

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXIII.—NO. 1.

JANUARY, MDCCCLXXXII.

ARTICLE I.

PROFESSOR W. ROBERTSON SMITH.

The Old Testament in the Jewish Church. Twelve Lectures on Biblical Criticism. By W. ROBERTSON SMITH, M. A., New York, D. Appleton & Co. 1 Vol., 12mo., pp. 300.

Four years ago the author, an Assembly's Professor in the Free Church Theological College at Aberdeen, startled us by contributing to the *Encyclopædia Britannica* an article on the "The Bible," which attacked the validity of the Old Testament canon, as held by the standards of his own Church. Discipline was attempted; but legal quibbles delayed it for three years; until, in May, 1880, the charges against him came to be issued by his General Assembly, through reference from his Presbytery and Synod. Instead of trying the charges judicially, the Assembly, in its forbearance, patched up a compromise with him and his numerous supporters, in which it condoned his past offence, continuing him in his professorship over its candidates for the ministry, and in its honors and emoluments; and he accepted a public admonition and gave a pledge not again to disturb the faith and peace of the Church by such speculations. It is true that his pledge was given in very diplomatic terms, and was meant in a very "Pickwickian" sense. But it was accepted. The members of the Assembly had,

however, hardly reached their homes, when another volume of the *Encyclopædia* appeared, with a critical article from Prof. Smith worse than the first. It had been in the printer's hands at the very time he was giving his pledge of good behavior and receiving the generous forgiveness of his judges. Yet his conscience permitted his suppressing all allusion to it at that juncture! The best excuse stated was, that he bethought himself that it would then be too late to recall the article, without inconvenience to the publisher. Of course this new assault roused the mind of the friends of truth with amazement, grief, and just indignation. The Assembly's commission was called together, the spontaneous attendance of members making it almost as numerous as the body itself, and after another session in autumn, Prof. Smith was deprived of his right to teach the Assembly's students, on a new charge framed against him. It is not our purpose to discuss or defend the regularity of the Assembly's process against him. It should be noted, however, that it did not attempt to usurp his Presbytery's powers of original jurisdiction, by passing any sentence of suspension from the ministry; it only claimed the power to control his teaching-functions in its own theological school, which functions he had derived immediately from the Assembly.

Far more gravity is to be attached to the following which he gained from numerous ministers of the Free Church and more numerous divinity students, than to the case itself. These favorers sustained his errors with heat; and during the discussions of the Assembly, by methods which we should regard as flagrant and indecent outrages on parliamentary order. They chose to adopt Mr. Smith's assumption, that the sacred cause of free thought, scholarship, and free conscience, were assailed in his person. It is the currency of this unsavory delusion which is most ominous. The distinction between the sacred cause of freedom of mind, and the impudent claim to hold a given association's pay and appointment, while attacking the very doctrines that association was formed to uphold, is so broad that only a very deep and inflamed hatred of sound doctrine would seem adequate to blind Presbyterians to so clear a thought. But the charges were hotly hurled at those who were simply unwilling that Mr. Smith should use

the Assembly's own place and money to pull down the Assembly's own principles, that they were Middle Age reactionists, enemies of scholarly progress, repressors of free thought, persecutors. Now, to the honest plain mind, all this appears as though, when Mr. Jefferson Davis was indicted for treason and Mr. Charles O'Connor had voluntarily assumed the place of his counsel, the latter should have chosen to adopt the newly found heresy of the victor's sycophants making his client a traitor, in the teeth of the constitutional and historical doctrine which justified him, and which Mr. O'Connor perfectly knew he was engaged to defend, he still holding fast to Mr. Davis's promised fees and the name and place of his counsel. And it is as though when Mr. Davis and his friends demurred, the lawyer had charged him as a persecutor and as the enemy of the progress of legal science! Now, in the fictitious case supposed, any mind above idiocy would be competent to answer, that, if Mr. O'Connor supposed it due to his liberty of thought, and to the advancement of legal science, to support the heresy newly invented by the courtiers of the triumphant brute-force, his plain course would be first to surrender his place and his fee as Mr. Davis's defender. Our parable is just. No fair man doubts but that the Confession of the Free Church, Chap. I., § 2, means to assert what Mr. Smith distinctly impugned, touching the Old Testament canon. It is no new thing, indeed, in Church History, to find the advocates of latitudinarian views raising this false issue. None the less is it an ominous symptom that Free Church Presbyterians in such numbers should adopt a strategy so perverse in logic, and so marked by moral obliquity.

The author tells us, that, after his removal from his chair, "six hundred prominent Free Churchmen" in Edinburgh and Glasgow requested him to defend his views. This he did in the twelve lectures, delivered in both cities, to audiences averaging, he says, eighteen hundred hearers. These lectures, afterwards prepared for printing, with notes, compose the present volume. It is now republished in this country for popular circulation, by at least two publishers; and its adroit poisons are dished up for "consumption by the million," in a "Seaside Library" edition, at the price of twenty cents.

The object of the Lectures is, to disparage as much as possible the genuineness, antiquity, and authority of extensive parts of our Old Testament. To do this, the loose and rash methods of the most sceptical school of criticism are freely employed. But a worse trait is, that the sounder criticism is usually disregarded, and treated as non-existent. In the language of Mr. Smith, to oppose his perverse and groundless methods is to condemn "biblical science" and biblical criticism. Reluctance to follow the rash leadership of his virtually infidel guides is either indolence or ignorance. As a specimen of this arrogance, let the reader take his last paragraph: "*To the indolent theologian*, the necessity of distinguishing . . . is unwelcome." The failure to adopt Mr. Smith's groundless distinctions condemns as "indolent," a Calvin, a Bengel, a Michaelis, a Lowth, a J. A. Alexander! Well! All the mental activity and scholarship are tacitly assumed to be on his side; on the side of those who dissent, are only stolid and lazy reliance on prescription, and obstinate prejudice. The reader will find this quiet but intensified insolence pervading the whole. Of course, every scholar knows that this saucy strain is not the trait of true learning. Nor is the mode of tactics ingenuous. Unless Mr. Smith is a very shallow young man indeed, he knows that there is more than one school of criticism and that those schools which disallow his critical conclusions on the most thorough and learned grounds, have able and well-informed supporters. He knows that the divines in his own Church who condemn him, are not opposed to "biblical science," or to the "historical study" of the canon, and do not hold its authority on mere tradition. He knows that they fully hold that man is not bound to accept a book as a rule of faith, with the Papist's implicit faith; that the valid claims of the canonical books are to be established by an honest critical process; that they employ and value this criticism. Only they will not follow his criticism, because it is uncritical. His trick of attack is no more respectable than that of the quack, who declaims against sensible people declining to poison their families with his *nostrums*, that they oppose the science of medicine. They oppose his empiricism, because it is not science.

A second general criticism which we urge is, that Mr. Smith, turning his back on a sounder and more learned school of critics, gives his almost exclusive allegiance to that European school whose foundation maxim is, that the true critic must admit neither the possibility of the supernatural nor of inspiration—taken in the Church's sense. The names oftenest in his mouth are of such men as Graf, and Wellhausen, of Germany, and Kuenen, of Holland, these recent and extreme advocates of this infidel theory. But any one can see, that if God has indeed given his Church a true inspiration and supernatural helps, and has meant his Bible to record such gifts, then the expositor who sets out to explain the Bible from the prime assumption that such gifts cannot possibly exist, must infallibly go amiss. Now, if Mr. Smith will announce himself openly an unbeliever, he can consistently adopt the system of these unbelievers. But he tries to use their system, while still professing to recognise inspiration and the supernatural. With such a method, confusion and error are inevitable.

A third general objection to his work is, that the author utters at least an "uncertain sound" as to the nature of inspiration itself. He says many handsome things about it. But in many places he seems to hold that conception of what inspiration is, known in Scotland and America as "the Morell Theory." That inspiration is only such views of truth as the soul attains by the exaltation of its religious consciousness; so that the difference between the declarations of an Isaiah and a Whitefield is not generic, but only a difference of degree. It is true, that in Lecture X., when speaking of the Hebrew prophets, he defines their inspiration correctly. But he then betrays the sound doctrine by saying that under the "new covenant the prophetic consecration is extended to all Israel, and the function of the teacher ceases because all Israel shall stand in the circle of Jehovah's intimates." (He had just described the prophets, as under the old, constituting that "circle.") That is to say: the reason why the Church has no prophets or apostles now, is, that all regenerate people are inspired generically as Isaiah and Paul were. So, in Lecture I., near the end, the same extreme and vicious system of exposition is asserted, which we briefly showed, at the close of Article IV. of our April

No., 1881, to be virtually exclusive of real inspiration. This theory claims, not only that the Holy Ghost, in moving holy men of old to speak, employed their human faculties and knowledge as instruments; not only that we should throw all the light archæology can derive from the human use of language in their days, on the exegesis of their words; but also, that the inspired man's propositions are to be construed in accordance with the inspired code of opinions, which, archæology tells us, he presumably found in and imbibed from his contemporaries. Says Mr. Smith: We are "always to keep our eye fixed on his historical position, realising the fact that he wrote out of the experience of his own life, and from the standpoint of his own time."

Now we object, first, that this travesty of the enlightened theory of archæologic exegesis is false to the facts. It is usually the grand characteristic of prophets and apostles, that they did not teach divine truth "from the standpoint of their own times," but exactly opposite thereto. Paul was a Pharisee by rearing, and wrote among and for Pharisees. But his whole doctrine of the law and justification is precisely contra-Pharisaic. We object, secondly, that this theory might, at any stage in the function, make it impossible for the man to be the channel of divine truth. Only let the "standpoint" of him and his contemporaries be contradictory to that of the Holy Ghost, as all human "standpoints" have usually been, on vital subjects, then on this scheme, he *could not* write the mind of the Spirit. It could not be transmitted to his readers through such a *medium*, without fatal discoloration. And lastly, a system of doctrines thus transmitted, could never enable us to discriminate the fallible human coloring from the infallible divine light—the very result which Mr. Smith's rationalistic friends are seeking.

