

The Sunday School Times.

JOHN D. WATTLES,
PUBLISHER.

PHILADELPHIA, JUNE 18, 1887.

{ VOLUME XXIX.
NUMBER 25.

Copyright 1887 by John D. Wattles.

Entered at the Post-office at Philadelphia as "second-class matter."

The regular edition this week is 110,500 copies.

The Sunday School Times will be sent post free for a year to any address in the United States or Canada for \$2.00. It will be sent on trial to any subscriber every week for three months for 50 cents. For sale by newsdealers. Price, five cents.

CONTENTS.

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| EDITORIAL: | |
| Notes.—Trusting God for Results. Matthew's Gospel Story. Critical Notes are from Scholars and for Scholars. Helping Another by Receiving from Him. Industry an Element of Scholarship. Gains Through an Exhibit of Pentateuch Criticism..... | 385 |
| Growth of Interest in the International Lesson Plan..... | 385 |
| NOTES ON OPEN LETTERS: | |
| Luther's Catechism Defended..... | 386 |
| FROM CONTRIBUTORS: | |
| In the Region of Death [poem]. By Leonard Woolsey Bacon..... | 386 |
| The Characteristics of the Gospel According to Matthew. By the Rev. D. S. Gregory, D.D..... | 386 |
| God's Husbandry [poem]. By Alexander R. Thompson, D.D..... | 387 |
| Pentateuch Criticism. By Professor W. Henry Green, D.D., LL.D..... | 387 |
| LESSON HELPS: | |
| Lesson Calendar..... | 389 |
| Quarterly Pre-View..... | 389 |
| [Lesson I. July 3. The Infant Jesus. Matt. 2: 1-12.] | |
| Lesson Text..... | 389 |
| Lesson Plan..... | 389 |
| Lesson Analysis..... | 389 |
| Lesson Bible Reading..... | 389 |
| Lesson Surroundings..... | 389 |
| Critical Notes. By President Timothy Dwight..... | 390 |
| The First-Fruits of the Gentiles. By Alexander McLaren, D.D..... | 391 |
| Teaching Points. By Bishop H. W. Warren, D.D., LL.D..... | 392 |
| Illustrative Applications. By H. Clay Trumbull..... | 392 |
| Teaching Hints. By A. F. Schaeffer, D.D..... | 392 |
| Hints for the Primary Teacher. By Faith Latimer..... | 393 |
| Oriental Lesson-Lights. By Professor Dr. Isaac H. Hall..... | 393 |
| Question Hints. By Miss Anna T. Pearce and Eugene Tappan..... | 393 |
| Questions for the Superintendent. By Benson Van Vliet..... | 394 |
| Blackboard Hints..... | 394 |
| Hints for Lesson-Hymns..... | 394 |
| WORK AND WORKERS: | |
| Convention Calendar for 1887..... | 394 |
| The Fifth International Sunday-school Convention..... | 394 |
| College Students' Bible School..... | 396 |
| WORTH REPEATING: | |
| Living and Dying [poem]..... | 398 |
| Religion in Japan..... | 398 |

Results, as we see results, are of minor importance in the progress of plain duty doing. Our care must be to do that which we ought to do in the light which is ours at the time of our decision. The consequences of our course under such circumstances are a matter for which God alone is responsible. And God can be trusted with the responsibility that is his own.

After six months with the Old Testament, the Bible students of America enter upon six months with the New. It is Matthew's presentation of the Gospel story which is the immediate theme of this New Testament study. The Rev. Dr. D. S. Gregory, whose work on *Why Four Gospels?* is a standard in its sphere, treats of the characteristics of this first phase of the fourfold story, for the benefit of readers of *The Sunday School Times*.

The Critical Notes on the Bible lessons, which are given in these pages week by week, are designed for the aid of clergymen and for other advanced students of the inspired text (who are so important an element in *The Sunday School Times* constituency), rather than for the average Sunday-school teacher. These notes are, as a rule, from the pens of the foremost biblical scholars on either side of the Atlantic. On the recent Old Testament lessons, they have been prepared by Professor Drs. W. Henry Green of Princeton, and Franz Delitzsch of Leipzig, scholars of pre-eminence in their several spheres. And now on the New Testament they are to be given by President

Timothy Dwight, of Yale University, a scholar who certainly has no superior in his sphere among American scholars. The other regular lesson-help writers continue their work through the year; nor will there be any lack of valuable side-light helps to an understanding of the New Testament lessons.

