

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/robbadshaw>

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

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

a single friend or acquaintance whom I then knew, and were confirmed invalids, who are now alive—not one.

No one possessing any tenderness of heart can look without emotion upon the misery of others. The law of friendship is to some extent a community of possession. We are made the confidants of intimate acquaintances, until, little by little, our friends become rather "part of us than ours." A word in secret spoken has more effect than many letters written at a distance; one look has more in it than all the cold processes of pen, ink, and paper. And when one calls to mind the painful experiences of health-resorts in England, on the Continent, and elsewhere, cold indeed must that heart be that can look back upon a sojourn at Bournemouth, or St. Leonard's, or Cannes, or Montreux, or Baden-Weiler, or Algiers, etc., etc., without a feeling of sadness, which all the associations of time to come, however happy, can never obliterate from the mind. Happy indeed must be the retrospect where these places have proved turning-points in the restoration of impaired health and vigour. But when "friends depart and Memory takes them to her caverns pure and deep," a shade of sadness must always pass over one's thoughts when we recall the circumstances connected with the failure of every effort to regain lost ground, and the delusion of every hope that told its flattering tale.

G. W. WELDON.



ART. VI.—DR. EDERSHEIM ON WELLHAUSEN'S THEORY.

Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah. The Warburton Lectures for 1880-1884. By ALFRED EDERSHEIM, M.A., Oxon, D.D., PH.D. Longmans.

THE subject chosen by Dr. Edersheim for his Warburton Lectures is one of the most fascinating that can secure the attention of the Christian apologist. It lies at the very heart of Revelation; and to trace the golden thread running through the volume of the Book wherein it is written concerning the Hope of Israel and of Humanity demands the highest gifts of the theologian, coupled with the acuteness of the accomplished critic and the constructive intellect of the scientific historian. This subject may easily become the dominant force in the life of a student, leading him through the well-trodden paths of history, and luring him to explore dark tracts in the past till he finds the light broaden to its

central source, though at first its radiance was but an after-glow that seemed ready to fade from the favoured spots on which it still lingered. To carry out his scheme comprehensively, the writer must conceive a well-defined theory of the history of the Jewish people, and fortify it by trustworthy notice of the sacred Hebrew books. He would be led to compare the Messianic Hope, as it unfolded itself in them, always rising to a higher because more spiritual standard, with the religious ideas of other nations, that are persistently turned to the past rather than the future, and lose all hold upon the heart and conscience the longer we are conversant with them. Such a work would show on a smaller scale what the history of man shows on a larger—how the Christ draws all to Himself, and dominates the whole nature that comes within the circle of His influence. We must not be seduced, however, into writing an ideal sketch of a work that does not exist, but hasten to assure our readers that though these Lectures do not occupy as wide a field as their title seems to indicate, they are deeply interesting as indicating the line on which the attack and defence of Christian faith in the Old Testament Scriptures will move. We are tempted to wish that the arguments adduced in them had been put more tersely, and in a form that would have imprinted itself more firmly upon the memory. We should also have preferred the conflict with negative criticism removed from the body of the work, while the author's conclusions might have been incorporated in his Lectures without any break in the continuity. But we welcome the work as a most useful one, for it shows that many of the conclusions of the negative criticism are based upon insufficient data, that it has omitted to weigh many of the weightiest arguments that are advanced by its opponents, and that it parades as facts what are to a large extent nothing but the play of an unbridled literary fancy, which casts a delusive gleam upon the darkness of the past.

There are twelve Lectures contained in this book. The first traces the origin of Christianity to the Old Testament; the second deals with the "kingdom of God" as the leading idea in it; the third establishes the position that the New Testament presents Christ as the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy. Lectures IV., V., and VI. lay down some fundamental principles in regard to prophecy and its fulfilment. This section is the least satisfactory in the book. The statements lack the precision that appeals so powerfully to the ordinary reader, and worst of all, the illustrations are neither sufficiently vivid nor full. Had the introductory Lectures been compressed, Dr. Edersheim, without increasing the bulk of his work, might