This book may be justly described as *thoroughly untrustworthy*. The careful reader can hardly trust the author in a single paragraph. Citations are warped, history misrepresented, other theologians' views adroitly travestied, half truths advanced for whole ones. All is dogmatic assertion. In the construing of Scripture statements, the author, as if he were the critical Pope, discards expositions which do not suit his purpose, however well

supported by critical learning and the greatest names, without giving reasons for his decrees. His readers have not a hint that the soundest biblical learning has rejected his views, and that on conclusive grounds. Everything which does not please him is absolutely uncritical; so much so as, in the majority of cases, to deserve no refutation, nor even mention. Must the well-informed reader explain this as a disingenuous and wilful *suppressio veri*, or as ignorance? It is more charitable to him to surmise that, with all his affectation of mastery of modern critical science, his knowledge is really shallow and one-sided, and that he has fallen under the blinding influence of his leaders. The charitable reader may think this judgment severe. If he afflicts himself, as we have done, with a careful study of his book, he will conclude that the verdict is just, and even forbearing. He will reach the same conclusion if he will ponder our specific criticisms.

The erroneous points made by the book are so multitudinous that, if all were thoroughly handled, a still larger book must be written. Our aim will be to give a general outline of the main *theses* advanced, so as to put our readers in possession of the drift of the work; and to test these *theses* in some of the points supporting them, so as to give fair specimens of the author's method.

The positions taken seem to aim at three leading ends:

1. To disparage the antiquity and accuracy of that established text of the Hebrew Scriptures, known as the Masoretic Text, from which all our Bibles are printed.

2. To throw as much uncertainty as possible over the authorship of the Psalms, to assign a recent date to as many of them as possible, and to bring down their compilation below the ages of Old Testament inspiration.

3. To convict the Pentateuch of manifold and extensive interpolations, many centuries after its professed date, and to deny the Mosaic authorship of nearly the whole law.

1. Mr. Smith concedes to the great Reformers a correct conception of the task of biblical criticism, taking good care to travesty their view, in part, as he delineates it; but he thinks that

their almost exclusive dependence, unavoidable in their case, on Rabbinical scholars for a Hebrew text, led them to confide entirely too much in the Masoretic recension. He does not believe that the valuable series of critics and editors (beginning with Ezra), called by the Rabbins the "Great Synagogue," ever had a particle of existence as such. Nor does he seem to be certain whether Ezra himself ever did anything important for the correction and preservation of the Hebrew text. Noting the fact that the oldest known MSS. of the Masoretic text date several centuries after the Christian era, he regards the admirable and accurate correspondence of nearly all their readings as ground of suspicion. Dr. Kennicott, for instance, after many collations, found the variations very trifling and few. Mr. Smith wishes to know why they are not as numerous as between Greek MSS. of the New Testament. He concludes from this very sign of accuracy, that there has been foul play; that the Masorites, when making their recension and affixing their points (vowel and accent), arbitrarily selected a *codex* from among many varying ones, which suited their own ritualistic views, published that, and burned up all the others! And for this marvellous *hypothesis* he thinks he has historical evidence—that of the Septuagint translation!—for it varies very much, in some places, from the Masoretic text. When he examines a number of these variations, he is convinced that there are internal critical marks that the copy followed by the Seventy was the correct one. Their omissions, he thinks, make the narrative much more coherent. Their transpositions, which are in some places extensive, leave the contents of the prophet in a far more natural order. We cite the instance which Mr. Smith seems to regard as most conclusive, from 1 Samuel, xvii. to xviii. 5. The reader is requested to place the passage before him. He will see that the narrative represents David as a favored resident of Saul's court, and his honorary armor-bearer; that still, when the war with Philistia comes on, David is not a soldier; that when he comes to the camp as a shepherd-youth, his elder brother, Eliab, treats him with disdainful petulance, notwithstanding David's favorable standing at court; that when he appears before Saul as Goliath's victor, neither Saul nor Abner recognise his

parentage. This story, says Mr. Smith, "presents inextricable difficulties." "Every one has been puzzled by these apparent contradictions." But when we turn to the Septuagint, we find that it omits verses 12 to 31, and verses 55 to xviii. 5. This omission leaves the narrative clear of the difficulties. It is therefore the true original text; and the Hebrew text is largely corrupted. So would Mr. Smith conclude.

Now, we begin our reply by saying, that "every one" has not been puzzled, or "found an inextricable difficulty" in the narrative of the Hebrew text. Not to mention such sound old expositors as Gill, Henry, Scott, who see no contradiction whatever, the following, including learned Germans, concur; Chandler, Wordsworth, Houbigant, Keil, Hävernick, Saurin, Toy, Broadus. And the great mass of intelligent readers doubtless have concurred with them in thinking that the narrative is perfectly authentic, and all its parts consistent with the facts and with each other, whether they had the exact clue to their explanation or not. *Next*, the reader must be advertised that *other old codices of the Septuagint do not omit the parts* which Mr. Smith dislikes. The Vatican Codex does; which, it seems, he chooses to follow. The Alexandrine Codex corresponds exactly with the Hebrew throughout the passage. The Tischendorf and the other uncial MSS. bear no witness in the case, because they lack the books of Samuel. The Complutensian edition, printed from Spanish MSS., also contains all that the Hebrew contains. So that Mr. Smith has the authority of only one MS. even of the Septuagint for omitting the verses. Is it not a little singular that *he suppresses this material fact?* Nor do all good critics concur with him in preferring the Vatican MS. as the most accurate. Vossius condemned it as the worst of all; Prideaux, with many others, preferred the Alexandrine MS. *Thirdly*. Mr. Smith, with his preferred "higher" critics, forgets a very obvious reflection, that were there glaring discrepancies, the sacred writer would have been fully as able to see and appreciate them as the rationalists are. Hence, on the theory that the difficulties are there, the most reasonable supposition is that the writer, being strictly honest, felt constrained to tell his story as he has, not-

withstanding the foresight of readers' difficulties about it, simply because such were the facts; that the reason why he did not pare and trim his narrative, as one codex of the Septuagint does, was, that Saul and Abner really did express, or else feign, an ignorance of David's parentage, whether we can explain why they did so, or cannot. *Fourthly.* Josephus, a Greek-speaking and Septuagint-reading Jew, still gives the narrative as the Hebrew text does. *Fifthly.* The fact that David was not recognised by Saul, either when he presented himself—verses 32 to 39—to ask leave to take up Goliath's challenge (where the narrative does not decide whether he was recognised), or when, verses 58, etc., he returned with the giant's head in his hand, would involve no serious difficulty, when compared with xvi. 19, etc. For either one of several natural and reasonable hypotheses removes the difficulty. It may have been that Saul's ignorance of David was wholly affected; because the king's capricious and insanely jealous temper makes it wholly probable that David's triumph had already roused the envy, of which we read a few hours later; and that it took, at first, the disdainful form of this ironical affectation. "What obscure stripling is this, who presumes thus to outshine us all?" This irony, Abner, courtier-like, would be prone to imitate with a shrug equally disdainful. Or, it is easy to believe that Saul honestly did not recognise David. When he ministered at court, we may be sure that the proud mother had arrayed her darling in his best "Sunday-clothes"; now, he appeared travel-soiled and unkempt, in his coarse shepherd's coat. His ministry had been very irregular and short at court; and his enrolment among Saul's numerous honorary or titular armor-bearers implied by no means any intimate or long service; for the relations of his forces to the king were those of a mere militia. It must be remembered that, for all the history teaches us, many months, or even two or more years, may have elapsed between David's return from court and this war. When, in addition, we remember that, during the time of David's residence with Saul, he was of unsound mind, there appears nothing difficult in the fact that Saul failed to recognise the young volunteer. Another hypothesis is tenable: that David was recognised, but that his parentage was forgotten. What

more natural than that Saul, after he saw that he stood pledged to marry his daughter (verse 25) to the young victor, should desire to know all about his lineage? But it must be noticed that Saul's language does not imply forgetfulness or ignorance of David, but only of his parentage: "Whose son is this youth"?

Mr. Smith also deems that Eliab's irritable taunts of David are very inconsistent with his previous court-favor! What is this species of guessing-criticism worth? It may raise a difficulty in any series of facts. What more natural and probable, than that the court-preference for David occasioned this very irritation in the stalwart elder brother, handsome, but vain and selfish? Authentic histories present many surprising features; but this feeling of Eliab is not even surprising.

In fine, one is strongly impelled to ask Mr. Smith why it is, that, supposing the narrative of the Hebrew text, so difficult of reconciliation, as compared with that of his edition of the Septuagint; he does not here apply the pet canon of the critics, "*Praestat ardua lectio*"? "The more difficult reading is to be preferred." The surmise, that the Seventy, influenced by these imaginary difficulties, tampered with the original in order to smooth the narrative, is precisely such as Mr. Smith's school of critics is wont to apply for rejecting the easier reading, when it suits their purpose. This specimen-case has been fully considered, in order that the reader may have a fair sample of the way in which our author endeavors to exalt the Septuagint over its original, by inventing imaginary objections, and advancing groundless assertions.

But now, let us address ourselves to the general merits of the assertion, that the Septuagint is to be preferred to the Masoretic text for giving us the original state of the autographs of the Prophets. The author confesses, what Keil asserts correctly, that the Protestant critics have usually been against him. And here, let the reader's attention be called to that way which Mr. Smith practises, of intimating that only the recent criticism is "scientific." One would think, from the coolness with which he sets aside the established conclusions of earlier biblical scholars, that somehow, he and his party have formed a whole world of new

critical *data*, and that they alone know how to use them scientifically. But we beg their pardon. *There are no new archæological data* to be found in this particular field. The rationalistic school have, at this point, no other materials, of which to construct a new theory, than those possessed by scholars for the last hundred and fifty years. The only difference is, that while the old critics made a sober, honest, logical use of this common stock of *data*, the "destructive" school shuffles them over and rearranges them capriciously, wilfully, illogically, to strain them into correspondence with a foregone, sceptical resolve that the Bible shall speak their philosophy. Let us take, for instance, the learning embodied in the *Prolegomena* of Bishop Walton's great Polyglot, of Prideaux, and of that illustrious school of biblical scholars in England. They surveyed the whole field of testimony as to the Septuagint. They reason from the facts gathered, in the spirit of the soundest criticism. To them, the theory that an original is to yield to a version, in the sense claimed by Mr. Smith, appeared, as it does to us, just as absurd, as that the quality of a stream should determine that of its spring.

