

# THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

---

NO. 22.—OCTOBER, 1892.

---

## I. THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

THEY to whom the Bible is a sufficient rule of faith have this great question happily settled for themselves. For in the gospel, life and immortality are clearly brought to light. The doctrine is expressly asserted in a multitude of places, and is necessarily implied in the whole moral system which the Bible teaches. But unfortunately there are now many who hold the word of God as not authority. Christendom is infested with schools of evolution and materialism, which attempt to bring this great truth in doubt by their "philosophy, falsely so-called," and which mislead many unstable souls to their own undoing.

To such as will not look at the clear light of Scripture, we propose to offer the inferior light of the natural reason. The sun is immeasurably better than a torch, but a torch may yet save the man who has turned his back on the sun and plunged himself into darkness, from stumbling over a precipice into an unseen gulf. We claim that we are entitled to demand the attention of all such doubters to the rational argument; for as they have set up philosophy against the Bible, mere honesty requires them to listen to philosophy, the true philosophy, namely:

There is certainly probable force in the historical fact that most civilized men of all ages and countries have believed in the immortality of their souls, without the Bible. Even the American Indians have always believed in the Great Spirit, and expected a future existence in the happy hunting grounds. The

#### IV. A MODERN JEHU.<sup>1</sup>

SOME of the friends and representatives of the higher criticism have projected an *International Theological Library*. Rev. Charles A. Briggs, of Union Seminary, New York, and Rev. Stewart D. F. Salmond, of the Free College, Aberdeen, are the editors. Charles Scribners' Sons, of New York, are the American publishers. The book named in the note by Dr. Driver, is the first of the proposed series. Eleven others are already arranged for, and a glance at the names of the authors suggests that whatever merit may be wanting to the proposed library, it will not lack the merit of being abreast of the times. In fact, unless the times are very much in advance of the date assigned to them by the great majority of mankind, this library will set forth views considerably ahead of the times. It is possible that the millennium will come, or even the end of the world, before the times and the precedaneous views of these authors become cotemporary.

No disrespect is meant by the title of this review. One whose studies have made him familiar with the progress and results of the higher criticism might follow Dr. Driver without any sensation of dizziness. But when a neophyte watches his chariot wheels as they cut through the Old Testament Scriptures, turning up the yellow subsoil, and hurling fragments of rocks and roots and clay in every direction, his first thought is of the driving of Jehu, the son of Nimshi, "for he driveth furiously."

It is believed by the present writer that the time has come when every one who claims to be called of God to the special work of studying and expounding the Bible, should know something of what these enemies or allies, whichever they may prove to be, have done and are doing with our sacred Book. Once when they challenged busy preachers and pastors to a friendly or an unfriendly

---

<sup>1</sup> *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. By S. R. Driver, D. D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ's Church, Oxford, Formerly Fellow of New College, Oxford.

conference, it might have been proper to answer their challenge as Nehemiah answered Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geshem, "I am doing a great work, so that I cannot come down. Why should the work cease, whilst I leave it and come down to you?" That was wise while Sanballat and his associates stood at a respectful distance. But suppose they had come up to the very walls, and had gone to undermining and removing brick, and threatening to bring the whole structure tumbling to the ground? Suppose that a process of desertion from Nehemiah's ranks had begun, and that it was growing in importance from day to day, that the deserters included some of his chief men? In these circumstances would it not have been wise in Nehemiah to lay aside his trowel, gird on his sword and come down and have a distinct and decisive settlement with Sanballat? Granted the supposed conditions, and nothing could have been more important than Sanballat's complete annihilation, and no amount of time consumed in this laudable endeavor would have been wasted. In other days the higher criticism was at a great distance. It was hedged off from the popular mind by the barrier of an unknown tongue. The higher critic was a spectacled German professor who, more to gratify the instincts of his prying nature than anything else, was practising his microscopic eye-sight. Having no experimental knowledge of religion, and constrained in virtue of his professorship to occupy himself with theological literature, he found it more congenial to his taste to divide hairs and split atoms than to teach the saving truths of Christianity. He had no more reverence for the Bible than for Homer, and it was fine entertainment for him to exhibit his acuteness by picking the Bible to pieces, and at the same time to create a sensation in the world of letters. There was no way by which he could so surely attract attention to himself, and have himself written and talked about, as to proclaim the discovery of something new about the Bible. The noise would be all the greater, if that something new was also something smacking of heresy. That day has gone by. The higher criticism is no longer a matter of pastime with German professors, and is no longer locked up from the English-speaking world in the German language. It has left Germany and crossed over to

