

FACTS ABOUT
THE BIBLE

ANGELO HALL



BS 475 .H3 1919
Hall, Angelo, 1868-
Facts about the Bible

L6167

H78

FACTS ABOUT THE
BIBLE

ANGELO HALL, A.B., S.T.B.

SECOND EDITION



BOSTON
RICHARD G. BADGER
THE GORHAM PRESS

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JUL 15 19
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

COPYRIGHT, 1919, BY ANGELO HALL

All Rights Reserved

Made in the United States of America

The Gorham Press, Boston, U. S. A.

DEDICATED TO THAT WISE MOTHER AND
BRAVE COMPANION IN ARMS

MY WIFE

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

THE first edition of this little book, published privately twenty years ago, when I was the Unitarian minister at Turners Falls, Massachusetts, has become exhausted. A thousand copies were printed, and the bill for printing was paid by my father, Asaph Hall, the distinguished astronomer, who, having known me intimately for nearly thirty years, believed in me.

My reasons for publishing were, I trust, unselfish, as are my reasons for publishing this Second Edition in the fifty-first year of my age. At fifty one who has failed in the ministry can hardly hope to re-establish oneself by means of such a work as this. For the past fourteen years I have earned a living as a teacher of mathematics, thus reversing the custom in England, where mathematicians have secured comfortable livings in the church and then proceeded to publish works on higher mathematics. I republish this little book now, as I published it twenty years ago, simply to pass on to others information that may prove valuable.

The intelligent study of Christianity helps to

break down sectarianism and to prevent the rank growth in the rich soil of America of such weeds as Mormonism and Christian Science. Now all intelligent study of Christianity must begin with the study of the Bible. This I saw as clearly twenty years ago as I do to-day. I had spent three years at the Harvard Divinity School making as thorough a study of the Bible as the time permitted—not shunning the study of Hebrew as some theologians do. In my early youth I had had a thorough drill in Latin, Greek, and mathematics; and at Harvard College I had taken high rank, especially in mathematics. So I took up the study of the Bible with the open mind of a scholar. Let me pass on to my fellow citizens the fruit of my labors. There is enough of the dynamite of truth in this little book to tumble high priests from their thrones and so help to make the world safe for democracy. “Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.”

I have said so much that is personal that I will here add another bit of personal history. Eighteen months before I entered the Divinity School I had read the New Testament carefully, and with a layman’s untutored mind I had made the following note, which I sent to that famous theologian, Dr. James Martineau, with the comment that the resur-

rection of Jesus might be accounted for on the hypothesis that he had not died upon the cross but swooned:

All four Gospels state that Jesus gave up the ghost. But witness these statements: "Then came the soldiers, and brake the legs of the first, and of the other which was crucified with him. But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was already dead, they brake not his legs."—*John* 19, 32-33. "When the even was come, there came a rich man of Arimathæa, named Joseph, who also himself was Jesus' disciple: He went to Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus."—*Matthew* 27, 57-58. "And there came also Nicodemus."—*John* 19, 39. "And Pilate marvelled if he were already dead."—*Mark* 15, 44. "His disciples came by night, and stole him away. . . . And this saying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day."—*Matthew* 28, 13-15. "I am not yet ascended to my Father."—*John* 20, 17. "Go tell my brethren that they go into Galilee, and there shall they see me."—*Matthew* 28, 10. "He said unto them, Have ye here any meat? And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honeycomb. And he took it, and did eat before them."—*Luke* 24, 41-43. "They saw a fire of coals there, and fish laid thereon, and bread."—*John* 21, 9.

To this Dr. Martineau was generous enough to reply, in his own handwriting, as follows:

35 Gordon Square,
London, W. C.

Mr. Angelo Hall,
Dear Sir,

Mar. 7, 1892.

The hypothesis which you propound, of a swoon on the cross and subsequent resuscitation, to account for the belief in the resurrection of Jesus, has been often advanced and discussed; and is, I think, prevailingly regarded as one of the least tenable. As it is to be found argumentatively treated in a copious literature of Christian Evidences, positive and negative, you must excuse me from reconsidering it. The *method* of speculative conjecture, so devised as to fit in with the particulars contained in the narratives of the four gospels, is in itself obsolete; all critical research being directed, as an essential preliminary, to the origin, growth, and historical material of the documents themselves. The *facts* cannot be sifted and brought to light, till the *record* has been made to tell its story. This is the work, not of inventive ingenuity, but of close critical study and exact learning; the application of which has already been fruitful in its results of clearer insight into the early history of Christianity.

I have not time to enter into further explanations, and must ask your indulgence to my brevity.

Yours faithfully,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

Needless to say, this epistle of James to the Americans is preserved among the most precious of my possessions. James Martineau here urges us to ascertain in a scholarly way the Facts About The Bible.

In this second edition I add a chapter on Live Issues. Perhaps this will serve to satisfy such critics as the prosperous Unitarian minister who did me the honor of noticing my little book publicly at King's Chapel, Boston, years ago. He said people don't want to know facts about the Bible (and many, I confess, do not). They want to be inspired by the Bible. "The letter killeth but the spirit giveth life." I, too, believe this. In witness thereof I add the chapter on Live Issues.

ANGELO HALL.

Annapolis, Maryland.

October 12, 1918.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION	5
I. THE BIBLE	15
II. THE OLD TESTAMENT	17
EXTERNAL EVIDENCE	17
INTERNAL EVIDENCE	21
THE BOOKS OF THE LAW	23
THE OLD TESTAMENT AS A WHOLE	34
THE TWO ISAIAHS	38
III. ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE APPLICATION OF THE FOREGOING FACTS TO THE STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT	40
I. REFERENCES TO MAGIC, WITCHCRAFT AND DIVINATION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT	40
II. THE SONG OF DEBORAH	45
III. THE STORY OF SAMSON	47
IV. RELIGIOUS LIFE AND BELIEF OF DAVID	50
V. CONCEPTIONS OF GOD AND RELIGION IN AMOS	53
VI. THE GROWTH OF THE LAW	56
IV. THE FORMATION OF THE NEW TESTA- MENT	71
EXTERNAL EVIDENCE	71
INTERNAL EVIDENCE	78
NEW TESTAMENT EPISTLES	88
V. THE HISTORY OF JESUS AS PRESENTED BY THE STUDY OF FACTS	90
VI. THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST	97
VII. LIVE ISSUES	109

FACTS ABOUT THE BIBLE

FACTS ABOUT THE BIBLE

CHAPTER I

THE BIBLE

THE word "Bible" is Greek for "the books." Our Holy Bible is a library of sacred books, 66 in the Protestant Bible, and upwards of 70 in the Catholic Bible. Old Testament Books called by the Protestants *Apocryphal*, that is, unauthoritative, were declared by the Catholics at the Council of Trent (A. D. 1546—fourth session of the council) to have equal authority with the rest of Holy Writ. The New Testament of both Catholics and Protestants comprises 27 books. The difference between Protestant and Catholic Old Testament came about in this way:

The Old Testament in Greek was the sacred scripture of the synagogues in Asia Minor and Greece where Paul and other apostles preached Christianity; so that before the books of the New Testament were collected together, the Holy Writ

of the early Christians was this Old Testament in Greek, commonly called the Septuagint. Now the Septuagint originated in Alexandria, Egypt, where there was a large Jewish population two or three centuries before Christ. These Alexandrian Jews, living among Greeks, learned to speak and to write the Greek language; and they caused their Holy Scriptures to be translated from Hebrew into Greek. In the course of time, the Scriptures of these Greek-speaking Jews came to comprise books—such as I and II Maccabees, Ecclesiasticus, Judith, Tobit, the Wisdom of Solomon—not included in the Hebrew Old Testament. At the time of the Reformation the Protestants set aside these additional books as apocryphal, and returned to the Old Testament in Hebrew as the authoritative collection of sacred books.

CHAPTER II

THE OLD TESTAMENT

CONSIDER the Old Testament and the New Testament separately.

What do we know about the origin and history of the Protestant Old Testament, that is, the Hebrew Bible? Examine first the external evidence—from sources outside these Hebrew books.

EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

First, there is the Septuagint, the Greek translation just described. It shows many interesting things in regard to the ancient Hebrew books. For instance, there are passages in the Greek translation which do not appear in the Hebrew. Thus in I Samuel, chap. II, there are half a dozen lines in the Greek version of Hannah's song not to be found in the Hebrew. So with Daniel, chap. III. On the other hand, the Greek book of Jeremiah is one-eighth shorter than the Hebrew Jeremiah. There are, as would be expected, many discrepan-

cies between Greek and Hebrew readings throughout the Old Testament, and obscurities of the one text are often explained by reference to the other.

Secondly, there is the great flood of light shed upon Biblical matters by recent discoveries in ancient Mesopotamia. When the children of Israel were wandering in the wilderness, the people of Mesopotamia were enjoying a state of civilization many centuries old. Statements in the books of Kings regarding the Hebrew kingdom are corroborated by monuments and records found in Mesopotamia. Thus Jehu, who reigned about 840 B. C. (see II Kings, chaps. IX and X), is represented on an Assyrian monument as paying tribute to Assyria. Sennacherib, the Assyrian, has left us writings describing how he shut King Hezekiah up in Jerusalem like a bird in his cage. (See II Kings 18: 13 fol.) Again, many Old Testament stories appear to come from Mesopotamia, as they are found recorded on clay tablets which once belonged to the libraries of Assyrian monarchs. (See George Smith's "Chaldean Account of Genesis.") Such is the case with the story of the flood and Noah's ark. Seven was a sacred number with the Mesopotamians, and very likely the Hebrew seven-pronged candlesticks derive their mystic meaning from some such idea. (See Exodus 25: 31-37.) In Isaiah 27:

1, Amos 9:3, and Job 26:13 are references to a Babylonian myth about a great serpent.

Thirdly, the study of the religion of Semitic nations in general, Phœnicians, Assyrians, Arabians, etc., throws a flood of light upon early Hebrew religion. (See W. Robertson Smith's famous work on "The Religion of the Semites.") For example, we find in the Old Testament reference to Jehovah as a tribe God, just as Chemosh was the tribe God of the Ammonites. (Judges 11:21-24.) Laws regarding unclean animals (Leviticus 11) correspond with the general custom of taboo. Early Hebrews wore nose-rings. (See Gen. 24:47 and Isai. 3:21.) The sacredness of a Nazarite's hair (Judges 13:5 and I Sam. 1:11, and Numbers 6:5), holy ground (Exodus 3:5), etc., are general Semitic ideas, not peculiar to the Israelites. It should be remembered that the Israelites were much like their neighbors, given to the worship of local deities (Hosea 2:13, and 4:13), believing in angels (Judges VI and XIII) and witches (I Samuel 28). So that the study of general Semitic religious thought helps a great deal in the proper understanding of the Old Testament.

As the last source of external evidence, we have to consider direct testimony. The apocryphal book of the Old Testament Ecclesiasticus is the oldest

witness. It says (see the prologue of Eccles.) that the grandfather of Jesus the son of Sirach wrote the book (about 185 B. C.). Now chap. 44 and following of this book mention incidents recorded in the books of the Law and the Prophets of the Hebrew Bible. Now the Hebrew Bible has three divisions, the Law (known to us as the Pentateuch, being Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy), the Prophets (including historical writings as well as the books of prophets), and the Writings (Psalms, Job, etc.). Jesus son of Sirach in his preface to Ecclesiasticus mentions the Law and the Prophets and "other [or, perhaps, *the other*] books of our fathers." This evidence seems to indicate that in 185 B. C. the books of the Law and the Prophets were in their present shape, while the books of the Writings had not been definitely selected and arranged. Other evidence corroborates this view, for at councils of Jews as late as the second century A. D. the question of retaining certain books of the Writings as Holy Writ (for example, Esther) was hotly discussed.

The name given to Hebrew Scripture by New Testament writers is usually "the Law and the Prophets" or "the Law." (See Math. 5:17, 11:13, 22:40, John 1:45, Acts 5:34, etc., etc., etc.)

In Luke 24: 44 it is "the Law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms."

INTERNAL EVIDENCE

For details concerning the Old Testament we are thrown back upon the internal evidence of the books.

At first let us notice a piece of internal evidence which fits in with what has just been said in regard to the three divisions of the Hebrew Bible. After the return of the Jews from captivity in Babylon, Ezra, who was a "ready scribe in the law of Moses, which the Lord, the God of Israel, had given" (see Ezra 7:6), went to Jerusalem (about 450 B. C.), and there with the help of the patriotic Nehemiah set up a theocratic government based upon "the book of the law of Moses." (See Nehemiah 8:1 fol. and compare Ezra 3:2 and Ezra 7:6.) This book must have contained things found in the book of Deuteronomy (compare Neh. 13:1 and 2 with Deut. 23:3 and 4), and in Leviticus (compare Neh. 8:14-18 with Lev. 23:39 fol.). And it probably contained things found in the remaining books of the Pentateuch (see Neh. 9:6 fol., 9:9 fol., and 9:22 fol., with which last compare Numbers 21:21 fol.). So it is generally con-

ceded that the Pentateuch, that is, the five books of the Law, which in after years, before the coming of Christ, became the especial object of veneration with pious Jews, was this "book of the law of Moses" read to the people by Ezra, and used as the foundation of the re-established government at Jerusalem. The collection of prophetic books seems not to have been completed as yet. Indeed, the prophets Haggai and Zechariah were among the returned exiles (Ezra 5: 1). Ezekiel had written while in exile, and Jeremiah just before the downfall of the old Jerusalem and during the downfall.

To sum up, then, of the three divisions of the Hebrew Bible,

(1) The Writings had not been definitely selected and arranged in 185 B. C. Indeed, several of the Psalms are supposed to have been written after this date, when the patriotic Maccabees were struggling against the Greeks (about 165 B. C.). For instance, compare Psalm 79 with 1 Maccabees 7: 16 and 17 and 1: 24.

(2) On the other hand, in 185 B. C. the Law and the Prophets were in substantially their present shape.

(3) Finally, in 450 B. C. the Law was extant, but the Prophets and the Writings had not yet been compiled.

THE BOOKS OF THE LAW

The next step would be to trace out the origin of the Law, or the Pentateuch, as it is called. A popular notion among uneducated people is that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. Indeed, many of the laws given in these five books are therein attributed to Moses, the Law-giver; so that it is no wonder that the Jews of Christ's time (450 years after Ezra had quoted Moses as an authority for the laws of the new state) spoke of the Pentateuch as the Law of Moses. (See John 1:45.) But the events described in Genesis are said to have happened centuries before Moses was born; and at the close of the last book of the Pentateuch, Deuteronomy, is an account of the death and burial of Moses. In Numbers 21:14 a book called "the book of the Wars of the Lord," by an unknown author, is directly quoted from. Nearly a thousand years had elapsed since the death of Moses when Ezra the scribe read the Pentateuch to the people. In these days we should question very carefully the authorship of a manuscript written in the year 900 A. D.

While many laws of the Pentateuch are attrib-

uted to Moses by the Pentateuch itself, it is evident that Moses is not the author of all five books as we have them.