have furnished a full and satisfactory account of the nature and office of prophecy in the ancient Church, with special reference to the Messianic hopes it awakened and sustained amongst the Hebrews. We purpose returning to consider at length the discussions in Lectures VII. and VIII.; but would draw especial attention to the four remaining Lectures which deal with the Post-Exilian period. The general reader will find much interesting matter here of a kind that he could not have gathered from any one English author, nor from foreign sources without great trouble and research. In this department Dr. Edersheim is an undoubted master, and those who submit themselves to his guidance will find that a guide who is pre-eminently capable is prepared to give them the benefit of his unique knowledge. We will quote one or two passages to show what these chapters contain. Our first quotation presents a vivid picture of Israel at the conclusion of the exile :

Yet here also Israel had failed. It was the beginning of its last fatal failure. Not only did Israel not understand its mission, but it had not heart for it. In the first of the three periods—that of the law, holiness, priesthood, and symbolism—Israel had failed through a bare externalism. In the second of the periods—that of teaching, prophetism, and the prospect of conquest of the world for God—Israel had failed, on the one hand, through apostasy to heathenism, and so on the other, through national pride, selfishness, and vainglory. And in the third and final period of completion Israel utterly and finally failed, misunderstood the teaching of God, and perverted its mission ; failed even in its repentance of past sins . . . Israel's final apostasy in the time of Christ began not at His appearance ; this was only the logical outcome of all that had preceded. And Israel's final rejection also began not with the subjection to Rome, still less with the burning of the city and temple, but with the return from the exile. . . . Israel was baptized in the wilderness unto Moses to a new and promising spiritual life ; it was ossified in the exile to a religion of Pharisaism, exclusiveness, and national isolation and pride. No wonder that new forms had to be created for the Divine Spirit, and that no longer Palestinianism but Hellenism became the great factor and connecting link between the kingdom of God and the kingdoms of the world. Thus the old fig-tree withered at its roots. The Diaspora, rather than the Palestinian minority, became the missionaries of the world ; Hellenist thought, culture, and modes of presentation—not Pharisaism or Rabbinism—became the medium through which the kingdoms of the world were to be made the kingdom of God.

This passage shows a very clear insight into the mental and spiritual condition of Israel after the Exile, and as a companion to it we quote the discriminating criticism on the Apocrypha, which “themselves mark their line of separation from the Canonical Books.”

The presentation of the Divine Being is no longer as in the Old Testament. Sometimes it is gracious in its form, as chiefly in the Book of Wisdom, and in minor degree in some portions of Ecclesiasticus ; in other books, as in Judith and Baruch, it is Judaic, narrow, and nationalistic, while in Tobit we have almost the late Rabbinic view of the propitiation of God by alms. Similar remarks apply to the presentation of the

doctrine of Creation and of Providence. As regards the doctrine of angels the Apocrypha have much more developed teaching, which in the case of Tobit descends to the low level of superstition—a respectable religiosity and a sort of common-sense decency take the place of fervour of love, entireness of devotion; externalism of work, rather than deep, inward, spiritual views, characterizes the righteousness described. Thus we have in the Apocrypha a marked divergence from the lines followed in the Canonical Books of the Old Testament. The latter, as has been well remarked, led up to the manger of Bethlehem; the Apocrypha may, as regards dogmatic views, be considered only a kind of preface to later Judaism (p. 309).

The tenth Lecture deals with the Pseudepigrapha—"A series of spurious writings mostly professing to be derived from Old Testament events, but all of them Apocalyptic, though in varying measure, and bearing distinctly, though in different degrees, on the Messianic kingdom." Here, again, the general reader will find much to awaken his curiosity and to arouse his wonder at the great likeness and the yet greater unlikeness to the Christian ideas of the Messianic kingdom which are presented by these writings. In this direction much awaits the patient investigation of the scholar, and unless we are greatly mistaken clearer light will be thrown from these writings upon questions that are now debated rather on *à priori* grounds than on the firm footing of fact.

The eleventh Lecture gives an account and analysis of the Pseudepigraphic literature, which will at least whet the appetite of the reader to know more of this remarkable series of writings, from two of which—the Book of Enoch and the assumption of Moses—quotations are made in the Epistle of St. Jude. The remaining chapter deals with the last stage of Messianic hope, and brings us to the days of Christ Himself, in "Whom is the reality of all to all ages."

