

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

record of seventeen years before. I long and I pray for Sunday-school teachers with the spirit of the 'Son of Consolation,' and for the one order of talent so precious as that of Barnabas."

THOMAS JORDAN.

ART. III.—THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE CRITICS.

(Concluded from page 533.)

WHOEVER was the author of the first chapter of Genesis, whether Moses or Ezra or some unknown scribe, he must either have had a communication of the subject-matter of his composition made to him from without, or he must have elaborated it from his own heart's inventions. There is no escape from this alternative. So many writers nowadays observe a strange reticence on this point; they insinuate that the cosmogony was a conception of some late Jewish genius, but shrink from saying openly that God had nothing to do with it. Now, which commends itself most to the common-sense of mankind: that a Jew at a late period of the world's history should have invented this theory—that he should have persuaded his contemporaries, without one contradictory voice, to accept his teaching—that the Apostle St. John should frame the opening of his Gospel so as to reflect the literal history in the spiritual, and that all after-generations of the most enlightened nations of the world should have followed in the same course; or that God, the Maker of man, should in some way which we know not reveal to man in the beginning of his being some information concerning his own origin and that of the creatures animate and inanimate that he saw around him? This is intimately connected with another question—How and whence did Moses (assuming his authorship) derive his knowledge? If we choose the alternative that God did make a revelation, and that the account of the genesis of man was not the design of man, but of God, there would be traditions handed down doubtless, from the beginning; and there can be scarcely any question that some kind of notation was invented in the earliest ages to register and record thoughts and facts—of this, perhaps, the old hieroglyphic characters of the ancient Egyptians may preserve some of the earliest examples. Such archives would be, through God's providence, preserved in the families of the faithful. St. Luke tells us that he had traced all things to their true origin; and so, it may well be conceived, Moses collected, arranged, and edited these relics of antiquity. It may be conceded that much, even all, that took place prior to his own day might be derived from such traditional sources; further, that after his time new editions, as we should term them, were made by the schools of the prophets, or by priestly

custodians, or by Ezra and the Great Synagogue; that the earlier portions would be penned at first by some mode of indication now quite unknown; that much might have to pass through translation or transliteration, as we know that the Phœnician characters gave way to the square Chaldee form at a late period of Israel's history. But all these admissions, though they would account for the introduction of many glosses and insertions which in modern books would be found in the editor's marginal and foot-notes—a mode of supplementary information unknown in that day—would not touch the question of ultimate authorship, or the true place of the book in the history of the ages.

Much has been made of the prevalent use of the different names by which the Maker of the universe is notified in Genesis. It is undeniable as a fact that many portions in Genesis present a more frequent and sometimes exclusive use of Elohim (God), and others a similar preponderance of the name Jehovah (LORD). These, say our critics, prove a difference of authorship; but this is not necessarily true. The words may be used according to their special meaning and the requirements of the context in which each is found. Our Lord uttered three prophetic parables, which are given us by St. Matthew (chap. xxv.). In these Christ is set forth as Bridegroom, Lord, and King; but was ever a critic so audacious as to assert that there must have been three Matthews, whose contributions to the Gospel might be disentangled by the diversity of names they assigned to their Master? Again, in the Apocalypse we have the period of the tyranny of the Antichrist stated under three different arithmetical forms; but who has ever ventured to say there were three Johns, whose works were distinguishable by their arithmetical notation? It is probable, as we have said above, that the occurrences of the most primitive times were transmitted through the patriarchal ancestors to Moses, and not, as Neologians tell us, fabricated in after-ages and foisted into the archives of the nation under false pretensions. If so, one line of tradition might preserve—as, it is to be observed, is a fact—the material and, so to speak, the more secular side of the history, and the other the spiritual and religious. Thus the grouping of these paragraphs into these alternating subjects would well account for this arrangement, and the very feature which is now charged upon mere useless repetition and mutually destructive statement would assume at once a profitable and, it may be, necessary mode of setting forth the treasures of the tradition that had been stored by Moses.

There is one omission that strikes one as glaring on the part of these writers, the almost entire ignoring of the genius of Hebrew composition, which is commonly called parallelism.

This arrangement or order does not merely affect clauses and sentences, but paragraphs, and even books. The interlacing of what appear to be separate and independent accounts is at once disentangled by this disclosure, and will render a reason for many of the seeming difficulties and discrepancies that are paraded with so much confidence against the advocates of orthodoxy.

