

ARTICLE VIII.

"IF ONE LOVE ME, HE WILL KEEP MY WORD."

BY HOWARD OSGOOD, ROCHESTER, N. Y.

LOVE and gratitude are the dominant motives of the redeemed of Christ. They have known their sin and their utter inability to overcome it. They have trusted Christ's word, "Come unto me, and I will give you rest." In Christ they have found pardon and peace with God, and their hearts well up in love and gratitude "unto him that loveth us, and loosed us from our sins by his blood." "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." "We love, because he first loved us." This grateful love is the active principle of faith, for "in Christ Jesus" nothing avails "but faith working through love." And this love is manifest only when it keeps the commands, the teaching, the words of him who redeems the soul, our Lord and our God. "If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments." "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me." "If a man love me, he will keep my word." "He that loveth me not, keepeth not my words: and the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's who sent me."

They who know that they have been redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, that they were bought with a price, have found liberty and peace in becoming, with Moses and Paul, Christ's bond-servants. To know Christ more intimately, to think with Christ, to feel with Christ, to speak the truth with Christ, to do Christ's will,—that is the hunger and thirst, as it is also the education, of those who serve their

Redeemer, not for hire but freely, not in order to be saved, but because they have been saved.

Nothing is more important at the present day, for him who makes Christ his model and his aim, than to ascertain by all the means in his power the view which Christ took of the written word of God. There are so many discordant voices, so many utterly contradictory teachings, so many "say unto us, Lo, here is the Christ, or, Here," that the only refuge is to study for ourselves the plain teachings of Christ, and follow as we see that he believed and taught. The four Gospels are the only reports we have of the teachings of Jesus Christ, and, believing those Gospels to be true and accurate accounts, there is no difficulty in learning from them Christ's treatment of, and teaching concerning that written word of God, which was before him as it is before us now, the Old Testament.

The minds of some believers in Christ as the Saviour have been strangely obscured and troubled by the teaching of a few learned men, that Christ voluntarily limited himself and consented to be finite in knowledge while here on earth; and therefore his teaching is only human and, as human, short of perfection. But the extent of the knowledge of Jesus Christ as man has, by his own testimony, nothing to do with the perfect truth of his teaching. For he repeatedly denies that he can do anything of himself,—“The Son can do nothing of himself”; “I can of myself do nothing”; “I do nothing of myself”;¹—or, that his teaching is his,—“My teaching is not mine, but his that sent me”; “I do nothing of myself, but as the Father taught me, I speak these things”; “I spake not from myself, but the Father who sent me, he hath given me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak; . . . the things therefore which I speak, even as the Father hath said unto me, so I speak”; “the words that I say unto you I speak not from myself: but the Father

¹ John v. 19, 30; viii. 28.

abiding in me doeth his works"; "the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's who sent me"; "the words which thou gavest me I have given unto them"; "I have given them thy word";¹—or, that he came of himself,—“I came forth and am come from God; for neither have I come of myself, but he sent me”; “I am not come of myself, but he that sent me is true”;²—or, that he came to do his own will,—“I am come down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me”; “I seek not mine own will, but the will of him that sent me”; “My meat is to do the will of him that sent me”; “nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt.”³

On the contrary, Christ teaches, in places too numerous to quote, that he was sent into the world by his Father,⁴ and that he taught only what he had heard from his Father,—“he that sent me is true; and the things which I heard from him, these speak I unto the world”; “A man that hath told you the truth, which I heard from God”; “all things that I have heard from my Father I have made known unto you”;⁵—what he had seen with his Father,—“I speak the things which I have seen with my Father”; “The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father doing”; “we bear witness of that we have seen”; “what he hath seen and heard, of that he beareth witness”;⁶—and what his Father taught and commanded him to say,—“I can do nothing of myself, but as the Father taught me, I speak these things”; “the Father who sent me, he hath given me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak.”⁷

So that, in the most positive way, by denial and by affirmation, Christ makes his Father the immediate author of all his words and teaching. According to Christ's repeated,

¹ John vii. 16; viii. 28; xii. 49, 50; xiv. 10, 24; xvii. 8, 14.

² John viii. 42; vii. 28.

³ John vi. 38; v. 30; iv. 34; Matt. xxvi. 39.

⁴ Mark ix. 37; Luke iv. 18, 43; ix. 48; x. 16; John v. 23-38, and often.

⁵ John viii. 26, 40; xv. 15. ⁶ John viii. 38; v. 19; iii. 11, 32.