Great Britain and the United States. It has learned the English language, and uses it with wonderful fluency, precision, force and elegance. It has entered and taken its seat in some of the most important chairs in the historic universities of England, and in the theological schools of Scotland and this country. It has stood before the highest ecclesiastical tribunals of orthodox Presbyterianism, summoned thither to answer the charge of heresy, and in every instance it has come off with flying colors. It is speaking in no timid accents from some of the leading pulpits in the centres of culture and influence. Its tone has ceased to be apologetic, and has come to be strongly dogmatic. It unblushingly claims to speak the last authoritative word touching the nature, structure and contents of the Bible. What is profoundly more significant, it has secured the admission of this claim by the compilers of the world's libraries, the great encyclopedias. It is writing books "for the people," and through the channel of magazine and church periodical it is sending its potent voice from one end of the land to the other. Last, but not least, it is now preparing an *International Theological Library* to garner up and put in usable shape all its rich harvest of results. This library is to cover the whole field of theological science, and its avowed object is to furnish a series of text-books for theological students. In the judgment of the higher critics the time has come when they must supply a literature to take the place of that which has become effete. This new library means that not only the musty tomes of mediæval schoolmen, the weighty volumes of Reformers and Puritans, must be laid aside, but also the carefully and prayerfully wrought theologies of the honored teachers of the present generation. Henceforth theological students must learn new names and acknowledge new masters. These benevolent gentlemen do not wait to be asked. Having discovered the need, they proceed on their own motion to supply it. Is this arrogance born of blindness, or is it confidence born of past success? The latter would seem not improbable in view of the facts already cited. The higher criticism has been regarded as an enemy, and some show of resistance has been made, but its progress has not even been retarded, much less checked, by the methods employed. From a disreputable birth,

and an unpromising childhood, it has grown to such lusty proportions in the face of scoff and derision, that it can now use scoff and derision rather more effectively than its adversaries. It has entrenched itself within the pale of the church. It is in possession of many of the strongholds of Zion. Its redoubtable champions get the "sinews of war" from the temple treasury. They draw their support from the "shekels of the sanctuary."

In this state of affairs, can the Nehemiahs decline the summons to come down and confer, on the plea that they are doing a great work? Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geshem are now actually engaged in undermining the walls, taking brick after brick from the foundation, and threatening ruin to the whole structure of sacred truth. Desertion to their ranks is going forward at an increasingly rapid rate, and among the deserters are men of conspicuous ability, and standing in the front rank of scholarship.

The object of the present writer is to furnish an article which shall serve as an eye-opener to those who are disposed to keep their eyes shut. He will touch on the aims, methods, results, tendency, and effect of the higher criticism, giving Dr. Driver as authority for results, and devoting most space to this phase of the subject.

I. *Aims.* Having discovered that the structure of the Bible is very different from what it was once supposed to be, that each separate book, instead of being the work of one author, is a compilation from various documentary sources, and represents the work of several agents, the higher criticism proposes to discover these various sources from which the Bible has been derived, to separate these sources from each other, to determine the character of each, whether historical, traditional, or legendary, to fix their several dates, and then, finally, to show their logical and chronological relation to each other. In other words, the one comprehensive aim of the higher criticism is to resolve the Bible into its primitive constituent elements, to examine and weigh those elements, to test their value, to see how much alloy, if any, enters into their composition, and by this means to reach a rational and scientific estimate of the worth of the Bible as a whole. The function of the higher critic is that of the assayer. He seeks

to separate the gold from the dross, and to place upon each its proper stamp. It is called the higher criticism to distinguish it from textual criticism. While the latter endeavors to find, amid innumerable, various and corrupted readings, the pure original text of each book of which the Bible is composed, the former rises higher, and proposes to point out the various sources whence, and the various times when, that original text emanated.

It is freely conceded that in prosecuting this aim the higher critics have not spared themselves labor. They have given to the Bible an amount of patient study that should put the average preacher to the blush. In looking at the results, one is painfully impressed with the idea that they have been searching for dross rather than gold, and that under their touch even "the gold becomes dim, and the most fine gold is changed," but there can be no doubt of the thoroughness of their work. They have analyzed every phrase, and put every word under the microscope. They have studied Scripture in the light of Scripture, and made each part bear witness to every other part. They have studied Scripture in the light of contemporary history, and, apparently, have left nothing undone to extort from every source whatever aid it can give to the solution of the questions at issue. However much we may deplore the conclusions to which they have come, they are entitled to recognition as men of ample scholarship and of profound and persevering research.