We now return to the section on the negative criticism of the Pentateuch, in which the author deals with the latest theories as to its date and composition, and the results that will follow the general adoption of the destructive criticism. It is against this portion of the work that the greatest hostility will be shown, and that from both sides—orthodox and unorthodox. Many will blame the lecturer for broaching the question. They hold with a simplicity that springs from unquestioning faith rather than elaborate logical processes, the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and deprecate any acknowledgment of the difficulties their theory encounters. But we think the lecturer has ample justification for his course, and for singling out Wellhausen as the representative of the newest form of doubt on this point.¹ Since these

¹ It is admitted on all hands that for practical purposes Kuenen and Robertson-Smith are Wellhausen masquerading in slightly different costumes.

Lectures have been delivered Wellhausen's "Prolegomena to the History of Israel" has appeared in an English dress, and a widely circulated periodical has given an exceedingly lucid and complete account of his theories, which amply acknowledges the revolutionary character of them, and in which the writer pathetically declares that he is not prepared to attempt an answer to them, while he promises to give in future articles proof how they revolutionize the history of Israel and Old Testament theology. We need say no more in Dr. Edersheim's defence. It has happened again, as it has frequently happened before, that the doubt and scepticism, with which scholars have been too sadly familiar, but which they had hoped to confine to their own circle—as disease in a hospital where it can be confronted and cured by the physicians—have suddenly been carried into the most thickly thronging haunts of men. The escape of pestilence from the hospital, however, is no ground for panic in the physicians. The history of similar movements ought to have taught us—

To cling to Faith beyond the forms of Faith :
She reels not in the storm of warring words,
She brightens at the clash of "Yes" and "No,"
She sees the best that glimmers through the worst,
She finds the fountain where they wailed "Mirage."

Those who are enamoured of the results of negative criticism will receive Dr. Edersheim with something more than mild regrets for inopportune frankness. His blows are too heavy and his indictments too direct not to provoke rejoinders, and he must not be surprised if the weak spots of his armour are occasionally pierced to his great discomfort, though his enemies are too weak to deliver a fatal thrust.

We proceed to consider Wellhausen's theory. His first conclusion is that the Pentateuch is composed of different documents so imperfectly, not to say clumsily, amalgamated, that the critical faculty can distinguish the fragments with more or less certainty at the present moment. On this point Dr. Edersheim well replies : "In reference to the Pentateuch it is not requisite, nor in any way implied, that it represents one homogeneous work. As the history of our Lord is derived from different Gospel sources which, in turn, look back upon the universally accredited tradition of the Church and on special sources of information, and as the Gospels view the same Divine Life from different standpoints and mutually supplement each other, so may the Pentateuch consist of several original documents or sources, welded together by one or more redactors; and there may even be emendations and additions—glosses, if you like to call them so—by redactors, revisers, or final editors. This is simply the historical aspect