In many a case, it is doing more for a person to receive a gift or a service from him, than to give a gift or to render a service to him. Just because it is more blessed to give than to receive, we have no right to be always taking that blessing to ourselves; but we should permit others to gain their share of it. A child is helped by being privileged to give a gift to his parents, or to render a service to some one whom he loves and honors. A scholar is worth more in a class, through contributing to the stock of its common knowledge; and the class is worth more to him in consequence. Mind and character are developed through their exercise, and are gainers through their outlay; hence, in every sphere of life there is an attainment which is possible only through self-denial and self-expenditure. Our duty toward others involves a looking at their needs in more directions than one; and in order to the meeting of their need of this aid to their highest development of mind and character, we must often permit them to be the givers and doers, when we should really find more personal enjoyment in conferring favors than in receiving them.

It is always the laziest man who shrinks most from any expenditure of time. He who is a hard worker, and who is hard worked, is readiest to take whatever time is necessary for that which he has to do—and he will find the time. This shows itself in little things as in larger. A lazy man finds a few lines quoted as from Tennyson or Whittier in an editorial he is reading. If he is unfamiliar with those lines, and would like to locate them, he is quite likely to write a letter to the editor, asking him to inform him by mail, or through the columns of his paper, in which of the poet's writings those lines are to be found. A busy man, on the other hand,—especially if he have the scholarly instinct,—will, under such circumstances, go through the entire writings of the poet named, line by line, if need be, in order to locate the quotation. And a similar difference will show itself in the lazy man and the busy one in every direction of research or of other activity. A lazy man is too lazy to use his time—even when he wants to use it. A busy man is too busy to neglect the right use of his time—for whatever that time is needed.

During the past six months of Old Testament study, the readers of *The Sunday School Times* have had an opportunity of becoming better acquainted than before with the different views of representative scholars concerning the authorship and composition of the earlier books of the Bible. The opinions of those who hold to a fourfold documentary origin of the Hexateuch have been represented by such scholars as Drs. Delitzsch and Driver and Briggs; while the more conservative view has been presented by Drs. Green and Osgood and Chambers and Schodde and Stevens and others. It can hardly be doubted that there has been a substantial gain to the cause of real truth in this free examination of those extremes of opinion on this subject which now find a place within

the bounds of Christian scholarship. Nor will it be questioned that the emphatic expression of opinion now given by Dr. Green, in his article on Pentateuch Criticism, will have, from tens of thousands of Bible students, more attentive and interested reading than would have been accorded to it in these pages, except for the discussion here carried on. Danger to the cause of truth does not come from the fair consideration of the different views of different Christian scholars. Nor would it be possible to conceal from the Bible students of to-day the fact of these differences of opinion among scholars, even if such a concealment were desirable.

GROWTH OF INTEREST IN THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON PLAN.

Now that the International Lessons are such a power in the world, it is not easy to realize the immense gain that has come to the Sunday-school agency through the introduction of this system of Bible study. Nor is it easy to bear in mind the objections to this system, and the difficulties in the way of its adoption, which presented themselves at the time of its inception, and which have had to be overcome in its progress to the position of world-wide favor which it now enjoys. The sentiment of the Fifth International Sunday-school Convention, as reflected in its reports in these pages, prompts to a fresh consideration of the beginning and growth of interest in the International Lesson plan, and of the difficulties which have encompassed it from the beginning until now.

In the earlier days of the Sunday-school, the memorizing of the Bible text was the principal feature of Sunday-school class study; and there were wondrous feats of memory in that line. But this, in itself, secured no religious teaching; and there were scholars who could recite the words of the entire four Gospels, who lived and died in ignorance of the way of salvation.