In their conclusions they rely mainly on two tests, one literary, the other historical. After these two tests have been applied and probable conclusions suggested, other subsidiary tests, such as theological and ethical ideas, may be used to confirm them. Literary criticism has to do with style and vocabulary. Historical criticism is chiefly concerned with the matter of dates. By looking at the history of any given period, the social, political and religious condition of the people, it undertakes to say what laws and institutions had or had not been promulgated before that time. It assumes that no laws were in the Book at any given time which cannot be found in the life of the people at that time.

II. *Results.* If by results is understood only those conclusions in which all the critics are agreed, the showing will be meagre

indeed. The critics agree that the old traditional view of the Bible is altogether erroneous, and that no one who holds it is entitled to the credit of scholarship or critical insight. They agree that the Bible is made up of scraps, pieced together by unknown hands; and that those who hold this view have a monopoly of learning and critical ability. They agree that no matter what conclusions they put forth it is presumption in any one to contest them unless he has spent his life in the investigation of the questions involved, and even then he is not to do it unless he has the critical discernment to see that their conclusions cannot be called in question. But if by results is understood conclusions that are acquiesced in by many, or most of the higher critics, conclusions that meet with general favor, then the showing is large.

Following in the wake of Dr. Driver we will glean and exhibit these results. The higher critics class Joshua with the five preceding books, and speak of the Hexateuch instead of the Pentateuch, this for the reason that these six books are made of the same material and built by the same architects. The Hexateuch is made up from four principal sources, designated as Elohist, Jehovist, Deuteronomy and Priest Code. Deuteronomy may, for the present, be eliminated as practically independent of the others. The first four books of the Bible and Joshua are of similar composition. The sources are three writings known as Elohist, Jehovist and Priest Code, but for convenience they are designated by the initial letters, E, J and P. Beginning with Genesis, let us make a rapid survey of each book of the Old Testament. The process by which Genesis was formed may be represented approximately as follows: The two independent, but parallel narratives of the patriarchal age, J and E, were combined into a whole by a compiler whose method it was sometimes to incorporate long sections of each intact, or nearly so, sometimes to fuse the parallel accounts into a single narrative. The whole thus formed was afterward combined with the narrative of P by a second compiler, who adopting P, as his framework, accommodated J E to it, omitting in either what was necessary in order to avoid needless repetitions, and making such redactional adjustments as the unity of the work required.

The structure of Exodus is the same as that of Genesis; the same sources P and J E appearing side by side, and exhibiting the same peculiarities.

Leviticus forms throughout a part of the Priest Code, in which, however, chapters xvii.—xxvi. constitute a section marked by certain special features of its own, and standing apart from the rest of the book. The higher critics call this section the "Law of Holiness." It is made up of elements derived from P, combined with excerpts from an earlier and independent collection of laws.

In structure, Numbers resembles Genesis and Exodus. J E reappears by the side of P, though as a rule not being so closely interwoven with it.

The structure of Deuteronomy is relatively simple. The body of the book is pervaded throughout by a single purpose, and bears the marks of being the work of a single writer, who has taken as the basis of his discourses partly the narrative and laws of J E as they exist in the previous books of the Pentateuch, partly laws derived from other sources; and who also, towards the end of his work, has incorporated extracts from J E, recording incidents connected with the death of Moses. One of the final redactors of the Pentateuch has likewise, towards the end of the book, introduced notices of P relating to the same occasion.

The Book of Joshua consists, at least in large measure, of a continuation of the documents used in the formation of the Pentateuch. Chapters i.—xii. are made up chiefly from J E; and chapters xiii.—xxiv. chiefly from P. There is, however, another element in the book of Joshua. J E, before it was combined with P, seems to have passed through the hands of a writer who expanded it in different ways, and who being strongly imbued with the spirit of Deuteronomy may be termed the Deuteronomic editor.

It is presumed that the reader would like to ask a few questions about the date and authorship of the Hexateuch. We pause to give him an opportunity. How many writers have contributed to the composition of the first six books of the Bible? Six principal writers, viz.: J and E and the compiler of these two, J E; P and the compiler of P and J E; and Deuteronomy,



known for short as D. Besides these there were a few minor writers whose initials have been lost.