⁷ John viii. 28; xii. 49, 50.

plain words, to receive and believe him and his words is to receive and believe God the Father and his words,¹ and to refuse to receive and believe him and his words is to refuse to receive and believe God and his words.²

Christ's description of his relation (in teaching) to the Father is the complete description of the God-inspired prophet. The prophet is sent by God on his special mission to deliver the message or words God teaches and commands him to speak; so all the Old Testament prophets assert of themselves. And the New Testament, in exact accord with the Saviour's denials and affirmations concerning himself, declares that "no prophecy ever came by the will of man, but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit." Christ calls himself a prophet,³ and it is as a prophet, speaking as God teaches and commands him, that he not only interprets, against the learned men of his day, God's words and deeds in the far past,⁴ but from the beginning to the end of his public life he constantly exercises the predictive office of the prophet, and foretells the future of himself on earth,⁵ the future of this world,⁶ events in the future world,⁷ and the eternal purposes of God.⁸ The distinct foretellings of Christ number over fifty.

All his teaching pulses with yearning care that his disciples should know and live in the truth. "No lie is of the truth." He stamps his whole teaching with this solemn at-

¹ Matt. x. 40; Mark ix. 37; Luke ix. 48; John v. 24, 38; vi. 29, 40; x. 38; xii. 44.

² Luke x. 16; John xii. 47-50; xiv. 24.

³ Luke xiii. 33; Matt. xiii. 57 and elsewhere.

⁴ Matt. v. 18-48; x. 15; xi. 20-24; xii. 40; xv. 1-9; xix. 4-8; xxi. 42; xxii. 29-32, 37-45; xxiv. 15, 37-39, and very often.

⁵ John i. 51; ii. 19; iii. 14; Matt. xii. 40; xvi. 21; Mark viii. 31; Luke ix. 22; Matt. xx. 18, 19; Luke xviii. 31-33; Matt. xxvi. 12; John xii. 7; xiii. 18, 19, 26; Matt. xxvi. 31; Luke xxiii. 29, 30.

⁶ John iv. 21; Matt. v. 18; xxiii. 35, 36; Luke xix. 43, 44

⁷ John v. 28; Matt. vii. 22; viii. 11, 12.

⁸ Matt. xii. 32; x. 15; xix. 28, 29.

testation: "To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." He assures his followers that he is "the Truth"; that he "tells the truth" which he "heard from his Father"; that they shall be taught by the "Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father"; that they can pursue the path that leads to certainty of the truth: "My teaching is not mine, but his that sent me. If any man willet to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God, or *whether* I speak from myself." This certainty and freedom shall be theirs on one condition: "If ye abide in my word, *then* are ye truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." But mere teaching was not enough for that heart of truth and love. Before the fiery altar, on which he was that day to be laid, he prays for his disciples through all time, in words which are, "as it were, great drops of blood"; "Sanctify them in thy truth: thy word is truth." Nor was this enough. He lays these disciples on the Lamb of that supreme, final sacrifice with this petition: "for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they themselves also may be sanctified in truth."

When, therefore, Christ interprets the Scriptures, or makes assertions concerning them, his words, by his testimony, are the very words God taught and commanded him to speak; his teaching, in every respect, is God the Father's teaching; his interpretations of Scripture are God's interpretations; to refuse to receive and believe them is to refuse to receive and believe what God the Father says about his own word. Men may receive or men may reject, but the testimony of Christ on the authorship and character of his teaching is so abundant and plain that it cannot be mistaken.

By the united testimony of Philo, Josephus, and the New Testament, the Old Testament we now have was the only book received as the book of God, the word of God, by the Jews in the first century of our era. None of these, the

only contemporary authorities, include the apocryphal writings in the sacred books. The Old Testament was the only Scriptures, writings of God known to the Saviour, for the New Testament was not written during his life on earth. His attitude towards these writings is one of the most striking facts in his life. Their words were ever on his lips. He knew them so intimately that he always chose the most fitting passages to illustrate his teaching. From their sentences, or events recorded by them, he taught the deepest doctrines that fell from his lips. And when he ascends up to what has been called the most perfect expression of Christian love, the loftiest reach of universal morality, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them," he is careful to impress upon his disciples in Galilee that this is the fundamental teaching of the Old Testament, "for this is the law and the prophets." When he teaches the Pharisees in the temple in Jerusalem that the greatest commandments of God are love to God and to our neighbors, he declares that this is also the essential doctrine of "the whole law and the prophets." He claimed to teach the same morality and the same love to God and man that is taught by the Old Testament.

To Christ, God was the author of these writings. He taught that God created man as it is reported in Gen. i. 1-31, and God spoke the words in Gen. ii. 24; that God's appearance to Moses in the bush was a historical fact, and God spoke the words recorded in Ex. iii. 6; that God's greatest commandment is found in Deut. vi., and the other greatest commandment is found in Lev. xix. 18, while the series of commandments, based on these greatest, are in Ex. xx. Christ takes a verse of a minor psalm, calling it "the law," "the word of God," "the Scripture," and ranges it with his own deity (John x. 34, 35). He takes another verse of one of the shortest psalms and sets it as the testimony of the Holy Spirit to his deity by the mouth of David.