Who then *did* write the Pentateuch, the law of Moses? This question has engaged the attention of the wisest scholars for two centuries, and it will probably never be answered satisfactorily. But about a century and a half ago, Jean Astruc, a celebrated French physician, hit upon a clue to the solution of the question. Modern criticism of the Old Testament may be said to date from his work, 1753 A. D.

Churchmen in regular standing in England accept the results of this criticism, and have written books based upon it. For example, "An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament," by S. R. Driver, D. D., Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford; and "The Canon of the Old Testament, an Essay on the gradual Growth and Formation of the Hebrew Canon of Scripture," by Herbert Edward Ryle, B. D., Hulsean Professor of Divinity, Professorial Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, and examining chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Ripon.

Dr. Driver says in the preface to his work, dated June 18, 1891:

“Criticism in the hands of Christian scholars does not banish or destroy the inspiration of the Old Testament; it *presupposes* it; it seeks only to determine the conditions under which it operates, and the literary forms through which it manifests itself; and it thus helps us to frame truer conceptions of the methods which it has pleased God to employ in revealing Himself to His Ancient people of Israel, and in preparing the way for the fuller manifestation of Himself in Christ Jesus.”

Driver might have added that there are evidently many literary errors in the Old Testament, due to human carelessness, not to speak of such vicious stories as that of Lot and his daughters and Judah and his sons (like idle tales in Homer, too ancient to be credited). For example, on what theory of literal inspiration are we to account for such repetitions as:

Ps. 14,	repeated in Ps. 53.
II Chron. 36: 22-23,	“ “ Ezra 1: 1-3.
Jer. 49: 14-16,	“ “ Obad. 1-4.
II Ki. 24: 18-25: 21,	“ “ Jer. 52: 1-27
II Kings 18: 13-20: 19,	“ “ Isai. 36-39.

To resume, scholars think they have discovered that in the book of Genesis there is a combination of three narratives, woven together: one a record of the beginning of things and a list of genealogies;

one in which the name of God is Elohim (a Hebrew word translated "God"); and one in which the name is Jahweh (a Hebrew word translated "Lord"). After separating the first narrative (designated by the letter P) from the whole, these two words are the key words with which to unravel the one of the remaining narratives from the other. For short, the one of these narratives is designated by the letter E, the other by J. To quote Driver (page 12) "E first appears in the story of Abraham."

Driver gives the following analysis of Genesis:

P* = 1:1 — 2:4^a (that is, through first part of 2:4) + 5:1 — 28 and 30 — 32 + 6:9 — 22 + 7:6 and 11 and 13 — 16^a and 18 — 21 and 24 + 8:1 — 2^a and 3^b — 5 and 13^a and 14 — 19 + 9:1 — 17 and 28 and 29 + 10:1 — 7 and 20 and 22 and 23 and 31 and 32 + 11:10 — 26 and 27 and 31 and 32 + 12:4^b and 5 + 13:6 and 11^b and 12^a + 16:1^a and 3 and 15 and 16 + 17 (entire) + 19:29 + 21:1^b and 2^b — 5 + 23 (entire) + 25:7 — 11^a and 12 — 17 and 19 and 20 and 26^b + 26:34 — 35 + 27:46 — 28:9 + 29:24 and 29 + 31:18^b + 33:18^a + 34:1 — 2^a and 4 and 6 and 8 — 10 and 13 — 18 and 20 — 24 and 25 partly and 27 — 29 + 35:9 — 13 and 15 and 22^b — 29 + chapter 36 (in the main) + 37:1 — 2^a + 41:46 + 46:6 — 27 + 47:5 — 6^a and 7 —

* Compare the beginning of I Chronicles.

11 and 27^b and 28 + 48: 3 — 6 and 7 (?) + 49: 1^a and 28^b — 33 + 50: 12 — 13. (See Driver pp. 9 and 10.)

P being eliminated, the book is further analyzed thus:

I. CHAPTERS 1—11 THE BEGINNINGS OF HISTORY

J = 2: 4^{b†} — 3: 24, 4: 1 — 26, 5: 29, 6: 1 — 8, 7: 1 — 5 and 7 — 10 (in the main) and 12 and 16^b and 17 and 22 and 23, 8: 2^b and 3^a and 6 — 12 and 13^b and 20 — 22, 9: 18 — 27, 10: 8 — 19 and 21 and 24 — 30, 11: 1 — 9 and 28 — 30.

II. CHAPTERS 12—26 ABRAHAM AND ISAAC

{ J = 12: 1 — 4^a and 6 — 20, 13: 1 — 5 and 7 — 11^a and 12^b — 18.
E = chapter 15.
{ J = 16: 1^b — 14 (except verse 3), 18: 1 — 19: 28 and 30 — 33.
E = 20: 1 — 17.
{ J = 21: 1 and 2 (in part) and 33, 22: 15 — 18 and 20 — 24.
E = 21: 6 — 21, 21: 22 — 32^a, 22: 1 — 14 and 19.

† "2: 4^b," that is, the last part of verse 4, as 3^a means the first part of verse 3.

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} J = 24 \text{ (entire), } 25:1-6 \text{ and } 11^b \text{ and } 18 \\ \text{and } 21-26^a \text{ and } 27-34, 26:1-14 \\ \text{and } 16 \text{ and } 17 \text{ and } 19-33. \end{array} \right.$$

III. CHAPTERS 27—36 JACOB AND ESAU

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} J = 27:1-45, 28:10 \text{ and } 13-16 \text{ and } 19, \\ 29:2-14. \\ E = 28:11 \text{ and } 12 \text{ and } 17 \text{ and } 18 \text{ and } 20- \\ 22, 29:1. \end{array} \right.$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} J^* = 29:31-35, 30:3^b-5 \text{ and } 7 \text{ and } 9- \\ 16 \text{ and } 20^b. \\ E = 29:15-23 \text{ and } 25-28 \text{ and } 30, \\ 30:1-3^a \text{ and } 6 \text{ and } 8 \text{ and } 17-20^a. \end{array} \right.$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} J = 30:24-31:1, 31:3 \text{ and } 46 \text{ and } 48- \\ 50. \\ E = 30:20^c-23, 31:2 \text{ and } 4-45 \text{ (except} \\ 18^b) \text{ and } 47. \end{array} \right.$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} J = 32:3-13^a \text{ and } 22 \text{ and } 24-32, \\ 33:1-17. \\ E = 31:51-32:2, 32:13^b-21 \text{ and } 23, \\ 33:18^b-20. \end{array} \right.$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} J = 34:2^b-3 \text{ and } 5 \text{ and } 7 \text{ and } 11 \text{ and } 12 \\ \text{and } 19. \\ E = 35:1-8 \text{ and } 16-20. \end{array} \right.$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} J = 34:25 \text{ (partly)and } 26 \text{ and } 30 \text{ and } 31, \\ 35:14 \text{ and } 21 \text{ and } 22^a. \end{array} \right.$$

* See the passage in the Bible. This bit of analysis appears absurd.

IV. CHAPTERS 37—50 JOSEPH

- { J = 37: 12 — 21 and 25 — 27 and 28^b and 31 — 35.
E = 37: 2^b — 11 and 22 — 24 and 28^a and 28^c — 30 and 36.
- { J = chapter 38 and chapters 39, 42: 38 — 44: 34 (with traces of E).
E = chapters 40 (with traces of J), 41: 1 — 45 (with traces of J).
- { J = 46: 28 — 47: 4, 47: 6^b and 12 — 26 and 27^a and 29 — 31.
E = 41: 47 — 57, 42: 1 — 37, 45: 1 — 46: 5 (with traces of J).
- { J = 49: 1^b — 28^a, 50: 1 — 11 and 14.
E = 48: 1 and 2 and in the main 8 — 22, 50: 15 — 26.

(From Driver pp. 12 — 16.)

Investigating this question, Driver says (pp. 6-8): "As soon as the book [of Genesis] is studied with sufficient attention, phenomena disclose themselves which show incontrovertibly that it is composed of distinct documents or sources, which have been welded together by a later compiler or redactor into a continuous whole. These phenomena are very numerous; but they may be reduced in the main to the two following heads: (1) the same event is doubly recorded; (2) the language, and frequently the representation as well, varies in dif-

ferent sections. Thus 1:1-2:4^a and 2:4^b-25 contain a double narrative of the origin of man upon earth. It might, no doubt, be argued *prima facie* that 2:4^b ff. is intended simply as a more detailed account of what is described summarily in 1:26-30; and it is true that probably the present position of this section is due to the relation in which, speaking generally, it stands to the narrative of those verses, but upon closer examination differences reveal themselves which preclude the supposition that both sections are the work of the same hand. In 2:4^b ff. the order of creation is: 1, man (v. 7); 2, vegetation (v. 9; cf. v. 5); 3, animals (v. 19); 4, woman (v. 21 f.). The separation made between the creation of woman and man, if it stood alone, might indeed be reasonably explained upon the supposition just referred to, that 2:4^b ff. viz. describes in detail what is stated succinctly in 1:27^b; but the order in the other cases forms part of a progression that is evidently intentional on the part of the narrator here, and as evidently opposed to the order in chapter I (vegetation, animals, man). Not only, however, are there these *material* differences between the two narratives; they differ also in form. The style of 1:1-2:4^a is unornate, measured, precise, and particular phrases frequently recur. That of 2:4^b ff. is freer and more varied; the actions

of God are described with some fulness and picturesqueness of detail; instead of simply *speaking* or *creating*, as in chapter I, He *fashions, breathes* into man the breath of life, *plants, places, takes, sets, brings, closes up, builds*, etc., (2:7, 8, 15, 19, 21, 22), and even, in the allied chapter 3 (v. 8) *walks* in the garden: the recurring phrases are less marked, and *not the same* as those of 1:1-2:4^a. In the narrative of the Deluge, 6:9-13 (the wickedness of the earth) is a duplicate of 6:5-8, as is also 7:1-5 of 6:18-22—the latter, with the difference that of every clean beast *seven* are to be taken into the ark, while in 6:19 (cf. 7:15) *two* of every sort, without distinction, are prescribed; similarly 7:22 f. (destruction of all flesh) repeats the substance of 7:21; there are also accompanying differences of representation and phraseology, one group of sections being akin to 1:1-2:4^a and displaying throughout the same phraseology, the other exhibiting a different phraseology, and being conceived in the spirit of 2:4^b-3:24 (compare for example 7:16^b *shut in* 8:21 *smelled*, with 2:7, 8, 15, etc.). 17:16-19 and 18:10-14 the promise of a son to Sarah is twice described, with an accompanying double explanation of the origin of the name Isaac*.

* "There is a third explanation, from a third source in 21:6."

The section 27: 46-28: 9 differs appreciably in style from 27: 1-45, and at the same time exhibits Rebekah as influenced by a different motive in suggesting Jacob's departure from Canaan, not as in 27: 42-45 to escape his brother's anger, but to procure a wife agreeable to his parents' wishes (see 26: 34 f.). Further, in 28: 19 and 35: 15 we find two explanations of the origin of the name *Bethel*; 32: 28: and 35: 10 two of *Israel*; 32: 3, 33: 16 Esau is described as already resident in Edom, while 36: 6 f. his migration thither is attributed to causes which could only have come into operation after Jacob's return to Canaan."

The same analysis applies to the Pentateuch in general, and to the book of Joshua also. But many more elements besides P, J and E enter into composition. Leviticus is almost entirely devoted to giving codes of priestly laws. Deuteronomy stands by itself, being substantially the product of a single author, as it appears. Even in regard to the book of Genesis, Driver says (p. 8):

"The Book of Genesis presents a group of sections distinguished from the narrative on either side of them by differences of phraseology and style, and often by *concomitant* differences of representation: these differences, moreover, are not isolated, nor do they occur in the narrative indiscriminately:

they are numerous, and reappear with singular persistency *in combination with each other*; they are, in a word, so marked that they can only be accounted for upon the supposition that the sections in which they occur are by a different hand from the rest of the book."

It next remains to determine, or to guess as well as possible, the probable origin of the narratives P, J and E. To do this it is necessary to trace the growth of Hebrew culture as shown in the history of the people. The conclusion of scholars is that all the narratives P, J and E were composed centuries after Moses died, and long after the times of King David.

No doubt this date for the Pentateuch is about right. But as for the analysis of the books into separate "narratives" and sources of information, the whole subject is in hopeless confusion. It is assumed that Jahweh, the name of the early national deity of the people of Israel, characterizes one narrative, and that Elohim, a more general name for the deity, characterizes another. Whether this assumption is borne out by the facts is a matter that no common man can decide. For my own part, I doubt if its application to the book of Genesis can appear satisfactory to the reader of this treatise. To my mind, the only book in the Penta-

teuch which has been satisfactorily accounted for is the book of Deuteronomy, of which I shall speak later.

THE OLD TESTAMENT AS A WHOLE

The safest way in which to deal with the internal evidence of the Old Testament, it seems to me, is to see what history it contains. Beginning with the book of Judges, nobody will dispute the general accuracy of the history of the Jews presented therein from the times of Joshua down to the times of Ezra and Nehemiah—a period of nearly a thousand years. Due allowance is to be made, of course, for the admixture of legendary matter. Beginning with the book of Judges and continuing through I and II Samuel and I and II Kings the narrative proceeds from the conquest of Canaan to the fall of Jerusalem (586 B. C.); and it is corroborated by the Prophets, Amos (about 750 B. C.), Hosea (about 740 B. C.), Jeremiah (625-585 B. C.), Ezekiel (about 595-560 B. C.), Zephaniah, Nahum, etc. In I and II Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah is a repetition of this history, extended to the times of Ezra and Nehemiah and corroborated by Haggai and Zechariah. Thus, most of the Bible (excepting literary books like Job, Psalms

and Proverbs) is accounted for at once, to be accepted at face value like the history of Greece from the siege of Troy to the conquest by Rome (146 B. C.)

Of the conquest of Canaan there are two accounts, one in the book of Joshua (which scholars class with the Pentateuch as a late production) and one in the book of Judges. In Joshua we find the famous statement about the sun's standing still* (chap. X: 13) and the story of the miraculous fall of the walls of Jericho by the blowing of trumpets. Canaan is conquered in short order by the hero Joshua. Evidently this is a romance. The other account of the conquest of Canaan, in the books of Judges and I and II Samuel, appears to be the historical one. Here the conquest is gradual, attended with great perils and set-backs, and occupying several generations of men. In Judges and the books of Samuel, moreover, we find folk-lore and national songs (cf. Judges 5; II Sam. 1: 19-27) of an early period.

After the days of local chieftains (called "Judges") came Samuel and Saul and David, clearly-cut historical personages. Then, under

* Copied, by the way, from "the book of Jashar," which must have perished long ago. See Josh. 10: 13 and cf. II Sam. 1: 18.

David, the Israelites unite into one firmly-knit kingdom (about 1000 B. C.). Under Rehoboam, Solomon's son, the kingdom was disrupted into two kingdoms—Israel and Judah. Through the books of Kings the history of both kingdoms is traced down in regular order to the captivity of the Northern Kingdom in 722 B. C. (date fixed by Assyrian records) and the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B. C. In the books of Ezra and Nehemiah the history is continued to the restoration of Jerusalem and the Jewish worship (about 450 B. C.).

