



BS511
.R59

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY. On the
Basis of Prof. Rudolf Sohm. 16mo. \$1.00.

THE OFFICIAL RECOGNITION OF
WOMAN IN THE CHURCH. An Histor-
ical Study. Large 16mo. 15 cents.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

An Outline

OF

MODERN BIBLICAL STUDY.

BY

REV. C. W. RISHELL, A. M., Ph. D.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION

BY

PROF. HENRY M. HARMAN, D. D., LL. D.



CINCINNATI: CRANSTON & CURTS.
NEW YORK: HUNT & EATON.

1893.

Copyright
BY CRANSTON & CURTS,
1898.

PREFACE.

THIS book has been written for the purpose of furnishing a concise and convenient answer to questions frequently asked concerning the higher criticism. Its province is not therefore to discuss and weigh, but to report the facts of the subject. Nevertheless, the careful reader will find the principles stated upon which the opponents of the critics proceed in their refutations.

For our facts we have gone to the original sources, whenever they were accessible. We have not, however, referred to all the works consulted, but chose those for reference which were found most helpful, or which are easiest of access. Zöckler's "Handbuch der Theologischen Wissenschaften," Vol. I, and Weiss' "Einleitung in das Neue Testament"—the former on the entire Bible, the latter in its own department—were constantly in use. In this connection the writer wishes to express

his gratitude to Librarian Whelpley, of the Public Library of Cincinnati, and his intelligent assistants, for their uniform courtesy during the preparation of this work. The library contains a most excellent collection of theological literature.

Our aim has been to give chief prominence to the views of the more conservative critics, introducing as deviations therefrom the opinions of those who are more radical. In consulting brevity, we found the task a difficult one of keeping these views separate. Some study on the part of the reader who wishes to understand the subject is therefore expected.

As, in the course of several years, we have investigated this subject, we have felt as one feels when a dear friend is on trial. And, pleased with the concessions his enemies made in favor of the excellence of his character, we could scarce refrain from shouting aloud our rejoicing at his complete vindication by his friends. To one who enters upon such a course of study with the experience of Bible religion in his soul, no attacks aimed at fundamentals have any force. But it is a constant

source of satisfaction to see that the vast majority of the critics find nothing in the Bible to shake their faith in Jesus Christ or his gospel, but only that which confirms.

Part V is a reproduction of articles connected with the general subject published in the *Western Christian Advocate* during the spring of 1893. This will account for some repetition of thought which the reader may possibly notice.

The writer desires to express his thanks to the Rev. Professor Henry M. Harman, D. D., LL. D., for the Introduction he has written to this work. His "Introduction to the Holy Scriptures" is a mine of information on every phase of higher criticism, which we heartily commend to our readers for discussions which could not find place here without changing the entire scope and purpose of the work.

CHARLES W. RISHELL.

CINCINNATI, O., June 1, 1893.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PART I.

INTRODUCTORY DISCUSSION.

	PAGE.
‡ 1. The Aims of the Higher Critics,	17
‡ 2. The Methods of the Higher Critics,	23
‡ 3. Higher Critical Principles and Assumptions, . . .	31

PART II.

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

‡ 4. General History of Old Testament Criticism, . . .	42
‡ 5. History of Pentateuchal Criticism,	47
‡ 6. Present-day Criticism of the Pentateuch,	53
‡ 7. The Relative and Absolute Age of the Sources, .	61
‡ 8. Summary of the Argument for the Dates of D. and P.,	66
‡ 9. Criticism of the Prophetical Books,	71
‡ 10. The Book of Isaiah,	73
‡ 11. Jeremiah and Ezekiel,	78
‡ 12. The Minor Prophets,	80
‡ 13. Zechariah,	82
‡ 14. The Book of Jonah,	85
‡ 15. The Book of Daniel,	86
‡ 16. The Psalms,	90
‡ 17. The Book of Proverbs,	96
‡ 18. The Book of Job,	101

	PAGE.
‡ 19. Ecclesiastes,	106
‡ 20. The Song of Solomon,	110
‡ 21. The Lamentations of Jeremiah,	114
‡ 22. The Book of Ruth,	117
‡ 23. The Book of Esther,	119
‡ 24. The Chronicles,	122

PART III.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

‡ 25. General History of New Testament Criticism,	129
‡ 26. Present-day New Testament Criticism,	135
‡ 27. The Synoptic Question,	137
‡ 28. The Gospel of Matthew,	141
‡ 29. The Gospel of Mark,	143
‡ 30. The Gospel of Luke,	144
‡ 31. The Acts of the Apostles,	148
‡ 32. The Gospel of John,	149
‡ 33. The Johannean Epistles,	152
‡ 34. The Book of Revelation,	155
‡ 35. The Epistle of James,	159
‡ 36. First and Second Peter,	160
‡ 37. The Epistle of Jude,	162
‡ 38. Galatians, Romans, and 1 and 2 Corinthians,	164
‡ 39. First and Second Thessalonians,	169
‡ 40. Ephesians,	171
‡ 41. Colossians,	172
‡ 42. Philemon,	173
‡ 43. Philippians,	174
‡ 44. The Pastoral Epistles,	175
‡ 45. The Epistle to the Hebrews,	177

PART IV.

ESTIMATE OF RESULTS.

	PAGE.
§ 46. Discrimination of Critical Schools—Criticism in Germany, England, America, France, Switzerland, and Holland Compared—Value of Critical Conclusions—Criticism not to be Roundly Condemned—Traditional View not to be Summarily Pronounced Unscholarly—Critical Considerations not Sufficient for the Pronouncement of a Judgment on Critical Questions—The Appeal to Christ—The Doctrine of Inerrancy—Of Inspiration—The True Starting-point and Goal of all Fruitful Criticism, . . .	181

PART V.

IF THE CRITICS ARE RIGHT, WHAT?

§ 47. The Doctrine of Inerrancy,	194
§ 48. Inspiration,	200
§ 49. Date and Authorship of the Books of the Bible, . . .	207



INTRODUCTION.

“HIGHER CRITICISM” is a phrase used to express all investigations respecting the genuineness, authenticity, and integrity of ancient literary works, especially the various books of the Bible. By whom the phrase was first used we can not say. Dr. Seiler, in the preface to his “Biblical Hermeneutics,” published at Erlangen in 1800, speaks of “the subtilty of a (so-called) higher criticism, which cuts into the very life-blood of Christianity.” And in the body of his work, in speaking of “Introductions,” he says: “This branch is called by some the higher, historical, or real criticism. The investigation of the genuineness and uncorrupted state of the readings is special, or common, and verbal criticism.” This we would now call “textual criticism.”

The higher criticism is not a modern science. In the third and second centuries before Christ, there was a flourishing school of criticism at Alexandria, which discussed very thoroughly the Homeric poems. In this school Zenodotus, Aristophanes, and Aristarchus were brilliant instructors. In the first century before Christ, Dionysius of Halicarnassus was pre-eminently distinguished for his great critical ability. In the early Chris-

tian Church, Clement and Dionysius of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius of Cæsarea Palestinæ, and Jerome were no mean critics.

But little Biblical criticism existed in the Middle Ages. The revival of learning gave a new impulse to literary criticism; and Richard Simon, born in France in 1638, may be regarded as the founder of modern Biblical criticism; and Richard Bentley, of England, who came upon the literary stage a little later, formed an epoch in the history of general criticism, and has not been surpassed.

Of all the people of the Modern World the Germans have most distinguished themselves in Biblical and classical literature and criticism. But they are too much given to speculation and theory, and often show a lack of vigorous common sense and knowledge of real life. Their criticism often rests upon too narrow a basis, and upon minute and uncertain points. They rely too much upon internal evidence, and depreciate external testimony. They are controlled too largely by subjective feelings, and excessive confidence in their individual opinions, and contempt for others. Some of these latter traits are found also in some of our American skeptical higher critics. We make no objection to higher criticism being applied to the Bible. On the contrary, we believe in it. But it must embrace the discussion of *external* as well as internal evidence. In many cases, the *only* proof of the authorship of a book

is *external* evidence. The internal evidence may, in fact, amount to nothing at all. On this point we need refer only to the authorship of the Letters of Junius. How has the question of their authorship puzzled the learned and critical world!

Where external and internal evidence unite in proof of authorship, we have the highest certainty. But one of the most difficult of all problems is to determine whether a book is the work of *one* author or more. We may be satisfied that there is a unity of plan in it, and of course some arranger or architect of the whole; but how many men had a share in the work, we could never tell. We may be thoroughly convinced that a house was planned by some architect, and that the men who built it acted in concert; but how many workmen there were would not be manifest. We might easily imagine, in some cases, that one man designed and built the whole.

Let us apply these reflections to the Pentateuch. If Moses was not the author of this work, who was? It certainly bears strong marks of unity, and therefore it must have had some arranger or editor who gave the material of which it is formed its present shape. Whence were the materials derived? Did he use previously existing documents? If so, how many? How far did the author or editor make omissions, additions, or alterations in his documents? Who can solve all these difficult questions? If there were four original documents, what each contained is as difficult

to determine as it is to find the value of *four* unknown quantities from a *single* algebraical equation; in short, we would say, impossible.

Suppose our Gospels, some time after the apostolic age, had been molded into one, somewhat after the manner of Tatian's Diatessaron, but without a single mark to indicate that it was a composite, except so far as the work itself might show it; and that not a hint had come down to us that it had ever existed in any other form than as a unity,—can we believe that any set of critics would have been able to show that it was a combination of *four* documents or Gospels, and at the same time to assign to each evangelist what belongs to him? Even if they had been able to some extent to disentangle John, they could never have ascertained that there are three others, and still less have given to each evangelist his due.

Suppose, some day, there should be applied to American history the skeptical principles sometimes applied to the Bible, what havoc will be made of our history! Let us take the following language of the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Let it be borne in mind that when this language was used the African slave-trade was carried on, not only by the Southern States, but also by Massachusetts and other New Eng-

land States; and African slavery existed in about every State of the Confederacy.

What will the future critics of Germany say of this Declaration two thousand years hence? Will they not declare it *unhistorical*? They will say that it is perfectly absurd that men should appeal to the Supreme Ruler of the universe for the rectitude of their intentions, declaring that *all* men are created *equal* and *entitled to liberty*, while these very rebellious States themselves were enslavers of human beings. The critics will assert strongly that the Declaration arose—or, at least, was modified—in the age of freedom!

Take another instance of a surprising character. On Thomas Jefferson's monument stands the following inscription: "Author of the Declaration of American Independence, of the Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom, and Father of the University of Virginia." Not a word about his having been President of the United States! What an omission! Suppose this monument, one or two thousand years hence, should be dug up among the ruins of America and transported to Germany, what a sensation it will make! Will they not straightway revise American history, and affirm that the author of the Declaration of Independence and President Jefferson were two *different* persons, as established by monumental testimony?

The books which compose the Bible have not all the same degree of certainty and strength, or

the same inspiration and importance. They are not like the links in a chain, which is no stronger than its weakest link; but they are like witnesses in court in favor of some great cause which depends upon the strongest, not upon the weakest witness. The great center of the Bible is Christ, whose history is one of the best authenticated in the world. He is our Great Citadel, and in possession of this Impregnable Fortress we need not be alarmed if some of the outposts are carried by the enemy. But to proceed to the work before us.

Rev. Dr. Rishell's book is clearly and tersely written. His two years' residence in Berlin has not vitiated his English style. He gives, in a very succinct and fair manner, the views of the higher skeptical critics, and occasionally those of a more evangelical type. Of course, in a treatise of this kind, the strong objections to radical views, and the answers that may be given them, do not come into view.

In PARTS IV and V he discusses, under the heads of "ESTIMATE OF RESULTS," and "IF THE CRITICS ARE RIGHT, WHAT?" the questions of *Inspiration* and the *Inerrancy* of the Bible with much good sense and moderation. This part of the work is especially worthy of being carefully read.

HENRY M. HARMAN.

THE BIBLE AND HIGHER CRITICISM.

PART I.

INTRODUCTORY DISCUSSION.

§ I. THE AIMS OF THE HIGHER CRITICS.

MANY are asking, What are the aims of the higher critics? What do they hope to accomplish? By what motives are they prompted? To answer these questions is the object of this section. But it must first be premised that the critics are not all led on by the same purpose. Some are more, others less religiously earnest. Some, indeed, have only an historical or a literary interest in their work. All claim to be free from any conscious bias which could influence their conclusions.

First in order we mention the literary aims of the critics. These confine themselves chiefly to what is ordinarily called "Introduction," although they do not exhaust that field. They

strive to ascertain everything which can be known concerning the books of the Bible. They ask, By whom, for whom, when, where, under what circumstances, and for what purpose, was each book of the Bible composed? They interrogate tradition, sit in judgment on the opinions of the Hebrew and Christian fathers as to these matters, and demand of the books themselves an account of their origin. To them the Bible is a phenomenon, or a composite of phenomena, the existence of which is to be explained. They ask, Who wrote the Bible? just as they would ask, Who wrote the plays usually attributed to Shakespeare? They are not content with a superficial examination of the problems before them, but strive, each according to his ability, to study them broadly, profoundly, and exactly. To some portions of their work they do not attach any great religious significance; yet in some cases they have discovered, by their minute research, facts of great value in the proper interpretation and application of the Word.

This seems in many respects a perfectly harmless object; but, as we shall see, some

of the most vital issues connected with the entire work of Biblical criticism depend upon their conclusions.

Another class of critics have historical rather than literary aims in view. Of this number are the oft-mentioned Wellhausen and Kuenen. Their literary criticism is not for its own sake, but in order to elicit the historical facts. To them the Bible is just like any other source of historical information. They can not accept its statements simply because they are found in the Book. If other sources contradict, they weigh, sift, and decide, as though the Bible had been written without any Divine help. There is no presumption in its favor drawn from religious considerations, nor is there any prejudice against it. If its utterances are adjudged contradictory, no effort is made to harmonize them; and one or all on the subject in question must be rejected.

From the standpoint of the historian, nothing could be more fair; and these critics are conscious of no wrong. Their honesty, to themselves, perfectly clear. They naturally

can not understand what objection can be made to such a treatment of the Scriptures. They are very much inclined to think that one who does not look at the Bible as they look at it, acts in the interests of his faith or his prejudices, and is indifferent to the truth, which, however it may contravene all that has heretofore been believed, must be accepted with unquestioning obedience.

A third class approach the Bible and its study with religious motives. They see in it a book of religion, not of history. They can not divest themselves of the impression that it holds a peculiar position in literature. They may apply all the canons of literary and historical criticism just as the first two of the above-mentioned classes; but they do not feel that, in so doing, they have exhausted the significance of the Bible. There are elements in it which can not be tested except by the heart. Some of this class incline decidedly toward the conclusions of the purely literary and historical critics; others regard them as erroneous because reached by inadequate methods.

Taking the Bible as a book of religion,

these critics ask themselves the questions, How came the Bible here? Is it a mere record of human experiences and beliefs? Were these experiences had under the direct providence of God? Were these beliefs wrought in the minds of men by the Holy Spirit? Were men inspired to write the things contained in the Bible? It is plain that the object of all such critics is to sound the depths of the Bible's religious value. Its literary and historical worth sink into insignificance, and is prized only as accessory to the embodiment of the truth of God. Hence there are those who assert perfect and equal inspiration in all parts of the Bible, since they can not imagine the truth of God in a setting of error; while others affirm that the test of the truth is in those parts which have to do with our religious life, and declare that if we admit the supposed existence of myth and fable, these still contain the precious kernel of religious truth.

The chief source of disturbance to faith has arisen from the attempts at reconstruction of Bible history. This is not the place to speak at length of these attempts; but many

are convinced on historical grounds of the truth of the conclusions of historical investigation as applied to the Bible who, at the same time, feel that these conclusions must be maintained in the interest of faith. They point out the fact that many educated men discover, or think they discover, a conflict between certain statements of the Bible and the results of investigation relative to the same subjects in other fields. To such men the solitary testimony of the Bible is not sufficient to outweigh all other opposing considerations. It is only the thoroughly religious man who will continue his faith in the Bible after he finds its utterances contradicted by all other authorities. But as these are matters which do not pertain to the faith, the third class of critics may admit all that the first and second classes claim, and thereby win them to faith in the religious elements of the Book. If they insist that all is inspired or none, then the scientific man rejects all. If they limit inspiration and inerrancy to those parts which center about the religious life, they conciliate, and perhaps even win, the

opposer to Christ. Hence, some who would take but little interest in these critical questions for their own sake, are profoundly interested for the sake of the good they may do.

The principal aims and motives of the higher critics have now been set forth in brief, and it will be seen that some are actuated by purely secular, others by purely religious motives; still others by a mixture of the two, with a preponderance of one or the other. Few aim solely at literary or historical ends without any mixture of the religious; yet with many the latter plays so feeble a part as to vitiate all conclusions which conflict with faith. The further discussion will lend increasing light, and still further reveal the aims, as the present remarks will aid in understanding what is to be said as to methods, principles, and presumptive results.

§2. THE METHODS OF THE HIGHER CRITICS.

Of necessity, the methods employed correspond in form to the design of the investigation.

The linguistic method is well known, and

will scarcely need illustration. It must be confessed that of the correctness of many of the conclusions based upon its revelations, only those can judge who are themselves experts in the sacred languages. Doubtless the differences in linguistic style between two books attributed to the same author, might suggest the necessity of denying the composition of one or the other to him. Where differences of style are very wide, the probability of different authorship might become so great as to overcome a constant and unbroken tradition. It is not sufficient to say that the same writer varies his style according to his subject; or, that it undergoes a change with advancing age and culture, or in accordance with his subjective condition at the time of writing. This is all true in the abstract; but in each particular case the critic must settle whether the actual differences are to be so accounted for. As they do not appear in our English translation, only the critical student can decide how much dependence may be placed upon them.

More uncertain still is that form of the lin-

guistic method which attempts to determine the literary dependency or independency of one book or author upon another. Here it is agreed that the authors are distinct; but certain portions of their works are so much alike in thought and language that it is easy to suppose one must have quoted from the other. The question then arises, Which is the borrower? Upon the answer may depend the conclusion as to the authorship of one or the other of the so related books; but it is evident that any opinion based upon such an investigation must be most precarious. The danger that the judgment of the investigator will be warped by other considerations is great, and jeopardds, in consequence, all his conclusions. On the whole, linguistic considerations are to be pronounced insufficient. And this is indeed tacitly acknowledged by the critics, who seek to support arguments drawn from this source by others less open to suspicion. Illustrations of the use and abuse of this method will be found under the discussion of the results attained by the higher critics.

For historical purposes the principal dependence is upon a comparison of Biblical records with those of other nations. The close contact into which Israel was brought by its geographical situation with the principal nations of antiquity, facilitates such an investigation. It must be said that the results, thus far, have been strikingly confirmatory of the Biblical record in general. As the monuments of Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, and Persia give up their secrets, the student will have still more ample material for comparison. This, of course, pertains chiefly to the political history of the Jews; but for its religious history a similar form of historical investigation is employed. A study of the religious books of other ancient nations shows that, in many of their traditions, they are remarkably like those of the Jews. For example, all ancient religions of Asia, Africa, and America have a story of the Deluge essentially like that recorded in Genesis. This fact, while it helps to confirm the truth of the Biblical record, suggests that it is not a matter of revelation. Thus the historian takes

the Bible as one of the sources of history, whether political or religious. By this method some things in the Bible are rendered more probable than they would otherwise be; while others, which find no corroboration, are rather made doubtful.

But the historical method goes further. It is not content to take the several accounts of the same transaction and harmonize them. It does not take for granted that each account is true, and that only our ignorance prevents us from discovering the connecting link. Each account is made to stand on its own merits. If it contains statements which seem improbable as compared with other Biblical accounts, or with other portions of the same account, it is ruled out. In fact, the historian dares not do otherwise. Outside the Bible he employs this method most rigidly. Should he assume that the Bible, because it is his religious book, is more perfect than other books, he would at once make himself in so far a theologian. On historical grounds he may or may not be convinced of the accuracy of the Scripture record; but as a historian

he dares not admit any intermixture of theological principle which would detract from the strictness of his method. In short, the historical method can only see in the Bible a "source" of history, not history itself. It places it upon a par with other sources, and only comes to regard it as having the quality of superior trustworthiness after it has been tested. It feels at perfect liberty to reject its historical statements entirely, or to correct them according to other sources of information. That such a free handling of the Book has a tendency to destroy reverence for it there can be no doubt; but the critic affirms that so far as reverence can be destroyed by criticism it is unworthy of reverence. And he declares that, so far from destroying the historical trustworthiness of the Bible in its general statements, his work tends directly to confirmation.

Another method of criticism, less popularly known than the two just mentioned, is that of Biblical theology. As a method it is primarily analytical, but it ends with synthesis. It takes up the separate books of the Bible,

and studies their theology. It seeks to find the fundamental principles of each author, and sometimes denies a book its traditional authorship because it diverges from the theological position of other books from the supposed author's pen. Having analyzed the theological contents of the separate books and authors, it proceeds to formulate them into a more or less complete system. It discovers that there is a development of religious ideas from Genesis to Revelation. It may place the date of the composition of a book earlier or later than it would otherwise be supposed to be, because its theological standpoint is found to be that of the age to which it is assigned. Sometimes Biblical theologians think they find irreconcilable differences between the theological positions of the books of the Bible, and are inclined to reject from the canon such as can not be harmonized. Others find all the teachings of the several books necessary to a complete system, and base the perfection of the canon upon the fact that it contains just what it does, without diminution or increase. This method, as

well as the others, may be made to do service in judging of the minutest details of the Bible. Anything which conflicts with the internal harmony of Scripture teachings must give way before it.

We have mentioned the aims and methods in their separate forms for the sake of clearness; but, as a matter of fact, they are seldom found alone. There may be a ruling motive, or method; but others usually accompany, to modify or to support the result. It is the strength of the cause of the higher critics that the application of the various methods usually leads to the same conclusions. The literary style, the historical setting, and the theological position of the latter part of Isaiah are all declared to be different from those of the former part. Nor are many of the critics rigidly either literary or historical; the majority are theologians who combine with their religious interests the literary and historical methods.

§ 3. HIGHER CRITICAL PRINCIPLES AND ASSUMPTIONS.

Some of these have been intimated in the preceding remarks; yet it may be well to formulate them here in order to correlate them with those not already mentioned.