Who was J? Nobody knows. Who was E? Nobody knows. Who was J E? Nobody knows. Who was P? Nobody knows. Who was D? Nobody knows. Who combined J E and P? Nobody knows. It is to be noted that the knowledge resulting from the labors of the higher critics is not unlimited. It can only tell us who did *not*, and not who *did* write the Bible. Which of these unknown scribes is the oldest? Critics are divided between J and E. When did they flourish? Not earlier than 900 B. C., the age of King Ahab; not later than 750 B. C., the age of King Hezekiah. When did J E combine J and E? Nobody knows. When did D write Deuteronomy? Shortly prior to, or during the reign of Josiah, 700 B. C. When did P flourish? Probably about 550 B. C., certainly subsequent to Ezekiel who belongs to the period of the Babylonish captivity. When did the last of them gather up the documents furnished by his predecessors and put the Hexateuch into its present shape? Nobody knows.

It will thus be seen that while many matters of interest are unknown, it is agreed among the critics that the oldest documents which enter into the composition of the oldest books of the Bible date subsequently to the division of the kingdom on the death of Solomon. There is general agreement among the critics that J belonged to the northern kingdom and E to the southern. These writers, J and E, made up their narratives mostly from tradition, but incorporated short fragments which possibly date from the age of Moses. The Bible, however, does not begin with the oldest writings. The first chapter of Genesis belongs to P, and P belongs to the period of the exile, or later.

Passing from the Hexateuch we note very briefly the results of the higher criticism as respects the other books of the Old Testament. Judges is a compound of fragmentary histories and oral traditions which became very much exaggerated as they passed from generation to generation. The book exhibits marked differences in language and style in different parts, giving rise to the probable conclusion that it is the work of more than one compiler.

Ruth was composed by a writer of the exilic, or post-exilic age. The basis of the narrative was family traditions respecting Ruth and her marriage with Boaz. These have been cast into a literary form by the author, who has to a certain extent idealized both the characters and the scenes.

I and II Samuel are made up of fragments; the compiler putting the material together without reference to chronological order, and attributing some events to one period of the history which belonged to another. The song of Hannah, for example (1 Sam. ii. 1-10), is not early in style, and seems unsuited to Hannah's position. The song was probably composed in celebration of some national success, and ascribed to Hannah because of certain incidental expressions.

I. and II. Kings were constructed in the same manner as the Book of Judges, *i. e.*, from preëxisting material, arranged together and expanded in a frame-work supplied by the compiler. This compiler was probably a cotemporary of Jeremiah.

I. and II. Chronicles are the work of an author who probably belonged to the priestly tribe of Levi, as there is an evident tendency throughout the books to magnify the priesthood. This author could not have written earlier than B. C. 300. His sources were the earlier historical books, from Genesis to II. Kings, other books now lost, and tradition. The additional matter supplied by this writer cannot be relied on as history. He was influenced by his surroundings, and imagined things on a much larger scale than they actually existed. He transferred to the times about which he wrote the ideas peculiar to the late age in which he lived.

Ezra and Nehemiah are a compilation made by an author who wrote long after the age of Ezra and Nehemiah, probably the same author who wrote the Chronicles. The basis of his work was partly the authentic memoirs of those two reformers, and partly other material, either documentary or traditional.

Esther is not strictly historical, but has a basis of historical truth. The elements were supplied to the author by tradition, and aided by his knowledge of Persian life and customs, he combined them into a consistent picture. The author belongs to the third century B. C. The moral tone of the book is not good;

and Esther and Mordacai can only be acquitted of blame by calling in question the accuracy of the history, "which happily an impartial historical criticism allows us to do."

Job is not the recital of literal history, but a drama based on a nucleus of fact. The date of its composition cannot be fixed with absolute certainty, but it will scarcely be earlier than Jeremiah, and belongs most probably to the period of the exile.

Of the seventy-three Psalms traditionally ascribed to David, the majority cannot be his. Ewald assigns twelve to him, and fragments embedded in three others. It is possible, says Dr. Driver, that this list is too large, but it is not clear that *none* of the Psalms contained in it are of David's composition. Discarding the titles of the Psalms as unworthy of credit, the date of each Psalm is to be determined altogether by internal evidence. The criteria relied upon lead the critics to as many different conclusions as there are critics. The only points of agreement are, that very few Psalms are of Davidic authorship, and that most of the Psalms are of much later date than that assigned to them by the traditional view.

The Book of Proverbs was formed gradually. It is divided into sections, but critics differ as to which sections are the older. They agree, however, that the present arrangement is not chronological, and the common opinion is that the oldest part of the book is the section embraced in chapters x.-xxii. It is not at all probable that Solomon had any hand in the composition of chapters xxx. and xxxi.; it is doubtful whether he contributed anything to chapters i.-ix. Of the remaining proverbs embraced in chapters x.-xxix., he was joint author with a number of other wise men.