It was a decided gain when limited lessons, with an opportunity for the study of their teachings, were generally adopted in the Sunday-school. Then came the era of question-books, which were multiplied as the leaves of the forest. There still were Sunday-schools which continued Bible memorizing, without the use of question-books; but these were in a small minority, and, almost without exception, they restricted their range of Bible study to the New Testament and the Psalms.

Various attempts were made to introduce plans of systematic Bible study, similar to the plan finally adopted in the International series; but these were successful only within a limited field, and they rather illustrated what was desirable, than supplied what was really needed. And this was the state of things when the International Lesson plan of Bible study was fairly inaugurated.

At the start, not a single denomination of Christians was, as such, in favor of the International Lesson plan. Wellnigh every great religious publishing house was opposed to it; nor could any one of those houses adopt it without rendering useless valuable plates and copyrights of series of question-books. In some cases, the opposition to the new plan, from this source, was outspoken and prolonged. On all sides there was more or less of reluctance to accept the new system in all its essential features. It secured its posi-

humanity or the whole Gentile world. John's Gospel was for the Christian,—the man of faith in Jesus as the Son of God, and devoted to his service. These three Gospels were fashioned and colored by these facts of origin and aim, which furnish the key to their correct understanding, as well as to the understanding of the differences between them and Matthew's Gospel.

The origin and aim of the first Gospel we learn from the testimony of Papias, Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, Gregory of Nazianzen, and other writers of the early Church. The main facts are, that Matthew the apostle wrote the Gospel in Judea, for his Jewish fellow-countrymen, when he was about to leave them for the wider extension of his apostolic mission; that it was substantially the embodiment of the oral gospel which he had preached to them; that it took advantage of their messianic beliefs and expectations to commend to them Jesus of Nazareth as the promised Messiah; that it was written for the saving of the children of Abraham. Its Jewish origin and aim open the way to the right understanding of the first Gospel.

Certain characteristics distinguish the Jews from the other great historic races of the ancient world. They were the chosen people of God. They had the world-religion, the only written revelation of the true God. They had the only divinely ordained forms of religious worship. To them had been given the promise of the Messiah. When Jesus of Nazareth appeared, they were in hourly expectation of the advent of the Messiah. In presenting the Gospel to this race, Matthew's one subject, always and everywhere, is Jesus is the Messiah. Hence the peculiar characteristics of his Gospel.

Preaching, and not History or Biography.—The first Gospel must be studied with its practical aim in view. That aim having been to convert the Jew to the belief in Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah, the attempt to find in the Gospel a chronological record of events in the life of Jesus is most misleading. The facts and events, the plain teaching and parables, the ordinary incidents and the miracles, are grouped for the unfolding and enforcing of the argument, but with only accidental or incidental reference to the order of time.

Systematic Form.—The First Gospel is one of the most wonderfully systematic books ever written. The business training of Matthew as a tax-gatherer peculiarly fitted him to give his material this systematic shape. It was demanded by the Jew, whose system of law and ritual trained him to careful habits of thought. Moreover, the prejudiced mind of the Jew made it necessary that the Gospel should be put into such form that it could not fail to be understood and remembered. Matthew's arrangement was such as to fix itself most easily and permanently in the Jewish memory. Indeed, the Jew who once took its truths and facts into his mind, could not well get them out again; for it connected the name and career of Jesus of Nazareth indissolubly with all the religious knowledge and hopes of the descendant of Abraham, and with all the glories of his own past national history. It could not but leave Matthew's theme, "Jesus is the Messiah," ringing continually in the mind of even the Jewish rejecter of Jesus.

The Royal Son of David.—Matthew seizes upon the regal idea as the one uppermost in the mind of the race, and constantly takes advantage of it to open the way for the favorable presentation of Jesus to the Jews. Its opening genealogy is that of Jesus, the Messiah, the Son of David (Matt. 1: 1); not the son of Adam, as with Luke. The magi inquire, "Where is he that is born King of the Jews?" (2: 1). John the Baptist announces him as the founder of the kingdom of heaven (3: 2); and Jesus himself begins and continues with the proclamation of that kingdom (4: 17; 5: 3; etc.). Jesus is Messiah the King throughout the Gospel.