First, the assumption that the Bible is to be judged by purely literary standards, as any other literature. Within limits, this can not be disputed; but when it is made to embrace a denial of the element of divine inspiration, the theologian at least has a right to object. A book whose author or co-author is God must be treated with a reverence not due to a purely human production; besides, the very assumption is dangerous to the influence of the Bible. Here, therefore, is one of the principal causes leading to fear of the higher critics. One of their first assumptions, if unchallenged, would undermine its authority.

The same may be said of the assumption that the historian is at liberty to treat the Bible as any other source of history. This assumption, however, is objectionable from an

additional point of view. To refer again to the Isaian question, the strict historical view forbids that the latter part of Isaiah should have been written at the same period as the former part, since its historical setting is in the exilian period. But admit the fact of true predictive prophecy, and there is no insuperable difficulty in supposing that the earlier Isaiah and the later are identical; but of course we do not mean by this that such an admission would prove the identity of the two.

A second assumption is that the books of the Bible are separate productions, each of which must be studied by itself, and that we may not in every case explain the meaning of a passage in one book by an utterance on the same subject in another book. This principle is only modified when two or more books are supposed to have been written by one author, or when there is a supposed literary dependence between two books by different authors. It is this assumption which produces such havoc with the traditional view of the Pentateuch. Three or four authors are supposed to be traceable in the so-called books of Moses.

They wrote independently of each other, and their accounts of the same events have been loosely strung together under the name of Moses. On this supposition, it is easy to see irreconcilable difficulties between the distinct narratives. If one author were supposed to have written all, we could easily imagine that facts known to him, but not committed to writing, would explain the variations. Or the adherents of the traditional view can take refuge in the doctrine of inspiration. God is the author of all Scripture, and to each writer he simply gave one phase of the truth, to be brought out in its strongest possible light. Thus apparent contradictions are accounted for. We have stated here only the practical effect of the two views; the truth or falsehood of the one or of the other we do not attempt to discuss, since it does not fall within the scope of our undertaking.

Another point concerning which critics differ in principle is that of the relation of the natural and supernatural. There are few who would deny the Divine influence upon the soul; but there are many who dispute the

reality of the miraculous element in the Bible. All those accounts of special Divine appearances to men, and of Divine interposition in their behalf through physical agencies, are, at most, instructive myths. Their only reality is in the doctrine they contain that God is somehow interested in mankind. The practical effect of all this is to remove from the Bible the power to make the immediate impression that God is near—an impression which, true or false, the stories of the miracles chiefly produce as we read the Scriptures. If the miracles are unreal, we can learn from the Bible of God's nearness only by inference. But another exceedingly important consequence is, that under this supposition the Bible loses its character of reality in general. The miracles are related as truth; if they are not true, then much of the Bible is given up to a relation of fictitious matter, without any warning to that effect.

Different entirely is the view of those who admit the reality of miracles, but who reserve the right to judge concerning the trustworthiness of the record in each case. The former

say there is no such thing as a physical miracle; the latter say we must not believe every miraculous story. The former are obliged by their principle to deny the miraculous conception of Christ, and his real resurrection and ascension. The latter may admit both; but of the latter many do practically obliterate all trace of the miraculous by their criticism. This miracle is inherently improbable; that not necessary, since the event can be accounted for on natural principles; the others insufficiently supported by testimony. Under this head fall all such questions as the Divinity of Christ, the personality of the Holy Spirit, the value of prayer, and the possibility of regeneration. Those who deny the miraculous must deny all these in any form which maintains the substance of them. Those who admit will emphasize them more or less according to their belief in the frequency of Divine interposition in the affairs of men. The same is true of the doctrine of inspiration. All must admit the possibility of it who admit the intimate influence of the supernatural among men. But the degree and

quantity of it in the Bible is a question to be settled by the critical judgment.

Still another principle which must be mentioned is the doctrine of evolution as applied to the Bible and its contents. The evolutionist may be a Theist, although he need not even be a Deist. But even theistic evolution in Scriptural matters is a far-reaching principle. Evolution might account for the production of every book of the Bible, and for the formation of the canon, without any Divine interference. In that case it would be at most deistic. More generally, however, the Bible is regarded by evolutionary critics as the record of experiences wrought in the hearts and lives of men and nations by the purpose of God. Under this view, God's providence determined each step in the progress of revelation. The revelation was not to the intellect, but in hearts and lives. Men wrote what they felt God had done. God did what was needed according to the then development of mankind, or of the chosen people. As man advanced, the revelation was made clearer; that is, God's dealings corresponded more closely to

his own ideal, and less with the imperfect condition of man. Such a view may or may not admit the reality of a revelation to all peoples as truly as to the Jews. Any imperfection of a heathen religion would be accounted for just as any imperfection in the Jewish faith, by the supposition that God was doing the best for men under the circumstances. So far as Judaism is concerned, it need not follow that the books of the Old Testament present as a whole a true picture of the actual development. The evolutionist supposes that the development of religious knowledge and practice kept pace with each other. Our Old Testament leaves the impression that, far in advance and almost once for all, God laid down a standard of faith and practice, behind which the actual practice of the people lagged for centuries. To the evolutionist this seems highly improbable. Hence he attempts to reconstruct the history according to his views; and he claims that he finds numberless hints throughout the Scripture in support of his theory. On the same principle the development of Christianity is accounted

for. The centuries preceding the birth of Christ were preparing the way for Christianity in Judaism. Christ's very Messianic consciousness would have been impossible without the preceding development of Messianic hope to which Christ's view of himself and his mission closely conformed. Thus our Lord was not so much a fulfillment of the expectations of the Jews as portrayed in the Bible as of those who lived subsequently.¹ With the scientific difficulties in the way of such an opinion we have here nothing to do, nor can we spend time on the practical effects. These depend almost wholly upon the thoroughness with which the theistic idea pervades the critic. While in fact there often is, there need be in it nothing antagonistic to the fundamental principles of our faith.²

It remains merely to state the attitude of the critics toward Christianity. That some are antagonistic goes without the saying. Most, however, hold with greater or less te-

¹See Thomson, *Books which Influenced our Lord*.

²Abbott's "Evolution of Christianity" is a good illustration of the evolutionary theory as applied to religion. Others which might be mentioned are far more radical.

nacity to our holy religion. It may even be said that most believe it to be the only true religion. Yet some there are who regard it as only the best of all, and do not hesitate to say that it will undergo transformation to fit it fully for its universal mission.¹ Of those who adhere to the divine origin of the Bible, some justify their critical researches by the results to be attained; others declare that criticism is a science, the same as any other, and may be practiced upon the Bible just as upon any other book. The results of their investigations have nothing in common with their faith, which is entirely unaffected by critical inquiry.² With such, criticism must be a mere pastime—a pleasurable employment of the mind. But, perhaps, the majority are filled with the idea that all truth is in harmony; and that therefore, in the end, no real truth of Christianity can be affected by criticism, while it may be very useful to sweep away any falsehood and superstition to which

¹*E. g.*, Toy, Judaism and Christianity.

²*E. g.*, Eibach, "Ueber die wissenschaftliche Behandlung und praktische Benutzung der heiligen Schrift."

men cling. There is great danger, however, that our very devotion to truth will induce us to employ inadequate means for its universal discovery and valuation. If by truth we mean truth which can be tested by the judgment alone, we practically abandon Christian ground. Christianity, as a practical concern, can be tested only by its proper agencies. These include the experiences of the heart. If religion has its rights they should be respected. The truths which can be subordinated to reason do not of necessity exhaust the sum of truth, since the reason is not the only human faculty capable of testing phenomena; nor is reason any more reliable in its judgments than the heart. That in which the human heart can quietly and permanently rest may be regarded as true, just as that may be regarded true in which the reason can rest. The Christian must search for truth; but he may not reject one class of truths in the interest of another, and especially if by so doing he overturns the truths of religion. The whole danger arises from the attempt to act the part of the scientific investigator without

recollection of what one has discovered by experience. But these imperfections of method and purpose are only incidental and temporary. They will be corrected as time goes on. Christian truth will not permanently nor widely suffer, although many individuals may be deprived of its comforts for the time.

PART II.

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

ALTHOUGH criticism is a comparatively youthful science, it has already reached many conclusions upon which the majority of investigators agree. This does not necessarily imply that such conclusions are correct; for in the republic of truth majorities dare not rule. And the critics themselves, who agree with each other so completely, would not deny that many points are only probably established. The results attained are merely held to be in accordance with the best information within our reach. Further discovery may make a change of position necessary. Hence we speak of the presumptive results of higher criticism. We enter first upon

§4. THE GENERAL HISTORY OF OLD TESTAMENT CRITICISM.

The way was prepared for the critical study of the Old Testament by two French

scholars—one a Protestant, Ludwig Cappellus¹ († 1658); the other a Romanist, Johann Morinus² († 1659), who disputed the belief in the continuous and perfect preservation of the Masoretic text, and the high age of the Hebrew punctuation, doctrines generally accepted and founded upon Rabbinical tradition. But the first epoch-making works on higher critical lines were those of Benedict de Spinoza³ († 1677) and Richard Simon⁴ († 1712).

Spinoza's philosophical standpoint was Pantheism, and his conclusions concerning Revelation, Miracle, and Prophecy were seriously affected thereby. According to him the task of criticism is to investigate the origin of individual books, and the history of the Scripture text and canon. Abraham ibn E'zra had designated certain portions of the law as mysterious. To these Spinoza added others, and denied the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. By a comparison of Numbers

¹ See Schnedermann, *Die Controverse des L. Cappellus mit den Buxtorfen*.

² *Exercitationum Biblicarum*, etc.

³ In his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*.

⁴ *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament*.

xxi, 14, with Exodus xvii, 14, and in Exodus xxiv, 4, 7, and Deuteronomy i, 5; xxxi, 9, he found intimations of the real literary activity of Moses. He saw much in Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings to indicate a late composition for these books. The books from Genesis to Second Kings, inclusive, form one great historical work by a single author, whose purpose throughout was to teach the words and ordinances of Moses. This author was probably Ezra; and his work consisted in the collection of material from different authors, as is still observable. But many of the divergences which would naturally thus arise, Ezra could not reconcile. Chronicles he supposed to be a very late work, written probably after the restoration of the temple under Judas Maccabæus. The prophetic books were composed of fragments collected from various sources, and in arrangement have suffered many displacements of their natural order. Previous to the Maccabæan period there was no canon of Holy Scripture. Many of the conclusions of this pioneer among higher critics find recognition even yet.

The title of Simon's work was *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament* (Critical History of the Old Testament). Into this work he gathered all the results of the labors of his predecessors, Cappellus, Morinus, Spinoza, and others, many of which he more firmly established by his own researches. His scientific and brilliant presentation of the subject lent it uncommon interest. Attention was still further called to it by its confiscation in France, and by the author's keen and prompt replies to his literary opponents. He spent little time upon the origin of the individual books, although he gave some space to the proof that in its present form the Pentateuch could not have been composed by Moses. He developed the theory that in all Oriental States there were official historiographers. The only difference between the Hebrew historiographers, who had probably existed since Moses, and those of other nations, was that the former were inspired, while the latter were not. It was the duty of these men to write out the important events of their own period, and to alter, abbreviate, and enlarge

upon the work of their predecessors, as seemed to them necessary for the circumstances of the time. Ezra, or probably still later writers, collected all that had been previously written, and out of the material at their command wrote our Old Testament; but in so doing they allowed themselves much freedom in the handling of their sources.

With these two writers the work of higher criticism was fairly initiated. During the early part of the eighteenth century, Joh. Gottlob Carpzov¹ († 1757) distinguished himself by the learning and comprehensiveness of his work in this department, and especially by his spirited antagonism to Spinoza and Simon. Special mention must also be made of the work of Joh. Gottfried Eichhorn († 1827), who was greatly influenced by Spinoza and Simon on the one hand, and by Semler and Herder on the other; also of Ewald's "History of Israel," "Prophets of the Old Covenant," and "Poets of the Old Covenant;" of the works of Hävernick († 1845) and Keil († 1838), both of which followed the traditional lines;

¹ *Introductio*, etc., and *Critica Sacra*.

and of the historical-critical labors of De Wette († 1849) and Édouard Reuss († 1891).

For many details the reader is referred to the following pages.

§ 5. HISTORY OF PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM.

Excepting the last eight verses, the Jews and the ancient Church held the Pentateuch as the work of Moses. The denial of its Mosaic authorship by Celsus and other early antagonists of Christianity was not founded upon critical, but dogmatic reasons. Andreas Bodenstein of Carlstadt¹ († 1541) was the first to question on critical grounds the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch. The Pentateuchal law he recognized as of Moses, but the thread of the narrative and the style excited his suspicion. Andreas Masius² († 1574) believed that the Pentateuch in its present form could not have been written by Moses, and supported his view more especially by the occurrence of names not in existence during the time of Moses (*e. g.*, Dan-Laish). The long-cherished

¹ Libellus de Canonicis Scripturis.

² Kommentar zu Josua.

hope that the force of the attacks upon the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch could be weakened by the interpolation hypothesis, was finally given up by the majority.

The first to base a systematic and scientific criticism of the Pentateuch upon a literary analysis was Jean Astruc¹ († 1766), royal physician and professor of medicine in Paris. Others before him, as Vitringa, had conjectured that, in the composition of Genesis, Moses had employed older sources. Adopting this idea, Astruc asserted that Moses had not even worked over these sources, but had merely placed them side by side without essential alteration. He also undertook to distinguish these sources from one another. This he did by taking as his criterion the peculiar use of the names of God—in some passages only Elohim, in others only Jehovah. Besides the two sources thus distinguished, he supposed ten others, less frequently employed, and distinguishable by other characteristics. It will be noticed that thus far the hand of Moses in the composition of Genesis is not denied, al-

¹ Conjectures sur les mémoires originaux, etc.

though he is made only the compiler. Nor did Astruc dispute the Mosaic authorship of the four additional books. Eichhorn¹ showed that the passages in Genesis which Astruc distinguished by the divine names of Elohim and Jehovah were also characterized each by a different linguistic style. This discovery is still one of the principal supports of the critics. He held that the other books of the Pentateuch were composed from documents written in the time of Moses, some of them by Moses himself, others by his contemporaries. The compilation of all the documents of which the Pentateuch is composed he is disposed to place somewhere between Joshua and Samuel. De Wette was the first to discover what is now generally held by the critics; namely, that Deuteronomy differs wholly in character from the preceding books; and to-day the critics maintain a distinct source for Deuteronomy. Frederick Bleek² was the first to assert that the death

¹Einleitung in das A. T.

²Einige aphoristische Beiträge zu den Unters. über den Pent.

of Moses could not have formed the natural conclusion of the history of Israel and their exodus from Egypt; but that this must include also their conquest of Canaan; and hence that Joshua was a part of the same work with the other books of the Pentateuch. Here, then, we have the idea of the Hexateuch, so generally accepted at the present time. Up to this point it had been assumed that the Elohistic and Jehovistic documents could only be traced through Genesis, and into Exodus as far as chapter vi, 2; but, in 1831, Ewald¹ showed that these sources could be traced with distinctness through the other books of the Pentateuch. In a short time the same was asserted also of Joshua. Thus another evidence of a Hexateuch instead of a Pentateuch was added. Karl David Ilgen² and H. Hupfeld³—the former prior to 1834, the latter in 1853—undertook to show that

¹Consult his works mentioned above, and *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1831.

²*Die Urkunden des Jerusalemischen Tempelarchivs in ihrer Urgestalt.*

³*Die Quellen der Genesis u. die Art ihrer Zusammensetzung.*

the Elohim and Jehovah documents were each composite in their character, and not the work of single authors, as had been assumed.

If the reader will take the trouble at this point to go back over the names mentioned in this section, and fix in his mind just what it is which each added to the sum of critical conclusions, it will greatly facilitate his further study.

It will be observed, also, that the principal questions are as to the extent to which the "sources" are traceable. The sources or documents themselves were supposed to be practically of the age in or immediately subsequent to that in which Moses lived. But we have now to trace the development of other new ideas, more startling in their character, because they completely overturn all our former opinions concerning the date of the origin of the Pentateuch. Before doing so, however, it may be well to summarize the results of the criticism thus far noticed.¹ *First*, the four principal sources of the Hexateuch

¹For the summary here given we are indebted to Professor H. L. Strack, of Berlin.

(the Pentateuch and Joshua) were supposed to be: 1. The Priestly Code, otherwise known as The First Elohist, The Foundation Document (Grundschrift), The Book of Origins, The Annalistic Relator. This document is designated by Wellhausen¹ by the letter "P;" by Dillmann as "A." 2. The Second Elohist, otherwise called The Younger Elohist, The North Israelitish Relator, The Third Relator, The Theocratic Relator; lettered "E;" by Dillmann, "B." 3. The Jehovist, or Jahvist, otherwise called The Additor, The Fourth Relator, The Prophetic Relator; lettered "J;" by Dillman, "C." 4. The Deuteronomist; lettered "D." *Second*, that several sections of the Pentateuch, although preserved for us only in the above-named sources, sprang from a period considerably earlier. Among these were the Decalogue, The Covenant Book, Exodus xx, 22-xxiii, 19, the principal part of the song in Exodus xv, and other poetical portions. *Third*, that the Elohist Documents, of which (see above) there were sup-

¹Wellhausen's designations throughout are preferable, and will be named first.

posed to be two, were older than the Jehovistic. *Fourth*, that P, E, and J had been wrought together prior to D. Essential differences of opinion existed only with reference to the manner in which these documents were brought into the Pentateuch. The majority supposed that one editor had united P, E, and J, and that D was afterward added. Schrader supposed that the Jahvist had added material of his own (J) to P and E, and then worked the whole together.¹ According to some, the Deuteronomist united his own work (D) with P, E, J; but the majority were of the opinion that P E J and D were brought together by a special editor.

§ 6. PRESENT-DAY CRITICISM OF THE PENTATEUCH.

The work begun by Astruc had been carried to completion. The Pentateuch was no longer regarded as originally the work of Moses. The documents entering into its composition were distinguished the one from

¹In his De Wette's Einleitung.

the other, and Joshua was regarded as organically connected with the Pentateuch. When this process of investigation was practically ended, the thoughts of critics took a new turn. They began to compare the contents of the Pentateuch with the later history, and with the prophecies of Israel. Simultaneously, but independently, W. Vatke¹ and J. F. L. George² began studies of this kind. They were both tinged in their historical philosophy by the principles of Hegel. The middle books of the Pentateuch—Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers—were supposed to be characterized by the prominence given, in the laws they contained, to the understanding, while the laws of Deuteronomy were distinguished as those of the feelings. Their studies led them to believe that the former were more recent than the latter, whose origin they placed in the time of Josiah. Hengstenberg,³ Ranke,⁴ and others answered their arguments;

¹Die Religion des Alten Testaments.

²Die älteren Jüdischen Feste mit einer Kritik der Gesetzgebung des Pentateuchs.

³Die Authentic des Pentateuchs.

⁴Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch.

their philosophy fell into disrepute, and their conclusions seemed destined to be forgotten.

But even earlier than Vatke and George, Edouard Reuss¹ had carried on similar studies, and was led to similar conclusions. As he studied the condition of the Jews, as described in the historical books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings, he thought he discovered a contradiction between their practice and the laws of Moses, and hence concluded that they could not have been known during the periods described by those histories. He also taught that the prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries seemed to know nothing of the Mosaic Code. According to him Deuteronomy was the oldest part of the law given in the Pentateuch, and the prophecy of Ezekiel was older than the editing of the Ritual Code and the law upon which the final elevation of the hierarchy depended. These startling conclusions, however, received little attention, and it remained for others, less original than the three pioneers now mentioned, to make them

¹ Reuss was much later in publishing his views than some others. See his works mentioned below.

known to the world. An earlier student under Professor Reuss was the first to win general attention to the new form of criticism. K. H. Graf⁴ was his name, and to him, rather than to Wellhausen, belongs whatever of literary honor may attach to the achievement. He distinguished the legislation of the middle books of the Pentateuch from what he called the primitive document, or the Elohistick book of history. According to him the middle Pentateuchal legislation is found in Exodus xii, 1-28, 43-51-xxv-xxxv, xxxv-xl; Leviticus; Numbers i, 1-x, 28, xv, xvi, xvii, and parts of xviii, xix, xxviii-xxxv, xxxv, 16-xxxvi. This, he declared, bears in itself the clearest possible evidences of its post-exilic composition. Leviticus xvii-xxvi contains a book of law composed by Ezekiel, later called the Law of Holiness. He was led to these conclusions chiefly by his investigations of the festivals, the priestly ordinances, and the tabernacle. His utterances were, however, challenged by Riehm and Nöldeke with such success that he was compelled to give up his

⁴Die geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments.

position; but instead of returning to the early composition of all, declared all to be post-exilic. The investigations of Kayser¹ confirmed the conclusions of Graf. But if Graf first won general attention to what Reuss originated, Wellhausen's brilliant presentation of the evidences and results of the new view won large numbers of adherents. In his "Prolegomena to the History of Israel" he designated the course of reconstruction necessary to conform the history of the religion and tradition of the Jews to the recent discoveries. His "Composition of the Hexateuch" (so far as we know, not translated into English) presents the critical reasons for his adherence to the new hypothesis. After it had thus been popularized, Reuss, the originator of the idea, discussed the whole Pentateuchal question in two separate works—one in French, *L'Histoire Sainte et la Loi*; the other in German, *Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments*.

It may be well here, in the interest of

¹Das vorexilische Buch der Urgeschichte Israels, u' seine Erweiterungen.

clearness, to point out the difference between the results of criticism as portrayed in § 5 and those just stated. The former was a criticism based chiefly on literary grounds; the latter, rather on historical. The former asked after the literary elements entering into the composition of the Pentateuch (Hexateuch); the latter inquires after the time of the composition. The former declared that Moses could not have written the Pentateuch in its present form; the latter strongly intimates that he wrote none of it. The former regards it as possible that the Pentateuch was composed largely of writings left by Moses, and not long after Moses' death; the latter places the composition of Exodus-Numbers subsequent to the Exile. The former compared the language of the various parts of the Pentateuch with each other, and with Joshua, to trace the different literary styles; the latter takes up the history and the prophecies, and undertakes to prove therefrom that the Pentateuch was unknown until a very late period, because no trace of its influence can be found. The former sees no reason why the Penta-

teuch should not have been a product of an early period; the latter regards it impossible that in their then stage of development the Jews should have produced the Pentateuchal legislation, and regards it as a possible offspring only of the later age. But the newer critical school has, in common with the old, the belief in a variety of documents as constituents of the Pentateuch, and in fact could never have come into existence without the older criticism.