Our author, as we have seen, thinks the very accuracy with which all known *codices* of the Masoretic text agree, is ground of the condemnation of all. He actually complains because they do not vary as much as our New Testament *codices* in Greek. Now, when a number of witnesses, testifying separately, concur with great exactness in the same story, one of two hypotheses is reasonably taken: either, they are truly well-informed and honest witnesses, and their testimony is valuable according to its harmony; or they are dishonest witnesses, whose too close harmony betrays previous collusion. But no fair mind adopts the harsher judgment without some ground of confirmation. Now, we have this undisputed fact: that the Jewish copyists and critics of their text, since the Christian era, have a great reverence for the accuracy of their holy Book; that they have adopted an exact system for ensuring accuracy of transcription; and that the faithful use of this system has actually given us, for the last thousand years, a set of *codices* almost without various readings. *Why may not the same reverence, and the same method of copying, have pro-*

duced the same happy result in the previous thousand years? History assures us that the same reverence for Scripture, and the same exact system of transcribing, prevailed before Christ. Surely modern Jews are not more trustworthy than the Jews of the ages of Malachi, Judas Maccabec, and Simon the Just. Oh, it is insinuated, the intense fondness of the scribes for their traditional *Halacha* must have tempted them to take liberties in transcribing, and to foist some of their traditions into the text. But the Rabbins of the post-Masoretic ages have been still fonder of their ritual and tradition, and yet they have not touched a letter of the text they received from the Masorites!

Again: whether the Septuagint *codices*, taken together, present a more accurate view of the autographs of the inspired men than the Masoretic *codices*, the plain reader may judge from these indisputable facts: that the Septuagint was the work of a series of Alexandrine Jews, some more than one hundred years before the others; that the origin of the versions is involved in a fog of ridiculous myths; that the versions of different books are of exceedingly various quality—some, as that of the Pentateuch, the earliest made, being very good, and others wretchedly bad; that the critics have clearly detected purposed corruptions of the text in some places: as Isaiah xix. 18, 19, was evidently twisted to support the enterprise of Onias (149 years before Christ) in building his temple at Heliopolis in Egypt, which fixes the late date of the translation of this prophet; that parts of the translations are so bad that such critics as Horne have concluded that the translators were not acquainted with the Hebrew language, and others, as Lyschen, that the *codices* used by the translators must have been the Hebrew Scriptures approximately spelled in Greek letters. The last two conclusions are not mentioned for the purpose of endorsing them, but to show how sorry the credibility of this Septuagint version appears in the eyes of men skilled in critical investigations. It is still more to the purpose to remind the reader that the state of the text of the Septuagint copies is itself too variant and corrupt, granting that the original version may have been perfect, to rely on any edition we now have, for correcting the Hebrew text. A glaring example of the uncertainty of the

Septuagint text we now have the reader has seen above. Every student of its history knows that the scrupulous care which the Hebrew scribes employed in their transcriptions, was not employed by the copyists of the Greek. Hence, by the end of the second century of our era, the state of the Septuagint text was so intolerably bad that Origen undertook to correct it by collations. His amended text he published in his "Hexapla." He was a learned, but a fanciful and untrustworthy critic. None of his copy has been extant for 1,200 years, except a few fragments copied by others. They tell us that Origen's copy was destroyed; a Pampylilian, a Lucian, and a Hesychian edition were prepared by these three editors, with the aid of Origen's emendations. And our (very clashing) *codices* of the Septuagint may be the descendants of one or another of these recensions, or some of them may be the progeny of the worthless copies which Origen condemned. And this is the standard by which our new school of critics propose to carve and expunge our Hebrew text.

The critical licentiousness of this proposal appears from other facts. The Samaritan sect had their own Pentateuch, written in characters older than the Masoretic. Between this old text and ours there are few various readings, and almost the only important one is the substitution of Gerizim for Ebal in Deut. xxvii. 4; Josh. viii. 30. But the Samaritan Pentateuch dates probably from 2 Kings xvii. 23, and, at latest, from the times of Ezra. This witness to our Hebrew Pentateuch makes it probable that the rest of our Hebrew text is equally ancient and trustworthy. The text followed by the Peschito Syriac version is unquestionably the Masoretic, and not the Septuagint. But the Syriac, if not translated in the first century, as some foremost scholars judge, was unquestionably made early in the second. This was *before the Masorites had done* that work of collation, which is so suspected by Mr. Smith. The accuracy of the old Syriac version is impregnable; all who have examined it testify to it. It is also nearly literal, rendering the Hebrew word for word, which the close idiomatic likeness of the language, the West Aramaic, enabled the writers to do, as the heterogeneous idiom of the Greek did not permit. Again, we have every reason to believe that the *Vetus Itala*,

the Latin version made before the Masoretic revisal, followed our Hebrew text, and not the Septuagint; as does also Jerome's Latin version, the Vulgate. Once more: the version of Aquila, also made before the completion of the Masoretic revisals, is almost perfectly literal; and this also follows our Hebrew, as against the Septuagint text. The reader will find a characteristic specimen of the logic of the "higher criticism" in the modes by which Mr. Smith tries to break the fatal force of this witness. First, he assumes, without proof, that the literary demand among learned Jews of the second century for another Greek version than that of the Seventy arose, not out of the great corruptions of their Septuagint copies—its obvious cause—but that it arose out of a purpose to change and shape an Old Testament text to suit the new and growing Rabbinical traditions. Hence, he suggests, Aquila was put forth to publish his pretended literal version. Our answer is, to challenge Mr. Smith to adduce one single *clear instance* in which Aquila has changed a Septuagint translation in the interests of Rabbinism. Apparently mistrusting this plea, he then intimates another, which is, that the resemblance of the names *Onkelos*, *Aquilas*, betrays that this pretended work of Aquila is but a pious fraud, being really a Greek presentation of the Targum of Onkelos so far as the Pentateuch goes. And yet, the birth, history, work of Aquila of Pontus are expressly given in our most authentic Church history. "The force of nature can no farther go."

Let this trait of the Septuagint be added, which Mr. Smith himself adduces (Lecture V.) for a sinister purpose: that it makes no distinction between the canonical and apocryphal books, mingling them together on its pages. But the Hebrew text always kept this distinction between the divine and the human, as clear as a sunbeam. This difference may teach us how low and poor the authority of any Septuagint *codex* ought to be, for deciding particular readings, as against our Hebrew text. One of Mr. Smith's particular cases on which he attempts to ground a preference for the Seventy (1 Sam. xvii.) has been examined, that the reader *ex uno discat omnes*. His other cases, when strictly tested, are equally invalid.

The last point we make for the correctness of the Masoretic copies of the Pentateuch, is peculiarly fatal to Mr. Smith and his critical comrades. He has vaunted the authority of the Septuagint, as containing the most accurate extant representation of the Old Testament text. He wishes us to correct the Prophets by it. But now, it turns out that this Septuagint *follows our Hebrew text in the Pentateuch*, with peculiar, and almost entire, exactness. We pointedly ask, why this Greek witness, so credible elsewhere, is not equally credible here? Is the "New Criticism" wilfully inconsistent with itself? And how came our learned critic to overlook this fact?

And now, after this review of the authentic facts of antiquity which demonstrate the inferior value of the Septuagint, it may be seen what ground the new critics have for reversing the impregnable verdict of all the great Protestant scholars, from the Reformation to the nineteenth century.

2. The second topic of Mr. Smith's criticism, which we mention, is the Book of Psalms. In his 7th Lecture, he crowds together the largest mass possible of assumptions and rash assertions, touching the date and authorship of the Psalms, derived from the wilful, frivolous, and reckless speculations of his favorite teachers, the rationalistic (which means infidel) scholars of Germany. There, as is well-known, is a class of scholars, who although holding the seats and drawing the salaries of theological professors, avowedly disbelieve all inspiration and all supernatural agencies; who regard all the Psalms as on the same level with a Vedic hymn or a saga; who discuss them merely as antique literary curiosities; who use them thus only to occupy their literary leisure and whet their inventive ingenuity, ventilating any plausible guess about them which may be made a string to connect specimens of their learning, and probably laughing in their sleeves at the British and Americans who are simple enough to take them seriously; or, who only trouble themselves about the Scriptures because *they get their salaries* by lecturing on them, and therefore must say something; where otherwise, they would concern themselves with these books no more than with Uncle Remus's fables. Such is the attitude of the guides whom our author selects, while

teaching biblical criticism in the orthodox Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland; a Church whose very corner-stone is belief in the genuineness and inspiration of these books! Mr. Smith's object is, to unsettle our belief in the authorship of as many of the Psalms as possible, to make it appear an immethodical bundle of several earlier Temple-Psalm books, put together by nobody knows whom. Especially does he labor to show that several Psalms must have been written after the days of Malachi, and even as late as the Maccabees; and that, therefore, the compilation dates long after the ceasing of the Old Testament inspiration. The inference obviously is not stated, but hinted, that the collection is therefore not of authority, and may contain much uninspired matter. First he recommends, and then amends, the fanciful division into *five* collections, for which his pleas are three: that some are Jehovistic and some Elohist; that in the Hebrew text, each book "has a separate heading not translated in our English Bible;" that each book ends with a significant doxology. The first ends with Ps. xli.; the second with Ps. lxxii.; the third with Ps. lxxxix.; the fourth with Ps. cvi.; the fifth with Ps. cl. This imaginary partition Dr. J. A. Alexander on Psalms rightly discards. How flimsy its first ground is, may be seen from the fact which Mr. Smith admits, that both the names Elohim and Jehovah appear in all the five parts, only the one is more frequent than the other in certain parts. Now who can say what impulse of faith and piety may have moved a Psalmist, at any given time, to address his God by the one title or the other? The inference is baseless. Of the second point, it is enough to say, that our closest search of the Hebrew text utterly fails to detect any "separate heading" not translated in our English Bible, for the imaginary "five books." As to the grounding of a partition on the recurrence of a doxology at the end of certain Psalms, how worthless this is appears from the fact that distinct doxologies occur in a large number of other Psalms, at their end, and in the body of them, as in Psalm xxviii. 6, and xxxi. 21, and lxvi. 8 and 20, and lxviii. 19, and xevi. 2, etc., and ciii. 1, and cxiv. 6, and cxxxv. 19, and cxliv. 1, and cxlv. 21; and Psalm cxvii. is nothing but a doxology. Why do not the critics make a "book" end with Psalm cxvii.? Why not

VOL. XXXIII., NO. 1.—2.

with each of these doxologies, or at least with each terminal one? The feebleness of this fancy is also betrayed by this: that Mr. Smith and his guides themselves say, that the sequence of the several Psalms in each "book" was not made systematic by the unknown collectors, but is immethodical. Then, the Psalms with the terminal doxologies might just as likely have fallen elsewhere; and their place, being accidental, gives no basis for any partition. Epiphanius and Jerome mention, that in their days some Jews maintained this fancy about five books. Their object was to make the Psalms resemble the Pentateuch in its partitions; this craving for arithmetical symmetry is a motive just suitable for a cabalistic rabbi.