But to return to the use of the Divine names. We find in Genesis three that are specially prominent—Elohim (God), El Shaddai (God Almighty), and Jehovah (the Self-existent). This is not the place to attempt to trace the philological meanings of these names, it will be sufficient to say that “power” is the radical meaning of the first two, and “being” and “unchangeableness” of the last. But what is the Biblical use? It is probable that the Trinity is suggested to us in these titles. Elohim is the maker and preserver of nature, El Shaddai subdues nature and bends it to His will; and Jehovah directs the purposes of grace in the midst of the world; or, as Delitzsch has said: “Elohim is the God who created the soil of nature; El Shaddai is the God who omnipotently ploughs it, and scatters therein the seed of promise; Jehovah is the God who brings this seed of promise to its flower and fruit.” The controversy has gathered more especially round the names of Elohim and Jehovah. If the former conveys to us the idea of Deity in the abstract as the Source and Centre of all power, and the latter of a personal, superintending God, one who is known, though vested in the regalia of mystery and awe, as *our* God—if the one name is generic, the other appellative—if the one is God over all pre-eminent in majesty and might, and the other the Covenant-keeper, the Ruler and Rewarder of His people, are we to be surprised if different paragraphs exhibit one name or the other according to the subject-matter? But though this is not only granted, but admitted as patent, it is not true that these names are very seldom or never mingled in the same period; and as this proximity of the names is a fact beyond controversy, the task of separating the warp from the woof has given rise to some of the greatest extravagances of hypercriticism. Thus in the account of the creation, after Elohim has been used throughout the first chapter, we find Jehovah Elohim combined in the fourth verse of the second chapter. Now, whether this verse belongs to the Elohist or Jehovist, whether it relates to the chapter that precedes or to that which follows it, the difficulty is equally great, as both names are found together; and to attribute the combination to a redactor is only an effort to escape from the testimony of a difficult fact. The fifth chapter is attributed to the Elohist, but Jehovah appears at the end of it in verse 29; and what is the

special pleading of the objector when pressed with this, but that the exceptional name is the interpolation of a later age, and its insertion is charged either on design, or the ignorance or the intermeddling of the compiler? Is this criticism? is this honest? is this common-sense? Could we treat any one of our own histories in this way before the literary public? Again, it is asserted that whole passages are mere repetitions, each containing a full and perfect history without the other, though it is questioned whether they always substantiate each other, the one of such passages being Elohist and the other Jehovistic, and the inference drawn is that they proceed from different sources. Bishop Jebb has shown that the *Benedictus*, by the laws of parallelism, may be separated by the alternate extraction of the component sentences into two perfect psalms; but who would argue on discovering this that there were two Zachariahs, each of whom raised a hymn of praise, and that they afterwards got mixed up together? But let us take as examples two prominent specimens, the history of creation and the history of the flood. It is objected that the Elohist penned the first chapter of Genesis and the first four verses of the second, and at this point the Jehovist inserted his tradition or theory of the cosmogony, because we then first meet with the name Jehovah. But if we examine, we shall discover that in the first chapter we have only a grand outline of creation recorded, with man the culminating point of all; whereas in the following section we have man in his own province, the special features of his introduction into the world, his allotted work and duties, and, above all, the covenant made with him. Then comes the fall, the rupture of the covenant, followed by the embryo of the Gospel conceived in the promise that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head. How natural, how fitting, how consistent with accurate statement and arrangement! In the *fiat* of creation He is Elohim, the mighty one; in the roll of the covenant and the Gospel promise He is Jehovah, the living and faithful; and yet not one separate or diverse from the other, but He that created and He that saves is the same: He is Jehovah Elohim, not two, but one!

In the account of the flood, we may remark that much in this section is a prophecy of the approaching visitation, and it is a well-known feature in Divine predictions that the same things are treated of under various figures and forms in parallel paragraphs, the prophecies starting from the same point and reaching the same goal, though presenting different phases. Thus, it may be, we have a twin prophecy of the deluge, each furnishing its own particulars, and each distinguishable by the selection of a name of the Deity; but what does it matter whether both came through the same traditional channels

or not? In any case, we are bold to say that in the arrangement and grouping of these records the greatest wisdom is manifested; the parts which refer most to the act of executing judgment are marked by the presence of the name Elohim, whereas the grace which Noah found, the door of salvation closed after him, and the sacrifice he offered on his exit from the ark—all these portions of the narrative shine with the presence of the covenant name of Jehovah. And here it may be well to add, as intimately connected with these examples, that if the proposal of these critics be accepted to split up the narratives in Genesis into a medley of contributions made by later authors, the whole continuity of such biographies as those of Noah and Jacob and Joseph would be broken, and the records themselves dissolved in ruins.