The results (presumptive) of present Pentateuchal criticism may be briefly summarized as follows: The first four books are a compilation from earlier written sources, the number of which is not definitely settled, although opinions waver between two and three; Deuteronomy is based upon a still different source; the sources distinguishable in the Pentateuch are also distinguishable in Joshua, and hence could not have been written by Moses; or, in other words, a later than Moses wrote not only the Pentateuch as we have it, but also Joshua. There are critics who deny this last conclusion, together with the supposed fact

upon which it is based; but we pretend only to state here the conclusions generally received. The critics generally deny that Moses claims to have written the Pentateuch, although they do not generally assert that he may not have written parts now incorporated into it; yet that he wrote any of the principal documents of which the Pentateuch is formed they deny, since they claim that these are traceable through Joshua, which describes events subsequent to the death of Moses. At best, therefore, the critics can give Moses but little credit for literary activity in connection with the Pentateuch. Since Deuteronomy is regarded by so many critics as having been written shortly before the eighteenth year of King Josiah (B. C. 621), and since the Deuteronomic source extends through Joshua along with the other sources, the composition of the Pentateuch is placed of necessity subsequent to B. C. 621, although parts of it may be much older. The question then arises, What is the relative and what the absolute age of the different sources according to the critics? These are questions yet in dispute, and we must

therefore content ourselves with a statement of the views of the principal investigators.

§7. THE RELATIVE AND ABSOLUTE AGE OF THE SOURCES.

The reader who desires to follow all the details of criticism must needs pause here, and familiarize himself with the names, characteristics, and extent of the Hexateuchal documents. For this purpose we would recommend the "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament," by Samuel R. Driver, D. D. An attempt to present all this matter here would carry us beyond the design of this work.¹ But we may clarify the subject some-

¹For convenience and by way of illustration we here give Driver's summary of the Priest's Code:

Genesis i, 1-ii, 4^a; v, 1 28, 30-32; vi, 9-22; vii, 6, 7-9 (in parts), 11, 13-16^a, 18-21, 24; viii, 1, 2^a, 3^b-5, 13^a, 14-19; ix, 1-17, 28, 29; x, 1-7, 20, 22, 23, 31, 32; xi, 10-27, 31, 32; xii, 4^b, 5; xiii, 6, 11^b, 12^a; xvi, 1^a, 3, 15, 16; xvii; xix, 29; xxi, 1^b, 2^b-5; xxiii; xxv, 7-11^a, 12-17, 19, 20, 26^b; xxvi, 34, 35; xxvii, 46; xxviii, 1-9; xxix, 24, 29; xxxi, 18^b; xxxiii, 18^a; xxxiv, 1, 2^a, 4, 6, 8-10, 13-18, 20-24, 25 (partly), 27-29; xxxv, 9-13, 15, 22^b-29; xxxvi (in the main); xxxvii, 1, 2^a; xli, 46; xlvi, 6-27; xlvii, 5, 6^a (lx^x), 7-11, 27^b, 28; xlviii, 3-6, 7 (?); xlix, 1^a, 28^b-33; l, 12, 13.

Exodus i, 1-7, 13, 14, 23^b-25; vi, 2-7, 13, 19, 20^a, 21^b, 22;

what by stating that P begins with the first word of Genesis and runs through Joshua. P contains both Elohist and Jehovistic elements, the question being which is the elder, the majority leaning toward the greater age of E. Besides the Jehovistic source—which begins with Genesis ii, 4—the Elohist, the Priest's Code, and Deuteronomy, Dillmann adds S, the Sinaitic Law.

It is usually admitted that D is younger than J. Hupfeld, Ewald, Knobel, Schrader, and Riehm regard P as the oldest documen-

viii, 5-7, 15^b-19; ix, 8-12; xii, 1-20, 28, 37^a, 40-51; xiii, 1, 2, 20; xiv, 1-4, 8, 9, 15-18, 21^a, 21^c-23, 26, 27^a, 28^a, 29; xvi, 1-3, 6-24, 31-36; xvii, 1^a; xix, 1, 2^a; xxiv, 15-18^a; xxv, 1-xxxii, 18^a; xxxiv, 29-35; xxxv-xl.

Leviticus i-xvi; (xvii-xxvi); xxvii.

Numbers i, 1-x, 28; xiii, 1-17^a, 21, 25, 26^a (to Paran), 32^a; xiv, 1, 2 (in the main), 5-7, 10, 26-38 (in the main); xv; xvi, 1^a, 2^b-7^a (7^b-11), (16, 17), 18-24, 27^a, 32^b, 35 (36-40), 41-50; xvii-xix; xx, 1^a (to month), 2, 3^b, 6, 12, 13, 22-29; xxi, 4^a (to Hor), 10, 11; xxii, 1; xxv, 6-18; xxvi-xxxii; xxxii, 18, 19, 28-32 (with traces in 1-17, 20-27); xxxiii-xxxvi.

Deuteronomy xxxii, 48-52; xxxiv, 1^a, 8, 9.

Joshua iv, 13, 19; v, 10-12; vii, 1; ix, 15^b, 17-21; xiii, 15-32; xiv, 1-5; xv, 1-13, 28-44, 48-62; xvi, 4-8; xvii, 1^a (1^b, 2), 3, 4, 7, 9^a, 9^c, 10^a; xviii, 1, 11-28; xix, 1-8, 10-46, 48, 51; xx, 1-3 (except "and unawares"), 6^a (to judgment), 7-9 (cf. lxx); xxi, 1-42 (xxii, 9-34).

tary source of the Pentateuch, while Dillmann regards it as old, though not the oldest. On the other hand, P is regarded as the youngest portion of the Pentateuch by Graf, Kayser, Kuenen, Wellhausen, and Reuss. When we consider the contents of P, we discover the tremendous significance of the position that it was more recently composed than any other document of the Pentateuch. As to the absolute age of the sources, *Nöldeke* holds that P, E, and J belong to the tenth, or, more likely still, the ninth century B. C. P is not the oldest, but can not be much younger than the two others. D was written shortly before the reformation under Josiah. Ezekiel is dependent upon P. *Schrader* places P at the beginning of David's reign; E, soon after the division of the kingdom; J, added to his predecessors, and worked them together between 825 and 800. D was composed shortly before Josiah's reformation; and the Deuteronomist continued the history down to 2 Kings xxv, 21. The separation of the Pentateuch, in its present form, from the other historical

books did not take place until the end of the Exile. *Dillmann*¹ makes the Hexateuch to consist of five documents—E, P, J, D, and S (Sinaitic Law). E was written by some one from the Northern Kingdom, during the first half of the ninth century B. C. J is a Judaic document, written not earlier than the middle of the eighth century. D was written not long before the eighteenth year of Josiah; P he places about 800; S is composed of portions as old as Moses, and as recent as the Exile. Before the return of Ezra, the Pentateuch was separated from Joshua. Ezra gave the Pentateuch public recognition in 444. Still later scribes worked over certain portions of the text, but added no new laws and no new historical incidents. *Delitzsch*, in his latest "Commentary on Genesis," does not give exact dates for the various documents. In 1880 he fixed the sources in the following order: J; D (subsequent to Solomon, but prior to Isaiah); the law of holiness; P (prior to the Exile). Both P and D underwent modifi-

¹Über die Komposition des Hexateuchs in Commentar zu Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua.

cations subsequent to their original composition. Of the two principal documentary forms, it is more probable that the Jehovistic-Deuteronomic follows the old Mosaic type than the Elohist. P is younger than J. The processes by which the Pentateuch was brought into its present form continued until after the post-exilian period. Ezra, in 444, probably read only P in the presence of the people. These are very important concessions, and bring Delitzsch almost over to the side of *Wellhausen*,¹ who places J in the period of the prophets and kings who preceded the dissolution of the two kingdoms. E is younger, and E and J were later united into EJ. D was composed in the period in which it was discovered. The principal part of Leviticus xvii-xxvi was composed during the Exile, subsequent to Ezekiel. P is not the product of one author, but is the result of labors extending through and beyond the Exile.

Only a careful, protracted, and painstaking study of these views as to the relative and absolute age of the sources of the Pentateuch

¹ See mention of his works above.

will enable the reader to judge which is more and which less radical. In fact, they are all so much at variance with traditional opinion as to leave but little choice between them. All make the earliest sources, with but few unimportant exceptions, the product of a comparatively late age. All deny the authorship of the Pentateuch to Moses; and this is the position of most other critics of Germany and England. Almost without exception, they believe in the Hexateuch; and some even trace the Pentateuchal sources beyond Joshua, into Judges.

§ 8. SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT FOR THE DATE OF D AND P.¹

Intimations have been already given, but it will be better to bring all the arguments together here in brief. We begin with the generally accepted theory of

DEUTERONOMY.

The theory is that this book was written later than the sources J, E. This is supported

¹ Compare Driver's Introduction and Briggs's Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch.

on the ground that the legislation of Deuteronomy presupposes a more highly developed civil organization than JE. The historical books, in perfect accord with the foregoing fact, give evidence that Deuteronomy was not composed until after the establishment of the monarchy. Deuteronomy forbids the offering of sacrifice except at a single fixed place; while in Exodus xx, 24, many places of worship are implied. Now, in Joshua and First and Second Samuel, the practice seems to have been in accord with JE, and in conflict with Deuteronomy. (Joshua xxiv, 1, 26; 1 Sam. vii, 9 f., 17; ix, 12-14; x, 3, 5, 8; xi, 15; xiv, 35; xx, 6; 2 Sam. xv, 12, 32.) According to 2 Kings xxii, xxiii, Deuteronomy must have been in existence as early as the eighteenth year of King Josiah (B. C. 621). That it is not much earlier, the critics maintain on the ground that the law of the kingdom (Deut. xvii, 14 ff.) seems to have been influenced by facts of Solomon's reign; that, while Judges-Kings make no mention of the worship of the "host of heaven," although describing various other forms of idolatry, Deu-

teronomy presupposes its practice ; that while the earlier prophets—such as Amos, Hosea, and 1 Isaiah—appear not to be influenced by Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, and other later prophets exhibit marked traces of the book ; that the theology of Deuteronomy is more advanced than could be expected in the early history of Israel, while it approaches more nearly that of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Yet Deuteronomy must not be regarded as a forgery, since Moses does not profess to be its author, much of its matter is very ancient, and the book is only an adaptation of older legislation in the light of prophetic teaching.

ARGUMENTS AS TO THE PRIEST'S CODE.

The literature of the period prior to the Exile shows no trace of the legislation of P. In P, the place of sacrifice is strictly limited ; in Judges and Samuel it is not so. In P, only priests may offer sacrifice ; in Judges and Samuel, laymen offer, without any protest even from such men as Samuel and David. In P, the arrangements for the care of the ark are elaborate ; in Samuel they are very sim-

ple. According to P, the ark could never have been taken into battle as in 1 Samuel i-iii. When the ark was restored to Kirjath-Jearim, it was not in the hands of the persons P prescribes as its exclusive protectors. So also, when David removed it to Zion. (Compare 2 Sam. vi, with Num. iii, 41; iv, 1-15). Further, Deuteronomy seems to know nothing of P. Had P been in existence when D wrote, he must have made references to it. But while Deuteronomy commands the centralization of worship, P assumes that such is already the case. In Deuteronomy, any man of the tribe of Levi may exercise the right to sacrifice, if he live at the central place of worship; in P, only the sons of Aaron may exercise this right; and, in all particulars, P shows greater development than Deuteronomy, and hence appears to be later.

That P is also later than Ezekiel, at least in some of its parts, is also maintained by the extreme critical school. They claim that, while P excluded all except sons of Aaron from priestly rights, Ezekiel assumes (chapter xliv, 13) that all Levites had exercised these

privileges. Ezekiel now commands that only the sons of Zadok, who alone had not idolatrously worshiped at the high places, should be clothed with the office of priests. Had he known of P, he would not have reduced all other Levites after admitting that they had lawfully been priests. Rather he would have pointed to the provisions of P as showing that only the sons of Aaron could exercise priestly rights. Besides, as Ezekiel's regulations (chapters xl–xlviii) are more elaborate than those of Deuteronomy, so P is more elaborate than Ezekiel, showing that the order of age is Deuteronomy, Ezekiel, and P. The final argument is from the more pure conception of God, and the generally evident marks of a higher stage of culture, and freedom from primitive conceptions in P.

But as Deuteronomy is not supposed to have been an invention of the age of Josiah, so P is, though a late composition, not in all its parts equally late. It allows the great antiquity of the principal parts of the Israelitish ritual. In fact, P is really in the main a codification of temple usages which had

gradually grown up in the course of the centuries, and it only changes these in certain of their forms. Although Ezekiel is earlier than P, yet Ezekiel presupposes some things contained in P, particularly the Law of Holiness. The arguments by which it is attempted to fix the approximate date of the different institutions, the regulations concerning which are codified in P, we can not give here. The reader can not avoid observing the large place thus given by the critics to evolutionary principles in their conclusions.

§9. CRITICISM OF THE PROPHEITICAL BOOKS.

It will be found more convenient to pass over the books Joshua—Song of Solomon for the present. But before taking up the prophetical books in order, it may be well to briefly summarize the results of criticism relative to the nature or function of Old Testament prophecy. Critics do not generally regard prediction as the chief element of prophecy.¹ The mere foretelling of future

¹ So Orelli, *The Prophecies of Isaiah*; Delitzsch, *Commentary on Isaiah*; Farrar, *The Minor Prophets*.

events, with the details of time and place, was too wanting in the moral and spiritual purpose which distinguished the prophets.

{ Kuenen denies all inspired prediction in Hebrew prophecy. But the majority admit prediction just as they admit miracle. Each prediction, however, is to be examined by itself, by the application of grammatical and historical tests, and it is no detriment to it if not literally fulfilled; for the type can not in the nature of the case equal the fulfillment, and the prophets were limited in their employment of figures by the material which their knowledge of the age in which they lived and of the past furnished. Each prophetic utterance has but one meaning, generally limited to the immediate environment of the prophet. But criticism admits a symbolism where it denies direct prediction.¹ This does not give a prophetic passage a double sense, but makes it possible to apply the same words to the description of different events. The prophets generally spoke of their predictions as about to be fulfilled, showing that

¹ Horton, Revelation and the Bible:

they themselves did not know the times and the seasons. Hence it is possible to deny fulfillment to many of the prophecies if they be taken in all literalness. If, however, they be regarded not as advance descriptions of historical events, but as utterances designed to move upon the hearts of the auditors, they can not be denied fulfillment. Besides, many prophecies go unfulfilled because of a change in the purpose of God or the conduct of man. This is particularly true of the threatenings and the promises. The main point to be noticed is, that the denial of miracle goes hand in hand with the denial of prediction. But the conservative critic admits and emphasizes both.

§ 10. THE BOOK OF ISAIAH.

Critics are agreed in dividing this book into three parts; namely: Chapters i-xxxv; xxxvi-xxxix; xl-lxvi. The middle portion is historical in its contents, and is believed to be of much later origin than the first part. The third part was not written by Isaiah, but by the "Great Unknown," at the close of the Exile. The first to question the unity of

Isaiah was Döderlein, in the latter part of the last century, and his views were essentially those of the critics of the present day.

The principal difficulties in the way of supposing that Isaiah wrote the last twenty-seven chapters of the Book of Isaiah are:

1. *The historical background.*¹ Throughout all these chapters the writer assumes the existence of the Exile, but also its early end. Judea has long lain waste, and Jerusalem and the temple in ruins. Babylon has long oppressed Israel, but her dominion will soon cease. The time of the Assyrian oppression is in the distant past (chap. lii, 4 f.) These assumptions are supposed to be incompatible with the authorship by Isaiah, whose entire prophecies are connected with the Assyrian period. Were this part of Isaiah from the same pen as the former part there would have been some recognition of the change from the Assyrian to the Babylonian rulership, and some mention of the destruction of Jerusalem and the captivity of the people. He could not have supposed that, except from his own

¹ Compare throughout, Dillmann, *Der Prophet Jesaia*.

pen, such an event would be anticipated. It was difficult even in Jeremiah's day to make such a possibility comprehensible to the nation. Besides, every prophet aims to affect his contemporaries; but the chapters in question take up a situation wholly different from that in which Isaiah lived. Furthermore, the author of these chapters repeatedly refers to prophecies of the very conditions he assumes as existing. Isaiah could not have had such prophecies before him, since they were first uttered by Jeremiah and Habakkuk. 2. *The ideas and doctrines of the latter are wholly different from the former part.* Not threats of punishment on account of sin, but consolation in the midst of affliction, and the prospect of early release. Again, Isaiah assumes the nothingness of the false gods, and the rulership of Jehovah even over the heathen. His purpose is to impress upon men's minds the thought of God's holiness. The author of this portion of Isaiah, on the other hand, makes it a principal business to declare the true deity of Jehovah to his people and to all the world. 3. *The literary style of this is different from the*

former part. Of this argument no illustration need be given here.

But it is not held by the critics that the first thirty-five chapters are all Isaian. The majority exclude from the true Isaian portions chapters xiii-xiv, 23; xxiv-xxvii; xxxiv. It may be helpful to give the arguments, at least in the case of xiii-xiv, 23. This is regarded as having been composed in the period of the Babylonian exile, for the following reasons: 1. *Every prophecy must have an occasion to call it forth.* No prophet speaks except as the situation in which he is placed demands it. In chapter xiii, 6, 22, the occasion which prompts this prophecy is stated to be the nearness of the judgment upon Babylon, which was to bring the release of Israel. God has his instruments ready (xiii, 3 f.) in the Medes (xiii, 17). But such a situation never existed in the time of Isaiah. 2. *The historical background lies far from the time of Isaiah.* Nothing is said of Assyria. Babylon is the ruler who has long trodden Israel under foot without pity (xiv, 1 f.) Isaiah has never mentioned the transfer of authority to Baby-

lon, nor announced the Exile. Whoever wrote these chapters simply and unannounced takes his standpoint in the Babylonian exile.

3. *The spirit and tone of these chapters proves the same.* The author makes no attempt to hide his joy at the speedy fall of Babylon; and pictures with delight the terrible fate of Babylon, its inhabitants, and its ruler. He expresses the bitterest irony upon the anticipated humiliation of the tyrant. Such a sentiment would be explicable in one who had experienced the wretchedness of the Exile, but not in Isaiah, who never spoke thus even of the Assyrians.

4. A final argument is drawn from the literary style, which, however, is not as strong as the others.

It is not our purpose here to answer, or even weigh the conclusions reached by criticism. For this the reader is recommended to any of the excellent introductions to the study of the Holy Scripture. Our task is merely to set forth, as briefly as possible, the most generally accepted results of recent criticism.

§ II. JEREMIAH AND EZEKIEL.

The chief critical problems concerning Jeremiah pertain to its relation to the text of the Septuagint, and to the genuineness of certain portions (x, 1-16; xxv, 11^b-14^a; xxvii, 7, 16-21; xxxiii, 14-26; xxxix, 1, 2, 4-13; 1; li), opinions being divided.¹ The Septuagint text is almost always shorter where it differs from the Massoretic; but it is generally agreed that the Massoretic text is preferable. Kühl says: "The principal divergences of the Septuagint from the Massora must be charged to the translator—divergences so deliberate that we can not attribute them to a transcriber, but only to a translation."

Ezekiel² is of special interest to-day because the newer critical school places it earlier than the Priests' Code, for which it prepared the way. As a priest, Ezekiel might well be

¹ See Zöckler's *Handbuch der Theologischen Wissenschaften*.

² Compare von Orelli, in Strack and Zöckler's *Kurzgefasstes Kommentar*.

supposed to have known the temple ritual prior to the Exile. The provisions made by Ezekiel for the temple service recognize some things forbidden by P; for example, the rights of Levites in connection with the temple. (Chapter xlv, 10, 13.) On the other hand, there is every reason to believe that the Law of Holiness was known to Ezekiel. The language in chapter iv, 14, indicates this; with which compare Leviticus xxii, 8. Many other passages might be adduced. (See list in Driver's Introduction, p. 139.) Some, indeed, see so much and so many resemblances between Ezekiel and the Law of Holiness that they have concluded that the prophecy and H were both by one author; but, while the evidence of this is strong, it has not met even with general favor, on account of differences of style and matter. Thus parts, but not all, of P were known to Ezekiel. Since the relation of Ezekiel to P has been already treated, however, we follow the subject no further here. The genuineness of Ezekiel throughout is almost universally admitted.

§ 12. THE MINOR PROPHETS.

We pass by the Book of Daniel for the present, reserving it for subsequent special mention. Kuenen gives the chronological order of the prophets as follows:

1. B. C. 900-850. Pre-Assyrian Period—Amos, Hosea, Joel (?).

2. B. C. 850-700. The Assyrian Period—Micah, Isaiah.

3. B. C. 626-586. The Chaldean Period—Nahum, Zephaniah, Jeremiah, Habakkuk, the elder Zechariah (see under Zechariah below), Obadiah.

4. B. C. 586-536. The Exile—Ezekiel.

5. B. C. 520-400. The Post-Exilic Prophets—Zechariah, Haggai, Malachi.

Of the prophets of the first period, we may pass by Amos and Hosea, since there are no very important critical questions raised concerning them. Joel,¹ however, is under dispute. The more conservative critics place his prophecies in the first decade of Joash,

¹ See Farrar, *Minor Prophets*, and von Orelli in Strack and Zöckler, *Kurzgefasstes Kommentar*.

basing this early date upon the fact that he seemed to know nothing of Syrian or Assyrian oppressions, and represented the foes of Judah as Phœnicians, Philistines, Egyptians, and Edomites; and further upon the apparent knowledge of Joel's prophecy exhibited by Amos. (Compare Amos i, 2, with Joel iv, 16; and Amos ix, 13, with Joel iv, 18.)

