

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 22—April, 1895.

I.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE EXPERIMENTAL METHOD.

IN a scientific age like ours, something will be gained if we can show that Christianity is amenable to the Experimental Method. This method has very largely made the modern world. It received its great exposition and impulse from Lord Bacon, and is sometimes called the Baconian method. It consists of three stages: first, the collection of all the facts procurable upon the subject in hand; secondly, the casting about for some happy hypothesis to explain the facts; and, thirdly, the verification of the hypothesis by experience or experiment.

Now it so happens that Christianity may be made amenable to this method; and, that there may be no mistake about this being the Founder's intention, let us look at one declaration He made in the days of His flesh. His enemies had, strange to say, argued themselves into the idea that He deserved to be killed because He had made a man every whit whole on the Sabbath day (John vii. 23). They illustrated in doing so the fact that, if we only set ourselves to it, we can argue ourselves into anything. The history of human thought shows that there is nothing too absurd, nothing even too diabolical, to be reached by argument. But Jesus has a better method to suggest than this one of everlasting discussion; and it is contained in the words, "If any man will [*willeth to*—Revised Version] do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself" (John vii. 17). He does not say, "If any man will *discuss* God's will in all its length and breadth, he shall know of the doctrine;" but if he will *do* it, he shall reach

ble. Prof. McCurdy favors the view that the Hyksos kings were of Semitic race, notwithstanding the monumental physiognomy to the contrary. Ramses II is the Pharaoh "who knew not Joseph," and who began the oppression not only of the Hebrews but also of other Semitic peoples who had come in various emigrations from Palestine to Egypt. The Pharaoh of the Exodus was not Merneptah, the immediate successor of Ramses II, but was Ramses III, making the Exodus about 1200 B.C. The forty-years wandering in the neighborhood of Kadesh Barnea is regarded as historically true.

The providential preparation of Palestine for the successful invasion thereof by the children of Israel is clearly shown, but the victory of Israel seems to be attributed rather to the debility of their opponents than to the arm of Him who cast down the walls of Jericho.

On the Hittite problem, after discounting some of the extravagances of other writers, Prof. McCurdy has little to offer which may not be found in Sayce and Wright. He has no key for the Hittite inscriptions, but is hopeful of the general line taken by Jensen.

It would be difficult to say what portion of this book does most credit to its author. Such commonplaces as the Tell-el-amarna inscriptions, the Moabite Stone or the Black Obelisk are made to tell their story with a pleasing freshness. Taken as a history, the book is good throughout, and it will be welcomed as a substantial addition to this department of literature. We join with the author in hoping that the concluding volume will not be long delayed.

Lincoln University, Pa.

W. D. KERSWILL.

DIE FESTE DER HEBRÄER in ihrer Beziehung auf die modernen kritischen Hypothesen über den Pentateuch. Von WILLIAM HENRY GREEN, Dr. theol., Professor an der Universität zu Princeton, N. J. Aus dem Englischen übersetzt von OTTO BECHER, Pastor an der deutschen evang. Kirche zu Elmira, N. Y. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1894. 8vo, pp. vii, 304.

There is a general impression abroad that German scholars are so wedded to the conclusions of the school of radical criticism at present dominant in Germany, that no voices are raised among them in advocacy of a soberer view. This impression is thoroughly justified if we have in mind the academic circles alone; and one may read the works of the critics themselves with all diligence and remain practically unaware that any opposition whatever is made to their conclusions from any worthy quarter. As Dr. A. Zahn truly says in his tract entitled *Was lehrt man gegenwärtig auf der Universität Halle-Wittenberg über das Alte Testament* (p. 30), it appears to be the settled custom of the writers of the radical party to treat with a studied contempt all that Hengstenberg and his school did in the last generation, as well as all that is at present being done, in an apologetic interest. Nevertheless, Dr. Zahn is able to give us a short list of German works, not altogether despicable, which in one way or another represent a living opposition on German soil to the radical conclusions, concerning the origin and composition of the Old Testament, which are now being pressed upon the world as settled facts of science. This includes Böhl's *Zum Gesetz und Zeugnis*, 1883; Roos' *Die Geschichtlichkeit des Pentateuch*, 1883; Bredenkamp's *Gesetz und Propheten*, 1881; Köhler's *Lehrbuch der biblischen Geschichte des Alten Testaments*, 1875-1893; Klostermann's *Der Pentateuch*, 1893; Bender's *Vorträge über die Offenbarung auf alttestamentlichem Boden*, 1891; Billeb's *Die wichtigsten Sätze der neuzeitlichen alttestamentlichen Kritik vom Standpunkt der Propheten Amos und Hosea aus betrachtet*, 1893; Rup-