Thus we are brought back again to the problem of the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, for these are about the only books of the Old Testament remaining that need any explanation. In them the ancient history of the Jews is related (for many centuries before they had a settled government), and that history is carried back to the beginning of the world. No other nation ever made a history of this sort which has ever been accepted as fact by rational minds. Just how this Jewish history was constructed and what truth it contains we can never know fully. The decalogue in Exodus 20, and the laws of the three succeeding chapters, evidently (internal evidence) come down from early times. Moses is constantly referred to as the great law-giver; but we can hardly believe that the elabo-

rate description of the furniture and ritual in the tabernacle of Jehovah given in Exodus 25-30 and repeated at length in the last chapters of the book came down word by word from the lips of Moses. He must have had more important business to attend to. This is to say nothing of the account in the book of Exodus of the passage of the Red Sea and the plagues inflicted upon Pharaoh's people—evidently national legends like those to be found in Greek and Latin traditions. The books of Numbers and Leviticus are full of laws which we shall glance at later.

Concerning the book of Deuteronomy there is a most interesting theory. It is believed to be the book the discovery of which is described in II Kings 22:8-11, and upon which King Josiah (about 620 B. C.) based the reforms described in II Kings 23:1-24. These reforms came under two heads: (1) Suppression of heathen worship, and (2) Centralization of the worship of Jehovah, that is, worship at Jerusalem and suppression of local shrines (such as those permitted by the law of Ex. 20:24-26, and referred to by Amos and Hosea as at Bethel, Gilgal, Beersheba and Samaria, Amos 4:4, 5:5, 7:10, Hos. 4:15, 8:6, etc.). These two heads are covered by Deuteronomy, chapters 12-26, as follows: Deut. 12:1-3, 12:4-31, 16:21-22,

18: 10-12, 23: 18, 14: 23, 15: 20, 16: 2, 18: 6-8, 16: 1, 16: 5 fol.

As to the introductory and concluding chapters of Deuteronomy, scholars are in doubt; but chapters 12-26 they believe to be included in the book discovered in 621 B. C. by the priest Hilkiyah and presented to Josiah, as related in II Kings 22. It may have been written, scholars think, twenty-five years or so before its discovery, but not many years earlier; for it forbids the ancient custom of local worship of Jehovah, which was never forbidden before the time of Josiah—unless in the reign of Hezekiah, (see II Kings 18: 4, the phrase "high places"). It looks as if the book were written for political as well as for religious effect, and presented to the young King Josiah (25 years old) by designing priests.

THE TWO ISAIAHS

There is one more question as to the Old Testament books which might be mentioned before I go on to give illustrations of the application of the foregoing reasoning to the scholarly study of the Old Testament. This is in regard to the long book of Isaiah.

It is evident that there were at least two authors of Isaiah. The book is broken in two at the for-

tieth chapter. One Isaiah lived in the 8th century B. C., in the reign of Hezekiah. (See Isai. 1:1.) Another author lived in the 6th century B. C., in the time of Cyrus the Great. (See Isai. 45:1.) Again, the "virgin" who was to conceive and bear a son (Isaiah 7:14) is simply Septuagint Greek for a Hebrew word meaning "young woman", and is the mother mentioned in the next chapter, Isai. 8:3 (*not*,—as supposed by the early Christian who wrote Matt. 1:23, quoted from his Greek Septuagint,—*the mother of Jesus of Nazareth*). The person referred to in chapters 49 and 53, and thought to be Christ, seems to rational scholars an impersonation of the exiled nation of Israel (cf. Isai. 44:1 and 2), about to be restored to Jerusalem by the great Cyrus (Isai. 44:28).

CHAPTER III

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE APPLICATION OF THE FOREGOING FACTS TO THE STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

I. REFERENCES TO MAGIC, WITCHCRAFT AND DIVINATION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

MAGIC as distinct from enchantments and witchcraft seems to have been but little practiced by the Hebrews. The magic attributed to Aaron in Exodus 7 and 8 may have come from eastern practices in the mind of the narrator. Snake-charming is alluded to in Jeremiah (8: 17.)

As witchcraft and divination are the outgrowth of the same feeling as that which regards dreams as supernatural, a word as to dreams: Divination from dreams is recognized as legitimate (see Numbers 12: 6) from the time of the book of Daniel (written, as is supposed, about 170 B. C.) back through that of Job (see Job 4: 13, 7: 14, 33: 15) to the time of Solomon (I Kings 3: 5) and of Saul (I Sam. 28: 6.) Compare the visions in the

books of Daniel and Ezekiel. In Micah (3:5-7) "ye shall have no vision" is spoken of as a national calamity. In Joel we have Jehovah's promise that through the outpouring of his spirit "your old men shall dream dreams," "your young men shall see visions." Deuteronomy 13:1 *fol.* warns the people against the dreams of *false* prophets. Compare Jer. 14:14, 23:25, 29:8-9; Ezekiel 13:6, 22:28; and Zech. 10:2.

Next, before considering witchcraft, etc., among the Hebrews, it is well to recollect that they were surrounded by superstitious nations—the Philistines (I Sam. 6:2), Moabites, Edomites and Phœnicians (Jer. 27:9 and 10), Egyptians (Isai. 19:3), Babylonians (Ezek. 21:21 *fol.*—with which compare Isai. 47:12 and 13). Jeremiah warns his people against the way of the nations (Jer. 10:2) and Deuteronomy says (18:12) "because of these abominations the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee."

Therefore, passing to the Hebrews, we may expect to find many of them, in the words of Isaiah (2:6), "filled with magic" and that they "are sooth-sayers like the Philistines." That divination by signs was common among the early Hebrews is shown by such incidents as that of Gideon's fleece (Jud. 6:37) and the sound of marching in the

tops of the mulberry trees (II Sam. 5:24). Compare I Sam. 14:9 and 10:9. Witchcraft, too, was practised in early days. But this practice is also early disapproved of—Saul, probably under the influence of Samuel, put away “those that had familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land.” (I Sam. 28:3.) According to the early law of Exodus 22:18 a sorceress should not be permitted to live. Jezebel, however, among her many whoredoms, practiced witchcraft (II Kings 9:22). So did as late a king as Manasseh (II Kings 21:6). Micah (5:12) speaks of witchcrafts. And when King Josiah made his reforms he found wizards and “them that had familiar spirits.” (II Kings 23:24). Even as late as the codification of the Law of Holiness (*Lev. chaps. 17-26*, codified probably about 550 B. C.) we find the warning: “Turn ye not unto them that have familiar spirits, nor unto the wizards.” (*Lev. 19:31*). But the severity of the punishment of such transgression (to be cut off from among the people, *Lev. 20:6*), and the law of stoning witches and wizards to death (*Lev. 20:27*) suggest that witchcraft had been nearly stamped out at this time.

Manasseh “made his son to pass through the fire, and practiced augury, and used enchantments, and dealt with them that had familiar spirits, and with

wizards." (II Kings 21:6). Compare the parallel passage in Deuteronomy 18:10 and 11. Also II Kings 17:17. It is only natural that witchcraft should be connected closely with all sorts of superstition. The law "ye shall not eat anything with the blood: neither shall ye use enchantments, nor practice augury" (Lev. 19:26) stands close to the prohibition of witchcraft (Lev. 19:31.)

An examination of the passages cited indicates that most of the superstition of the Old Testament turns about divination, whether by witches or dreamers. The most remarkable thing in the story of the witch of Endor seems to be this passage:

"I see Elohim [a Hebrew word meaning 'a god' or 'gods'] coming up out of the earth." (See I Sam. 28:13 and compare Isai. 29:4; "thy speech shall be low out of the dust; and thy voice shall be as of one that hath a familiar spirit, out of the ground"). This points to the custom of necromancy, noticed in Deut. 18:11, and brought out in Isai. 8:19—"on behalf of the living should they seek unto the dead?" Thus the Hebrews of early days appear to have invoked the spirits of the dead up from the under-world, and these spirits were regarded as Elohim. In early times, before any definite form of religion was established, revelation was sought from any source. The very king

who at one moment banishes witches, at the next moment seeks them. (See I Sam. 28). Despite the early law in Exodus 22:18, witchcraft is practiced in Jerusalem till the time of Josiah (II Kings 23:24). Ezekiel describes the abominations of the chambers of imagery (Ezek. 8). Even when the Law of Holiness was codified some traces of such things remained.

With the growth of religion the indiscriminate resorting to Elohim was more and more discountenanced. Mental vision took the place of mechanical enchantment. The prophets protested against superstition. Ezekiel says: "ye shall no more see vanity, nor divine divinations: and I will deliver my people out of your hand; and ye shall know that I am the Lord." (13:23 and compare verse 18). Isaiah 44:24 and 25 says: "I am the Lord . . . that frustrateth the tokens of the liars, and maketh diviners mad." Compare also the Law of Holiness, Lev. 19:31: "seek them [witches and wizards] not out, to be defiled by them: I am the Lord your God." Isai. 8:19 and 20 says: "when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits and unto the wizards, that chirp and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? on behalf of the living should they

seek unto the dead? To the Law and to the testimony!"

II. THE SONG OF DEBORAH (JUDGES CHAP. 5).

This is probably one of the oldest pieces of writing in the Bible. All national literatures are apt to begin with ballads or songs about national heroes. The text of Judges chap. 5 is very old, and is corrupted: for example, in verse 5, "Even yon Sinai" is probably a note added by a comparatively late scribe.

The chief point to notice is that Jahweh (translated "Lord"), in this early bit of literature, is already recognized as the God of Israel. See verses 3 and 5. But that Jahweh was not yet thought of as being so powerful as he is represented to be by the later author of *Judges, chap. 4*, where (verse 6) he takes the initiative and (verses 15 and 23) discomfits Sisera before the children of Israel, is shown by *chap. 5: 7* (Deborah takes the initiative herself) and by *chap. 5: 23 and 31* (Jahweh has enemies against whom he needs help). But even in the early days he was thought of as being a terrible God, withal: for the earth trembled, the clouds dropped water, and the mountains flowed

down at his presence. As terrible as Olympian Zeus! It is hard to think that Israel's adoption of "a great variety of shrines and images" meant a higher worship than this of the mountain God. (But compare Schultz's Old Testament Theology vol. 1, p. 207).

Piepenbring remarks (Theol. Old Test., p. 120): "The metaphysical attribute that takes place of all others, and is most frequently mentioned in the Old Testament is the *power* of God." This is attested by the mention of the early book of the "Wars of Jahweh" in Numbers 21:14, by the martial song of Exodus 15, and by this song of Deborah.

In verse 23 the angel of Jahweh bids the people curse the inhabitants of Meroz "because they came not to the help of the Lord." But the revolting cruelty of Hebrew fiction, such as one meets in Joshua 6:21, 7:25, 8:26, is shown by the spirit of Deborah's song to be imaginary rather than real. Jahweh is a powerful god of war, but his people are not mere savages. "So let all thine enemies perish, O Lord: *But let them that love him be as the sun when he goeth forth in his might.*" The ethics of Jahweh's people are severe but not altogether brutal. "Blessed above women shall Jael be"—the woman who treacherously slew Sisera:

but observe, it is a woman who is to be blessed. Hannah Duston, who slew her sleeping captors with a tomahawk, has a monument to her memory in Haverhill, Mass. Among the princes (verse 15) and governors (verse 9) and nobles (verse 13) of the ten tribes which are mentioned in the song, stands Deborah, a mother* in Israel, a leader of the people, the equal of Barak. Such recognition of women in the early history of a nation argues well for national ethics.

III. THE STORY OF SAMSON

“The story of Samson (Judges XIII-XVI) is so full of legend that it is hard to extract history from it. Some writers suppose that it is all a sun-myth, like the story of Hercules. It is possible that it is a mixture of history, legend and myth.” (Toy’s *Religion of Israel*, p. 30.) Conrad Schwenck in “*Die Mythologie der Semiten*” (1855) pp. 277 and 278, shows how the Canaanitish Moloch, called by the Tyrians Melcart, came over under this name to Greece and “became so woven into the stories of Hercules that he passed as the

* That Deborah was a “prophetess” (Judges chap. 4:4 and 5) may be the fiction of a later day. If a prophetess, she was doubtless like Samuel, a seer. (See I Samuel 9:9).

Tyrian Hercules." Professor Moore of Andover, in his late Commentary on the Book of Judges, pp. 364 and 365, says that in view of Samson's nearness to Beth-Shemesh (the name of the place is Hebrew for "house of the Sun") his name may perhaps be etymologically "sun-worshipper." Perhaps this meant the worshipper of Moloch.

But whatever be the most probable view of the sun-myth theory, the story of Samson affords some glimpses into primitive Hebrew religion. As regards the angel of Jahweh appearing in the shape of a man (Judges 13:3) we have only to compare Judges chap. 6:12 fol., Gen. 18:2 fol., Josh. 5:13 fol., to see that the idea was common among the early Hebrews. That his appearance is "terrible" (Judges 13:6) is corroborated in Joshua's vision of the captain of the Lord's host with his drawn sword. Indeed, the early belief seems to have been that to behold such a divine apparition meant death. (Judges 6:22; and 13:22).

In both the Gideon and the Samson story, *sacrifice is offered on the bare rock*, where the divine message is received. (Judges 6:20; 13:19). Compare W. Robertson Smith's *Religion of the Semites*, pp. 116 and 378. Smith remarks in a footnote: "the more modern story of Gideon's offering gives the modern ritual." See Judges 6:26.

So, too, in Judges 13:20 an *altar* is mentioned. Gideon offered a "kid and unleavened cakes of an ephah of meal," and Manoah a kid and a meal offering. Both were burnt offerings and in both cases the angel of the Lord departs out of sight when the sacrifice is performed, thus proving his divine nature.

Such things bring us close to the times of primitive religion like that ascribed to Abraham in the book of Genesis. In the Samson stories in the phrase "Nazarite unto God" (Elohim) in which only does the word Nazarite occur (Judges 13:5, 7; 16:17), we may have another indication of very primitive religious ideas. This because of the word Elohim instead of Jahweh. In Amos 2:11 fol. it is Jahweh who complains that *his* Nazarites have been corrupted. In "Elohim" (a plural form meaning "god" or "gods") there seems to be an indication of ancient polytheism; and so we may class the Nazarites with the early religionists among Semites and Greeks alike who offered their hair to their gods. See Smith, *ibid.*, page 332 and the preceding pages.

Of course, a custom that continued down to the time of Christ (see Lam. 4:7 and 8, 1 Macc. 3:49, Luke 1:15, Acts 21:24, with which compare *Josephus B. J. II 15:1*) would undergo some

change. The sacredness of the hair (I Sam. 1:11, Jud. 13:5 and 16:17) becomes in the time of Amos associated with "total abstinence"—see Amos 2:11 and 12—a thing enjoined upon Samson's mother during pregnancy, though not upon Samson himself. By the time Numbers, chap. 6, was written, the ritualists had involved the Nazarite in purification and sacrifices; but even here the ancient phrase "Nazarite unto Elohim" finds an echo in verse 7, "separation unto Elohim."