But the adherents of the modern views of the Pentateuch generally place the prophecy of Joel subsequent to the Exile. The principal arguments upon which they base this view are, that the prophecy makes no mention of the Northern Kingdom, which would scarcely have been possible in the days of Joash; that he does not condemn idolatry, one of the chief sins of the times of the Kings; and that he makes no mention of the High Places, so frequently rebuked by the early prophets. Chiefly, however, their dependence is upon the theology, eschatology, and ritualism of Joel, all of which are said to be post-exilic, rather than exilic or pre-exilic. It is also supposed that his references to the elders and inhabitants of the land, and

not to the kings and princes, as was usual with the prophets, point to the very state of organization which obtained under the Persians. Furthermore, Joel iii, 1, and iii, 17, are interpreted as direct references to the Babylonish Captivity. It will be seen that the principal arguments for the late date are similar to those which decide the late origin of the Priests' Code in the Pentateuch.

The only other book demanding mention here is

§ 13. ZECHARIAH.¹

It is uniformly agreed that chapters i–viii were written after the return from the Exile, and that the author was a contemporary of Haggai; but as early as 1638, English theologians suspected that the later chapters must be attributed to another author. What aroused their suspicion was the reference of a prophecy in Zechariah to Jeremiah by Matthew xxvii, 9. One hundred and fifty years later (1784), Pastor Flügge, of Hamburg, in an anonymous work, supported the supposition that chapters ix–xiv did not originate with

¹ See works referred to under Joel.

Zechariah. Since then this view has been generally maintained by critics. Many are also inclined to make the authorship of the last six chapters twofold, attributing ix-xi to a contemporary of Hosea, and xii-xiv to a writer who lived but a short time prior to the destruction of Jerusalem. The style of ix-xi is different from i-viii; its view of the temple and its ordinances, and its references to moral conditions are also different. There is no trace of the angelology of the first eight chapters; the death of Josiah is recent (xii, 1); the people are still idolatrous (x, 2), which was not the case after the Exile. Thus, if we think of ix-xi as pre-exilic, and of i-viii as post-exilic, we can more easily explain these divergences of view. The author of xii-xiv anticipates some terrible disaster. Jerusalem will be dishonored (xiv, 2). This probably referred to the coming siege and destruction of Jerusalem under Nebuchadnezzar. Thus, instead of one Zechariah we have three, as we have three parts in Isaiah instead of one. If such a severing of what seems to the ordinary reader a unit is condemned as unjusti-

fiable, the critic is ready with a reply. He affirms that written prophecies were often anonymous; that they were first collected into the canon subsequent to the Exile; that, meantime, traditions as to authorship had become untrustworthy; and that therefore when we find four books of prophecy in the Hebrew canon—namely, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the book of the twelve prophets—we dare not safely assume that all the prophecies which lie between a name and the name following are the product of the pen of the first. If differences of style, matter, historical groundwork, and the like, show themselves in any considerable degree, the evidence of different authorship from these sources is stronger than that of a single authorship from their place in the canon. To put it in plain words, those who formed the canon did the best they knew, but their knowledge of the authors was no better than ours; while the fact that they followed tradition without critical scrutiny renders their conclusions less trustworthy than those of the well-equipped critic of our day.

§ 14. THE BOOK OF JONAH.¹

That this book is the work of Jonah, the son of Amittai (2 Kings xiv, 25), is universally denied by the critics. It is generally believed to have been composed during or subsequent to the Exile, this opinion being based chiefly upon the language used. It is pointed out that there is nothing in the book to suggest Jonah as its author, but that Nineveh being spoken of in the past tense (chapter iii, 3), indicates a composition long after the time of the events described. Some have supposed that the whole story is a pure fiction, perhaps in imitation of a heathen myth; but perhaps the majority are of the opinion that the author at least employed an old tradition of a mission of Jonah to Nineveh, during which he experienced some unusual adventures. The rationalists explained the miracle of the fish as a dream, or took the fish for the sign of some ship which picked Jonah up, and after three days set him upon dry land. The modern critic either regards it as a pure fiction, or

¹See works referred to under Joel.

allows more or less of historical reality in the story. All are agreed that it is not prophecy, a conclusion which a moment's thought will support; and all are agreed that the book has for its object something outside of the mere relation of the events described. As to what that object is, opinions differ. There are those who think it intended to justify God in sending his prophets with predictions against the heathen which were subsequently unfulfilled. Others think the book a lesson to the prophets, who are thereby instructed in their office, the nature of prophecy, and the conditions of fulfillment. But the most generally accepted view is, that it is intended to teach God's care of the heathen, and to rebuke the Jews for their narrowness and bigotry.

§ 15. THE BOOK OF DANIEL.¹

The traditional view of the date and authorship of Daniel, though still represented by some eminent names among the critics, is yielded by the vast majority, and for the fol-

¹ See Zöckler's *Handbuch der Theologischen Wissenschaften* and Meinhold in *Kurzgefasstes Kommentar*.

lowing reasons: 1. *The place of the book in the Hebrew canon.* The second part of this canon contained the prophets; but Daniel is not placed among them. On the contrary, he is placed among the books of the third collection, which was formed at a late period. 2. *Daniel is not mentioned in the list of prophetic writings given by Jesus, the son of Sirach,* who, writing about the year 200 B. C., mentions, in his chapters xliv-1, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets, but not Daniel. 3. *Linguistic considerations.* Chapters ii, 4^b-vii are written in Aramaic, which was hardly known to the Jews earlier than the Persian period. Furthermore, the style of this portion is the Aramaic of Palestine, not of Babylon—a fact which points to the composition in Palestine, and, hence, after the Babylonian Exile. Besides, the name given to the wise men (בְּשָׂרִים) points to a period when, the Chaldean kingdom having been destroyed, only the magi remained, to whom was applied the title belonging to the whole nation. Especially weighty is the evidence from the fact that Persian words are placed

in the mouth even of Nebuchadnezzar, which could only be done by an author who had entirely forgotten their Persian origin. The late origin of the book is also deduced from the Greek names of musical instruments, which could only have been learned after the invasion of the East by Alexander the Great. Linguistic considerations also prevail in those parts which are written in Hebrew, comprising chapters i, viii–xii, the unskillful handling of the language indicating that it was, at the time of the writing, either dead or dying.

4. *Arguments drawn from the contents of the book.* Chapter ix, 1, presupposes a collection of sacred Scriptures which included Jeremiah; but such a collection could hardly have been in use in the time of the Exile. Then the mention of the names and orders of angels, and the reference to national guardian angels (x, 13, 20; xi, 1; xii, 1), indicates a development of angelology not probable in the time of the Exile, but suitable for the Maccabæan period. Further, the other prophets made the end of the Babylonian exile and the beginning of the Messianic kingdom identical, while in

Daniel the redemption of Israel is placed in the distant future. Besides, the author seems to have no message for the people of his own times—as prophets usually did—on the supposition that he lived in the period of the Exile; but if he be supposed to have written in the age of Antiochus Epiphanes, then his minute description of events down to that age, and the indistinctness subsequent thereto, are easily accounted for.

As to attributing the book to Daniel, the author simply did what was common in his time. Those who did it had no thought of forgery, as we understand it. Besides, he was not writing a canonical book. Nevertheless, the Jews did well to receive it into the canon, since in the time of the Maccabees it was a source of great religious stimulus. The book is supposed to rest upon old traditions concerning Daniel, and perhaps to have been written, in part, not earlier than B. C. 300. The purpose of this Aramaic document was to strengthen the courage of the Jews in persecution by the example of Daniel. This was wrought into the later Maccabæan document,

the object of the whole also being encouragement to faithfulness in trial.

§ 16. THE PSALMS.¹

For convenience, we give here the divisions of the five books of the Psalter. The first book contains Psalms i-xli; the second, xlii-lxxii; the third, lxxiii-lxxxix; the fourth, xc-cvi; the fifth, cvii-cl. It has been supposed that this division was made to correspond to the five books of the Law; but, as we shall see, it had another origin.

Psalms are attributed by the superscriptions attached to them to David, Moses, Solomon, Asaph, Heman, Ethan, and the sons of Korah. The value to be attached to these superscriptions is in dispute. Most critics unhesitatingly pronounce it impossible that David should have written all the Psalms ascribed to him in the Psalter. They claim that, in many cases, the language employed decides; in other cases, the historical condi-

¹ Hupfeld, *Die Psalmen*; and T. K. Cheyne, *The Psalms*; also Driver, *Introduction*; and H. P. Smith, in *Biblical Scholarship*, etc.

tions revealed are such as do not suit the times in which David lived. But if some of these superscriptions are thus proved unworthy of credence, we have no assurance, without special examination in each case, that any of the others are trustworthy. It is asserted that the LXX treated these superscriptions with a freedom which indicated that they did not regard them as fixed; that those who attached them were probably not the authors themselves, but later editors; that in so doing they did not, in all cases, mean to designate the author, but rather to indicate that they were taken from collections in possession of those who claimed descent from David, or Asaph, or some other. Thus, while the compiler only meant to place at the head of each Psalm a reminder of the source from which he had taken it, the later generations understood it to mean that it was composed by the one whose name it bore.

The followers of the extreme Pentateuchal criticism deny the Davidic origin of almost every Psalm ascribed to him, and make the Psalms the products of the late post-exilic

period, some even dating the larger part of the Psalter in the Maccabæan period. They point to the fact that in the earlier books of the canon—as Samuel and Kings—David is represented as a player, but not as a composer. They emphasize the frequency of the supposed antithesis in the Psalms between the godly and the godless, and affirm that such an antagonism was never distinctly marked until the beginning of the persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes, when the true servants of God had to struggle against their heathen oppressors and their apostate brethren.

But a more conservative criticism, while not denying the late origin of some of the Psalms, arranges the order somewhat as follows: 1. A collection of Davidic Psalms, beginning with Psalm iii, and distinguished by the prevailing use of the name Jehovah (or Jahveh) for God. 2. A collection of Psalms of Korah, in which the name Elohim is used for God. (Psalms xlii–xlix.) 3. These were united by an editor who added an Elohim Psalm of Asaph (the fiftieth), a number of Elohim Psalms by David (li–lxxi), and

then the Solomonic Psalm lxxii. He also prefixed an ancient Messianic Psalm (our second Psalm), and possibly composed Psalm i as an introduction to all. If so, he must have written prior to Jeremiah, to whom Psalm i was known. 4. The third book, judging from Psalms lxxiv and lxxix, may have come into existence subsequent to the Babylonian exile; and the collector of these Psalms was not identical with the editor who united the first two books. 5. The work of still another collector begins with the fourth book, which contains but two Psalms (ci and ciii) with the names of the authors attached, both of which the Hebrew canon attributes to David. 6. The fifth book is from still another collector. It contains fifteen Davidic Psalms and one Solomonic Psalm. This collector is supposed to be also the final editor, having supplied the doxologies which mark the close of each of the first four books of the Psalter. Those who deny the Maccabæan date of any of the Psalms think the final editor lived in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah.

While the critics deny the binding force of the titles which profess to give either the liturgical or historical occasion of the composition or the names of the authors of the Psalms, yet the more conservative are disposed to defend those who attached these titles from the charge of arbitrary guesswork, and to believe that they represent very old tradition. As to the authorship of seventy-three Psalms ascribed to David in our Psalter, Hitzig, who thinks most of the Psalms were composed in the period of the Maccabees, allows that David wrote fourteen. Ewald only gives him eleven entire Psalms, and some parts of four others (xix, 2-7; lx, 8-11; lxxviii, 14-19; cxliv, 12-14). Delitzsch thinks forty-four are Davidic, and holds that Psalms lxxiv and lxxix are from the time of the Maccabees; possibly also Psalm cxxiii.

As to the value of the Psalms, the critics generally agree that few are truly prophetic; even conservatives limiting the Messianic Psalms to the second and the one hundred and tenth, while Psalms xxii, xlv, lxix, lxxii, may be regarded as typical-prophetical. Some

few others are classed as merely typical, as xli, 10. The Law and the Prophets gave the rule for conduct; the Psalms give the experiences of those who endeavored to conform themselves to the standard of the Old Testament. The Psalms do not, according to the critics, give us a standard by which we may regulate our experiences. They must each be judged by their approach to the spirit of Christ. The Psalms exhibit, not what a Christian should be, but what piety was in the light of the revelation granted in pre-Christian times. It is assumed that as the revelation was not so pure and complete, the religious life could not be so exalted as under the Gospel dispensation. This denies the distinctive inspiration of the thoughts and feelings expressed in the Psalms, and makes them the portrayal of the religious consciousness of those who were trained under the Law and the Prophets.

§ 17. THE BOOK OF PROVERBS.

Strack¹ divides the book into nine parts:

- I. Superscription (i, 1-6) and Motto (v. 7).
- II. Introductions (i, 8-ix).
- III. First collection of Solomonic proverbs, designated S I (x-xxii, 16).
- IV. First appendix (xxii, 17-xxiv, 22), Words of the Wise.
- V. Second appendix (xxiv, 23-34), also Words of the Wise.
- VI. Second collection of Solomonic proverbs, designated S II (xxv-xxix).
- VII. First supplement (xxx), Words of Agur the son of Jakeh.
- VIII. Second supplement (xxxi, 1-9), Words of King Lemuel.
- IX. Third supplement (xxxi, 10-31), Praise of a virtuous woman.

Of all these parts the only ones generally recognized as Solomonic are III and VI. It is claimed that none of the rest professes to have been written by the wise king. That

¹In Zöckler's *Handbuch der Theologischen Wissenschaften*,

there are many expressions in I and II which are identical with those in III is admitted; but this is explained by the supposition that the author of the former was the collector of III, to whose style of thought and language he conformed himself as much as possible. Against the Solomonic origin of I and II it is urged that they contain a series of expressions not found in III nor VI, and, indeed, not elsewhere in the Bible. To the words of chapter i, 1, the collector added a long introduction, as a comparison with chapter x, 1, shows. Delitzsch and Kuenen have both shown that there is a relationship between I and II and Deuteronomy. Attention is also called to the fact that there is a dependence between Job and I, II, and III. Some, however, think that the collector of I, II, and III used Job, rather than the reverse.

That Solomon wrote proverbs is settled by 1 Kings v, 9-13. In III and VI are found five hundred of his three thousand proverbs. The Solomonic authorship of III is proved by chapter x, 1, in connection with chapter i, 1, and by xxv, 1, on the supposition that the men of

Hezekiah there mentioned knew III. All the proverbs of III are composed of two lines, the form supposed to be earliest in use for proverbial writing. Yet III did not come from Solomon in its present form; for the proverbs it contains are not arranged according to any consistently applied principle, but seem in most cases to follow each other as accident happened. Hence it is presumed that III must have gradually grown up, partly from the noting down of the proverbs as remembered by the people, and partly from written sources. Furthermore, each verse of III is an independent proverb, which is not the case with VI. This leads to the supposition that some one, whose literary tastes were less varied than Solomon's, collected III. In addition, the repetitions of word and thought are so numerous in III as to forbid the supposition that Solomon himself made the collection. He might often have repeated himself in three thousand proverbs, but he would hardly have done so in a collection of the three hundred and seventy-five in III. It is also supposed that in III there are some post-

Solomonic proverbs, the principal proof being founded on a comparison of the Hebrew and LXX text. Various dates are given for the collection of III, but it is generally agreed to have been during the period of the early kings.

The Solomonic origin of the proverbs of VI has been disputed by Ewald on the ground that the earliest form of Hebrew verse was composed of two lines, and the attempt to make it appear that Solomon wrote only antithetical proverbs in this form. This is answered by the fact that we can not suppose Solomon to have been mentally so poor as only to write in one style. It must be admitted, however, that VI is very different from III in several respects. The form of the verses is different; the parabolic (emblematic) manner of expression is frequently found here, and only twice in III; while in VI the dark side of the monarchy is emphasized in contrast with III, which sees only its bright side. But all this is explicable on the supposition that we have in VI more post-Solomonic proverbs. According to xxv, 1, a commission

formed by Hezekiah copied VI. An attempt has been made to show by the repetitions in VI of proverbs in III that the men of Hezekiah did not know III; but these repetitions are so few in number as to make the supposition necessary that they knew it, and knew that it was widely employed, or else they would have repeated far more than they did.

As to IV, its non-Solomonic origin is supposed to be proved by chapter xxii, 17, which seems to attribute what follows to a variety of wise men. Delitzsch supposed it to have sprung from the author of I and II and collector of III. Others think that this collector found IV ready prepared, and joined it to his I, II, and III. The first verse of V is supposed to show that it is from another collector. The similarity of its beginning with that of xxv, i, is evidence that it was placed here by the one who united I, II, III, IV, and VI, his purpose being to prevent the proverbs it contained from being lost.

The author of II is presumed to be the same as the author of I. We still have to deal with VII, VIII, and IX. Neither Agur nor

Jakeh are known outside of VII; but they must have been Israelites, since verse 5 is dependent upon the Davidic Psalm xviii, 31, and verse 6 upon Deuteronomy iv, 2; xiii, 1. Verses 1-4 emphasize the insufficiency of human knowledge, which had been done long before. The author is supposed to have lived subsequently to Hezekiah. As to VIII, it was certainly written outside Palestine, if the translation of the superscription proposed by Hitzig and maintained by Delitzsch and others shall finally prevail, making Lemuel king of Massa. It is yet in dispute. The third supplement (IX) is in the form of an alphabetic song. It presupposes a carefully ordered civil state, flourishing trade relations, and the cultivation of the soil as a principal occupation. It was probably written in the time of Hezekiah. In order to bring all these parts together, one final editor must be assumed.

§ 18. THE BOOK OF JOB.¹

Among the critical conclusions reached by some is the idea that the book is intended to

¹ Volck, *Das Buch Hiob*, in *Kurzgefasstes Kommenaar*.

describe the sufferings of the Israelitish people during the Babylonian exile. To this it is answered that, if for no other reason, this opinion must be rejected, because Job (the Israelites, on this supposition) denies all guilt or self-censure in connection with his suffering. He is, in his own estimation and in that of God, an innocent sufferer; but Israel, in the Exile, suffered because of its sins.

The great majority of critics hold to the belief that the author had for the basis of his work a tradition which more or less completely corresponded to reality. It is, of course, impossible to tell how closely the author adhered to this tradition; but it is almost universally conceded that the book is not a pure fiction. His long life (one hundred and forty years subsequent to his great affliction); the mention of coins known to us from the history of Jacob and Joshua (Gen. xxxiii, 19; Josh. xxiv, 32) in chapter xlii, 11; the fact that the only musical instruments mentioned are those mentioned in Genesis, indicates that Job lived in the early patriarchal time; but his peculiar use of names to designate the Deity shows

that he lived and moved outside the Israelitish fold.

The principal part which has been regarded as spurious is the chapters xxxii-xxxvii, containing the speeches of Elihu. The reasons for regarding them as the work of a later hand are: 1. That they seem not to fit into the general plan of the poem. Elihu is not mentioned in the prologue among those present. Also in the epilogue, when God expresses his judgment of what has been said, Elihu is not mentioned; nor is any reference found in any part of the book to what Elihu has here said. The passage can be removed bodily, and never be missed in the argument. 2. On the other hand, the passage disturbs the unity of the whole. It says beforehand some things found in Jehovah's address, and repeats much said by the friends. When God speaks in chapter xxxviii, he assumes that Job has just finished, so that the passage in question destroys the connection between chapters xxxi and xxxviii. 3. It differs in language from the other portions of the book. 4. Elihu introduces himself, which

excites our suspicion, while the subscript following xxxi, 40, makes the section evidently an addition.

Both the prologue (chapters i and ii) and the epilogue (chapter xlii, 7 ff.) have been attacked; but the majority regard them as necessary to the poem, and to its understanding by the reader. Opinions are divided concerning the genuineness of chapters xl, 15-xli, 26. It is attacked chiefly on the ground that it is in bad taste. Studer (in *Jahrb. für prot. Theol.*, 1875) tried to prove that the original Job is found in chapters xxix; xxx; iii, 3-xxvii, 7; xxxi; and that it was subsequently edited and reconstructed five different times. This view has now no followers.

The book has been attributed to Moses, Solomon, Baruch, and Job; but there is nothing except supposition in favor of any name. That it was written by Moses is now almost universally disputed, because it evidently was written later than his period. All that is known of the development of Hebrew literature speaks against so early a date. The mistake arose from the confusing of the poet

with the hero of the poem, the time described with the period in which the author lived. On the other hand, but few now place the book so late as the exilian period. This view was defended chiefly on the ground that the Satanology of the book is too developed for an earlier period; but most critics think there is no connection between the Satan of the Book of Job and the Parsee doctrine of angels. In favor of the Solomonic period, it has been urged that the book displays a remarkable fullness of knowledge of nature suitable to that period; also that Proverbs i-ix seems to be dependent upon Job. Besides, it has been said that such a book as Job, so full of reflection and so carefully planned, must belong to the period of highest literary culture. But unless Proverbs i-ix was written at least in the time of Jehoshaphat, there is no proof from the literary connection between Proverbs and Job; besides, the period of high literary activity was not confined to the time of David and Solomon.

Since Jeremiah xx shows that Jeremiah had Job iii before him when he wrote, it is

plain that Job was not written later than Jeremiah. From Job xii, 14-25, where the reference is to a captivity of a nation, it may be presumed that there is an example first in the Assyrian period, and, hence, that the book may have been written about 700 B. C. This is perhaps the most generally accepted date.

The date of the interpolation of chapters xxxii-xxxvii can not be fixed.

§ 19. ECCLESIASTES.¹

While some see in this book a dialogue between two persons of different opinions concerning the subject in hand, others see in it only a succession of contradictory thoughts held together by the constantly recurring idea that all is vanity. Some have thought that the book fell into two parts, a theoretical and a practical—the former including chapters i-iv, 16; the latter, chapters iv, 17-xii, 7. But while these sections bear respectively the general character thus assigned them, yet the

¹Volck, *Der Prediger Salomo*, in *Kurzgefasstes Kommentar*,

theoretical and the practical are well represented in both parts. Perhaps the most satisfactory view is, that it is not a systematic presentation of the theme, but that the author simply utters the feelings of his heart as they come to him, thus speaking from his very soul.

Some have found in the book a philosophical tendency—a search after the highest good, or for that which is permanent in the midst of the evanescent and changeful. Some have thought they saw a dependence of the author upon the Epicurean and Stoic philosophy. Others have thought the book skeptical in tendency, while the school of Schopenhauer have found their pessimism in its first four chapters. Still others find the book written with a practical religious purpose. This is perhaps the most satisfactory opinion.

