

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1853.

No. I.

ARTICLE I.—*Outlines of Moral Science*, by Archibald Alexander, D. D., late Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J. New York: Charles Scribner, 1852.

THIS treatise, although published after the death of its lamented author, had been fully prepared for the press by him while living, except in a few unimportant details, in the final revision of which he was arrested by his last sickness. It was, however, so far completed by him, that he instructed his sons to give it to the world, and empowered them to make all necessary literary corrections—a liberty which they scarcely found occasion to use. It differs, therefore, from most posthumous publications, in being published by the direction, and upon the responsibility of the author. It exhibits his thoughts on the momentous topics treated in it, in the form in which he has chosen to present them to the world. It is, in every sense, Dr. Alexander's work, and sets forth those ethical teachings for which, with death and heaven immediately in view, he stood ready to be held responsible, not only at the bar of human criticism, but at the tribunal of God. This is not often true of posthumous publications. We doubt whether it was true of President Edwards's posthumous work on one important branch of the subject, his "Dissertation on the Nature of Virtue;" a

ART. V.—*Theology of the Old Testament.*

Prolegomena zur Theologie des Alten Testaments, von Gust. Fr. Oehler, u. s. w. Stuttgart, 1845. 8vo. pp. 95.

THE expression, Theology of the Old Testament, is not a familiar one to English ears. The idea which it represents is perhaps not much more so to English minds. Certainly the thing holds no adequate place, if it have any place at all, in our theological literature. We hardly admit even a Biblical, as distinguished from a systematic, or from a Church Theology; although in regard to the first, and the last, especially, there is a simple and obvious difference, logically at least, even if not practically, in the point of departure and the methods pursued, if not in the results attained, between a theology which shapes itself by the teachings of the Bible, and a theology which takes its form from the faith of the Church. These may, in point of fact, entirely harmonize. The standards deemed regulative of orthodoxy may coincide precisely with the utterances of Holy Writ. And in that case, the theologian who undertakes to exhibit in systematic order the truths of Scripture, would have to go over exactly the same ground, and occupy in all the same position, as he who aims at presenting the belief of the Church. And it might consequently be found more convenient, as well as serve a number of valuable ends, to combine these two things together, rather than to treat them separately. It may be advisable to unfold the Confession of Faith and the Bible in connection, rather than apart, that thus an opportunity may be taken, not only to show what the teachings of each are, but also to show that these are identical, or rather, that the former is simply based upon or drawn from the latter. And yet, whatever may be said in favour of this combination, whatever convenience may attend it, and whatever advantages may follow from it, it is neither necessary nor desirable to forget that they are, in conception at least, distinct. It is an important Protestant principle, that the standards of the Church are her standards, not for their inherent value, but only because they represent the Bible; and that they ought to be her

standards only in so far as they represent the Bible. If they swerve from that, the true and highest norm of faith and duty, their authority is null, and they ought in so far to be discarded. Church dogmas are of worth only in so far as the Church has held fast to the lively oracles of infallible truth; only in so far as the faith of the Church coincides with the faith once delivered to the saints. The standard of her faith, which she has for important reasons framed for herself, may not be put upon a par with the divinely inspired sources of her faith, as though those had, like these, an original underived authority. And for this reason, it may be well that the distinction between Biblical and Church theology should be stated and remembered, even though it may not be practically observed. It is not a matter of course, however, that they should even harmonize, much less coincide. They have not always been harmonious in fact.

The condition of the church here may be a reason why this distinction has not been more insisted on amongst us;—why it has either not been made or has been esteemed unimportant. All diversities of theological belief have their representatives in the numerous denominations of Christians, with their proper symbols, and their well understood distinguishing sentiments. Every man may thus seek his proper affinity in the ranks of those like minded with himself, or failing to discover such, may head an independent sect of his own. Every one may accordingly find in the belief of that branch of the church to which he is attached, the counterpart of what he personally holds to be the teaching of the Bible. Biblical theology and Church theology are thus to him the same, or differ only in the aspect under which the same body of truth is contemplated.