These proofs that the Saviour held and taught that God was the author of the Old Testament extend over all his more than one hundred quotations and references to it. In his instructions to his disciples, or in his discussions with his fierce and learned opponents, the supreme proof he adduces of all his statements is, "It is written," "Have ye never read." For Christ the plain teaching of the Old Testament was the all-sufficient proof of the mind and will of God on the point involved, and beyond that there was nothing more to be said, for if one rejected that word he rejected the counsel of God.

To Christ the Old Testament was crowded with foretellings of himself, of events in his age, and of the future yet distant. These foretellings of himself, fulfilled by him, were used by him as unanswerable proof that God was the author of them, for God alone can with certainty foretell the future. Moses, he says, wrote of him, and Moses' writings were then before the people to read and search them to prove that Moses wrote of him; but if they would not believe Moses' writings, they could not believe Christ's words.¹ Christ says that "David himself" wrote of him;² that the psalms, titled as well as untitled, tell of him;³ that Isaiah wrote of him and of his enemies, and that Isaiah's foretellings were fulfilled in himself and in his enemies;⁴ that "Daniel the prophet" foretold the abomination of desolation to come into Jerusalem, and Christ makes Daniel's prediction his own;⁵ that Zechariah foretells Christ's death and the dispersion of his disciples;⁶ and that Malachi foretold the coming and teaching of John the Baptist.⁷

It is in entire accord with this whole teaching that Christ at different times takes single words of the Old Testament,

¹ John v. 39-47. ² Matt. xxii. 43f.; Mark xii. 36; Luke xx. 42.

³ John x. 34; xiii. 18; xv. 25; xix. 28-30; Matt. xxi. 16, 42; xxiii. 39.

⁴ Matt. xiii. 14, 15; xv. 7-9; Luke iv. 18, 19; xxii. 37.

⁵ Matt. xxiv. 15; Mark xiii. 14. ⁶ Matt. xxvi. 31; Mark xiv. 27.

⁷ Matt. xi. 10; Luke vii. 27.

and uses them as proof of his most important teachings; "gods" (John x. 34), "God" (Matt. xxii. 31), "Lord" (Matt. xxii. 45). And he has no hesitation in teaching, at different times and to various audiences, in Galilee and Perea, "Till heaven and earth pass away one jot or one tittle [the smallest letter or the smallest part of a letter] shall in no wise pass from the law; till all things be accomplished."¹

Another evidence of Christ's attitude to these writings is his use of them for his own support in trial. His only defence against the arch-tempter in the wilderness is to quote against him the words, by which man lives, that proceed "out of the mouth of God." He is calm and at peace in full view of sufferings of soul beyond all power of words to express, because they were the will of his Father, foretold by the prophets, and the Father was ever with him.² In the midst of soul-sufferings so dreadful that the sun's light failed, "the earth did quake," and darkness covered the scene, he rests his breaking heart, and commends it in peace to God, in the few words of three psalms.³ And, on rising from the grave, he hastens to comfort and strengthen his despairing disciples by "beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself"; and "he opened their mind that they might understand the Scriptures" (Luke xxiv. 27, 45). This, with the gift of the Holy Spirit (John xx. 22), was the supreme blessing from him, who, "having loved his own who were in the world, loved them unto the end."

In view of the proclaimed results of some criticism of the present day, it is needful to mark that Christ believed and taught as true the facts, whether natural or miraculous, narrated in the Pentateuch. He taught that God created man "male and female";⁴ that God spoke the words contained in Gen. ii. 24;⁵

¹ Matt. v. 18; Luke xvi. 17. ² Luke xviii. 31-33; John xvi. 32.

³ Matt. xxvii. 46; John xix. 28; Luke xxiii. 46.

⁴ Gen. i. 27; Matt. xix. 4.

⁵ Matt. xix. 5.

that the devil was a murderer and liar from the beginning;¹ that Abel was a righteous man, a prophet, his blood was shed;² that the Flood was a historical event and destroyed all but those in the ark.³ He taught that Abraham lived, and his descendants were still on the earth; that Abraham saw Christ's day and was glad, and was a true servant of God;⁴ that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob did live, that God was their God, and that they were still living in Christ's day;⁵ that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were in the kingdom of heaven;⁶ that circumcision was not "of Moses, but of the fathers";⁷ that Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed by "fire and brimstone from heaven," that Lot escaped, but Lot's wife was a warning;⁸ that the miracle of Jacob's ladder was to be repeated upon the Son of man.⁹

The Saviour taught that God spoke the words recorded in Ex. iii. 6;¹⁰ that God gave the manna;¹¹ that there was a law of Moses concerning circumcision;¹² that God and Moses spoke the words in Ex. xx. 12;¹³ that the words of Ex. xx. 12-17 are God's commandments;¹⁴ that God and Moses spoke the words in Ex. xxi. 17;¹⁵ that Moses gave them the law;¹⁶ that Moses gave the law of the leper;¹⁷ that the second greatest command of God is in Lev. xix. 18;¹⁸ that the law against

¹ Gen. iii. 4, 5; John viii. 44.