The idea that it was written by Solomon is almost wholly abandoned by recent critics. The language of the book is regarded as positive evidence of very late composition; but when the attempt to fix the exact period of its composition is made, opinions divide. All

agree that it is post-exilian. But it is held that while the language of Malachi is still a pure Hebrew, that of Ecclesiastes shows distinct traces of the Aramaic and of the idioms of the Mishna. So that the book must be later than the time of Malachi. The author speaks of the power, the caprice, and the voluptuousness of the rulers. This corresponds to the later period of the Persian rule. Some have thought that the book was written in Alexandria; but others object to this that chapters xi, 3 f., and xii, 2, presuppose a country in which the rain frequently falls, and in which the fruitfulness of the earth is dependent upon the rain, which is not the case with Egypt. On the other hand, chapter i, 7, does not conflict with the idea of its Palestinian origin; while v, 1, implies the presence of the temple, and viii, 10, the existence of holy places, and x, 15, nearness at least to the city of Jerusalem. Formerly it was customary to dispute both the unity and integrity of the book; but both are now generally recognized. Only a few small portions are in doubt; viz., the epilogue (xii, 9-14); xi, 9^b; xii, 1^a; and

xii, 7. Concerning the epilogue it is declared that it is superfluous and without object; that while in the other portions of the book the author speaks in the first person, here the third person is employed; that here he represents piety and the fear of God as the goal of all true endeavor, in contradiction to the previous recommendation of enjoyment as the highest good; that the representation of a last judgment in verse 14 contradicts the former denial of immortality; and that it was not true in the time of the Persian epoch, when the book is supposed to have been written, that it was a book-making period. To all this the defenders of xii, 9-14, reply that there is no ground for the last assertion; and that, properly understood, the contradictions urged disappear.

Let it be observed that, while almost all deny the authorship to Solomon, it is agreed that the real author attributes it to the wise king.

§ 20. THE SONG OF SOLOMON.¹

Two views concerning the unity of this book obtain to the present day. According to the first, it is not a unit, but a series of love-songs, strung loosely together. Reuss held this view, except that the sixteen different pieces—of which, according to him, it is composed—all related to the same circumstances. The other view, which is now the prevailing one, is, that it is a unit, although opinions differ widely as to the manner in which the parts are related to each other. The majority regard it as a melodrama. The difficulty of finding any single connecting thread has been the chief support of the opinion that it is a medley rather than a united whole. The argument of the Song is thus given by Oettli, who divides the whole into fifteen scenes: As the Shulamite, the daughter of well-to-do country people of Shunem, upon a spring day, went into her garden, her beauty was observed by the occupants of a royal carriage-train, and she was brought into a royal summer

¹ Oettli, *Das Hohelied*, in *Kurzgefasstes Kommentar*,

villa, not far from her home. Here she was placed under the care of the women of the harem, who were to dispose her favorably toward the king. In secret, however, she loved a youth of her native place. All efforts of the king to win her affections were made vain by her loyalty to her peasant lover; and at length the king himself let her go in peace. Her lover, with whom she had meanwhile held conversations, led her home, and with him she entered into a covenant of eternal love.

J. G. Stickel holds essentially the same view, but thinks that interwoven with the drama of Solomon and the Shulamite is another pertaining to a shepherd and shepherdess, whose scenes—three in number—are as follows: i, 7, 8; i, 15-ii, 4; iv, 7-v, 1. He thinks that the interweaving of this drama heightens the interest of the other by contrast, and designates the breaks in the treatment of the principal theme.

Delitzsch held that Solomon and the supposed friend of the Shulamite were identical. He supposes that Solomon, being by chance in the neighborhood of her home, had his

attention called to her beauty, and that this Song describes the progress of his suit up to the time of their marriage. The principal objection urged against this hypothesis is the improbability that Solomon, the delicate and fastidious king, should descend to the manner of life of a peasant, and for a considerable period of time, as this conception of the Song requires.

The allegorical interpretation makes Solomon and the Shulamite the representatives respectively of God and Israel, or Christ and the Church, some (Roman Catholics) making it even to stand for the relation of Christ to the individual soul. Of any such interpretation there is no trace in the New Testament; and, in the Church, it first appeared with Origen. To make it a literal description of the love experiences of two young people in early centuries seems to rob it of its right to a place in the canon. The defenders of the literal interpretation, however, say that such a representation of faithfulness in love is not unworthy of a place in the religion of revelation.

The question of the authorship and date of the book is closely connected with the opinion held as to its *dramatis personæ*. Most of those who believe the hero and heroine to have been Solomon and the Shulamite, without the interference of a peasant friend of the heroine, hold Solomon to be the author. This they maintain on the ground of the superscription. The opposers of this view regard this superscription as untrustworthy, and think that, since its supporters interpret v, 2-7, as a description of Solomon's unfaithfulness to the one he had just won, it is unlikely that Solomon wrote the book, since he would hardly have celebrated his own depravity in song.

If, on the other hand, the beloved is not Solomon, but the shepherd, then it is impossible that Solomon should have written it. He would not have described himself as sensual, nor as having been rejected by a country girl.

Yet the testimony is in favor of its early composition. Hosea, in the eighth century B. C., had read the book. (Compare Hosea xiv, 6-9, with Song ii, 1, 3; iv, 11; vi, 11.) The mention of Tirzah (vi, 4) points to a time

when that city, the residence of Omri (1 Kings xvi, 24), was still standing. The memory of the Solomonic period seems fresh in the mind of the author; and there is no trace of national misfortune. This, with other facts, speaks strongly in favor of the early part of the tenth century B. C. These considerations forbid placing the drama in the exilic or post-exilic period, as some have done. The closeness of the time of its composition to the period of Solomon also forbids that it should have been intended for pure fiction. It is probably founded in large measure on fact. This further forbids the supposition that it was written to rebuke the immorality of the court in Alexandria in the time of the Maccabees.

§21. THE LAMENTATIONS OF JEREMIAH.¹

The Lamentations do not name their own author. But the oldest of our traditions ascribe them to Jeremiah; so, the LXX, Targum, and the Talmud (Baba Bathra), which also makes Jeremiah the author of Kings. The

¹ Oettli, Die Klagelieder, in Kurzgefasstes Kommentar.

critics of to-day are divided in their opinions. There have been those who denied the unity of authorship, a variety of authors being suggested by the fact that i and ii mention the deportation of the Jews, while the remainder only speak of the laying waste of Zion; that the alphabetical order followed in the main by the first four is given up in the fifth; and by the inequality of merit in the five poems. The majority, however, are convinced that all are the product of one author, since the style and the circle of ideas are essentially the same throughout.

Arguments against the Jeremianic authorship, however, are brought forward in large numbers. The style is supposed to be different from Jeremiah's; the alphabetical arrangement followed in the first four poems is nowhere found in the prophecy; Jeremiah xxxi, 29, 30, is declared to be in contradiction to Lamentations v, 7; the author of Lamentations does not remind his readers of his prophecies, as it might be supposed Jeremiah would have done.

By placing the writing of Lamentations

subsequent to Ezekiel, some have tried to prove that it was not written by Jeremiah. Chapter ii, 14, is supposed to be borrowed from Ezekiel xii, 24, or xiii, 6. To this the defenders of Jeremiah answer that, according to Ezekiel viii, 1, we must suppose that chapters xii and xiii were written in the sixth year of the carrying away into captivity of Jehoiakim, and hence five years prior to the destruction of Jerusalem. Since Lamentations bemoans the destruction of the city by Nebuchadnezzar and his successors, Jeremiah might have seen Ezekiel's language in chapters xii and xiii.

Very conservative German critics see no reason to doubt that the book might have been written by another than Jeremiah, and attributed to that prophet after the real authorship had been forgotten; but such would hardly deny that it is, all things considered, probable that the book was written by Jeremiah.

§ 22. THE BOOK OF RUTH.¹

The object of this book is evidently to relate the early history of the family of David. There are those who suppose, however, that a correlated purpose was to show that God had no exclusive interest in the Jews, and that he would not despise to have a Moabitess among the female progenitors of the line from which Christ sprang.

The book has been regarded by some as pure fiction. The principal supports for such a supposition are: 1. That the marriage of Ruth with Boaz transcends the law requiring the brother-in-law to marry the widow; 2. That if the Book of Judges gives us a trustworthy impression of the period, Ruth must be wholly unhistorical; 3. The fact that the names employed in the book appear to be symbolical. Those who defend the historical character of the book admit the possibility of a somewhat artificial dress for the real facts, but deny the validity of any of the arguments mentioned above.

¹Oettli, *Das Buch Ruth*, in *Kurzgefasstes Kommentar*.

Ewald placed the date of composition in the exilian, Kuenen, Wellhausen, von Orelli, and others, in the post-exilian period, in support of which they offer a variety of reasons, particularly those drawn from the language, which is full of Aramaisms. But none of these would have been impossible, it is replied, in the times of the later kings; and, besides, they are placed by the author in the mouths of the persons speaking, and do not occur often in his own language, thus proving that they are employed to give a popular coloring to the story. The probability that Ruth was originally not connected with Judges, but found its place in the so-called third canon—that is, latest collection of Old Testament books—has also been used to prove the late (post-exilic) origin of the book; but it is answered that this would not prove its non-existence prior to its reception into the canon.

The strongest argument for its composition in the same period from which the Books of Samuel sprang is, that it could only have been produced when the feelings of the Jews

were yet comparatively liberal toward the Gentiles, the style of writing still simple, and the narrowness of the post-exilian Judaism was yet unknown.

Chapter iv, 18-22, is supposed by many to be a later addition, made in the early Greek period, and taken from 1 Chronicles ii, the object being to carry the genealogy of David back to the beginnings of the people of Israel. It has been observed that this genealogy can not be complete, since it gives but ten names for the period of eight centuries.

§23. THE BOOK OF ESTHER.¹

Much in this book has led to the belief that it is at most a fiction founded upon fact, while many reject its historical trustworthiness altogether. Among the reasons for the latter conclusion are the following: The decree itself, which granted the right absolutely to lay Judea waste; the too early publication of the same, thus making it possible for the condemned to escape; the sudden turning

¹Das Buch Esther, Oettli, in Kurzgefasstes Kommentar.

of the king in favor of the Jews; the immense number of Persian subjects put to death by the few Jews, and that with the connivance of the Persian authorities; the ease with which the time was extended in which the Jews could take revenge on the Persians in Susa; the immense height of the gallows; and the conversion of many Persians to Judaism.

On the other hand, those who favor the historicity of the book affirm that the author had a most exact knowledge of the Persians and the Persian court; that the portraiture of Ahasuerus (Xerxes) agrees with what Herodotus says of him in his seventh and ninth books; that it was not uncommon for whole peoples to be destroyed by their enemies; that the Feast of Purim among the Jews can not be accounted for except by some incident like that related in the Book of Esther.

The purpose of the book seems to be to explain how the Feast of Purim came into existence. It does not mention the name of God, which fact has been accounted for on

the ground that the later Jews avoided the use of the name of God except in the temple worship. Yet it recognizes the providence of God, although the zeal of the characters is for the people rather than for God. It is full of the spirit of race prejudice and of revenge.

Few to-day regard Mordecai as the author. The believers in the strict historical character of the book think it was written near the time of the scenes it depicts. Those who deny it any historical value place it late in the time of the Seleucidæ. The splendor the author ascribes to the rulership of Xerxes would seem to point to a period considerably later than the events.

No doubt is felt as to the unity of the book, except the parts ix, 20-28, and 29-32. It is asserted that the language here is different from the other portions; that the date of the feast given in ix, 17-19, contradicts the statements of ix, 20-28; and that ix, 32, refers to a book in which these "matters of Purim" were written, and from which the letters in question might have been taken by the author himself, or by a later editor who inserted them.

§ 24. THE CHRONICLES.¹

It is agreed that the two books were originally one, and the division is supposed to have been first made by the LXX. *Ezra* and *Nehemiah* are also believed to have belonged originally together. The last verses of *Chronicles* are identical with the first verses of *Ezra*; and, since they seem to be necessary to *Ezra*, it is assumed that they did not originally belong to *Chronicles*, but were placed there to indicate that *Ezra-Nehemiah* is the continuation of the history given in *Chronicles*. The four books form one continuous whole from the time of Adam to the middle of the fifth century before Christ. They are strikingly alike in language. They display a like interest in genealogical tables and in the description of events and general facts pertaining to worship. Hence, it is supposed that they were compiled by the same author; or else that they had a common editor; or, third, that the author of *Ezra-Nehemiah* subse-

¹ Evans and Smith, *Biblical Scholarship and Inspiration*; Oettli, *Die Bücher der Chronik*.

quently carried his historical work backward by writing Chronicles.

One of the points in dispute between the critics pertains to the sources from which the chronicler drew his information. It is agreed by nearly all that he knew and employed the canonical books of Samuel and Kings; and those who deny the trustworthiness of Chronicles think these books were his chief, if not his only source. Those, on the other hand, who believe the Chronicles to contain reliable historical data, think his principal source to be the "Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel," so often referred to by the chronicler, and which evidently contained much matter not found in Samuel and Kings. He also refers (1 Chron. xxix, 29) to the books of Samuel the Seer, of Nathan the Prophet, and of Gad the Seer; and, in 2 Chron. xii, 15, to the books of Shemaiah the Prophet, and of Iddo the Seer; also, in 2 Chron. xiii, 24, to the story (or as in margin, commentary) of the prophet Iddo, and (2 Chron, xxiv, 27) to the story or commentary of the Book of the Kings. The general supposition is, however, that the prophetic books

mentioned were parts of the "Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel," while the stories or commentaries referred to also formed another source. As facts bearing on the question of the date of composition, Oettli gives the following: 1. The close of the Chronicles indicates a post-exilian date; and the Aramaic preferences of the language, its late orthography, and its place in the third canon subsequent to Ezra-Nehemiah, point to its composition at a still later period. 2. The mention of Cyrus as "King of Persia" (2 Chron. xxxvi, 22 f.), and the frequent mention of his successors in Ezra-Nehemiah as "Kings of Persia," indicate that the author lived in the Greek period. 3. The author carries the line of David down to the sixth generation after Zerubbabel. (1 Chron. iii, 19-24.) Even on the supposition that the line is not broken as here given, it carries the period of composition to the middle of the fourth century B. C. Since the author may be supposed to have witnessed the growth to manhood of the seven sons of Elioenai, we are brought down to the point where the Persian merged into

the Greek period, as the mention of Jaddua the high priest, a contemporary of Alexander the Great, fixes the time of the composition of Ezra-Nehemiah. The author is supposed to have been a Levite of the post-exilian temple, and one of the singers, since he follows the activities of the Levites, and especially of the singers, with uncommon interest.

The trustworthiness of Chronicles has been severely attacked by many of the critics. The author almost wholly neglects the northern kingdom, confining himself chiefly to Judah and Benjamin. In giving his genealogical lists he dwells with special interest on Judah, Benjamin, and Levi. He hastens over the history of Israel until he comes to David; and from then onward to the Exile he lays special stress upon the specifically religious portions of the history. He also makes the weal or woe of the people to have been dependent upon their religious loyalty and faithfulness. This fact has suggested to some critics that he made history out of his own subjective prejudices to fit it to his theory. But to him religion was not so much morality

and justice—the kings were judged according to their attitude toward the false religions. His tendency to avoid mention of the faults of David, Solomon, and other early kings, and to glorify and idealize them, is attributed to the fact that a downtrodden race which has no hope for the future seeks to glorify its past. He enlarges the real numbers and quantities of men and of money; and, according to the taste of the period, delighted in naked lists of names.

In view of all this, the frequent mention of his sources has not saved him from the suspicion of misrepresenting and manufacturing history. Those who deny the historical character of Chronicles assume that the author wrote his history to show the blessings which would attend a Levitically correct practice of religion. Since they suppose his chief source of information to have been the canonical books of Samuel and Kings, they hold that he accomplished his end by the most unconstrained misplacements, additions, omissions, inventions, and misrepresentations. According to Wellhausen he falsely represented

the entire Priest's Code as in use prior to the Exile, whereas he maintains it was not then known, nor in existence. The answer of the more conservative critics to such charges can not here be given, except to say that they affirm that the work gives the most indubitable evidence of trustworthiness in its historical representations.

Nevertheless its defenders suggest that caution must be employed in the construction of history from the data given by the Chronicler. It is admitted that he wrote the history of Israel from his own standpoint—the Levitical-priestly; that in consequence where he wished to dwell upon a subject, he involuntarily attributed views and customs to the past which belonged in reality to his own age; that his immense sums of gold and silver, sacrificial animals, and soldiers can not in all cases be accepted as facts, and that the errors arose not from the carelessness of transcribers, but, in some instances at least, from his love of large numbers; that the great festivals of David, Solomon, Hezekiah, and Josiah may have been decked out with splen-

dors known only in a later time; that the Hymn of David (1 Chron. xvi), the longer speeches of David, Solomon, Abia, Asa, Jehoshaphat, and Hezekiah, together with the warnings of the prophets Nathan, Obed, and others, may be free reproductions of traditional utterances of these men. Such a reproduction they defend on the ground that John did the same with the words of Jesus; and they deny that they lose their historical worth thereby, any more than do the speeches found in Thucydides or Livy, which are subject to the same criticism. Of intentional misrepresentation they do not accuse him. They conclude that where the older historical books give a record of an event recorded in Chronicles, the former is to be preferred; but that, except where there are special reasons to the contrary, what is peculiar in the record of the Chronicles may be accepted as a contribution to the history of Israel.

PART III.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

§ 25. GENERAL HISTORY OF NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM.

IT was under the influence of rationalism that the critical treatment of the New Testament began. Semler,¹ in a series of treatises concerning the free investigation of the canon (1771-1775), gave up the doctrine of inspiration, and made the canonicity of the books of the New Testament independent of their authorship. The Bible contained elements which were not only erroneous, but positively injurious; others which were only local and temporary; and still others which tended to moral improvement, or to real spiritual benefit. The last only was the Word of God. As the early Church had decided upon the books which should be regarded canonical, and as Luther had exercised his own judgment in the valuation of the individual books, so the

¹Abhandlungen von freier Untersuchung des Kanon.

Church of his (Semler's) day must judge which portions of the Bible it would admit into the canon.

The next important step was that of Eichhorn.¹ Tradition being no longer the guiding principle of the critics, it became necessary to substitute such hypotheses as would account for the facts. Eichhorn supposed that the peculiarities of the three synoptical Gospels were capable of explanation on the hypothesis that they had for their groundwork an original Greek Gospel (*Urevangelium*). Gieseler² (1818), on the other hand, proposed to explain all the facts on the supposition that the Gospel as preached by the different apostles became more or less stereotyped in their own and their hearers' memories, and, when reduced to writing by the different evangelists for different purposes, must come forth with just such similarities and divergences as these Gospels exhibit.

Schleiermacher³ sought, as early as 1811, to

¹ *Einleitung in das Neue Testament.*

² *Die Entstehung der schriftlichen Evangelien.*

³ *Darstellung des Theologischen Studiums.*

guide criticism into a new channel. He proposed to place the reader of to-day in the position of the original reader of the Gospels. In order to this, he discussed first the history of the canon and the text, and then the origin of the individual books. For this purpose a knowledge of the literature of the period, and of the class of readers for which it was intended, was necessary. His was the boldest judgment yet uttered concerning the genuineness of the various books of the Bible. He rejected as decidedly spurious the synoptical Gospels—which he held were composed subsequent to the Apostolic Age—1 Timothy, 2 Peter, and Revelation; while of doubtful genuineness were Ephesians, 2 Timothy, James, and 2 and 3 John.

By this time the historical-critical method of Biblical investigation was fairly established; and distinguished services were rendered by De Wette, Credner, Volkmar, and Neudecker. In the defense of traditional views, Guericke, Olshausen, and Neander wrote—the latter, however, making more concessions than the former two.

With the Tübingen school, whose founder was Ferdinand Christian Baur,¹ New Testament criticism passed from its literary to its historical stage. Baur taught that the place of each New Testament document in the development of the history of primitive Christianity must be ascertained in order that criticism may fulfill its mission. Such an investigation would involve the question as to the circumstances which called forth the book, its purpose, and its doctrines. As he studied early Christianity, he thought he saw a profound conflict between the Christianity of Peter and that of Paul. This he thought was traceable through all the Christian literature of the first century, and far into the second. By it he proposed to explain the form which the old Catholic Church took in the second half of the second century. It was also the touchstone by which he tested the genuineness of all the New Testament books. The four letters—1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans,

¹His views are found in full in his "Paulus," and in "Das Christenthums u. die Christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte."

and Galatians—were Pauline, and represented Paul's own views. The other books were all written with a tendency to bring out the unity which lay beneath the supposed Petrine and Pauline antagonisms. The single exception to this was the Apocalypse, which represented the anti-Pauline view. Strauss¹ is perhaps better known in this country than Baur, and is generally regarded as belonging to the Tübingen school; but, as a matter of fact, he was far less profound than his preceptor, Baur, and scarcely held or promulgated any of the opinions peculiar to him. Strauss dealt rather with the life of Jesus than with the questions of Biblical criticisms, the trustworthiness of the record rather than the authorship of the documents. Strauss regarded the incidents related in the Gospels as "myths;" Baur supposed the Gospels to have been written for the purpose of aiding the harmonization of Pauline and Petrine Christianity. Strauss hurried into print, while Baur, his preceptor, was painstakingly studying the whole question. But the Tübingen school had many able champions,

¹Leben Jesu.

among whom were Zeller,¹ Schwegeler,² and, for a time, Ritschl. Bruno Bauer will be mentioned under the latest criticism of the four principal Pauline epistles (§38).

We can not here mention the able arguments which the orthodox party brought to bear against the Tübingen school; but such men as Dietlein, Thiersch, Ebrard, and Lechler must at least find mention. So, from less orthodox sources, Bleek, Ewald, Meyer, Reuss, and Hase powerfully assisted in overcoming the new view. And even from within the school itself divisions arose. Hilgenfeld³ soon took an independent position. But especially was it Ritschl⁴ who broke the strength of the Tübingen school by proving that Baur had missed the real facts in the historical development of the old Catholic Church; that, except for a short time, there was no such conflict as Baur saw so prominent in the first two cen-

¹His views were advocated in the *Theologischen Jahrbücher*.

²*Das Nachapostolische Zeitalter*.

³First in the "*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*," and later (1855) in "*Das Urchristenthum*."

⁴In *Die Entstehung der Altkatholischen Kirche* (2d edition, 1857).

turies; that Baur's assertion that to admit the reality of miracles is unhistorical, is incorrect; and that the only true method of judging Christianity is not to place it under a secular measuring-rod, but to estimate it from the religious standpoint. The principal living representatives of the Tübingen school are O. Pfleiderer¹ and C. Holsten,² although neither of them adheres strictly to Baur's views.