An altered condition of things can, however, be readily conceived, which would naturally and necessarily bring the distinction between these two modes of theology into greater prominence. Suppose, for example, that it should become a matter of doubt and controversy in any communion, what the settled and proper faith of that communion was. Suppose, that the strifes which rose, concerned questions like those now agitating the Episcopal Church, not only in this country, but in Britain, regarding the true intent of the Prayer Book, or like those some

years since, in the bosom of our own communion, touching the tenets of the Presbyterian Church. And if, still farther, as was the case in the Quaker controversy, the denominational creed was to be found, not in definite articles or symbols of faith, but in a great number of voluminous writings belonging to different occasions, different periods, and even different countries, and these ambiguous perhaps, or perhaps contradictory upon the points in dispute; it can be easily seen, that in such a case the distinction must be made. What is the faith of the Bible? What is the faith of the Church? would be totally distinct questions; each would possess an independent importance; and they would of necessity, be treated separately.

Again, suppose a different case. One may be imagined in which the faith of the church was perfectly well understood, and no controversy could be raised upon that ground; but many within her pale, whether constituting a majority or not, whether following one road or not, had departed from her recognized tenets. Now, let it be assumed, either that the church creed was right, or that it was wrong; in either case there will be a juncture which cannot fail to suggest and to bring out the distinction already several times referred to. This case is not a merely imaginary one in either of its aspects. Besides numerous other exemplifications of it, which might be named, the period of the Reformation is an instance of the former; the counter revolution in Europe in the last century, in which a shallow rationalism took the place of the Reformers' faith, though still retaining the Reformers' symbols, affords an instance of the latter. And this last was really the occasion and the time which gave birth to Biblical Theology in its present sense, and as a study to be separately pursued.

It does not, however, fall within the limits of the theme suggested by the treatise before us, to discuss the subject of Biblical Theology generally, nor even to raise the question with regard to its desirableness; accordingly, we pass this by, and advance nearer to our proper theme, by remarking, that if Biblical and dogmatic Theology have thus to so great an extent coalesced amongst us, it was scarcely to be expected that any clear separation would have been effected between the different branches of Biblical Theology itself. A salutary fear of mar-

ring the unity of the sacred volume, may have had something to do with restraining the formation of an Old Testament, as distinguished from a New Testament, Theology, and within the latter again of further subdivisions, such as a Petrine or Pauline Theology, or that of the beloved disciple. We must not be understood to sanction either the principles or the methods of many of those who have admitted these distinctions, and who have undertaken to carry them out. We have neither fellowship nor sympathy with those who would sunder the real and intimate bond of union between all the sacred writers, by ignoring or denying the directing influences of the Holy Spirit, by whom all were moved. Regarding merely their human origin, they entirely isolate the books of Scripture, as the work of independent thinkers; or esteem them to have had no more connection with each other than that they are occupied with the same or similar subjects, and were the products of the same age, and of a similar congeries of influences. This is to overlook the very thing which makes the Bible what it is; the very thing which gives to it its chief value for us and for the world. The Bible is a unit; not, however, as a uniform undistinguishable mass is a unit; but as a system combining many and various parts, yet all constructed and arranged under the guidance of one master mind, and all harmonizing, all governed by one pervading principle; all conspiring to one grand and worthy result. A machine has unity in spite of its complication; or rather the sense of unity, which beholding it produces, is heightened by reason of the very complication of its parts; its wheels moving upon wheels with their various velocities and directions, yet no interference, no jarring, all necessary to the end of its formation. A tree has unity, with its roots, its trunk, its branches, its leaves, diverse, yet the same. The pure ray of light, as it comes to us direct from heaven, is one; and yet it has all the prismatic colours beautifully blended within it.

While investigations into the varied exhibitions of truth, to be met with in different parts of the sacred volume, may be so conducted as to interfere with the unity of the whole, they need not be. Nor does a just regard for the divine character and inspiration of the sacred volume, require that these should

be overlooked, or thrust into a corner as insignificant and unimportant. There is no impropriety in the admission that there are peculiarities of style and diction belonging to each of the sacred writers; and no harm is done by investigating what these are. On the contrary, they have a place and an importance which every critical student of the Scriptures knows. Neither is there any more impropriety in admitting peculiarities, not barely in the mode of conceiving and presenting truth, but in the truths themselves presented, whether as to the degree of clearness with which they are set forth, or the position which they occupy in the scheme of revelation. Only our admissions must not outrun the reality, and our investigations must be conducted fairly and on sound and sober principles, not for the sake of inventing or proving a theory, but of discovering the facts as they exist. That mechanical view of the nature of inspiration which would take offence at such investigations, or be alarmed at their results, finds no warrant in the teachings of Scripture, and no support in the phenomena which it exhibits.