Now, of course, every Bible reader knows that all the Psalms were not written by David, nor in David's age; that several, especially of the Asaph-Psalms, were written during the seventy years' captivity, as, for instance, the 137th. But the faith of the Church has always embraced these two points: that all were composed by inspired poets; that the authorised compilation was settled by inspired authority, and therefore not later than Malachi. There is no difficulty about the question of authorship; for after Nathan and David, there were twenty-four prophets and prophetesses at least; and every prophet was a poet. As to the compilation, the Church doctrine is: that this was attended to continuously by the authorised prophets, as piece after piece was given to the Church by the Holy Ghost; and that the whole compilation was verified, and the latest poems added by Ezra and his inspired successors. So say the authentic uninspired Jewish writers. 2 Macc. ii. 13; Josephus against Apion, I. 8; Philo, II. 475. So teach the inspired writers of the later ages of the Old Testament. 2 Chron. xxix. 30; Zech. vii. 10 (quoting Ps. xxxvi. 4), 1 Chron. xvi. 7 to end (with Psalms cv., cxvi., cvi.), Ezra iii. 10. But, especially, so teaches Christ in Luke xx. 42, and xxiv. 44, and Peter in Acts i. 20. In the first and last of these places the Lord and his Apostle speak expressly of "the Book of Psalms," while quoting it as infallible Scripture. There was, then, in the Church of that day a book—*one book*—received by all as "*the book*" of lyrical worship. There are also thirty-one

quotations from the Psalms in the New Testament, all treating them, either expressly or by clear implication, as God's word. And these quotations are from nearly all parts of the book of Psalms, from the second to the 140th; and eleven of them are from Psalms which have no author named, which shows that the inspired apostles had just the same confidence in these as in the others. When we couple the allusions from Chronicles and Ezra, the testimony of Josephus and Philo, the fact that the Septuagint presented just the one book of one hundred and fifty pieces; that Heb. iv. 7 quotes the same book as *David's* ("saying in David"), yet ascribing it to God; it is impossible to doubt the conclusion that our present Psalter, as one collection, was of divine authority to the Church from the days Old Testament inspiration.

We may add, also, that our Saviour bears his testimony in Luke xxiv. 44, with equal decisiveness, to the whole Old Testament canon. He cites them as an infallible rule of faith under the well-known division of Law, Prophets, and Psalms—the very classification under which Josephus has been cited as including all the books in our Old Testament, and no others; the very classification which we know from the testimony of the Hebrew and Christian writers nearest our Saviour, was generally adopted by all. Mr. Smith does, indeed, (Lecture 6th,) with equal weakness and bad faith, attempt to break the force of this fatal testimony, by the sneer that it is but "rationalism" in us to take the terms in our Saviour's mouth in the historical sense. And in Lecture 6th he attempts to sustain this charge, against the whole current of Christian and Jewish learning of all ages, by intimating that Josephus' evidence is not near enough in time to our Saviour to define his meaning. Now, Josephus ended his career as a public man A. D. 70, soon after which he wrote his books. Several years before, he had been wholly engrossed by the civil and Roman wars. Hence, as it is out of the question to suppose him pursuing any new Biblical studies while in the very vortex of these convulsions, we must conclude that his statements touching the Old Testament canon reflect what he was taught in his earlier years. But the words cited from Christ above were uttered A. D.

33 or 34. Hence Josephus was *virtually* his contemporary, as a witness to this point of belief.

Mr. Smith's method is, to support the modern assault upon the genuineness of the Hebrew superscriptions of the Psalms, by impugning as many of those which name David as their author, as he can; and to date as many of them as possible after the cessation of inspiration. A few average specimens must suffice to possess the reader with his spirit. Psalms xx. and xxi., ascribed to David, "are not spoken *by* a king, but addressed *to* the king by his people." Mr. Smith cannot believe "that David wrote for the people the words in which they should express their feelings for his throne," etc. But was not David a prophet? and is it not *the very business* of a prophet to teach the people the sentiments God wishes them to cherish? It was as the defence of the Church that the believers then prized David's throne. Again, how does Mr. Smith know but that it was *Messiah's throne* David wished them to value and uphold?

He pronounces, with disdainful levity, that the title of Psalm xxxiv. must be false, because it "speaks of Abimelech as king of Gath in the time of David. In reality, Abimelech was a contemporary of Abraham, and the king in David's time was named Achish." Now, is it possible Mr. Smith does not know that every previous expositor has noted and explained this, by the simple remark that Achish was this ruler's *individual* name, and Abimelech (My father-king) his *regal* title, as *Pharaoh* was of the Egyptian kings? So not only do all the wise, learned, and sober British expositors say (of whom our author seems to have no opinion at all), but also a plenty of learned Germans, as Gesenius, Lange, etc. But he treats this obvious and sufficient solution, supported by so many of the best scholars, as unworthy of mention to his readers, or of refutation! His papal word must suffice.

Psalms xxvii., he thinks, cannot have been written by David, because it speaks of inquiring in "his temple" (*viz.*, God's). But in David's time there was "not a temple, but a tent." Will not the reader be shocked with the disingenuousness of this, when he turns to the Hebrew with us, and finds that the word for "his

temple" is הַיְרֵבֶלֶן? This, Gesenius tells us, means, when spoken in connection with God, simply *his sanctuary*, and is applied to the sanctuary when it was a tent. Again, he argues that the 10th verse, "When my father and mother forsake me, then the Lord will take me up," are quite inappropriate to David. Why? He attempts to invent a reason by prefacing his cavils with the suggestion, that the Psalm must have been written after all David's triumphs, because he would only speak of "Zion as God's holy mountain," and of the "house of God at Zion," "after he had brought the ark to Jerusalem." Again, will the reader be shocked by the author's disingenuousness when he reads the Psalm, and finds that *there is neither word nor allusion in it about Zion*; nor a single trait to prevent our dating the Psalm from the days where David was a young man, deprived for the first time of a father's counsels and a mother's love, by Saul's persecutions.

"Ps. lii. is said to refer to Doeg." (See in the title the reference to the slander of that Edomite herdsman of Saul against the priests who had succoured David at Nob.) "Now David had *nothing to fear* from Doeg." "The *danger was all* for the priests at Nob. How could the Psalmist" . . . "not express in a single word his sympathy with the unhappy priests who perished for the aid they gave him?" Therefore, he concludes, David did not write it. But if the reader will examine 1 Samuel xxii. and xxiii. chapters, he will see for himself whether the lies of Doeg portended danger to David. The case meant just this: That Saul, wholly deluded by the vile delator, was now with Doeg pursuing David's life with all the fury which was expressed in his ferocious murders at Nob. And we presume that no one except Prof. Smith ever failed to see in verses 1-5 the most ardent sympathetic indignation for the wrongs done the priests.

Our author does not even believe that David wrote the 51st Psalm, or that it ever had any reference to his sin towards Bathsheba and Uriah. On what argument does he rest? "The prayer (verse 18) that God will 'build the walls of Jerusalem' refer so manifestly to the period of the captivity." He assumes that at this prosperous stage of David's reign, Jerusalem needed

no more wall-building. (Borrowed from the ultra-rationalist, De Wette.) How wretched does this trifling appear, when we remember simply that David *was writing poetry*, and hence, uses an appropriate and natural image? The parallelism of the verse is enough to guide every reader: "Do good unto Zion." This shows that the figure of the defending walls up-built expresses the same thought—edification to the Church, so exposed to reproach and attack by David's own crimes (see 2 Sam. xii. 14). David, as a military captain, had literally fortified his city with stone walls. But his shocking sins had now laid the Church of God open and defenceless against the reproaches of infidels. God alone, by his grace, could repair this ruin. Hence David prays: "Do thou build up what my sin prostrated." This gives a perfectly logical connection with verse xix. For God's acceptance of holocausts does result from such spiritual restoration of professed worshippers; but no success in fortifying a town with literal ramparts has any relevancy whatever to making animal sacrifices more pleasing to a spiritual God.

One more of these far-fetched difficulties must suffice. Mr. Smith does not believe the title of the famous 139th Psalm, when it says David wrote it; because he thinks he finds four Aramaic words in it; which proves it must have been written during, or after, the captivity in Chaldea. Now, there are but three words to debate: as one recurs twice, חָשַׁב—thought, in verses 2 and 17; שָׁבַע—lying down, in verse 3; and עָרַץ—energy, in verse 20. He thinks the classic Hebrew must have spelt them with the rougher צ, instead of ע. But it turns out that the softer forms in each case are derivable from appropriate 'Ayin-roots; and that the spelling appears with the ע in the earlier books of the Bible. So that the one is as much old classic Hebrew as the other! But how slender a basis would this matter of Aramaisms not be, on which to deny David's authorship, when we remember that Chaldea and Syria with their closely cognate dialects bounded his kingdom on the north and east, and had constant intercourse with it?

When the attack on the genuineness of the titles is made on grounds as flimsy and uncandid as these, the sound biblical scholar

can well afford to rest in the old conclusion which accepts them as valid, along with the modern Keil and the great body of the older critics. The titles are now, and so far as we can decide, always were, a part of the Hebrew text. There is no valid canon of textual criticism authorizing their excision, that would not equally expunge any verse from the body of the Psalms. Even the Septuagint, Mr. Smith's great authority, recognises all the titles of David's Psalms, except a very few.

One other point remains to be briefly mentioned affecting the Psalms. This is Mr. Smith's attempt to bring the date of as many Psalms as possible down to a time subsequent to the cessation of Old Testament inspiration. The critic's motive is obvious. Malachi is believed to be the last of the inspired Old Testament prophets. If the book of Psalms can be proved to contain pieces later than him, the point so dear to the sceptics is made out: that the Scriptures contain spurious materials.