Ecclesiastes was not written by Solomon. The language, the tone, the social and political allusions show that it is the product of a far later age. The tone is not that in which Solomon could have spoken. The author must have lived when the Jews were but a province of the Persian Empire. The probable date is not earlier than 332 B. C.

The Song of Solomon is certainly the song of some unknown author. Solomon's authorship is out of the question. Most mod-

ern critics agree that it was written in the northern kingdom in the tenth century B. C.

Isaiah. There is much difference as to the number of authors concerned in the production of this book. The majority of critics agree in ascribing chapters i.-xxxix. to Isaiah; and perhaps the majority agree in ascribing the remaining chapters, xl.-lxvi., to one whom they designate Deutero-Isaiah, and who wrote towards the end of the Babylonian captivity. But many critics divide the book into numerous parts, and assign the numerous parts to dates equally numerous.

The process by which Jeremiah assumed its present form is matter of conjecture. The chronological disorder and dislocations are decisive against the opinion that the prophecies were arranged as we now have them by either Jeremiah or his scribe Baruch. Jeremiah is the author of all but the fiftieth chapter.

In Ezekiel we have the rare exception of a prophet who seems to have done his own prophesying and his own writing. He was not much of a writer, however; having no poetic talent, the most uniformly prosaic of the earlier prophets.

As for Daniel, internal evidence shows with a cogency that cannot be resisted that this book was not written by Daniel, but must have been written not earlier than 300 B. C., probably not earlier than 168 B. C. The narrative is not throughout a work of imagination, but rests upon a basis of tradition.

Jonah was written after the exile by one who had forgotten most of the history. He did not know the name of the king of Nineveh. The materials of the narrative were supplied to the author by tradition, and rest ultimately upon a basis of fact. "The outlines of the narrative are historical, and Jonah's preaching was actually successful at Nineveh, though not upon the scale represented in the Book."

The book of Zechariah is the work of two prophets. Chapters i.-viii. are by one hand, and chapters ix.-xiv. by another.

The dual authorship of Micah is probable.

It will be seen from this brief summary of results that the higher criticism leaves unquestioned the authorship of only ten of the twenty-nine books of the Old Testament. Of these ten, only

one, the book of Ezekiel, is a book of any considerable size or prominence. The other nine belong to the list of minor prophets, and taken together contain only forty-eight chapters, fewer by eighteen than the one book of Isaiah. Small indeed is the residuum of Old Testament literature left to us with its genuineness and authenticity undisputed.

III. *Tendency.* The author from whom the foregoing results have been gleaned, says: "These conclusions affect not the *fact*, only the *form* of Revelation. They do not touch either the authority or the inspiration of the Old Testament." We cannot call in question the sincerity of the writer who makes this statement; we cannot but call in question the accuracy of the statement.

1. As a matter of fact, do the higher critics hold the same views of the authority and inspiration of the Bible as those who oppose them? Wellhausen notes that the forerunners of the higher critics were certain writers of the seventeenth century who called in question the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. The most conspicuous of these were Hobbes and Spinoza, one an atheist, and the other a pantheist. Of course neither believed in the divine authority and inspiration of the Bible. Jean Astruc, to whom the higher critics look up as their first parent, the Adam of their race, was a French infidel. Eichhorn, in whose fertile mind the seed dropped by Astruc first germinated and bore fruit, was a rationalist of the most pronounced type. Then followed De Wette, and after him Hupfeld, Noldeke, Vatke, George, and Graf. Each of these names marks a distinct stage in the development of Astruc's primordial idea; and they were all rationalists of the same spirit with Eichhorn. Kuenen took up the matter where Graf ended and pushed the development one step further, and then Wellhausen added the finishing touches which brought it to its present well-rounded state of perfection. These last two writers so far from holding to the divine authority and inspiration of the Bible are avowed enemies of supernaturalism in all its forms. It is safe to say that not one of the great names most closely identified with the origin and development of the higher criticism held to the authority and inspiration of the Bible in any such sense as would be acceptable to evangelical Christendom. Of the Eng-

lish and American followers of those German rationalists, what shall be said? Not one of them, so far as the present writer knows, but rejects the doctrine of verbal inspiration, and the idea of the inerrancy of the Scriptures. This is certainly true of such distinguished leaders as Prof. W. R. Smith, Dr. Marcus Dods, Profs. C. A. Briggs and C. H. Toy. Dr. Philip Schaff, a friend of the higher criticism, has recently said that it is impossible to hold the doctrine of verbal inspiration in the present stage of exegesis. Is it at all probable that Dr. Driver's own views of the authority and inspiration of the Old Testament have remained unaffected by the conclusions to which his critical theory has led him? What must he think of the inspiration of the author of the Chronicles whom he charges with the grossest exaggerations, and with ascribing to remote generations of the past ideas which were peculiar to his own age? What of the inspiration of him who wrote the book of Esther, and who in that book inculcates bad morals, and slanders Esther and Mordacai? It is certainly not too much to say that the inspiration of the writers to whose authorship Dr. Driver ascribes the greater part of the Old Testament is not the kind of inspiration which most persons think necessary to make the Bible "an infallible rule of faith and practice."