IV. RELIGIOUS LIFE AND BELIEF OF DAVID (ABOUT 1000 B. C.)

No doubt many passages in Samuel are to be rejected along with Chronicles as unauthentic. For example, I Sam. 21:1-9; II Sam. 7; and II Sam. 12:20, where "the house of the Lord" is mentioned; also many embellishments of the Goliath story.

Using the evidence as best we can, we may first inquire what were David's surroundings. The Hebrews felt their tribal kinship strongly (II Sam. 5:1 and 19:12 and 13). It was still an age of blood and savagery. (II Sam. 1:16; 3:27; 14:11; 16:8; 21:1; I Sam. 18:7 and 27 and 27:9). Religious life is not organized—even Samuel goes to

Bethlehem with a heifer to sacrifice (I Sam. 16:2)—witchcraft is practiced (I Sam. 28)—David swears by Elohim (I Sam. 25:22, II Sam. 3:35)—he goes to his own yearly sacrifice (I Sam. 20:6)—and he keeps teraphim (household god) (I Sam. 19:16). Indeed, there seems to be a general recognition of more gods than Jahweh. "The ark of the covenant of God" (II Sam. 15:24 fol.) is called the ark of Elohim and the ark of Jahweh indiscriminately in II Sam. chap. 6. David goes to live with Achish and can consider it a compliment to be called "as an angel of Elohim." (I Sam. 29:9: compare, however, chap. 26:19). Perhaps the tribal worship of Jahweh was not yet fully established, for Elohim-worship is spoken of in II Sam. 15:32, and indicated by the speech of Joab in II Sam. 10:12—"let us play the men for our people, and for the cities of our Elohim; and Jahweh do that which seemeth him good."

But, as in the name of Jonathan (Hebrew for "gift of Jahweh") so in the names of David's sons, Adonijah and Jedidiah, we have clear etymological evidence of Jahweh-worship in the nation. No doubt the priests, Zadok and Abiathar (see I Sam. 23:9 fol. and 30:7 fol.) stood up for the national god. Nathan and Gad were ready to strengthen the King's allegiance to Jahweh. In fact, during

David's long reign his religious ideas must have developed a good deal, and the influence of such men as the Jahweh-prophets Gad and Nathan must have been considerable. As a young man he swears by Elohim (I Sam. 25:22, II Sam. 3:35); as king at Hebron he makes a covenant with the tribes of Israel "before Jahweh" (II Sam. 5:3). At his death he recalls his oath by Jahweh. (I Kings 2:8).

His chief business with Jahweh appears to have been "to inquire of the Lord"—that is, to practice augury. (I Sam. 23:2 and 4, comparing 22:13; also 23:9 fol.; 30:8; II Sam. 2:1; 5:19 and 23). He prayed when in great misfortune. (See his bitter prayer when fleeing from Absalom, II Sam. 15:31, and his prayer for the putting away of his iniquity for numbering the people, and the one offered for stopping the plague, II Sam. 24:10 and 17).

In II Sam. 6:17-19 is an account of a national feast of sacrifice in honor of Jahweh—"David offered burnt offerings and peace offerings before the Lord . . . he blessed the people in the name of the Lord of hosts, and he dealt among all the people, even among the whole multitude of Israel, both to men and women, to every one a cake of bread, and a portion of flesh, and a cake of raisins."

This was the occasion of the bringing of the ark into Jerusalem—when “he sacrificed an ox and a fatling” and danced mightily before the Lord.

At the death of Jonathan and Saul and the people of Jahweh (II Sam. 1:12) David mourned; and afterward at the death of Abner (II Sam. 3:33 and 34). In the case of Bathsheba’s child, he fasted and “lay all night upon the earth” and besought Elohim (II Sam. 12:16 and compare 13:31).

In the days of David everybody’s religion was probably as simple as his. His morals were probably like those of neighboring kings, not much better and not much worse, and would probably have been worse than they were had he had no religion at all. He was generous, poetical, attractive. He is called a man after God’s own heart; for by his zeal and administrative ability he laid the foundation for religious organization, thus achieving a reputation like that of Moses.

V. CONCEPTIONS OF GOD AND RELIGION IN AMOS. (750 B. C.)

Amos says “the Lord took me from following the flock, and the Lord said unto me, Go, prophesy unto my people Israel” (chap. 7:15). The burden of his message was,—“Behold, the eyes of the

Lord God are upon the sinful kingdom" (9:8).

First, as to the matter of interpolation in this earliest of the prophetic books. All through Hebrew writing ante-dating II Isaiah we find no reference to Jahweh as the Creator of the world. See Hosea, I Isaiah, Micah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Therefore we may strike out Amos 4:13, 5:8 and 9, 9:6 as pretty certainly interpolations. The similarity between 5:8 and 9 and the corresponding passage in Job 9:8 and 9 (a later writing than Amos) (compare also Job 38:31) is so striking that the former—wedged in as it is with no apparent connection with the context—seems to be certainly an interpolation. But though Jahweh may not have been thus early represented as creator of heaven and earth, that he was by Amos conceived to have power in the same is proved by 5:20; 8:9; 9:2.

At the time of Amos, Jahweh is still popularly considered the tribe God of Israel (7:8, 7:15—and compare 9:15; 4:11 and 12—"prepare to meet *thy* God, O Israel"). He had led His people up "out of the land of Egypt", through the wilderness, and had dispossessed the Amorite before them (2:9 and 10; 3:1; 5:25; 9:7.) "You only have I known of all the families of the earth" (3:2).

Jahweh-worship in the time of Amos was not yet

centralized at Jerusalem (3:14; 4:4; 5:5; 8:14); but Amos appears to have battled for the cause of centralization. Not only does he assume that Zion is the proper seat of Jahweh, whence he utters his voice to the nation (1:2); he speaks of swearing by the *sin* of Samaria (8:14), he attacks the altars of Bethel (3:14), and predicts that "the high places of Isaac shall be desolate, and the sanctuaries of Israel shall be laid waste" (7:9). Amos represents Jahweh as extending his authority even over the surrounding Gentiles (1:3 to 2:1).

Together with this higher conception of the old tribal Jahweh came the idea that his worship should consist of righteousness, not feast and sacrifice—"I hate, I despise your feasts, and I will take no delight in your solemn assemblies (compare 8:10). . . . Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of thy viols. *But let judgment roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream*" (5:21-23). Israel is morally corrupt (2:6 fol. and 12; 3:10; 5:12; 8:5). She is sunk in luxury (6:1 fol.). She must *return* to the service of her righteous God (4:6-11). "Seek good and not evil, that ye may live" (5:14). "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water,

but of hearing the words of the Lord" (8: 11).

It is to be noted that the old tribal unity remains; for Amos preaches to the nation at large as sinful, rather than to individual sinners. Amos is properly classed among those men of his nation who founded ethical monotheism. He understands all the phases of his countrymen's beliefs, and he urges them on toward the conception of a supreme God of righteousness.

VI. THE GROWTH OF THE LAW

§ 1. *Definition*:—In the theocracy established by Ezra and Nehemiah and continuing to the time of Josephus (70 A. D.), "The Law" meant the Pentateuch, "the book of the Law of Moses," (Neh. 8: 1). This "Jewish Law was . . . an attempt to define all the beliefs and acts of life." (Prof. Toy, in *Judaism and Christianity*, p. 239). It "was originally the divine word which came to the prophets respecting the moral, religious and political condition of the nation." (Ibid. p. 69).

§ 2. *Before Samuel*:—To begin with it will be well to place ourselves in the earliest historic times, when Jahweh was to the Hebrews simply what they conceived Chemosh to be to the Ammonites, a national god (Jud. 11: 24). "Who is like thee, O

Jahweh, among the gods" are words of the old song in Exodus 15. The whole people is holy to Jahweh, as is shown by the ancient rite of circumcision (II Sam. 1:20) and the idea of tribal solidarity (cf. Achan's trespass, for which the whole people suffer, Josh. 7:20 fol.; compare I Sam. 14:38 fol.) The religiousness of early Hebrew life comes out in the stories of Gideon and Manoah, who offer sacrifice on the bare rock without the formality of an altar (Jud. 6:20, 13:19); in the worship by families (I Sam. 20:6); in the vow of Jephthah (Jud. 11:35)—"I have opened my mouth unto the Lord, and I cannot go back"; in the consecration of the Nazarite (Jud. 16:17 and 13:5 and I Sam. 1:11). The figure of Melchizedek seems to fit in well with these early times. (Gen. 14:18.)

Apparently, the religious genius of the Hebrews began to manifest itself early. If we adopt the view of Driver (Introd. p. 144) and Schultz (O. T. Theol., p. 220), we should treat Ex. 18:13-27 as an historical passage, and hence conclude that Moses was the first expounder of The Law. Certainly, Hebrew tradition points to him as the first law-giver. See Hos. 11:1; 12:13; 13:4; and the ancient song of "the well whereof the Lord said unto Moses, Gather the people together and I will

give them water"—for the song reads, if we adopt the marginal rendering: "Spring up, O well; sing ye unto it: The well which the princes digged, which the nobles of the people delved, by order of the *lawgiver* with their staves." (Num. 21: 16-18).

After Moses came the governors of Israel mentioned in the song of Deborah (Jud. 5: 9.) Such governors must have taught a kind of Law. So men learned to "Bless the Lord" (Jud. 5: 2, 9) and to "rehearse the righteous acts of the Lord" (Jud. 5: 11). "Righteous acts of the Lord" imply a Law of righteousness, whether written or oral, among the Lord's people.

§ 3. *Written Law in Early Times*:—Starting with the book of Deuteronomy, written before 620 B. C., we can trace back a *written law* through the time of Hosea (about 750 B. C.). Hosea 8: 12 certainly speaks of *written law*. No doubt Hosea was numbered among those prophets by whose word of mouth "the Lord testified unto Israel and unto Judah." (II Kings 17: 13.) But the Lord said: "keep my commandments and my statutes, according to all *the law which I commanded your fathers*." (Ibid.) If this passage in II Kings is to be depended on there is good reason to believe that Ex. 20: 23-23: 19 (which has every appearance of being the earliest written law in the Old Testa-

ment) was extant in the days of Hosea as an heirloom from the fathers, and "sent . . . by the hand of my servants the prophets." (See the passage in II Kings). These prophets may have handed down the law from the governors of the days of Deborah.

§ 4. *The Rise of Prophets:*—In the time of David (about 1000 B. C.) the functions of priests (II Sam. 8:17; 20:25 and 26) were different apparently from those of prophets (see stories of Nathan and Gad, II Sam. 12 and 24:11). As far back as we can trace priests they are priests still and not prophets (the company at Nob, slain by Saul, I Sam. 22:11 fol., Eli and his sons, I Sam. 1 fol., the Levite of *Judges 17*, Jethro, the priest of Midian, Ex. 18). The earliest prophets, on the other hand, appear to have been little different from priests. Their successors seem to have become more and more distinct from priests till in the times of Amos and Hosea prophets and priests are in open conflict.

The first historical prophet is Samuel, priest as well as prophet. In I Sam. 7:5, 9, 16, 17, he appears as a priest. In the anointing of Saul and David he appears as something more. In his slaying of Agag (I Sam. 15:33) he appears as a prophet of Jahweh.

Elijah was very little of a priest. He treated Ahab with a high hand, as Samuel did Saul; he slew the priests of Baal; he threatened the land with drought; he acted under the consciousness of divine guidance.

Elisha collected about himself a school of prophets (II Kings 6: 1-5,) one of whom he sent to anoint the usurper Jehu (II Kings 9: 1 fol.)

When the people had become securely settled in Canaan and their ideas had begun to grow, the priesthood continued in the conservative ways of the forefathers while the more liberal and advanced religious thought was represented by the teaching of the prophets. So there arose the prophetic word which became Law.

§ 5. *Amos and Hosea*:—It is nearly a hundred years after Elisha that we reach the sure historical ground of prophetic writing in Amos and Hosea. They both condemn priestcraft. (See Amos 4: 4; 5: 5; 5: 20-22; 7: 10-17; 8: 11-14; 9: 1; Hosea 4: 6-10, 15; 5: 1; 6: 9; 8: 5; 9: 4; 10: 5). They were “concerned with no mere lists of statutes touching ritual and cleanliness, but with the eternal principles of truth, justice and mercy.” (See Ryle’s *Old Testament Canon*, p. 33). Such principles were what they meant by Law. (Amos 2: 4; Hosea 4: 6; 8: 1, 12).

Amos, with his lofty conception of the righteous Lord God, and Hosea with his conception of the one true God, God of righteousness and mercy, laid the foundation for the highest moral laws of the Pentateuch. Their teaching was taken up into the thought of their countrymen, and is embodied in Deuteronomy.

§ 6. *Exodus 20:23-23:19*:—Through Amos and Hosea we may attempt to fix a date for the earliest legal code in the Old Testament, Ex. 20:23-23:19. I have already cited Hosea 8:12, where reference is made to written law. II Kings 11:12 and Isaiah 8:20 appear to refer to the same. When I consider the high moral development of Amos and Hosea, together with the fact that the kingdoms of Israel and Judah had by their day existed two hundred years, I am inclined to ascribe great antiquity to Ex. 20:23-23:19. Deuteronomy 17:8-13 points back to an ancient custom where teachers of the national religion decide cases of civil law, and this is decreed in Ex. 21:6; 22:8, 9, 28. The state of affairs represented in Hosea's condemnation of the priests as dispensers of justice (Hos. 5:1; 4:8) must have arisen long after the formulation of the statute in Ex. 22:8 and 9; for evidently when this statute was written priests were acceptable as the regular dispensers of justice. It

may be objected that Hosea finds the people awhoring after foreign gods, although commanded in Ex. 23:13 (cf. 22:20) to "make no mention of the name of other gods." But if they did this in direct disobedience to written law, we simply have the justification of Hosea's violent language. Hosea in his idea of mercy appears to have got far beyond the rule "eye for eye, tooth for tooth." (Ex. 21:23-25). Compare Amos 2:8—clothes taken in pledge—with Ex. 22:26 and 27. All things considered, the date of the earliest written law in the Old Testament, namely, Ex. 20:23-23:19, may be put as far back as 850 B. C.

This earliest written code is the civil code of a religious people. Besides the passages already cited I note the following:

Direction is given for building altars to Jahweh. *Ex. 20:24-25.*

The "oath of the Lord" shall witness the good faith of neighbors. *Ex. 22:11.*

The fugitive murderer is to be taken from the altar. *Ex. 21:14.*

"Thou shalt not suffer a sorceress to live." *Ex. 22:18.*

"He that sacrificeth unto any god, save unto the Lord only, shall be devoted." *Ex. 22:20.*

“The firstborn of thy sons shalt thou give unto me”. *Ex.* 22: 29.

“Ye shall be holy men unto me.” *Ex.* 22: 31.

The sabbath. *Ex.* 23: 12-*cf.* 21: 2.

