

the traditional authorship were some other disciple, he might be identical with Lazarus. Instances of twofold naming are not rare in the New Testament. Johanan (the favoured) might be also Eleazar (the God-succoured), or, indeed, as its symbolic meaning seems to suggest, the name Lazarus, used by the Lord Himself in a parable as typically common among the Jews, might have been assumed in the Gospel narrative from motives of humility or for allegorical reasons.

To sum up, then: we need as author of the Gospel one who knew much of Jerusalem and its neighbourhood, well informed as to the counsels of its rulers, and perhaps personally known to the high-priest; one versed in the mysteries of life and death; above all, beloved by Jesus, and able to tell much of His inmost mind. And we have all this precisely in Lazarus, a dweller near Jerusalem, rich and influential, raised to life after four days' experience of death; above all, one whom Christ, we are significantly told, named as *φίλος ἡμῶν*; whom He loved not only with an earthly friendship (*ἐφίλει*), but also (*ἡγάπα*) with the deepest spiritual intimacy.



Mr. Moulton's "The Witness of Israel."¹

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR JAMES ORR, D.D.

IT is pleasant to meet with a work which, while accepting the results of the newer critical analysis of the Pentateuch, can treat the religious history of Israel, and its message to the world, in a positive and reverent spirit, discarding most of the negative results with which the critical treatment is generally associated. Mr. Moulton's book does not, indeed, enter into much detail, and presents broad aspects of his subject, which leave many important facts untouched. It will be seen that we differ from him in thinking that his constructive work is quite as independent of his critical views as he supposes, but we are grateful for the general trend of the volume, in showing the fallacy of much of the modern theorizing on the religion of Israel, and demonstrating how, from the beginning, there has

¹ "The Witness of Israel." The Thirty-Ninth Fernley Lecture. By Wilfrid J. Moulton, M.A., Headingley College, Leeds. London: Robert Culley. Price 3s. 6d.

been a steady movement on in God's revelation till its completion in the appearance and work of the Incarnate Son. The knowledge and culture of the book will impress every reader.

Mr. Moulton divides his book into three parts—(1) Preparation ; (2) Anticipation ; and (3) Realization. He points out the changes in the treatment of the Bible resulting from archæology, comparative religion, and historical criticism ; then goes on to consider the influences which moulded Israel's religion, and the successive stages in its development. On this latter subject he separates himself definitively from those who would resolve the whole patriarchal history, and most, even, of the Mosaic story, into legend, and argues cogently, with the help of archæology, for the substantial historicity of the accounts of Abraham, Joseph, and Moses. He rejects the view that the Israelites began with the worship of a storm-god of Sinai, and defends the monotheism of Abraham, and specially of Moses. He repudiates the view that the God of Israel was worshipped in earlier times with images, and shows the nullity of the proofs alleged of this practice. He has excellent chapters on the Prophets. One of the best parts of his volume is the treatment of the prophecies of the servant of Jehovah, which, he shows, point ultimately to an individual, and were fulfilled in Christ. The chapters on the realization in Christ deal trenchantly with the modern "historical-critical" school of writers.

Mr. Moulton, as said above, accepts the newer critical analysis of the Pentateuch, and current critical results on other Books, as on Isaiah and Daniel. He even accepts the view of a post-Exilian *Palestinian* origin for Isa. lvi.-lxvi.—a position which seems to us hopelessly untenable. "In their broad outlines," he says, "the results of modern criticism have secured the allegiance of nearly all the scholars of all the Protestant Churches, and seem to be impregnable." He accepts the well-known theory of the codes, and says: "Corresponding to the three main codes of the Law which it [criticism] discovers in the Pentateuch, it is able to point to the three periods of history during which these codes were active." Holding this view, he subjects the contentions of the present writer in "The Problem of the Old Testament" to occasional criticisms. A few remarks may be offered on the points of difference.

It is hardly correct to say that it is contended in the above work that there is "a necessary connection between these [critical] results and the theological views of some of those who profess them," seeing that half "The Problem of the Old Testament" is devoted to showing that, even if the critical literary analysis is accepted, the theological conclusions do *not* follow. Mr. Moulton adds: "Nor does the fact that a Christian teacher accepts in the main Wellhausen's dating of the component parts of the Pentateuch compel him to believe in that scholar's statement of a non-miraculous Christianity." This is likewise the present writer's contention. The critical analysis must be tested on its own merits ; but what may safely be affirmed is that much in it depends on Wellhausen's theory of religion as its concealed premise, and that, if the naturalistic presupposition be taken away, the criticism also will undergo a radical change. In this point of view, in the writer's judgment, Mr. Moulton's work presents an amalgame-

tion of critical opinions and positive historical results which will not ultimately hold together.

