

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

---

NO. 20.—APRIL, 1892.

---

I. THE QUESTION OF INSPIRATION IN ITS BEARING ON THE DOCTRINES OF GRACE.

HOWEVER Christian men may differ respecting the nature and extent of inspiration, they are all agreed in regard to its importance. In the estimate of all it is looked upon as presenting the gravest question the church has ever encountered. Nor is this estimate of its importance to be wondered at when we consider the relation which this question sustains to all the doctrines of revelation. There is no question respecting the being and attributes of God, the mode of the divine subsistence in three persons, the origin and original state of man, the fall and the state into which it brought mankind, the covenant of works and the covenant of grace, the atonement and intercession of Christ, the office of the Holy Spirit, the nature and prerogatives of the church and her unity as the one body of Christ, the doom and destiny of the finally impenitent—there is not one of these questions whose solution does not depend absolutely upon the testimony of the Bible. Within the sacred volume, and there alone, have we any reliable information on any of these subjects.

It must, therefore, be manifest that all questions in regard to the trustworthiness of the sacred record are questions in regard to the very foundation of Christianity. When a passage from this record is adduced in support of a particular view on any of these subjects, the question arises, of necessity, on what ground is it brought into court, and why should it have any weight in determining the issue? As the ultimate authority on

theory concerning the question of the Origin of Sin. The theory makes no claims of a clear solution beyond the facts revealed in God's word:

"Let no man say, when he is tempted, I am tempted of God; for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man. But every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then, when *lust* hath conceived, it *bringeth forth sin*; and sin, when it is finished, *bringeth death*." Out of the moral character of man hath sin its origin, and man is responsible.

But if God's creature sins out of the very constitution of his being, is not God primarily responsible for the sin? "Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he still find fault? For who withstandeth his will? Nay; but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why didst thou make me thus?"

These assertions of Scripture rear up two great bulwarks—the absolute sovereignty of God, and the responsible choice of man. As regards man himself, the controlling force of character is clearly and fully revealed. The reason for God's choice that sin should enter man's nature—that reason hath not yet appeared. "It doth not yet appear what we shall be" hereafter, and in like manner hath it not yet been told how we came to be what now we are. Nor does it limit the truth of our theory that this is so. No theory concerning man's freedom of action is able to find out facts which God has not chosen to reveal. But the creed of moral certainty is the only one that can build up a symmetrical structure from the facts already spoken through inspired tongues and by the voice of God himself.

HENRY ALEXANDER WHITE.

*Washington and Lee University, Virginia.*

DRIVER'S INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. *By S. R. Driver, D. D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford; formerly Fellow of New College, Oxford.* New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1891. Pp. xxvii. 522. \$2.50.

"Of making many books there is no end." So said the Preacher twenty-eight centuries ago. Had he lived now, he might have added—Of projecting libraries there is no end. The book before us is the first volume of a library which proposes to compass the field of Theology, and to bring the discussion up to date all along the line.

This new library is to have a fine name, quite in keeping with this age of International Conventions and World Fairs. So it is to be called the *International Theological Library*, and its projectors propose to make it international and inter-confessional. Already twelve treatises are arranged for at the hands of eminent scholars of the Presbyterian, Anglican, and Congregational communions in Britain and America. This new library is to be under the joint editorship of Professor C. A. Briggs, of New York, and Professor S. D. F. Salmoud, of Aberdeen. Thus across the sea scholars clasp hands in international amity, and over denominational barriers scholarly hands are reached to build up this *new* Theological Library. How far the cause of truth will be served thereby remains to be seen.

As already stated, Dr. Driver's treatise on the literature of the Old Testament, is the first of the series which is to make up this library. In a well written preface the author is at pains to tell us what his subject of discussion really is. He says

that it is not an introduction to the *theology*, or to the *history*, or even to the *study* of the Old Testament. It is rather an introduction to its *literature*, and on the whole, he confines himself quite closely to his theme.

In his preface our author further states that the methods and results of his study do not affect the *fact* of revelation, but only its *form*. And he adds that his conclusions do not touch either the authority or the inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures. He therefore assumes the *fact* of revelation, and the *reality* of inspiration, and he argues that he has ample scope for his critical procedure without impairing in the least degree the authority of the Old Testament Scriptures. He does not tell us precisely what doctrine of inspiration he assumes, and many will seriously doubt whether his critical results can be harmonized with the true scriptural doctrine of inspiration. And, further, it is a question admitting of serious debate whether the *fact* and *form* of revelation can be so widely separated as our author in his preface argues they may be. It may be reasonably maintained that the *fact* takes its complexion from the *form* in which it is communicated.

Taking next a general survey of the treatise itself, we find that after a brief introduction the literature of the Old Testament is discussed in twelve chapters. I., The Hexateuch; II., Judges, Samuel and Kings; III., Isaiah; IV., Jeremiah; V., Ezekiel; VI., The Minor Prophets; VII., The Psalms; VIII., The Proverbs; IX., Job; X., The Megilloth; XI., Daniel; XII., Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah; These chapters are of unequal length. Chapter I., on the Hexateuch, takes 150 pp.; chapter VI., on the Minor Prophets, has 53 pp.; and chapter II., on Judges, Samuel and Kings, has only 24 pp.