“Three times in the year all thy males shall appear before the Lord God.” *Ex.* 23: 17.

There is also in this early code a beginning of written priestly Law—such as Zephaniah may have referred to when he said “her priests have profaned the sanctuary, they have done violence to the Law.” (*Zeph.* 3: 4.) For example:

“Thou shalt not delay to offer of the abundance of thy fruits, and of thy liquors.” *Ex.* 22: 29.

“Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread; neither shall the fat of my feast remain all night until the morning. The first of the first fruits of thy ground thou shalt bring into the house of the Lord thy God. Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother’s milk.” *Ex.* 23: 18 *and* 19.

The law in regard to the three feasts. *Ex.* 23: 14-17.

Such is the early written code of a religious people. Fidelity to Jehovah and free access to him, wherever a man chose to build an altar of unhewn stones. Simple and reverent rules for his

worship and his feasts. Consecration of self and children unto Jehovah. More reverence for justice than false pity for the murderer. Indeed, the purely civil laws of this code display a high ideal of morality, as severe as it is simple: the Hebrew servant shall go free in the seventh year if he so chooses: he that smiteth his father, or his mother, shall be surely put to death: he that stealeth a man shall surely be put to death: ye shall not afflict any widow or fatherless child: thou shalt not take up a false report, nor wrest judgment: a stranger thou shalt not oppress. Such ethics promise well for future religious development.

§ 7. *The Law Book of 621 B. C.*:—As we have glanced backward from Amos and Hosea to the early written code, we may look forward through Isaiah (about 730 B. C.) to the elaborate book of the Law found in the temple by Hilkiyah the high priest in 621 B. C. (See II Kings 22: 8.) Save the law of love to one's neighbor (Lev. 19: 18), no new law of the prophetic kind was added to the Pentateuch after this. The Hebrew nation had to realize through calamity and long years of religious training what her prophets had taught her. No doubt the words of Isaiah had much to do with shaping the final prophetic law as found in the Law Book of 621 B. C. Isaiah identified the "law

of the Lord” with the words of the prophet whose lips had been touched with a living coal from off the altar—with “the word of the Lord.” (See Isai. 6:7; 5:24; 1:10; 8:16; 30:9). He rebukes the lying children who will not “hear the law of the Lord.” (30:9.)

In Hilkiyah’s Book of the Law, identified as the book of Deuteronomy, substantially, is the constantly recurring phrase, “the Lord thy God.” In Deut. 13:4; 12:3; 14:2 is commanded the worship of Jehovah alone. Severe punishment is to be meted out to those who are false to him. (13:9, 15, 16; 17:5; 18:20).

The book contains half the early code of Ex. 20:23-23:19; and more elaborate rules of social ethics than are therein to be found. The laws of Deut. 22:13-30 go to remedy evils which Amos (2:7 and 8) and Hosea (4:13 and 14) depict. Compare also Amos 8:5—false weights and measures—with Deut. 25:13-15.

The priestly law of the old code is also enlarged—by a list of clean and unclean animals (14:3-20), a more elaborate account of the three feasts (16:1-17), and the law of tithes (12:11, 17; 14:22, 28; 26:12). A reference to unwritten priestly law which afterwards finds a place in Leviticus is made in 24:8.

It will not be necessary to dwell upon the *political nature* of this Deuteronomic code, written with the express purpose to suppress foreign cults (12:2, 3, 31; 16:21, 22; 13:6 fol.; 14:1), and to centralize worship at Jerusalem, "the place which the Lord your God shall choose to cause his name to dwell there" [a Hebrew idiom awkwardly preserved in the English translation] (12:11, 13, 5; 14:24; 16:5; 17:10). Nor will it be necessary to cite at length the provisions to meet the exigencies of the proposed centralization of worship (12:15, comparing verses 17 and 18; 18:6-8; 14:29; 12:18, 19; 16:14). In II Kings 23 is a picture of the violent commotion caused by the enforcement of the Deuteronomic code. Compare II Ki. 23:9 with Deut. 18:6-8.

The leaven of the prophets had worked till idolatry and local worship of Jehovah were together swept from the face of the land. The word of the prophets had become the written law of the people. The conservative worship of Jehovah of Amaziah's day (Amos 7), which had not been of high enough order to preclude the rise of Canaanitish worship among the Hebrews (Hosea 2), had given place to higher things. Indeed, this Law created by the prophetic teaching of the eighth century was a high-

water mark of national religious feeling. The successors of Josiah did that which was evil in the sight of Jahweh till Jerusalem fell. (II Kings 23: 32, 37: 24: 9, 19.)

§ 8. *How Further Prophetic Teaching Affected the Law:*—In the two centuries following the first appearance of Hilkiyah's book, the chief additions to the written Law were matters of ritual and the priesthood of this higher religion. As Wellhausen says (Hist. of Israel, translation p. 402): "There was now in existence an authority as objective as could be; and this was the death of prophecy."

Jeremiah, "the last of the prophets," who tried to add to the prophetic Law the idea of individual responsibility towards God (Jer. 31: 29-34; compare Deut. 5: 9, also Deut. 24: 16), could scarcely get a hearing. He taught by word of mouth (Jer. 7: 1-15), and his prophecies were collected and put together without order by future moralists. When he threatened, "Thus saith the Lord: If ye will not hearken to me, to walk in my law, which I have set before you, to hearken to the words of my servants the prophets, whom I send unto you, even rising up early and sending them, but ye have not hearkened; then will I make this house

like Shiloh," the people could reply: "we are wise, and the law of the Lord is with us." (Jer. 26:4 and 5 and 8:8).

Ezekiel followed the more successful policy when he took steps to develop the laws of ritual. Wellhausen calls him "the connecting link between the prophets and the law." (Ibid. p. 421). He lays down the "law of the house" (43:12), "the ordinances of the house of the Lord." (44:5). He defines the position of the Levites "which went astray from me." (44:10). He describes the Day of Atonement. (45:18 fol. cf. Lev. 16). He designates the place of the guilt offering, the sin offering, and the meal offering. (46:20). The east gate shall be opened on the Sabbath day and the day of the new moon. (46:1). In short, chapters 40-46 are devoted to laws of temple service.

In the theocracy of the future, Ezekiel would revive the old rule of priestly courts of justice found in Ex. 22:8 and 9. See Ezekiel 44:24. The people are to become a nation with priestly laws: the priests "shall teach my people the difference between the holy and common, and cause them to discern between the unclean and the clean." (44:23, and compare 22:26).

Ezekiel wrote in exile. And so did the Second

Isaiah, who hailed the era of good law: "Hearken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law." (Isai. 51:7). Again: "Attend unto me, O my people; and give ear unto me, O my nation: for a law shall go forth from me, and I will make my judgment to rest for a light of the peoples." (Isai. 51:4).

§ 9. *The People of the Law*:—Then came the return of the exiles and the actual founding of a theocracy by Ezra and Nehemiah based upon the "law of Moses." This the Jews studied and cherished, producing no great original prophets till Jesus came, but ripening and enriching their thought till the ground was ready for his sowing. To this the production of the Psalms bears witness.

Josephus (about 100 A. D.) has much to say in praise of the Jewish theocracy, of which he was a member. "Moses did not make religion a part of virtue, but he saw and he ordained other virtues to be parts of religion; I mean justice, and fortitude, and temperance, and a universal agreement of the members of a community with one another." (II Apion 17). Again: "the Lacedemonians and the Cretans did teach by practical exercises, but not by words; while the Athenians and almost all the other Grecians made laws about what was to be done, or left undone, but had no regard to the

exercising them thereto in practice.” (Ibid.) Josephus contrasts this with the Jewish custom of meeting every week “for the hearing of the law.” The Jews knew their laws, “having them as it were engraven on our souls.” (Chap. 19). He speaks of the moral courage which his countrymen displayed in adhering to their laws. (Chap. 33). Of this the heroic struggle of the Maccabees is an illustration. He speaks of Jewish purity (chap. 25), and of the proof of long use as to the real value of the Law. (Chap. 21). To conclude: “We have one sort of discourse concerning God, which is conformable to our law, and affirms that he sees all things; as also we have but one way of speaking concerning the conduct of our lives, that all other things ought to have piety for their end; and this anybody may hear from our women and servants themselves.” (Chap. 20).

CHAPTER IV

THE FORMATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

NOT till the third Council of Carthage, in 397 A. D., do we find our particular collection of New Testament books adopted as the authoritative collection of the West. (See *Westcott's N. T. Canon*, p. 439 fol.) In the East is recognized to this day the Syrian Canon, which omits II John, III John, II Peter, Jude, and the Apocalypse, but includes "all the other books as commonly received without any addition." (Ibid. p. 236 fol.)

Our oldest manuscripts do not contain the New Testament just as we have it. The Vatican manuscript, assigned to the fourth century, is mutilated, so that the Epistles to Timothy, Titus and Philemon are wanting; and the Apocalypse has been added by a later hand. (See Hammond's *Outline of Textual Crit.* p. 126). Our only other manuscript of the fourth century, the Sinaitic, contains our New Testament entire, with the addition of

the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Her-
mas. (Ibid., pp. 124, 125 and 40). Codex Alexan-
drinus, of the fifth century, in addition to our New
Testament contains the first epistle of Clement of
Rome and a fragment of his so-called second epistle.
(Ibid., p. 125).

Eusebius, the father of Church History, describes
the accepted books of the New Testament of his
day (325 A. D.) as follows: (Ecc. Hist. Book
III, chap. 25):

“The holy quaternion of the gospels; these are
followed by ‘The book of the Acts of the Apostles’;
after this must be mentioned the epistles of Paul,
which are followed by the acknowledged first
Epistle of John, as also the first of Peter, to be
admitted in like manner. After these is to be
placed, if proper, the Revelation of John, concern-
ing which we shall offer the different opinions in
due time. These, then, are acknowledged as gen-
uine. Among the disputed books, although they
are well known and approved by many, is reputed
that called the Epistle of James and Jude. Also
the ‘Second Epistle of Peter,’ and those called ‘the
Second and Third of John,’ whether they are of the
evangelist or of some other of the same name.
Among the spurious must be numbered both the
books called ‘The Acts of Paul,’ and that called
‘Pastor,’ and the ‘Revelation of Peter.’ Beside
these, the books called ‘The Epistle of Barnabas,’

and what are called 'The Institutions of the Apostles.' Moreover, as I said before, if it should appear right, 'The Revelation of John,' which some, as before said, reject, but others rank among the genuine. But there are also some who number among these, the gospel according to the Hebrews, with which those of the Hebrews who have received Christ are particularly delighted. These may be said to be all concerning which there is any dispute."

Many other passages in Eusebius bear upon our subject. He says:

Of Mark: "The divine word having been established among the Romans, the power of Simon was soon extinguished and destroyed together with the man. So greatly, however, did the splendour of piety enlighten the minds of Peter's hearers that it was not sufficient to hear but once, nor to receive the unwritten doctrine of the gospel of God, but they persevered in every variety of entreaties to solicit Mark as the companion of Peter, and whose gospel we have, that he should leave them a monument of the doctrine thus orally communicated, in writing. Nor did they cease their solicitations until they had prevailed with the man, and thus become the means of that history which is called the gospel according to Mark. They say also, that the apostle (Peter) having ascertained what was done by the revelation of the spirit, was delighted

with the zealous ardor expressed by these men, and that the history obtained his authority for the purpose of being read in the churches." (Euseb. Ecc. Hist., Bk. II, chap. 15.)

Of Luke: "Luke, who was born at Antioch, and by profession a physician, being for the most part connected with Paul, and familiarly acquainted with the rest of the apostles, has left us in two inspired books, the institutes of that spiritual healing art which he obtained from them. One of these is his gospel, in which he testifies that he has recorded, 'as those who were from the beginning eye-witnesses, and ministers of the word,' delivered to him, whom also, he says, he has in all things followed. The other is his Acts of the Apostles, which he composed, not from what he had heard from others, but from what he had seen himself. It is also said that Paul usually referred to his gospel, whenever in his epistles he spoke of some particular gospel of his own, saying, 'according to my gospel.'" (Ibid. III: 4.)

Of Matthew and John: "Matthew also having first proclaimed the gospel in Hebrew, when on the point of going also to other nations, committed it to writing in his native tongue, and thus supplied the want of his presence to them by his writings. But after Mark and Luke had already published their gospels they say that John, who during all this time was proclaiming the gospel without writing, at length proceeded to write it on the follow-

ing occasion. The three gospels previously written, having been distributed among all, and also handed to him, they say that he admitted them; giving his testimony to their truth; but that there was only wanting in the narrative the account of the things done by Christ, among the first of his deeds, and at the commencement of his gospel." (Ibid. III: 24.)

Such were the views of orthodox Christians of the year 325 A. D. The views thus expressed by Eusebius came down from the times of Irenæus (about 180 A. D.). A perusal of chapters IX-XI of the third book of his *Adv. Her.* reveals the fact that he had before him our gospels in their present shape. That they were extant in 175 A. D. is attested by much concurrent testimony—the "Logos Alethes" of Celsus, the Muratori fragment, Tatian's Diatessaron, the mention of John's Gospel by Theophilus in his defense of Christianity, etc.

Between the years 175 and 135 A. D. testimony as to the authority of the four gospels becomes scarce. Justin Martyr (about 145 A. D.) quotes largely from a written source which he calls the "Memoirs of the Apostles," quoting many passages from the Synoptic gospel story. [Matthew, Mark and Luke are the "Synoptic" gospels]. He also refers to a number of things not mentioned in

our gospels: such as the descent of Mary through David, the birth of Jesus in a cave, the close of the angel's speech to Mary—all which things are found in the Apocryphal Gospel of James. (See *Supernatural Religion* vol. 1, p. 299 fol., and compare Westcott's *N. T. Canon* p. 158 fol.). Apocryphal gospels of Christ have been collected and published by B. H. Cowper, London, 1881. Justin distinctly refers to John the Apostle as the author of the Apocalypse; and a number of passages in his first Apology seem to echo the Fourth Gospel. Our four gospels may have been known to him; though it would seem from his use of apocryphal matter that the collection of books of the New Testament was still in an unsettled state. He does not mention Matthew, Mark, Luke or John as the author of a gospel.

About 140 A. D. Marcion formed the first historical collection of New Testament books, containing "the Gospel" and the "Apostolicon" (See Westcott, *Ibid.*, p. 312). "The gospel was a recension of St. Luke with numerous omissions and variations from the received text. The Apostolicon contained ten Epistles of St. Paul, excluding the Pastoral Epistles and that to the Hebrews" (Quoted from Westcott, p. 314). *Supernatural Religion* (vol. II p. 108 and p. 141) disputes the statement

that Marcion's gospel was a recension of Luke.

The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (date about 100 A. D.) contains the Lord's prayer (chapter 8): and Clement of Rome (about 96 A. D.) used fragments of the language of the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5-7). (See Westcott p. 60.)

Of such a nature is the evidence before 150 A. D. It is very meagre. Just when and just how our four gospels came into existence, and how they came to be ascribed to the authors whose names they now bear will no doubt remain insoluble questions—unless we take the titles in good faith.

