

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 50—April, 1902.

I.

CURRENT OLD TESTAMENT DISCUSSIONS AND PRINCETON OPINION.*

NEARLY ninety years ago, in the first year of the existence of Princeton Theological Seminary, Dr. Archibald Alexander, the sole professor and the incumbent of the chair of Dogmatic and Polemic Divinity, informally inaugurated the work of the Old Testament department by giving instruction in the original languages of the Scriptures and in the laws and customs of the Hebrews. In 1822 a distinct department of the curriculum was erected for Oriental and Biblical literature, and the Rev. Charles Hodge was appointed professor. As planned and organized, the new department embraced the literature of both the Old and the New Testaments. A separation began to be made in 1834, when Joseph Addison Alexander was chosen to be an assistant to Dr. Hodge in the department of Oriental literature; and the instruction in the Pentateuch and Psalms and in Biblical archæology was devolved upon him. In fact, this appointment inaugurated a new era in Old Testament work in the Seminary. The erection of the Biblical department in 1822 had been a harbinger of the coming day. The dawn appeared when the elder Alexander, while occupying the chair of Dogmatics, published a small book on the canon of Scripture, covering both the Old and the New Testaments, which obtained notable recognition on both sides of the Atlantic. But the morning of the new era was not yet. Dr.

* An address delivered on Tuesday, October 8, 1901, in the chapel of the Theological Seminary at Princeton, by appointment of the Board of Directors, to mark the transfer of the author from the Chair of Semitic Philology and Old Testament History to the Chair of Oriental and Old Testament Literature.

Hodge faithfully discharged his duties to his classes, and he had shown to his pupils the large way in which Biblical subjects should be handled; he was soon to publish a commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, which has been pronounced one of the most masterly commentaries ever written on this portion of Scripture; but his inclination and the sovereign authority of the situation which confronted the Church at the time withheld him from specialization in studies pertaining to the Old Testament and bade him devote the strength of his superb mind to ecclesiastical and dogmatic questions. The new era opened when Joseph Addison Alexander received his appointment.

Unlike his predecessor, Dr. Alexander had little relish for philosophical studies. He playfully owned to an "anti-metaphysical prejudice" (*Life*, II, 625; cp. 624, 702, 736). His supreme interest lay in letters; and he brought to his literary labors in the Seminary fondness for his work, enthusiasm in its performance, and tireless energy, together with remarkable powers of mind. He not only organized the Old Testament department, but he gave it a position in the world of scholarship that was commensurate with the growing importance of Old Testament studies—an importance due to the new science of Hebrew grammar and lexicography, the new methods of exegesis, the new construction hypothetically put upon Israelitish history, which had taken their rise or had made distinct advance toward maturity in the new century. He secured for the Old Testament department at Princeton an international reputation. He achieved this success by his method, his judgment and his temper. These excellences are well illustrated in the two volumes of his commentary on Isaiah, which were issued from the press, the first in 1846, the second in 1847. They exhibit his method of exhaustive investigation and prolonged reflection. They represent the labor of ten years in accumulating and digesting material. In copious citation and masterful analysis they review the recorded opinion of all previous expositors on each exegetical question. They are characterized by calm, dispassionate and profound debate of the conflicting views; by the absence of dogmatism; and by willingness to leave questions open where the obtainable data do not justify a judgment. Unhurried, thorough, searching investigation, candor, fairness, insight, clear discrimination and sound judgment are in evidence on every page.*

* An edition of this commentary was published in Great Britain under the editorship of Dr. Eadie.

His commentary on the Psalms was published in 1850. His original intention was to prepare an abridgment of Hengstenberg's commentary for American pastors, by omitting what is technically called "Introduction." As he advanced in

The commentary on Isaiah established Dr. Alexander's reputation as a great scholar; and the excellence of his method and temper at once set a new standard at Princeton. The seminary had been for the third of a century an important school of higher education for the Christian ministry and an influential centre of ecclesiastical and theological thought. It had been a seat of learning. His method contributed as much as any other one thing to make Princeton a home of learned research as well. But, restless and impatient of monotony, he was glad, after sixteen years of connection with the department, to hand over its duties to the Rev. William Henry Green, though somewhat reluctant himself to assume the obligations of the professorship of Church History, to which he was transferred. The new incumbent occupied the chair for forty-nine years. After eight years he was relieved of all New Testament work, and fourteen years later he was freed from instruction in Hebrew grammar and enabled to devote his

his work, however, he found himself constrained to differ from the German commentator, principally indeed in minor matters, but to such an extent that he deemed it unjust to Hengstenberg to place that honored name on the title-page. Unlike his exposition of the prophecies of Isaiah, his commentary on the Psalms does not display the processes of exegesis, but only the conclusions of the author. The utility of the work to the Christian ministers of his generation is attested by its continuous sale through six editions during twenty-five years. The Rev. Charles Spurgeon, in preparing his *Treasury of David*, made more use of Joseph Addison Alexander than of any other single writer for critical notes on the meaning and especially for the analysis of the thought in each Psalm. Mr. Spurgeon sought a critical basis for a practical commentary; and in prosecuting this quest he laid under contribution virtually all the important critical commentaries which had appeared on the Psalms during his century. He used Rosenmüller, de Wette, Ewald, Hitzig, Hengstenberg, Alexander, Olshausen, Hupfeld, Delitzsch and Perowne—commentaries written in two languages, proceeding from three peoples, and representing various schools of theological thought. A comparison of the extent to which Mr. Spurgeon drew from these several writers can readily be instituted, without much expenditure of time. It will be found that he quotes passages from Alexander more frequently than from any of the others, not less than 115 times—about twice as often as he cites either Hengstenberg or Delitzsch, 67 and 63 times respectively; and considerably more frequently than he draws upon his fellow-countryman and contemporary, Perowne, 96. Besides these quotations, there is abundant evidence that Mr. Spurgeon studied Alexander carefully and appreciatively, and was strongly influenced by him in his view of each Psalm as a whole. The introductory analyses, while the result of Mr. Spurgeon's own study and expressed in Mr. Spurgeon's striking style, reveal the constant profit which he derived from Dr. Alexander's work and the satisfaction which the great popular evangelical doctrinal preacher of England found in the Princeton commentator's analytical exposition of the thought of the Psalms. Compare not only Psalms 72 and 110, but also 4, 5, 8, 22, 30, 43, 81, 97, 98, 103, 111, 112, 115.

Further proof of Dr. Alexander's scholarship, exegetical ability, and critical judgment is furnished by his commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. "Though printed in 1857, it anticipates more than half the changes made in the Revised Version" (*Sunday School Times*, 1897, p. 19).

undivided attention to the study of the Hebrew Scriptures. Upon his predecessor had devolved mainly the pleasant task of employing the improved apparatus provided for exegetical study, and the better methods that had come into vogue for the purpose, to bring the interpretation of the Psalms and Isaiah to a degree of scholarly precision and accuracy worthy of the intrinsic importance of the subject. Criticism, as the term is commonly employed, stands in the background, so far as his appearance before the public is concerned. To Dr. Green fell the more arduous duty of entering the arenas of higher criticism and religious philosophy, and with the keen weapons of exact scholarship contest the field in high debate on Biblical literature, history and prophecy. A century—even the stirring, progressive nineteenth century—was covered by the lifetime of this succession of learned men; and in the important Biblical discussions of that century they took no mean part.

Many of these questions have been bequeathed to the scholars of the twentieth century for further debate. The time is accordingly favorable for surveying the Biblical discussions of the day as they are viewed from the Old Testament Chair at Princeton. It is not to the past that thought is invited, but rather to the present and future; not to the men who gave their days to patient research and have at length rested from their labors, but to the present stage of the great investigations in which they took part, including the special minor inquiries which they prosecuted and which contribute to a solution of the problems, the estimate which they placed on the relative value of the arguments now contending for suffrage and on the relative importance of the various matters in debate, and the present issues that emerge out of the past discussion. Attention is accordingly asked to a review of current Old Testament discussions, conducted by means of a historical exposition of Princeton opinion.

THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The canon of the Old Testament naturally engages first attention, for it happens that the first book published within the sphere of the Old Testament department and also almost the last one deal with the canon. The purpose of these books must not be overlooked. They were not intended to be exhaustive treatises on the canon. For that reason they do not review the history of opinion, nor tabulate the literature, nor to any great extent cite authors and their works. They were intended for popular use. They were planned to be sufficiently advanced for the instruction

of theological students and sufficiently elementary to meet the needs of cultured laymen.

The treatise by Dr. Archibald Alexander was not confined to the Old Testament, but dealt with the canon of the Christian Scriptures as a whole. It was first issued in 1825, and the sixth American edition was published twenty-six years later, in 1851, the year of Dr. Alexander's death. It met with favorable reception on the other side of the Atlantic. A London edition and a Scotch edition were published; and the substance of the chapters on Mark and Luke was inserted in Horne's *Introduction to the New Testament* and in Watson's *Theological Dictionary*. Of this successful and influential treatise, only fifteen pages were devoted to the canon of the Old Testament. This small number, however, sufficed, as Dr. Alexander's main purpose was merely to exhibit the extent of the canon at the time of Christ. The question was purely historical, comparatively simple, and already settled. He laid before his own particular public, for their edification, the sufficient proof that the Old Testament contains to-day the same books, neither more nor less, that in the first century of the Christian era formed the completed canon of the Jewish Church. Much more space was allotted to the Apocrypha and the later ecclesiastical question of its right to inclusion in the canon of Scripture. Dr. Green adopted his predecessor's discussion of the Apocrypha and its relation to authoritative Scripture; but in dealing specifically with the canon of the Old Testament—in other words, with the Jewish canon inherited by the Christian Church—he greatly enlarged the scope of the work and correspondingly increased the material. Not that he introduced new subjects of discussion. Dr. Alexander, in treating of the extent of the canon at the time of Christ, had incidentally commented on the several other questions which pertain to the general subject, but they were subordinate to his purpose. In Dr. Green's plan they are given a more distinct place and debate. Dr. Alexander's scanty citations from Scripture are expanded by Dr. Green into a chapter of eight pages, entitled "Testimony of the Bible in Regard to the Formation of the Canon." The collection of this material into a chapter by itself, and the significant title given to it, are indicative of the importance attached to determining correctly the principle that resulted in the formation of the canon. Six chapters, iii to viii inclusive, are next inserted on the opposing theories. And to the chapters on the "Canon of Christ and the Apostles" and the "Canon of the Christian Church" there are allotted fifty-four pages to Dr. Alexander's nine.

By common consent a treatise on the canon of the Old Testa-

ment is restricted to a history of that canon. The genuineness and authenticity of the constituent books are not discussed. The topics that are recognized as properly belonging to such a treatise, and necessarily included in any adequate presentation of the subject, are four: 1. The principle that determined the formation of the canon. Why was a book regarded as canonical? 2. The principle that prevailed in the classification of the books of the canon. Why were they distributed into three groups? 3. The date of the completion of the canon. And 4. The extent of the canon. What books belong to it? In the treatment of these topics the last is often taken up first, and the order is: What books belonged to the Jewish canon at the advent of Christ? Why was a particular book regarded as canonical? Why were the books distributed into three groups? When was the collection and arrangement complete? Of these four topics, the extent of the canon, as well as the nature and amount of Jewish dissent, has long been an ascertained fact of history. Drs. Alexander and Green content themselves with merely exhibiting the evidence. It is needless to say that a knowledge of the canon's greatest extent, and of its attainment of this ultimate comprehensiveness by the time of Christ, is of prime importance in Biblical research. It is the assurance that men hold in their hands to-day the Bible of Jesus. To some investigators, perhaps, the conquest of this fact denotes merely the fixing of a historical date, the driving in of a peg, the establishment of a boundary line beyond which, on the one side; no work remains to be done, and from which, on the other side, new inquiry takes its start. But to the Biblical scholars at Princeton it has always signified more. It guarantees to them their possession of the Bible from which Jesus taught; the Bible of which He declared that not one jot or tittle shall fail; the Bible which He set over against the traditions of the elders as the Word of God; the book called "The Scriptures," of which He said that they cannot be broken and which He declared testify of Him.

The remaining three topics are still questions. They are yet under debate. Of these the fundamental question relating to the canon, by which the subject is brought into closest relations with the other departments of theological science, but which is nevertheless a purely historical question, concerns the principle that determined the formation of the canon. On this point Princeton believes that each of the several writings had canonical validity on its first appearance, or at least as soon as its authorship was ascertained. As soon as it was published with the proper imprimatur it was received by God-fearing Israelites as authoritative.

This belief springs solely from historical considerations. It is based in part upon explicit statements of the records. There are important allusions in the sacred books themselves "which must have their place in any reliable account of the" formation of the canon (Green, *Canon*, p. 11). They throw light on the manner in which the canon grew. They afford the earliest evidence. On any theory regarding the origin of the Old Testament, they were already in these books at the time when the canon was completed and long before. They testify that the address of Moses, which forms the bulk of the book of Deuteronomy, was received as the law of the Lord; that, in the belief of the time, it was committed to writing as soon as delivered and deposited in the sanctuary beside the ark; that an addition was made to the book of the law by Joshua, consisting of a solemn engagement on the part of the people to obey it; that Samuel the prophet expounded to the people the regulations belonging to the kingdom which they were about to establish, wrote them in a book and laid it up before Jehovah; that the public reading of the written law in the audience of the assembled Israelites was incumbent upon the priests once every seven years, at the feast of the tabernacles; and that it was a duty devolving upon the king with his own hand to make a copy of the law out of that which was before the priests (Deut. xvii. 18, xxxi. 9-13, 24-26; Josh. xxiv. 26; 1 Sam. x. 25). All this means that these documents, whatever their number and extent and form, had religious authority and had that authority as soon as published. In other words, they possessed canonical validity on their first appearance.

In addition to these explicit statements of the record about the immediate reception of certain writings into the sacred canon, there is an unavoidable inference from historical facts which points to the same efficient principle in the formation of the canon, and at the same time brings into view the wide sphere in which it was necessarily operative. The facts and the inference are these: "The prophets were acknowledged messengers of Jehovah, who spoke in his name and at his bidding. What they uttered was [regarded as] the word of Jehovah and the law of God (Isa. i. 10, etc.)." Now "the word of Jehovah by the prophets had, of course, the same binding authority when written as when orally delivered" (Green, *Canon*, p. 17). Consequently "each individual book of an acknowledged prophet of Jehovah, or of any one accredited . . . to make known his will, was accepted as the word of God immediately upon its appearance. It had its own independent authority, derived from the source from which it came. . . . And thus the canon gradually grew, as such books

were produced from time to time, until the last was written, when consequently the canon was complete." In a discussion of the canon, "the question is not as to the reality of the inspiration of the sacred writers, but as to the faith of Israel on this subject. Those books, and those only, were accepted as the divine standards of their faith and regulative of their conduct which were written for this definite purpose by those whom they believed to be inspired of God. It was this which made them canonical. . . . And the public official action, which further attested, though it did not initiate, their canonicity, followed in the wake of the popular recognition of their divine authority" (Green, *Canon*, p. 35).

