

# THE CRITICS :

Shall We Follow Them ?

---

BY

C. E. STUART

(Author of "*Tracings from the Gospel of John*,"

"*Outline St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*," &c.)

---

SECOND EDITION.

---

WESTON-SUPER-MARE : WALTER SCOTT, HAMILTON HOUSE,  
CLIFTON ROAD.

LONDON : W. BLATCHLEY, 27, LANCEFIELD STREET, W.

NEW YORK : LOIZEAUX BROS., 63, FOURTH AVENUE.

---

1902.

---

ONE PENNY.

# The Critics: Shall we follow them?

---

*Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament* is the title of a book of which Professor George Adam Smith is the writer. As the Professor of Old Testament language and literature in the Glasgow College of the United Free Church of Scotland, his book has made a stir in that denomination, and has caused a feeling of considerable alarm in the minds of members of that community. Into that controversy we have no call to enter. How far the teaching of this book conforms to the standards of that communion is a question, of course, for its members to debate and decide. But as a unit in the assembly of the Living God, and a member of the Body of Christ, one must feel interested in the subject of the volume, as being professedly a guide, a help to preachers in the present day. For the Professor seeks to bring his readers face to face with a vital question of our time, may we not call it, viz., the conclusion of critics on the Old Testament Scriptures, as against the opinion of the authorship of different books of that volume held by students and devout readers from apostolic times.

*The critics!* How these words may tend to loosen from their moorings souls not established in the faith. Who should venture to differ from the conclusions at which such learned people have arrived, for learned Semitic scholars we must own many of them to be? Then some might think we must accept them as guides in such an important investigation, if we would be abreast of the teaching of the day. But linguistic learning and Semitic scholarship are not all that are needed where God's Word is concerned. The Lord's words to the Jews may well be remembered, "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God or whether I speak of (rather, from) myself" (John vii. 17). To understand the things of God we must be taught of God. Learning, scholarship all should value, but with the teaching and guidance of the Spirit we cannot in this matter dispense.

What can Professor Smith tell us of critical conclusions? "With critics," he writes, "there has been a distinct reaction of late in favour of admitting the personal reality of Abraham" (p 107). According to our author then those, who had followed earlier critics in questioning the personality of that patriarch, were led in that matter astray. Clearly then even critics can go astray, and lead astray, and the teaching of that class in one age may be repudiated in the next. Then if we admit the personality of Abraham on the ground of the general agreement as to it of critics to-day, how shall we be sure that we may not have to change front on the morrow, if taught then just the opposite? Are we driven to rest on the conclusions of critics in this matter, and so be tossed about like shuttle-cocks at the whim of that class? Have we not undoubted authority for that patriarch's personality beyond the reach of criticism to upset? For certainly we need no school of critics to assure us of it ere we accept it, nor their whole collective company to declare it. The testimony of God, the witness of the Son, and the teaching of the Holy Spirit shall be *our* authority for it. No higher authority can there be than this. With no greater certainty can we be assured of it.

"I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" (Exod. iii. 6) is a divine attestation of the personality of the father of the faithful. And to this the Lord Jesus bore testimony in the Gospels as being the word of God spoken to Moses (Mark xii. 26; Luke xx. 37), adding, God "is not a God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto Him." A real person was, and is, Abraham. Then of that patriarch's personality the Lord Jesus Himself affirmed, when He said to the opposing Jews, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad" (John viii. 56). No one among them doubted of their forefather's existence. Then the Spirit of God by the Apostles Peter (Acts iii. 25; 1 Peter iii. 6); and Paul (Rom. iv. 1, 3, 9; Gal. iii. 6-9) testifies to the same effect. It is well for the critics if they admit the personality of Abraham; but who, with the inspired word in their hands, should allow them-

selves to doubt of it? Who need the critics to assure them of it?

Then we learn (p. 151) that E. Meir, Winter, and Budde reckon Jud. v. 31 to be a later addition to the song of Deborah. With that Prof. Smith does not agree. Against Isaiah ix. 6. ; xi. 1-5, we read strong reasons have been adduced (p. 160). Our Professor, however, does not agree with them. Again, "most modern critics," we are told, view Isai. liii. as a personification of the righteous and suffering remnant of Israel (p. 167). From that Professor G. A. Smith dissents. Were we then as to that chapter following most modern critics we should in the judgment of our author go astray. But who is right? How can we be sure whom we should believe? God, we can indeed say, has not left His people in doubt as to it. And if we find ourselves on this occasion in agreement with the Professor, it is because we are authoritatively taught by the Word of God, written by the Evangelist St. John. He has plainly declared to whom chapter liii. of Isaiah refers, quoting in connection with the rejection of the Lord Jesus the first verse of that well-known portion, "But though He had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on Him; that the saying of Esaias might be fulfilled, Lord who hath believed our report? and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed?" (John xii. 37, 38). That arm was Christ (Isai. li. 9). Then Philip the Evangelist opening up that chapter to the Ethiopian eunuch met his inquirer's question, of whom did the prophet speak? by preaching to him Jesus from that same scripture. John was an Apostle. Philip was under the guidance of the Spirit (Acts viii. 29). These are trustworthy teachers. Can the critics on their part present any such credentials? Most modern critics therefore may err. It will be perilous blindfold to follow them.

Then we are informed that most critics (p. 174) assign Isai. xxxiii. 21, 22, to some disciple of that prophet. Who he was is not told us. When and where he lived is not by our informant disclosed. But we are at this point in the Professor's book learning to distrust the judgment of even most modern critics, unless

confirmed by unquestionable authority. Does this savour of presumption? We can quote, as we have seen, the Professor in support of such a step, though on this occasion we are left, it appears, without a word from him to tell us what is his mind about it, and so to guide his readers. Meanwhile, as we discover a want of unanimity of judgment on the part of the critics, and those who would plead for them, we need not be dismayed when they are quoted before us, nor need our belief be disturbed, that the son of Amoz, the writer, we believe, of the four preceding woes (xxviii.-xxxi.), was the writer of this one (xxxiii.) likewise.