If the Spirit of truth, in communicating to the world the way of salvation, chose to make use of not one man as his organ, but many, and those in different ages, from different ranks of life, trained under different circumstances, and with different mental constitutions and habits, had he not a design in all this? Or by what principle of faith or of religion can we be required to shut our eyes upon it if he had? If Holy Scripture, instead of presenting a dead level, contains the most grandly beautiful diversities of scenery, why may we not delight our eyes with beholding, whilst we are busying ourselves with gathering the rich grain from its surface, or with digging the precious ores from its bosom? Or rather, if there is not only a beauty which may please but a heavenly meaning in all this; if there is here a confirmation of the divine original of the Bible, and valuable suggestions as to the true character and intent of the Bible, why must we be denied the instruction no less than the gratification hence afforded?

If the wondrous constitution of the Bible is such as of itself to evidence, from first to last, one guiding superintending mind, acting above and through the human instruments; if it can be

shown that there was a mind engaged in framing the earlier portions of the sacred record, and in conducting the earlier portions of the sacred history, who was all the while intimately and profoundly conscious of the whole that was to come after, though not unfolded for centuries upon centuries; is not this a fact to be observed and pondered? If this can be shown not only in a prediction here and there which lies upon the surface, but if it has penetrated the framework of the whole, and the proofs become more marked and multiplied the farther and the deeper we push our investigations; if even what at first sight seemed random and unconcerted, perhaps conflicting, is upon renewed examination perceived to fall in exactly with a regular and consistent plan; and it is seen at the close more clearly than it could possibly be discovered before, that all has been driving towards one issue, evidently designed from the first and aimed at throughout, though the human actors could have had but a faint anticipation of it, even if any whatever, then here is a proof which none can controvert of divine superintendence and guidance. Now if all this be in the Scriptures, or any thing approaching or resembling it, which is the more culpable, he who searches it out, or he who refuses to see it himself and hinders those who would?

To confine ourselves, however, to the Old Testament, the advantages are evident and unquestionable which would be derived from a thorough and systematic exhibition of its contents distinctly and by themselves, whether taken as a whole or considered in their gradual development from the patriarchal germs. Such a careful tracing out of all the facts and a presentation of them in their mutual relations and their ulterior bearings is necessary to a proper comprehension of the Old Testament, of the religion which it embodies, and the connection between it and the revelations of the New. In fact, if we would rightly understand the whole scheme of revelation, we must first get clear and definite conceptions of its opening stage. By some it may be imagined that the character of the former dispensation is sufficiently obvious without the need of any deep investigation. But such a thought only betrays the shallowness of their acquaintance with the subject, who are capable of cherishing it. There is room for the most elaborate and

profound inquiry: and this will be amply repaid by discoveries not only interesting and unexpected, but valuable in the highest degree. It is in this case as in that of many other works of God. The superficial observer passes them by as undeserving of attention; but the profound student tarries long, and the longer he examines, the more cause he sees to wonder and adore. If now a clear and succinct account of the religion of the Old Testament be asked for, which shall be at once comprehensive and minute, embodying the facts and revelations of the former dispensation in systematic or generic order, and without any foreign elements, those acquainted with English and American Theology will know how many works there are within the range of our literature in which it can be found. They will know whether there is a single one which even undertakes to present such an account, or once grapples fairly with the questions which it involves, however imperfectly or inadequately the task may be performed.

But apart from the dearth of comprehensive and systematic exhibitions of the theology and religion of the former dispensation, the elucidation of individual points, where that has been attempted, has not been all that could be desired. This is in fact what might have been expected. The want of a just conception of the whole must lead to erroneous or defective views of the several parts. Besides, the points examined have been superficially and incidentally touched upon, rather than thoroughly and *ex professo* investigated. Or when a more elaborate attention has been bestowed upon them, as for example, upon the Mosaic doctrine of atonement, it has been more for the purpose of gathering arguments for a New Testament doctrine, than with the view of an independent inquiry into the ideas, which the old economy bodied forth.