There is a passage in Eusebius which may yet prove to be the key to these questions, "a tradition which" Papias "sets forth concerning Mark"; also, his statement in regard to Matthew:

"And John the Presbyter also said this, 'Mark being the interpreter of Peter whatsoever he recorded he wrote with great accuracy, but not, however, in the order in which it was spoken or done by our Lord, for he neither heard nor followed our Lord, but, as before said, he was in company with Peter, who gave him such instruction as was necessary, but not to give a history of our Lord's discourses; wherefore Mark has not erred in anything, by writing some things as he has recorded them; for he was carefully attentive to one thing, not to pass by anything that he heard, or to state

anything falsely in these accounts.' Such is the account of Papias respecting Mark. Of Matthew he has stated as follows: 'Matthew composed his history in the Hebrew dialect, and every one translated it as he was able.'" (Eusebius, Bk. III, 39.)

Now fragments of the Gospel according to the Hebrews have been collected from authors who quoted it. (See E. B. Nicholson's *Gosp. acc. to Hebr.*). It is not hard to suppose this Hebrew gospel to have been in its earliest possible form the work of Matthew himself. The earliest Greek Gospel is probably Mark, and perhaps, as Papias says, Mark was its real author.

Papias wrote about 140 A. D. (See Westcott, p. 70 footnote).

INTERNAL EVIDENCE

Strauss maintained that the truth as to the composition of our gospels must "be determined wholly by internal grounds of evidence." (See Geo. Eliot's *Life of Jesus*, p. 75 and following.)

The interdependence of the first three gospels, the Synoptics, is shown by the fact "that *twelve-thirteenths* of the ministry which they describe is left without a record; and that the three gospels move within the limits of the remaining one-thir-

teenth." (Martineau's *Seat of Authority in Religion*, p. 185.)

W. G. Rushbrooke's *Synopticon* shows very clearly that one Greek gospel story underlies the first three Gospels. For example, a comparison is made of Mk. XII: 1-11, Matt. XXI: 33-42 and Luke XX: 9-17, with this result:

"That from Mark XII: 1 to Mark XII: 11, St. Matthew and St. Luke contain nothing in common which is not also found in a slightly modified edition of St. Mark. This being the case, it can be proved by *reductio ad absurdum* that St. Mark did not copy from St. Matthew and St. Luke. For, suppose that he did so copy; it follows that he must not only have constructed a narrative based upon two others, borrowing here a piece from St. Matthew and here a piece from St. Luke, but that he must have deliberately determined to insert, and must have adapted his narrative so as to insert, every word that was common to St. Matthew and St. Luke. The difficulty of doing this is enormous, and will be patent to every one who will try to perform a similar literary feat himself."

Mark, therefore, did not copy from Matthew and Luke. Matthew did not copy from Luke and Mark: for had he done so, Matthew and Luke would contain something in common not found in the parallel passage of Mark. Luke did not copy

from Matthew and Mark for a similar reason. No one of the three copied from both the others.

Luke did not copy from Matthew alone. For had he done so they would have contained things in common not found in Mark. For similar reason Matthew did not copy from Luke alone.

Mark did not copy from Luke alone. For had he done so, there would be found parallel passages in Matthew and Luke not found in Mark. For similar reason Mark did not copy from Matthew alone.

The only possibility left is that Luke and Matthew (at least in the case of many parallel passages) each copied separately from Mark, or a document underlying Mark.

To bear out this logic it may be observed that Luke is later than Mark. For in Mark we have a comparatively simple narrative, no wonderful birth of John the Baptist or of Jesus, no artificial genealogy for Jesus, no wonderful stories of his reappearance after resurrection (that is, if we follow our fourth century manuscripts of Mark—at any rate, Mark is very brief as regards things happening after the resurrection when compared with Luke). Furthermore, Papias, while he gives us a tradition as to Mark and Matthew, affords no evidence for Luke. Again, Luke 21:20 reads:

“when ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that her desolation is at hand”—a passage which must have been written after the taking of Jerusalem in 70 A. D., and which is without its parallel in the corresponding passage of Mark XIII. Yet again, Luke 1:1 reads, “Forasmuch as *many* have taken in hand to draw up a narrative,” etc.

Therefore Luke is later than Mark.

Likewise it may be shown that the Greek Matthew is later than Mark: (1) On account of the beginning and the close of the book. (2) On account of the use of prophecy quoted to prove that Jesus was the Messiah. (See chap. I:22; II:5; IV:14; XII:17; XIII:14, 35; XXI:4 and compare the use of prophecy in Mark, not in a dogmatic way but more as liberal preachers to-day use a Bible text: Chap. I:2; VII:6, with which compare Matt. 15:7; XII:10, cf. Matt. 21:42; XII:36, cf. Matt. 22:43). (3) On account of the use of a sign to prove the same thing, in Matt. 12:39: “An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it but the sign of Jonah the prophet,” etc., cf. Matt. 16:4. In the parallel of Mark (8:12) we have simply: “he sighed deeply in his spirit and saith, Why doth this generation seek a sign? verily I say unto you,

There shall no sign be given unto this generation.” (The signs spoken of in Mark 16:9-20 indicate perhaps that these disputed verses are spurious.) (4) On account of the reference to the church in Matt. 16:18 (cf. 18:17). (5) On account of the passage in Matt. 24:15 about the “abomination of desolation” in the holy place—thought to refer to the statue of Zeus set up in the holy place by Emperor Hadrian, 134 A. D. (So says Prof. Moore of Andover.)

Therefore Matthew in its Greek form is later than Mark.

Now there are strong arguments to support the belief that Mark actually did write the simplest of our Gospels. The report that John the Presbyter gave out concerning the composition of the second gospel (see p. 77 of this treatise), and that was accepted by Papias in good faith, and that accords so well with the simple straightforward story of the second gospel, should be carefully weighed. Again, the genuineness of Paul's epistles argues for that of all the New Testament books with which they have come down. Mark may have recorded miracles in good faith—the real author, whoever he is, probably did so. Mark would have believed in the Second Advent more easily than a man of a succeeding generation. The Second Advent was

a part of the Christian belief of his day. (See chaps. 13; 8:38; 9:1.) Very likely, then, our Greek Mark (rejecting the last twelve verses, and allowing for later interpolations) is the work of the man Mark, who, as Papias observes, neither heard nor followed our Lord.

Our Greek Matthew is later than Mark, as has been shown. It is evidently not the gospel mentioned by Papias—"Matthew composed his gospel in the Hebrew dialect, and every one translated it as he was able." The author of our Greek Matthew copied passages from Mark or from a manuscript underlying Mark. He may have obtained the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5-7) and other passages from Matthew's gospel; and for that reason, perhaps, his gospel has received its present name, "according to Matthew." It is natural to suppose that the Gospel which is pervaded with the idea of the fulfillment of Jewish prophecy must have some connection with Matthew's Gospel in Hebrew.

That one and the same author wrote both Luke and Acts is shown by the dedication of each to Theophilus, as well as by similarities of style. "The literary evidence, from the complexion of the language, and organism of the style, clearly indicates the action of the same mind and hand." (Marti-

neau's *Seat of Authority*, p. 245.) But that that author was Luke, as Eusebius believed him to be, is not so certain. (See Euseb. Ecc. Hist., Bk. III, Chap. 4.) It is hard to believe that the actual companion of Paul (II Tim. 4:11; Phil. 24; Col. 4:14) would have recorded such things of him as his miraculous cure of the lame man (Acts 14:8), his miraculous escape from prison (Act 16:26), his cures by holy contagion (Acts 19:12), his raising a person from the dead (Acts 20:9) *together with parallel incidents in the life of Peter* (Acts 3:2; 12:7; 5:19; 5:15; 9:36 fol.). Yet, in the case of Paul, a man of such wonderful activity and daring, there may have been grounds for these stories. The raising from the dead in Acts 20:9 is easily explained: Paul himself declared that the young man still had life in him. Now II Tim. 4:11, Col. 4:14 and Phil. 24 (the only passages in the New Testament where Luke is named) were all written after 60 A. D. Luke must have come into relationship with Paul no earlier than 50 A. D. (cf. Acts 16:10-17, and the *later* "we" passages in Acts 20:5-15; 21:1-18; 27:1 fol.) So that Luke must have recorded much from hearsay, "even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the

word." (Luke 1:2.) This does not preclude the probability that he copied largely from Mark.

Next we come to the Fourth Gospel. Here there is no tradition of Papias to start with—save that it is said that Papias "made use of testimony from the first Epistle of John," which closely resembles the writing of the author of the Fourth Gospel. (See Euseb. Ecc. Hist. III, 39.) The first mention of the gospel is made by Theophilus, 175 A. D. Even the apologetic writers to-day rank the Fourth Gospel as a late one. The Second Advent idea of the Synoptics is replaced by the idea of the Paraclete. The Synoptics put the Lord's supper at the time of the Jewish passover, while the Fourth Gospel puts it the day before the passover; in which respect there is the same variance between the two as divided the churches of Lesser Asia from the West in the famous paschal controversy of the Christian church. (See Martineau, *Seat of Authority*, pp. 227-235 and compare Mk. XIV:12-17, Luke XXII:7-15, Matt. XXVI:17-20 with John 13:1, 18:28, 19:14 and 36.)

In Mark's simple gospel Jesus is said to have refused to give a sign (8:12). In the fourth Gospel he begins his career by changing water into wine—"this beginning of his signs did Jesus in

Cana of Galilee, and manifested his glory; and his disciples believed on him." These passages mark the distinguishing characteristics of the two books, as I will proceed to point out. Salvation through belief, because of his miracles, that Jesus was the Christ, is the central teaching of the Fourth Gospel: "Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, *that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name*" (John 20: 30 and 31). Such passages are too numerous to quote. I cite John I: 7, 12, 15, 29 fol., 34, 41, 50; II: 11, 22; III: 15, 16, 36; IV: 26, 39, 42, 53; V: 23, 27, 32-39, 46; VI 14, 29, 40, 47, 64, 69; VII 5, 31, 38, 41; VIII 18, 24, 28, 46; IX 3, 22, 36, 38, 41; X 7 fol., 25, 38, 42; XI 15, 25-27, 45, 48; XII 36, 38-40, 44, 46; XIV 1, 6, 7, 10-12, 20; XV 6; XVI 27, 31; XVII 3, 8, 20, 21; XX 8, 25, 27.

Contrast such doctrine with the teaching of the Synoptics, and judge which is theology and which is the religion of Jesus of Nazareth. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven: but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven" (Matt. 7: 21). Consider these passages in Mark: "repent ye and

believe in the gospel" (*not*, "that I am the Christ"), I: 15; the parable of the sower, IV: 14 fol.; the nature of the kingdom of God, IV 26-32; "and they went out and preached that men should repent," VI: 12; "whosoever shall lose his life for my sake *and the gospel's* shall save it," VIII 35 and compare X: 29; "Suffer the little children to come unto me . . . for of such is the kingdom of God," X 14; "why callest thou me god?" X: 18; "whosoever would become great among you, shall be your servant," X 43; "the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many," X 45; "Have faith *in God*," XI 22; "There is none other commandment greater than these," XII 31; "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" XV 34.

There are, indeed, numerous passages showing the *tendency* even at the early date of Mark's Gospel to deify Jesus, as he is deified in the Fourth Gospel: E. g. Mk. I: 1, 24, 34; II: 10; III: 11; IV: 41; V: 7; VIII: 29, 38; IX: 7, 9, 12, 38, 41; X: 47; XIII: 6, 9, 22, 26, 32; XV: 32, 39. But *belief* in such deification is not as yet made the test of faith.

I do not believe that Jesus preached that belief in his divine sonship was requisite to salvation. The sort of belief, or faith, which he preached is illus-

trated in Mark IX: 23—"All things are possible to him that believeth" (cf. V: 36); also, "Go thy way; thy faith hath made thee whole," X: 52.

The Fourth Gospel, then, is the furthest from the real Jesus. It is the doctrinal product of early Christians written to persuade people that "Jesus is the Christ."

Begin with Paul's simple, straightforward account of his adventures in II Cor. XI, and by the time the Acts of the Apostles was written he is performing miracles. Begin with the spoken word of Jesus, whom they understood not, "and were afraid to ask him" (Mk. IX: 32); and, passing through the pure teaching of the sermon on the mount and Mark's simple miracle stories, in the Fourth Gospel we find a God in disguise, proving his nature that men may be sound in their theology.

NEW TESTAMENT EPISTLES

Thus we should be led on to the consideration of the Epistles of the New Testament, and the Book of Revelation, which contains the punishment for him who would add to or subtract from the words of the prophecy of this book. (Rev. 22: 18-19.) We have already noted the doubt which the early church historian Eusebius throws upon the

genuineness of this part of the New Testament. But the great epistles of Paul the apostle remain unquestioned. Here, then (for example, in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians where he speaks of Christ's resurrection, in a spiritual sense, perhaps, chap. 15; and of the Lord's Supper, chap. 11), we have historical testimony of a date probably preceding the writing of Mark.

Without going through with the discussion of the rest of the New Testament, we can now try to trace out the truth about the great central character, Jesus of Nazareth, from the testimony at hand.

CHAPTER V

THE HISTORY OF JESUS AS PRESENTED BY THE STUDY OF FACTS

BEFORE Christ's coming, the Messiah was expected by the Jews. Not to speak of the national anticipation of the victory of the religion of Israel (see *Isai. chaps. 40-55*), there were two important documents current perhaps in the days of Jesus, which gave evidence as to the "Messianic Expectation," as scholars phrase it.

The first of these is the detailed account of the Messiah in the Psalter of Solomon, chap. 17: 23-51. This Psalter, found only in the Septuagint, was unquestionably written in Hebrew, and is one of our few sources for the history of the Messianic hope. (So says Prof. Moore of Andover Theol. Seminary.) The passage in question is:

"Look upon them, O Lord, and set up over them their king, son of David, at the time when thou, who art God, seest fit, that thy son may rule over Israel.

And gird him with strength to break in pieces

unrighteous rulers. Cleanse Jerusalem from nations who destroy her in haughtiness. With wisdom, with justice, may he cut sinners off from inheritance. May he break in pieces the sinner's arrogance like a potter's vessels. With a rod of iron may he annihilate all their foundation. May he destroy lawless nations by the word of his mouth," etc., etc.

The second document in question is the Similitudes of the Book of Enoch, comprising chapters 37-70. These chapters have many points of contact with the New Testament. They plainly represent a Jewish idea of the Messiah, who, after Daniel, chap. 7: 13, is called Son-of-Man. The use of the phrase by Jesus may have come from this writing. (So thinks Prof. Moore of Andover.)

I note the following extracts from the Similitudes:

(Chap. 46): "And there I saw one who had a head of days, and his head was white like wool, and with him was another being whose countenance was full of graciousness, like one of the holy angels. And I asked the angel who went with me and showed me all the hidden things concerning that Son of Man . . . this Son of Man whom thou hast seen will arouse the kings and the mighty ones from their couches and the strong ones from their thrones, and will loosen the reins of the strong and grind to powder the teeth of the sinners. . . ."