² Gen. iv. 8, 10; Luke xi. 51; Matt. xxiii. 35.

³ Gen. vi-ix; Matt. xxiv. 38; Luke xvii. 26, 27.

⁴ Gen. xii.-xxv.; John viii. 37-58; Luke xiii. 16; xix. 9.

⁵ Matt. xxii. 32; Mark xii. 26; Luke xx. 37.

⁶ Matt. viii. 11; Luke xiii. 28; xvi. 22-31.

⁷ Gen. xvii. 10f.; John vii. 22.

⁸ Gen. xix. 24-26; Matt. x. 15; xi. 23, 24; Luke x. 12; xvii. 29, 31, 32.

⁹ Gen. xxviii. 12; John i. 51.

¹⁰ Matt. xxii. 31, 32; Mark xii. 26; Luke xx. 37.

¹¹ Ex. xvi. 4, 15; John vi. 32. ¹² Ex. xvi. 23-30; John vii. 22, 23.

¹³ Matt. xv. 4; Mark vii. 10.

¹⁴ Matt. xix. 18, 19; Mark x. 19; Luke xviii. 20.

¹⁵ Matt. xv. 4; Mark vii. 10. ¹⁶ Ex. xx. ff.; John vii. 19.

¹⁷ Lev. xiv. 2; Matt. viii. 4; Mark i. 44; Luke v. 14.

¹⁸ Matt. xxii. 39; Mark xii. 21; Luke x. 27.

eating the showbread was imperative in David's day;¹ that the fathers of the Jews died in the wilderness;² that Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness;³ that the greatest of God's commands is found in Deut. vi. 4, 5;⁴ that words that "proceeded out of the mouth of God" are found in Deut. vi. 13, 16; viii. 3;⁵ that Moses wrote the law contained in Deut. xxiv. 1.⁶

Christ's quotations are from all the so-called documents of the Pentateuch.

From the so-called Priest Code ("P") he quotes: Gen. i. 27; vii. 7, 13; xvii. 10; Ex. xvi. 15, 23-30; Lev. xiv. 2; xix. 18; xxiv. 5-9; Num. xxviii. 9, 10; xxxv. 30.

From "J": Gen. ii. 24; iii. 4, 5; iv. 8, 10; vi.-ix.; xii.-xxv.; xix. 24-26; Ex. xvi. 4, 23-30.

From "E": Gen. xxviii. 12; Ex. iii. 6; xx. 12-17; xxi. 17; Num. xxi. 8, 9.

From "D," "D¹," or "D²": Deut. vi. 4, 5, 13, 16; viii. 3; xvii. 6; xix. 15; xxiv. 1.

Christ makes no distinction in the validity of these passages. The greatest of all God's commandments is found by Christ in "D¹?" or "D²?" The second, "like unto it," is found by Christ in the "Priest Code." Christ says that God spoke the words of Gen. ii. 24 in "J," and God spoke the words in Ex. iii. 6, and God gave the commandments in Ex. xx. 12-17 in "E."

What is called in some quarters the "higher criticism" of the Old Testament, by others, "scientific criticism," "historical criticism," "modern criticism," has taken possession of all the holders of chairs in Old Testament literature in the Protestant universities of Europe, of many similar teachers in

¹ Lev. xxiv. 9; Matt. xii. 3, 4.

² Num. xiv. 29, 32; Deut. ii. 14; John vi. 49, 58.

³ Num. xxi. 8, 9; John iii. 14, 15. ⁴ Matt. xxii. 37; Mark xii. 29, 30.

⁵ Matt. iv. 4-10; Luke iv. 4-12. ⁶ Mark x. 5; Matt. v. 31; xix. 8.

England, and of some few in America. This criticism and its results are commended to Christians, as the highest result of modern biblical science, on the strength of this accord in Europe, and the speedy acceptance of these results by all enlightened and aggressive Christians is firmly prophesied. Each herald of this coming "scientific position" towards the Bible, gives us his own version of what this criticism means and what are its results. But if we are not to be dazed by misleading names, but would know accurately what are the results of this criticism, what it really means, we must ask the leaders, men who know what they mean and mean what they say; who strive to be consistent with themselves and do not cry out, when their own words are quoted by fair opponents, that they are misunderstood. These men speak so plainly that there is no possibility of a fair-minded man misunderstanding them. What do all these leaders agree is the result of their criticism of the Old Testament?