§ 26. PRESENT-DAY NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM.

Weiss³ divides the theologians of to-day, so far as they have to do with New Testament questions, into the newer critical school and those whose tendencies are apologetic or defensive. Under the former he ranks Harnack, Weizsäcker, Pfleiderer, Mangold, H. J. Holtzmann, Immer, Wittichen, Lipsius (de-

¹See his views set forth in his "Paulinismus" and his "Das Urchristenthum."

²His opinions are fully given in "Zum Evangelium des Petrus und Paulus," "Das Evangelium des Paulus," and "Die drei ursprünglichen, noch ungeschriebenen Evangelien."

³Einleitung in das Neue Testament.

ceased), Overbeck, Paul Schmidt, W. Brückner, Seuffert, von Soden. Among the ^{Cabr}former he mentions Beyschlag, Grimm, Klöpffer, Weiss (Bernhard), L. Schulze, Hofmann (deceased), Th. Schott, Luthardt, Klostermann, Zahn, Grau. In fact, there is no classification better than this; although, especially in the latter, there are vast differences.

The newer critical school rejects Baur's theory of an opposition between a Petrine and a Pauline Christianity, and hence finds the true explanation of old Catholicism elsewhere; but it maintains many of the presumptive results of the Tübingen school, and is governed by its methods and presuppositions in a large measure. In addition to Paul's four principal epistles, they generally accept also Philemon, Philippians, and 1 Thesalonians; but, in contradiction to the Tübingen school, they reject the Apocalypse. They do not accept as belonging to the apostolic age the so-called catholic (general) epistles, nor Hebrews; reject the fourth Gospel most decidedly; and even deny that the apostle John ever lived in Asia Minor.

Among the apologists, the school of Hofmann, to which Luthardt, Zahn, and Grau belong, is distinguished by great conservatism in the criticism of the New Testament. This school is, in a large measure, influenced in its criticism by dogmatic considerations. It regards every book in the canon as absolutely necessary—the Scriptures as an organic whole; and holds to the doctrine of inspiration, not so much of each book as of the canon as a whole. Beyschlag and Weiss, on the other hand, are much freer in their treatment of the canon and the individual books, and have no respect for dogmatic considerations in the conclusions they reach. Yet, compared with the critical school, they may be called conservative.

§ 27. THE SYNOPTIC QUESTION.

A cursory examination of the first three of our canonical Gospels reveals a remarkable similarity in contents, as well as in language and in the order observed. This, rather than the fact of variations, has led to the critical theories with regard to their origin. Until

the beginning of this century the prevailing method of explanation was, that each evangelist used one or more of the Gospels produced by the others. *Griesbach* supposed that Mark had abbreviated Matthew. *Wettstein* and others that Mark used Matthew; and Luke, both Matthew and Mark. *Owen* held that Mark epitomized both Matthew and Luke.

Early in our century *Eichhorn* undertook to explain the similarities on the supposition that the authors of our canonical Gospels all based their work on an older Gospel (the so-called Primitive Gospel), used by the assistants of the apostles as a guide in their labors. This hypothesis found many supporters, but its details were so complicated and improbable as to render it impossible of final acceptance. Yet critics generally agree that his hypothesis pointed in the right direction. Taking the suggestion from *Herder*, *Gieseler* undertook to show that all the peculiarities of our synoptic Gospels can be best explained on the hypothesis that a comparatively fixed form of teaching concerning our Lord, his words and deeds, would naturally develop during the years in

which the apostles preached the gospel in and about Jérusalem, and that this oral gospel formed the basis of the writings of our canonical Gospels. This hypothesis was favorably received, but soon discovered to be inadequate; although it is not without supporters even in the present day.

The *Tübingen school* introduced the next important change in the criticism of the synoptics. According to this school the Gospels were not intended to be histories, but bear the character of "tendency writings," intended to help forward the union of the Petrine and Pauline parties. The Gospels, themselves, however, bore but little evidence of such a strife as Baur had supposed to exist for more than a century after the ascension of Christ. Hence he supposed them to have been written at a date late enough to allow the dispute to have almost died out (130-170). With the fall of the *Tübingen school* fell also this hypothesis concerning the origin of the synoptic Gospels.

Early in this century *Weisse*¹ argued that

¹In his *Evangelische Geschichte*.

the testimony of Papias concerning a Gospel by Mark is applicable to our canonical Mark, and that hence we have here an original source from which the two other Gospels (synoptic) drew much of their matter. *Bernhard Weiss* holds to a document still earlier than our Mark, and known to him. This document he supposes to have contained a collection of our Lord's sayings, and also a collection of incidents in our Lord's life. *Holtzmann*¹ thinks these two were distinct sources, and that our Mark was dependent upon the collection of incidents, while Matthew and Luke were dependent upon it and the collection of sayings of our Lord. It will be impossible, however, to give here an account of the multitudinous theories which have been advanced to clarify the synoptic question. For details the reader is referred to the larger *Introductions*.

¹See his views in full in his "Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament." Erster Band.

§28. THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW.

The early Church held this Gospel for the first. Holtzmann, although denying that in its present form it was written by Matthew, admits that it was not without good reason that the early Church held it to be the work of the apostle whose name it bears. Papias said that Matthew wrote a book of sayings of our Lord in Hebrew. Some think this does not exclude the supposition that his book also contained records of the doings of our Savior. Many competent critics think it probable that our canonical Matthew is simply a translation of the Hebrew Gospel. Others think that the author of our Matthew drew from the apostolic document. Weiss thinks that he drew from the apostolic document and from Mark. It is plain that those who are described in the last two sentences deny the apostolic origin of our Matthew, although they may credit it with entire trustworthiness. Those who deny the apostolic origin of the first Gospel, but derive it from an apostolic "source," suppose that the first two chapters

did not belong to the "source." With some it is doubtful at what date the "traditions" arose which they record.

The majority place the date of the Gospel about 70 A. D.; but Baur fixed it at 130, some of his followers going back still earlier to 105-110. Opinions are divided as to the nativity of the author. Holtzmann argues from chapter xix, 1, that the author lived in the country east of the Jordan. Weiss argues in favor of the non-Palestinian residence of the author, because he explains the names Immanuel and Golgotha, and the prayer of Christ on the cross (i, 23; xxvii, 33, 46); because he did not know the original home of the parents of Jesus, which he infers from chapter ii, 22; and because he supposes Matthew to have drawn from Mark, who was not an eyewitness; whereas, had he lived in Palestine, he would have gone direct to still living eyewitnesses. Others argue with equal cogency for the Palestinian nativity and residence of the author. It is pretty generally conceded that it was written for Jewish readers, although some

think they were Jews who lived in the midst of Gentile populations, and not in Palestine.

§ 29. THE GOSPEL OF MARK.

The contents of this Gospel are nearly all found in Matthew, and, for the most part, in essentially the same order; but while Matthew undertakes to show that Jesus is the son of Joseph and the son of David, the Messiah of prophecy, Mark's purpose is to exhibit Jesus as the Son of God. Matthew seems to be written for Jewish, and Mark for heathen Christians.

Mark has sometimes been taken for an epitome of Matthew, sometimes for an epitome of the first and the third Gospel. Weiss thinks Mark's chief source was the collection of our Lord's words and deeds by Matthew—the so-called Logia document; Hilgenfeld, that it was a tendency document, designed to harmonize doctrinal differences between parties; Volkmar,¹ to show that Paulinism began as early as the time of Christ. Some think this not

¹ In *Marcus und die Synopsis*.

the Gospel written by Mark, but that it is based upon a Gospel by him. The majority are disposed to believe that this Gospel is the product of a pupil of Peter, as Mark was supposed to be. (1 Peter v, 13.)

The same arguments which would fix the date of Matthew prior to the destruction of Jerusalem hold good for Mark. Those who regard Mark as the author, place it about that time. Those who hold to a primitive Mark, upon which our Mark is based, or maintain that ours is made up of extracts from the other Gospels, place the date variously from 110 to 130 A. D. The genuineness of chapter xvi, 9-20 has been challenged. It does not seem to fit well the former part of the chapter, and it is wanting in some of the oldest manuscripts.

§ 30. THE GOSPEL OF LUKE.

While there are many critics who deny that our third Gospel was written by the person whose name it bears, attributing it rather to Timothy, Titus, or some other person, the majority admit the truth of the constant tra-

dition from the time of Irenæus, that it was written by Luke. This is supported by the almost universally accepted theory that the Gospel was produced by one who had been closely associated with Paul, and represents his conception of the availability of the gospel of Christ for heathen as well as Jews. This is proved by the many coincidences between the doctrinal presuppositions of the Gospel and Paul's well-known views, as well as by the harmony of its historical statements with Paul's record of the same events.

The date of composition has been a point in controversy. The Tübingen school, regarding it as a tendency document, intended to act as an irenic in harmonizing the supposed Pauline and Petrine factions, could not at first place it earlier than 130 A. D. Present-day adherents of that school place it about 100 A. D. Deniers of the principle of the Tübingenites feel at liberty to place it anywhere between 63 and 80 A. D. The general supposition that Luke and Acts were written by the same person makes it probable that the former was written before the latter ;

but the abrupt close of Acts with the account of Paul's imprisonment in Rome, has suggested that the Gospel must have been written prior to 64. This presupposes, however, that the Acts was intended to give a history of the apostles. Most critics deny this, and explain the book as an account of the spread of Christianity, and think that Luke was satisfied when he had traced its progress to Rome, the capital of the empire. In this case, the date with which Acts closes would give no hint of the date of composition; and hence none of the date of the composition of Luke. This clue having failed, other critics decide from such criteria as they can find. Weiss, who regards Luke as the author, thinks it was written about A. D. 80.

In the beginning of his Gospel, Luke sets forth his purpose to write an exact account of the life and deeds of our Lord. He intimates that others before him have not succeeded in this attempt. This suggested that he could not have meant to criticise Matthew and Mark; and hence these Gospels were not in existence when he wrote. This would make

Luke the first of our canonical Gospels in order of time. But in any case it is asserted that he proposed to profit by the defects of his predecessors; and hence he must have had "sources" at his command. What these were, is the question. Weiss thinks he had the apostolic document of Matthew, and that, besides, he employed Mark and another source traceable, but whose authorship is unknown. Others who adhere more closely to the theory of Gieseler (§ 27), lay greater stress upon the information he received from eyewitnesses of the life of our Lord, and from Paul.

Attacks have been made upon the historical trustworthiness of this Gospel; but they are little emphasized in the present day. Luke assures us that his purpose was to write accurately, so that Theophilus might be confirmed in the teaching he had received. The integrity of the book is universally conceded at present. Some reject the statements of the first two chapters, explaining their admission into the book as best they may. The chief obstacle to their acceptance is the miracles they record.

§ 31. THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

The connection of this book with the foregoing makes it convenient to treat it here instead of after John. It is generally, though not universally, agreed that the author of the Gospel also wrote the Acts, and that it was Luke who wrote both. Some, however, hold that Luke wrote the "we" portions—that is, the portions in which the author writes in the first person plural—and that this was made in part the basis of the book, especially of the latter part, by another author.

As to the sources of information, critics generally hold that they were mostly written. This supposition is absolutely necessary to those who believe it to be a production of the second century. But while few think oral sources sufficient to explain the peculiarities of the Acts, many believe that Luke received much of his information from those who were eyewitnesses of the events recorded. The majority, therefore, believe in the trustworthiness of the record. The miraculous nature of many of the events has only caused its cor-

rectness to be doubted by those who reject all miracle. The Tübingenites held that the facts were distorted to suit the purpose of the author, which was to harmonize the Pauline and Petrine factions. Paul's sayings and doings were modified to give them a Petrine coloring; and Peter's, to conform them more nearly to the standard of Paul. But even followers of the Tübingen school now largely discredit this idea. Other questions will be found mentioned in the preceding section.

§ 32. THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

The Johannean question briefly stated is this: The synoptic Gospels present a picture of Christ so different from that of John that many have felt that if the former are true to the facts the latter is false, and *vice versa*. The doubt has also been strongly felt of the possibility of John's having written both the Gospel and the Apocalypse.

The first to raise any serious doubt of the genuineness of the Gospel was *Bretschneider*.¹ In one form or another he presented about

¹In his "Probabilia."

all the objections that have ever been produced. Among the principal opposers of Bretschneider was *Schleiermacher*. He argued that the Synoptics and John are respectively to Jesus what Xenophon and Plato were to Socrates. In both cases the former concerned themselves rather with externalities, and the latter with the true inner personality of their masters. With *Baur* a new form of criticism began. He attempted to show that the whole Gospel is simply an attempt to construct the history of Jesus in accordance with the Logos idea of the prologue. In this way he explained the divergences of the fourth from the first three Gospels, which far more nearly represented to him the real history. Hence it was not written by an apostle; and it was not written—as we might expect of John—from the Judaistic-legalistic standpoint, but from that of the heathen-universalistic Christian. Since it presupposes the entire development of Christianity to the middle of the second century, it could not have been written until after that time.

The defenders of the genuineness of the

Gospel have generally rejected all attempts to show that it is genuine only in parts, and have insisted that it is wholly reliable history; but there are those who have admitted that John may have unintentionally colored the utterances of Jesus according to his own subjectivity, although giving them in the main as they fell from the lips of our Lord. Such was the view held by *Luthardt*.¹ *Weizsäcker* holds essentially to this opinion; but denies that it was written by John, attributing it to one of his disciples.

At the present time there is a tendency on the part of the opposers and defenders of the genuineness to come still nearer together.² The opposers place the date earlier than formerly, and allow more of historical trustworthiness; the defenders grant that John wrote his Gospel under the influence of the impression which Jesus made upon him throughout a long life. This is the opinion of such men as *Luthardt* (as before stated),

¹ Das Evangelium nach Johannes.

² Schürer, Ueber den gegenwärtigen Stand der Johanneischen Frage.

Grau, Beyschlag, and Weiss. Others there are, however, who defend the genuineness, trustworthiness, and integrity of the Gospel in every sense of the word. Among these may be mentioned Godet and Keil. To such thinkers, John is not theology clothed in biographical or historical form, but genuine history. They deny any contradiction between John and the Synoptics, and stand firmly by the reality of all John's representations.¹

§ 33. THE JOHANNEAN EPISTLES.

The majority agree that the Gospel and First Epistle of John were written by the same person. Of course the Tübingen school deny that the author is John, and place the date of both comparatively late in the second century. One of the critical questions has been: Which is earlier, the Gospel or the First Epistle? Baur decided in favor of the Gospel, because he thought the Epistle so poor in thought. Hilgenfeld, on the other

¹A most excellent defense of John will be found in Nast's forthcoming volume on the fourth Gospel, advance sheets of which have been kindly placed at our disposal.

hand, took opposite ground, because of the riches he saw in the Epistle. Both assumed that the earlier one must be the richer in thought. The newer critical school deny the Johannean authorship of both Gospel and Epistle.

Bretschneider was the first of importance to deny the Johannean authorship of the Epistle. Both he and Paulus attributed it to John the Presbyter. The principal reason they assigned was the nature of the error referred to in the Epistle. This they supposed to be the error of Docetism. Since that time, there has been a dispute among the critics as to what the error really was which John condemned. Perhaps the majority have now reached the conclusion that the false doctrine attacked was that of Cerinthus, who taught that the heavenly *Æon*, Christ, united himself with Jesus at his baptism, and separated from him before his death. The Cerinthian error was promulgated during the lifetime of John the apostle.

Even those who in the present day deny the Johannean authorship of the First Epistle,

affirm that it rests on Johannean traditions, which had continued to make themselves felt to a very late date. Baur thought he found in the Epistle evidences of the influence of Montanism. In any case, the supposition that the Epistle was written to confute error is erroneous, as one can see in the very first verses of the first chapter, where the purpose of the letter is named. Some have supposed the Epistle to have been written in Patmos, but the majority place it in Ephesus.

Even the Second and Third Epistles have been made to bear the character of tendency writings by the Tübingen school. Baur supposed that they were written to the Montanistic portion of the Roman congregation. He attributed them to a third John, only the Apocalypse, according to him, being the work of the apostle. Opinions have differed decidedly as to the real authorship of the epistles among those who deny them to John. Perhaps the majority favor the authorship of the Presbyter John. This they support particularly by the fact that, while the author of the Gospel and the First Epistle nowhere names

himself, here the author calls himself the *Presbyter*. One of the critical questions here is, whether the *Second Epistle* is addressed to a *Christian matron* or to a congregation under the figure of a *matron*. The generally accepted opinion is the former. *Hilgenfeld* thinks it was written for the entire *Christian Church*. The majority of those who attribute these letters to the *Apostle John* think they were written about the same time, and at *Ephesus*. *Weiss* thinks they were written prior to the *First Epistle*.

§ 34. THE BOOK OF REVELATION.

While we are treating the other *Johannean books*, we depart in this—as in some other cases—from the canonical order of the books, so as to bring those by the same author together. The principal questions with which we are concerned are those of the genuineness and the unity of the book. For the first time, we have to record that the *Tübingen school* adhered to the genuineness of a non-Pauline *New Testament book*. To them no book had so good testimony to its apostolic origin as the

Apocalypse; but while they held John for its author, it is to be feared their chief motive was to find an excuse for the rejection of the Johannean origin of the Fourth Gospel. According to the Tübingen critics, it was impossible that both Revelation and Gospel should have been written by the same person. This opinion was shared by Schleiermacher, Neander, and others; but these rejected the Apocalypse in the interest of the Gospel. Weizsäcker thinks there is enough difference between Revelation and the Gospel to exclude a common authorship, but that there is also enough similarity to suggest it. Among those who have denied the Johannean authorship is Luther. On the other hand, the genuineness is defended by a powerful company, including the Tübingenites. Truly, theology, like politics, sometimes makes strange bedfellows. Another class will not deny its Johannean character, although they dispute his authorship. Volkmar thinks it was written by an antagonist of Paulinism, but in the spirit of John. Weizsäcker thinks it was written by a pupil of John, toward the end of the first cen-

ture, but subsequent to the apostle's death. Grau holds that it was written under the direction of the apostle.

The unity of the book has also in recent years been vigorously attacked. *Völter*¹ thought he could distinguish five strata in the book: 1. A primitive Apocalypse of the Apostle John in the year 65 or 66; 2. A supplement by the original apocalyptist in the year 68 or 69; 3. The first revision, in the time of Trajan; 4. The second revision, about 129 or 130; 5. The third revision, about the year 140. *Vischer*² gave a new turn to the discussion when he announced the theory that Revelation is a Jewish Apocalypse, revised by a Christian hand, with additions. This he supports on the ground that the book contains unmistakably Jewish elements, together with others as distinctively Christian. *Düsterdieck*, while not accepting *Vischer's* theory, admits that it has in its favor the fact that Jewish Apocalypses were sometimes so revised by Christians, and thus found their way into

¹ Entstehung der Apocalypse.

² Offenbarung Johannis.

congregational use. *Schön*¹ assumed that the Christian author took up into his work Jewish oracles of the year 68-70. *Pfliederer* thinks there are distinguishable two Jewish apocalyptists and two Christian revisers. The second of the two former adopted an Apocalypse of the years 66-70. The first Christian reviser wrote under Domitian; the second, under Hadrian. *Spitta*² assumes that John Mark wrote an Apocalypse about A. D. 70. This was combined, toward the end of the first century, with two Jewish Apocalypses, the first of which belonged in the time of Pompey; the second, in the time of Caligula.

The time and place of composition are both in dispute among the critics, who are by no means at one as to whether it was written before or after the destruction of Jerusalem, or as to the place of composition.

According to Volkmar, the false teachers of chapter xvi, 13, include Paul; and Völter identifies the Nicolaitans with the Montanists.

¹ L'Origine de l'Apocalypse de Saint Jean.

² Die Offenbarung des Johannes.

It is also a disputed question whether the scenes follow each other, or are intended to be contemporaneous. The difference of view here gives rise to a great variety of methods of interpretation. The book is one which more than any other puzzles the critics.

§ 35. THE EPISTLE OF JAMES.

The principal critical questions connected with this Epistle center about its relationship to the teachings of St. Paul. Luther thought its teachings were diametrically opposed to those of Paul; and as he accepted Paul's views alone as evangelical, he called James an epistle of straw. The Tübingen school also held that Paul's letters and James were contradictory, and saw in this a proof of the supposed antagonism between Paul and the original apostles; although it did not fit into their scheme to make the Apostle James the author of the Epistle. The majority of critics to-day do not see any essential contradiction between James and Paul. There is one class who regard the Epistle as having been written so early that it could not possibly

have been intended to antagonize the Pauline doctrine of justification, since that doctrine had not yet spread very far, or perhaps had not even been promulgated. According to them, James saw in the Jewish Christians scattered abroad among the Gentile populations certain defects both in the theory and practice of Christianity, and these his letter was written to correct. Others think that the Epistle was written after the doctrines of Paul had become well known, and that the author of the Epistle had full knowledge of them. Of these that portion who deny any purpose to antagonize St. Paul or his doctrine, suppose that James intends merely to guard his readers against false applications of the Pauline doctrine.

§ 36. FIRST AND SECOND PETER.

Among the methods employed to cast doubt upon the genuineness of First Peter has been the attempt to show that Peter never was so situated that he could have learned the Greek. Another point much disputed is as to the relation between First Peter and

Ephesians. The coincidences are acknowledged by all; but some think First Peter was influenced by Ephesians; others hold precisely the reverse. It is also a question whether the Epistle is written to Jewish Christians, to heathen Christians, or to mixed congregations of Jews and heathen. The Tübingen school held First Peter to be spurious, and attributed it to the purpose of the author to unite the divided parties in the Church. According to their theory the Epistle, pretending to come from Peter, testified to the correctness of Paul's teaching. Of course since, according to their view, it was not written by Peter, but by a member of the Pauline party, it was a pious fraud.

The genuineness of Second Peter has been far more generally doubted than that of the First Epistle. The principal source of doubt, so far as the internal evidence is concerned, is the relationship it sustains to the Epistle of Jude. The dependence of one upon the other is universally admitted. Opinions divide as to whether Second Peter drew from Jude or the reverse; but defenders of the

genuineness deny that Peter could not or would not have drawn from Jude. The fact that he touches upon matters wholly unmentioned in the first letter the defenders explain on the supposition that a considerable time elapsed between the composition of the two epistles, during which those addressed in both letters had undergone a change of situation. The late adoption into the canon of the New Testament, which has caused many to doubt its Petrine origin, is generally explained on the supposition that it was written too near the death of the apostle to obtain circulation during his lifetime, and hence, from the beginning, lay under the shadow of unjust doubt.