So far as we have gone it becomes manifestly permissible, and at times right, to differ from the judgment of most critics. The critics criticise the inspired Word, and the reader is to sit in judgment on their conclusions. In other words, man is to decide for himself what he will believe, and what he will refuse. Where is God in all this? Where is any recognition that the sacred volume differs essentially from all mere human records, the divine Word having characteristics peculiar to itself? It can quicken the soul (1 Pet. i. 23). It can enlighten and make wise the simple (Ps. xix. 7, 8). It discerns the thoughts and intents of the heart (Heb. iv. 12). And the Lord's word, if not listened to by the creature when in life, will judge him at the last day (John xii. 48). Is there any real sense in the conclusions of the critics? The words of the Living God are treated by them as if they were the words of a mere man. Are we to come to that?

But, there are conclusions of critics to which in the judgment of the Professor there is no help for it but submissively to bow. "Present criticism," we read, "has tended to confirm the impossibility of proving any given Psalm in our Psalter to have been by David" (p. 87). Simple folk may well demur to this with 2 Sam. xxii. before them. "Now with the time of Samuel," we are told, "we at last enter real indubitable history" (p. 77). But this composition just referred to is found near the end of the second book of Samuel, so must be well within the bounds of "real indubitable history." And the eighteenth Psalm of the Psalter is evidently the same composition as that of 2 Sam.,

though with some variations. At any rate, then, this Psalm in the Psalter, met with also in *real indubitable history*, must be, as stated in both places, a song by the sweet Psalmist of Israel. So whilst we may not be able to certify to the authenticity of all the Davidic headings of Psalms, of this one we must believe that we have clear proof. "Only a fondness for doubt can lead any one," writes Delitzsch, "to doubt the Davidic origin of this Psalm, attested, as it is in two works, which are independent one of another."

Then what shall we say of Ps. xcvi, when we read in 1 Chron. xvi. 23-33 that it was delivered by David into the hands of Asaph and his brethren on the occasion of the entrance of the ark into Jerusalem? It is not said to be by the king, but who can affirm that it was not? For no hint have we that David delivered that day to Asaph and his brethren any compositions not really his own. And now, we would submit that simple folk may more than just demur to the Professor's sweeping announcement, having inspired authority to reject it. For as to Psalms cx. and xvi. we have distinct averment of their Davidic authorship. The Lord Jesus in the Gospels silenced all objectors and questioners in the Temple court, by calling attention to the cxth Psalm as a witness to His own divinity, and a witness by David in the prophetic spirit, who lived about ten centuries before the incarnation. In the three synoptic Gospels is this recorded. To quote from one will here suffice. "Whilst the Pharisees," writes Matthew "were gathered together, Jesus asked them saying, what think ye of Christ? Whose son is He? They say unto Him, the son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord: Sit thou on my right hand, till I put thine enemies underneath thy feet? If David then call Him Lord, how is He his son?" (Matt. xxii. 41-45). And in one respect Luke is more precise, as quoting the Lord's words he writes, "David himself saith in the book of Psalms" (Luke xx. 42). If David had not really written the words quoted by Christ, there would have been no point at all in the Master's reference to the Psalm. All depended on their really being the

words of the royal Psalmist. And if he wrote them, as the Lord declares, that whole Psalm, it will be seen, must have been penned by David. Would any demur to the accuracy of the Evangelists in this matter? They must establish against the authority of uncial M.S.S. in the three Gospels, that what has been handed down by them is a mistake. That we believe is a task beyond the critics' power to accomplish.

Then as to the xvth Psalm, Peter, filled with the Holy Ghost, addressing the company come together on the day of Pentecost, quoted from that Psalm, to show that the Lord's resurrection had been foretold, and thus decided the matter as to its Davidic authorship for any who may need it, by saying, "Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore, being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins He would set him on His throne; he seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of the Christ, that neither was He left in Hades, nor did His flesh see corruption" (Acts ii. 29-31). Again we have to ask, what point could there be in Peter's reference to David if he was not the author of that Psalm? Then, too, Peter affirmed the Davidic authorship of Ps. lxi., in Acts i. 16-20; and the whole company in iv. 25 quote in addressing God the second Psalm as written by the king of Israel. At that time there was no doubt that some Psalms in the Psalter were written by David. A little later we find Paul of the same mind (Rom. iv. 6; xi. 9). Sufficient surely are these proofs of the untrustworthiness of the Professor's announcement. And we might ask, have the New Testament Scriptures, and even the words of Christ Himself, no authority with the critics of the Old Testament? Psalms ii; xvi; xviii; xxxii; lxi; cx were certainly by David.

Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors, and Teachers have been the authorised channels to communicate or minister God's truth in Christian times. John the Apostle thought that Isaiah had written chapter liii. of that prophet. The Apostle Paul was under the impression that Isai. lxi. i. was by the son of Amoz.

Peter thought Moses had predicted the coming of the Lord Jesus as the Prophet like unto him (Acts iii. 22) ; and Stephen had the same impression (vii. 37). Matthew also believed that Isaiah wrote chapter liii. of his book, as well as that which he quoted as the prophet's words (Isai. xlii. 1.), and recorded in chapter xii. 17 of his Gospel. Luke (iii. 4.), believed that Isai. xl. was really written by the prophet. And the Lord read in the Synagogue at Nazareth out of the book of Isaiah (lxi. 1, 2.) a portion which it is said now never proceeded from that prophet's pen ! Were all, the Lord included, under a delusion, which critics of our age are now at work to dispel ? For Moses, they would assure us, never wrote Deuteronomy, and Isaiah xl.-lxvi., could not have proceeded from the son of Amoz. To an unnamed, and unnameable evangelist of the exile are we indebted for those beautiful chapters (p. 162).

Startling, indeed. But the Professor has much of which to instruct us. "We are uncertain," he tells us, "whether any written law has reached us from Moses himself" (p. 139). And "criticism," we read, "has already removed from many of the Prophets large portions of the books which bear their names" (p. 217). Nor have we bottomed the subject yet, for our author prepares us for fresh discoveries looming, it would appear, in the distance. He does not forget "that we (*i.e.*, critics), have entered upon a more thorough analysis of these books which may issue in further subtractions of the same kind" (p. 217). To what shall we come, when the critics have finished their work ? No extant written law of Moses ! No Psalms from David !