precht's *Die Anschauungen der kritischen Schule Wellhausens vom Pentateuch*, 1893; Rupprecht's *Der Pseudodaniel und Pseudjesaias der modernen Kritik*, 1894; Zahn's *Das Deuteronomium*, 1890; Zahn's *Ernste Blicke in den Wahn der modernen Kritik des Alten Testaments*, 1892.* To these are to be added certain later publications, such as Rupprecht's *Das Räthsel des Fünfbuches Mose und seine falsche Lösung*, and the new part of Zahn's *Ernste Blicke*, noticed elsewhere in this number of the REVIEW by Dr. W. H. Green. These are not despicable books, we say; but what a meagre array to set over against the immense host of extended and thoroughly wrought treatises which have poured of late years from the German press in advocacy of the methods and conclusions of the radical criticism! It is another case of a stripling David in his unarmored nakedness, with but his homely sling and five smooth stones from the brook in his hand, set over against a ponderous Goliath in all the panoply of scientific war. Surely Pastor Becher was right in supposing there to exist something like an urgent need for placing by the side of Böhl's and Zahn's treatises, the lectures of Dr. Green on the *Hebrew Feasts*; in order that students of the Bible in Germany may know that outside of Germany also there still remain those who are able to withstand the tyranny of fashion in Biblical criticism, and to bring the conclusions which are now so widely acquiesced in to the test of the law and the testimony. Pastor Becher has done the work of translation well, his German readers themselves being judges, and has conferred a boon on sound scholarship in Germany by placing in the reach of all this thorough study of one portion of the Hebrew legislation.

Pastor Becher's praiseworthy object was to bring the *Hebrew Feasts* to the notice of German-speaking students of the Bible. This object can scarcely fail of accomplishment. The book has been issued in excellent form from the well-known publishing house of C. Bertelsmann, and is being heartily recommended to German readers by the local journals which have access to the pastoral circles. In America, we find it cordially recommended to their constituencies by *Der Presbyterianer* (Aug. 18, 1894), of Dubuque, and equally by *Der Christliche Apologete* (Oct. 18), of Cincinnati. In Germany, strongly commendatory notices appear in such journals as the Karlsruhe *Badische Landpost* (July 14), and the Leipzig *Christlicher Bücherschatz* (Nov.). A hearty greeting has been given it by the excellent *Evangelisch-Reformirte Blätter*, published at Prag, and edited by Pastor J. G. A. Szalatnay, of Kuttelberg, who "greet the translation with glad thankfulness." The reviewers in Luthardt's *Theologisches Literaturblatt* (for Dec. 7, under the signature of A. K.) and in Pastor Eger's *Theologischer Literatur-Bericht* (Oct., p. 218, by Prof. Dr. Oettli) are careful to commit themselves to nothing, while yet extending a welcome to the book and showing appreciation of its force and value. The former recognizes the wisdom of Dr. Green's choice of the feasts of Israel as a subject in which the validity of the critical theories may be fairly tested, and the skill and success with which he deals with his material. He feels that even those who do not share Dr. Green's point of view must still, after his treatment of the subject, be impressed with the premature character of the critical conclusions, and must be convinced that the bases of the prevalent view are laid in a region still in dispute. "In these circumstances," he remarks, "it will be wholesome for the real advance of science, for the disciples of this school to go back—as will be rendered possible by this volume—before the time when the present mode of working was begun, and test afresh whether the founda-

* Notices of these may be found in this REVIEW as follows: Zahn's *Deuteronomium*, ii, 328; Köhler's *Lehrbuch*, ii, 150; Rupprecht's *Wellhausen*, iv, 482, and v, 309; Klostermann, ii, 318, and v, 261; Bender's *Vorträge*, v, 137; Zahn's *Ernste Blicke*, v, 129, 310.

tion is solid and the task has been commenced with the requisite care." Prof. Oettli shares in both of these impressions: he counts it a happy thought to test the Grafian hypothesis in its application to the feasts, and warns the advocates of the opposite view not to shove aside Dr. Green's treatment as antiquated apologetics. But for himself, he feels that the proverb is applicable, *Qui nimium probat, nihil probat*; and he charges Dr. Green with "passing too lightly over the gradual concentration of the places of worship which is given in the strata of the legislation and the periods of history, over the linguistic peculiarities of the documents, and over the repetitions and inequalities in the presentation." On the whole, Dr. Green reminds him very strongly of Hengstenberg: he finds in him "the same thorough knowledge of the problems in discussion and of their history, the same acuteness deterred by no difficulty, the same genuine interest in the truth of the divine revelation, but also the same acrobat-like leaping of every gulf and chasm which divides the investigator from the fixed goal which from the first he had sought."