Two questions relating to the canon remain, but the Old Testament department at Princeton has never felt deep concern about either the time when the canon was closed or the principle which determined the order and arrangement finally adopted for the canonical books. It is interested in these latter matters, discerns their importance, and teaches definitely about them; but it looks upon them as relatively inferior to the question why the several canonical books were regarded as a rule of faith, and as measurably advanced toward settlement by the solution of that problem.

As to the matter of arrangement, it knows that all the phenomena are explained by a theory that is sufficiently formulated in the words borne by the collected Hebrew Scriptures: Law, Prophets, and Writings. According to this theory the Pentateuch was placed first because its history belongs there chronologically, and the law which is recorded in it is the foundation, and was acknowledged to be the foundation, upon which all the other Scriptures rest. The second group of writings, called "the Prophets," is composed, as the title denotes, of those Scriptures which were written by official prophets. It is arranged in two portions, of which the former is characteristically historical and the latter doctrinal, though both parts contain history and both were written for a doctrinal purpose. It was placed immediately after the Law, because it takes up the history at the death of Moses, with which the Pentateuch closes, and carries it on consecutively. The third group of writings in the Hebrew canon, called simply Writings, or referred to as "the other writings," contains the Scriptures written by men who were inspired indeed, but were not prophets by office. Officially they were kings and governors and priests and such like. These writings are to a large extent poetry, like Job, the Psalms, Proverbs, Song of Solomon. Two brief writings, Lamentations and Ruth, which to judge from ancient catalogues originally stood in the second division of the canon, and

a Psalm or two, all of which were ascribed to prophetic authorship, ultimately found a place in the third division, either because being poetry they were attracted to the poetic section, or else because on their being assigned to special use in the service it was convenient that they be included in a set of writings which were employed for the same occasions (*J. A. Alexander, on Isaiah, I, xviii-xix*; *Green, Canon, p. 80-81, 107-108*).

Regarding the date when the canon was completed, a final conclusion has not been reached. Various dates have been proposed from the time of Ezra to that of the Maccabees, from about 425 B.C. to about 125 B.C. If the date could be established, it would be of prime value as a regulating factor in investigation; but this question in itself has never been regarded at Princeton as fundamental. It happens that all scholars to-day believe that Ezra had a hand in the work of bringing the books of the canon together. Inquiry into the extent of his participation raises fundamental questions. The Princeton scholars have thought it, on the whole, "highly probable that the canon was collected by Ezra and Nehemiah, or in their time" (*Green, p. 118*; *cp. Alexander, p. 26*); and Dr. Green defended this theory with his accustomed earnestness, learning and power of argument. But neither he nor Dr. Alexander regarded the matter in itself as fundamental. Both admitted that paragraphs may have been appended to books and entire books added to the canon after the time of Ezra. "Whatever interest may attach to" the question concerning "the process by which, the time when, or the persons by whom the sacred books were put together as we already find them in the time of the son of Sirach"—"about 180 years before Christ"—"it is plain that it does not in any measure affect the authority of the sacred writings. This is in no wise dependent upon their being gathered together. A book inspired of God is just as authoritative in its separate state as it is when united with other books of like character" (*Green, p. 113*; *cp. Alexander, p. 25*).

We leave the consideration of the canon, then, with the distinct impression that the fundamental pending question concerns, not the time of its completion, but the principle which determined its formation.

LITERARY CRITICISM OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

In literary criticism diction, phraseology, syntax, style, tone, conceptions afford important criteria by which to determine the date of a document and test the integrity of its text. Dr. Joseph Addison Alexander employed this instrument in his work of criti-

cism, but he pointed out its limitations. He contended that minute resemblances in literary phenomena cannot establish identity of authorship, nor the lack of resemblance prove diversity of writer. He believed that to the great mass of cultivated minds conviction in such cases is produced by data of another sort, not susceptible of exhibition in the form of schedules, catalogues or tables—a conviction due to subtler influences and instinctive considerations, and which might be just as strong if not a single word or phrase recurred, and which could never be aroused by any number or servility of verbal repetitions (*Commentary on Isaiah*, I, xxix seq., II, xvii, xxii). This does not mean that Dr. Alexander had no literary feeling, or was lacking in fineness of literary perception. On the contrary, Joseph Addison Alexander was literary by instinct; his vocabulary was rich and varied to an extraordinary degree; the apt expression ever sprang to his lips at his bidding; his style was flexible and responded to every subtle change of thought or mood and adapted itself to the composition on which he was engaged, whether he was writing a letter to an intimate friend, a squib for a newspaper, a nonsense story for a child, an essay for a stately review, a meditative poem, a heart-searching sermon, or a concise critical commentary. It is quite a literary treat to gather together the published writings of Dr. Alexander and revel in them for a summer's day or two, with no other aim or care than to watch the play of style and the masterful use of English as his whims change or as he passes in the sheer delight of power from one form of literary activity to another. Doubtless his own instant responsiveness to the literary demands of his theme made him peculiarly sensitive to the harshness of a criticism which takes no account of a sympathetic author's instinctive and unconscious adaptation of himself, his language and style to his theme, which infers diversity of authorship from change in mode of expression, and mechanically takes a literary production to pieces and gathers the several parts into groups on the basis of sameness in vocabulary, manner, thought of God, and aspects of truth. Dr. Alexander was not a wooden man himself, and he had no faith in the assumption that the Hebrew writers as a class were wooden men.

Dr. Green, with characteristic candor, opened anew the question concerning the unity of the books of Isaiah, Samuel and especially Genesis. His first investigation of the question in connection with the book of Genesis—the first at least after the analysis had assumed its present form—began with an examination of the general principles of the divisive criticism, and was completed by a study of their practical application to the text, conducted patiently

and minutely, verse by verse, word by word, through the first eight or nine chapters of Genesis, following out every lead that was suggested. For himself he had no need to go farther. He had become convinced that the divisive criticism is precarious. The words which he used should be carefully noted. He was passing judgment on the literary analysis in its principles, methods and results, and judicially he declared that the method of argument is "in very many respects precarious; the criteria alleged are often fallacious to the last degree; and the resulting partition is extremely dubious" (*Presbyterian Review*, 1887, p. 138). He undertook a second investigation at the instigation of the editor of *Hebraica*. He conducted it in the pages of that periodical from 1889 to 1892. In 1895 it was issued in revised form, untrammelled by the limitations necessarily imposed in a crowded quarterly, as an independent publication under the title of *The Unity of Genesis*. In connection with it he issued a prefatory volume entitled *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*. In the latter book, as an integral part of his larger theme, he reviews the history of the literary criticism and briefly discusses its general principles, while in the former he takes up the particular application of these principles to the text of Genesis. This second investigation, which is wholly comprised in *The Unity of Genesis*, did not differ essentially from the first. The broad treatment and the comprehensive discussion of fundamental principles are there, although they are somewhat obscured by the mass of detail enforced by the character of the work, which requires the text to be traversed word by word. The difference lies in the completeness of the work, in the extension of the detailed examination by chapter and verse to the entire book of Genesis. And he succeeded in showing that what he had found in regard to the first half-dozen or so of the chapters holds good throughout the entire fifty.

The essential correctness of the literary analysis had become the accepted working hypothesis of Old Testament scholars of the highest standing, men who commanded Dr. Green's admiration and respect. This fact had its due weight with him as he undertook his study of the question. A remark which he made several times, when conversing on the work he had done for *Hebraica*, throws light on the attitude of mind in which he approached the literary question. Adopting a current proverb, he said he anticipated that where there was so much smoke there might perhaps after all be some fire—fire, that is, of the origin and kind so loudly and confidently noised abroad. He already knew the general phenomena which were occasioning the smoke. He found, as he had discovered in part in his early examination, that

they are greatly exaggerated as to number and importance and system and definiteness. He saw the fire ; but he was able without difficulty to trace it, mostly at least, to a different origin from that so commonly assumed, and also to exhibit the subtle and beautiful quality of the flame.