Constant Appeal to Old Testament Scriptures.—This Gospel cannot be understood except as an argument drawn from the Old Testament for the Messiahship of Jesus. Mark has perhaps less than a score of references to the Old Testament, Luke has about thirty references and allusions to it, and John has twenty or more; but with these evangelists the argument does not turn upon, or depend at all upon, the authority of the Scriptures or the fulfillment of prophecy. Matthew, on the other hand, rests his Gospel entirely on the basis of Old Testament revelation. He presents one continued comparison of Jesus of Nazareth and the Messiah of the Prophets. Much of his Gospel is a direct appeal to the authority of the Scriptures; and all the rest is a tacit appeal to that authority, and cannot otherwise be understood.

The Messianic Plan.—The first Gospel opens with an introduction giving the messianic origin of Jesus and his official preparation for the work and induction into the office of the Messiah (Matt. 1 to 4: 11). Part first presents

the public proclamation, by Jesus as Messiah, of the coming kingdom of heaven,—first by himself alone (4: 12; 9: 35), and later as associated with the twelve apostles (9: 36; 16: 12). Part second exhibits his public claim to be the Messiah,—first, as made and confirmed to the twelve, while correcting their false Jewish views of his priestly character and kingdom (16: 13; 20: 28); and then to the people at large at Jerusalem, the city of the great King (20: 29; 23: 39). Part third sets forth his sufferings and death as the Messiah,—first repeatedly announced as being at hand, in preparing the twelve for his sacrificial death (24: 1; 25: 46); and then prepared for, and endured as, a ransom for many (26: 1; 27: 66). The conclusion exhibits the facts and proofs of the resurrection of Jesus as Messiah from the dead, and his assumption of the royal messianic prerogatives (28).

Omissions for the Jews.—Matthew omits all explanations of what the Jew was familiar with,—such as that which Mark gives (for the Roman reader) of the religious ablutions of the Jew (Mark 7: 2-5); as those of Jewish topography, which Luke gives (for the Greek Gentile reader), of the village of Emmaus (Luke 24: 13); as those which John gives (for Christian readers over the world) of the Jewish facts, as of the enmity of the Jews and Samaritans (John 4: 4). He also leaves out the vivid details and scenic representations by which Mark fits his Gospel to reach and save the Roman, the man of vigorous and restless activity; the eminently human features, the ministry of Jesus to the Gentiles in Perea (Luke 9: 51; 18: 30), and those universal aspects and relations of the work and teachings of our Lord by which Luke sought to reach and save the Greek, the representative of universal humility; and the ministry to the true Israel and those pre-eminently spiritual discourses which constitute the greater part of the fourth Gospel, by which John sought to edify the Christian, the man already joined to Christ by a living faith. With Matthew the Gospel is first a Gospel for the Jews, and then for all mankind.

Additions for the Jews.—If Matthew's Gospel be regarded as made up of one hundred parts, fifty-eight of these are common to this with the other Gospels, and forty-two are peculiar to Matthew. These forty-two parts all have special reference to the needs of the Jews. The origin of Jesus as Messiah is peculiar to Matthew. The genealogy shows Jesus to be the son and heir of David (Matt. 1: 1-17). His Divine origin and human birth are according to Jewish prophecy (1: 18-25). The proof that, though apparently coming out of Nazareth, he was born in Bethlehem (2), is given for the Jew, to correct a prevalent error which must have led to the rejection of Jesus. The Sermon on the Mount is peculiarly directed to the Jew (5 to 7). The original sending out of the twelve was to the Jews (10). The Jewish reference is marked in the upbraiding of the cities of Galilee (11: 20-30); in the answer to the scribes and Pharisees who demanded a sign (12: 38-45); in the Divine compassion for the lost, and the law of church censure and forgiveness (18: 10-35); in the judgment of the scribes and Pharisees of Jerusalem (23: 1-39); and in the description of the day of judgment (25). Matthew emphasizes the fact that Jesus made the change from plain teaching to parabolic because of the blindness and obduracy of the Jews (13: 10-16), and the parables of the long list in the latter half of his Gospel are specially condemnatory of the Jews,—as that of the unmerciful servant (18), of the laborers in the vineyard (20), of the ten virgins (25), and of the talents (25). The great groups of events and teachings all have the same marked reference to the Jews,—the three series of miracles (8: 1 to 9: 35), the parables of the kingdom of heaven (13: 1-53), the progressive stages of Jewish doubt and opposition (11: 2 to 12: 50), the series of rejections (12: 54 to 16: 12), the series of conflicts (21: 18 to 23: 39). The forty-two parts peculiar to Matthew thus bear the plainest marks of his Jewish aim, and cannot be understood without keeping this in view.