What is unpleasant in this comparison with Hengstenberg, a genial notice in the *Beweis des Glaubens* (Sept., 1894, p. 363), presumably from the pen of the veteran Dr. Zöckler, fully sets aside. Dr. Zöckler thinks Dr. Green deserves the name of Hengstenberg, but "not in the bad, but in the good sense: *i. e.*, it is the better qualities of Hengstenberg, his acuteness and solid learning, not his occasional advocate-like methods and sophistical pleas," which Dr. Green shows himself endowed with, as he takes the field against the destructive efforts of recent criticism. Dr. Zöckler regrets that the book does not cover the whole ground of Pentateuchal criticism, and that it is ten years old and therefore not quite up to date, in so far as it does not deal with the minutiae of the most recent critical assaults; but he adds: "Nevertheless, even as it stands, it witnesses to thorough knowledge of its subject and noticeable acumen, and presents much that is instructive and that deserves to be recommended to the friends of profound and thorough study of the Scriptures." In a later notice (*Beweis des Glaubens*, Jan., 1895, p. 37) the same writer pronounces the book "a fragmentary indeed, but on manifold sides an instructive and thankworthy contribution to the criticism of the argumentation of the opposing school;" and closes this notice by expressing the wish that some one acquainted with Dr. Green's critical writings as a whole would translate into German a full *précis* of his treatment of the outstanding questions at issue—remarking: "a *lacuna* in our theological literature would thus be filled." We fully agree with Dr. Zöckler, and heartily wish some one would give the Germans one volume at least of Dr. Green's critical essays. It might be the beginning of better things in the treatment of the problems of Old Testament criticism in that land of scholarship.

Even such a radical as C. Siegfried (*Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 2 February, 1895), though writing of the book in a half-satirical vein, is constrained fully to recognize the thoroughness of Dr. Green's equipment for the task he undertook and of his accomplishment of it, as well as the propriety of his tone in the discussion. He can find little to complain of indeed, except that Stade is neglected as well as certain obscure English writers mentioned by Cheyne in his *Founders of Criticism* (without stopping to consider that Stade's book appeared only subsequently to Dr. Green's Lectures!); and that Dr. Green seems to be content to meet the assault of the critics "blow for blow" without adding a constructive view of the history of the Israelitish feasts and their laws which will commend itself to the historical consciousness. But he allows that this foreign author "is extraordinarily well-versed and well-read in the history of German Pentateuchal criticism, and in the writings of the critics," and follows them indeed almost too thoroughly into the details of

their assertions and arguments. "One dare utter only a single word," exclaims Siegfried, "and straightway he is brayed in the mortar." Of course Siegfried is not converted. But it is possible that he may have learned that there is yet something noteworthy to say in defense of the account which the Bible gives of the ordinances of Israel, and that there yet exist some who can and will say it. And the saying it is half the battle. The truth of what is said will do the rest.

Princeton.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

HANDKOMMENTAR ZUM ALTEN TESTAMENT. In Verbindung mit anderen Fachgelehrten herausgegeben von D. W. NOWACK. III. Abtheilung. Die Prophetischen Bücher. 3. Band. 2. Theil: Das BUCH DANIEL übersetzt und erklärt von GEORG BEHRMANN, Senior d. Ministeriums, Hauptpastor zu St. Michaelis, Hamburg. Göttingen, 1894. 8vo, pp. 84.

This commentary is based on the conjectural Higher Criticism. The supernatural is completely ignored in the production of Daniel's book. The author aims to explain all the facts and phenomena of it on purely naturalistic principles. Behrmann holds that Daniel contains no prophecy, but is of the nature of an apocalypse; and by apocalypse we are to understand the brilliant picturing of the near future from the trying experiences of the past and present, as a ground of comforting hope (xi). True, Christ calls Daniel a prophet, but the New Testament uses the word prophet in so loose a sense that it can have no influence on our judgment in the matter (xi). More exactly, Daniel is a visionary. The book of Daniel was produced during the Maccabean period in the inner circle of a Jewish party called the Asidees (*Ἀσιδαῖοι*), and this gives it its specific character (xxv). Its purpose was not to give inspiration to the Maccabean uprising, since it took a position of hostile criticism to that movement, but to encourage the true Israel patiently to wait on the Lord until the times of the promised deliverance (xxvii). The Asidees were the originators and preservers of all apocalypse literature, and the "legend of Daniel" was, both in respect to time and matter, the prototype of that literature (xiv.) Our book is in the form of an analogy, in which the author shields with Daniel's name what he had himself heard and seen. For some things in his book there is an undoubted historic basis, but he relates as actual facts matters which had a legendary growth (xxvii). The only thing which we can affirm with certainty about Daniel himself is that his name was used proverbially for a righteous and wise man (xvi). In passing an ethical judgment on this kind of composition, we must remember that since the writer of an apocalypse made claims higher than those made by the prophet, he was necessarily in need of a pseudonym. His pious purpose and the custom of his time amply justified the author in resorting to this method (xii, xxvii).

From his point of view that Daniel contains no prophecy, the author is able to determine the exact date of the composition of the book. Having shown it to be a unit, he naturally contends that it is the work of a single author. But from the exact historical narrative which we have in chap. xi, in which the entire book centres, it is clear that it must have been written before the end of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, but after the taking away of the daily sacrifice and the "setting up of the abomination which maketh desolate," chap. xi. 31, sometime between 168 and 164 B.C. But since chap. xi. 34 points already to the Maccabean uprising, we must narrow the limits to 166 and 164; and inasmuch as in chap. vii. 25 a definite period is set for the continuance of the persecution—the word "*time*" being equiva-