It must be something more than coincidence that those who are conspicuous as higher critics are also conspicuous for denying the divine authority of the Bible, or for holding loose and incoherent views of its inspiration. It is more than probable that they either espouse this radical theory because they have little reverence for the divine majesty of Scripture, or they come to have little reverence for the divine majesty of Scripture because they espouse this theory.

2. Admitting the theory of the higher critics as to the structure of the Bible, it is pertinent to ask, Who were inspired? The writers of the original documents, J, E, D, and P? If so, the redactors who took them in hand, and joined them into a connected narrative, were men sadly wanting in reverence for sacred writings. Think of a man's taking three inspired documents and tearing them to tatters, and then placing them together again

after the fashion of the redactor who manipulated J, E, and P! He does not place the three side by side, and let each tell its own tale. He tears a little strip from J, then a little strip from E, and then a little strip from P, and fits these together as best he can. As a specimen of his work, look at the fourteenth chapter of Exodus; verses 1-4 are from P; 5-7, from J; 8, 9, from P; half of verse 10 is from J, and the remaining half from E; verses 11-14 from J; 15-18 from P; half of verse 19 is from E; the other half, together with verse 20, is from J; one line and a half of verse 21 is from P, three lines from J, and the remaining line from P; verses 22, 23 are from P; 24, 25 from J; 26 and a part of 27 from P, the remainder of 27 from J; verses 28, 29 from P; 30, 31 from J. It will be seen from this specimen, that the redactor takes considerable liberty with his material. He tears his documents into fragments of all sizes and shapes. Moreover, if these little fragments do not fit smoothly when brought together, he tears from one and another, and throws away, until he secures a satisfactory joint. Or, failing in this, he supplies a little conciliatory material from his own inner consciousness, and joins them by this means. On the supposition that these redactors were dealing with inspired documents, they must have gone to the judgment burdened with quite a grave responsibility.

It is supposable, however, that the redactors were inspired, and that the material which they manipulated was not the product of inspiration. Then the question arises, of what value the result of their labors? One of the higher critics has himself answered this question. Professor W. R. Smith, in his *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, says: "When it is admitted that the Bible history is based upon written sources, oral testimony and personal observation, no theory of inspiration can alter the principle that the knowledge of the writers was limited by their sources. Whatever they say which they did not find in their sources is not evidence but commentary." It is plain that an inspired man, no matter how plenary and unexceptionable his inspiration, cannot make inspired history out of uninspired historical documents.

3. The results of this criticism are such that they cannot but impair one's faith in the authority and inspiration of the Bible.

(a), This criticism attributes by far the greater part of the Old Testament to the authorship of men whose names and characters are utterly unknown and unknowable. It does not reassure us to be told that the human authorship does not affect the credibility of the contents of any given book. This is true only where we have reason to believe that the book was written under the supervision, or at least had the endorsement of a man who furnished credentials of his divine calling. This condition is not met in the case of these supposed authors, who, their names forever lost, must be designated like unknown quantities in algebraic equations. What "legate of the skies," proved to be such by the gift of prophecy, or the power of miracles, vouches for J, or E, or D, or P? These alphabetic spectres not only stand veiled in impenetrable darkness, but "none so poor to do them reverence." Should we try to exorcise demons by pronouncing over them these ghostly initials, the response would be, "Jesus, we know and Paul we know, but who are ye?" The critics themselves, though they have done them the high honor to place them in Moses' seat, Moses being thrust out, will not vouch for them.