Incidental Variations for the Jew.—Matthew's Jewish aim shows itself everywhere by his incidental variations from the other Gospels. For example, all the Gospels record or refer to the mission of John the Baptist. In Mark, the work of the Baptist is introduced to exhibit by contrast the mightier power of the Son of God, who comes to set up the kingdom of God; in Luke, to bring forward Jesus as the one perfect Man, placing himself on a level with all mankind by coming to be baptized "when all the people were baptized;" in John, to witness to Jesus as the divine, only-begotten Son of God, the Lamb of God sacrificed to take away the sin of the world, the life and light of men; but in Matthew alone, the Baptist heralds Jesus as the Messiah of the Jews, coming in fulfillment of the Law and the Prophets, and about to

set up the messianic kingdom. Did space permit, this same feature could be traced through the narratives of the fifty-eight parts common to Matthew with the other Gospels, and would be found accompanied by abounding word-changes and many other peculiarities.

The key to the first Gospel is its Jewish origin and aim. *Morgan, Minnesota.*

GOD'S HUSBANDRY.

BY ALEXANDER R. THOMPSON, D.D.

O thou sent forth of God the truth to sow,
Who wariest with watching, waiting long
For that which comes not! wilt thou never know
The jocund music of the reaper's song?
A moment pause, and hear me patiently;
Like him who spake in parables, I speak to thee.

I asked a husbandman: Did God set thee
To make the ground, that lies beneath thy feet?
When time had branched out from eternity,
Didst thou in motion set the forces meet
For such a work,—flood, flame, and glacial cold,
To melt and grind the rock to fertile mold?
Or did he bid thee make the tiny seed,—
Its outer coat of mail, its compact store
Of sustenance against its time of need,
And deep within, behind its double door,
The vital germ, that would need none to show
To it the way to live, to spring, to grow?

Or did he wait for thee to call the sun
To take his place in yonder azure heaven,
And pour life from his depths of life upon
The eager earth each day, from morn till even?
Art thou the father of the rain? Dost know
The loom that weaves the fabric of the snow?

Or doth the Maker of the earth, the rain,
The sun, the seed, only depend on thee
To sow his seed upon his spring-tide plain,
Which he made rich in its fertility,
And then to leave it, till, beneath his care,
It grow and ripen in a harvest fair?

Toiler for God, know by my parable
What of thy love his bounteous love doth ask:
No more, no less, than thou canst do full well,
And, doing, share with God the pleasant task.
God's seed sow in God's ground, and leave it there;
Not thine, but his, it is to make it spring and bear.

PENTATEUCH CRITICISM.

BY PROFESSOR W. HENRY GREEN, D.D., LL.D.

For the last six months, the International Sunday-school lessons have been drawn from the books of Genesis and Exodus. And, as is quite natural, in the discussion of these lessons, and in the various helps prepared with reference to them, the critical questions which are now agitated respecting the Pentateuch have received more or less attention from time to time. A few general remarks upon the subject of Pentateuch criticism may therefore not be out of place.

The leading European critics are practically unanimous in their conclusions as to the constitution of the Pentateuch. They claim that it is not the production of a single author, but is of composite origin, and has been compiled from four different documents. These are respectively denominated E (the Elohist), J (the Jahvist), P (the Priest Code), and D (the Deuteronomist); which were finally combined and pieced together in their present form by R (the Redactor). Upon one point of no small importance, the relative age of P and D, the critics divide into two hostile camps, under the leadership respectively of Wellhausen and Kuenen on the one hand, and of Dillmann, their most learned and strenuous antagonist, on the other.