But the grounds presented for this late date of some Psalms are as wretchedly flimsy as the aim is mischievous. One argument is, that the "musical titles are discontinued" (Lect. 7th) in the Psalms of the fourth and fifth "books." The proposed inference is, that the prevalence of the Greek art, after the Macedonian conquests, had caused the ancient Hebrew melodies to be so forgotten by the people, that the old musical terms were useless and meaningless. Therefore many of these Psalms, after Psalm xc., were written after the Macedonian era. But we object, *first*, the distribution of the Psalms into five "books," is imaginary. *Secondly*, the musical titles are lacking in Psalms which are unquestionably David's, as in Ps. cviii. and cx. Hence their absence proves nothing as to date. *Thirdly*, if Mr. Smith's surmise were worth anything whatever, it would be better satisfied by supposing that it was the Babylonian captivity, and the total interruption of temple-worship for seventy years, which made the old temple-tunes to be forgotten; not pagan Greek art, which never could have influenced Jews abhorring all pagan worship and speaking the Aramaic tongue. Hence, the argument, were it not wholly worthless, would only suggest a possibility that some of these Psalms were written after the captivity began. The other

pretended argument is, that the "Pilgrimage-Psalms" ("Songs of Degrees") "are plainly, in part, later than the exile; for they speak of captivity and deliverance." Ps. cxxii. is later than Ezra and Nehemiah; for it speaks of "Jerusalem the rebuilt." Such is Mr. Smith's translation; but it is not that of other Hebraists fully as good as he. Again: Jerusalem might just as well have been spoken of as "rebuilt," after David's storm and sack of Jebus, 2 Sam. v. 9, and his restoration and enlargement, as after Nehemiah's work; and the tone of pride and confidence the spectator is made to express in view of the royal city and bulwarks, suits far better to the prosperous city of David, than to the poor, half-populated, scrambling town as restored by Nehemiah. As to the allusions to captivity and deliverance in the "Songs of Degrees," these contain nothing more than was applicable to previous disasters before the Babylonish captivity. The proof is, that Hosea vi. 11, and Joel iii. 1, both celebrate a similar joy; and both are indisputably prior to the great carrying away. When these Psalms are examined, they clearly describe national dangers which threatened but did not destroy the state and city; as the invasion of Sennacherib. Ps. cxxiv, "The Lord *hath* not given us as a prey to their teeth." Ps. cxxv, "The rod of the wicked *shall not rest upon* the lot of the righteous," etc. These Psalms point much more probably to the times from David to Hezekiah, and to the approaching dangers and deliverances of those reigns. *Lastly*, the utmost that could be inferred, granting the validity of the points made, would be, that sundry of these Psalms were composed by inspired men of the era of Ezra, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. That any of them were written during or after the Maccabean era, there is not a particle of proof. So much for the attack on the divine authority of the Psalms.

3. But Mr. Smith's main and final effort, pursued through five lectures, is to prove the larger parts of the Pentateuch forgeries. The position he has adopted, from his infidel teachers, Graf, Wellhausen, etc., is: That the Levitical details of sacrifice and ritual were never legislated until at or after the days of Ezekiel; that throughout all the ages from his day up to Samuel

and the Judges, these laws, now written in the Pentateuch, were never observed, and had never been heard of; that especially was this true of the statute now found in Deut. xii. 11 to 14, enjoining the maintenance of only one altar of sacrifice, at only one place, and prohibiting all others; that the priestly caste at the end of the Babylonian captivity devised this restriction as a means to restrain the disastrous tendency of the people to idolatrous worship; and to give more authority to their device, inserted it in their new recensions of the Pentateuch, and claimed Mosaic authority for it; that Ezekiel's last chapters, xl., etc., gave the key-note for this new legislation, and indeed sufficient divine authority for it; whence he does not regard this ritual, after its late introduction, as lacking in inspired sanction, according to his low conception of inspiration. He thinks he knows just how much Moses actually legislated, viz.: Exod., chap. xxi. to xxiii. inclusive, and Deut., chap. i. to xi. Deut., chap. xii. to xxxvi. forms a later code, ascribed indeed to Moses by the Jews, but in reality first enacted and published by some prophet, or prophets, of the times of Josiah. The largest code is what he calls the Levitical. It embraces Exod., chap. xxiv. to end, and most of the legislative parts of Leviticus and Numbers. This code, with its multiplied and exact details, was utterly unknown until the days of Ezekiel and Ezra, and was introduced by the priests subsequent to the former, and probably upon the hints he gives in his picture of the new sanctuary, chap. xl.-xlviii.

The pretended evidences for this division are numerous, embracing a multitude of points, all either frivolous or sophistical; of hardy assertions having no other ground than wild dogmatism; of ingenious wrestings of history; of exaggerations of facts; and of misinterpreted texts. The text most relied on is Jer. vii. 22 and 23: "For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices. But this thing commanded I them, saying: Obey my voice, and I will be your God," etc. On the evidence of these verses, Mr. Smith roundly asserts, again and again, that Jeremiah knew nothing of a Levitical code of sacrifices, and that none such existed in his day.

Similar passages from Isaiah, Hosea, etc., are quoted, in which God rebukes the Jews for *insincere* offerings followed by impenitence; and all these are wrested to teach, that the Levitical offerings had never yet been enjoined. Especially is the argument pressed, that the Levitical code could not have had existence during all the ages from Joshua to Zedekiah, because the history in Samuel and Kings does not exhibit Israel as living up to that code. And to exaggerate this argument, the history is in many cases falsified to make the contradictions between the code and the conduct more salient. But the chief plea of all is, that whereas the "second or Deuteronomic code," chap. xii. 3 to 14, expressly enjoined that there must be but one altar for the twelve tribes, to which every bloody sacrifice must be brought, at a single place of divine selection, the historic Israel down to Josiah always had many altars of sacrifice and high places, which even an orthodox Asa or Hezekiah did not abolish, and worse yet, inspired prophets, as Samuel and Elijah, offered on them. See, *e. g.*, 1 Sam. xvi. 5; ix. 12, etc.; 1 Kings xviii. 32, etc.

It would be unmerciful to the reader, as unnecessary, to detain him for an exposure of the multitude of points sophistically made. A few of them will be mentioned and refuted, in order to sustain our assertion as to the uncandid spirit of the reasoning, and the worthlessness of the conclusion. This reprehensible temper is well instanced in the text cited from Jeremiah. The author, of course, knows perfectly well, that the great current of learned expositors explain it as a rhetorical hyperbole. The prophet wishes to emphasise the truth, that in Jehovah's eyes sincere heart-religion is far more important than ritual: so much more essential, that the precepts about the ritual are as nothing compared with the requirement of sincere obedience. He knows that all this class of passages receives the same obvious explanation. But all this he disdains either to mention, or look at, or reply to. For all he tells his readers, they would remain ignorant that any body attempted to explain the passages thus! Yet this explanation is clear and satisfactory; and these very prophets themselves shut us up to it, by other clear declarations, which Mr. Smith takes especial pains not to mention. Says Lange, on Jer. vii. 22:

“But to find in this passage a proof that Jeremiah was ignorant of any legal enactment with respect to sacrifices at the time of the exodus, as Graf does, following Hitzig and others, is a proceeding *for which there is no ground*, either in the historical books, or in the writings of the pre-exilic prophets generally.” (See Amos iv. 5, compared with Levit. vii. 13; Hos. iv. 10, with Levit. xxvi. 26; Amos v. 25, compare Hosea vi. 6; 1 Sam. xv. 22, Ps. li. 16.) These passages make unquestionable allusions to the Levitical code, which Mr. Smith would have non-existent when these prophets wrote. “So also,” adds Lange, “in this passage the negation has a rhetorical, not a logical significance.” So, in substance, Gill and Calvin. One fact is fatal to Mr. Smith’s exposition of Jeremiah. The exodus from Egypt was indisputably attended by the divine appointment of the Passover. But the *paschal lamb was a sacrifice*. Mr. Smith’s version as to this is puerile and uncandid. It is therefore impossible that Jeremiah could have meant that the exodus was literally unattended by any ordinance of sacrifice. But let the reader consult the following places in the pre-exilic prophets, and especially in Jeremiah himself, and he will feel how amazing is the audacity which can assert (as Lecture 10) that these prophets “say Jehovah has not enjoined sacrifice”; and, “It is simple matter of fact that the prophets do not refer to a written Torah as the basis of their teaching” . . . and “absolutely deny the existence of a binding ritual law.” Jer. ii. 8; vi. 19, 20; xvii. 26; xviii. 15; xix. 4; xxxiii. 11 and 18; Isaiah viii. 20; xxxiv. 16; xliii. 22, 23; lvi. 3 and 7; lxvi. 3; Ps. xix. 8; xxvi. 6; xliii. 4; l. 8; li. 19; lxvi. 13; Hosea viii. 12; ix. 4; Ezek. xx. 28; 2 Kings, xxii. 8, etc.

The coolness with which the book of Joshua is excluded from witnessing to these facts is as refreshing as our author’s hardihood of assertion is astounding. Lecture 8th says: “I exclude the book of Joshua, because it in all its parts hangs closely together with the Pentateuch.” The logic of this exclusion is the following: We assume without proof that A is a false witness. Then, since B agrees with him, he must be a false witness. And hence, again, since A agrees with B, he must be a false witness. A pretty circle, truly! But the real reason why Joshua is not per-

mitted to testify, will appear in the following fatal passages, chap. xviii. 1: "And the whole congregation of the children of Israel assembled at Shiloh, and set up the tabernacle of the congregation there;" thus explicitly carrying out the law of Deuteronomy xii., which Mr. Smith says was never heard of until Josiah's days. Chap. xx. 2, "Appoint out for you cities of refuge, whereof I spake unto you by the hand of Moses." Deut. xix. 3. But this part of Deuteronomy, says Mr. Smith, was never published until Josiah's day! Chap. xxi. 2, the Levites at Shiloh say: "The Lord commanded by the hand of Moses" (see Num. xxxv. 2) "to give us cities to dwell in, with the suburbs," etc. But the most significant place of all is the 22d chapter. The two and a half tribes whose cantons were east of Jordan, in returning to their homes after the war of conquest, build an altar at the river. They meant it not for an altar of sacrifice, but of witness, designed merely to attest their and their children's rights in the national altar at Shiloh. But the remaining Hebrews, supposing that these were preparing to break the law of Deuteronomy xii. against a plurality of altars of sacrifice, are so determined to enforce that Mosaic statute that they prepare for war against their own brethren. Yet Mr. Smith says no such statute existed until Josiah! See verses 10, 16, 22-29. The high priest decides, vs. 32, 33, that such an altar of witness is no breach of that statute. Now, the genuineness of this book is indisputable for every sound critic. Not only does every codex and every version, including Mr. Smith's special favorite the Septuagint, sustain its integrity, but the internal evidences of it are peculiarly clear. The lines of the cantons, and the references to topography alone, when tested by the subsequent Hebrew history, and by modern explorations, prove the perfect accuracy of Joshua.

