who have at all studied the subject must hold what Bishop Ellicott calls "the rectified traditional view," and that, as regards the Book of Genesis, Moses was a compiler or editor, rather than an original composer—in other words, that he had before him primeval documents, patriarchal records, registers and biographies, archives, in part the property of the Hebrew race, and partly a possession common to that race with others, and that, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, he chose such as were historically true, and which bore upon the religious history of the human race. It is a strange and interesting fact that the only book out of the five which expressly claims to be from the hand of Moses, that of Deuteronomy, is the very book which modern criticism refuses to admit to be of Mosaic authorship. With reference to the anachronisms of the Pentateuch, I can only refer my readers to the extremely valuable remarks of Lord Arthur Hervey in his book "Chronicles in relation to the Pentateuch," published by the Christian Knowledge Society. We do not deny that the Pentateuch may have been authoritatively revised more than once; hence the glosses which do exist; and then finally edited

by Ezra, under inspiration. This fact would explain the occurrence of "Chaldaisms" in the text. We quietly wait for further light. "There is nothing new to Him who is from everlasting." Those are weighty words of the late Bishop Wordsworth in his "Introduction to the Pentateuch": "Faith, Patience, and Humility are wise readers of the Bible; and Time is an excellent interpreter."

3. I must mention a third reason why the Higher Critics impugn the authenticity of the Pentateuch and deny its historic character. They say that "there is no evidence of the existence of the Mosaic institutions between the time of the Exodus, when the Mosaic laws purport to have been given, and the later times of the Jewish monarchy." I can only suggest reasons for disbelief in a statement so subversive of inspiration. The Mosaic ritual as a whole cannot be of later introduction than the time of the Judges, from the fact that twelve or thirteen of its chief points are noted as being at that time in force. It is always dangerous to argue from silence. Here the silence is only partial. The Scriptures do not give us an exhaustive account of all the events which happened in those times of which they wrote, but only such a selection as seemed good to the wisdom of God, *e.g.*, there is an absolute blank as to the events of thirty-eight out of forty years in the life of Israel in the wilderness. Is there silence with reference to the Mosaic institutions? Take the Tabernacle, in which the ritual centred. I ask are there no traces of the existence of this tabernacle between the Exodus and the reign of Solomon? I read, Joshua xviii. 1, "And the whole congregation of the children of Israel assembled together at Shiloh and set up the tabernacle of the congregation there." Jeremiah confirms this statement. Again, in 2 Sam. vii. 6, the answer of God by Nathan to David is decisive: "Whereas I have not dwelt in any house since the time that I brought up the children of Israel out of Egypt even to this day, but have walked in a tent and in a tabernacle." Again, 1 Kings i. 39, "Zadok took a horn of oil out of the tabernacle and anointed Solomon." At the consecration of Solomon's temple we read that the Priests and Levites "brought up the ark of the Lord and the tabernacle of the congregation, and all the holy vessels that were in the tabernacle." The writer of the second book of Chronicles adds, chap. i. 3: "The tabernacle of the congregation of God which Moses the servant of the Lord had made in the wilderness." The Tabernacle of Witness is mentioned eighty times in the Pentateuch, and in the other historical books eighteen times. We have six recorded instances of the observance of the Passover, and we have hints of others. We have the unbroken succession of High Priests from Aaron to

Zadok. In the Chronicles we have the genealogy of High Priests, beginning with Aaron and ending with Jaddua, containing twenty-nine generations. We meet with nineteen men filling the great office of High Priest, each turning up in his right chronological place. Priests and Levites always appear as occasion requires, and yet we are told by Kuenen in the *Hexateuch*, and by Wellhausen in his "History of Israel," that the Priestly Code, which comprises the great bulk of what has been commonly known as the Mosaic or Levitical Law, with its whole round of sacrifice, priesthood, central sanctuary, one altar, dates from about B.C. 445 (Hervey, p. 10), that there was no such thing as the tabernacle and the ceremonial law in the time of Moses, but in the imagination of credulous men like the writer, and, it may be, the reader of this paper. Kuenen says of the altar of witness, "It is an absolutely unhistorical invention framed to defend the doctrine of a unique sanctuary" (p. 109), and Wellhausen, the high priest of the critics, in defiance of the facts I have just mentioned, has the hardihood to say that "the suddenness with which the full-grown hierarchy descended on the wilderness from the skies, is only matched by the suddenness with which it disappeared from Canaan, leaving no trace behind" (p. 127). An objector says, "Look at the infraction of the Ceremonial Law! Look at David's 'Priests of the tribe of Judah!'" Is this a proof that the Mosaic ritual was not yet in existence? Precepts may be heard and known, and not carried out in fact. An authority may be acknowledged, and yet not obeyed. I ask a question. You believe that the moral law was given by Moses? Yes. Because David broke the seventh Commandment in the case of Uriah's wife, did that infraction of the moral law prove its non-existence?