§ 37. THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

This is another of the New Testament books which Luther rejected; but he was governed by the traditional view that the author meant to represent himself as an apostle; whereas, to Luther, it was apparent that he was not an apostle. Critics now almost universally admit that the letter does not in

any way make the claim to having been written by an apostle, but by Jude, the brother of James, the brother of our Lord. He was also governed in his opinion by its apparent relation of dependence upon Second Peter, and by its quotation from the Book of Enoch. It has been often supposed that the false teachers condemned by Jude are those prophesied by Peter, and hence that Jude must be later by some years than Second Peter; but others are of the opinion that Jude does not attack false doctrine, but a misapplication of Pauline truth. It is admitted on all sides that the citation from the Book of Enoch gives us no data by which to determine the time of composition; and critics to-day take no offense, as Luther did, at the citation of unscriptural books by a Scripture writer. The newer critical school generally, however, deny that it was written by Jude, the brother of James, and place the date of composition about A. D. 140. They think it professes to antagonize the Gnosis of Carpocrates, and the Antinomian Gnosis of the second century in general.

§38. GALATIANS, ROMANS, AND FIRST AND SECOND CORINTHIANS.

Until very recently criticism had, almost without exception, admitted the genuineness of these four principal Pauline epistles. F. C. Baur, the founder of the Tübingen school, declared that the evidence of their Pauline origin was so indubitable that it was unthinkable how criticism could ever raise doubts concerning them. In fact, these and the Revelation of St. John were the necessary foundation of their theory that there was a profound disharmony between Paul and the primitive apostles. Bruno Bauer's¹ attempt to cast doubt upon the genuineness of these epistles received no countenance whatever. The first in recent years to attack their genuineness were the two Hollanders, Pierson and Loman. Pierson² says it is natural to suppose that so remarkable a personage as the Paul of Galatians is a fiction of a member of the ultra-

¹Kritik der Paulinischen Briefe.

²De bergrede en andere Synoptische Fragmenten, and in various articles.

Pauline school, and not a reality. But it remained for the Swiss theologian, Rudolf Steck,¹ to develop this doubt systematically. He attempts to prove that none of the four principal letters attributed to Paul is from his pen; and, in fact, that we have nothing which was written by him. His method of investigation is far more scholarly, calm, and respectful than Bruno Bauer's, and, unlike him, he maintains the historic personality of Jesus Christ. According to his view it is improper to assume the genuineness of these four letters, and it is the duty of criticism to apply the same principles to their investigation that are applied to the smaller Pauline epistles. The importance of the problem thus raised demands comparative fullness of treatment.

Steck affirms that we must either allow that Paul wrote more than these four principal letters, or else deny that we have anything whatever from his pen. He argues that since Revelation—which was one of the main supports of the Tübingen school—has recently

¹In "Der Galaterbrief." He is well answered by Johannes Gloël, *Die jüngste Kritik des Galaterbriefes*.

fallen into doubt, we must needs suspect, also, the other books acceptable to the Tübingenites. He sees in Galatians a dependence upon Romans and the Corinthian letters of such a kind that it is impossible they should all have been written by the same hand. He regards the Paulinism of Galatians as far more advanced than that of Romans. While the Tübingen school rejected the Acts as historically untrustworthy, Steck regards its information concerning Paul as substantially reliable. He thinks the author of Galatians secured his information largely from the Acts, but distorted it in the interest of ultra-Paulinism. To his mind, the most senseless thing which could have been done at the time was what is related in Galatians ii. The author of Galatians meant to deny that Paul ever made the smallest concession. The Paul of Galatians is not the real Paul, but an ideal of an extreme disciple of the great apostle to the heathen. In Galatians, which was composed about A. D. 120, is found not the Paulinism of Paul, but of his disciples. He thus supposes that the opposition between Paulinism

and Jewish Christianity did not appear in its sharpest form during, but subsequent to, the lifetime of the apostles.

His conclusions concerning Galatians he seeks to support by pointing out the evidences of a late composition for the Roman and Corinthian letters. He also affirms that the Christology of these letters is too advanced for the time of Paul, the argument being based on the presumption that the Christology of the primitive apostles was far simpler than that which prevailed seventy-five years later. In this connection, also, he draws an argument from the similarity in many particulars of the Johannean and the Pauline Christology. From the fact, also, that the Old Testament citations are from the LXX version, he argues that the author could not have been acquainted with the Hebrew, which Paul of course understood. He also attempts to show that these four letters exhibit a literary dependence upon the synoptical Gospels, the Ascension of Moses, the fourth Book of Ezra, and the philosophical writings of Philo and Seneca. On the other hand, he denies that any writing prior to

A. D. 130 shows literary dependence upon our four letters.

Steck is of the opinion that the antagonism between the Pauline and the primitive apostolic Christianity became greatly accentuated subsequent to Paul's death, and that the order of the development of this antagonism is marked by the order of the composition of these four epistles, which he makes Romans, First and Second Corinthians, Galatians. All the New Testament documents were produced, according to him, in the first half of the second century. The custom of attributing letters to celebrated men was so common in those days as to remove it from the category of the blameworthy. He even claims for his universal rejection of the genuineness of the New Testament documents an advantage equal to allowing all to be genuine. If all are spurious, none are spurious; no single document falls into contempt in comparison with others because it is supposed to be spurious.

In Germany, Steck's criticism has found only opposition; but in Holland, where the movement had its start, it has found consider-

able favor. Professor Van Manen, of Leyden, goes much farther than Steck. He even accuses him of too great conservatism in allowing historical trustworthiness to the Acts. With Steck, Paul is a great historical personage. Van Manen does not deny his existence; but he denies that we know anything very distinct concerning him. He suspects that we have to thank Gnosticism for the four principal letters of Paul. According to this, we would have absolutely no data but our own inner consciousness to teach us what Paul taught, or who he was.

§39. *FIRST AND SECOND THESSALONIANS.*

The common interpretation of the first three chapters of First Thessalonians in the days of Baur, according to which the apostle was supposed merely to have given expression therein to the feelings of his heart, suggested that no worthy motive could be discerned for the Epistle, and hence it was not apostolic. He also rejected the supposition of Pauline origin, because he thought it to be dependent upon the Acts, which he regarded as a post-

apostolic production. The late date of the epistles has been suspected because of the celebrity of the congregation at the time of writing, and the supposed considerable number of deaths which had occurred among the Thessalonian Christians. It has also been thought that both the doctrine and the language of the epistles are un-Pauline.

The apocalyptic character of part of the Second Epistle has given occasion to considerable criticism. During the first century the opinion prevailed that although Nero had disappeared he was not dead, and that he would reappear from the Orient. The apocalyptic features of Second Thessalonians have been supposed to be constructed in some way according to this expectation. The one thing common to all these theories is, that Vespa- sian was that which "hindered," and who must be gotten out of the way before the Apocalypse could be fulfilled. Hilgenfeld took a different view. He thought he saw in the "falling away" a time of severe persecu- tion, and hence held that the letter was writ- ten during the reign of Trajan. Especially

did he regard the "mystery of iniquity" as identical with the rising Gnosticism.

The vast majority of the newer critical school maintain the genuineness of the First Epistle and reject that of the Second; but as there are names of the first order who can be quoted against the First, so can others equally strong be quoted in favor of the Pauline origin of the Second.

§40. EPHESIANS.

The principal argument which has been urged against the genuineness of this Epistle is its relationship to Colossians, which has been supposed to be that of dependence. It has been declared that Ephesians is an enlargement of Colossians without addition of thought, though with a redundancy of words. The letter has been accused of displaying a style of thought and language unworthy of the Apostle Paul. Many have found references to phases of Gnosticism not in existence at the time of Paul. The Tübingen school found not only references to late Gnosticism, but even thought the writer was in-

fluenced by Montanus. They thought that the tendency of the letter was to unite the yet divided parties of the Church by a union of faith and love, and by mutual concessions. The relationship of the Epistle with First Peter has also been a subject of dispute. The similarity is not disputed; but the question is, whether Ephesians presupposed a knowledge of First Peter or First Peter a knowledge of Ephesians. Those who deny the genuineness are inclined to the former supposition.

§41. COLOSSIANS.

Mayerhoff¹ was the first to dispute the genuineness of this Epistle. He thought that both the language and the teaching were un-Pauline. Baur saw in the Epistle the attempt of a pupil of Paul to bring the latter into harmony with the Logos doctrine of the Fourth Gospel. He thought that the—to him—evident references of the Epistle to Gnostic ideas proved it to have originated with one who was impregnated with Gnosti-

¹ In *Der Brief an die Kolosser*.

cism. Ewald supposed that Timothy wrote the letter after conversing with Paul, and thus explained the differences between this letter and others unquestionably Pauline. A still different form of criticism is that of Holtzmann. He thinks¹ it possible to distinguish a genuine letter of Paul to the Colossians in our Epistle, which was imitated by the author of the Epistle to the Ephesians, and interpolated by him so as to make up our present Colossians. This idea he supports by the attempt to show that Colossians lacks true connection of thought. Bleek supposed that Paul had dictated the letter to Timothy, which reminds one of Ewald's hypothesis mentioned above.

§ 42. PHILEMON.

The close relationship between this short letter and Colossians is universally admitted; but Baur, who rejected Colossians, did not spare even this Epistle. He held it to be an undeveloped romance, intended to teach that compensation is found in Christianity for all

¹Kritik der Epheser- und Kolosserbrief.

our earthly losses. Holtzmann thinks that verses 4-6 are additions by the author of the letter to the Ephesians. Weizsäcker thinks it is intended as an illustrative representation of a new doctrine in reference to the Christian life, and that the very name Onesimus indicates the allegorical character of the letter. The genuineness of the letter is universally conceded to-day; and it is held to be one of many similar letters which Paul must have written to friends, but which have been lost.

§ 43. PHILIPPIANS.

The Tübingen school led the way in pronouncing this letter spurious. A principal argument was its supposed Gnostic ideas, and especially its presumed relation to the Valentinian Gnosticism. The usual "tendency" to conciliation of the divided parties of the Church is here assumed to exist; and Schwegler even saw in the two women of chapter iv, 2, typical representations of the Pauline and anti-Pauline parties. One by one, however, all critics have come over to the defense of its genuineness, except two or three. Yet

there are those who feel that there is a decided difference between the Paulinism of this and some of the older letters; and this acknowledged fact is one of the arguments upon which the few who still reject the Epistle depend.

§ 44. THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

The question of the genuineness of these epistles is interwoven with that of a second Roman imprisonment of the Apostle Paul. The majority maintain that there is no period in the life of Paul, as it is known to us, when these letters could have been written. Those, therefore, who would defend their Pauline origin, suppose that Paul was released from his first imprisonment, spent several years in travels and preaching, and was subsequently arrested, imprisoned, and executed. Such a supposition, they claim, has reasonable historical evidence in its favor. Others hold that the supposition of a second imprisonment is insufficiently supported, and hence deny the genuineness of these epistles, or, if convinced on other grounds of their Pauline origin, undertake to show how the situation

presupposed in them fits into the, to us, known life of Paul.

But the critics have found other difficulties in the way of accepting these epistles. Schleiermacher, who rejected only First Timothy, thought that Epistle was a compilation from Second Timothy and Titus. As criticism advanced, it was made plain that these letters attacked errors, and presupposed an advancement in ecclesiastical organization not hinted at in the other Pauline epistles. It was further admitted that the letters contained language and ideas peculiar to themselves. Some undertook to show that they were composed by some immediate disciple of Paul, perhaps by Luke.

Baur supposed that they were written in the second century in the name of Paul, for the purpose of lending the weight of his name to opposition against certain Gnostic heresies. He also supposed that it was the necessity of protection against these same heresies which made their recommendations concerning Church government necessary. Thus, according to his opinion, about the year 150

A. D. furnished the only conditions out of which such letters could spring.

The attempt to declare these letters spurious has met with arguments so cogent on the other side that many have proposed to show that one or all of them are combinations of genuine Pauline documents, with additions by a pupil of the great apostle. Grau thinks this was done by the aid of remarks by Paul in letters written to their author, together with recollections of his utterances in conversation. The attempts at discovering genuine elements in the Pastoral Epistles are a concession in favor of their Pauline origin. But there are few who would not admit that there are serious difficulties in supposing that the letters were written entire by Paul; yet there are many who, recognizing these difficulties, refuse to reject the epistles on their account.

§45. THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

The principal critical question in connection with this Epistle pertains to the authorship. Opinions continued to waver until Bleek—in his work of 1828, *Der Brief an*

die Hebräer—settled the question against the Pauline authorship for almost all German critics. Weiss (*Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Neue Testament*) claims the following arguments as decisive against the Pauline authorship: The letter gives no hint of a claim to have been written by Paul. It has no address at the beginning, as do all Paul's letters. The author does not call himself an apostle nor assert apostolic authority. Paul always insisted that he had not received his gospel from man, but direct from God; whereas, the writer of Hebrews (chapter ii, 3 f.) speaks of himself as a disciple of the primitive apostles. The whole plan of the letter is different from the Pauline. The doctrinal and the practical portions are not separated as by Paul, but interwoven. No New Testament document is so free from Hebraisms, and written in such pure Greek. While Paul struggles to express himself, the language of Hebrews flows on with great smoothness; and the evidences of rhetorical skill are in plain contrast with the dialectic brevity of Paul. The great apostle generally quotes from the LXX, but always

betrays an acquaintance with the Hebrew text, while the writer of Hebrews evidently does not know the Hebrew. While Paul cites freely from memory, the writer of Hebrews quotes so accurately that it must have been copied from an open book.

The fact that Paul argues against the permanency of Judaism has led many to trace the Epistle to the Hebrews either to him or to one of his disciples. But the opponents of the Pauline origin of the letter point out that, while in the undoubted letters of Paul he assumes that, however perfect the law was, it was never intended to be more than temporary, the writer of Hebrews argues that it is temporary because imperfect. They deny the identity of the doctrines of Hebrews with those found in Paul's letters. Having denied the Pauline authorship, recourse has been had to the supposition that it was written by a pupil of Paul, as Luke, or Clement of Rome; others have thought of Mark or Aquila. Luther, and with him are many others, attributed the letter to Apollos. Weiss favors the hypothesis which attributes the

letter to Barnabas. He thinks that his birth in Cyprus would account for the evidences of Alexandrian culture found in the Epistle, while his Levitical extraction explains his knowledge of the ritual service of the Jews, and the emphasis he places upon it. His companionship with Paul will explain the similarity of the Epistle to those of Paul. Many critics agree with Weiss. It is interesting to note that criticism now inclines to the opinion that the ritual service of Hebrews is not that of the temple, but of the tabernacle. Especially does Von Soden insist on this view.

PART IV.

ESTIMATE OF RESULTS.

§ 46.

THE purpose of this book is neither the defense nor the denunciation of the higher criticism; nor did its purpose admit of an attempt to refute the arguments by which the conclusions recorded were sustained. Our aim has been to state the critical problems and their proposed solutions, without any attempt to estimate their importance, correctness, or tendency. Yet there is one class of scholars whose opinions and arguments we have scarcely noticed in these pages. This, not because they were unworthy, but because they are already well known. We refer, of course, to the so-called traditionalists. But it must not be supposed, on the other hand, that we have recorded the conclusions alone of the skeptical school. We have given, so far as space would permit, the views of every grade of critic except the traditionalist.

It is difficult to find any accurate designa-

tion for the different schools of critics. To call them destructive only means that they destroy previous opinions, and overlooks the fact that, at the present day, no critic is content with this; but all feel called upon to construct a theory in place of every one overthrown. The same remarks apply to the terms negative and positive as distinctive of different schools of criticism. More nearly correct is the distinction of radical and conservative. This, however, overlooks the fact that these two classes shade into each other until it would be almost impossible to classify under the one category or the other. It has also been proposed to apply the political designations of Right, Left, and Center. But the Center always stands for a distinct policy; whereas those critics who may not be classed with the Right or Left, can hardly be said to be guided by principles distinct from the other two parties, but are rather influenced by a mixture of both. They are not as conservative as the Right, nor as radical as the Left; but they do not differ from either so much in kind as in degree. Between the radical and

the conservative, however, there is a distinct difference in kind, at least so far as principles are concerned. The former shrink from the supernatural in Scripture; the latter fully admit it. The presumptive results of the latter might be—although generally they are not—as radical as those of the former, but they would not spring from radical principles. Here lies the really important difference between the radical critic and the conservative. It is not in the conclusions they reach concerning the date and authorship of a book, but in the principles which lead them to their conclusions. In the one case we are robbed of our Book and our religion as well; in the other, the determinative criteria as to the Book leave our faith intact. Now, it is just here that the critic whom we would call mixed conservative-radical finds his place. He leans with his heart to the old faith, but his intellect leads him to cut away its foundations. And his results will be as mixed as his principles, since, in fact, he is governed in part by subjective considerations in what he retains of the Bible.

The general opinion perhaps is, that Germany is the home of the most radical criticism. If we compare Germany with England this may be true, and still more so if compared with America. For the staunchest defenders of the faith in Germany are as radical in their criticism of the Bible as our most objectionable critics in America. But if we compare Germany with France, Switzerland, and Holland, we shall find the former far more conservative.¹ Not to mention the fact that the French, Swiss, and Dutch scholars are less original, it must be confessed that they are far less sober than their German neighbors. They seem to delight in extremes, perhaps under the impression that the more a position diverges from that commonly accepted the greater the evidence of scholarship. It is the usual error of imitators. The one who has made a profound investigation of any subject may reach erroneous conclusions; but he generally does not draw conclusions beyond the warrant of the facts he supposes himself to have discovered.

¹See, for example, § 38.

As to the value of the conclusions reached by the critics it is difficult to express an opinion without incurring the risk of opposition. One thing is practically demonstrated in the preceding pages; namely, that the variations of opinion among the critics themselves are so great as to suggest the propriety of being in no haste to give up the traditional view of the date and authorship of the books of the Bible. There are very few positive conclusions upon which the critics agree among themselves, and it looks as though it were hopeless to expect agreement in the future. The arguments of one are ignored or opposed by another of equal ability, although they may agree in their conclusions. In other cases they agree upon the facts involved, but differ in their interpretation of them and as to the inferences to be drawn. What seems to one the height of wisdom, appears to another the depth of absurdity. Such differences among the giant intellects will cause the ordinary man to despair of reaching a safe conclusion, and will drive the practical man to adhere with greater firmness than ever

to what has been hitherto found a good working hypothesis, allowing those who have time and inclination to concern themselves with these theoretical questions.

On the other hand, while opposing with all our power the love of negation so prominent in many critics, and the skeptical principles of those who deny the supernatural in the Bible, a hearty welcome should be extended to all reverent Scriptural investigation, even though the investigator may not always reach the conclusions we accept. To cast the *odium theologicum* upon those who profoundly, minutely, and in the proper spirit, study the Bible to elicit its secrets, would be to subject the world once more to the rulership of ecclesiastical authority. The reverent study of the Bible may be safely trusted to result in placing it higher, not lower, in the esteem of men, to say nothing of the fact that it will freshen the soul with new revelations of truth from God. The great danger is that Bible study with scientific appliances will be content with its science, and not go on to the study of its practical and spiritual truth for daily religious needs.

In estimating the value of the presumptive results of higher criticism, it must not only be remembered that most of them are merely presumptive, but also that there are men of profound learning who dispute almost the entire system of critical conclusions. They have weighed the arguments, and found them insufficient; they have critically examined the Bible for themselves, and find the strongest evidences of the truth of the traditional theory. One might not be convinced that these scholars are right; but, at least, one must admit that conclusions so supported by such men are entitled to respectful consideration. If we demand that the critics have a hearing, fair play requires that the opposing theories be not summarily discarded as un-scholarly, and especially in view of the fact that most of the traditional views have the weight of great critical names in their support. Almost every new theory, however plausible in its entirety at first, is liable to subsequent modification, not to say rejection.

It is a serious question whether the conclusions of criticism may properly be left to

stand or fall by critical considerations alone. The Christian should not lightly yield a point which affects his faith, even when the adverse conclusion seems to be supported by sufficient argument. It is impossible for the genuine Christian to be indifferent as to the outcome of a dispute concerning his faith or its foundations. While it is not justifiable to give one's self up blindly to a creed, some things must be regarded as fixed if chaos is to be prevented in thought and life. No one can think without presuppositions. The presuppositions of Christianity may as scientifically be made the starting-point of inquiry as those of negation or infidelity. We must suppose the essentials of Christianity to be either true or not true. To attempt to leave this an open question is practically to deny, although it may be but tentatively, that Christianity is true.

That form of argument, therefore, which appeals to Christ as authority on this subject is legitimate if properly employed.¹ If Jesus has spoken directly or indirectly on the ques-

¹ See in particular Ellicott's "Christus Comprobator."

tions at issue, the Christian must hear and heed. This nearly all admit, but some deny that he has spoken. There are critics who deny the omniscience and even the superiority of Christ's knowledge. They do not hesitate to say that Jesus was ignorant of the facts as to the authorship of the books of the Old Testament, and, with his fellow-countrymen, took their reputed for their real authors. Others suppose that he knew the facts, but that he merely accommodated his language to the belief of his hearers. The difficulty of this theory is that it does not recognize the frankness of speech which characterized the utterances of our Lord. Jesus was accustomed to expose, not to leave untouched, the errors of the Jews. Another form of this theory is, that by a metonymy Jesus may have merely spoken of a work by its reputed author. Whether all the references of our Lord to the Old Testament can be thus explained is a question each must decide for himself. It is difficult to suppose that, with all the facts before him, he would have left

them in such egregious error as to their history as the higher critics suppose to have prevailed among the Jews.

One of the most far-reaching conclusions of the critics is that the writers of the Bible erred in some or many of their statements of scientific, historic, and psychological fact.¹ They deny the inerrancy of the Bible, and affirm that as long as these errors are not as to matters of faith and practice, the value of the Bible is not thereby diminished. They argue that the Bible is not a book of science, of history, or of philosophy, but of religion. It can be expected to be correct, therefore, only so long as it speaks on religious themes. More radical critics, however, do not hesitate to say that the Bible contains errors even in its religious and moral utterances, and that therefore reason must be employed in distinguishing the true from the false. Some say that the Bible not only does not claim perfection for itself, but even denies its own perfection.² Most are content to account for any

¹ See Evans and Smith's "Biblical Scholarship and Inspiration."