Want of space compels that the answer be given as to only one of the so-called documents of the Pentateuch. That document shall be the Priest Code,¹ because it is the very heart of the Pentateuch, covering its history in great part and all of its legislation, as will be seen by the following synopsis² of that code given by Cornill, which, with minor variations, agrees with the synopsis of other writers:—

Gen. i. 1-ii. 4a.	Gen. xii. 4b, 5.
v. 1-21, 22*, 23, 24*, 25-27,	xiii. 6, 11b, 12a.
28*, 30-32.	xvi. 1a, 3, 15, 16.
vi. 9-22.	xvii. 1-27.
vii. 6, 11, 13-16a, 17a*, 18-21,	xix. 29.
23b? 24.	xxi. 1b, 2b-5.
viii. 1-2a, 3b-5, 13a, 14-19.	xxii. 1-20.
ix. 1-17, 28, 29.	xxv. 7-11a, 12-17, 19, 20, 26b.
x. 1-7, 20, 22-23, 31, 32.	xxvi. 34, 35.
xi. 10-27, 31, 32.	xxviii. 1-9.

¹ P is used to designate the Priest Code in the following pages.

² a, b, = the verse before or after the athnach.

* = worked over.

† = belongs essentially to P.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>Gen. xxix. 24, 28b, 29.
xxx. 22a.
xxxi. 18*. *
xxxiii. 18a*.
xxxv. 6a, 9-13, 15, 22b-29.
xxxvi. 1, 5b-8, 40-43.
xxxvii. 1, 2a.</p> <p>Exod. i. 1-5, 7*, 13, 14*.
ii. 23*, 24, 25.
vi.† 1-30.
vii. 1-13, 19, 20a*, 21b, 22.
viii. 1-3, 11a-15.
ix. 8-12.
xi. 9, 10.
xii. 1-20, 28, 37*, 43-51.
xiii. 1, 2.
xiv. 1-4, 8, 9b, 10b, 15*, 16-18, 21-23†, 26, 27a, 28*, 29.</p> <p>Lev. i. 1-xxvii. 34 [i. e., the whole book].</p> <p>Num. i. 1-x. 28.
xiii. 1-17a, 21, 25, 26a*, 32*.
xiv. 1a, 2*, 3, 4? 5-7, 10, 26-38†.
xv. 1-41.
xvi.† 1-35.</p> | <p>Gen. xli. 46-48?
xlvi. 6, 7, 8-27?
xlvii. 5, 6a. LXX 7-11, 27b, 28.
xlviii. 3-6.
xlix. 1a, 28b-32, 33†.
l. 12, 13.</p> <p>Exod. xvi. 1-3, 6, 7, 9-18†, 19*, 20, 22a-24, 32-35a.
xvii. 1a.
xix. 1*?, 2a.
xxiv. 15b-18a.
xxv. 1.-xxxi. 18a.
xxxiv. 29-35?
xxxv. 1-xl. 38.</p> <p>Num. xvii. 1.-xx. 13†, 22*, 23-29.
xxi. 10, 11*.
xxii. 1.
xxv. 6-xxxii. 54.
xxxii. 1-5†, 16-32†.
xxxiii. 1-49? 50-xxxvi. 13.</p> |
|--|--|

Our authorities shall be Kuenen, Wellhausen, Dillmann, Reuss, Stade, Cornill, Holzinger, Smend, Piepenbring, Riehm, Kittel, Schultz, Westphal, König, Marti. No one, I think, who knows the history of this criticism will deny that these men have been, and are, its eminent and learned leaders. What they say of the Priest Code is certainly the voice of that criticism. Only a small fraction of their statements can be quoted.

The greatest of all these critics, Kuenen, shall answer first, and give an explanation of constantly recurring terms.¹ "We shall use the word legend . . . for every narrative which is not trustworthy, but is nevertheless given us as his-

¹ The Bible for Learners. By Oort, Hooykaas and Kuenen, Boston, 1878, p. 8.

tory. By this trait it is distinguished from the fable, the hearers or readers of which are warned beforehand, as it were, that the story is invented. In this sense the legend includes the myth. . . . As a rule the words legend and myth as well as saga are used for one another, and in a different way by almost every writer on this subject."¹

On P, "The Bible for Learners" says, p. 36, of Gen. i. 1-31, "This legend"; p. 64, of Gen. v., "Invented by the writer himself"; p. 65, "We can no longer accept his statements as true"; p. 76, of the Flood, "We cannot give any high position to the legend itself"; p. 242, "Legend plays a greater part than history itself in the accounts we possess of him" [Moses]; p. 5, "In the eyes of the writers [of the whole Bible] everything was subordinate to their object, so that they often sacrificed what we consider very important interests to it, historical truth, for example. As a rule they concerned themselves very little with the question whether what they narrated really happened so or not. . . . This is why the Old and New Testaments are so full of legends."

KUENEN, *Hexateuch*, 1886:—

P. 173, "Of the examples, by which previously the unhistorical character of the Hexateuch was proved, those which speak most strongly are now seen to be derived from P." "It is in P that the absolutely unhistorical representation of Israel's settlement in the Trans-jordanic district and of the division of Canaan by lot is most fully developed." "He [P] shows little care for the reality, and subordinates his-

¹ "Dr. Oort is responsible for the portion which deals with the Old Testament; but his work has always been submitted, before publication, to the careful examination of Dr. Hooykaas, and Dr. Kuenen. By this means the chance of any inaccuracies finding their way into the book has been made as small as possible."—Translator's Preface.