Whether this be so or not, it is, perhaps, more pertinent to remark that Mr. Moulton is too confident in his belief that the critical results to which he commits himself are secured beyond all possibility of reversal. He speaks of the allegiance of scholars, but that is becoming a very questionable support. Leaving out of view the archæologists, who mostly reject the Wellhausen hypothesis, there are abundant signs of large changes in the critical camp itself. One need, perhaps, only notice the latest of these in the revolt of Professor B. D. Eerdmans of Leiden, Kuenen's own successor, and long a defender of the theory. Now he formally cuts himself off from all connection with it, and in published writings trenchantly assails not only the specific Wellhausen theory, but the whole documentary hypothesis introduced by Astruc. What is, perhaps, as significant, the reviewer of Eerdmans in the German *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (Volz) practically grants the success of his attack on its "negative" side, and says: "It is more and more becoming recognized that the names of God cannot serve for the distinction of sources." A Viennese professor, too (Dr. N. J. Schlögl), writing in the *Expository Times* for September, 1909, declares, as the result of an exhaustive analysis: "It is, consequently, unscientific to determine the analysis of a source by the names of God."

There remain the three codes, and the three periods during which these were active. But who does not know the various sides from which this hypothesis is now being assailed? Mr. Moulton himself says of the recent Elephantinè discovery: "Thus we learn the extraordinarily interesting fact that the law of the central sanctuary [in Deuteronomy], whose gradual growth we have observed, was not, even at this date (410-407 B.C.), recognized universally by worshippers of Jehovah." How, then, should irregularities in its observance in earlier times throw doubt on the existence of the Law? It may be remarked that the author is mistaken in supposing the meaning of "The Problem of the Old Testament" to be that "additional altars" were erected in Israel to Jehovah after the division of the kingdom—those whose breaking down Elijah laments. Altars to Jehovah had no doubt been common in Israel long before the building of the Temple, and the slight interval between that event and the division of the kingdom would do little to cause their disuse. In truth, as has often been pointed out, while a central sanctuary was the ideal from the first, local shrines were not, even according to Deuteronomy, unlawful till a settled house of God was built (1 Kings iii. 2; cf. Deut. xii. 9-11).

Mr. Moulton passes all too lightly over the introduction of the Levitical law by Ezra, and hardly seems to realize the difficulty of getting this huge body of new laws and institutions—for such in the theory most of them were—accepted without demur by a divided and disaffected community, on whom heavy burdens (as in tithes) were being laid. When it is said, "The constantly recurring words 'And the Lord spake unto Moses' are a formula corresponding to our own 'Be it therefore enacted,' and were freely used by legislators who believed truly that they were the heirs of the spirit of Moses, guided by the same God who had called him," one is entitled to ask for proof of so positive an assertion. We fail to find evidence of it in the Bible.

Many changes were made in both David's and Ezra's times to which Moses' name is not attached; indeed, the Levitical laws are often entirely unsuitable to the age of Ezra, as many of those in Deuteronomy were to the age of Josiah.

The impression is forced on us that, had Mr. Moulton exercised as independent a criticism on the literary analysis and the dating of codes as he has on the history and the religion of the people (the "allegiance" of scholars is hardly greater in the one case than in the other), he would have been able to adopt a firmer tone on many points, and would have given more consistency to his valuable work.



Studies in Texts.

SERMON SUGGESTIONS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE.

BY THE REV. HARRINGTON C. LEES, M.A.

Suggestive book: "Witness of the Wilderness" (= L.), by Rev. G. Robinson Lees. Others quoted: Neil's "Palestine Explored" (= N.); Schumacher's "Across the Jordan" (= S.); Hastings' "Bible Dictionary" (= H.).

TEXT: "*In the name of our God we will set up our banners.*"—Ps. xx. 5.

Subject of Ps. xx.: God's blessing on a military expedition.

Analysis: Prayer for Victory (vers. 1-4); Praise for Victory (vers. 5-8); Petition for continuance of triumph (ver. 9).

Four thoughts circle round word "banner."

1. A STANDARD OF WAR.—"When tribe called to arms, a flag hoisted on hill-top" (L., 159). "Once, during a survey, the red and white flag on triangulation staff drew armed men rallying to it: difficult to persuade them no warlike purpose" (S., 105). Also badge of *religious* warfare: device of a god on it (H., i. 238). So God calls (Isa. xi. 10, etc.). Rally round His banner of red and white (*cf.* Isa. i. 18). Unashamed of loyalty: banner = "that which is meant to be seen" (Heb.; see H., i. 237, and *cf.* Ps. lx. 4).

2. A SIGNAL OF PEACE.—"When tribes wearied with war, messenger sent bearing white flag. Two men chosen, one from each tribe, to discuss arrangements." Phrase used is that "face" of each tribe is "turned towards other" (L., 160). So we, wearied of strife against God, have received white flag of Luke ii. 14. God's face towards us (*cf.* 2 Chron. xxx. 9). No need for *two* mediators, because our one Mediator belongs to both camps (Gal. iv. 4). This is the reasonableness of the Incarnation.

3. A SIGN OF GRATITUDE.—When a Bedawi is liable to death from the avenger of blood, he will call upon the name of some powerful chief, even though he has never seen him: "I am the dakheel [member of the household] of Sheikh —." Appeal to name of even absent chief is respected as sufficient protection (L., 166, 167; N., 108). And appeal to unseen God