The task undertaken throughout is to discover, as far as possible by every available means, *how* and *when* the literature of the Old Testament assumed its final form, and to trace the various elements which enter into that literature to their sources. To this end the resources of historical, linguistic and literary criticism are employed, and the instinctive insight—we shall not say fancy—of the author plays no unimportant part in the procedure.

The methods employed by our author are those of advanced reconstructive criticism, which argues in various ways in favor of the composite structure of the Old Testament. It might be too much to say that Dr. Driver's methods are entirely those of the negative or destructive critics, and yet there is much in the book before us which might be made to justify this characterization. Again and again his conclusions agree with those of Wellhausen and Kuenen. And he accepts fully what he terms "the assured results of modern criticism" which are so largely negative. Perhaps he owes more to Dillmann than any other continental writer, and his sympathies are all with writers like Cheyne, G. A. Smith, Sanday and Briggs. Then in the bibliography and notes with which each chapter is enriched the vast majority of authorities cited belong to the advanced school of critics. Only here and there is even a conservative continental critic quoted, and seldom is an English speaking conservative mentioned at all. But perhaps this is done of necessity and not of choice, on the ground that the advanced critics have appropriated all the scholarship which gives an opinion any authority in this field.

In working out his method our author takes up each book in order and goes through it with marvellous and microscopic care. Every verse, every clause, word by word, is sifted and weighed, and its place in the literary organism decided upon. With almost superhuman insight the parts of the literature thus sifted and

separated are assigned to their respective, but generally nameless, authors. The symbols used by advanced critics are employed by our author constantly. Hence on almost every page the symbols J. E., J. E., D., H., P., appear, indicating the various authors of different parts of the literature.

The composite authorship runs all through the Old Testament, but it is seen specially in the Hexateuch. Probably a table taken from our author (p. 67) may illustrate his method better than any description. The table selected for this purpose is that given for Deuteronomy, the structure of which our author tells us is "relatively simple."

P.				
(J. E.	Ch. 27, 5-7 <sup>a</sup> .			
(D.	Ch. 1-26. 27, 1-4.	7 <sup>b</sup> -8, 9-10, 11-13 (14-26),	Ch. 28.	Ch. 29-30.
P.	32, 48-52.			
(J. E.	31, 14-22.	32, 1-43.	44.	
(D.	31, 1-13.	23-30.	45-47.	Ch. 33.
P.	34, 1 <sup>a</sup> .	8-9.		
(J. E.	10.			
(D.	34, 1 <sup>b</sup> -7.	11-12.		

The three main divisions in this table denote the three leading sections of Deuteronomy. Those chapters and verses which follow P., J. E. and D. indicate those parts of the book which belong, in our author's opinion, to the several writers denoted by these symbols.

To indicate further our author's style of criticism, two quotations may be given. The first is from the Book of Exodus (p. 29), which is a fair sample of the majesterial tone of our author apparent on so many pages.

"The structure of J. E.'s narrative of the transactions at Sinai . . . is complicated, and there are parts in which the analysis (so far as concerns J. and E.), must be regarded as provisional only. Nevertheless, the composite character of the narrative seems unmistakable. Thus, in ch. 19, the natural sequel of vs. 3, *went up*, would be, not vs. 7 *came*, but vs. 14, *went down*; vs 9<sup>b</sup> is superfluous after vs. 8<sup>b</sup> (if, indeed, it be more than an accidental repetition of it); vs. 13<sup>b</sup> is isolated, and not explained by anything that follows (for the "trumpet" of vv. 16-19 is not the "ram's horn" of this verse). In the latter part of the chapter, vv. 20-25 interrupt the connection; vs. 20 is a repetition of vs. 18<sup>a</sup> ("descended"), and vs. 21 of vs. 12; the priests and the ark are introduced without preparation; vs. 25 "and *said unto them*" (not "and *told them*") should be followed by a statement of the words reported, and is quite disconnected with 20, 1; on the other hand, 20, 1 is the natural continuation of 19, 19. It is evident that *two* parallel narratives of the theophany on Sinai have been combined together, though it is no longer possible to determine the precise limits of each."

A second quotation is from page 115, where the prophetic narrative of the Hexateuch is under discussion. In speaking of the Song of Moses (Exod. xv.), of the Song of the Well (Numb. xxi.), and of the Song of Triumph over Sisera, we have a passage which finely illustrates the purely hypothetical procedure of our author. He says (*italics mine*):

"There is no express statement that these were taken by him from one of the same sources; but in the light of his actual quotations, this is *not improbable* at least for the first two. The Song of Deborah (Jud. 5) *may also have had a place* in one of these collections. Further, the command to write 'in a book' the threat to extirpate Amalek (Exod. 17) *makes it probable* that some written statement existed of the combat of Israel with Amalek, and of the oath sworn then by Jehovah to exterminate his people's foe. The poetical phrases that occur in the context *may suggest* that this too was in the form of a poem, reminiscences of which were interwoven by E in his narrative. And the ten commandments, which E incorporates, of course existed already in a written form. The blessing of Jacob (Gen. 49) *may have been derived* by J from a source such as the book of Jashar. The song of Moses in Deut. 32 (which is very different in style) *was taken, probably, from an independent source.* The ordinances which form the basis of the 'Book of the Covenant' *must also have existed* in a written shape before they were incorporated in the narrative of J, as well as the 'Words of the Covenant,' *which, probably in an enlarged form, are preserved in Exod. 34.*"