The early chapters of Genesis "in their framework were woven from raw material of myth and legend" (p. 92). Genesis iii. is a "prose poem of the fall" (p. 93). The man who composed that chapter "was the acute and faithful reader of his own heart" (p. 94). Surely simple folk may well ask—If critics are to lead us, have we any reliable Old Testament at all ? In the meantime, where are we to stop ; for the final consensus of criticism has not yet appeared ? (p. 217). For that, it seems, we must still wait, but whilst waiting we may indeed think, shall we

ever get it? So here, in the twentieth century of the Christian era, we are still to be in doubt as to what is really comprised in the Old Testament. But meanwhile a word of comfort is offered us. "This absence of history from the chapters (Gen. i-ix.), this fact that their framework is woven from the raw material of myth and legend, cannot discredit the profound moral and religious truths with which they are charged, any more than the cosmogony of his time, which Milton employs, impairs by one whit our spiritual indebtedness to *Paradise Lost*" (p. 92). What shall we say of such an announcement? Does any one view *Paradise Lost* as an inspired writing? Is it real, authentic history? Does anyone dream that it is a revelation from God?

The Word of God and *Paradise Lost*, think of the association!! Raw material of myth and legend! Is this the character of the Word of God? How did Israel acquire this myth and legend? Whence came it? The Professor is prepared to enlighten us. "Critics are now generally agreed that the traditions reached Israel at an early age, and that along with other elements of Babylonian legend and mythology, they underwent considerable modification and gradually became, when, perhaps, all memory of their true origin was lost, part of the folk-lore of Canaan. The process gradually extended through many centuries before the authors of these chapters of Genesis used them for a higher purpose" (pp. 91, 92). The *authors* of these chapters! Who were they? Who can tell? Who will tell? Here, Professor G. A. Smith, who has conducted his readers to such an embarrassment, forsakes them, only assuring them, "nor (it is hardly necessary to add) does the legendary character of these stories altogether destroy their historical value" (p. 92). Historical value! Is that all we gather from them?

But, there is a book professing to speak the truth, which directly conflicts with such a nebulous hypothesis. The history of Adam and Eve just myth and legend! Paul thought differently, and taught differently. Eve to him was no legendary character, nor the history of the fall a myth. Adam was a real man, and the first man (1 Cor. xv. 45). Eve was a real woman, and the

temptation by the serpent a real though sad history (2 Cor. xi. 3 ; 1 Tim. ii. 13, 14). The story of Cain and Abel a myth ! John the Apostle teaches differently (1 John iii. 12). Abel's blood *was* shed we can say on the highest authority (Matt. xxiii. 35). And the record of his sacrifice and its acceptance we are taught is reliable and instructive history (Heb. xi. 4).

Coming down the stream of time we read of the translation of Enoch. A mere legend is this ? Was he a mythical person ? Jude acquaints us (14, 15) with the words of his prophecy, and Heb. xi. 5 assures us of the reality of his translation. Then the story of the flood confronts us (Gen. vi-viii) ; what can the Professor state about it ? Writing of the creation and the flood he tells us, " We are ignorant of the time at which the Hebrews received these stories," founded, as we are to understand, on Babylonian legends. Then as to the shape in which these chapters in Genesis have come down to us, we read, " in their Biblical form they exhibit so many differences from the Babylonian, as to make it probable that the materials were used by the writers of the Pentateuchal documents only after long tradition within a Hebrew atmosphere " (p. 62). What room is there for the thought of divine revelation in all this ? A Babylonian legend the source of information, and the materials of it used by the Pentateuchal writers only after long tradition within a Hebrew atmosphere. Is such a conclusion sober truth, or is it the dream of men who reject the thought of verbal inspiration ? Granting that the Babylonian legends of the flood, and that of Creation are of older date than the days of Moses, does that confirm the allegation that Gen. i., vi-viii. are Semitic products based on Babylonian materials ? God, of course, knew of these legends. What then more proper, when Israel as His people were commencing their national existence, than that He should by Moses put on record the real history of creation and the true story of the flood, the cause of it, the nature of it, and the issue of it in the preservation in the ark of Noah and his family ? The Babylonian stories would show that the history of the flood was no myth. But reading the two accounts surely

anyone could see to which should be given implicit credence. The Babylonian legend of the flood is polytheistic in character. The History in Genesis is essentially monotheistic. Was the knowledge of the One True God evolved out of the story of many Gods?

Can we then call the Mosaic account a myth, of course then of no historical authority? It is very precise in its details. Do men commonly give implicit credence to details of a myth? Now the Spirit of God by the prophet Isaiah distinctly avers that the flood was a real fact. "This is as the waters of Noah unto Me; for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth; so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee" (Isai. liv. 9). Then, of that Patriarch's personal existence Ezekiel was sure, as he wrote by the Spirit of God of him in connection with Daniel and Job (Ezek. xiv. 14, 20). Twice over, too, does Peter refer to the flood as real history (1 Pet. iii. 20; 2 Pet. ii. 5), and each time mentions Noah by name. To the fact of the deluge and its awful results the Lord Jesus has borne witness (Luke xvii. 26, 27); telling us, too, who more fitting, what men were about in the old world, till the flood came and took them all away.

Myths, legends are these ante-diluvian histories? How clearly does the New Testament bear witness to their credibility. Abel, Cain, Enoch, as well as Noah, have a place in New Testament Scriptures. Matt. xxiii. 35; and Heb. xi. 4 have preserved a record of Abel. The former passage from the mouth of the Lord Jesus keeps in memory his death; the latter by the Spirit recalls God's acceptance of his sacrifice. Then of Cain, 1 John iii. 12; Jude 11, perpetuate the story of his wickedness. And Enoch's faithful walk, service, and translation (Heb. xi. 5, 6; Jude 14, 15) are facts never to be forgotten. Call these histories legends if anybody will. Such must reckon with the Author of the inspired Word, who presents them to us as veritable history. And as for the flood, the Lord Jesus has drawn a lesson for all from its suddenness, to warn all of the suddenness of His return to earth to reign (Matt. xxiv. 37). He would teach all of the historical

value of the Mosaic account of Gen. vi-viii. Peter likewise attests it (2 Pet. iii. 5, 6).