He studied the criterion derived from the use of the divine names in order to learn whether these names are used mechanically, as the theory assumes, or discriminatingly, and so that ordinarily the reason for the preference of one to the other is plain. In regard to diction and style, he made inquiry of the several documents into which the Pentateuch is distributed by divisive criticism to discover whether their style and diction were individual peculiarities of different authors, or might find their rational explanation rather in the demand for different words and different modes of expression which different themes make upon a sympathetic writer. Concerning duplicate and divergent narratives, he inquired whether they were variant traditions of the same event, and distinguished from each other by the literary earmarks of the hypothetical writers, or whether they can be readily understood as different events, such as they purport to be, narrated each for its own purpose and appareled in its own appropriate style and diction. He found abundant evidence in each case for the latter theory. He showed that the prominent words and phrases characterize the hypothetical documents to an extent only and with ever-recurring exceptions. And he was able in effect to challenge the divisive criticism to disprove the broad principle that diction and style and choice of divine names conform to the nature of the theme and the particular aspect of the truth.

Here then are two views regarding Genesis and more comprehensively the Pentateuch or Hexateuch, and it may be added that they in principle affect the criticism of the entire Old Testament. At bottom the question is a literary one and concerns literary phenomena, although it is seldom or never kept within these bounds, but is constantly complicated by considerations other than those of a literary kind. The department has shown itself ready and willing to discuss it on either literary or other grounds. Its interest in the literary problems is primarily scientific. It has nothing that it regards as indispensable staked on the issue. Apart from one of the criteria, the one based on assumed contradictions, and making an exception of that criterion only when it is pressed into the service of certain particular theories, the literary analysis is not in necessary conflict with any cherished conviction or vital doctrine. The establishment of its truth or falsity would bring other questions appreciably nearer settlement. and

would enable a nicer adjustment and closer statement of related facts (Green, *Moses and the Prophets*, p. 46; *Presbyterian Review*, 1887, pp. 140, 141; PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW, 1893, p. 539). But science, pure and simple, is cold, indifferent to the subject on which it is working and unconcerned about the outcome of its investigation, provided only the sum of knowledge is increased. Still, the scientist is often actuated by the desire of fame or fortune or moved by love of humanity as he prosecutes his researches. So in the matter of the analysis. The interest is, indeed, primarily scientific; but it is properly enhanced by the consideration that the conclusion reached necessarily affects to some degree men's conception of their book of religion. The interest becomes human and moral. The element of responsibility to man and God enters.

On the other hand, the theory of divergent duplicates possesses inherent importance. It is of great consequence. In it the literary critic is concerned, and the historian and the theologian. The theologian is interested because the discussion touches upon the doctrine of Holy Scripture. The historian is interested because the inquiry concerns his sources. If the issue of the investigation impugns the records, he is at sea in regard to early Hebrew history. The flood-gates are opened to a subjective criticism of the narrative, and especially the supernatural in the history becomes a cork tossed about on the waters. The literary critic is interested because the theory has become essential to the further prosecution of his work. The divisive criticism began with Genesis and based itself at first on the use of the divine names. The discussions of one hundred and fifty years, and its extension to the other books of Scripture, have led it finally to lean for main support on the discovery of divergence. If discrepancies do not pervade the narrative of Genesis, the divisive criticism has little to stand on. Thus the question whether a pervasive discrepant duplication exists in the narrative portion of the Scriptures assumes prime importance in Biblical study. Theoretically, it is natural and, in the overwhelming majority of cases, possible to follow the narrative and regard all events professedly distinct as really distinct and, when they are interwoven into one story, to look upon them as different incidents that together make the more complex occurrence. In practice, however, the current divisive criticism is prone to treat them as contradictions. It postulates that several narratives are divergent—that is, contradictory—traditions of the same event and asserts that this assumption is confirmed by stylistic peculiarities which indicate diverse authorship. Thus two questions raised by divisive criticism are blended: First, are the assumed contradic-

tory narratives stylistically different, and accordingly diverse in authorship? This is the old story and need not be considered again. Suppose the contention be granted. Secondly, if so, are they divergent? To this latter question let us direct our attention. We will fix our eye particularly on the Hexateuch, but will remember at the same time the books of Samuel, and we will not forget the books of the Prophets. Kindly assume that the Hexateuch is a compilation. Grant an observable difference in style and interest, and consequently four documents from four different pens. Admit that there was a narrative of Israel's early history, written by a prophet who belonged to the kingdom of Judah. The favorite aspect of God with him is that which the name Jehovah denotes. While not neglecting the other history, he follows with intensest interest and loves most to dwell upon the early events which took place in the hill country of Judah, or relate to the early fortunes of those families in Israel who belonged to Judah. Admit, further, that another narrative was written by a man of Ephraim. His standpoint also is prophetic. In speaking of the Deity he employs the sublime name Elohim. He pursues with peculiar fondness that portion of the history of the patriarchs which was associated with the hill country of Ephraim. Admit yet further that a third narrative was prepared by a priest. He uses the divine name Elohim. Of the patriarchal history he gave at most a bare outline. For his purpose a mere abstract was sufficient; for his aim was to give a systematic view, from a priestly standpoint, of the origin and chief institutions of the Israelitish theocracy.

Now, granting these documents and these diverse aims and interests on the part of their authors, the question arises whether there are discrepant duplicate narratives. Two remarks are in place: First, with these three documents, and for the later history a fourth, blended together in the Hexateuch, the same question confronts the student of the Old Testament as in kind stands facing the student of the New Testament. The scholar who harmonizes the four Gospels, which were written from different standpoints and possess different literary characteristics, should in consistency harmonize the four documents of the Hexateuch. It is as easy and as proper to adjust in harmonious narrative the particular incidents recorded in the one set of documents as in the other. There is no problem, fundamental or superficial, involved in harmonizing the hypothetical documents of the Hexateuch or the books of Samuel that is not involved in harmonizing the four Gospels. For example, Saul, son of Kish, was privately anointed by the prophet Samuel to be king. Soon afterward Samuel sum-

moned the Israelites to Mizpah, and in their presence cast lots for a king before the Lord, and Saul was chosen. But some of the men of Israel murmured at the choice, and Saul retired to his father's farm until circumstances of which he took advantage changed public sentiment in his favor and he was enthusiastically proclaimed king by the victorious host, and the kingdom was joyously renewed at Gilgal with sacrifices unto the Lord. These three occurrences are said to represent two contradictory traditions regarding the elevation of Saul to the throne. Place beside this Old Testament narrative the story of how Peter, Andrew and John became apostles, as it is gathered from the various evangelists. The three fishermen of Galilee became disciples of Jesus at the Jordan. Some weeks later, at the sea of Galilee, they were called to leave their secular employment and follow the Master permanently, and later still they were set apart to be apostles. The same method that insists on contradictory accounts of Saul's elevation to the throne would, if consistently applied, declare that these steps in the selection of the apostles are irreconcilable differences. Take another instance: The raising of Jairus' daughter is mentioned by each of the three synoptists. Their accounts vary in several particulars; and Matthew speaks of the father of the maiden merely as a ruler, while Mark and Luke call him by his name, Jairus. These accounts are combined by sober criticism, and a minute, consistent and true record of the transaction is the result. Shall this method be pursued in the New Testament, and yet when on literary grounds the Pentateuch is analyzed and it is discovered that the same event is related with variations in the different documents, these divergences be called contradictions; or, in the absence of all marks of literary difference, shall particulars be pitted against each other in order to make out different documents? Why may not various details, given by different reporters, be historical? But to hasten on. Does it appear from the narratives of Matthew and John that Jesus indicated the character of Simon by bestowing on him the new name, Peter; and at a later period, at a crisis in the experience of the disciples, drew particular attention to it and forever linked it to a doctrine or made it significant of a new act of grace? If so, might not similar instances occur in earlier history? Did Jesus, at the beginning of his ministry, while in attendance at the Passover, drive the traders from the temple precincts, and at another Passover season find the court again filled with dealers in sacrificial animals and with money-changers, and again cast them out and overthrow the tables? Did Jesus on two different occasions feed a great multitude miraculously? Did he twice direct the fishing net to be cast with success by His