The thing complained of is not that the Old Testament has not been studied, nor that it has been left out of sight in our theology; but that one particular method of study has been overlooked which might be applied to it with eminent advantage—advantage both to our theology in general, and to our understanding of that large portion of the Scriptures in particular. It has been too little studied in itself. Sufficient attention has not been paid to its significance and its value to those who

lived while the former dispensation still lasted. It has not been regarded enough exactly in that light in which it chiefly presents itself as an earnest and a type of good things to come. Some sunder completely the connection of the two dispensations, others almost identify them. And where in general statements the true religion is admitted, this is lost sight of again in the details. The business of an expositor is simply to deal with the materials which he finds before him, to unfold, elucidate and arrange them. Instead of this, we too often find in the expositions of this part of Scripture, foreign ideas brought in from other quarters and intermingled with the instructions of Moses and the prophets, if not actually substituted for them. Those who have undertaken to handle the Jewish Scriptures, have been wont for the most part to tend toward one of two extremes, the precise opposites of each other in spirit and aims, and including between them a multitude of subordinate forms as they are variously modified and combined. These may be characterized as belonging respectively to the unbelieving and to the believing interpreter. The first empties the text of its meaning; the second overloads it. The first would make all shallow enough to be fathomed by the human understanding and to be explained from natural causes. The second would make the seed contain not the germ of the tree, but the tree itself, and would obliterate all that divides the inception from the consummation. The first would degrade the Old Testament by striking out of it all that distinguishes it as a supernatural revelation. The second would exalt it unduly by striking out all that marks it as an incomplete revelation, each then filling after its own fashion the void thus arbitrarily created.

The method of unbelief deals with the religion of Israel as it does with those of the heathen world. In its earlier phases it assumed all to be alike downright impostures, in which an ignorant people were the dupes of crafty priests, or designing rulers. And here, as has but too frequently been the case in the history of religious opinion, the friends of truth, by the lameness of their defences, played into the hands of its foes, and supplied them with weapons and arguments from their own magazine. The case of sacrifices must have been deemed almost desperate,

when their very unreasonableness and absurdity could be made, by Shuckford, the gist of their defence; and it could be argued that, inasmuch as no rational ground of their institution existed or was conceivable, they must have been of divine origin. The legislation of Moses must have been in straits, when Bishop Warburton could adduce in proof of his divine legation, the inferiority of his enactments—contending that the state he founded must have been under extraordinary divine protection, or it could never have held together. It would be better, with Spencer, to regard these institutions as yielded in accommodation to an ignorant and superstitious people; or, with Michaelis, to give them at least the praise of political sagacity and legislative skill, notwithstanding the meager flatness of his views, and the puerile length to which he carried them.

This purely rationalistic form of opposition, by which the half of man's nature is ignored, and all that is religious in religion is denied, has passed away; we may hope, for ever. Even the religions of the heathen are not explicable as priest-craft, or as political contrivance. No intelligent account can be given of them which leaves out of sight the fact that man's spirit has cravings and needs, which must in some way, appointed or self-devised, seek or find a fanciful or real satisfaction. The ground of unbelief is consequently so far shifted, as to claim that Judaism, like pagan forms of belief and worship, was a simple outgrowth of natural religious feelings; the form in which they were developed being in each case modified or determined by the circumstances in which they found their exercise. Judaism, like paganism, had its temple, its altars, its priesthood, its mythology.

Acting on the sound principle, "*fas est et ab hoste doceri*," we cheerfully admit, that distorted and false as this view is, it nevertheless encloses an element of truth which we must take into our theory, if we would have it perfectly adjusted to the facts. The religious nature and the religious necessities of the Hebrew and the pagan were the very same. The instinct of the latter led him on to grope darkly after a satisfaction of those very wants and longings, which were fully met in the revelation granted to the former. The religion of the Old

Testament did not present, even in its types, mere shadowy forms of coming good, empty and unsubstantial for the present. It was not an aggregate of arbitrary institutions, established for the bare purpose of imaging forth what lay in the far distant future. While it pointed onward, it had a value and a reality for the present too. It was designed for, and it was adapted to the then pressing wants of those to whom it was given. It was set to awaken and express religious emotions; to open afresh the interrupted intercourse with God; to restore his lost favour to them by whom it had been forfeited; and to body forth the sentiments that were felt, or should be felt, of homage, and thanksgiving, and self-consecration. Though not the spontaneous growth of man's religious feelings, it was precisely accordant with them, or rather, with what those feelings ought to be. There is an intimate correspondence between the religion of the Old Testament and man's spiritual nature. What our Saviour declares regarding one institution, was true of the whole; all was made for man. This relation of correspondence, existing between the nature of man and Judaism, is not so aptly represented by that of the seal to the wax upon which it has impressed its own image, as by that of the lock to the key which threads its intricacies and moves its bolts, because it has been fitted to it by the maker of them both.