It is evident that these nameless authors, supposing them ever to have had an existence outside of the fancy of the higher critics, thought there was something in a name. The book of Leviticus is supposed to be the work of P, who wrote in the exilic or post-exilic period of Jewish history. He was so intent on making Moses responsible as the human medium for the laws which he would foist on the church that he broke that short book of twenty-seven chapters into thirty-three paragraphs that he might introduce each one with the phrase, "The Lord spake unto Moses, saying." He never permits the reader to read a page without reminding him afresh that what he reads is what "the Lord spake unto Moses." There is every whit as much evidence that the laws of Leviticus were spoken to Moses, as that they were spoken by the Lord. It is preposterous, therefore, to tell us that the theory which eliminates Moses from the book of Leviticus does not affect the authority and inspiration of that book. The same reasoning applies to Deuteronomy. If D, who is supposed to have written Deuteronomy in the reign of Josiah, thought there was



nothing in a name, why did he put all his laws and discourses in the mouth of Moses? Instead of beginning his book by saying, "These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel on this side Jordan in the wilderness in the plain over against the Red Sea," why did he not just out with the truth and say, "These be the words of me, D?" He must have thought that the church would yield a more ready assent to his teachings if it could be made to appear that they proceeded from Moses. No doubt he was right. And no doubt if the church of that day had found out what our critics have discovered, that he was attributing to Moses what Moses never wrote, it would have been necessary for him to emigrate. The church of to-day is, in this respect, like the church in Josiah's day, it will yield a much readier assent to Moses who exhibited credentials of his divine mission than to those whose resurrection from the grave of oblivion has waited so long that nothing remains to each but a single initial.

(b), This criticism tells us that much which purports to be history is not history. Some of it is tradition which has grown up around a nucleus of historic fact. How large the nucleus, and how extensive the growth of tradition in any given case are matters of conjecture. Some of that which purports to be history is merely a literary frame-work which a writer has constructed to serve as a setting for his moral precepts. Perhaps such a view of the narrative parts of Scripture does not affect the estimate which the higher critics place on the authority and inspiration of the Bible. But the minds of most persons are so constituted that they will doubt the truth of that which purports to be one thing and is in reality another.

(c), This criticism seeks to confirm its conclusions by pointing out not merely variations in style and language, but positive contradictions between different component parts of a given book. How do we know that the first and second chapters of Genesis are by different hands? One argument of the critics is the contradictory accounts which they give of the order of creation. In chapter first, man is made last; in chapter second he is made first. In chapter first man and woman are created at the same time; in chapter second quite an interval separates them. How do we

know that Leviticus and Deuteronomy are from different hands? They contain contradictory laws and institutions. It is in the interest of the theory to multiply and magnify these discrepancies and contradictions, and no critic who becomes an advocate of the theory is proof against the temptation. Hence the sad spectacle of men, bound by their ordination vows to honor the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as "the word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice," now engaged in the unholy task of trying to impeach its authority by convicting it of error. The higher criticism was born in infidelity, nurtured in rationalism, and it leaves the mark of its obnoxious parentage on all who embrace it.

IV. *Effect.* If the tendency is as indicated, the final effect of the higher criticism, should it prevail, can be nothing less than the total destruction of the whole Bible as a divine book. This involves the destruction of Christianity as a supernatural religion, reducing it to a system of human philosophy, which will have with each man just the measure of influence which his own judgment may allow to its internal worth.

1. The methods of the higher criticism are such that no book in the Bible can stand the test of their application. The Epistle to the Romans bears as many marks of unity of authorship as any piece of writing well could. Its compact logic, its parenthetic arguments, its sustained and almost impassioned earnestness carry an irresistible impression of one distinct individuality. But a brilliant critic has recently applied the same principles to it that have been used in dissecting the books of the Old Testament, and has resolved it into four distinct documents by as many different authors. He has accomplished this result by a fair and unstrained application of the principles. The documents, designated as G<sup>1</sup>, G<sup>2</sup>, J C, and C J, are clearly differentiated by doctrinal and linguistic peculiarities. Then using the same mathematical argument used by Dr. Harper on the first twelve chapters of Genesis, he makes a stronger case against the unity of Romans than Prof. Harper against the unity of Genesis. Now, if the Epistle to the Romans cannot escape destruction when subjected to the methods of the higher critics, evidently no book of either the Old or the New Testament can stand the test.

2. Such is the unity of the Bible as a whole that when one part suffers, all the parts suffer with it. The higher critic seldom puts his dissecting knife in any part of the Old Testament that he does not touch a vital part of the New. The name of Moses is not only woven into the texture of the Pentateuch, but it is also woven into the Gospels and Epistles. It is hard to believe that the influence accorded to the Pentateuch by the writers of the New Testament was independent of their faith in the inspiration of the man Moses. Jesus said, "had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me." We must do violence to language to so interpret this as that it shall have no reference to the man Moses. Every unbiased and unsophisticated mind must assent to the following propositions laid down by the author of "Deuteronomy, the People's Book;" "First, that Moses is spoken of in the New Testament as a man and not as a system; second, that the Hebrew law as a whole, in other words, the Five Books, are ascribed to him."