disciples who had been toiling on the sea in vain? Did he ever repeat the same doctrine or use the same metaphor a second time? If so, why should any student of the Scriptures declare similar repetitions in the Old Testament to be mutually exclusive? Does one evangelist sometimes record an event in a single sentence which another evangelist describes at length? Does one evangelist ever bring out in his narration but one aspect of an event, while another dwells upon the importance of the same incident from an entirely different point of view? Does one evangelist ever fix attention on one actor in an event, while his fellow-evangelist tells only of a different participant? If so, why should a student who accepts the existence of the four hypothetical documents in the Hexateuch pronounce similar literary differences in his four narratives to be inconsistent reports? Surely Dr. Green was right in making a distinction between literary arguments and that canon of the divisive criticism which assumes the existence of a pervasive and prevalent contradiction between the hypothetical documents. Surely he was quite within bounds when he pronounced this assumption to be an unfriendly prepossession and an arbitrary judgment (*Old Testament Student*, VI, p. 318; *Treasury*, IX, 665-666; PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW, IV, 539).

This argument that has now been dwelt upon at some length is the argument from analogy of method and principle. Its force is felt most strongly by those Biblical scholars whose range of study embraces both Testaments and who harmonize the Gospels. But the argument is more than an analogy drawn from the methods of New Testament scholars. It is nothing less than an established canon of historical research, observed by all historians in their study of records. Historical criticism is wary of unnecessarily charging the sources of its information with contradiction. It receives reconcilable reports as worthy of credence (*Presbyterian Review*, 1887, p. 141).

There is a second remark concerning the postulated contradiction between the several hypothetical narratives which were interwoven to form the present Hexateuch: Documentary evidence exists against the theory of divergence. This evidence is limited indeed in its extent; but it is wide in its bearing. The divisive criticism has often paraded the Hebrew narrative of the flood as affording evident tokens of compilation in diversity of style and inconsistent statements. But the Assyrian story can now be laid down beside this very narrative of the flood. This Assyrian tale of the deluge came down through many centuries, and naturally did not entirely escape amplification and corruption; but it was

not pieced together out of two traditions, such as divisive criticism declares the Hebrew narrative to have been. It is a unit. Now, in the Hebrew narrative diversities of conception are, indeed, made out on separating it and opposing its parts to each other; but of these hypothetical diversities such important and determinative ones as the different causes assigned to the deluge, the different accounts of its progress and decline, and the dispatch of the birds after land had been sighted are found existing in the Assyrian story in harmonious unity; and by this token the assumed contradictions in the Hebrew account are proven beyond question or cavil, we think, to have been foisted upon the Hebrew narrative. This evidence casts discredit upon the divisive criterion of contradictions. The discovered contradictions are generally purely subjective; and they have signally failed of confirmation in an important test case (Davis, *Genesis and Semitic Tradition*, pp. 123-129; *Bible Student*, July, 1901, pp. 54-56).

This department is quite ready to admit the possibility, or even the probability, of occasional duplicates in the Pentateuch. The sacred text has not escaped corruption in either the Old or the New Testament, and additions have crept in that perplex the historian and the harmonist. The aid of textual criticism is sorely needed. But there is no basis for a belief that duplication is characteristic and prevalent. The criticism that assumes a pervasive contradictory duplication rests upon evidence which is capable of rebuttal point by point; it proceeds upon a method which violates the ordinary canons of historical research and erects a new canon for a special field; and it absolutely fails at the points where it can be tested by ancient documentary evidence. Such criticism this department is compelled to regard as unsound and deceptive.

HISTORICAL CRITICISM OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

We leave now the literary question to take up the historical one. In Dr. Alexander's day the influential school of historical criticism, dominated by the spirit of Ewald, saw in the early period of the Hebrew monarchy the historical crisis which called for a strengthening of the priestly organization and an elaboration of the ritual as a measure of self-protection on the part of the ecclesiastical order against the growing power and magnificence of the kings. The book found in the temple several centuries later, during the reign of Josiah, was the Pentateuch, which had recently been enlarged to its present dimensions by the addition of Deuteronomy. About the middle of Dr. Green's incumbency of the Old Testament chair, an opposite theory, brilliantly championed by Julius Wellhausen, swept the field. According to the new hypoth-

esis, the priests did not assert themselves before the great literary prophets arose, as had been taught, but the activity of the prophets came before that of the priests; Leviticus, the priests' book, did not come into existence before Deuteronomy, with its spiritual insight into the law, but Deuteronomy came before Leviticus; the entire Pentateuch was not found in the temple during the reign of Josiah, but the book of Deuteronomy only; Deuteronomy appeared about the time of Josiah, the priestly legislation about the time of the exile, and the Hexateuch about the time of Ezra.

The sharp distinction between these theories of the development of Israel's religious institutions (in whatever form, early or late, these theories are propounded) and the literary questions which confront the critic, has ever been clearly discerned by this department. And rightly. For while a particular solution of the literary problems is essential to the theory of development, as that theory is presented and argued by its advocates; while the partition of the Pentateuch is an indispensable precondition to any hypothesis about the gradual growth of Israel's religious institutions; while the splitting of individual laws and groups of laws is necessary in order that the fragments may be regarded as the accretion of ages; yet the settlement of the literary question, even in favor of partition, does not inevitably carry with it the establishment of the development theory. For the Pentateuch or the Hexateuch, both the narrative and the legislation, might be partitioned among four chief documents, prepared by four different hands, and yet, if the analysis were based solely on literary grounds, the question remains open whether they are the strata deposited during successive eras in the evolution of a national religion or truthfully represent the Mosaic legislation (Green, *Moses and the Prophets* p. 47).

And the discussion of the origin of the religious institutions as a question by itself is possible for the further reason that the theory of growth rests upon two postulates, the validity of which can be tested without reference to the analysis of the Hexateuch. In saying this, however, it is not forgotten that the theory of development involves a vast amount of subjective literary criticism of the remaining books of Scripture.

In its perfected form the most recent theory of the growth of Israel's religious institutions is based on two assumptions; namely, that a simpler form in religion, as in other things, precedes the complex, and that the successive stages of this growth in the institutions of Israel, as these can be traced in the Pentateuchal laws, can be recognized afresh in the course of the national history. In

accordance with the principle that the simpler form must precede the complex—which, of course, is true enough as a general proposition—the three legal codes which are discerned in the latter part of the Pentateuch are arranged in a different order from that in which they appear, but so as to form a series of increasing complexity. By the new arrangement the book of the Covenant, including the Ten Commandments, stands first, as it does in the Bible; after it are placed the laws of Deuteronomy, which, among other matters, insist upon one altar for all Israel, to the exclusion of other places of sacrifice; and after these laws there is put the priestly legislation characteristic of Leviticus, Numbers and the latter part of Exodus. The implication is not only that the simpler form precedes the more complex in time, but that centuries are demanded for the development in institutional life represented by these successive codes.