The prime error of this theory, however, and that which necessarily vitiates all its conclusions, is, that it overlooks entirely, or denies both the supernatural character and the objective truth of the Jewish religion. These are just what distinguish it from the religions of the heathen, and *toto caelo* prevent its being ranked upon an equality with them. The same necessities and wants lie at the basis of both. This constitutes all that is real and striking in their resemblance. In the one, but not in the other, God has revealed the remedy, and that not fictitious or imaginary, but real. This constitutes the heaven-wide divergence. The error is the same, whether a revelation of God to Israel is denied, or is asserted as part of a universal and continuous revelation to or in all nations, and running through all time. The peculiarity of this religion, by

which it is absolutely sundered from all eontemporaneous systems, is in either ease destroyed.

A second error attaching to this theory, and the only additional one which will be named here, is that of assuming an identity on the mere ground of a resemblance in outward forms, without regard to the spirit embodied in them. This is, as though an etymologist were to make similarity of sound his sole test of community of origin between words, and to pay no regard either to their meaning or to their history. Speneer's derivation, not only from similar, but from opposite forms, is wider still of the mark, and has even less to recommend it than "lucus a non lucendo." Nothing is more common than for scattered sentenees, here and there, to be culled from the writings of Confueius, for example, and set over against similar expressions in the Bible; and the inferenee is tacitly suggested or openly drawn, that the Chinese philosopher has fallen but little behind the revelation of God. The language of the Greek respecting Zeus, or the inscription on the Isis temple at Sais,* is quoted as parallel with the doctrine of Jehovah's eternity and unsearehableness. The rites of pagan worship are, on the ground of the slightest external similitude, held up as identieal with those of the Mosaie ceremonial. The fragment torn from its eonnection may be dressed up to assume quite a different appearanee from that which belongs to it in the scheme of which it is part, and from which, if it is to be estimated aright, it must not be sundered. The eanon insisted upon by Bähr, in regard to the Levitical symbols, is the only sensible one in that and in all similar eases. "The symbolie worship in general and in particuilar, must represent such ideas and truths as agree with the aeknowledged and elearly uttered principles of the Mosaie religion. Coneeptions and ideas foreign and opposed to the spirit of this religion, or expressly rejeeted by it, to which there is never an allusion nor a referenee, eannot possibly be signified by its symbols." No eanon ean be more self-evident than this, and yet none has been more frequently and grossly

* Zeus was, Zeus is, Zeus shall be.—*Pausan.*

I am all that has been, and is, and shall be; and my robe no mortal has ever uncovered.—*Plut. in Is. et Osir.*

violated. To all proper understanding of any ancient system of religion, and above all, of Judaism, it is obviously essential that this rule be rigidly adhered to. And if it be, it will destroy this equalizing of the heathen and Jewish religions, root and branch.

Before turning away from the phases of unbelief, it will be well to take a view of the attitude assumed by the modern philosophy of Germany toward the Old Testament. We are glad here to have the brief but interesting sketch furnished by our author, which as coming from a native we presume may be safely followed. The work which led the way in this field was Kant's "Religion within the bounds of Reason." Kant there maintained the relative necessity of a positive religion. The categorical imperative of the moral law that the radically evil must be overcome with good, can only be realized in mankind as a whole by the establishment of an ethical commonwealth, in which the moral law shall be the ruling principle. Such an ethical commonwealth can only be established by means of religion, which must take on a statutory form, since men always need the confirmation of sense for the truths of reason. This statutory law must be prescribed under divine authority; by it as a vehicle of the religion of reason, men must train themselves to free morality. Kant was not, however, so favourably inclined towards the Old Testament, as these principles might seem to indicate. He had a strong antipathy against it on account of its restrictions, and because it did not teach the doctrine of immortality, and against the Mosaic law in particular, because its enactments were political rather than moral, and were not based on moral motives.