of the book as it exists at present, and with which criticism has to busy itself" (p. 232). This would seem to reduce the question between the combatants to one of degree, for Dr. Edersheim goes so far as to say in a note, "I might not, in principle, shrink from even such a word as 'interpolations,' if I had only space and time to define what may be meant by that term, with what important explanations and limitations it may be applicable, and to what portions in the Old Testament it might be referred." We are by no means prepared to say that the admissions of the Lecturer are made in language we should have chosen; but to trust to such apparent agreement between Dr. Edersheim and his opponents as these verbal coincidences suggest would be to the last degree fallacious, for Wellhausen has pushed his theory so far as to identify the documents even when they stop short in the middle of a verse, and he has portioned out the dates of the various documents in the most decided fashion. If we put his conclusions in the baldest form, we must hold that the earliest portion was written from 850—770 B.C., and contained the extant ideas of Creation, and continued the history of the conquest of Canaan by the Jews. This is the earliest stratum into which the various stories floating in Jewish circles were gradually incorporated. It underwent several redactions and additions, which negative criticism can discover by an infallible test. The next document at first only comprised Deut. xii.-xxvi. It belongs to the Assyrian period, and was due to a desire to restore the theocracy, and was discovered in the reign of Josiah, 621 B.C. Another document was the "Priest Code." It is now found in the middle of the Pentateuch. It is "after Ezekiel," and is a sort of *olla podrida*, contributed by various members of the priesthood. It is interwoven with another document, and the Ezekiel form was published about 573 B.C. The finishing-touch was put upon the curious conglomerate about 444 B.C., by Ezra, though various alterations and additions were made up to 300 B.C. It is true that both schools of critics agree that the final redaction of the Old Testament took place under Ezra, but what a different work is it in the conception of Wellhausen and an orthodox critic! The latter holds that "what we have to insist upon is the general truthfulness and reliability of the book, alike as regards its history and legislation; that it is what it professes, an authentic record of the history of Israel, and a trustworthy account of what was really the Mosaic legislation" (p. 252). The negative critic considers the whole to be a series of legends—a sort of ancient novel, to be flouted by reasonable men. He delights in the thought that these ancient and unknown writers, after palming themselves off upon their contemporaries and all succeeding generations for some two

thousand years, are found out at last. Their stories of Creation, of the founding of cities, of the training of a nation by Divine interpositions, of building up an imposing system of worship, and welding a horde of slaves into a homogeneous commonwealth by laws, by prophets, by kings, by national successes and national reverses, is a brilliant romance, or rather series of romances, that has had its day, producing a national character, giving rise to a form of belief that for centuries has ruled Western Europe, and furnished humanity with its noblest ideal, winning its heart and drawing forth from successive generations their passionate love. Physical catastrophes on the grandest scale are feeble things compared with the mental, moral, and spiritual revolution this theory will produce, if accepted. For though some philosophic divines, through the force of early prepossessions, may cling to a simulacrum of their faith, the generation that has never known Moses, except as a myth, nor a Psalmist that lived before the exile, will not believe that One rose from the dead. The force of Dr. Edersheim's words may be blamed by critics who do not see the tremendous issues involved in connection with Christ; but his utterances will find a response in many hearts:

If there really is no Mosaic legislation; if the largest, the central, and most important part of what professes to be such was the invention of the priesthood about the time of Ezra, foisted upon Moses for a specific purpose; if there was not a "tabernacle" in one sense of it, with its specific institutions, nor a central place of worship, nor the great festivals, nor a real Aaronic priesthood; and if the so-called historical books have been coloured and elaborated deuteronomistically, or in that spirit; if they are full of spurious passages and falsifications; if the anonymous prophets of 1 Kings xx. have all been afterwards inserted because Israelitish history is never complete without this kind of garnish . . . then there is in plain language only one word to designate all this. That word is *fraud*. Then must the Gospel narratives and the preaching of Christ lose their historical basis, and rest in large measure on deception and delusion. For Holy Scripture, as the communication of God to man by man, does indeed contain a distinctively human element, but that element cannot have been one of human imposture (p. 220).¹

Of course no one thinks of producing these consequences to bar inquiry into the origin and date of the Pentateuch. They are simply alleged to inspire caution; for as no one fondly imagines that depicting the horrors of a colliery explosion will prevent the ignition of fire-damp, so we do not imagine that the prospective ruin of Christianity will close discussion. Only men do not go into dangerous pits with

¹ The coarse terms employed in the negative criticisms of the ancient Hebrew writings by the new German school of critics is decorously veiled before English readers, but the original will show their animus. The "dry light" of knowledge cannot burn when we read of 2 Kings i. "Wo Elias zu einem übermenschlichen Popanz entstellt ist."

naked lights. We must at least have caution in our inquiries; and it may at any rate suggest to us the possibility of error in our methods if we find them ending in the destruction of so much that has been precious to man, and that they land us in such labyrinths of doubt as to right and wrong, truth and falsehood. Nor can we at least ever forget that to attribute to Christ appeals to legends and forged codes founds the throne of truth on the bases of falsehood, and we cannot do Him this wrong, He being so majestic.