Dr. Green made the obvious remark upon this theory that “the fallacy . . . lies in the primary assumption that the Priest code was a further development of the Deuteronomic code; whereas [in fact] . . . these codes were developments from the Covenant code, one in one direction and the other in another” (PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW, IV, 549). The implication that the complex observances gradually grew up in Israel itself out of simpler practices is also fallacious. Granting the slow evolution of religious institutions, yet it is to be remembered that the Mosaic cult represents a late stage of development. The simple in religion had long since had its day. The complex was in full vogue among men when Moses came upon the stage of action. The contemporaneous appearance of the Covenant code and the priestly laws, followed nearly forty years later by the Deuteronomic addresses rehearsing, inculcating and emending the statutes and ordinances and insisting upon those features of the law which the experience of thirty-eight years had shown to be peculiarly essential to the welfare of the nation, are all in place in any evolutionary scheme whose field of vision is large enough to take in the world’s history. There was no need for the simple to precede the complex in the formative period of Israel’s national religious life.

Dr. Green incidentally touched upon this counter-argument (*Hebrew Feasts*, pp. 31, 32), but many more facts are known than he had occasion to mention. For instance, the current conception of the Mosaic age regarding the externals of public worship is known. The universal religious sense of mankind demanded splendid ecclesiastical architecture. Throughout the ancient civilized world, from Babylonia to Egypt, it led to the temples being

of all buildings the most imposing and magnificent. The king dwelt often in a more spacious abode, but not in a nobler and richer one. The encompassing court, the sacred house or pyramid, and the adytum of the deity were on a scale of beauty and grandeur commensurate with the opportunities of the worshipping people. Curtains within the chamber of the god, and sheathings of gold and silver and symbolical figures added to the splendor and impressiveness and significance of the place. The priesthood was a numerous body, and was accorded high social rank. At its head, to speak more particularly of the Egyptian priesthood, stood the high priest, the embodiment of the order, and officially distinguished by gorgeous attire. Under him were orders of priests and inferior temple servants. The respective duties and prerogatives of these various classes of sacred ministers were carefully defined. The prospective priests passed through an elaborate preliminary training in order to be fitted for the performance of pontifical functions, and when graduated and on service purified themselves by ablutions and were arrayed in white raiment of linen or cotton. Besides the minute regulations to govern the conduct of the ministering priests, an elaborate sacrificial ritual was drawn up. The offerings consisted of animals for sacrifice and vegetable products. Beasts were distinguished as clean and unclean. To be fit for use upon the altar the sacrificial animal must be not only clean, but without blemish in the eyes of the priest. When the sacrifice was on the altar, cakes of fine flour and sometimes honey, raisins, figs, incense, odoriferous wood and oil were added. It was an age in which men were accustomed to see significance in small acts of the ritual, when they were delicately sensitive to religious symbolism and keenly alive to the proprieties of worship. The ceremony spoke to them. It turned their thoughts into religious channels, prompted them to devotion, and held true ideals before their minds. Worship at the great sanctuaries was profoundly impressive. The venerable antiquity of the temple linked the worshipers to the past; its correct architectural proportions unconsciously appealed to their æsthetic sense, without perhaps their knowing why, and soothed them; its style called forth the light or the grave mood; its vastness or exceeding richness awed them. And amid those surroundings and in that superb setting the religious service was performed—picturesque, pompous, significant. The formal worship, viewed in each detail and accessory and the *tout ensemble*, was a finished product of evolution.

Such were men's religious conceptions and tastes, and such were his conscious needs concerning forms of worship when Moses ap-

peared. Evolution had been going on for centuries, for milleniums. The simple and obvious had become complex and recondite. The ideas lying at the base of primitive institutions had been wrought out in minute detail and given a subtle expression. Public worship had reached a state of high refinement. Can it be thought strange that the Hebrew legislator should start the national worship of his people with an elaborate ritual? Can it be regarded as surprising that at the founding of the nation, politically and religiously, the book of the Covenant, which in modern parlance would be called the constitution and statutes, should be immediately followed by the plan and specifications for a national sanctuary and by a manual for the priests containing minute instructions for their guidance in the performance of a symbolic service? Nay; the Mosaic system as outlined in the Pentateuch was timely.

But, say the advocates of the theory that Israel's religious institutions were of slow growth, the history shows that the priestly and Deuteronomic codes were not in existence among the early Israelites. This is the main contention, and it is to it that this department has paid chief attention. Now the recent theory that neither the priestly nor the Deuteronomic legislation was in existence before the accession of Manasseh or Josiah to the throne at once solves, as the advocates of the hypothesis claim, several problems connected with the earlier history of Israel. It explains the recognized worship at high places, the repeated mention of sacrifices offered to Jehovah elsewhere than at the central sanctuary, the performance of priestly functions by a man like Samuel, who was not of the house of Aaron. The theory seems to fit the lock on first trial. But it is not the only key that fits the lock. The Mosaic legislation, as outlined in the Pentateuch, can be accepted as genuine without coming into conflict with the succeeding history; for in that history for what is abnormal there is a simple and sufficient reason. The sacrifices which were offered elsewhere than at the central sanctuary fall into two groups: 1. Sacrifices which were irregular, and were condemned as such. 2. Sacrifices offered elsewhere than at the national sanctuary, and not condemned. Only these latter come into consideration. They are found on investigation to have been of two kinds: (1) Single occurrences, called for by a special manifestation of Jehovah, and not afterward repeated at the place. Such sacrifices at a distance from the sanctuary were legal, being provided for by the law. (2) Sacrifices offered when the sanctuary was forsaken of God or was inaccessible. It was forsaken by God at Shiloh in the days of Eli on account of great national apostasy, and the covenant suspended until a reformation had been effected under the leadership

of Samuel (Jer. vii. 12 ; Ps. lxxviii. 60-70). It was generally inaccessible to the pious Israelites of the north after the disruption of the kingdom. In either case men must revert to the patriarchal custom or not worship God by sacrifice at all. This explanation of anomalies, real or apparent, in the early history is at once comprehensive and obvious. A separate reason does not need to be sought for each several case. All unrebuked deviation from the law of one altar or from the law restricting priestly functions to the house of Aaron find their ample justification upon one or the other of these two grounds. Either there was a special manifestation of Jehovah's glory or else worship at the sanctuary was interrupted by reason of divine displeasure or was prevented by political barriers. This explanation has satisfied Biblical scholars for ages. In bringing it forward again, Dr. Green, like Moses in the camp at Shittim, brought forth things that were old and rehearsed them in the ears of a new generation (*Presbyterian Review*, 1882, p. 133 seq. ; *Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, pp. 149-153).

Here, then, are two keys by which it is proposed to unlock the early history of Israel. One proposes to regard the conditions existing in the early history as altogether normal and deny Mosaic origin to the priestly and Deuteronomic legislation. The other accepts the legislation as Mosaic and explains the two classes of anomalies. Which is the right key? Which one unlocks the truth?

This leads to the third argument advanced by this department, namely, possession. Under this caption several items are included. One is that the three codes come to us with the imprimatur of Moses, and are further authenticated by explicit statement of the time and the place and the occasion of the enactment of the laws. Such formal declaration in the documents themselves cannot be lightly ignored. To set them aside, a theory must be more than a plausible explanation of other facts. It needs to be the only reasonable explanation of the other facts. And this the theory of the gradual growth of Israel's institutions by no means is.

Further, the Mosaic origin of the legislation is the current Biblical representation or tradition, if you will. It is an old tradition. It was the uniform tradition in the ancient days when Israel was a nation. "Both the book found in the temple in the reign of Josiah and that brought forward and read by Ezra after the exile are expressly declared to have been not recent productions, but the law of Moses" (Green, *Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, p. 155).

The development theory has been pronounced by this depart-

ment to be unscriptural and anti-biblical. These terms have not been used in bitterness or with invective, but simply as the correct description of the fact. The leading advocates of the development theory make no concealment of this fact. They admit that their doctrine not only runs counter to the traditions and beliefs of Israel four centuries before Christ, but also contradicts the entire representation of the Scriptures themselves in their present form, and is irreconcilable with the Biblical view of the history of Israel. This fact of its unscripturalness and anti-biblical character stubbornly confronts the development theory.