According to the system of Hegel, there are three stages in the progress of religion: nature-worship—the religion of subjectivity, or spiritual individuality, in which the divinity is conceived of as free, self-determining, and pursuing definite ends—and finally the absolute religion. The second of these stages includes three forms, represented respectively by the Jewish, Greek, and Roman religions. In each of these, the religious idea is developed in one particular direction. They mutually supply each other's deficiencies, and from their combination and mutual action results Christianity, which is the absolute

religion. Judaism, therefore, stands related to Christianity, and is preparatory to it, but no more so, nor in fact so much as the religions of the Greek and Roman; for it is lower in the scale than either of these. Judaism put an irreconcilable breach between God and nature. Its God is an infinite and independent spirit, on whom all that is natural and finite is simply and absolutely dependent. This God reveals himself in nature, but is superior to the manifestation of himself in the natural world and distinct from it. The breach here created is in a measure filled up in the religion of the Greek, which looks upon the natural as the sign of the spiritual, and clothes the divine in a multitude of human forms; thus standing more nearly related than Judaism to the incarnation of Christianity. It fails however to gather these up again into the proper unity, linking them only outwardly by subjecting all to inexorable fate. Judaism again gave to its infinite Deity aims, which in their realization at least were restricted and local, and by this contradiction wrought its own destruction. The religion of Rome strode after universal empire. By the might of arms and the favour of its gods, it annihilated or incorporated within itself the local deities of other nations, and over the ruins of the ancient world prepared the way for the advent of the absolute religion.

It is useless to argue with a thing so airy and intangible as a German philosophy: and it would carry us too far from our purpose to attempt restoring every thing to its true place after all has been thus confusedly whirled topsy-turvy. We shall only allow ourselves to say a few words in reply to the statements more distinctly put forth in the above summary.

With all the Jew's immeasurable superiority above the Greek, he is not one whit behind him, even in the point in which they are here compared. The Greek, instead of having attained to the knowledge of the infinite separation between the divine and the human, and advanced beyond that to some imperfect conception of the reconciliation and union of the two, which was to be effected in the person of Christ, had not yet risen to the conception of a God distinct from, and supreme above, the powers and objects of nature. And when its rising systems of philosophy exposed the fallacies and

absurdities of the popular superstition, the Greek religion staggered to its fall, from its inability to grasp and to present that most elementary of all conceptions of the true God, which Judaism had carried in its bosom from its origin.

Nor was the Jew behind the Roman. Judaism was from the first, and through all its course as unrestricted in its ultimate aims touching the spiritual reign of righteousness, which it was sent to introduce, as Rome was in its unhallowed lust of worldly power. And the frustration of Rome's ambition stands in signal contrast with the accomplished, or at least accomplishing design of the religion of the patriarchs and the prophets, to whose enlargement it is the highest glory of the temporary successes of the imperial city to have been subsidiary.

Nor do these several religions stand in any thing like a coordinate relation to Christianity. This is, and always has announced itself, not the resultant of the various religious forces previously existing in the world, but the legitimate offspring of Judaism alone. Its God is the God of Abraham, its faith the faith of Abraham, its believing adherents the children of Abraham, its inheritance the promises made to Abraham. The Gentiles so far from possessing a religion related to Christianity as was that of the Jews, are declared to have had no hope and to have been without God in the world. And the fact that the gospel found even more adherents from Greeks than Jews, instead of proving the larger antecedent riches of the former, proves rather their deeper destitution and their keener sense of poverty.

Some disciples of the Hegelian school have undertaken to apply the principles of their master to the Old Testament in detail. Vatke in his book, by a singular misnomer called *Biblical Theology*, distinctly announces it to have been his method, first, to determine speculatively what ideas must have unfolded themselves in the history, and in what order—to determine, *e. g.*, what the history ought to say as to the progress of religion, and with this settled beforehand to advance to the exposition. Here his aim is not to verify his theory nor to correct it by the facts, but to correct the facts by it. The strangest perversions are of course the consequence, and that

not in theology alone, but in criticism. These ever mutually corroborate or pervert each other. A correct theology is a staunch friend to a sound criticism. And a false theology is apt to betray its unsoundness by the necessity under which it lies of tampering with the truth of the history or with the genuineness of the record. The extravagancies of Vatke find a fitting refutation in a kindred work from the same school, Bruno Bauer's *Religion of the Old Testament*. This is throughout polemical against Vatke, and is equally baseless and destructive with that which it opposes. They are well illustrated by the chemical phenomenon of two poisons equally malignant, acting as the antidotes of each other.