Then the book of Jonah, we are told, "is not real history, but a sermon in the form of a parable upon the great evangelical truth, that *God has granted to the Gentiles also repentance unto life*" (p. 89). Is it not strange that if Professor G. A. Smith is here correct, the Lord Jesus never intimated it? He referred to the history of Jonah, affirmed thereby that it was *real* history, and made mention of the two wonderful events in that book—Jonah in the belly of the fish three days and three nights, and the effect on the Ninevites by his preaching just for one day. He drew lessons from them for the men of His day (Luke xi. 29-32); but mentioned nothing of events in the then future Christian times, *i.e.*, subsequent to the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. What the Lord dwelt on the Professor passes over. What the Lord did not even hint at is presented to us as the legitimate teaching of the history. But how suggest a lesson from that which was not real history?

Again, "Take," we read, "the different stories of the origin of the name of Bethel. It is impossible to believe that these came from the same hand" (p. 47). We cannot see the impossibility. Jacob when *alone* at Luz (Gen. xxviii. 10-22) on his way to Padan Aram called it Bethel. God, in xxxi. 13, appearing to Jacob in Padan Aram, acknowledges and endorses the name that Jacob had given to the spot. But who else was to know of the change of name by which it was to be called? This was provided for in xxxv. 9-15. Jacob now returned to it, no longer alone, but with a *large company*, publicly called the place Bethel. All with him were to recognize the change of name. Very natural was this. So of his name of Israel. Given to him when *alone* with the angel (Gen. xxxii.), arriving at Bethel God appeared unto him and called his name Israel. Now in the midst of his company, no longer alone, his new name was openly declared. These two supposed difficulties are surely easily explained, and the argument sought to be founded on them has no substantial support from the narratives.

It becomes evident that following the critics of the Old Testament we must set aside New Testament teaching, as in the case of Jonah, and repudiate the direct statements of inspired Scripture. Nay, more, we must be prepared to hold that the Lord Jesus could be, and was mistaken, and asserted as fact what never happened. Truly we shall have much to unlearn. The volume, too, of the Old Testament will shrink into small, and who can yet say into how small, dimensions? For Deuteronomy, we are told, did not come into force till B.C. 621 under king Josiah (p. 66); and "Pentateuchal legislation was not in existence in the time of the Judges, or of the earlier Kings" (p. 60). Of Isaiah, too, we are told that chaps. xl-lxvi. were the product of some unknown writer, who lived a good while later than the era of the son of Amoz (p. 162).

Shall we accept the critics in opposition to Prophets and Apostles, and even to the Lord Jesus Himself? Shall we place these last in one scale and all the critics in the other, and find, as we do so, that the critics outweigh the others? Are the whole company of critics agreed on that which is declared? Can they truthfully claim for themselves what David, Paul and John could say of themselves? Are they prepared to challenge the truthfulness of the Master Himself? David affirmed that the Lord spake by him, and His word was on his tongue (2 Sam. xxiii. 2); and his "tongue," he elsewhere said, "was the pen of a ready writer" (Ps. xlv. 1). St. Paul tells us that he and others spake in words which the Holy Ghost taught them (1 Cor. ii. 13). What critic would dare to affirm that of himself? St. John claims special attention to his teaching, as he unhesitatingly writes, "He that knoweth God heareth us" (1 John iv. 6). Then the Lord declared of Himself, "We speak that we do know" (John iii. 11). And Peter, writing of the Prophets in general, states that "holy men of God (or, men from God) spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Pet. i. 21). Which of the critics could affirm that of himself? Certainly all could not, for they do not all agree.

Now to turn to Deuteronomy. "The written law of Israel,"

we read, "in the three forms in which we possess it, cannot have been the work of Moses or of the Mosaic, or immediately post-Mosaic age, but must be assigned to a much later date" (p. 52). This is plain speaking. So Deuteronomy to use a common expression, must go by the board. It did not come into force till B.C. 621 (p. 66). Where was it previously? Now let us remind the reader of a principle, as we believe it to be, in God's dealings with men, viz., that at the outset, or in the early days of a divine movement God communicates for those concerned what is suited for them to know. In Eden this appears as He warned Adam and Eve against eating of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Of all other fruits they might freely eat. The fruit of that was alone debarred to them. No further revelation was required. Keeping God's command they would live, transgressing it they would die. We know the result. God at the outset had issued this command; and Eve in her reply to the serpent expressed her full cognisance of it.

The next great movement was after the flood, when Noah and his family, the only ones spared of the human race, were to multiply and replenish the earth. Fresh regulations were therefore vouchsafed. The sweet savour of the sacrifice rising up to God, He blessed Noah and his sons, an act for man never repeated after the creation of Adam and Eve. The fruits of the trees, of which Adam and his posterity were deprived by the fall, were given back. Flesh, too, without distinction was granted them, blood only being forbidden. And the sword of government was now placed in man's hand (Gen. viii. 21; ix. 6). All this, that little company of eight heard as they stood around the altar. Before there was any dispersion they were acquainted with the revelation for their day.

Years rolled by, and Abraham was called out to be a pilgrim and stranger upon earth. To him new revelations, but those just suited for the pilgrim, were vouchsafed. It was this time a revelation about his inheritance, and a revelation about God. He started on his pilgrimage to reach the land. Reaching Sichem he learnt that Canaan was the land; and dwelling there God

spoke to him saying, "I am the Almighty God ; walk before Me, and be thou perfect " (Gen. xvii. 1). To Abraham the father of the faithful was this first made known. A stranger in the land of promise, moving amongst people of different nationalities, though all descendants of Ham, God revealed to the patriarch that He was the Almighty, and therefore could, of course, protect His servant. This revelation suited for the patriarchal and nomad life, Isaac evidently treasured up. For when Jacob was to leave his father's house to go to Haran, a lonely traveller with nothing but his staff, his father remembering surely the revelation vouchsafed to Abraham, said to his son " God Almighty bless thee " (Gen. xxviii. 3). No more suited revelation of God for those times could there be, than that which Abraham had received. The promise of the land God confirmed first to Isaac (xxvi. 3), and then to Jacob (xxviii. 13) ; for as yet there was no written revelation to which they could turn. Then that revelation of God as the Almighty, Jacob remembered, when sending his sons with Benjamin on their second journey to Egypt. "God Almighty give you mercy before the man, that he may send away your other brother and Benjamin " (xliii. 14). The old man evidently felt in his soul the value of that revelation first communicated to his grandfather Abraham, when called to walk as a pilgrim and a stranger upon earth. Thenceforth after Jacob, with the exception of Exod. vi. 3, and Numb. xxiv. 4, 16, that name of God is no longer found in the Pentateuch.