I come at once to the last and much the most important part of my subject. What was our Lord's attitude to the Pentateuch? We are face to face with a question of vital interest. It is allowed (1) that the Old Testament, to which our Lord referred, was practically identical with that with which we have to do. (2) It is admitted on all hands that our Lord Jesus Christ taught plainly and unreservedly the Divine authority and Mosaic authorship of the books traditionally ascribed to him. I have, therefore, no necessity to prove this all-important point. Would that time had allowed me to show how carefully Christ authenticates as distinctly historical and official the very parts of Genesis which Canon Gore in his essay in "*Lux Mundi*" on "The Holy Spirit and Inspiration" describes as being "of the nature of myth, using the word in its technical sense, or of an allegorical picture." How do the Higher Critics meet this difficulty? Professor Sanday, the



most moderate of them, says in his "Oracles of God" (p. 111): "I should be loth to believe that our Lord accommodated his language to current notions, knowing them to be false. I prefer to think, as it has been happily worded, that He condescended not to know." But most men of his school would answer you that in His human nature Christ shared the ignorance of the men of His own generation. There is much confusion of argument. This is not a question of limitation of knowledge, but of liability to error.<sup>1</sup> Was the verdict of Jesus Christ fallible or infallible? Of whom are we speaking? (1) Of One who in His human nature was absolutely sinless by reason of His supernatural birth, and who had, therefore, a Divine illumination such as we cannot possess, and upon whom the Spirit was poured "without measure." (2) Of one who had qualities and powers above nature which it is indisputable both the body and soul of Christ did receive by the influence of Deity wherewith they were united. I ask all candid students to read again the fifth book of the "Ecclesiastical Polity," and ponder over Hooker's magnificent illustration of the heated sword. Standing upon these two facts as upon a rock, Christ's verdict of the Old Testament is the only one which I can possibly receive. Remove the supernatural from the historical books of the Old Testament, and you prepare the way for the denial of the evidence upon which the Incarnation rests. We who keep to the traditional view of the Old Testament regard it as Christ regarded it. In the words of another, "For Him it possessed the peculiar and awful characteristic of Divine authority. He stated no theory of its construction; but, looking upon it as it existed, He recognised in it the decisive utterance of God, even in its minor features of expression. For the mind which recognises in Jesus Christ all that He claimed to be, this verdict on the supernatural character and Divine authority of the Old Testament is final" (Moule's "Outlines of Christian Doctrine," p. 6). In conclusion, I would warn my readers of one of the most subtle errors, and, to my mind, one of the most dangerous positions of some of the men of the analytical school; subtle because it is a one-sided view of a most precious truth. They imply that those parts of the Scripture are inspired which "find" the soul. The word is that of Coleridge. In his "Confessions," p. 12, he says: "In the Bible there is more that *finds* me than I have experienced in all other books put together; and *whatever finds* me brings with it an irresistible evidence of its having proceeded from the Holy Spirit." In

---

<sup>1</sup> See Canon Liddon's masterly discussion of this subject. Bampton Lectures. Fourth edition. Pp. 453-472.

other words, I read the second book of Chronicles, it does not "find" me; I read the "Imitatio Christi," and it does "find" me—therefore the latter is inspired, the former is not. The written word is more than a reflection of the inward light; *it is an outward and objective revelation of God, which exists entirely independent of the intuitional faculty of the soul.* The whole historical record of the Old Testament is part of the great depository of God's revealed will. It comes to us with Divine credentials attested by Christ and the Apostles; it is *Θεόπνευστα*, "God-breathed." And yet there is an inward witness to the truth—there is an experimental evidence—there is a key which unlocks the sacred treasury. The sheep know the voice of the Divine Shepherd. I walk along the sea-shore; there is a pool of salt-water. I place in it a land-plant; it collapses and withers and dies. I take up a piece of sea-weed which seems half-dead, and place it in the pool; how beautifully it expands its feathery fibres, how brightly it unfolds its radiant hues, how joyously it waves its elegant streamers. There is an affinity between the sea-weed and the salt-water. "He that heareth hath the witness in himself."

J. W. BARDSLEY.



### ART. III.—JOSHUA'S LONG DAY AND THE SUN-DIAL OF AHAZ.

"The will of God has been active and operative as the sole cause throughout all ages of the world's creation and history."—Sir J. W. Dawson, "Origin of the World," p. 14.

**T**HE battle of Beth-horon (Josh. x. 8-14), one of the most wonderful in the world, is not so well known as are many of less importance. It was fought by Israel, under the leadership of Joshua, against five kings of the Amorites and their combined armies. The armies being discomfited by Israel with a great slaughter, the surviving Amorites were chased along the way to Beth-horon, and were smitten to Azekah and unto Makkedah. As they were going down to Beth-horon, "the Lord cast down great stones from heaven upon them unto Azekah, and they died: they were more which died with hailstones than they whom the children of Israel slew with the sword. Then spake Joshua to the Lord . . . and he said in the sight of Israel, Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon. And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. Is not this written in the Book of Jasher? So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not