(Chapter 47—compare passages in the Book of Revelation):

“In those days will the holy ones who dwell above in the heavens unite with one voice and supplicate and intercede and laud and give thanks and bless the name of the Lord of Spirits on account of the blood of the righteous which has been shed, and the prayer of the righteous that it may not be in vain before the Lord of Spirits, that judgment may be done unto them, and that they may not have to suffer forever. And in those days I saw the Head of Days when he had seated himself on the throne of his glory, and the books of the living were opened before Him, and His whole host which is in heaven above and around Him stood before Him,” etc.

Jesus of Nazareth came and taught. In the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5-7), one of the most authentic of New Testament documents, we have the spirit of his teaching. “I came not to destroy, but to fulfill”—to give the golden rule for the harsh laws of old-fashioned justice, to bid men to pray to “our Father” in secret, to be anxious about no worldly thing but to seek the kingdom of God, and to do the will of our heavenly Father.

Jesus was crucified and buried. His followers scattered; rallied; gained adherents. Stephen suffered a martyr’s death, Paul standing by consenting

to it. Paul repented, being called by a heavenly voice to preach the gospel to all the world. He wrote of the appearance of Christ after death (I Cor. 15).

So the Galilean conquered. He became deified. His return was expected, on clouds of glory: "they shall see the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory" (Matt. 24:30). See Matt. 24 and 25; also, Matt. 10:23 and 13:39-49 and 16:26-28 and 19:28. Compare Mark 13 and Luke 21; and see also Mark 8:38 and 9:1; Luke 17:20-21 and 9:26 and 27. Paul wrote of the Second Advent I Cor. 10:11, I Cor. 7:29-31, I Cor. 4:5, I Cor. 1:4-8, II Thess. 1:7-10, Phil. 1:6 and 4:5, I Tim. 6:13 and 14, II Tim. 4:1. Compare epistles by other writers: I Peter 4:7, James 5:7-9, I John 2:18 and I John 2:28. So that the historian Gibbon is amply justified in saying (chap. XV of the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*): "It was universally believed [among Christians] that the end of the world and the kingdom of heaven were at hand." "The near approach of this wonderful event had been predicted by the apostles."

What wonder that by the middle of the second century A. D. the great teacher of divine truth had become deified, and Mary his mother raised to

sainthood? That all the marvelous stories found in the Gospels, of turning water to wine, of reappearance to doubting Thomas, of escape from Herod the Great who slew the infants, had been written down?

Finally the heathen world, through the Jewish synagogues scattered in foreign lands and visited by such men as Paul, heard the great name of Christ. But Christianity was brought into the world in a very quiet way. For a century the Pagan world hardly knew what had happened, so that if you look for references to Jesus in the authors of the period you will find hardly a trace of him. The great Roman historian Tacitus, writing about 100 A. D., gives an account of Nero's persecution of the mischievous sect called Christians, who derived their name and origin from a man who suffered death by the sentence of Pontius Pilate, governor of Judea. (Bk. 15, chap. 44.) There are only some half dozen other references to Christ in early Pagan authors, very brief and of little interest.

The kingdom of God grew as quietly as a mustard seed. In the early days it was of no credit to be called a Christian. Sometimes it meant an ignominious death. People of wealth and position, the brilliant authors and society leaders of the day,

didn't care to consider the new superstition—for superstition they probably called it if they heard of Christianity at all. To them it meant the acceptance of the belief that Jesus, a person crucified in Judea, was the Christ—whatever that might mean. For it was not generally understood among Greeks and Romans that the Jews had been expecting the Messiah [the Hebrew word for Christ] and that the followers of Jesus proclaimed that in his person the Messiah had come. This is the theme of the Gospel of John and the first Epistle of John. "Who is the liar," says the Epistle, "but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ?" The author of Matthew tries to fit the life of Jesus into the prophecies of the Old Testament. To a Jew such theological questions meant something. But to a cultivated Greek or a Roman it was only a family quarrel in the house of Israel that meant nothing to outsiders. A few plain people, who, having no great intellectual pride, waived the matter of theology, listened to the main teaching of this new sect of Christians, and believed that the religion of love does come from God.

The Roman author Pliny the younger, when he visited the Province of Bithynia in Asia Minor, wrote home to his emperor, Trajan, about this obscure sect of Christians, whose meetings were caus-

ing the government some anxiety. This was about 80 years after the crucifixion of Jesus. Pliny reports that Christians brought before him for trial affirmed:

“That they were accustomed to assemble on a stated day, before light, and sing among themselves, alternately, a hymn to Christ, as if God; and to bind themselves by an oath, not to any wickedness, but that they would not commit theft, nor robbery, nor adultery, that they would not falsify their word, nor when called upon, deny a pledge committed to them; which things having been enacted, it was the custom for them to separate and again come together to partake of food, a meal eaten in common.”

CHAPTER VI

THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST

ORIGEN said (first half of third century A. D.) "there were two sorts of Ebionites; some who believed Jesus to have been born of a virgin, as we do; some who supposed Jesus to be born as other men are."* And the great scholar Lardner said: "We cannot deny that there were some believers who supposed Jesus to have been born as other men."*

If we accept at face value the simple words of Mark, "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, and brother of James," etc. (Mark 6: 3), and the corresponding passages in Matthew and John, "Is not this the carpenter's son" (Matt. 13: 55), "Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph" (John 6: 42)—if we accept these passages as authentic, the origin of Jesus appears as natural as that of George Washington. And there is then some significance in the genealogy found in the first chapter of Matthew and ending thus: "Jacob begat Joseph the

* (See Lardner's Works, Vol. VI, pp. 382 and 383.)

husband of Mary of whom was born Jesus" (Matt. 1:16). On the other hand, those who make history of the legends regarding the miraculous birth of Jesus must be held responsible for the fanciful and fortunately unprovable theory that Jesus was an illegitimate child. There is sanity and wisdom in the Unitarian doctrine that the origin of Jesus was as natural and as pure as the origin of George Washington.

Now Unitarians are charged with denying the divinity of Christ. They ought rather to be charged with affirming the divinity of all souls. The difficulty is that they believe Jesus Christ to have come of human parentage. Admit that the introductory chapters of Matthew and Luke are legendary and you become virtually a Unitarian.

He who appeared to Paul on the road to Damascus, whom he believed to have been "born of a woman" (Gal. 4:4), "of the seed of David according to the flesh" (Rom. 1:3), had manifested in his life the spirit of God, although he became accursed through death on the cross. (See Deuteronomy 21:23 and compare Gal. 3:13.) "As many as are led by the spirit of God, these are sons of God." (Romans 8:14.) So Christ was in this sense the son of God. Even the Greek poet had said: "we are his offspring." (Acts 17:28.)

Paul said: "Because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father." (Galatians 4:6.)

But I will not try to prove that Paul was a Unitarian, although I believe he was not a Trinitarian. The Trinity, I suppose, was a product of Greek speculative thought, and had no place in the simple faith of Jesus himself. Pharisaical doctrine formed no part of his creed—his faith was the belief in the Fatherhood of God. The penitent publican was in his eyes more holy than the self-righteous Pharisee. The meek, the merciful, the peacemakers, those who hunger and thirst after righteousness, the pure in heart—such ones shall be called sons of God, such ones shall see the Father.

In the earliest Christian times there were Christians who believed that Jesus came of human parentage. But church organizations built upon the more mysterious doctrines. When Constantine made a written constitution for the church an anathema was provided for all heretics who might not believe as the majority of the bishops voted. Jesus was voted to have been the one Lord, the only begotten of the Father, God from God, very God begotten not made. But instead of quieting the heretics, the Nicene creed was the beginning of fierce ecclesiastical antagonisms in the Eastern church which

lasted till the Mohammedans came to end with the sword such theological Christianity. *The Western Church* under the leadership of Rome was not much concerned with the hair-splitting arguments of Greek Christianity, but built solid foundations on principles of tolerance. By the middle of the fifth century, the Roman bishop had attained such authority that he could teach doctrine to the whole of Christendom. Leo I (about 450 A. D.) was the first Roman bishop who can properly be called a Pope. At the council of Chalcedon his views as to the nature of Christ were adopted, and they form the basis of Christian belief to this day. He said that there was in Christ a union of the divine and the human, making one nature which we can not understand: that this is a matter not to be determined by philosophy, but to be shown by Scripture and to be accepted on faith.

The union of divine and human in one nature which we cannot understand—this is the belief of Unitarians to-day; and if Unitarians have reached the conclusion that there is the same kind of union of divine and human in every person, it is because the leaders of their churches have exercised themselves in the study of Scripture and have faith in the soundness of reason.

If we go back to the New Testament for evi-

dence concerning Jesus we have an authority higher than papal decrees or majority votes. Paul bears incontrovertible evidence as to the great influence of Jesus of Nazareth. He also bears evidence to the resurrection of Christ, though in precisely what sense it is hard to determine. Was the appearance to Cephas and the twelve, to the five hundred brethren at once, to James, to all the apostles, "and last of all, as unto one born out of due time, unto me also"—were these phenomena to be paralleled in the experience of other religious people, or something peculiarly divine? (cf. I Cor. 15). Paul also laid the foundation for church doctrines. He had been trained a Pharisee, and was skilled in matters of the Jewish law. Once converted to Christianity he brought with him not only his zeal, but his facility for Scriptural interpretation and for theorizing, also. His beloved master became for him the especial Son of God. A Greek poet had truly said that all men are his offspring; and "as many as are led by the spirit of God, these are sons of God," said Paul. But further: Jesus is the Christ, the Anointed One, the Second Adam faith in whom was to abrogate the divine law of Moses and give the freedom that is in Christ (*Rom.* 5). A modern world which denies that Moses wrote the Pentateuch and which regards the story of

Adam and Eve merely as an allegory can not but be relieved to turn from the theology of Paul to the simple soul-religion of Jesus himself.

Thus we turn from church councils where the majority ruled, and from the testimony of the first great Christian missionary to the gospels. A little study of the gospels brings to light an important fact: namely, that the first three gospels, the synoptics as they are called, contain a narrative of Jesus' ministry, while the Fourth Gospel is largely doctrinal. It was "written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name." Every page of the book aims to teach this doctrine. There is a little book called "Children of God and Union with Christ" recently sent out under the auspices of the Rev. John Hall of New York, and intended to arouse people unsound in doctrine to a sense of their mortal danger of hell-fire. If we examine the texts cited in the end of the little book, we find that the majority of them were taken from the Fourth Gospel. One of these texts reads: "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." Another reads: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life": but for some reason the words that immediately follow in the gospel have been omitted. The full gospel reading is: "He that believeth on

the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not [or, as exegetes prefer, "*obeyeth not*"] the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." (John 3:36.)

Now, I should be the last to deny that many a soul has found salvation by adhering to the doctrines of the Fourth Gospel. But I believe that such a passage as this is unchristian, untrue to the character of him who taught: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." (Matt. 7:21.) When we look into the history of the Fourth Gospel it turns out to be very doubtful what the origin of that gospel was.

It seems safer to turn to the synoptics for the best account of Jesus and his teaching. Here we find little that is doctrinal. His divinity the teacher does not need to prove. When asked by what authority he doeth these things, he asks by what authority John the Baptist came preaching. (Mark 11:30.) There are, indeed, many things in the synoptics which go to support the doctrinal teaching of the Fourth Gospel. There is the text at the end of Matthew: "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth"—but we distrust the historical value of the conclusion of Matthew as we

distrust the historical value of the beginning. There is the text imbedded in the body of the gospel: "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father save the Son and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him." (Matt. 11:27.) But this accords rather with the stories of the miraculous birth than with the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount.

Treat the gospels as we treat the Old Testament—make due allowance for stories of the marvellous and the products of oriental imagination—and we arrive at a religion which is summed up in the words, "love to God and man." *This* I believe to have been the religion of Jesus. In teaching this pure religion he proved himself to have been divine, gifted with a deeper insight into truth than belonged to Pharisee or Sadducee.

That he claimed for himself a peculiar divinity different in kind as well as in degree from that of his followers does not appear to be attested on trustworthy evidence. Indeed, we have in the synoptics a bit of evidence to the contrary: "whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him, but whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit it shall not be forgiven." (Matt. 12:32.) Or consider the parallel passages

in Mark and Luke which read: "Good master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life? And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? None is good save one, even God." (Mark 10:17 and 18; Luke 18:18 and 19.)

To be sure, the oldest text of Matthew reads: "Master what *good thing* shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, Why askest thou me *concerning that which is good?* One there is who is good." (Matt. 19:16 and 17.)

Now if we act on the principle of Dr. Ezra Abbot, that in the case of differing paralleled passages in the three synoptics, Mark represents the source from which the gospels of Luke and Matthew drew, we find that in the case in hand the objectionable words, "Why callest thou me good?" are not only confirmed by Luke, but are probably the basis of the text in Matthew. The writer in Matthew appears to have changed the words about—instead of "*Good master, what shall I do*" he wrote "Master what good thing shall I do." And in adapting the rest of the passage he spoiled the sense: "Why askest thou me concerning that which is good? One there is who is good." I must believe that Mark and Luke are right. This is what the scribe must have thought who penned the Greek text

from which King James's Version was taken. In King James's Version all three passages read alike.

"Why callest thou me good? none is good save one, even God." Here then, connected with a passage of evident authenticity, a passage bearing all the marks of an actual reminiscence of Jesus' teaching, we have a disclaimer from Jesus of any pretensions to especial divinity. He points the questioner to the One great Good—God. This seems perfectly in keeping with the character of the Son of Man who had "not where to lay his head." If this view of the divinity of Christ be correct, such language makes Jesus only the more divine. But if the special divinity of Christ be maintained, those who ask us to accept this doctrine or call Christ an impostor must tell us why Jesus imposed on his followers by such pretended humility.

"Impostor"—we do wrong to indulge in such terms when dealing with the doubting Nathanaëls of to-day.

Need we ask what Jesus himself would have us believe concerning his divinity? Certainly he believed that God was his Father: but he taught men to pray *Our* Father. He taught with authority—but so did John the Baptist, and so did those who penned the Law and the Prophets of Hebrew Scripture. He loved the publicans and sinners and his

own enemies; and shed his influence as generously as sunshine, which blesses both the just and the unjust. When he died it was not to maintain any *doctrine* of his divinity. Had it been so, his gospel would have become a theology—as many learned but foolish men have endeavored to make it. He offered up his own divine life freely, not asking to be crowned King of the Jews, but saying simply, “The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe in the gospel.” (Mark 1:15.) No wonder that such unselfish love could conquer the fanaticism of a Paul, and merit the name, Son of God.

Perhaps he realized the greatness of his mission—to transmit to future centuries the pure faith in God which his nation had cherished during centuries past—to free religion from the externalities of Scribe and Pharisee—to fulfill the law and the prophets—and so to put into the hearts of men the leaven that would leaven the whole fabric of human society. It was the grandest mission that ever man had, and he fulfilled it faithfully, even unto death.

It would have been strange if philosophy had not seen in the great-souled Galilean the Son of Heaven’s King come down to earth.