The next divine movement was the calling out, not now of a family as in patriarchal days, but of a nation. Further revelations were then given. God's name, Jehovah, was to be a special one for Israel, privileged, if they had only remembered it, to witness for the one true God against idols, "I am Jehovah " (Exod. vi. 2) was the divine announcement. And, "Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our God is one Jehovah " (Deut. vi. 4) was the repetition of it. Two Jehovahs, independent the one of the other there are not. In addition to that, the law was now given them by Moses (John i. 17), a code completed ere the law-giver died, and all that was needed for Israel, till the Prophet, like unto Moses, should appear.

Coming down to Christian times we see the same principle at work. To the revelation of God as Almighty and Jehovah was now added that of Father; and all that Christians need of divine revelation for their walk and guidance was given in apostolic times. Nothing further in this dispensation is to be looked for (Rev. ii. 25; iii. 11; Jude 3). The Apostle Paul had the service entrusted to him to fulfil the Word of God, as he declared and explained in Col. i. 25-27.

Would any here enquire, how does this bear on the question of Deuteronomy? We will explain. There were three covenants made by God with Israel during the lifetime of Moses. The first was made at Sinai. To this Israel were a party, and if kept by them rich blessing would have been theirs (Exod. xix. 5, 6). Soon broken by the making of the golden calf, Israel as far as they were concerned, had forfeited all favour. God then in grace made another covenant with them, and this time an unconditional one, by which He bound Himself to bring them into the land (Exod. xxxiv. 1. 10-27). On the strength of this covenant the people entered into Canaan. But entering into the land, and continuing to enjoy it, are two very different questions. On what terms could they hope to continue in the land? Here the *third* covenant, that was made in the land of Moab, comes in (Deut. xxix. 1). On the observance of this (xii.-xxix. 1) to which Israel were a party (xxix. 9-15), they would prosper and prolong their days on the earth for ever (iv. 40; xxviii. 1-13).

If the critics are right, Deuteronomy, according to some, appeared in the reign of Manasseh, according to others it only came into force in the reign of Josiah, B.C. 621. Then for upwards of *eigh. hundred years* after the death of Moses the people had not vouchsafed them the terms on which they could continue in the land. And only after the captivity of the ten tribes, and who, too, because of Manasseh's sins Judah must go into captivity (2 Kings xxi. 10-15), the conditions on the observance of which Israel could continue to enjoy the land were made known. Is this credible? Would that be like our God? And be it remembered that only in Deuteronomy is found that third covenant of which we have spoken.

If Moses, then, did not write the covenant made in the land of Moab, what a break there was in the needed instruction for Israel. And if he did not put it in writing, as Deuteronomy declares he did (xxxi. 9), difficulties rise up impossible to solve. There is a phrase, which is met with in that book about thirty times, and elsewhere in the law once or so, characterised by the Hebrew word *hayom*, *i.e.*, to-day, or as the A.V. often renders it, "this day." Moses is introduced as saying, "this law which I set before you this day;" "commandments which I command you this day" (iv. 8, 40), "the statutes and judgments which I speak in your ears this day" (v. 1), "words which I command you this day" (vi. 6). See, too, iv. 26; vii. 11; viii. 1, 11; x. 13; xi. 8, 13, 27, 28, 32; xiii. 18; xv. 5, 15; xix. 9; xxvii. 1, 4, 9; xxviii. 1, 13, 14, 15; xxix. 12; xxx. 2, 8, 11, 15, 16, 18, 19; xxxii. 46. If Deuteronomy does not give us the real words of Moses, but only conjectures of a scribe some eight centuries later, what imposition did that anonymous individual practice on his countrymen? To speak in plain language, the repetition of "this day" was the repetition of a lie. But believing that Deuteronomy was really the work of Moses, his words and his writing, we can see how the Holy Ghost provided beforehand by that one Hebrew word, *i.e.*, "this day," a safeguard against the dreams of critics in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries of our era,

Would any suggest that the frequent use of that one Hebrew word in Deuteronomy confirms the supposition of a different author than the law-giver? Simple folk may well ask what confidence could we have in the statements of the writer putting words into Moses' mouth, and fixing the date when he uttered them, yet well knowing that he was only presenting to his countrymen what, living eight centuries after the law-giver, he thought Moses might have said?

God acted towards Israel as He had on previous occasions, and as He has done in apostolic days. He communicated, ere Moses died, all the law that they were to keep, till the Prophet like unto Moses should appear.

We have said difficulties impossible to solve rise up as we ponder over the suggestions of the critics. We are told that Pentateuchal legislation was not in existence in the time of the

Judges, or of the earlier Kings (p. 60). Was it in existence in the days of Joshua? What would the critics answer? What, we may ask, would Scripture tell us? God's words to Joshua, just after the death of Moses, speak of the book of the law as in existence, and known to Joshua (Josh. i. 8). Then he spoke of it at the close of his life, addressing the elders gathered together as "the book of the law of Moses" (xxiii. 6). And that book he must have had in his hands when addressing the people at Shechem, who then and there openly declared that they would obey God. On the strength of that declaration the aged leader made a covenant with them, and wrote it in "the book of the law of God" (xxiv. 26). The book of the law was therefore in existence. And the book of Deuteronomy was owned as part of it. For Joshua years previously had assembled all Israel between Ebal and Gerizim, had erected an altar on Ebal, and there wrote upon stones a copy of the law of Moses, which the law-giver wrote in the presence of the children of Israel. "There was not a word," we read, "of all that Moses commanded which Joshua read not before all the congregation of Israel, with the women and the little ones, and the strangers that were conversant among them" (Josh. viii. 31-35). Where was to be found this commandment of Moses? Only in Deuteronomy xi. 26-32; and xxvii. 1-26. Deuteronomy then existed in Joshua's days, and was owned by him and all as part of the law of God by Moses. It was at Shechem that God first announced to Abraham that to his seed would He give that land (Gen. xii. 7). And after the lapse of upwards of four centuries and a half the people there met and read what we may call their title-deeds to the land.