These earlier assaults have, however, given way to more modern schemes of critical warfare. The Pentateuch is now displaced from its leadership among the books of the Old Testament. It is no longer "the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms," but the Prophets, the Psalms and the Law, or the two last are held to be almost or chiefly coeval; and the commencement of Genesis, instead of being the preface, is the appendix of the Bible, except in position, as an introduction was wanted for the collection of writings which the post-exilic editors had compiled and arranged. There are many modes of exposing the fallacy of such a theory, but the purpose of this paper is to bring forward only such arguments as are not only conclusive in themselves, but commendable to the common-sense of intelligent readers. On reading the works which advance this theory, the following refutation at once occurred to the writer of this article, as well as to a number of others, as it appeared afterwards. If the earlier portion of the Pentateuch was written by the returned exiles from Babylon, their verbiage would, like Peter's *patois*, bewray them. They had recently come from a long sojourn in Assyria, and consequently the names of the gods of Babylon would have been familiar to them; the words in daily use among the people with whom they were associated would crop up in the description of men and things, and this feature would be all the more prominent since we are given to understand that they had let their own ancient language fall into disuse, and that Chaldee had taken the place of the Hebrew tongue. On the other hand, if the Pentateuch was written by Moses, he had just brought the people out of Egypt; the gods of the Egyptians would be familiar to their eyes; Egyptian ideas, words and religious rites would rise naturally to the surface. There was about a millennium between the Exodus and the return from Babylon, and this length of time, and the difference of the nations, and the diversity of all the

circumstances, must find a corresponding evidence and echo in the writings produced at either period. It is most uncritical, and worse than unfair, to say, with one well-known critic of this school, that the writer did all he could to imitate the characteristics of the Mosaic times, or with another, that more words are claimed to be Egyptian than are really so, and that Isaiah employs Egyptian words in his writings, as though the times of Isaiah and Israel's then relations with Egypt were the same as at the period that was subsequent to the return from the Captivity. These are only evasions of the plain facts, and evasions are not disproofs. We will, however, take a few examples of words about which there is no dispute. The names conferred upon Joseph, Abrech and Zaphnath paaneah, are Egyptian words, not translated, but transliterated; these are as evident to the English reader as to the Oriental scholar, but there are many other words which are not thus easily distinguished by the general reader, such as the word rendered "river," which always means the *Nile*, and "meadow," which signifies the *rush* that grows on the banks of the Nile; "passover" is also an Egyptian word, and so is the "bush" in which the manifestation of God was made to Moses. These are but a few of the most familiar instances traceable in words.

To pass on to other points, the plagues that devastated Egypt were acerbations of well-known and not unfrequent scourges; the calf that Aaron made was a reproduction of Egyptian worship, and is as natural to the circumstances of that day as the calves of Jeroboam were in his case, as he had been a sojourner in Egypt from fear of Solomon before he returned to rend the tribes asunder and make Israel to sin; and further still, we may remark that the ark of the covenant itself had, it is well known, a prototype among the Egyptians. What can be more evident than that the author of the Pentateuch reveals undesignedly, but with perfect consistency, the circumstances of his own knowledge and experience, and so fixes the geography and the chronology—the place and the time—which are described in his works, which could only be written by one who was learned in Egyptian lore, and not one who was trained among the Magi of Babylon.

We may be excused if we make choice of two of the words above mentioned to exhibit in detail a further argument for the date of the Pentateuch. The words are "passover" and "bush." Both these words are, as has been stated above, Egyptian, and not Hebrew, in their origin, and were introduced among the Israelites, and not devised by them. "Passover," in the old hieroglyphic language of Egypt, is represented by, and signifies, a bird sheltering with its wings; the noun and the verb "pass-over" imply not, as often interpreted, the act of omission on the