The obstacle that exists in possession is indeed removed in part; but, in the judgment of this department, it is removed by arbitrary and violent procedure. Under various names and forms, a process of excision is carried on which we cannot but regard as high-handed in the extreme. Excision is not undertaken at a few points, but is employed pervasively and constantly from the beginning of the Old Testament to its end. As all readers of recent critical works are aware, it is not based on textual criticism; but yet it freely modifies the text, eliminating phrases and even adding words and clauses, in order to conform the statement of the text to the requirements of the theory.

The necessity of the theory is one of the causes, to speak more particularly, which has compelled the application of the knife to the prophets, and the cutting out of words and clauses and even chapters and casting them aside as late additions. The theory itself has become the standard to which everything is adjusted. "Traces of the legal organization and spirit, or of the Thora as an original whole, or of any of the alleged products of postexilic Judaism . . . have now become the criteria by which, without appeal, the late origin of every prophecy wherein they occur is established." And these traces of the Pentateuchal legislation have become accepted evidence of the interpolation or addition of clause, sentence or paragraph, contrary to the internal indications of a literary and contextual nature which point to unity (Vos, *PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW*, IX, pp. 220-221; see pp. 214-238, 411-437, 610-638; X, 70-97, 285-317).

As a further consequence of the development theory, it has been found necessary to assign the Psalms which compose the Psalter to a late date. Some of these sacred odes were composed, as everybody admits, during the exile and after the return; but the exigency of the development theory—and in ultimate analysis this is the determinative influence, as the progressive history of the criticism of the Psalter during the last hundred years sufficiently shows—has caused its advocates to assign most or all of the remaining

Psalms to the time of the exile and a long subsequent period. This assignment to a late period is made despite the tradition which attributes about one-half of these Psalms to David or a Davidic Psalter—a tradition that was in writing, that was specific regarding these Psalms to the exclusion of others, that was held by the Church of Israel itself, and that was already ancient when the Septuagint translation was made; a tradition of which the general credibility and consequent testimony to a preëxilic Psalter, with psalms written by David as its core, is not impugned because in isolated instances it has not failed to escape corruption or corrupt extension; a tradition confirmed by the congruity of the language with the Hebrew of David's time, by the attested poetic genius and preëxilic fame of David as a sweet singer and skilled musician, by the religious spirit exhibited by him, according to records which are acknowledged by the radical school of critics to be virtually contemporaneous with him.

When the whole field is taken under survey, and it is seen that the three codes were timely in the days of Moses and were to be expected, since they represented the best religious sentiment of the age; that they are accompanied by statements of the date and occasion and legislator, whereby they are assigned to Moses, and the whole body of the legislation and individual regulations thereof are continually referred to throughout the Scriptures as the law of Moses; that the early history of Israel is entirely compatible with their existence, and is as consistent therewith as the history of mediæval Europe is with the knowledge of the New Testament in that age; that their existence is presupposed in the several Scriptures from the earliest times onward, until these writings have been subjected to close scrutiny which follows up every trace of the existence of these codes and ruthlessly excinds it; and, further, when the pervading subjectivism of the criticism which supports the opposing theory is considered, this department has felt no doubt on which side of the debate the truth is found.

One key opens the lock with a little manipulation. A new key is tried. It enters the keyhole and moves slightly in the lock; but immediately it meets with an obstruction. Before the bolt will fly back the skilled locksmith must be summoned. He files away, not rust or other accretions, except to an inconsiderable degree, but mainly what on examination bears evidence of being part of the original structure. Then the key turns. Such a method will fit a key to almost any lock.

Under such circumstances this department has no difficulty in deciding which key to accept.

OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY.

We believe that the prophets of Israel received immediate communications from God. The evidence upon which this belief rests consists of the claims of the prophets themselves, tested by the intrinsic character of their teaching and by the fate of their predictions. These three concurrent attestations are as practical and as accessible as they were when first propounded and made legally binding by the laws of Deuteronomy; and they include the criterion accepted by all modern critics.

And, first, the claim. Prophecy "claims to be a divine product" (*Moses and the Prophets*, p. 212). The prophets claimed to be the organs of the Holy Spirit—men upon whom the Spirit of the Lord fell and filled with power (2 Kings ii. 15; 2 Chron. xv. 1, xxiv. 20; Ezek. xi. 5; Joel ii. 28; Mic. iii. 8), and through whom God testified by His Spirit (Neh. ix. 30; Zech. vii. 12)—so that their utterances are the word, the voice, the answer of God (1 Sam. ix. 27; Jer. xxxviii. 20; Mic. iii. 7), and are constantly accompanied by the phrase "thus saith the Lord."

The prophet was an organ of the Holy Ghost, but he remained a man. He remained the man that he had grown to be. "His native endowments, the experiences of his life, all that contributed to form his character, to determine or deepen his convictions, to shape his style of thought or action, in fine to make him what he was, was part of his providential training for his work" (*Moses and the Prophets*, p. 259). "The inspiration under which the prophets acted left them in full possession of their faculties, native and acquired, and with all their peculiarities of thought and feeling unimpaired" (Alexander on *Isaiah*, I, xvi). The prophet remained also a man of his own times. His language and his habits of thought and expression and ratiocination were those of his country and century (cp. *Moses and the Prophets*, p. 18). His knowledge—historical, geographical, astronomical, botanical, zoological, ethnological—was that of his contemporaries. His religion and religious aspirations were common to the godly Israelites of the time. His message also was to men of his own generation, "specially adapted to their own emergencies" (Green, *Princeton Review*, 1862, Vol. 34, p. 573). "Prophecy grew directly out of the heart of the Israelitish people, took its shape from their necessities, was moulded by their changing circumstances age by age" (*Moses and the Prophets*, p. 178). Further, even while in the prophetic office the prophet was apparently often left to himself and was as other men. The prophets "seem not to have been under the permanent influence of the Spirit" (*Classroom Notes on*

Dr. Green's Lectures, p. 21). "Expressions in which prophets simply utter their own thoughts are clearly distinguished from what they say in the name of God (1 Sam. xvi. 6, 7; 2 Sam. vii. 3, 4, 17)" (Green, *Canon*, p. 35). "In common matters, and especially in things noways connected with religion, it is reasonable to suppose that they were left to the same guidance of reason and common sense as other men" (Alexander, *Canon*, p. 86). The prophet, further, remained a man with human limitations. "The prophet is not omniscient. He has no predictive faculty by which he can survey the future at will. He knows barely what is revealed to him; of all else he is as ignorant as ordinary men" (*Moses and the Prophets*, p. 214; cp. *Princeton Review*, Vol. 34, p. 576). He "may not have been aware," when he described the Messianic age in the language and under the forms of his own time, "of the changes which Messiah's coming would introduce" (*Moses and the Prophets*, p. 246). He "may not have known the length of the intervening periods" between the events in a prophetic picture; he "may indeed not have suspected the existence of any interval whatever" (*Princeton Review*, 1861, Vol. 33, p. 91). Finally, though a prophet, yet like other men he must fight his way from darkness to light, through perplexing problems to the calmness of assured faith in God. In the book of Habakkuk there is "a remarkably clear instance of the wrestling conflict of which revelations were born: the inward struggle with great moral problems that clamored for solution, the mental process by which the strife was calmed and assured conviction attained, —and distinguished from this, and additional to it, the divine communication for which the mind was antecedently prepared" (*Moses and the Prophets*, p. 259).