So, in the book of Judges, while we have frequent relapses from the laws, and while we see the roots of all the subsequent abuses planted, yet the worship at Shiloh goes on with an approximate regularity in the better days, which constitutes a constant reference to the existence of the whole Levitical law.

Before proceeding to the remaining arguments, let us notice, as specimens of the bad faith with which the criticism is conduct-

ed, some of the attempts to exaggerate differences, and to make imaginary ones between the historical Hebrew usage and the Levitical law. Mr. Smith says (Lecture 8th) that the statute about the daily sacrifice found, for one place, in Numbers xxviii. 8-5, is of later date than the return from Babylon. His proof is, that whereas that statute required two lambs, one for the evening, as well as one for the morning, the usage was only to present a "meat-offering" in the evening, without any living victim, because in several places, as 1 Kings xviii. 36, it is called the *מִנְחָה*. But this noun, while we admit that it came frequently to mean the unbloody "meat-offering," is also the generic name for any offering, as its root signifies. It may mean a living offering. Thus say the best lexicons. Buxtorf defines it as meaning generically a sacrifice, specifically an oblation. Gesenius says it means, 1. A gift (its etymologic primary sense); 2. Tribute; 3. An offering to God, a sacrifice, spoken especially of one unbloody. Fürst renders it, *Donum, munus, sacrificium, προσφορά φυσία*. In Gen. iv. 4, it is used especially for a bloody offering: The Lord had respect unto Abel and his *מִנְחָתוֹ*. Thus the argument is exploded.

Mr. Smith says (Lecture 8th), that the Levitical ritual always represents itself as "the necessary forms *in which alone* the inner side of religion, love to God and man, can find acceptable expression." Again: "Accordingly, sacrifice, atonement, and forgiveness of sin, are absolutely dependent on the hierarchy and its service." "Its aim is, to *provide everything* that man requires to live acceptably with God," etc. The argument he suggests is: that as we see in the history of the Hebrews a good deal of religion which was not hierarchical, this proves the Levitical code was invented after the exile. But his assertion is simply false. Israel had its moral, sabbatical, domestic, and social worship, inherited from of old, which quietly held its way alongside of the sacrificial worship of the Tabernacle. This was so exactly provided for at the one chosen place, as the standing type of Christ's expiation. That the moral worship should go on in every town and family, as it always had done, is taken for granted as a matter of course. The main object of the Levitical code is to provide

for the typical observances, which were largely new. Hence, had the Levitical books said not one word about the general moral worship, Mr. Smith's assertions would remain groundless. But those books expressly contradict him. In Deut. vi. 7, etc., the daily duty of religious instruction in the family is enjoined. The Hebrew's religion was connected with every event of his daily life, verses 9 and 13. So in ch. xi. 18, 19. No priest intervenes here. Israel is repeatedly urged to love and serve his God in the heart, and not in the form only, and to regulate his daily life by this principle of piety. Lev. xix. 18; Deut. xiii. 4; xxx. 16. Solomon, in the very act of reëstablishing this ritual in his temple, in his dedicatory prayer again and again refutes Mr. Smith's assertion, by expressly praying that God would open communion between himself and his believing people, not only through the priest and at the altar, but without any priest and away from the altar, in their homes, in foreign lands, in captivity, in drought, in pestilence and in the sick room, in the battle field, on the journey. Even the foreigner turning to God is to enjoy like communion. This daily access to God from every heart and from every place, is grounded on God's omnipresence, which no temple can limit. See 1 Kings, viii. 27 to 52. The Psalms, which describe the very same state of religion depicted in the Levitical code, represent the godly man as meditating in God's law day and night; as praying to God when far away from priest and temple; as performing his individual devotions thrice, or seven times daily. Psalms i. 2; iv. 4; v. 3; xxxiv. 1; liv. 1; lvi. 1; lvii. 1; lv. 17; cxix. 164. See also Zech. xii. 12. Thus do the Scriptures themselves utterly deny that view of the Levitical religion which is reasserted through pages of this 8th Lecture, with a wearisome monotony of false assertion.

In the same Lecture it is roundly asserted, that the Levitical code, Lev. xvii., makes it "a perpetual statute that no animal can be slain for food unless it be presented as a peace-offering before the central sanctuary, and its blood sprinkled on the altar." Again, he makes Hosea teach that "all animal food not presented at the altar is unclean." His object, of course, is to argue hence that, in so large a country as Palestine, containing so many peo-

ple, many altars must have been made essential by this law; and that hence the restriction to one altar could not have been enacted or known. The least examination of Lev. xvii. 3 to 6, shows that to call this a "perpetual statute" is false. It had only a temporary force, so long as the people were gathered conveniently around the Tabernacle in one encampment. The thing which was made a perpetual statute was, that when flesh was eaten, the blood must not be eaten with it, but must be poured out and covered with dust. Even while the encampment continued, the Hebrews were allowed to dispose thus of the blood of the clean beast taken in hunting (v. 13), without bringing it to the altar. And in Deut. xii. 15, 16, in immediate connection with the absolute restriction of *all sacrifice* to one altar, express permission is given to butcher any clean animal for food anywhere, at any man's home, provided only the blood is not eaten. This shows that the restriction of Lev. xvii. was meant to be temporary, and was now removed, in view of the approaching separation of the people to their homes in Palestine.

It is argued that in the days of Eli and Samuel, the supposed law for keeping the ark in a holy *Tabernacle* was not observed, (and therefore had not been yet heard of,) because (1 Sam. iii. 15) the sanctuary at Shiloh *had doors to it*; and therefore must have been a timber or stone house, and not a tent! This beautiful point is unluckily ruined by observing that the word דלתות suggests by its very etymology, a curtain-door; for it means, says Gesenius, something "hanging and swinging," and that in David's time (2 Sam. vii. 2) the ark of God still "dwelt within curtains."

Mr. Smith argues that the Levitical code was not observed by good Eli, (and therefore had never been heard of as yet,) because he let the child Samuel, who was not of the Aaronic family, sleep in the holy of holies; a place which the high priest himself only entered once a year, according to that code, and then "not without blood." The shocking dishonesty of this statement is exposed, when we note that all the passage says is, that Samuel lay down to sleep in the הַיְקוֹל. This word, says Gesenius, "*never stands for the holy of holies.*"

Mr. Smith says that both David and Solomon "officiated in

person" before the altar; the latter frequently. Hence he would infer that the Levitical code restricting this privilege exclusively to the sons of Aaron had never yet been legislated. But his only proof that David and Solomon ever intruded into the priest's office is the places where it is said that they "offered" so many or such sacrifices. The same sort of argument would prove that David built with his own hands all his palace and bulwarks at Jerusalem, and that the Temple was all erected by Solomon's personal labor. Who does not see that, as they builded by the hands of the professional mechanics, so they sacrificed through the agency of the appointed priests? Let the reader compare 2 Chron. xxvi. 16-18.

He asserts that the Jewish kings habitually carried their pagan body-guards with them into the sanctuary; which shows that the Levitical code forbidding all but Hebrews to enter even its court had not yet been enacted. He finds these pagan retainers in the Cherethites and Pelethites of David, and the "guards," כְּרִי of Jehoiada's day, who guarded the child-king, Jehoash, in the temple. These, he is certain, were Cretans, Philistines, and Carians! Now, in the first place, if the orthodox kings had any such retainers of pagan blood, we may be very sure they had become Jews by proselytism and circumcision (as the history shows so many of David's had,) before they ever entered the sanctuary. But, in the second place, Mr. Smith ought to know that the best Hebraists regard the terms, not as names of nationality at all, but as names of calling. The Cherethites were armed guards and executioners, so called from כָּרַת —to cut. The Pelethites were couriers, from a root signifying to run swiftly. The כְּרִי of Jehoiada were executioners, "cutters," and were unquestionably the armed Levites mentioned in 2 Chronicles, xxiii. 2 and 7. How preposterous the dream that Jehoiada, hitherto a purely religious officer, holding his place by sufferance under the pagan Athaliah, in the little dwarfed inland kingdom of Judea, either could or would get pagan Cretans and Carians into his temple-guard! Such dreams are the chief staples of our critic's arguments. But the reader will cry, *Ohe! jam satis*; the recital of these points has become wearisome. Let these, then, and their exposure, suffice

as specimens of the multitude of such quibbles, industriously heaped together to travesty the actual state of the Hebrew religion under the orthodox judges and kings.

But while we object to these unjust exaggerations of the departures of Israel from the Levitical code, we expressly admit that there were, during a large part of his chequered history, wide departures. Rarely, after Joshua, did even the best judges and kings return exactly to the perfect pattern of the Law. Let us see now, how far we should, in candor, carry this admission. *First.* The history of the "altar of Ed," under Joshua's rule, while it perfectly demonstrates the existence and currency at that day of the very law of a single altar of sacrifice, which Mr. Smith so strives to date after the exile, also proves that memorial structures simply, in the form of altar or pillar, for the exclusive purpose of witness, were not against that statute. The prohibitions of them were designed to prevent their building under circumstances which tended to corrupt worship and idolatry. *Secondly.* It is expressly admitted that other altars for sacrifice were from time to time erected and used by inspired prophets, besides the one at the Sanctuary. Samuel sacrificed once and again at Ramah, and at Bethlehem once. David, while the Sanctuary and altar were still at Gibeon, sacrificed on the threshing-floor of Ornan once, and statedly on an altar before the temporary tent on Mt. Zion, where he had ensconced the recovered ark. Elijah built an altar and sacrificed on Mt. Carmel, in 1 Kings xviii., and there can be no question of God's allowance of this act at least, for he sanctioned it by miracle. On this class of facts Mr. Smith glories over us exceedingly. He would conclude from them that the statute of the single altar could not have been in existence in all these ages, because here it is not a fickle backsliding populace that breaks it, but apparently inspired men directed by God.