"He [Kuenen] had also a share in the composition of 'The Bible for Learners,' a work which, though all its positions are not to be commended, gives the biblical history and literature in general accordance with modern critical results, in a very striking and attractive way."—Toy, *The New World*, March 1892, p. 80.

torical probability to considerations of quite another order"; p. 43, "The Exodus, the wandering, the passage of the Jordan, and the settlement in Canaan, as they are described in the Hexateuch, are simply impossible"; p. 46, "The representation of all this [the Exodus] in the Hexateuch is absurd"; p. 192, "The representation of the Mosaic times and of the settlement in Canaan which the Hexateuch gives us is, as a whole, contradicted by the veritable history"; p. 295, "Fictitious genealogies . . . the priestly lawgiver sought his end by the employment of similar means"; p. 301, "P's genealogies are as unhistorical and artificial as those of the chronicler"; p. 478 [Onderzoek], "The historico-legislative fable of P."

KNAPPERT, *The Religion of Israel*,¹ Roberts, Boston, 1878:—

P. 21, "The great majority of the writers of the Old Testament have no other source of information than simple tradition." "Narratives of this sort are called sagas or legends"; p. 22, "When a prophet or priest related something about bygone times . . . he never hesitated to modify what he knew of the past, and he did not think twice about touching it up from his own imagination, simply that it might be more conducive to the end he had in view and chime in better with his opinion. . . . Our own notions of honor and good faith would never permit all this"; p. 25, "The Old Testament is rich alike in legends and myths. We may take as examples the stories of the first human pair, the Fall, Cain and Abel, the Deluge, the tower of Babel, God's appearance to Abraham, and Jacob's wrestling. These stories have no historical foundation whatever"; p. 27, "Israel . . . constructed myths and gave play to its imagination about the creation of the universe . . . others were invented by the

¹ "An abridged statement of the views of Kuenen and others of the latest school of Old Testament criticism."—Toy, *Hist. of Rel. of Israel*, 1882, p. 22.

authors themselves"; p. 41, "Of the circumstances which may have accompanied the Exodus we have no knowledge whatever"; p. 51, "The description given of both these [Ark and Tabernacle] in the Pentateuch is utterly incorrect"; p. 187, "Some events, elsewhere recorded [in P], are touched up in the priestly spirit, and others are entirely invented." "It does not trouble our author in the least that he is here utterly at variance with history"; p. 160, "Writing in the name of some celebrated character of antiquity is not, according to our notions, a moral proceeding."

WELLHAUSEN, *Hist. of Israel*, 1878:—

P. 38, "Totally transforms the past"; p. 40, it transforms the past after the pattern of itself"; p. 169, "it dresses itself up in archaistic fashion"; p. 41, "The historical sphere created out of its own premises is nowhere to be found in actual history"; p. 170, "It is full of historical fictions"; p. 438, "a fictitious product"; p. 333, "the audacity of its numbers is not proportioned to their trustworthiness"; p. 334, "all confidence in it is lost"; p. 331, "it is hard to give an idea of its pedantry"; "its incredible insipidity"; p. 332, "it reaches the acme of its dearth of ideas in Num. vii."; pp. 339-342, all these characteristics are shown in Gen. i. 1-ii. 4, where it reveals "its horrid scheming," "its insipid contemplation of nature"; p. 336, "indescribable pedantry of language accompanies the intellectual pedantry."

Hist. of Israel, Black, Edinburgh, 1885:—

P. 39, "The historical sphere, created by itself, is nowhere to be found within actual history. Thus it holds itself in the air by its own waistband." "The tabernacle rests on a historical fiction. In truth, it is proved"; p. 342, "The dislocation of the narrative by these monstrous growths of legislative matter is not to be imputed to the editor; it is the work of the unedited Priest Code itself, and is certainly intolerable"; p. 347, Lifeless itself, it [P] has driven the life out

of Moses and out of the people, nay, out of the very Deity."

DILLMANN, *Numbers, Joshua, and Deuteronomy*, 1886:—

P. 595, The Hexateuch is not "an authentic picture of the legislation of Moses"; p. 650, "Where he had no historical accounts he sketches freely an imaginary picture, e. g., Noah's ark, course of the Flood, tabernacle (after the manner of a movable holy tent, richly furnished), the order of the camp and march (in geometrical divisions . . .), the determination of the boundaries of the tribes by lot under Joshua, the numbers of each tribe in Moses' day, the quantity of manna that fell, etc." "They are not to be taken historically"; p. 655, "The oral saga within which falls all the history given by P"; "P knew and used the North-Israelite book of sagas."