But no Pentateuchal legislation in the days of the earlier kings!! Was this the case? Then David, Solomon, Asa, and Jehoshaphat were all under a delusion. They thought they had the law of Moses (1 Kings ii. 3; 2 Chron. xiv. 4). Rehoboam forsook the law of the Lord (2 Chron. xii. 1); then he must have had it. And Jehoshaphat sent of his princes and of Levites to teach in Judah, and they "had the book of the law of the Lord with them, and went about throughout all the cities of Judah and taught the people" (2 Chron. xvii. 7-9). Shall we view all this as myth and legend, or regard it as sober history? Then if the book of Deuteronomy only came into force 621 B.C., how was it that king Amaziah, whilst putting to death the murderers of his father, spared their children? What made him act thus?

The chronicler tells us that he followed in that what was "written in the law in the book of Moses, where the Lord commanded saying, 'The fathers shall not die for the children, nor the children for the fathers, but every one shall die for his own sin'" (2 Chron. xxv. 3, 4). Where is this found? Only in Deuteronomy-xxiv. 16. Did Amaziah know and act on a law which only came into force nigh two centuries later? Will it be said, that is only the Chronicler? The writer of 2 Kings xiv. 5, 6 relates the same.

Was the book of the law enlarged as time went on, or additions made to it subsequent to the death of Moses? There is no hint of that, and of this we can adduce a witness, whose testimony surely will be accepted. The prophet Ezekiel, himself a priest, who born in the days of Josiah, and dates his last prophecy in the seven and twentieth year of king Jehoiachin's captivity, knew of no addition to the law of Moses subsequent to the law-giver's death, as he shows by his words in xx. 10-12. The book of the law had been then completed. Revelations by prophets came from time to time, but no addition to the law. David instituted a service of song, but he did not incorporate that in the book of the law of Moses. His institution of music in the Temple service is mentioned (2 Chron. xxix. 25; Ezra iii. 10; Nehemiah xii. 24); but as Ezra iii. 2 compared with verse 10 shows, it was distinguished from the law of Moses.

As far as we have gone, the Old Testament does not bear out the dictum of Professor G. A. Smith, but distinctly refutes it. Pentateuchal legislation was in existence from the first, however the people failed in carrying it out. And that legislation included among the books of the law—the book of Deuteronomy as we have seen. And now ere leaving the subject of the Mosaic authenticity of that book, let us ask what the New Testament can tell us about it. That is as much entitled to be heard as the conclusions of the critics. As much? We must say, far more. The New Testament is composed of inspired writings, inspired by the Spirit of God. We shall find it on this subject by no means reticent. The Jews of that day, Apostles, Evangelists, and the Lord Himself all bear testimony to its Mosaic authorship. The Pharisees approaching the Lord on the question of divorce, were asked by Him, What did Moses command you? And they at once replied, "Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put her away" (Mark x. 4). Where was this found in the law?

In the book of Deuteronomy, and there only (xxiv. 1). Was that really a Mosaic exactment? What an opportunity, if critics are correct, for the Lord to have told them that Moses never wrote such words. By His answer, however, He has settled that question beyond dispute. "For the hardness of your heart," He replied, "he, *i.e.*, Moses, wrote you this precept" (Mark x. 5). What they had quoted, therefore, was not just a tradition, however carefully preserved. The words of Deut. xxiv. 1 were the words that Moses had *written*. The Pharisees by their answer expressed their belief that Deuteronomy was written by Moses. The Sadducees, too, the other great school of the day, were of the same mind, as they approached the Lord with their question as to resurrection, prefixing it with the statement, that "Moses wrote unto us" (Mark xii. 19), and quoting Deut. xxv. 5 about the levirate marriage. The Jews, then, whether Pharisees or Sadducees, were of one mind about Deuteronomy, however much they differed on other vital points. Then Peter (Acts iii. 22) and Stephen (vii. 37) held the like view, as they quote Deut. xviii. 18 as the words of Moses.

But we can carry the case further. The Lord in the Gospel of John v. 46, 47, said, "Had ye believed Moses ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" Moses then wrote something, and that something was in existence in the Lord's day. Had it been lost? We know it has not. Moses wrote, too, of the Lord. Where shall we find that in the Pentateuch? We think the Lord's word indicates it. "If ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" He had said. Was He not referring to Deut. xviii. 18, which foretold the coming of a Prophet like unto Moses, to whom they were to hearken? But, writes the Professor, "We are uncertain whether any written law has reached us from Moses himself" (p. 139). That may be his conviction. Ours, who believe the New Testament as well as the Old, is very different.

To refer again to Isaiah we are told (p. 53) that chapters xl-lxvi. were not by the son of Amoz. "These chapters nowhere claim to be by Isaiah, and do not present a single reflection of his time. But they plainly set forth, as having already taken place, certain events, which happened from a century to a century and a half after Isaiah had passed away: the Babylonian exile and captivity, the ruin of Jerusalem, and the devastation of the Holy Land." Such

is the indictment. What can be said to the contrary? 'The opening of the book presents an answer. It is called, "The *vision* of Isaiah, the son of Amoz, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem, in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah" (i. 1). Only two other prophetic books are described as *visions*; viz., that of Obadiah, and that of Nahum. The former was a vision concerning Edom, the latter a vision concerning Nineveh. This description then should arrest attention. Now a prophetic vision to be vouchsafed depended, of course, only on God who gave it. And a vision could depict events as if actually passing before the eye of the prophet, so that he would describe them as if actually taking place. Prophecy gives a *history* of that which is to be. A *vision* presents certain things as present to the gaze of the individual so favoured. It becomes then, not a question of what the prophet might surmise, but only of what he saw. The moment we recognise that the book is a *vision*, there can be no difficulty in events being described as actually taking place, though it may be centuries before they come to pass. The prophet, then, in the case of a vision sets forth what he sees.