Here, then, are men, men confessedly under human limitations, who come forward and profess to be organs of the divine Spirit and mouthpieces of the Almighty. The heavenliness of the matter in all its parts attests the truth of their religious teaching. But what substantiates their claim that they were organs of the Spirit, and as such were under exceptional divine control and instruction? Why, among other things, first, the inference warranted by contrast. "The prophets of Israel stand alone in the character of their revelations" (*Notes on Dr. Green's Lectures*, p. 8). There were deep thinkers elsewhere, and philosophers, but nothing equal to the insight of the prophets of Israel into religious truth has been attained by the thinkers of other nations. Under identical historical conditions, none of Israel's neighbors or kinsfolk among the nations produced religious teaching such as that of Israel concerning God, righteousness, sin and redemption.

And while elements in the teaching of the great sages of China, India and Greece not infrequently match precepts of the prophets, yet their doctrinal systems as a whole fall short of Israel's teaching in purity, value and fitness, in motive and aim. If prophecy were inherent in man, how could the superb isolation of Hebrew prophecy be explained? The attempt has, of course, been made to account for it on this low assumption; nevertheless, the incontrovertible and generally acknowledged superiority of Hebrew prophecy is strong confirmation of the claim of the prophets to be organs of the divine Spirit and, as such, peculiarly under his control and instruction—a corroboration felt most convincingly by those who are in deepest sympathy with the cardinal doctrines of the prophetic teaching.

Then there is, secondly, the evidence afforded by the fulfillment of predictions. This evidence happens to occupy a larger place in the published literature of the Old Testament department at Princeton than does the former; but this fact must not be construed as indicating that the department estimates this second evidence intrinsically at higher value than the former. In fact, it rejoices most at the sublime grandeur of Israel's doctrine, rising above even the glorious heights of the religious teaching of the Gentile sages, piercing through the investing clouds of human thought, penetrating into the pure atmosphere above, and reposing in the azure depth of heaven. Already we see that future upon which the prophets of Israel frequently and fondly gazed in part attained: "The mountain of the Lord's house established in the top of the mountains, and exalted above the hills" (Isa. ii. 2; Mic. iv. 1).

Nevertheless, the fulfillment of prophecy has a conspicuous importance of its own, and a prominent place in the history of apologetics, as a test whether the prophets of Israel received direct communications from God, as they claimed. The evidence is tangible, and through it the heart of the matter is reached at once. Obviously, "if these predictions have been fulfilled, they are from God; if not, they cannot be from Him" (Green, *Moses and the Prophets*, p. 181; Alexander on *Isaiah*, I, xii). This test is the accepted criterion of modern criticism.

In examining prediction and fulfillment Princeton holds three things to be necessary: First—and spare the smile, for the matter is serious—the exact words of the prophet must be made the basis of the discussion. Secondly, history must be allowed to tell its entire story. These two demands should be entirely unnecessary. Critical candor and literary honesty should secure the accurate citation of the prophet's words and a ready ear for all that history

has to suggest or declare. But insistence upon them is only too necessary, as a glance at past investigations at once makes manifest. The third requisite in examining prophecy and fulfillment is adherence to the hermeneutical principle that prophecy need not reach fulfillment at once, either in all its parts or as a whole, but may tarry long (Hab. ii. 3; 2 Pet. iii. 1-13); and if when so tarrying the dispensation changes, if in the interval Old Testament conditions and forms and hopes give place to those of the New Testament, then the external drapery of the prophecy may be exchanged for new raiment, while the fulfillment goes marching on in full vigor and unmistakable identity. This third consideration is thus twofold. It concerns delay in time and change of dispensation. It bulks more largely in the enumeration of the three particulars than do the former two, and it requires elucidation. This elucidation may suitably take the form of a comparison. Predictive prophecy bestuds the sacred page like single stars and constellations, and the history of its interpretation reads like the history of astronomy. Listen, then, for a moment to the story of astronomy; and, while listening to it, hear as in a parable the story of predictive prophecy also. The radiant planets in the heavens, and the blazing stars and constellations there, were placed in position by the Creator. Among themselves they afford no perspective to the natural eye, they seem to be at no great distance above the observer, they appear to rise in the east and pass majestically across the sky to the west. And man's thoughts about them in early ages were shaped by his first impressions, received from rude observations with untrained senses. But with all the resulting confusion of thought and false notions about the distance of the heavenly bodies and their movements and size and relations and source of light, they served their purpose in teaching men great religious truths. In Reason's ear they have been

" Forever singing as they shine,
 'The hand that made us is divine.' "

They have been declaring the glory of God, and showing His eternal power and godliness. The religious truth which they teach was learned by man first, as was intended; and by degrees men's crude notions of the luminaries gave place to adequate knowledge of their size and position and movements. Long study of them individually and collectively, reflection upon the causes of eclipses and differences of motion, lapse of time with its vindication of one surmise and disproof of another, perfected apparatus for accurate observation, corrected the naive thoughts of the first beholders. The stars were found not to lie so near the beholder as was at first imagined; the constellation was discov-

ered often to form a picture only when viewed without perspective, and in reality to consist of stars arranged not on the same plane, but as a vista stretching away into the depths of space. And when at length a new system of astronomy took the place of the old, and the system ceased to be earth-centred and found its central point in the distant heavens, then a new interpretation was placed on the ancient phenomena, and a new terminology arose without, however, wholly displacing the old phraseology in popular speech. Nevertheless, despite the change, the ancient predictions of eclipses and occultations have been fulfilled even in the new era, although the language in which they were couched belonged to a former day. The drapery is outworn, many of the conceptions which the old astronomers entertained of what would take place and of the process by which it would occur are antiquated; but the event itself, as determined by God and as the ancient student of the heavens was able to foretell, occurred, and the divinely predestined and discovered course of astronomical events has kept marching on, only more grandly to human apprehension than before.

So with predictive prophecy. The difference between the ancient astronomer and the prophets of Israel in their respective spheres of labor is that the conception of the older astronomy is radically wrong, whereas the prophet's conception that Israel was the kingdom of God was true. The kingdom simply unfolded into a new and higher form; so that the prophecy with the long vista is apt to begin its fulfillment in the old dispensation according to the terms of that dispensation, and to continue its realization in a higher form under new conditions.

The prophet doubtless did not always know the character of his prophecy. It is recorded that he sought what time and what manner of time the Spirit that was in him did testify. Perhaps he looked upon the fulfillment as near at hand, when in fact it was remote. Perhaps he thought that the picture which was presented to him in vision, and which was complex as a constellation, was without perspective and was a combination of events contemporary with each other, when in reality the events were successive. Perhaps he sometimes regarded the temporary conditions and forms of God's kingdom on earth, in which he lived and labored, as permanent. Such may have been his mistake. It is hard to tell. But not what the prophet himself may have thought of time and distance and changing form, when he meditated on God's communication to him, but what God taught, and what later observation shows to have been God's purpose.

These, then, are the demands which the Old Testament depart-

ment at Princeton makes upon the interpreter of prophecy: fidelity to the exact words of the prophet, a ready ear for the voice of history, the recognition that a prophecy may drop its wornout habiliments and don new raiment without losing its identity. An investigation conducted with careless indifference to these three essentials cannot reach trustworthy results. Accordingly, in 1878, Dr. Green rejected Kuenen's elaborate attempt to empty Old Testament prophecy of its supernatural element, because the distinguished Leyden professor disregarded each of these three prime conditions (*Princeton Review*, 1878, pp. 281-328). And likewise, in 1861, Dr. Green pronounced de Wette's citation of unfulfilled and shattered predictions to be a groundless accusation against the prophets of Israel, because this noted German scholar also trampled upon these rules of interpretation (*Princeton Review*, Vol. 33, pp. 119-122). When these legitimate demands of interpretation are cordially met, predictive prophecy affords direct and convincing proof that to Israel's prophets immediate communications were made by God. No means have been discovered to empty prophecy of a divine content.

PRINCETON.

JOHN D. DAVIS.