part of the destroying angel, but the act of Jehovah in protecting and sheltering His people. The sacrifice of the passover lamb was the mother of all sacrifices. The Levitical system derived from this source all the several and distinct sacrifices of the altar. All these sacrifices were concerned with the one great end, the making an atonement for the people. Now, atonement or reconciliation, both in the noun and the verb, is represented in the Law by the ordinary Hebrew word, which signifies "covering," the idea being that the innocent blood was a shield or shelter for the guilty. What has become of the old Egyptian word, which is only retained, except in one or two instances in the verb form, as the name of the yearly memorial feast? Why, the answer is plain: that it was translated into the language of ordinary life among the people. Again, the word "bush" is an Egyptian word, and, strange to say, is found in Egyptian papyri of the nineteenth dynasty; that is, about the same period as Moses. This word is only found in Exod. iii., where the account of the Divine manifestation is recorded, and in Deut. xxxiii. 16, in the blessing pronounced by Moses upon the tribe of Joseph, where the same historical fact is referred to. But what becomes of the word afterwards? The bush, *seneh*, is the well-known thorny acacia so abundant in the East, and must find mention in the sacred records. Again, we reply, this word was translated from Egyptian into Hebrew, where we find it is called the *shittim*-tree, of which, it will be remembered, so large a use was made in the manufacture of things pertaining to the tabernacle and the sanctuary. Now, to apply these words to our argument: Which are the oldest, the original Egyptian words or their translations into Hebrew? Could such strange and almost-forgotten words have been coined or re-introduced in the Assyrian or post-exilic period from a long unused language? Such a thing would be quite impossible: this must have been "imitation" of the most extraordinary character! At the time of the Pentateuch, such words were intelligible, but were fast giving way to others which were more generally so, as the people forgot Egypt, and were more conscious of their own independent nationality and rites. It is allowed that the earlier portion of the LXX. was made about 280 B.C. This would be rather more than a century and a half after the proposed date of completing the Pentateuch, but if anyone will take the trouble of comparing the places where the former verb occurs, he will find that those translators were not quite certain about the meaning of it. How could this be accounted for amongst the most learned members of a nation with whom tradition was as trustworthy as history amongst others?

The Book of Deuteronomy has become a special centre of attack. Modern critics have invented the painful theory that

the Book of the Law of the Lord, which is stated to have been found in the Temple by Hilkiah in the reign of King Josiah (2 Kings xxiii. 8), was not the entire Pentateuch, but only the Book of Deuteronomy; and that Hilkiah, the high-priest, did not find it at all, but composed it, either by himself, or with the joint connivance of the king, to suit the present urgent crisis. They thus unblushingly teach that it was a mere forgery to carry out a measure of expediency.

We have said that we give a foremost place to arguments based on common-sense, such as all can understand and appreciate at their value, whatever it may be. What, then, is the purport and object in view of this book? A sensible man takes up Deuteronomy; he reads it through with ordinary care and observation. Now, leave alone who the author is (whether Moses or Hilkiah, or anyone else who lived between them, or even after the latter), what does the book teach?—what is the object in view of the writer? Surely there can be no hesitation in replying: It is a denunciation of idolatry, a protest against the practice, a warning to the people of Israel against the snare that dominated their heathen neighbours. If, therefore, the writer had this purpose at heart, and if he had belonged to the late date assigned him, he would naturally have drawn his arguments from the experiences of the nation hitherto, and would have shown how disastrous idolatry had proved to their forefathers, and exhorted them to hear and fear and not do the like. How, then, could this (supposed) late writer omit all reference to Jeroboam and the calves set up at Dan and Bethel, and the judgment that had fallen on the ten tribes till they had been rooted up out of the land which God had given them? How could such an author pass by in utter silence the introduction of Baal into Israel, and the triumph of Elijah over Ahab and Jezebel? But not a single word touching these events is found. Why? Simply because they had not then taken place; they lay in the then future, not in the past, and consequently the author knew nothing of them. In addition to this common-sense argument, this book, like the rest of the Mosaic writings, makes constant references to Egypt, which are unnatural and inconsistent if the book were written in the days of Josiah, when Egypt had lost her prestige. We have also in Deuteronomy a detailed knowledge of the geography of the Desert and of all its localities. There is frequent mention of Moses as the speaker, and there is a completeness of design and a unity of style throughout which, if a forger had imitated, he must have betrayed himself hopelessly in some matters of detail at so distant a date and with such different surroundings. Moreover, the oft-reiterated declaration, "The Lord spake unto Moses," and similar statements that involve personal communication between the "servant