Now did Isaiah's book end with xxxix. 7, 8, what a lugubrious ending would it be, predicting the captivity of Hezekiah's posterity to become eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon, and no more. Was that to be the end of the royal house? Was that condition never to be reversed? Chapters xl-lxvi. assure all of Israel's final blessing. Then who was the writer of those chapters if Isaiah was not? Who knows? The critics do not. It would be an anomaly in God's ways in prophetic books for the writer not to be identified by name. Every really prophetic book is authenticated by the writer's name. Why was the name of the supposed writer of chaps. xl-lxvi. withheld from the reader? When did God send a written message by no one knows who? If we cannot name all the messengers God sent of old, the people of the day in which they appeared well knew them. Who knew, who say, who heard this unnamed individual? We may ask this, but ask in vain. Till, then, the existence of the supposed writer is cleared up, we may quietly and confidently rest in the belief that it was Isaiah the son of Amoz who wrote that long portion.

And this we think will be confirmed as we mark the arrangements observable in the book. A cursory glance at it shows that it is divided into two great parts, separated by the historical

chapters xxxvi-xxxix, which recount events of Hezekiah's reign. The first part i-xxxv. gives us the prophetic outline of events in connection with Judah and Jerusalem to take place from the days of the prophet to those of the Lord Jesus. The second part (xl., lxvi.) describes more the moral dealing of God with the nation to form the remnant, that will inherit the promises, and dwell in the land under the rule of the righteous King.

These two great parts of the book are further subdivided into sections, chapters i-xii. ; xiii-xxvii. ; xxviii-xxxv., each portion of which ends with gladness or praise ; and chapters xl-xlvi. ; xlix-lvii. ; lviii-lxvi, each of which ends with warnings about the wicked. This feature we can understand. For where it is a question of that which Jehovah will do on earth for His people, a scene of brightness will be witnessed, and praise will be the fitting utterance of the heart. But where the moral condition of the people forms the subject of the prophecy, since all will not be converted, words of warning about the wicked form the suited conclusion. God warns the ungodly in the latter part, the praises of His people are provided for in the former part. The book is a consistent whole.

We have endeavoured thus far to show from the book itself, that the Isaianic authorship of the whole is by no means improbable. We can now advance further, reminding the reader of the irrefragable evidence, for those who listen to the Lord Jesus and to apostolic teaching, that Isaiah was the writer of the sixty-six chapters in which in our Bibles the book is divided. Matthew three times in his Gospel confirms the common belief of the writer of xl.-lxvi. ; as he quotes the prophet by name in iii. 3 ; viii. 17 ; xii. 17. Luke thrice over attests the same (iii. 4 ; iv. 17 ; Acts viii. 28, 30). John has no doubt about the writer of the second part (i. 23 ; xii. 38). John the Baptist, too, believed it, as John the Evangelist tells us (i. 23). Paul also averred the same (Rom. x. 16, 20). And to this we may add the witness of the Lord as recorded in Luke iv. For when there was handed to Him in the Synagogue at Nazareth the book of the prophet Isaiah, He opened the book to read to the assembled congregation (Isai. lxi. 1-3). Authority, then, of the highest kind, and to which no critics can lay claim, must be held as settling the question. No other individual ever came forward even to assert, much less to prove, that he was really the writer. From the days of the son of Amoz to those of the Lord it was believed by all who possessed the book that Isaiah was the writer. What Scripture teaches, what it asserts

is, we may be sure, the safe and the true ground on which to rest.

Our space is limited, otherwise many other points could be noticed. Such, for instance, as the way God is presented (p. 136). Neither becoming reverence for Him, nor for the Lord Jesus, characterises the lectures. We would conclude with a few remarks on the way the Lord Jesus is presented in these pages. The Spirit of God testifies of Him (John xv. 26), and glorifies Him (xvi. 14). How do critics speak of Him as evidenced by Professor G. A. Smith? On p. 11 we read that Christ took for granted its, *i.e.*, the Bible's, fundamental doctrines about creation, about man, and about righteousness; about God's Providence of the world, and His purposes of grace through Israel. "*Took for granted.*" What does this mean? We have been told (p. 92) that the framework of the early chapters of Genesis is woven from raw material of myth and legend. Did the Lord, He who is the Word of God, take for granted the framework of myth and legend, and treat it as the inspired word of God? He describes Himself as the faithful and true witness (Rev. iii. 14). He spoke, He declared that which He knew (John iii. 11). Was that compatible with taking for granted what we are told was woven from myth and legend? If Professor G. A. Smith is right, did the Lord know the origin of those early chapters? Yet who can doubt that He did.

Again we read, "To many other observances of the Law, Christ showed by His neglect of them, or by His positive transgression, a high superiority. He touched the leper, and did not feel Himself unclean; He reckoned all foods as lawful; He broke away from the literal observance of the Sabbath law" (p. 14). Is this a true picture of the Lord Jesus Christ as He walked about upon earth? Let us hear His own words, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, 'Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled'" (Matt. v. 17, 18).\*

---

\*On this we read (p. 12), "If, as most critics allow, the second of these verses (18) be a genuine utterance of our Lord." What critics doubt it we are not told. But we receive it not on the authority of critics. No uncial MS. it seems, which has that portion of Matthew's Gospel, omits it. Ancient versions as the Vulgate, and Jerome's version exhibited in the Codex Amiatinas, and the Peshito-Syriac all have it. The testimony in its favour seems overwhelming. Neither Tischendorf, ed. 8, nor Tregelles doubt of it, nor Westcott and Hort either.