Against the assumptions of negative criticisms—for they are immense assumptions that lie at the foundation of these theories—Dr. Edersheim does valiant and successful battle. For instance, he shows (in pp. 261 *et seq.*) that “scholars of admittedly equal competence have on linguistic grounds declared certain parts to be of latest date, which others have for the same reason adjudged to be earliest.” He turns the tables upon his opponents by proving that on their own theory clever forgers “did succeed not only in inducing their own contemporaries to accept as archaic what was quite recent, but they similarly eluded the vigilance of succeeding generations—of all the Rabbis, of all the Church, and of all critics—none of whom till the present century discovered, or even suspected, the Post-Exilian composition of the Priest Code.” Indeed, the great objection we feel to Wellhausen's theory is that it makes such huge demands upon our fancy, and then multiplies mental and moral *tours de force* till we no longer feel ourselves living in a real world, but only in a Hebrew atmosphere suspiciously akin to that pervading the “Thousand and One Arabian Nights.”

It seems impossible, Dr. Edersheim forcefully argues, for the “Priest Code” to have been written at the date assigned to it in these new theories, because of its contents bearing no sort of relation to the times. “Let it be kept in view that it was only a small and comparatively uninfluential minority which returned with Ezra and Nehemiah. The rest remained behind, and rapidly spread over the face of the world. Yet the legislation supposed to have been then introduced made no provision for, took not the slightest notice of, the wants of the great majority. . . . In times which called for the widest comprehension, they concocted the narrowest conceivable legislation, and that in the interests of the small number of priests who returned to Palestine; and they not only succeeded in introducing it as the Mosaic law, but in imposing it upon the educated majority without eliciting a single contradiction! Was there not a single individual among those outside the circle where this fraud was perpetrated wise enough to discover, or honest enough to expose it? no one priest or

layman of those who did not return to Palestine? And what, all this time, had become of JE (*i.e.*, the Jehovistic recension of the Jewish history), or of Deuteronomy, which in some form must have existed, and the provisions of which are supposed to be inconsistent with this new Priest Code? Were these documents latent, lost, or unknown, except within the small circle of priestly forgers?" (p. 260).

The negative criticism, also, must be prepared to answer questions which it provokes in the minds of men conversant not with the niceties of Hebrew literature, but with the subtleties of human motive and conduct. We have seen what astute and able—well, "redactors," the wise call them—these men were; but how is it that they, being possessed of such marvellous literary skill, and troubled with no scientific conscience as to the inviolability of facts and the sanctity of accuracy, cutting and carving documents according to their fancy, inventing prophets, kings, and legislators according to their needs, nevertheless left such masses of contradiction upon their pages? "If the priests were able to introduce such an entirely new code, in which the privileges of their order and other arrangements were so much more emphasized than in the old legislation, why retain the latter, and insert it into the Canon? Or why should Ezra, for example, have read it in the hearing of all the people?—or did he read it?—and why should he have told them that the exile had been the punishment of their transgression of the Mosaic ordinances, when, according to our opponents, he was himself bringing in a new code on many points inconsistent with the old one?" (p. 273).

But it is in dealing with the problems presented by the history and development of the people of Israel that the lecturer most thoroughly traverses the statements of his opponents. He admits very frankly that in the Pentateuch we have an ideal rather than an actual ritual, and emphasizes his opinion. "Many—I had almost said most—of these (*i.e.*, the special legislative, religious, and even political institutions of the Pentateuch) had no place in the wilderness. This holds especially true in regard to what constitutes the central and really all-determining institution of the Mosaic religious legislation—sacrificial worship. Indeed the religious institution of the Pentateuch might be likened to the wood laid in order on the altar; and the actual observance of the Pentateuch sacrifices as the fire, significantly sent from Heaven at the consecration of the Temple, which is to set the whole in flame" (pp. 235, 236). He holds the modification of original precepts contained in Deuteronomy to be explained by the altered circumstances in which the Israelites found themselves when