faithful in all his house" and the Lord of that house—are these all to be set down to mere idealization?—in other plain but profane words, that God did not speak at all, but that Josiah and Hilkiah said He did, and the king and the high-priest, after their concoction was complete, like the Roman augurs, dared not look each other in the face, lest a laugh should put an end to their mummery? We repel such a thought with "Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offence unto me!" The argument, to a straightforward, honest mind, is more than conclusive. What man of the high moral tone of Josiah, the ardent reformer and zealous advocate of religion, what high-priest of the character sustained by Hilkiah, would make a forgery and publish it in the name of God? If a man were capable of such an act of lying and deception, he would be found among the idolaters and worshippers of the false gods, and not among the defenders of the faith and witnesses of the God of truth. "By their fruits ye shall know them" is a test in all ages—in those days as in our own. He that is of the truth is of God, and he that is not of the truth is not of God.

Having thus dwelt upon one or two salient features of the recent onslaught on the Law, we may proceed to the next section of the ancient Scriptures, the *Prophets*. As the Rationalists have adopted Hume's objection to miracles—that they are antecedently impossible, and so must be either denied altogether or qualified, or attributed to the interpolation of after-days—so also do they deny the possibility of *predictive* prophecy. Prophecy is only moral teaching; all seeming foresight into the future is only the penetration of a good or clever man into great general truths, the tracing of the convergence of lines that naturally lead to some distant centre, or the picturing of some ideal which will be concreted sooner or later in some great character. We have mentioned the wide range enclosed in this term "prophets." The prophetic schools were the authors, editors, and guardians of this section; hence the application of the term. All the works herein specified, the historical as well as the predictive portion, have been subjected to the scrutiny of the critic; but as it is with the prophets properly so called that the objectors have been most busy at work, we will select a well-known example for our purpose in the prophet Isaiah. It is observed that at the end of the thirty-fifth chapter the prophecy breaks off; then follow five chapters that are simply a reproduction of the parallel history given in the Kings. Probably both came from the same pen, as the Books of Kings were the work of the prophets, and the Books of the Chronicles were of the priests. The prophecy proper is resumed at the fortieth chapter. Now, in this last section there is a definite statement made that Cyrus shall be concerned in the restoration of Judah from Babylon

(xliv. 28). This, to say nothing about the distinct and accurate portraiture of the Messiah in chapter liii., is enough to call forth the animosity of the Rationalist. The Messianic prophecies are solved into the dream of the ideal reflected in that sense, not a vision fulfilled in the orthodox sense, in the person of our blessed Lord; but in the case of Cyrus there is no escape from the actual name of the benefactor, or from the fact that that statement embodied a well-known historical truth. How can it be disposed of so as to preserve their theory intact? There is only one way: we must raise the cry, The prophecy so called is not a prophecy at all; it was written after the fact. What matters it that the LXX. translators knew nothing of this? What matters it that the son of Sirach, about the same date, knew nothing of it? What matters it that Josephus says that the words were written 210 years before, and that Cyrus was moved by them to take steps in behalf of the captives? What matters it that the Baptist, the Evangelists, and St. Paul knew nothing of this novel theory? The theory must be true, because Rationalism has decided that prescience is impossible. Though Isaiah himself claims this test of truth as final, yet it cannot be, because it is contrary to the dogma of infidelity. So there must be two Isaiahs—one in the time chiefly of Hezekiah, and another who wrote after the Captivity—whose works were adroitly fastened on and affiliated to the evangelical prophet; and this prophet of their own creation or dream they adorn with the name of the "Great Unknown." Having started the theory, they search the two sections to discover any words proper to one that are not found in the other, shutting their eyes to the many words and phrases that are common to both, and forgetting, it would seem, that the one was the work of the youthful and the other of the aged prophet. We have heard something of late years advanced by a somewhat similar process to prove that the works of Shakespeare are not his, but Bacon's; but all this is being forgotten and has fallen to the ground, and time and further evidence will show also the futility of these absurd attempts to upset the creed of centuries. Volumes have been written to prove and to disprove the double, or, according to some, the manifold authorship of Isaiah. Space and circumstances alike forbid our proceeding further with the more abstruse argument founded upon language, unity of thought and purpose, balance of ideas, and unbroken tradition among both Jews and Gentiles alike; but one common-sense argument will, we are persuaded, not only appeal to the sound judgment of intelligent men, but also convince them of the identity of authorship in the roll of the prophet Isaiah. If we turn to our Bibles we shall see that throughout the Prophets the name of the prophet is always given in the superscription of his work.