In their analysis of the Hexateuch, under which name they include the Book of Joshua along with the five books of Moses, these two parties in the main agree. Though differing in many minor details, the lines of partition which they adopt are, on the whole, substantially the same. The same portions are, to a very considerable extent, assigned to these documents severally, and the same peculiarities of style and general characteristics are attributed to them.

They are further agreed that Deuteronomy was not, and could not have been, written by Moses, nor at any time near the Mosaic age. It first saw the light in the reign of Josiah, when the book of the law is said (2 Kings 22: 8) to have been found in the temple, and to have so impressed the youthful king that he at once instituted a reformation in compliance with its requirements. This book was Deuteronomy; and it is an accepted critical tenet that it was prepared at that time, or shortly before, with a view to those reforms which were then accomplished by it.

Both schools of critics unite again in affirming that the

oldest of the Pentateuchal documents are E and J; and, while they wrangle over some subordinate points as to the mutual relation and literary history of these documents, they nevertheless assign them to very nearly the same period. Kuenen puts J about 800 B. C.; Dillmann some fifty years later. Kuenen refers E to about 750 B. C.; Dillmann thinks that it may have been written a hundred years before this time.

If minor diversities be disregarded, the chief controversy between the critics concerns the time when the Priest Code, or Levitical law, was prepared. The question among them is not whether it was drawn up by Moses; this they all alike deny. Nor is it whether some portions of it may possibly be as old as the time of Moses; this Wellhausen himself admits. But it is whether the Levitical law, as a whole, belongs to 800 B. C., as Dillmann maintains, or was prepared after the Babylonish exile, and first announced to the people by Ezra, as Wellhausen and Kuenen assert.

It may seem startling that such conclusions should be reached by the most eminent professors in European universities; but it may afford some relief to remember that in those institutions learning is notoriously dissociated from evangelical faith, and bias against the supernatural has largely contributed to building up the divisive hypothesis in every one of its successive phases. If, however, general critical consent is to be made a criterion of truth, and the concurrence of distinguished foreign scholars is to be urged as decisive, this is the result to which it will lead. The account of Moses, and of the events of the Mosaic age given in the Pentateuch, will be conceived to rest upon four distinct documents, the two oldest of which were first committed to writing six or seven centuries after the events which they record, the third more than eight centuries, and the only question is whether the fourth was six hundred and fifty or a thousand years after the time of Moses. Of the transactions of that most eventful period, including the Divine interpositions and Divine revelations upon which the religion of the Old Testament was based, which is, in its turn, the foundation of the New Testament, we know absolutely nothing, and have no means of knowing anything, but traditions which were circulating from six to ten centuries afterwards. It is as if there were no written history of the Crusades, or of the reign of Charlemagne, and the attempt were now made to construct a history out of tales found floating among the people. What would be thought of the credibility of the Gospels, if they were not written for six or ten centuries after Christ?

But why not accept the analysis of the documents, and refer them to the Mosaic age? Or, if the Book of Joshua must be included, and the Hexateuch allowed to be one continuous work, why not refer them to the age immediately succeeding that of Moses? If all was written by eye-witnesses and participants, would this make a sufficient voucher for the truth of the narratives, and the credibility be the same as though penned by the great law-giver himself? Yes, if— But that is just the trouble. Give up the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy, expressly affirmed (Deut. 31: 9, 24), and of the Book of the Covenant (Exod. 24: 3-7), and of its renewal (Exod. 34: 10-27), and of the entire Levitical law, which, in all its details, "the Lord spake unto Moses" (Exod. 25: 1, etc.; Lev. 26: 46; Num. 36: 13), and which is further vouched for by the unanimous voice of Old Testament tradition and by the express and often repeated authority of our Lord and his apostles, and admit that laws thus explicitly declared to have been given to Moses or recorded by him, though bearing the clearest internal marks of their origin in the wilderness, were, either in whole or in part, not really his, but were the product of a later age, and only ascribed to him by a legal fiction, and you have lost all firm footing, and must thenceforth flounder through the centuries seeking a resting-place and finding none.