The obvious reply is, that Mr. Smith wholly misconceives the statute. It must be construed in the spirit of its design. This design was, to secure accuracy of typical teaching and purity of worship, by keeping the sacrificial ritual under the immediate eye and control of the responsible officers. The only ground for not

having a plurality of altars of sacrifice was, that it would open the door for religious schism, for departures from the authorised ritual, and for will-worship, and thus ultimately for idolatry. Where the Church was sufficiently guarded against such abuse by the presence of an infallible, because inspired, officer, these grounds ceased to exist. Hence, it is obvious that the force of the statutes was to inhibit the erection and use of a second altar *by mere human authority*. God never designed to intimate that he, by this command, inhibited himself from giving his people several altars. *He* might and would do it on suitable occasion; *they* must never presume to do so. When Joshua and Phinehas supposed the eastern tribes had raised an altar for sacrifice on their own motion, they correctly adjudged it a breach of the well known statute. On learning that it was only a memorial monument, these orthodox rulers approved it as entirely consistent with the law. When Micah (Judges xvii. 18) set up a local worship, and the corrupted Danites removed it to Laish, and all by mere human authority; when Jeroboam set up altars of separation at Bethel and Dan for a mere political motive, these were breaches of the statute, and they were clearly denounced as such by the inspired teachers. So was the erection of every "high place," if made by human authority. But when Samuel, David, or Elijah, acting by inspired warrant, reared an altar for sacrifice, the explanation is, that they were as truly prophets as Moses. Their act was as much God's act as the passing of Moses' statute was. How thoroughly thoughtless is this criticism, which mistakes a rule God *imposed on his creatures*, as though he had thereby forever tied his own hands! It is to be noted also that at each season when this additional altar of sacrifice was authorised by God, there was a special reason for its utility, and even necessity. In all Samuel's day the arrangements at Shiloh were disorganised by the loss of the ark and its stay at Kiriath Jearim. Many districts were also in Philistine hands, and many Israelites could not safely make journeys to Shiloh, across these districts occupied by the enemy. When David made the additional altar, the ark was still out of place, Shiloh was in ruins, the tabernacle and brazen altar were at Gibeon; and the project to which David

was, by divine direction, bending his energies, was the transfer of all to Jerusalem, and their rearrangement there under strict Levitical law, which Solomon completed. David's day was one of transition. Once more: When Elijah built his altar on Carmel for a special purpose, Jerusalem was practically inaccessible to most of Ahab's subjects. Hence, rather than let pious people worship at the unlawful altars of Jeroboam, God authorised Elijah, and perhaps several other inspired men, to rear an altar for temporary use, under safe, orthodox, and inspired regulations, at another point than Jerusalem.

But again, we admit that during most of the ages between Joshua and Ezra there was a large difference between the Levitical code and the usages actually prevailing in Israel. Mr. Smith urges that the difference is so wide as to imply that the stricter points of that code must have been all unknown during all these ages, and must have been introduced into the Pentateuch after the captivity. This inference we deny. Our grounds of denial are the following: *First.* The history itself recognises this departure from the code, in all its breadth and excess. The inspired writers of Israel also predict it and its calamitous consequences. (See the 28th chapter of Deuteronomy.) Joshua, even in the act of calling Israel to strict observance of the code, tells them that he knows they will violate it. (Chapter xxiv. 19.) In chapter xxiv. 31, the era of observance is expressly limited to life of Joshua and his contemporaries. (See also Judges ii. 7 and 10.) So, chapter ii. 11-19, gives us, as a prevalent picture of the state of Israel from age to age, this alternation: a wide apostasy from the Mosaic code, uniformly followed by the threatened calamities, and the pity of God excited by their sufferings, raising up some reformer; then a deliverance through the efforts of this reformer, with a partial, but only a partial (v. 17), return to conformity, and another speedy relapse into almost total departure, with another catastrophe. Such is the actual picture of the sinful cycle, around which Israel moved during the whole prophetic era. Whereas Mr. Smith thinks it incredible that the actual historical departures from a known Levitical code could have been so wide, the history itself tells us that the departure

was just such, always partial at the best epochs, usually great and lamentable. And such is the account of the history given by the prophets near, or at, its close—that Israel *had been* capable of disregarding *all the points* of the code given them at the beginning. (See Ps. xiv. 3; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 16; Jer. v. 5; Ezek. xx. 13; Amos ii. 4; Nehemiah ix. 29; 2 Kings xvii. 8 and 16.) “And they left ALL the commandments of the Lord their God,” etc.

Secondly. It is not at all incredible that a Church should possess a revealed code from its foundation, and yet live in habitual violation of its plainest rules, because we see precisely the same thing before our eyes in the case of the Papacy. This body has had both Old and New Testaments from the beginning, and yet has been for hundreds of years living in most flagrant violation of their plainest precepts. The Papist’s professed rule of faith, the Bible, expressly forbids the worship of any but God; Rome worships God, men, women, angels, bones, pictures, statues, and a piece of bread. The Bible forbids persecution; Rome persecuted every dissentient, no matter how holy. The Bible knows no priest but Christ in the new dispensation; Rome is full of human priests. The Bible says none can forgive sin but God only; the Romish priest undertakes every week to forgive sins. The Bible says marriage is honorable in all; Rome forbids her priests to marry. With this picture before our eyes, it is but silly to say that it is incredible the Hebrew Church could have departed so widely from a known Levitical code. And especially is the parallel instructive because in both cases the departures have been occasioned by the intrusion of the same human theories into the church—that of “tradition” and that of ritual righteousness. It was these errors, working, of course, upon and with human depravity, which made Israel’s revolt against a revealed code he professed to hold, a possible thing. It is the same in Rome. Hence, were all Mr. Smith’s claims of fact granted, his laborious conclusion, from the discrepancies of the code and the practice, would be worthless. It is contradicted by what we see every day.

Thirdly. While Mr. Smith supposes that this Levitical code

was first introduced after the captivity by Ezekiel and the prophets succeeding him, the fact is, that these prophets themselves refer to the code in many particulars, as already binding. Jeremiah, a little before the captivity, ch. xxxiv. 8, while citing the law of release for Hebrew servants, first given in Ex. xxi. 2, also makes an unmistakable reference to Lev. xxv. 10, and 39-46, borrowing its very words. In Nehemiah v. 1-12, there is an unquestionable reference to the release of debtors and lands, enacted in Lev. xxv. 9-13. But, according to Mr. Smith, this part of the Pentateuch was not written until after the captivity! Both 2 Kings xv. 5 and 2 Chron. xxvi. 20-21, in relating Uzziah's leprosy, make obvious reference to the law of leprosy in Lev. xiii. 46 and in Num. v. 2. But these books, Mr. Smith says, are, except their thread of history, not a part of Moses' Pentateuch. The same history, v. 18, makes equally obvious reference to the law forbidding any but a son of Aaron to offer incense, contained in Ex. xxx. 7 and 8, and Num. xvi. 40, and xviii. 7. But these also, Mr. Smith thinks, did not belong to the Law at that date. Nehemiah, chap. ix. 14, speaks of detailed "precepts, statutes, and laws," given from God by the hand of Moses, in terms plainly allusive to the Levitical particulars. Joshua, as the very first thing he did on his return from the captivity, resumed the offering of the "daily burnt-offerings by number, and the new moon continual burnt-offering, and of all the set feasts, according to the custom." These details are all contained in the Levitical code, and that code is here obviously referred to as having ordained them long before, not as now first invented.

The very places in the historical books which teach Mr. Smith that the law of a single place of sacrifice was so habitually broken, also imply that it was in existence and known. For example, 1 Kings xii. 29 to end, tells us how Jeroboam extended this unlawful usage; but it also plainly implies that the law of a single altar, and the law against worshipping Jehovah through images, and the law confining priestly functions to the sons of Aaron, and the law fixing the annual atonement on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, were all enacted, and known before Jeroboam. So of Rehoboam's sins (1 Kings xiv. 23). So, in recording that Asa

(1 Kings xv. 14), Jehoash (2 Kings xii. 3), Amaziah (2 Kings xiv. 3, 4), while in the main reformers, left the altars still in use, the historian clearly intimates that in doing so they came short of the existing law. They did right; "but not as David their father did." With Hezekiah it was otherwise (2 Kings xviii. 3, 4). Mr. Smith does not dispute but that good Josiah made an end of all "high places." Well; the narrative of his reform not only plainly implies that the recovered "book of the law," which guided him in doing so, was the Pentateuch itself; but every word and act of Josiah shows that he considered the abuses he removed, as every one violations of old law, which Israel was bound to know. He apprehended great wrath for its neglect. Did he suppose that God would punish Judah so fearfully *for not keeping a law before it was enacted?* Mr. Smith's hypothesis as to Ezra's first introduction of the Levitical code is most unlucky. In his history, (chap. ii. 63, and iii. 1 to 6) we find Joshua and Zerubbabel enforcing all the distinctive ritual of that code. Does the reader note how long this was before the appearance of Ezra as a teacher in Judea? According to Prideaux's chronology, which scholars now follow usually, about ninety years!

But especially is Ezekiel's testimony unfortunate for Mr. Smith. His theory is, that the ritualistic descriptions of Ezek. xl. to end, gave the first impulse to the introduction of this Levitical code. But the prophecies of Ezekiel teem with references or allusions to that very code as preëxistent and old. The emblematic temple which he describes in his last chapters certainly was not a model for the second temple or its ritual. It had the Shekinah, which the second temple never claimed. The land-allotments to the priests do not correspond to actual usage. There was nothing to correspond to the River of Life, which Ezekiel describes as flowing from his east gate. In his vision the "whole limit" of the top of the mountain is "most holy." In the second temple the court of the Gentiles was admitted within that circuit. Worse yet, this very vision refers unmistakably to the "law" and a "covenant," as preëxisting, which Mr. Smith would have first to be suggested by it. We read in ch. xliii. 8, "shall no

more defile" the house. This implies that they had defiled it before; which they could not have done had there been no ceremonial law. So ch. xliv. 7 speaks of a ceremonial covenant as already broken, but to be now renewed.