Genesis, 1892:—

P. 2, Gen. i. 1-31, "not the result of a prophetic vision"; p. 13, "no historical reality in the physical development."

REUSS, *Hist. . . . of the Old Test.*, 1881:—

P. 465, "For the author [P] the chief matter was not religion and morals, but the altar and its servants." "Instead of purity of heart, purity of the skin and of plates is the more important"; p. 467, "History . . . is created by fantasy [in P] and according to a preconceived theory." "A bald fiction is the tabernacle, the camp and the arranged parade march in the desert, the large numbers of the pretended census . . . and many other things that exceed by far the old sagas, and are really not sagas of the early days but dreams of an impoverished generation."

STADE, *Hist. of People of Israel*, 1887:—

P. 17, "P . . . presents a working over of the old saga material"; p. 62, "the saga material of P"; p. 71, "this section contradicts all we know of Hebrew antiquity. Its ideas agree with those of the author of P."

CORNILL, *Introd. to O. T.*, 1891:—

P. 67, "We have in P less the work of a single individual than of a whole school, and that this school arose in Babylonia is not chance"; p. 56, P contains "contradictions and inconceivable things"; p. 57, "Num. xxvi. . . . a genealogy dressed up with additions after the manner of Chronicles"; (p. 272, "All historical value must be denied to him"; p. 275, "A narrator whose untrustworthiness is proved," i. e., chronicler); p. 58, "An action puzzled out theoretically and a mechanical spinning out of the idea of sacrifice"; p. 59, "Num. xvi. . . . a transformation with a purpose"; p. 63, "The tabernacle . . . is merely a carrying back of the Deuteronomic central sanctuary, that is, the temple of Solomon, into the time of Moses, after it had been made movable through a waste of wit not to be despised"; p. 272, "The old historical books and the Pentateuch exclude each the other. Either the representation of the historical books is true, and then the Pentateuch cannot be the foundation of Mosaicism and of the religion of Israel; or, the Pentateuchal laws are from Moses, and then the representation of the historical books cannot be true."

HOLZINGER, *Introd. to Hexateuch*, 1893:—

P. 361, P is "a learned treatment of the saga material"; p. 362, "the fiction of antiquity is not entirely carried out"; p. 368, "bald pedantic learning"; p. 371, "the most numerous and worst impossibilities in the Hexateuch are from this source"; "the whole chronology of the earliest history is worthless"; p. 374, "its name-lists are bare-faced inventions"; p. 381, "gross, sheer mechanically enlarged miracles"; p. 389, "its historical presuppositions of the giving of the law are whimsies that force a smile"; p. 494, "the old idea of inspiration is impossible with Graf's [i. e., this] hypothesis."

This criticism has also brought forth two volumes of History of Old Testament religion or Old Testament theology, and we will hear their decision on P.

SMEND, *Hist. of O. T. Religion*, 1893:—

P. 70, "That representation [priests, worship, ritual] of P is a very transparent fiction"; p. 71, "the false history of that representation is very plain"; "it seems almost a silly trick when P makes the Sabbath a duty because God rested on that day"; p. 86, "prophetic inspiration, in the Hebrew idea, did not mean anything peculiar"; p. 140, "the Israelites received the Sabbath from the Canaanites"; p. 12, "The narratives of Genesis are wholly saga"; p. 13, "the representation of the Pent. proves itself not historical"; "the law-giver of the Pent. certainly was not Moses. . . . The narration of the time of Moses is saga"; p. 457, "A heathen myth is the substance of Gen. i., a product of Babylonian science"; p. 138, "the want of truth in the sagas about worship in Genesis is patent"; p. 98, "the life of Abraham is unthinkable . . . and false . . ."; p. 300, "there was no covenant of God with Abraham. That was the invention of a later age and dated back."

PIEPENBRING, *Theology of the O. T.*, New York, 1893:—

P. 133, "It represents God as the author of moral evil"; p. 283, "Those who consider this narrative [P] with historical discrimination can see in it only a fiction"; p. 288, "he [P] helped to stifle religious life in forms and led the religion of Israel into a wrong path"; p. 313, the author a "Levitical theorist"; p. 319, By P "formalism and legalism . . . got the upper hand and with it the claim to self-righteousness."

According to these writers, philologists and theologians, P, the heart of the Pentateuch, is legend, myth, saga, tradition, and not trustworthy (*glaubwürdig*, worthy of belief); a proved historical fiction, bald, transparent fiction, artifice, fantasy, false history, whimsies that force a smile, absurd, impossible, intolerable, contradictory and inconceivable, silly trick, unthinkable and false, bare-faced inventions, worthless, indescribable pedantry of language and thought, incredible

insipidity, stifles religious life, teaches self-righteousness, makes God the author of moral evil, driven the life out of God, not true, its writers sacrificed truth intentionally, all confidence in it is lost, not a moral proceeding.

Of course these writers never so contradict themselves as to imply that what they recognize as God had anything to do with the composition of such a document as they assert the Priest Code to be. According to their united testimony, man, and man alone, out of his own mind, created, evolved, invented the God of the Priest Code.