This has been the history of all such attempts at compromise hitherto. And it is inevitable; for if it be conceded that the arguments of the critics are valid against the Mosaic origin of the legislation as it now lies in the Pentateuch, they will carry it down for centuries without the possibility of halting. If different strata are to be distinguished in the legislation, and the growth of institutions through successive stages are traceable there, long periods are of necessity demanded for such a process. And if the methods which the critics employ in effecting their analysis are admissible, they not only result in establishing the existence of separate documents, but these documents must by virtue of the very grounds on which they rest be long post-Mosaic, as the critics with one voice insist.

When the venerable and excellent Dr. Delitzsch, who is alike eminent for his profound learning and his simple-hearted piety, first accepted the divisive hypothesis, it

was with the distinct proviso that the documents should be referred to Eleazar and to Joshua, or to men of like stamp among their coevals. Dr. Kurtz, after defending the unity of Genesis with remarkable ability and success, in an evil hour surrendered his impregnable position with a similar understanding, fancying that a secure shelter could be found behind the breakwater which Dr. Delitzsch had constructed. But these barriers have been swept away, and there has been no resource but to let traditional opinions go, and save whatever could be rescued from the rushing flood. It has been the same in Great Britain. The devout and evangelical spirit of Dr. Robertson Smith has not kept him from making the most perilous concessions, and from following his critical leaders to most remarkable lengths. And Dr. T. K. Cheyne, Professor of Interpretation at Oxford, in his very moderate and conciliatory paper read before the Church Congress, and repeated in his recent book, "Job and Solomon" (p. 5), states it as an established result of recent criticism, that the original documents of the Pentateuch date from various periods, mostly long subsequent to the time of Moses, and that at least three different sections and as many different conceptions of Israel's religious development must be recognized within the Pentateuch.

But may not the documents, which are the sources of the Pentateuch, belong to as late a period as the critics claim, and yet its truth be guaranteed by the inspiration of the documents and of the redactor, just as the history of Abraham and of Noah is on the traditional view accredited by the inspiration of Moses? The idea is altogether delusive. The critical processes, by which the documents are made out, assume as the basis of procedure that they are inconsistent with each other and mutually contradictory, and of course to that extent untrustworthy; and this not in incidental and trivial matters merely, but in those of the greatest consequence. It is further assumed that what appears upon the surface of the Pentateuch, as we possess it, to be a continuous and consistent narrative, is only made to appear so by the artifice of the redactor. Upon the application of the critical analysis, such narratives repeatedly fall apart into divergent accounts of the same affair, which, though quite irreconcilable, the redactor has sought to harmonize, or has converted them into separate transactions. Or they resolve themselves into independent accounts of quite distinct matters, which the redactor has misunderstood, and, thinking them to be identical, has blended them together.

Wherever it is possible to give a different interpretation to a passage or paragraph by isolating it from its context, it is assumed that the redactor has put a wrong meaning upon it by placing it in another than in its imagined original connection. Whatever stands in the way of the supposititious sense thus obtruded upon a passage is pared away as an insertion by the redactor, or is regarded as evidence of its having been freely manipulated by him. He has eliminated portions of the documents which, according to the critics, were essential to their correct understanding. He has added to them what is positively misleading. The difficulty of disentangling the documents blended in the Pentateuch and restoring them to their primitive condition is thus vastly increased by the mutilation and the modification which they have undergone at the redactor's hands as well as at the hands of others. They are neither complete, nor do they in a multitude of passages preserve their true original form in those portions which the redactor has spared.

The real truth in regard to the transactions recorded in the Pentateuch is not, the critics tell us, that which is yielded by the narrative as it now stands. The work of the redactor must first be undone. His spurious additions must be removed, what he has altered must be restored to its original form, what he has dislocated must be transferred to its true position, what he has woven together must be separated into its original constituents. When this shall all be done, and correctly done, it will put us in possession of what yet remains of the Pentateuchal documents as they lay before the redactor. These severally represent the various conflicting traditions, which were in circulation six centuries and more after the time of Moses; and from these we must do our best by comparison and conjecture to approximate the actual facts. This, without a particle of exaggeration, is the exact process pursued in the most elaborate and painstaking manner, not merely by critics devoid of all reverence, such as Wellhausen and Kuenen, but by such a reverential and conscientious scholar as Dr. Dillmann. And only that moderate residuum, which fails to be volatilized in such a critical crucible as this, is admitted by him to belong to the undoubted constituents of the Mosaic age.