The most marvellous thing about Mr. Smith's critical conclusion is, that this foisting in of the Levitical code into the Pentateuch, nearly a thousand years after it claimed to be written, does not seem to him at all to impair its divine authority. He thinks that such a pious fraud is, for all practical purposes, just as good Scripture as though it had been all written by inspired Moses. "That the law was a divine institution, that it formed an actual part in the gracious scheme of guidance which preserved the religion of Jehovah as a living power in Israel until shadow became substance in the manifestation of Christ, is no theory, but an historical fact, which no criticism as to the origin of the books of Moses can in the least degree invalidate." "If it could be proved that Moses wrote the law, what would that add to the proof that its origin is from God?" Lecture 11. The answer patent to the plain mind is, This is what would be added: a source for the Levitical code in Moses' inspiration, instead of in a literary forgery perpetrated a thousand years after Moses by unknown authors. One fact Mr. Smith either conceals, or else in one place feebly evades: that as the Levitical code now stands in the parts of the Pentateuch which Mr. Smith dates after the captivity, *the text claims Moses' authorship for it all*. All through the suspected passages, from Exod. xxiv. to the end of Numbers, and from Deut. xii. onward, the matter is continually ascribed to Moses at the introduction of each new section or topic. "And he said unto Moses." "And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord." "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, And thou shalt make," etc. These introductions, and such like ones, containing a distinct assertion of Moses' authorship or utterance of the code, recur not less than *one hundred and thirty-five times*, interspersed all through the matter which he says Moses did not write! Mr. Smith suspects many parts of the Pentateuch, because Moses speaks of himself in them in the third person. Well; in Deut. xiii., etc., and a number of subsequent chapters, Moses speaks

continually in the first person. But this does not please him any better; he rejects these chapters also!

Now the "higher criticism" may be able to believe that men who forged the name of one who had been dead a thousand years, one hundred and thirty-five times in seventy-six chapters, and then usurped his personality all through some twenty more chapters, were not only honest and truthful, but inspired of God. But Mr. Smith may be assured that all men of common sense will obstinately demur. To teach them that these chapters were written after the captivity is to convince them that they are spurious. There will be no help for it. And they will also conclude that this profession of respect for such impudent forgeries as of divine authority still, is a very thin mask. Such criticism cannot save itself from infidelity.

Our last objection is against the manner in which the book discounts the testimony of our Saviour and his apostles to the validity of the Old Testament canon, and of the passages impugned. The critic claims to be a thoroughly reverent Christian. But he virtually arrays himself against Christ's veracity, and he leaves his readers in ignorance of this irreverent and fatal feature of his reasonings. Let the reader, then, notice the following, in which the New Testament not only refers to this Levitical code as appointed of God, but *names Moses* as the inspired legislator of it. In Matt. viii. 4, Christ says to the healed leper: "Offer the gift that *Moses* commanded." This is in Levit. xiv. 3, etc., a part of the Pentateuch which Mr. Smith refers to Ezra's day or later! In Matt. xix. 7, "Why did *MOSES* then command to give a writing of divorcement?" This law is in Deut. xxiv. 1, one of the passages Mr. Smith says was never known until Josiah's day. So in Mark x. 3, "What did *MOSES* command you?" (on this same subject.) In Matt. xxiii. 2: "The scribes and Pharisees sit in *MOSES*' seat. *All therefore* whatsoever they bid you, that observe and do." This plainly implies that all the observances for which they quoted Scripture were quoted from Moses. In Mark xii. 19, "*Moses wrote*" (the law of Levirate marriage). This is in Deut. xxv. 5 again. So says Luke xx. 28. Luke xvi, 29: "They have *Moses* and the prophets," &c. In John i.

17: "The law was given by *Moses*." In John iii. 14: "*Moses* lifted up the serpent in the wilderness." (Numb. xxi. 9.) In John vii. 14: "Did not *Moses* give you the law?" Now, according to Mr. Smith's own theory, the "law" which the scribes of that day ascribed to Moses certainly included the whole Levitical code. In Acts iii. 22: "Moses truly said unto the fathers, a prophet like unto me," etc. This is said in Deuteronomy xviii. 15. So in Acts vii. 37 and Rom. x. 5: "*Moses* describeth the righteousness of the law." (See Levit. viii. 5.) In 2 Cor. iii. 15: "When *Moses* is read," meaning unquestionably, when the Pentateuch, as we now have it, is read. In Hebrews ix. 19: "When *Moses* had spoken every precept." This was in Exod. xxiv. 5, at the earliest, if not in Levit. xiv. Mr. Smith thinks Moses spoke very few Levitical precepts. Now, in view of these inspired assertions, can it be that all these men, when they called the Levitical law "*Moses*' law," only meant that it was a law which for four hundred years had gone by Moses' name, though really invented a thousand years after him? Again, Paul says expressly (Gal. iii. 17) that "the law," meaning unquestionably this Levitical code, was added "four hundred and thirty years after" Abraham. Mr. Smith thinks the larger part was added fourteen hundred years after Abraham. And Luke ii. 23, 24, refers to the law of the first-born male and the mother's cleansing as the "law of the Lord," but a part of it is found in Exod. xxxiv. 19, and Numb. iii. 13.

The intelligent reader of the Epistle to the Hebrews will especially remember how fatal its testimony is as to Mr. Smith's theory. The inspired author is beyond doubt (see chapter ix. 1-7) describing a tabernacle made at the time of the covenant of the Exodus. In this he places (chapters viii. and ix.) nearly every feature of what Mr. Smith calls the Ezdrine ritual. And then he ascribes the whole to Moses (chapter ix. 19-22) with an unmistakable reference to Exod. xxiv. 5. If the Epistle to the Hebrews is inspired, Mr. Smith must be wrong.

No better place than this offers to direct the reader's attention also to the theological tendencies of his criticism. He says that before the exile the prophets enjoined on Israel *no sacrificial*

ritual; that their teachings constantly depreciate the value of such a ritual, and point the people, as Micah vi. 8, to acts of justice and mercy, as what God requires of believers. But he admits that, after the exile, a sacrificial ritual was enjoined by divine authority. But the old dispensation was typical of the new, and foreshadowed the way of salvation. God, therefore, has taught *two opposite ways of salvation*. First, for a thousand years, the Socinian theology, which discards the necessity of expiation; and then, from Ezra's day to ours, the Calvinistic theology! Is the Christian reader ready for this conclusion?

Another class of attestations is found in the mode of the citation of the Old Testament as "the Scriptures," *ἡ γραφή*, or *αἱ γραφαί*, the "oracles of God," the "Sacred Scriptures," "the law and the prophets," and in one case, (Luke xxiv. 44,) "the law of Moses, the prophets, and the psalms." Now, the force of this attestation is contained in these facts: *First*, these "Scriptures" are usually quoted by Christ and his apostles as authentic and infallible as a standard of unquestionable appeal, as given from the Spirit of God. *Secondly*. The text and canon referred to were certainly those we now have, as is proved by particular citations from nearly every book, and by the testimony of the Septuagint, from which the quotations are usually made, not to say by the Hebrew codices extant, and represented in our copies. Hence, *thirdly*, the words "scripture" and "law, prophets, psalms," were certainly used by our Saviour and his apostles as distinctive of that canon of the inspired Old Testament which we now have. This conclusion is resisted, indeed, and the attempt is made to persuade us that our Saviour did not mean to state the threefold division of the Old Testament in the sense of the customary Jewish division, and that the word *γραφαί* may mean not only the inspired but any other religious writings of the ante-Christian times current among the Jews, as, for instance, the *apocrypha*. We have seen the disingenuous attempt to rob us of Josephus' witness, and that of the Targum of Onkelos as to what a Jew of the Christian era meant by "law of Moses." That attempt is futile. It is unquestionable that in Christ's day the terms *law, prophet, psalms*, had a perfectly definite meaning as

the three grand divisions of our present Hebrew canon. Hence, it is the plainest rule of hermeneutics that He shall be held to use the terms in their recognised sense, inasmuch as He gives us no *caveat* against it. Josephus, in his testimony, shows clearly that a broad separating line existed in every Hebrew mind between the books of the canon, and all others, however pious and popular.

That neither Christ nor the Jews of his day ever confounded these inspired books with any *midrash* or *halacha* appears again thus: in every place where authority is claimed for a rabbinical law, its inferiority to the inspired law is admitted on both sides. See, for instance, Matt. xv. 2 and 9. The scribes do not dare to call their rule of handwashing more than a "tradition of the elders," even when they claim obedience to it. Christ contrasts it with *God's* *δὲγματα*, as a "commandment of men." So Mark vii. 3, 8, 9.

Lastly. The words "Scripture," "Scriptures," and "Sacred Writings," are together used fifty-two times in the New Testament, and in every case the context makes it plain that the meaning attached is that which we give them—inspired writings. "The Scripture cannot be broken." "The Scripture must be fulfilled." "No Scripture is of private interpretation, but holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." "What saith the Scripture?" (evidently appealing to it as an infallible arbiter.) Such is the tone of this New Testament usage. Since the intensest Rabbinit did not dare to claim that his "tradition" was "Scripture," and since Christ so clearly distinguishes them, it is beyond debate that the words designated only the inspired canon. But since the very parts of Leviticus and Numbers, which Mr. Smith suspects, are quoted as "Law of the Lord," as "Scripture," as "God's teaching by Moses," his suspicions are contradicted by Christ and his apostles.

In concluding this review, we can add very little as a summing up. We can safely appeal to the attentive reader to decide whether our exceptions to Mr. Smith's conclusions are not deci-

sive. We can equally leave it to him to decide, after the exposure of his uncandid methods, whether our disapprobation of his work, though plainly expressed, is not just and deserved. Our word of condemnation was not too hard; and the safety of the Church and the truth requires from faithful defenders no less. Finally: while we do not presume to question the personal sincerity of Mr. Smith's protestations of his own confidence in the substance of the Bible as containing a divine religion, we warn him that few who adopt his principles of criticism will think that they can consistently stop where he stops. The Germans whom he follows do not think so. Their first principle is, that the supernatural is incredible. The very aim of their policy in adopting a method so rash is, to be able thereby to eliminate this supernatural out of the Scriptures. And such will be the tendency, wherever such methods are used. The result towards which they incline is virtual infidelity.

R. L. DABNEY.