We have hitherto taken the witness of writers who never in any way in their writings acknowledge the supernatural. But now we will take the witness of writers who claim to believe in the supernatural.

RIEHM, *Introd. to O. T.*, 1889:—

Vol. i. p. 339, "Not only did they [the authors of the Pentateuch] compose the speeches of the actors, as freely as Thucydides or Livy, but they also gave themselves to more or less free reconstruction of the popular tradition"; p. 340, "In the earliest history we find ourselves on the ground of sacred saga"; "Either this history must have been given to the narrators by revelation, or by historical archives in addition to the popular saga. Neither is the fact"; "thus it is *a priori* probable that these narratives were taken from the popular saga. Their peculiar character makes on the unprejudiced mind the clear impression that they are not history but saga."

KITTEL, *Hist. of the Hebrews*, 1888:—

P. 151, "None of them [documents of Genesis] can be used as archives in the sense of a source of history giving exclusively historical facts"; p. 153, "to accord historical character to the words of Genesis, or to one of its sources, would be contrary to the form of narrative"; p. 215, "The detailed account by P of a costly tabernacle cannot well be historical."

SCHULTZ, *O. T. Theol.*, Edinburgh, 1892:—

Vol. i. p. 62, "No original authorities for the period before Moses have come down to us. We can do nothing more than draw inferences from the national legends we have, and from any fragments of myth and of ancient customs that remain"; p. 73, "The work of a priest who, undeterred by the existence of sanctuaries in Israel, has presented us with his ideal of sacred customs in the form of a history"; p. 132, "For the latest writers of the Pentateuch it was an accepted fact that all the religious knowledge and all the sacred institutions of Israel that were in actual existence down to the time of Ezra, had been received from God by Moses. . . . This view is not that of Israel's early reminiscences, and no historical inquirer of the present day will advocate it."

WESTPHAL, *Revue Chrétienne*, 1892:—

P. 430, "It [P] could not engender and maintain in the soul individual piety, the need of pardon and conversion, personal communion with God, which is the very foundation of revealed religion. [Hence certainly not from God.] With its ceremonies and its casuistry, its confusion of the spiritual with the temporal, of the church with the nation, its obedience to priests and its tendency to hold as righteous him who conformed to the demands of the ritual, it ran the risk of leading astray and of materializing religious thought, of taking the form for the essence, and of encouraging the growth of the two great adversaries of revelation, pride and fanaticism." "The day when clericalism [P] was organized the fall commenced." "The prayer of the Pharisee . . . is the prayer of the self-righteous," i. e., the necessary effect of P.

KÖNIG, *Introd. to O. T.*, 1893:—

P. 228, "In this division of the Pentateuch [P] older materials reached their present extension only after a long process of tradition."

MARTI, *Influence of the Results of the Latest O. T. Investigations*, 1894:—

P. 48, "The tenet of inspiration . . . is to be considered as discarded when it is recognized how the several books of the Old Testament arose."

These writers who believe in the supernatural tell us that the Priest Code, which professes to be nothing but a history, is not history or historical, but saga, legend, myth and tradition; it was not, as it professes to have been, revealed by God to Moses, for it is nothing but an ideal sketch, opposed to patent facts, in the form of history, written by a priest a thousand years after Moses, and in its teachings it is contrary to the foundation of revealed religion; it was neither founded on archives nor given by inspiration.

There is another point on which both sides of these critics agree. The narrative of the fall of man in Eden is pure legend, myth, saga, and not worthy of belief; but the historical fall of man was in the composition and introduction of P.¹

What these critics say of P, as to its being myth, saga, legend, they say with greater emphasis of the other so-called documents of the Pentateuch, "J," "E," and of "D," "D¹," "D²," whose history is taken from "J" and whose reported speeches of Moses are pure fiction. As fair and honest men they go further. They tell us, what we can easily prove for ourselves, that all the other writers of the Old Testament, historians, prophets, and psalmists, believed and taught the same history we find in the Pentateuch, and thus we can measure the worth of their testimony, since that history is false and incredible.²

The teaching of Christ and the teaching of these critics concerning the Old Testament are plainly put before intelligent readers. The facts on both sides are clear and unmis-

¹ Piepenbring, p. 288ff; Westphal *l. c.*, and all the others quoted.

² Smend, p. 66; Schultz, p. 132, etc.

takable. Those who are acquainted with the works of Kuenen know that I can appeal with entire confidence to his numerous statements for his agreement in the absolute contradiction here set forth between the teaching of Christ and the teaching of this criticism; and that it is simply impossible to follow Christ's teaching as contained in the New Testament and receive this criticism. Kuenen never obscured that issue. He asserts that it is possible to save the character of Christ as an honest and intelligent teacher only by refusing to receive the New Testament account of him as anything more than myth or legend.

It is not possible on any theory to avoid the real issue. If this criticism is true, Christ was the greatest of false prophets and deceivers. If Christ taught God's truth, this criticism is absolutely false.