We have space only to state some of the main results which our author reaches as the outcome of his criticism of the Old Testament literature. The literature, as we now possess it, was a gradual compilation, and the result of many hands—authors, compilers, revisors and redactors—till it was completed. This is particularly the case with the Hexateuch, but in a measure with most of the prophets and the poetical books. The Pentateuch is not from the hand of Moses, but from various other hands, extending down to the period of the Exile. He admits that Moses "was the ultimate founder of the national and religious life of Israel," and that "he provided his people with the nucleus of a system of civil ordinances," with "some ceremonial ordinances," and with "some form of priesthood." But fully developed Mosaism did not appear till after the days of Josiah and Ezekiel. The Deutero-Isaiah is supposed to have written chapters xl.-lxvi. of the prophecy near the close of the Exile in the days of Cyrus. In like manner, Zechariah must have two authors; and the book of Job, we are told, "can scarcely be earlier than the days of Jeremiah, and belongs, most probably, to the period of the Babylonian Captivity." Many of the Psalms are of quite late date, and the book of Daniel may belong to the post-exilic era. But time fails us to follow out the results further. These are sufficient to indicate how radical they are at every turn.

We conclude with a few brief remarks in regard to this book and its general significance:

1. On every page there are evidences of great learning in certain lines, and of immense patience. Still we are not willing to allow our author and his fellow-critics a monopoly of learning, when compared with the conservative critics.

2. We are constrained to utter a note of warning against excessive specialism, even in biblical study. The effect of this is to fix attention too much on certain things to the exclusion of others equally important. Our author has used the critical microscope too much, and consequently incurs the danger of growing nearsighted. An occasional use of the telescope would be helpful in his case.

3. Then, after all, there is very little that is new in the book before us. We do not profess to be very deeply versed in Wellhausen, Kuenen and Dillmann, but from what little we do know of their writings we are willing to venture the assertion that nine out of ten of the opinions, conclusions and alleged facts are borrowed from some of these sources.

4. In reading this treatise one is amazed at the number of bold, unsupported statements, on the one hand, and at the vague hypotheses, on the other. Possi-

bilities are not proofs, and statements are not arguments, not even in advanced criticism.

5. Equally striking is the large scope allowed for the *subjectivity* of the author. The opinion of the critic is, again and again, in matters of style, of religious ideas and other things, taken to be conclusive. But fancy is not fact, and the mere opinion of a critic, no matter how learned, is not history. This is one of the most dangerous features of the critical school to which our author belongs.

6. It is by no means a very edifying spectacle to see an English-speaking author turning out to the inauguration of a *new* theological library in the cast-off study gown of the German professor. The gown clearly does not fit well, and, moreover, it is a little threadbare. Our author, too, seems to overlook the fact that more conservative views are coming to the front, and displacing the school to which he belongs, even in Germany.

7. We are inclined to advise all the critics of the advanced school to beware lest the old buried monuments with their inscriptions do not soon completely demolish their theories. Assyriology and Egyptology have already spoiled some fine theories, and the mine is perhaps half prepared to blow some other theories—perhaps our author's view as to the Book of Daniel—into piecemeal.

8. It is worth while pointing out that those continental critics whose step our author follows are on professedly naturalistic ground. This is true of Kuenen and Wellhausen, and, to a large extent, of Dillmann also. This being the case, it must be a difficult task—perhaps an impossible one—for English critics to adopt their methods, and accept their main literary conclusions, and at the same time retain a sound doctrine of inspiration.

9. It is evident also that a re-arrangement of the literature implies a reconstruction of the ritual and legislation of Moses. This raises the wider question of the mode of the development of the religion of Israel. Our author, as the result of his critical views, must logically take sides in the controversy raised by this question; and if he is consistent here he will find himself among those who hold naturalistic views.

10. Good will no doubt come from all this radical criticism. Just as the replies made to the theories of Baur and Strauss a generation ago established the historicity of the New Testament, so we believe the replies that will soon be more fully made to the critical theories of the Old Testament will in like manner confirm its real historical character throughout. But scholarship is needed, and here is a weighty reason why ministers should study the Old Testament in the original tongue.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

*Columbia, S. C.*

#### BROWN'S "APOCALYPSE."

THE APOCALYPSE. Its Structure and Primary Predictions. *By David Brown, D.D., Principal of the Free Church College, Aberdeen.* Tall 12mo., pp. xi-224. New York: The Christian Literature Company. 1891.

The return of the venerable and reverend Principal Brown, not only to the fields of authorship, but after the lapse of a half century to the interpretation of the Apocalypse, affects one somewhat as the reappearance of Nestor would have affected the younger generations of Greeks, if he had come back to the Troad to fight over his old battles again after fifty years' absence from the scenes of his