The historical books, such as Judges, Samuel, and Kings, were extracts from public records that were made as the occurrences took place generation after generation, and therefore, as they had no single author, no one name could be affixed to such works, and the last editor would not venture to claim as his the record to which he had only given the finishing stroke. But with a prophecy it was quite different. This was a revelation made to one man, and that man must be authenticated to his people; hence the name of the chosen vessel of communication between God and His creatures invariably stands in the forefront of his writings. To this is frequently added, for the purpose of identification, the name of his father, as "Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz." In some cases the chronology is fixed by the name or names of the reigning kings. In some the country only is added to the name; two are simply entitled "the prophet"; and Amos alone, as not being a prophet professionally, merely states his occupation; and in Malachi the bare name is given. But in all the name, and in most some particulars that furnish credentials, are stated. If, therefore, the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah are by a different author, what are we asked to accept? That one of the longest of the prophetic rolls, one that contains the most important predictions, one that defines the hope of Israel most distinctly, one that is noted for its transcendent thoughts and composition, the brightest star in the prophetic firmament, has been left like a wanderer without a name—that the author did not substantiate the revelations he had received by his own signature; that the men of his generation, who must have hung upon his golden lips, failed to perpetuate his memory not only by writing, but tradition also; that the Jewish Church, who read his writings in their synagogues, did not investigate the authorship, and, more than that, took occasion, in the most magnificent example of the prophetic gift vouchsafed to their nation, to violate their otherwise unbroken law, and sent forth to the world the pages that are crowded with the faith and hope of future generations pinned to the skirts of another's garment, as if needing the shelter of another's authority, and claiming to be heard under the disguise of falsehood and the disgrace of an anonym. No; we cannot believe this to be the case. This glorious prophecy needed a superscription, and God has given it one—"The vision of Isaiah, the son of Amoz," and "what God hath written, he hath written." This may serve as an example. We might show other instances in which this system of conjecture catches at insufficient, and sometimes trifling, points, and, by magnifying molehills into mountains, would displace others of "the goodly fellowship"; but we must hasten to the last section of the Old Testament writings, the *Psalms*.

The Psalter, the first portion of this section, is one of the grandest strongholds of prophecy. If the antiquity of many of the Psalms in this pentateuch of sacred song can be maintained, revelation and predictive prophecy cannot be denied. "But," argues the Rationalist, "we do deny them; they are in the nature of things impossible." How, then, will they deal with all this wealth of testimony? Again they fall back upon the theory of an ideal, and dissolve the divine Apocalypse into a human dream, or say, "Let us be bold, and deny the testimony altogether. The Psalter is no ancient work; it is a composition as well as a compilation of a late date; it is a product of the period of the scribes, of the latest days of the Jewish nationality." This is the theory that has been in part, and now in whole is being urged upon us by the most advanced representatives of this school; though how they are really advantaged by this it is difficult to see. If some at least of the Psalms were written before the time of our Lord, which none attempt to question, and granting that, according to His word, the Psalms testified of Him, a prediction is as hard to make a hundred years as a thousand before the date of fulfilment. To enter into so wide a controversy would require a volume, not a brief article. We shall again confine our remarks to a common-sense rejoinder. The Psalter, every Hebraist must confess, is written in the best Hebrew, some of it in the most archaic style. After the Captivity the old language, the classical Hebrew, was laid aside and superseded by Chaldee. How could the ancient Hebrew at such a period be produced? The Scriptures had to be interpreted by the Targums or expositions in Aramaic: what use could there be in penning Psalms to be sung in the Temple or for private use in a language that none could understand? The argument is like this: A hymn-book is required for the general use of the National Church for her daily services, and for the devotions of the closet, and Convocation invites contributions, and all the contributions when sent in are found to be written in the style of Wickliffe or Chaucer. The theory has not even the charm of cleverness to recommend it: it is as feeble as it is false.