These are the words of One, of whom we are told, that He was a transgressor of some of its precepts. Was that compatible with His words near the close of His life, "The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all, therefore, whatsoever they bid you, do and observe" (Matt. xxiii. 2, 3)? Did He enjoin such an observance on others, and yet be Himself a transgressor? "Which of you," He could say, challenging hostile Jews, "convinceth me of sin?" (John viii. 46). St. Paul writes of Him as one who "knew no sin" (2 Cor. v. 21); and St. John declares "In Him is no sin" (1 John iii. 5). Professor G. A. Smith asserts that He was a transgressor. "He that offends in one point is guilty of all," writes James (ii. 10). The Lord Jesus guilty of positive transgression of some of the observances of the law!! Is this what we are to believe? Irving taught that the Lord had a peccable nature, but did not sin. Professor G. A. Smith presents Him as guilty of positive transgression of the law. Could such an one, who must then have needed a sacrifice on His own behalf, have been as a Lamb without blemish and without spot, of which St. Peter writes (1 Peter i. 19)? What Christian could think that of the Holy One and the True (Rev. iii. 7)? Had He transgressed the law in a manner which seems not to have been transacted in a corner, how was it that the Jews, who were on the watch to accuse Him, never brought that up against Him?

For when was it that we are given to understand He transgressed an ordinance of the law? The reference given us in a note is to the cleansing of the leper (Matt. viii. 1-4); but without pointing the reader to the Mosaic law which the Lord is said to have transgressed. Now the authority of the law the Master maintained on that occasion by sending the cleansed leper to the priests. Had the Lord first transgressed it? The leper blazoned abroad the story of his cure. Multitudes thereupon sought the Lord to hear and to be healed of their infirmities (Luke v. 12-15). Did they run after an open transgressor of the law?

Next we read, "He reckoned all foods as lawful," and Mark vii. 15; Luke xi. 37; x. vii. are given as authorities. Not one of these support the statement. Luke xi. 37 certainly does not. Mark is equally wide of the mark. And Luke x. 7 refers to hospitality shewn the seventy by Jews, for they went not on that mission among Gentiles, going to the cities, etc., in the land to

which the Lord would go. They went therefore among Jews, who as Peter teaches speaking of himself (Acts x. 14) did not eat anything common or unclean. Then as to the literal observance of the Sabbath law, what the Lord refused was obedience to the traditional teaching engrafted on it, which never came from God. Men by their traditions would have hindered the outflow of divine mercy on that day. The Lord's teaching on such occasions silenced all outward objections to His acts in grace. The Lord's character, aspersed by the quotation we have given, is effectually cleared as Scripture is allowed its testimony.

In that same paragraph from which we have quoted we read that, "He, *i.e.*, the Lord, left no commands about sacrifice, the Temple worship, or circumcision, *but on the contrary by the institution of the New Covenant, He abrogated for ever these sacraments of the Old.*" The italics are ours. Strange it is to read of the abrogation *for ever* of the Mosaic ritual, whilst Ezek. xl-xlvi. remains uncanceled and unfulfilled. Stranger still to read of the Lord's institution of the New Covenant. It has not yet been made, as Jeremiah xxxi. 31-34 makes plain, but will be made in a coming day with the House of Israel, and with the House of Judah, not with Christians. We call attention to this to show the need of verifying such allegations instead of blindly accepting them. Two more quotations must suffice, 1st, "There are other parts of the law upon which He, *i.e.*, the Lord, turned with spoken condemnation" (p. 20). "The Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He seeth the Father do," etc. (John v. 19). Thus He spoke of Himself. Did He turn with spoken condemnation on God's revelation by Moses? 2nd, "The Lord did not count the whole of the Old Testament as equally divine" (p. 29). How does this square with His word on the day that He rose, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning Him (Luke xxiv. 44). The threefold division of the Old Testament the Lord here endorses, but makes no exception of any book in that volume as not equally divine.

He who would follow earlier critics in certain matters, as Professor Smith has informed us, would be led wrong. He who would follow the critics when they conflict with New Testament teaching, we learn from perusal of his book how such an one would be led wrong. To the Scriptures of truth must we keep, the only infallible guide for this day.

C. E. S.

# BY C. E. STUART.

<b>TRACINGS FROM THE GOSPEL OF JOHN ;</b> or, Records of the Incarnate World	...	...	...	...	5	0
<b>TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT</b> for English Bible Students	...	...	...	...	4	6
<b>PASTORAL AND DOCTRINAL.</b> A vol. of Pamphlets	...	...	...	...	4	0
<b>TRACINGS FROM THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES ;</b> or Thirty Years of Christian Work	...	...	...	...	3	6
<b>FROM ADVENT TO ADVENT ;</b> Outline of the Gospel of Luke	...	...	...	...	3	6
<b>THE OLD FAITH OR THE NEW, WHICH ?</b> An Enquiry and Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews	...	...	...	...	3	6
<b>THE BOOK OF PRAISES, OR THE PSALMS :</b> An attempt to trace their sequence...	...	...	...	...	3	6
<b>OUTLINE ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.</b> Second edition	...	...	...	...	2	6
<b>SIMPLE PAPERS ON THE CHURCH OF GOD</b>	...	...	...	...	1	6
<b>GOSPEL STUDIES.</b> (Second Edition)	...	...	1/-	and	1	6
<b>SKETCHES FROM THE GOSPEL OF MARK</b>	...	...	...	...	1	0
<b>REMARKS ON THE TABERNACLE.</b> New edition	...	...	...	...	1	0
<b>THOUGHTS ON SACRIFICES.</b> Reduced to 6d. ; cloth	...	...	...	...	1	0
<b>PRESENT SERVICE OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST</b>	...	...	...	...	0	6
<b>THE ATONEMENT</b> as set forth in the Old Testament	...	...	...	...	0	6
<b>PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY</b>	...	...	...	...	0	4
<b>CHRISTIAN STANDING AND CONDITION</b>	...	...	...	...	0	4
<b>PROPITIATION BY BLOOD</b>	...	...	...	...	0	3
<b>A SLIGHT SKETCH OF THE HOLY SPIRIT'S WAYS</b>	...	...	...	...	0	3
<b>RELATIONSHIP WITH GOD.</b> Second edition	...	...	...	...	0	2
<b>SALVATION AND ATONEMENT</b>	...	...	...	...	0	2
<b>A PLAIN PATH IN A DAY OF CONFUSION</b>	...	...	...	...	0	1

*Blatchley, Book Room, 27, Lancefield St., London, W.*