² Mead, Supernatural Revelation.

imperfection in religious utterances on the ground that revelation was progressive, and that the earlier must of necessity be defective. Those who insist on error in these earlier religious and moral precepts, either do not believe in their true revelation, or explain by saying that God adapted his requirements to the stage of advancement of the people.

Closely connected with the doctrine of inerrancy is that of complete and uniform inspiration. Very few theologians, and none of the critics, believe to-day in verbal inspiration; but the majority conform their doctrine of inspiration to their idea of the degree of truth or error in the Bible. Many critics, however, remand the question of inspiration to dogmatics, and feel called upon to investigate the human conditions alone under which the various books of the Bible as well as the canon came into existence. They naturally come to ignore, in some cases to deny entirely, the Divine element in the origination of the Bible.

Too much emphasis can not be laid upon the fact that, as the Bible is our only suffi-

cient rule of faith and practice, the chief study of the Book should ever proceed from and return to this starting point. The question is legitimate as to what authority or value any portion of the Bible possesses. To some we may attach more, to other parts less; but when we make such questions our principal business in the study of the Word of God, we pervert a means and make it an end. Criticism, so far as it concerns the Christian, is the handmaid, not the mistress. If criticism is practiced for the purpose of making the Bible more available for practical, devotional use, it is a blessing. If practiced for its own sake, it is likely to lead astray. And as long as the Church concerns itself to practice the plain, unquestioned teachings of the Bible, criticism, even of the most radical kind, can do no harm. The best preventive of spiritual defection is experience. Those who have tested the promises of the Word, and found them true, are not likely to be disturbed by any assaults upon the Scripture, nor by any reconstruction of theories concerning it. But if any one is more inclined to defend the Bible against

criticism than to practice its precepts and enter into the inheritance of its promised blessings, he is in as dangerous a position as the most skeptical critic; for, although theoretically a believer, he is practically an infidel, in spite of his belief. There is little danger from the most extreme conclusions of criticism as long as saints are common. There is far more to be feared from a dead orthodoxy. The chief cause of alarm in connection with Biblical criticism is not in its methods nor in its conclusions, but in its tendency to make the Bible a book to be studied, not practiced. Investigation there must be; and investigation should be so conducted that our faith may more perfectly conform to the gospel of Christ, and our practice to the teachings of his Word.

PART V.

IF THE CRITICS ARE RIGHT, WHAT?

§47. THE DOCTRINE OF INERRANCY.

THE Christian thinker may assume either one of two attitudes towards those results of Biblical criticism which contradict traditional opinion—that of hostility, or that of accommodation to the new situation. The former would require him to counteract argument with argument more cogent. The latter would not demand acceptance of the supposed results, but lead him to inquire what will be the consequences if, in the end, these results come to be accepted, and what sort of a Christianity that would be which would remain. And this is an inquiry which the Christian must make. An unbeliever might entertain a purely scholarly interest in the problems of higher criticism; but the Christian is conscious of a practical interest as well. There may be processes of scientific

investigation whose results are so remotely connected with our practical life that the Christian need have no care as to the outcome; but not such is the scientific investigation of the Scriptures. The Bible professes to be at least the record of God's revelation to man. If it does not contain trustworthy accounts of the words spoken, the deeds performed, and the spirit manifested by our Lord, then we have no account of these. If we have not here a portraiture of the effects which the forces of Christianity may naturally be expected to produce in the lives of the followers of Jesus, then we have no authoritative standard of Christian life. The Christian can not therefore divest himself of the consciousness of a profound personal interest in the results of critical inquiry into the origin and authority of the Bible. The capability in any one of such disinterestedness would prove that Christianity is of small value to him.

The Christian, then, must interrogate criticism concerning its practical consequences. If he finds that it is sweeping away the foun-

dations of his faith, he must prevent it if he can, or failing, mourn over the ruins of his cherished beliefs. But if he finds the conclusions of the critics consistent with the vigor and energy of Christian experience and life, even though requiring certain readjustments, he may let criticism go on its way with perfect unconcern, since, although it may cause him some inconvenience, it leaves him in possession of what he holds dear.

A comparatively limited knowledge of Biblical criticism will suffice to remind us that the critics are not all of one kind. Their principles, methods, and moral and intellectual qualifications differ greatly. It is customary to classify them popularly as radical and conservative; but there is no such distinct line of demarkation as this classification indicates. It would be better to designate them as radical, mixed, and conservative. We can not here consider the radicals, because it is plain that their principles would overthrow Christianity in any of its present prevailing forms. Nor can we deal with the mixed class, since they have no harmonious principles of proced-

ure, leaning toward the radicals with their judgment, and toward the conservatives with their hearts. We confine ourselves to the conservatives, whom we further distinguish from those critics who always reach traditional conclusions.

The gist of the entire question is the authority of the Bible. It has always been the fundamental principle of Protestantism that the Church is neither the first nor the final authority in matters of faith and practice. It is the very essence of rationalism to give to reason the final decision.

There would seem to remain, therefore, to the non-rationalistic Protestant only the recourse of appeal to the founders of Christianity. But for such an appeal we must have a record in which we can confide. There are those, therefore, who affirm that the Bible is infallible in all its parts, and that any error would invalidate the entire Book; that while it is not a book of science, history, or psychology, whenever it touches these points its statements are absolutely correct. On the other hand, exceedingly conservative critics

admit the existence of errors in dates, numbers, sequence of events, names of persons and places, statements of natural science, and the like. They admit that writers of the books of the Bible labored under misapprehensions, and yet placed these upon record in conjunction with other statements of exact truth. Now, the question is, Do these concessions destroy the authority of the Bible? The rationalist says they do, and rejoices that the divine faculty of reason in man is to take the place of an infallible pope and an infallible book. The ultra-traditionalist agrees with the rationalist, with an "if;" but he denies the existence of the errors, and thus saves himself from the rationalist's conclusions.

The conservative critic says that these concessions do not destroy the authority of the Bible, because they do not touch the points upon which the Bible professes to be authority. These critics distinguish between the religio-ethical and the other portions of the Bible, and affirm that the Bible was not given to teach science, history, etc., but to be a rule of faith and practice. They affirm

that since no error has ever yet been demonstrated in those particulars in which revelation is necessary, we need not be troubled if there are occasional errors elsewhere. Most of them, moreover, claim that the demonstrable errors in history, etc., are so few or so unimportant that to reject the Bible on their account would be like rejecting the sun because there are spots on it. In their principal contention they are supported by the fact that the great evangelical Confessions make the Bible solely a rule of faith and practice. And this is what the Bible says of itself. (2 Timothy iii, 15-17.) Nor do the great Confessions assert inerrancy or infallibility except in matters of faith and practice. Two less important Creeds teach the absolute inerrancy of the Bible—the Creed of the New Hampshire Baptists (1833), which says that the Bible “has absolute truth, without any mixture of error for its matter;” and, by implication, the Confession of the Evangelical Free Church of Geneva (1848), which says: “We believe that the Holy Scriptures are entirely inspired of God in all their parts.”

There are many who are not ready to give up their Bibles in the event that it should finally turn out that the zoology, botany, and other non-religious utterances of the Bible are demonstrated to be in some rare instances inaccurate. Such a conclusion is too weighty for such premises. We would not assert the existence of errors in the Bible; but if any one else does, we would deny the rationalistic conclusion that it is therefore a purely human book.

§ 48. INSPIRATION.

That the doctrines of the absolute inerrancy of the Scripture and of its inspiration are intimately connected is beyond doubt. And here again the principles of the radicals and those of the ultra-traditionalists are strangely parallel. If you could convince the former that the Bible is an errorless book, they would at once admit its entire divine inspiration. The latter hold to its inerrancy, and hence to inspiration in every part and particle. Consistently held, this theory can, at most, allow to the human subjects of inspiration the freedom of amanuenses, who must write exactly

what, and only what, is dictated. No room is left for the expression of the writer's individuality, and, of course, none for error. Very few would venture to-day to hold to inspiration in so extreme a form as this. It is now generally admitted that the Scripture writings display the individuality of their writers. The doctrine of inspiration may still maintain, however, that these peculiarities do not amount to errors, and that any true doctrine of inspiration at least required that the Inspiring Spirit should guard the writers from recording any error. And this is, briefly stated, what the believers in inerrancy claim. In their judgment, the doctrines of inspiration and inerrancy stand or fall together.

If the Book is not in all its parts the product of direct divine inspiration, it can not be inerrant. If, on the other hand, it is not inerrant in all its parts, it can not be inspired. If it is not inspired and inerrant in all its parts, it is in no part trustworthy. One adherent of this view illustrated his view by saying that Tray was a good dog, but because Tray was found in bad company he was shot;

that is, if we find truth mixed with error in the Bible, even the truth is rendered uncertain. This would certainly be the case if we supposed every part of the Bible to be equally inspired. For if the Holy Spirit could be supposed to inspire the proclamation of one error, we could not be sure, except by a subjective test, that he had not inspired much error. Now just here is where the conservative critic meets his chief difficulty. He can not believe in the absolute inerrancy of the Bible, although he finds it in the main so capable of bearing the most exact scrutiny as to indicate the greatest care on the part of the authors.

He can not believe that the errors are placed on record by inspiration, but is compelled to attribute them to human infirmity. On the other hand, he finds prophets and apostles claiming inspiration, or at least revelation, and he is in no wise disposed to deny their claim. He further asserts that the Bible nowhere gives us an exact account of the nature, degree, or extent of inspiration; and that all these have been fixed by uninspired men. Hence he maintains the right to examine the

phenomena which the Bible presents, and to reach conclusions divergent from those of his uninspired predecessors or contemporaries. The substance of the conclusions of the critics is that inspiration, like inerrancy, can only be predicated of those parts of the Bible which have to do with faith and practice. They do not say nor intimate that other portions of the Bible contain no truth. On the contrary, they assert that these parts manifest the greatest care to state things as they are, and with a very high degree of success.

The great purpose of inspiration undoubtedly was to secure to the word of the inspired speaker or writer unquestioned authority. It is the doctrine of "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" (chap. xi) that one may not question the accuracy of the utterances of one who spoke under the influence of the Prophetic Spirit. But the question whether any one should be acknowledged as a prophet still remained open. John exhorts his readers to "try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets have gone out into the world." And then he makes the test

of their true inspiration, conformity in doctrine with his teachings concerning Jesus Christ. (1 John iv, 1-3.) Paul applies a similar test to the professed prophets of his time. (Gal. i, 8, 9.) The assumption both of John and Paul is, that inspiration has to do with the gospel of Jesus Christ, and with nothing else. They based the proof that any one possessed prophetic gifts upon the contents of their gospel teachings, not upon the accuracy of their historical utterances.

If, then, we will not discredit the ascertained truth of the Bible because errors are supposed also to be found there, neither must we reject the inspiration of some parts, because other parts are held to be uninspired. And Paul and John, while apparently limiting the results of prophetic inspiration in their day to gospel questions, at the same time give us a criterion by which to judge of the inspiration of any document. If it contradicts the gospel, it is not inspired. And if those to whom Paul and John wrote could apply this test, so can we; for it is not to be supposed that they possessed the gift of the dis-

cerning of spirits any more than we do. Let it be observed that we are not arguing in favor of this partial inspiration of the Scriptures, but that we are trying to show that we need not reject inspiration entirely if the critics rob us of belief in the inspiration of all parts of the Bible. The inspiration of those portions of the Bible which have to do with our faith and practice remains untouched, and it assures us of the authority of those precious treasures.

It will be interesting to discover what the great Creeds have to say upon this phase of the controversy. The first and second Helvetic Confessions seem to forbid such a construction of inspiration as the conservative critics give us. This is probably true also of the Irish Articles of Religion of 1615, and certainly of the Creed of the New Hampshire Baptists of 1833, and of the Evangelical Free Church of Geneva of 1848. On the other hand, while they do not teach such a distinction as to inspiration, there is nothing to forbid it in the French Confession of 1559, the Belgic of 1561 (revised in 1619), the Scotch of 1560, the

Thirty-nine Articles of Religion of the Church of England, and the Articles of Religion of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

The language of the Westminster Confession is such as to admit of doubt. Yet we are inclined to the opinion that it would not forbid the view of inspiration held by the conservative critic. In all fairness it ought to be said that while not expressly forbidden by anything in the above-named creeds, their framers probably held to the view of the ultra-traditionalist. If they were living now, however, and were to write in the light of the discussions of the present and recent past, it is impossible to say where they would range themselves. The preponderance of evidence from the Creeds is apparently on the side of the traditionalists as regards inspiration; but it must be borne also in mind that the questions to be settled then were entirely different from those now engaging the Protestant world.

§ 49. DATE AND AUTHORSHIP OF THE BOOKS
OF THE BIBLE.

It would seem at first sight as though it could make no difference who wrote the books of the Bible, nor when they were written, if they were divinely inspired. What need has one to be an eyewitness of events if he can secure perfect knowledge of them through inspiration? So that on the theory of the complete inspiration of every part of the sacred Scriptures, neither the date nor the authorship of the Biblical books would have any effect upon their authority.

Nevertheless, it is just here that conservative criticism approaches nearest to traditionalism; and many a critic who willingly yields the doctrines of inerrancy and of the plenary inspiration of all parts of the Bible, is exceedingly chary of admitting the composition of a book at a later date than that in which its supposed author lived. The reason is not far to seek. The testimony of an eyewitness is all the more important in the absence of inspiration. Besides, some of the books of the

Bible profess to have been written by certain well-known characters. If they were not written by these men, they are forgeries. Now, the radical critics remind us that men of sincere piety did in those days sometimes write religious books for the edification of the people, and attach the names of Jewish or Christian celebrities to them to give them authority. This may be admitted. The end was supposed to justify the means. What they wrote was important truth; but the people would not bow to the authority of the real authors. In order to benefit their readers, they committed pious frauds by attaching the names of others of greater repute than themselves.

Thus the critics seek to show that, forgers though they were, these writers committed no conscious wrong. In this way it is indeed possible to overcome the old argument that a man who would forge a literary work could not inculcate such pure doctrines. Arguments contrary to the supposition of forgery throng upon us. The men who could write such works as those of our canonical Scriptures

must have been men who needed not to bolster up their writings with names of men of the past. Then, too, the radical critics have carried the matter so far that both the Old and New Testaments are, according to their theories, largely made up of forgeries. Conservative critics do not see how such a wholesale system of forgery can lay claim to be the Word of God. Surely God was not shut up to such a method of revelation. The editing and re-editing of some of these books they may admit. Interpolations need not be denied. One may even allow that documents originally separate, one or more of them by unknown authors, might in the course of time come to be regarded as the production of one man, as is supposed to be the case with the Psalms and Isaiah. But even this hypothesis, when employed to explain so many portions of the Bible, not only fails to secure the consent of the judgment, it produces the feeling that our confidence in the Bible must be given up if these things are true to the extent which radical critics affirm. Hence the tendency on the part of conservative critics to reduce the

number of such instances to the minimum. All such suppositions detract from the dignity of the Bible, and should not be lightly accepted. It is so exceedingly improbable that God would employ such methods of revelation to such an extent that most men would be compelled, if they accept the critical results as facts, to yield their belief in the Divine origin of the Book.

Those who hold to the traditional view of the date and authorship of the books of the Old Testament sustain themselves in their belief by the attestations given in the New Testament. We may pass by what all others—except our Lord—say of the Old Testament. Many tolerably conservative critics are inclined to believe that when Jesus refers to Isaiah, or to David, or to Moses, he does not thereby mean to set his seal upon their authorship of the books generally in his day attributed to them. One of the most offensive forms of this theory is that which maintains that Jesus was ignorant of the real authors, but supposed, with his fellow-countrymen, that their reputed were their real authors. Now,

apart from the doctrine of the omniscience of Jesus, such a supposition is a blow at his reputation for superior religious knowledge. In everything else he had an insight into the facts deeper than his contemporaries. But here he is represented as being as ignorant as they. The theory in this form is incompatible with faith in Christ as we conceive it in the orthodox Churches of to-day. The doctrine that he did not attest the authorship of the Old Testament books may be tolerated; but not the argument just mentioned in support of it.

But some who hold that he did not attest the authorship of the Old Testament explain his utterances on the supposition that he knew that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, nor David the Psalms, nor Isaiah the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah, but that, knowing these things, he accommodated his speech to their belief. It is true that one may sometimes, without mentioning it, doubt the premises of a speaker, yet for the sake of argument, and to prevent diversion or digression from the main point, assume them. But here again the frequency of it is the main obstacle to its ac-


ceptance. It is in plain contrast to the usual frankness of Jesus, and no pedagogical interest could demand such a sacrifice of his own belief and reserve of the truth. The theory does not attribute to Jesus any deception; but it presupposes a capability of knowing facts of importance, and yet of systematically withholding them from his hearers. It is therefore as much of a reflection upon his character as the former upon his intelligence, and is consequently even more objectionable.

The supposition that Christ's utterances were not meant for attestations of the authorship of the Old Testament books is capable of support in a manner entirely unobjectionable. When he referred to these books, it was the contents themselves, and not the authors, upon which the emphasis was laid. He may be supposed to have employed metonymy, to have spoken of a work by the name of its reputed author. This would not imply either ignorance of the facts nor a weak yielding through three years of public teaching to the views of his hearers. Put in this form, it would not be inimical to our

faith. But it would still be a debatable question whether all the references of our Lord to Old Testament books will admit of such an explanation. And it would also be a question whether Christ, who exposed so many Jewish errors, would have left this one untouched. For if Moses did not write the Pentateuch, nor Joshua the book of that name, nor David a large part of the Psalms, nor Solomon any of the three books ordinarily attributed to him, nor Isaiah the last thirty-one chapters of Isaiah, nor Jeremiah the Lamentations, nor Daniel the book which bears his name, etc.; and if the history of Israel is so entirely different from that which the Old Testament represents it, as the critics would have us believe,—then the Jews of Christ's day labored under a deception so broad, and an illusion so profound, that we can scarcely imagine Jesus to have known the facts and yet to have said nothing whatever about them. Of course it is possible; and our province here is not to discuss the merits of the case. Our interest is to discover whether the opinions of the critics are consistent with the existence of

our faith. The general conclusion reached is, that some modification of our accepted opinions concerning the inerrancy and inspiration of the Scriptures, and of the date and authorship of the Old Testament books, would be compatible with everything vitally connected with our holy religion. But such modifications must not be proposed upon purely literary considerations, nor may they be carried to the extent to which many critics would carry them. There is no danger to the truth; but to the one who misses the truth there is danger. Christian truth makes Christ not merely the founder of our religion, but the object of our love and the source of our life. Christianity will be destroyed by whatever robs us of this.

THE END.



THE WORKS OF BISHOP STEPHEN M. MERRILL, D. D., LL. D.

Aspects of Christian Experience.

16mo. Cloth. 297 pages. 90 cents.

"God works in us that we may have a good will, and with us when we have a good will, and in all his inworking he respects the nature of the soul, with its attributes of rationality and moral freedom. The divine agency neither overpowers nor violates the human agency."—*Extract.*

The design has been to group the substantial doctrines of Christianity with reference to Christian experience in such a way as to give to each its appropriate place and importance, without exalting one at the expense of the other.—*Preface.*

Christian Baptism. Its Subjects and Mode.

16mo. Cloth. 310 pages. 90 cents.

"The Gospel comes to all, in every age, in every condition, in the polar snows or the burning sands, in arid wastes or mountain fastnesses, in palace or hospital, in the air of freedom or within prison walls; and it comes with all its comforts and helps, and in perfect adaptation to all. But, tested by this rule, exclusive immersion is another system"—*Extract.*

I have thought that something of this character, inexpensive and unpretentious, ought to be offered to those who lack time or disposition to study more critical works, and with this view I send out these discourses, believing they will measurably meet a real want, and contribute toward the removal of the more serious difficulties from the minds of earnest seekers after truth.—*Preface.*

Digest of Methodist Law; or, Helps in the Administration of the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

16mo. Cloth. 277 pages. 90 cents.

"The design of all disciplinary administration should be kept in mind. It is the honor and purity of the Church, and the spiritual good of the parties concerned. It is not punishment. The Church has no power or mission in that direction."—*Extract.*

This treatise is written and sent out with the hope that it will prove helpful to all who are charged with the duty of administering the Discipline of the Church, and especially the younger pastors.—*Preface.*

CRANSTON & CURTS, Publishers.

CINCINNATI, CHICAGO, ST. LOUIS.



Works of Bishop Stephen M. Merrill, D. D., LL. D.—Continued.

The New Testament Idea of Hell.

16mo. Cloth. 276 pages. 90 cents.

"The clear, steady current of truth sweeps away all these devices of error, like drift upon the flowing stream, leaving no resort for the believer in the Scriptures but to acknowledge the fact that the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation."—*Extract.*

This little book is written for readers of the English Scriptures, and not for those having access to the wide range of theological discussions found in the ponderous works on Systematic Divinity, which crowd the libraries of the learned.—*Preface.*

The Second Coming of Christ, Considered in its Relation to the Millennium, the Resurrection, and the Judgment.

16mo. Cloth. 282 pages. 90 cents.

Hoping that it may be the means of saving some from falling into erratic notions, and of confirming the wavering in the truth, and of stirring up in others a profounder sense of accountability to God in a coming day, I prayerfully send this volume forth upon its mission, bespeaking for it as much of candor in its perusal as has been observed in its preparation.—*Preface.*

The Organic Union of American Methodism.

12mo. Cloth. 112 pages. 45 cents.

"The subject of the future relations of the dissevered branches of the Methodist family is sufficiently important to attract attention to the utterances of any one who feels moved to give expression to thoughts which have become convictions, especially when clothed in the language of moderation and sincerity."—*Opening Paragraph.*

From the Michigan Christian Advocate.

The book will be greedily read by the large-hearted men of all branches of Methodism. . . . It is not an impromptu production, but the crystallization of years of observation and thought.

CRANSTON & CURTS, Publishers,
CINCINNATI, CHICAGO, ST. LOUIS.

Nov 13

BS511 .R59

The higher criticism : an outline of

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00047 5634