Then as to the theory of an ideal. Here we have to repeat that these critics commence their study of Scripture with the foregone conclusion that prediction is impossible, though Scripture itself asserts that doctrine and claims it as a proof of its acceptance and authority, but, finding such a remarkable correspondence between the prophetic Psalms and Him that fulfilled them, they say that there was such a longing in the hearts of Israel after an ideal man, that they pictured in their minds what sort such a man should be, and that Jesus of Nazareth satisfied these demands more than any other. One simple word upsets this argument. If the Hebrew race had framed such an ideal, and if the Rational-

istic theory that Jesus of Nazareth realized that ideal more than any other, and so in a sense fulfilled prophecy, be accepted as an explanation, we may well ask, Why did the Hebrew race, as represented by all sorts and conditions of men, their rulers, priests, scribes and rabbis, and the whole crowd of common people, reject their ideal? So far from greeting Him as the consummation of their hopes and the verification of their dreams, they one and all cried out with throats of iron, "Crucify Him! crucify Him!" Why, we repeat, did they give up their ideal to be nailed to a heathen cross? The other theory, named above, which these teachers maintain, that the Psalms are all of very late date, aggravates the case, for, according to this, the conception of the ideal must have been of quite recent date, and so the almost immediate offspring of its authors were totally ignorant of its existence, and abnegated it altogether.

In this section the book called *Ecclesiastes* has a place. It bears the superscription, "The words of the Preacher, the son of David, king in Jerusalem." It does not in these words claim definitely to be the work of Solomon, but the Jewish Church received the book as the writing of Solomon, and taught that the "Song" was written in his youth, "Proverbs" in his maturity, and "Ecclesiastes" in his old age, after his fall, when he had tasted the after-bitterness of the sweets of sin. Notwithstanding the external and internal testimony that furnish a strong probability for this view, it has been held by some since the days of Grotius, and almost universally in our present time, that this book cannot be the work of Solomon. The chief reasons alleged are of a linguistic character. We do not, in our zeal for orthodoxy, for a moment undervalue the force of this objection, and are willing to admit the argument as a fair subject for inquiry, so far as it goes; but it has been much overstated, and the difficulties on the other side have been greatly ignored. In adjusting the balances fairly, there are, to say the least, quite as many difficulties to be got rid of if we accept the modern theory as there are if we cling to the ancient one. It is true that there are many words of foreign extraction and use found in its pages which, perhaps, were not current in Jerusalem amongst the people of that city at that date; but the book was not written by them. These extraneous words, so far from presenting an insurmountable obstacle to the Solomonic authorship, may perhaps provide stepping-stones whereby we may find our way into the explanation of the mystery. Are we not told in the history of that king that he loved many strange women of the Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Zidonians and Hittites; that of these foreign women his wives were 700 and his concubines 300? Would not such a medley cause a perfect Babel of languages? Would not constant intercourse with

them vitiate his diction? As they turned away his heart from his God, so did they degrade the pure lip of his fathers; and the book which testifies of his penitence bears the very impress of his sinful associations, and so becomes a witness of the authorship. At all events, sufficient weight has never been accorded to this historical explanation of the diction found in Ecclesiastes.

Daniel is another that is classed in the same section. In the LXX. (though Theodotion's version of the second century was adopted in place of the one first executed) this book is reckoned among the Prophets, but in the Hebrew Bible it is reckoned among the Psalms. It is quite possible that the LXX. preserved the original order, and that Jewish prejudice in post-Christian times transferred it to the place which it now occupies. Our Lord distinctly calls Daniel a prophet, and thus He seems to insist upon the arrangement of the LXX., and asserts beyond a doubt his foresight of futurity. The writings of Daniel differ in form from those of the prophets proper, in that they chiefly detail visions and dreams of himself and others and the interpretation of them. The Jews of a later period probably fastened upon this as an excuse for dislodging Daniel from his previous position, and raising the well-known cry, "Daniel is no prophet!" If so, it was bad enough in the Jew, but it is far worse for men calling themselves Christians to assert that the book is a pseudo-graph—that is, in plain language, a forgery, written in 163 B.C., the year after the death of Antiochus Epiphanes. This ground is taken because the contents of this book are supposed to depict with close accuracy the awful events of that tyrant's reign; and if it can be proved that the book was written before that date, predictive prophecy is proved beyond dispute. The critics who advance this theory support it by appeal to the language, and specially to the presence of words of Greek origin and use; but there are difficulties of equal force, if not greater, in the path of their own pursuing. It has recently been urged by Professor Margoliouth that words and usages of words found in the latest books of the Canon (and this has special reference to Ecclesiastes and Daniel) are older than words and usages which must have found place in Ecclesiasticus, which is outside the Canon. This last-named book was certainly written before the date 163 B.C., and hence the books of Ecclesiastes and Daniel must claim priority, and that, probably, by a very considerable interval. But, under all circumstances, how unavailing is this effort; for no opposition of this kind can dispose of the times and seasons, the image of the kingdoms, and the advent of the Messiah and the final triumph of His rule, all of which have been and are being verified in the history of the world.