in view of the immediate entrance into the land of Canaan. The opponents of the historical character of the Pentateuch argue that the notices incidentally afforded by it show that the religious ideas and institutions of the people were in a chaotic state, and, to borrow the technicalities of another science, that they did not undergo differentiation until a late date; that the persons introducing this highly differentiated religion published it in the "Priests' Code," and that it is there overlying the earlier statements. To adopt their ideas, they consider that Judaism, as we know it, was evolved from a chaotic state. The orthodox interpreter takes another method of explaining the facts. He considers the indications of the social position of the people to point to degradation, not to development. As in the case of certain ascidians, degradation and evolution may be present at the same time, and occupy the same field in Nature, so the highest ideal worship and ritual may be embodied in a national code, while much lower and apparently antagonistic forms may be found in the national life. It is impossible in a few pages to compress the necessarily extended arguments of this section, but we may quote a short paragraph that will indicate the course of remark here pursued. "Without entering into particulars," says Dr. Edersheim, "I think I am warranted in saying that the historical notices about the festivals are exactly as might have been expected in the circumstances of the land and of the people. And our reasoning regarding the scanty mention of the great national festivals, seems supported by the frequent references to domestic and communal celebrations, such as the observance of Sabbaths and New Moons, which evidently seems to have been general, because it did not involve the necessity of any central national attendance; and the general conclusion which we derive from a review of the actual state of matters in Israel is to the effect that, so far from the notices in the historical books being inconsistent with a previous Mosaic legislation, they are not only compatible with it, but even presuppose its existence; and without such previous religious institutions, the principal events and the leading personages in Jewish history—not only a Boaz, a Samuel, or a David, but even a Gideon, a Saul, or a Joab—would be unintelligible" (p. 257).

There are many most weighty considerations, and others that in themselves may seem of small importance, but become of cumulative force, and are not easily evaded, which irresistibly lead us to condemn a theory that is brilliant and ingenious. We are ready to admit that it is supported in a most forcible manner, and derives no small assistance from prevalent speculations in morals and religion, and that it

contains elements of truth that will hereafter be acknowledged; but we have no hesitation in adopting Dr. Edersheim's words, "We do not profess to explain every difficulty that may be urged; nor indeed do we believe that, with the material at our command, it is possible to do so. But with all deference for the learning and ability of the scholars who have adopted the views of Wellhausen, we must be allowed to express, in plain language, our conviction that their theory lacks the one element which is primary: it lacks a reliable historical basis."

Here, for the present, we leave this most fallacious and seductive theory, though we hope by the courtesy of the Editor to assign at an early date solid grounds for rejecting it. In the meantime, we cordially recommend this erudite and valuable Warburton Lecture to the attention of our readers. It will furnish them with cogent reasons for refusing to be led away by the rush of contemporary opinion, and will render them able to appreciate the tremendous issues with which this controversy is fraught.

FREDK. E. TOYNE.

Correspondence.

THE DEACON'S YEAR.

To the Editor of "THE CHURCHMAN."

SIR.—The minimum age for ordination to the office of priest in the Church of England is twenty-four years. In the ancient Church thirty years was the minimum fixed, but it has, I believe, been understood that at that time the Bishops had greater liberty to relax "rules" than now exists. It appears, then, that at present, in the English Church, there is but one year necessarily spent in the Diaconate before the ordination into full orders as priest; and thus any young man arriving at the age of twenty-four may attain full orders, and be held qualified to hold any benefice, be it large or small, for which he may obtain the preferment.

I can scarcely meet the end I have in view in this letter by any better means than here quoting from one I not long since wrote in the *Times*: "I would ask any true friend of the English Church, lay or clerical, to read calmly the service for the ordination of priests, accepting its language in a natural sense, as really representing the authority given to this young man of twenty-four years of age. Can he conceive language capable of conveying a more solemn bestowal of an authority such as scarcely any human being, except by special help from Heaven, could be qualified to exercise? I refrain from quoting it. Is it rational to suppose that such a youth, having served one year in the Diaconate, could be willingly accepted by any body of parishioners as qualified to exercise over them the awful spiritual authority with which he has thus been invested? He may be a sound theological scholar, really pious and earnest, but what measure of life's experience can he possess to fit him to meet the demand made upon him at the bedside of the sick and