We look up at the stars, and wonder who the

saviors of souls in other planets and other systems may have been. We turn our thoughts back to earth, and find in many a heathen heart the Christ-like spirit. At last we recognize that all souls have a spark of the same divinity that glowed in Christ's heart. And so we deny Christ's divinity? Not at all—we recognize that God is our Father, as Christ taught. *We affirm the divinity of all souls.* It is true that some souls do not accept their heritage of divine truth and love. We are weak, and the struggle of life is hard. Not a saint but would say "Why callest thou me good?" We need the encouragement of friends and loved ones. We need inspiration from our great Master. So as long as the earth endures there will be men called Christians. The divinity of Christ will forever be acknowledged by good and earnest souls who look to him as sent in God's Providence to turn men's hearts to the kingdom of heaven.

CHAPTER VII

LIVE ISSUES

LET us inquire what effect the higher criticism of the Bible has upon life. "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter." Its first effect is to simplify things, to make life more natural, freer, nobler. We are reminded of the words of Micah: "what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" With the formalism of the Scribes and Pharisees of this generation swept aside, the nobility and sublimity of the religion of Jesus himself appears: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

Such has been the faith of all great souls in all times whatever their nationality. It was not the exclusive heritage of those self-styled "chosen people," the Jews. Our own ancestors in the forests

of Saxony revered the great All-Father. Noble Greeks and Romans were as true to a neighbor as ever Jew was. Centuries before the Christian era India and China were not without the light of true religion. In all lands at all times the warfare between flesh and spirit goes on. The vital power of Christ's gospel is essentially the same as the vital power of every gospel—the appeal it makes to our higher instincts. Of all gospels Christ's has been the most elevating because his personality was greater, more spiritual, than that of other prophets. The Higher Criticism establishes this simple fact, clears the air of the mists and fogs of theology, and leaves us in the pure atmosphere of truth.

The Higher Criticism dispels that brood of sanctimonious thoughts which make their appeal to our inherited religious prejudices but which we know in our hearts to be evil. Take, for example, this idea of a "chosen people." In the economy of Nature it may have been fortunate that the Hebrews regarded themselves as God's chosen people; for from the stem of Jesse sprang the supreme religious genius of the human race. But it was the chosen people who rejected Jesus. The Germans to-day are obsessed with the idea that they are God's

chosen people, ordained to give *kultur* to the earth. Heaven defend us from the deceit, brutality, and tyranny of the Prussians! We Americans feel that *we* are the chosen people. Let us hope that we may preserve the freedom we have inherited and transmit it to posterity. But let us not lull ourselves to sleep with the comforting thought that we are God's chosen people and that therefore He will take care of us. Let us rather trust in God and keep our powder dry. A chosen people should not be self-chosen. God's chosen people must necessarily be good people, and good people everywhere, of whatever nationality, are God's people.

Take this idea of the sacredness of the Sabbath. "Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy"—it is one of the ten commandments of Moses. Jesus said, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." If we keep every day of the seven holy, it will not be necessary to join the Seventh Day Adventists. Let us free ourselves of the superstition that God transmitted His commandments to Moses on tables of stone. His commandments are written in the human heart. No church or priest should scare us with a bug-a-boo when we have graduated from the nursery of theology. If the civil authorities have established one day in seven as a day of rest, I

am thankful for it. It is good to relax, and to contemplate things higher and better than the things of this world.

Take this idea of a creed, in its narrow sense. Of course, in the true sense of the word, every man, good or bad, has a creed. As I believe so I do. But I stoutly refuse to repeat the formula that Jesus was the only begotten Son of God. To me this seems blasphemous—a foolish attempt to belittle God and to belittle Jesus. God is the Father of us all, as Jesus taught. The high-priests of to-day who deify Jesus belong to the same breed of high-priests who crucified him nineteen centuries ago. Is it not absurd that the noble Jesus whom they crucified has been adopted by these spiritual tyrants into their family of gods and that they threaten with eternal damnation the Jesus of to-day who will not bend before their altars?

Take this idea of God's promises. In a spiritual sense, what thought can be more sublime than the thought of God's promises declared unto mankind through Christ Jesus our Lord? Here is the promise that we may become Christ-like, that we may have the courage to be crucified, if need be, in the line of duty. But when some fanatic begins to tell me of God's promises as declared in His Word, I am tempted to tell him that God never signed

any promissory notes. Those who think He did so are likely to perish as the Armenians have perished. God's promises, like His laws, are implanted in the human heart. If we have inherited strength, He promises us long life, provided we will be temperate, and defend ourselves from the Turk. If we have been gifted with talents, He promises us riches and honor, provided we will make good use of our talents. If we have the will to fight for truth and justice, we may be crowned with thorns, but we shall receive His benediction: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant . . . enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

Finally, take this idea of the Word of God. It will probably be many years before the ministers of our churches get over the pernicious habit of referring to the Bible as the Word of God. It is the word of man. God did not write it. Even when He sent Jesus into the world, He did not make a scribe of him. Not one word of the New Testament did Jesus write; nor did God write one word of the whole Bible. Of course, the retort is that God inspired it. Parts of it, yes. Other parts of it, no. As a revelation of human nature the Bible is valuable from cover to cover—Protestant Bible or Catholic Bible. But as a revelation of God it must be used with discrimination, else we

shall be hanging witches again or establishing polygamy. The reason people make a fetish of the Bible now-a-days is that they don't study it, don't realize the fierce barbarity of the "chosen people," don't know what crimes are therein calmly charged up to the Lord. As a matter of fact, in reading the Bible ministers and people do use discrimination constantly. Nobody cares who begat Serug or whom Serug begat. We select the noblest passages of the Bible just as we select for our delectation the best poems of Tennyson, and we may then say truly, whether the author be Tennyson or Jeremiah, "thus saith the Lord."

So much by way of clearing the ground of theological rubbish. What does the true theology say of evil? Of sorrow, sickness, poverty, and sin? In vain do Christian Scientists ignore disease and death. In vain do social reformers devise new schemes to eliminate poverty and sin. In vain do the noise and distraction of civilization seek to drown the voice of sorrow. Still we hear the cry of David: "Oh Absalom, my son, my son!"

There is no denying the heart's need of comfort, solace, and forgiveness. Upon this vital need have the churches of all faiths and nations been established; and mankind will never outgrow this need. For the more virtuous a man becomes the

more sensitive becomes his conscience; the happier he becomes the more liable is he to the cruelest sorrow; the wiser he becomes the vaster appears the realm of the unknown. In man flesh and spirit are always in unstable equilibrium.

The only satisfactory solution of the matter is that offered by the churches: human life is the Great Artificer's workshop, where He fashions souls and purifies them in the fire of experience as gold is refined by fire. Because He desires man to master the forces of nature, He afflicts him with poverty, bids him till the soil, dig for coal and iron, seek for riches across the sea. Because He would have us clean, pure, and wise, He sends us diseases that we may conquer them. Because He would have us prize the spirit rather than the flesh, he sends death. He deprives us of our dearest companions that we may turn our thoughts to that which never dies. Because He desires us to rise to the dignity of immortal souls, He bids us wrestle with poverty, ignorance, disease, and death. And because He would have us realize the divinity of the human soul, He permits that worst of evils, sin, making it possible for us to destroy our souls. Because He would have us overcome evil with good, He sends His prophets to preach forgiveness to the soul that repenteth. Not that God would tempt us to sin

in order to forgive us: the ideal of the sinless Jesus shines before us. The forces that work for truth, righteousness, and love are constantly drawing us nearer to God—provided always that we will work with God and not seek to destroy ourselves. For as free moral agents we can commit the suicide of the soul.

Let us inquire next what fruits we may expect to gather from this tree of the Higher Criticism. It is a goodly tree, despite the contrary opinion of some of our brethren, and it bears good fruit.

We of this generation can hardly hope to surpass in nobility of character sainted men who have gone before us; but we can preserve an open mind and a teachable spirit and march on with the race to higher planes of living. To Christian meekness and forbearance let us add the valor and indomitable resolution of our Pagan ancestors. In the preaching of Christianity there has often been the taint of morbidness, self-effacement, false humility. Witness the doctrines of celibacy and non-resistance. Tolstoi advocated both these doctrines, and found his warrant for so doing in the New Testament. Although himself the father of thirteen children, he argued for the doctrine of celibacy, maintaining that a parent for the sake of his children is forced to fight his way in the world, and that all fighting is wrong,

as Christ has taught us to turn the other cheek. It is not necessary that we inquire as to the exact teaching of Jesus. If, feeling the burden of oppression under which his race had labored for centuries, he advocated the doctrine of non-resistance and in his own life gave us an example of celibacy, we serve him best not in the spirit of imitation and subserviency, saying, "Lord, Lord"; but in the spirit of obedience to the will of the Heavenly Father. Such was his teaching.

With the preaching of Malthus the blight of race-suicide struck America. The waste of our better womanhood is more disastrous than the ravages of war. A so-called high standard of living has been set up which is in reality a low, material standard; and women who should become mothers rush to the industrial centres to become slaves. Even professors of political economy in our universities advocate the policy that forbids marriage on a salary smaller than \$5,000 a year. Such a policy would lead to the propagation of the ignorant and vicious and would mean race-suicide for the intelligent. Let women as well as men renounce the cowardly doctrines of non-resistance and celibacy and stand with those who bear the burdens of civilization.

It is the duty of civilized man to maintain him-

self. The martyrdom of hundreds of thousands of Armenians ought to establish this truth for all time. The four thousand Armenian men, women, and children who fled to the mountains, where for fifty-three days they fought off the Turks until rescued by a squadron of French and English ships, not only saved themselves but with their few old-fashioned rifles shot more decency into the lustful heart of the Turk than was implanted there by the hundreds of thousands who perished like sheep. Sentimentalists are wont to deplore Nature's law of the survival of the fittest. How much more deplorable that the intelligent and industrious population of Armenia should have been destroyed to secure the survival of the unfit!

Civilized man must maintain himself against his enemies be they germs or Germans. Many brave men will perish in the struggle. Self-sacrifice seems to be an essential part of the divine economy. But whether we are to live or die, let us fight like men, with faces toward the enemy. Let us preserve the spirit of Christian charity; but let us not count it Christian charity to allow Turk or German to massacre our neighbors or ourselves.

Why specify other moral attributes that should spring from the root of truth? Once aroused to fight for righteousness we shall find no lack of

good causes. Let us rather seek inspiration, without which the heart grows sick and resolution fails. Fleeing to the wilderness before the wrath of some modern Jezebel, the strong man cries: "It is enough: now, O Lord, take away my life; for I am not better than my fathers."

There is inspiration in comradeship. Brotherhoods, religious societies, civil institutions and governments have been established to fortify and hold the territory won by civilized man from the powers of darkness. Let us rejoice in the goodly fellowship on every hand. So long as politics and religion are barred, good men everywhere will open their hearts to you. How foolish to try to carry the whole burden of civilization on one's own shoulders, when our neighbors are as loyal to truth and right as we. No man needs to exaggerate his own importance or to cherish gloomy thoughts over his own poor achievements when once he realizes how vast and powerful are the armies of the Lord. In any and every line of endeavor the human race is superior to the individual. Forget self and find encouragement, renewed confidence, and strength by entering into the comradeship of your fellows. Any true man, minister or layman, will extend the right hand of fellowship.

Because there is inspiration in numbers and or-

ganization society has established churches. There is every reason to believe that the disciples of the Higher Criticism should organize in order to minister to the needs of intelligent men. There are already a few liberal churches scattered through the United States—Unitarian, Universalist, Congregational. These we should cherish and strengthen, not only for our own sakes (and great is our need of them) but also for the sake of the nation. Let us maintain these altars to the true God, who is the God of truth. Let us organize the forces of intelligence. In the majority of the Christian churches of the country it is doubtful if Jesus could recognize the religion which bears his name. Where people are forever chanting about the trinity could he recognize the pure monotheism which he taught? A reform as great as Luther's is taking place. In spite of the Tom Paines and the Ingersolls we are preserving the sublime poetry of the Bible and learning to include in our Scripture the wealth of science and literature.

The day of a timid, doubtful liberalism is past. It is no longer necessary to "believe, as it were, and repent, so to speak, or be damned, in a way." The sparkling new wine of truth has burst the old bottles. Let us build up and strengthen our liberal churches lest it run to waste. No spiritual

wealth is too great to lavish upon our churches. It is right that Unitarians like Sir John Bowring, Sarah Adams, Theodore Parker, and John Chadwick should have given us some of the most beautiful hymns in the English language. It is fitting that we should have had sermons as noble as Channing's and Emerson's and James Walker's. Teachers and philanthropists we have had. There has been, and there should be in the future, no stinting of spiritual riches.

But in the matter of material riches we should be careful. A great movement can be crippled by contracting debts, by attempting to make an outward display to attract the crowd. Men who live the life of the spirit are not likely to be well supplied with this world's goods. It will hardly do to ask some holy pirate who has amassed millions at the expense of honest men to build us a noble edifice. We need to remind ourselves of the poverty of Jesus and his disciples. The church, the society, is the real and helpful thing, not the building which shelters it. The free man is not dependent upon a church building or even upon an organized church society. He can commune with other free souls everywhere—in books, at the club, in the marketplace. Hence the difficulty in organizing and maintaining a liberal church. Let us not make the diffi-

culty any greater by running into debt. Let us be content with a simple home, pervaded by an atmosphere of comfort and good cheer. The church atmosphere is the principal thing, and this must depend upon the people who compose the society. Where there are truth and good-fellowship and earnestness there we shall have a strong and useful church.

It is, finally, of supreme importance to inquire what vision inspires the disciple of liberalism. The chief objection to the liberal church arises no doubt from the belief that it has come to destroy rather than to fulfil. But liberalism offers more dazzling rewards than salvation and the golden streets of the new Jerusalem. Yet, when we substitute for the vision of orthodoxy our enthusiasm for humanity, establishing hospitals, schools for the unfortunate, social settlements, do we satisfy the highest need of the soul? We, too, must have a heavenly vision to beckon us. We may sacrifice treasure, and even life, in good works, and still excite the pity of some old-fashioned saint who sadly shakes his head over our mistaken efforts. Surely we want no man's pity. Have we not won the larger truth, and is not that in itself a more glorious thing to contemplate than all the visions that have vanished? Is it not a glorious privilege to live and fight for the

truth, to help others know it and love it? Yes, the truth is more precious than anything it replaces.

But we need not rest here. Let us look forward in confidence to the truth that God will yet reveal. Let us believe in and work for the salvation of immortal souls even more piously than our elders have. Let us believe that none of the doctrines of immortality is so comforting or so glorious as the truth that shall be revealed to us when we pass through the gates of death. Let us believe it worth while to redeem one human soul that it may taste the fruits of salvation. Above all, let us enter into immortality here and now through the medium of prayer. Let me not pretend to suggest how the soul should commune with God. But let me urge that nothing in the Higher Criticism should obscure our vision of that Heavenly Father to whom Jesus prayed.

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries



1 1012 01197 0151