Again, may we not ask, as a matter of common-sense, For

what purpose was this book penned and preserved? Was it not to fortify faith in the hour of trial, and could that be achieved by a modern fable or by a falsehood contrived only yesterday? The book was certainly written before the birth of our Lord, yet it predicted the date of that event, and did it fail? The dissolution of Israel's polity and temple was foretold, and has not this come to pass before our own eyes? and surely these undoubted examples of prophecy and fulfilment should confirm our faith and embolden us to believe that the residue only awaits its proper season when all the visions shall be verified.

We have given but a brief and very meagre sketch of the assaults that have been made upon the Old Testament Scriptures, and have selected a few prominent examples to show how the adversary may be repulsed—not by subtle disquisitions, but by mere common-sense and ordinary intelligence. And what is the result in looking back over the path we have trodden? On the one side we have seen the ancient Scriptures supported by the age-long history and traditions of the Jews, and by the tender care bestowed upon the text by the nation who are emphatically the witnesses of God. We have heard these Scriptures quoted by our Blessed Lord in the very passages under dispute, for He quoted from the Jehovistic portions of Genesis in His teaching, He repelled Satan by texts from Deuteronomy, He cited the second Isaiah as a prophecy of Himself, and Daniel before the High Priest and the Sanhedrim; He pointed to the Psalms as bearing witness to Himself, and echoed the prayers of the Psalter on the cross. The Apostles made these same Scriptures the basis of their preaching. They have been accepted by the universal Church; they have been brought forward as proof positive of their tenets both by the orthodox and heretics, by Christian teachers and Jewish rabbis, who, by their very antagonisms, have furnished testimony that refutes the possibility of collusion; and not a hint worth listening to, not a breath of suspicion of any weight, was uttered for, say, two thousand years. On the other side, if we omit such names as Celsus and Porphyry and Julian the Apostate in the earliest days, we reach the Middle Ages before we find an unbelieving Jew uttering a whisper which was probably meant to be as harmless as it was indefinite. Others followed at intervals, till of recent years theories have been started and called discoveries, difficulties magnified in quality and multiplied in quantity, and conjectures taught as facts; and now it has almost come to pass that if any scholar lifts his voice against the prevalent delusion, he is quietly set down as not having posted the last results. And what are the last results? They oftentimes remind one of a student who has wearied his

brain with investigation and invention, and gone to sleep with his cerebral organs excited and overwrought by his efforts. His studies flit before his dreaming mind like the mobile brilliants in a revolving kaleidoscope. On awaking he remembers something of this medley and farrago of critical phantasies, and from this nightmare of confused and contradictory thoughts and theories he elaborates a new phase in the science of theology, and this he propounds the next day to his class and to the world as the "last results" of criticism.

This is no overdrawn figure, though it may have the ring of satire; but what would be thought of the historian who, because he read in the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. evidences of a return to primitive Christianity, would pronounce the ancient Liturgies—such as that in the "Apostolical Constitutions" and the Mosarabic—to be the work of the early Reformation period? or, because the Greek text of the New Testament was almost unknown in the Western Church till the days of the Renaissance, would teach that the Greek Gospels and Epistles had their origin at that date, and were fabricated to meet the necessities of a religious crisis? Yet, if we had not independent history to controvert such propositions, the argument would be equally valid. In the Old Testament this appeal to contemporaneous history is barely possible; still, the discoveries made in Egyptian, Accadian and Assyrian relics go far to show that the historical grouping of events, as handed down in their traditions, bears a striking similarity to the Biblical documents; and the day may yet dawn, and that soon, when some conclusive evidence will be unearthed.

F. TILNEY BASSETT.

Dulverton Vicarage, May 14, 1890.



ART. IV.—SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN ENGLISH JUDAISM.

THE prevalent idea amongst Christians concerning Judaism is that it is a kind of changeless system which has existed from age to age without any perceptible alteration; in the midst of change it has resisted change, like one of those curious organisms, the existence of which is prolonged simply because all the exhausting movements of life have been reduced to a minimum. And there can be no doubt that this has to a very great extent been the condition of Judaism for centuries. But for some time past this fossilized state of Oriental changelessness has been passing away, a new life has been stirring, and with it there has been a growing sense of restlessness. The influence of