Isaiah is quoted twenty-one times in the New Testament, and eleven of these quotations are from that part of the book which the critics assure us that Isaiah did not write, that was not written till long after his death. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans says, "Isaiah is very bold, and saith, I was found of them that sought me not." The critics are much more bold and say that Isaiah never said any such thing, and that the man who did say it can not be found of them that seek him. In Matthew xxii. 41, and following, is the record of an interview between Christ and the Pharisees, in which Jesus asks them, "What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?" What think ye of the critics who hesitate not to say that David did not write the Psalm from which Jesus quoted, and hence did not say in the spirit what Jesus attributes to him? Let it not be supposed, however, that in denying the Davidic authorship of that Psalm they mean to reflect on Christ as touching either his knowledge or veracity. But one is constrained to ask, Could any kind of testimony in the New

Testament as to the authorship of the books of the Old, balk the critics in the application of their methods? What seem to be mountains of difficulty in their way shrink into insignificant mole-hills at one wave of their critical wand. It is nothing to them that our Saviour and his apostles quote from writers what the writers never wrote, and ascribe writings to persons who never wrote anything. But the average mind will persist in thinking that such manner of quoting betrays either ignorance or dishonesty.

3. It was pointed out by Dr. Francis L. Patton, in the *Princeton Review*, for January, 1880, that there is a philosophy behind this criticism, the philosophy of evolution. It starts with the assumption that national life in all its forms, social, political, and religious, must grow from a crude beginning to a mature stage under the influence of purely natural forces. The national life of the Jews was not exceptional. It had a childhood and a growth from that to manhood. This growth covered all the intervening centuries between Moses and the captivity in Babylon. This growth involved the gradual development of religious laws and usages through all that period. Of course this philosophy will not square with the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. It must take the laws accumulated in those five books and distribute them, as to their origin, over the space of one thousand years. As a handmaid of the philosophy of evolution, the higher criticism is a necessity; and if there were no other way to account for the phenomena of Israel's checkered career, those who have given birth and nurture to the higher criticism would be worthy of all admiration and gratitude. But those who believe in the supernatural, who stagger not at miracles, have no need for the methods of the higher critics. They believe that a nation *may* be born in a day, and that a religious system instead of being a thing of slow growth *may* be the direct gift of God.

Dr. Patton is careful to say that the conclusions of the higher criticism may be adopted by men who have no sympathy with the materialistic philosophy of such men as Kuenen. As he was writing with a special reference to the views of Professor W. R. Smith, he was at special pains to exonerate him from such a charge as that of sacrificing Scripture to the demands of a godless philos-

ophy. He says that Professor Smith has unequivocally expressed his utter abhorrence of Kuenen's philosophy. Such abhorrence seems hardly consistent with the following from his *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*: "But from the days of Moses there was no change. With his death the Israelites entered on a new career, which transformed the nomads of Goshen into the civilized inhabitants of vineyard-land and cities in Canaan. But the divine laws given them beyond Jordan were to remain unmodified through all the long centuries of development in Canaan, an absolute and immutable code. I say, with all reverence, *that this is impossible.*" What is impossible? It is impossible that an elaborate system of immutable laws should be imposed on a nation at the beginning of its career. Why impossible? Because incompatible with the idea of development, the philosophy of evolution. The assumption that religious laws and institutions gradually develop underlies the arguments of Dillman and Driver, as could be easily shown, and no doubt, either consciously or unconsciously, affects this whole school of criticism. But if one accepts the philosophy of evolution, and makes that the basis of his reasoning, he must not only reject the traditional view of the Old Testament, but of the whole Bible. Evolution did not stop with the coming of Christ; neither, then, did the development of religion. If Moses could not legislate for the times of Solomon and Ezekiel, no more can Christ legislate for us. Every nation must develop under the same laws that governed the development of Israel. Here, then, is the final outcome. We are no longer to be trammelled by the religious and ethical notions of a distant past. We must go to our inner consciousness for our Bible. Usually the secular papers are with the latitudinarians, but the *New York Sun*, in a recent issue, drove straight to the mark when, speaking of the higher critics, it said: "They try to make themselves and others believe that they are only putting the authority of the Bible on a more rational basis, when in truth they are utterly destroying it, and along with it the supernatural basis of all theology and religion." Believing this to be true, we believe that the higher criticism is the most dangerous enemy that the church of God has to confront in this generation. R. C. REED.

*Charlotte, N. C.*