But we have dwelt long enough in the region of unbelief. It is sufficiently apparent that it is vain to look there for a correct estimate of the religion and the theology of the Old Testament. By an easy, though not a necessary reaction from the error of those who would empty the first half of the Bible of its meaning, believing interpreters have gone to the opposite extreme, which though incomparably less injurious and offensive than the other, is still an extreme, and as such aside from the results of a just exposition, and needing to be corrected.

As was already intimated in the outset, the usual method of theology is to reduce the entire Scriptures to one uniform homogeneous mass, from the whole of which thus blended, the system of truth is drawn. The Old Testament and the New are ranged precisely upon a level, and proof-texts are taken indifferently from one or from the other. No clear distinction is drawn and maintained between their teachings, as to their relative perfection or the clearness of their announcement. Such a distinction is admitted to exist theoretically, and in the general; but practically, and in the details, it is neglected or lost sight of. No adequate conception is gained of the truths of the former economy, as a body, in their relation to the more fully unfolded, or more plainly established truths of the New. The result is, that instead of being gainers, we are really the losers by this method, even in regard to the defence of our Christian theology. Where the germ of a truth lay in the earlier Scriptures, and this meets its legitimate expansion in those that come after, a just and systematic conception of the Old Tes-

tament would lead at once to the detection of that germ, however undeveloped or remote in appearance from the form which it was afterwards to assume; and the argument could be pressed directly and forcibly from that to the unfolded flower and the ripened fruit, while it could be shown, from the system in which it was found, why that truth in particular was in its germinal, rather than in its unfolded state. On the method which overlooks the distinction between the Testaments, and throws all together as a common repertory of theological truth, we would in the case supposed, be obliged, in proving our doctrine, either to force a meaning upon texts which they do not bear, or to admit that the proof is partial and defective, when we might and ought to claim that it is real and complete, all that could be expected or need be desired.

It is to confound the nature of the two dispensations to attempt to bring every thing into the old, with the same fulness and distinctness as in the new. Thus there are plain intimations in the Old Testament, of a trinity of persons in the God-head, and the deity of the Messiah is very largely taught; and yet the attempt to make these fundamental doctrines of Christianity equally prominent in Judaism, must lead to the forcing of texts, and to resting upon insecure arguments. The immortality of the soul was a part of the creed of ancient saints, but there is no need of assuming that they knew all which Christ and his Apostles have taught us. And while, no doubt, Moses and the patriarchs knew far more of religious truth, and of the plan of mercy, than many are disposed to allow, still this does not justify the extravagant lengths to which others have gone in their ideas of the extent of revelation made beyond that which has been left on record; so much so, indeed, that it is hard to see how they would defend themselves against traditionists who claim this very thing in regard to the New Testament. Similar extravagant assumptions have been made with regard to their acquaintance with scientific and all other truth, as though Moses must have known as much about the origin and constitution of the universe as that Being who commissioned him, or as though dishonour were put upon our first father, by supposing him ignorant of steam or of the electric telegraph.

It is an error not to recognize the seeds of New Testament doctrine in the very earliest portions of the Old Testament; but then it is also an error to confound those seeds with the perfect growth which sprang from them. There is, in this, no approach to Manichean or to Gnostic depreciation of the Jewish Scriptures. These emanated from the same divine source with the writings of the Apostles. They are equals of the latter in inspiration; and in their spirit and essence they are of the same universal and perpetual obligation. There was that about them, however, which was temporary. Their revelations of truth, however clear and glorious in themselves, were, as compared with those which have succeeded them, partial and imperfect, designedly so; and it casts no imputation upon the wisdom or the goodness of their divine author that they were so. It is from failing to recognize this, that the types have been made in many hands to teach all the mysteries of the Christian faith; and the prophecies have been found so full and explicit as almost to render the gospels superfluous. A just idea of the relation of the two economies will save us from all temptation to allegorize, to multiply our assumption of double senses to a needless and unprofitable extent, or to employ any of that variety of means and applications which have been adopted to bring out meanings from the text which evidently are not there, to the neglect too often of the meaning no less important and far more obvious in its bearing upon Christian truth which really is there. From these and the like errors on the part of interpreters, it has happened many a time that the arguments drawn from the former dispensation to the present, even where there is abundant room for them to be strongly built, and on independent foundations, are vitiated by a needless and unworthy *petitio principii*.