To speak of inspired documents and an inspired re-

ductor in such a condition of things is to use words in an unusual and unnatural sense. By inspiration in such a connection must be intended something very different from that which this term is ordinarily understood to denote. It carries with it no implication of an infallible and trustworthy record. It is an inspiration that is compatible with legends and myths, with mistakes and contradictions, and with altogether unreliable materials. According to Dr. Cheyne, there are portions of the Old Testament whose strictly historical character cannot be and need not be maintained. And when this comes to be recognized, "our idea of inspiration will become broader, deeper, and more true to facts." That is, as I understand him, the accepted doctrine of the inspiration of Scripture must be revolutionized to conform with the tenets of an advanced criticism. The same distinguished authority adds still further: "We shall have to consider our future attitude to the Kenotic view of the person of Christ." I interpret this to mean that if Christ recognized the Law as Mosaic, when the higher criticism assures us that it was not so, our conception of his human personality must be lowered in consequence.

But why not admit the critical analysis, and refuse to accept the destructive consequences which the critics deduce from it? Will not their assault be repelled in the most effectual way by conceding the existence of the documents which they profess to discover, and showing that this concession is not prejudicial to the claims of the Pentateuch as a part of the inspired Word of God? Whoever is convinced by the arguments of the critics of the actual existence of the Pentateuchal documents, and still holds fast his faith in the Divine origin of the Scriptures, must reconcile these things in one or other of two ways. He may lower his idea of inspiration to the level of what seems to him to be the critical requirement; or he may limit his concessions to the critics to what a just view of the historic truth and the inspiration of the Scriptures will permit. The former has been the universal method with transatlantic critics, so far as I have any knowledge. They give up the historic accuracy of the Pentateuch, but insist that, in so doing, they do not deny or impair its inspiration; they only gain new and deeper views of what is meant by inspiration.

If, however, any one should attempt the reverse method, and do it in good faith, there is a broad field open before him, in which he may render valuable service; and I would be disposed to bid him God-speed. He would be hampered at the outset by the fact that the current analysis of the Pentateuch was wrought out by critics, whose prepossessions were adverse to its truthfulness and to the supernatural character of the events which it records and the revelations which it contains, and that this analysis was very largely shaped by those prepossessions. It therefore naturally conducts those who adopt it to conclusions akin to the principles from which it emanated. An analysis of the Pentateuch framed on the basis of its literary phenomena is in itself quite harmless, provided it leaves all its parts intact, and does not obtrude upon them another than their genuine meaning, but simply rearranges them in a different grouping. The destructive effect of the analysis arises altogether from arbitrary assumptions of what is unknown.

By the hypothesis, the Pentateuch in its present form is the work of a redactor (or series of redactors) who combined as he judged fit the documents which he had before him. The assumption of the critics that he misunderstood his sources, and put them together in a manner which obscures or perverts their original meaning, and that this meaning is to be recovered by altered connections, or the supposition of particular omissions, is gratuitous and inadmissible. There is no just ground for impugning either the capacity or the honesty of the redactor, supposing that such a person ever existed. As he possessed the documents in their separate state and in their original completeness, he was far more competent to judge of their meaning than the modern critic can possibly be. And if all parts of these documents which have been preserved to us properly bear that meaning which they have in the connection in which the redactor has placed them, the great body of the inconsistencies which the critics profess to have detected will vanish into thin air; all necessity for assigning the documents to post-Mosaic periods will cease; the institutions of the Pentateuch will be clearly Mosaic, and not the growth of ages; and the difficulties that remain will simply be those which scholars have long since recognized, and for which adequate answers have been abundantly provided. If this principle of interpretation, which is the obvious dictate of common sense, be permitted to prevail, the motto of the critics, "Divide and Conquer," will be no longer applicable.

Princeton Theological Seminary.