The little treatise which has suggested this train of remark is not a Theology of the Old Testament, but simply Prolegomena, in which the writer's views are given as to the outline of such a work, and the principles upon which it should be conducted. It is written with not a little ability; but some of the sentiments which it betrays cannot be regarded as unexceptionable, at least by American theologians. Ochler is a strenuous defender of the supernatural character of the Old Testament,

and of its intimate connection with the New. And from occasional glimpses of his sentiments, we are led to infer that upon many important theological questions he would be found to be right. But the development theory which he has adopted, and seems disposed to carry out in the most rigid manner, has vitiated his views of inspiration, and leads him not infrequently to an undue depreciation of the Old Testament. Nevertheless, we shall be pleased to see his promised work, whenever it appears; for whatever its deficiencies or its errors, we hardly think that it can fail to prove a valuable contribution to a much neglected branch of theological literature.

He divides Old Testament theology into three portions, as found respectively in the books of Moses, in the writings of the prophets, including both the prophecies properly so called, and the theocratic history, and in the writings of the sacred poets. The system of religion, as revealed through Moses, lies at the foundation, and includes within itself both the patriarchal and the ante-patriarchal revelations. These being presented in Genesis, under the aspect of a preparation for, or an introduction to, the covenant of God with Israel, belong properly to the Mosaic system itself, as a constituent of its religious faith, as the account which it gives of its own origin.

This Mosaic system was farther enlarged, on the one hand, by the providential leadings of God in the history of his people, and by the inspired communications of the prophets. This falls under the second division. Then the third shows how it was again enlarged on the other hand, by the struggles and questionings which it occasioned in the minds and hearts of holy men, as they strove to fulfil its tasks, to master its principles, and to solve its problems. What he says under this head, looks very much as though he meant to deny any other influence of the Spirit of God in this part of Scripture, than that exerted in the sanctification of the writers. The lyric poetry of the Psalms is the domain of religious feeling, striving to reconcile existing contrarieties between the idea and the outward manifestation, not by pointing to a future realization which is the method of the prophets, but by seeking a realization in their own experience, and by faith already appropriating the blessings of a salvation yet to be achieved. The didactic poetry of other

books is the domain of reflection. In Proverbs, the enigmas and contradictions of the present state are almost lost from sight, in the contemplation of the divine order which has been established and now exists in the world. And the realization of the divine purpose, by an active conformity to the will of God, is presented as at once the duty and the wisdom of man. In the book of Job, these enigmas have forced themselves upon the soul with all their formidable difficulties, and in the struggle after their solution which ensues, anxious questionings are awakened as to the truth of the Old Testament idea of God, or the reality of his providential government. The book, though not without some presentiments of a higher solution, takes refuge at last in the mysteries of the divine wisdom, and then falls back again into the view of the matter from which it had set out as confirmed by the events at their close. In Ecclesiastes there has been the same struggle, and it has been fought through; but the result is not the solution, but despair of it. The highest wisdom is placed in resignation; man is to use the things of this vain world as he best can, committing all to the sovereign pleasure of a sovereign God. A conviction is thus reached, of the insufficiency of the Old Testament stand point, and a negative preparation is thus furnished for the clearer revelations of the New, the positive preparation being given in the writings of the prophets.

In conclusion, we only add, for the information of such of our readers as may feel an interest in the subject, a few words respecting the better class of German works in this department. We pass by all those in silence, which are vitiated by rationalistic sentiments, or even worse. The Lectures on the Theology of the Old Testament, by Steudel, (1840), and those by Hävernick, (1848), both of them posthumous publications, stand on believing and evangelical ground, although allowance must be made in both cases for peculiarities of individual views. The essays by Hengstenberg on the theology of the books of Moses, in his *Authentic des Pentateuchs*, and on the theology of the Psalms, at the close of his Commentary, are among the most valuable contributions to these portions of the general subject.