

Our Contributors.

WHAT IS HIS STANDING AT HOME?

BY KNOWN MAN

During the time that he was President of the United States, Garfield suffered from occasional attacks of acute dyspepsia brought on by incessant worry. One day a friend called and asked him if he had ever tried a patent medicine which he described in this way:—

"GREAT REPUTATION ABROAD, LITTLE AT HOME."

It is quite possible that a good many patent medicines might be truthfully described in the same way. But whatever may be said of patent medicines it is an undoubted fact that a good many men have a much greater reputation abroad than they have at home. They stand better with the people who do not know much about them than with the people who know all about them. A hundred miles from home they are of much more importance than they are among their own neighbours. The people who know them best think the least of them. Abroad they are great men, put on big swelling airs and lecture their fellow men in a patronizing kind of way: at home they are nobody in particular. Perhaps they are dead beats.

In a few weeks we may have a general election. When the warfare begins the political managers will let loose upon the community a horde of electioneering scoundrels who have no reputation at home that they would not be much better without. From the cities and larger towns brazen-faced, long-tongued, characterless scamps are sent to the villages and townships "to work," as the phrase goes. At home nobody would pay any attention to them. The merchants of their own community would not credit them with five cents worth of tobacco. A hundred miles from home they swell out into pretentious politicians and tell the village and rural electors how they should vote. Their cheek is so hard that it would not freeze in a temperature fifty degrees below zero. Their tongues rattle in their empty heads like the clapper of an old fashioned cow-bell. One of their stale tricks is to talk glibly about the leaders of the political parties, hoping in this way to make the rural voters believe that they are on familiar terms with the great men of the country.

Why do political managers insult intelligent citizens by sending these creatures into the country? Do they think that the electors are chiefly fools and knaves. We can easily understand why unclean scamps are sent sneaking along the concessions to distribute the "boodle." No other kind would go. The meaner a man is the better qualified he is for a boodle distributor. It is in accordance with the eternal fitness of things that a creature who distributes boodle should be the meanest and most corrupt of all mean and corrupt men. But why, in the name of common sense, should a fellow who has no standing for reputation at home be put on a platform to address the electors. By all means let there be public discussion, but let it be conducted by men who at least enjoy the confidence and respect of their neighbours. We have no Roseberys, or Balfours, or Campbell-Bannermans or Gladstones, but we have many respectable, intelligent men who can instruct the people on public questions and who would willingly do so if public discussion during election times were made a decent enough thing for a respectable man to take part in without being smirched himself.

The people themselves are a good deal to blame for the low tone of much of our political discussion. They flock to hear the meanest kind of political hummers; they laugh at his stale jokes and vulgar stories; they speak of him as if he were greatly superior to their own neighbours, while as a matter of fact nine out

of every ten men in the village or on the concession are very much better men than he. Democracy is still on trial in this country and one of the outward and visible signs which painfully suggest its failure is the spectacle of a hundred electors in a village or rural school house sitting at the feet of an imported political hack who could not be elected pound keeper or post-master in his own neighbourhood.

The Church can hardly afford to throw stones at the political managers for using tools that have a reputation abroad but none at home. The Church has perhaps suffered more in this way than the State. But that view of the question must have a rest for the present.

Meantime, when you see a handbill announcing that Mr.—will address the electors just stop for a moment and ask who is that man? How does he stand at home? Did his own neighbours ever show any confidence in him? What is his business? Has he any standing in his own community? What claim has he to a hearing? Why should I spend an evening listening to a man that does not enjoy the company of his own neighbours.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE PENTATEUCH.*

BY REV W. G. HANNA, B.A.

The method of investigation called Higher Criticism has long been a required branch of study in theological seminaries. The familiar subject of Special Introduction has received a new name and new use. Any intelligent understanding of Holy Scripture presupposes enquiry as to the origin and character of the separate books. By whom were they written? at what time? under what circumstances, and with what purpose? In recent times, however, this enquiry has been prosecuted by many with a mere intellectual interest, just as one might study anatomy, and with little or no regard for the supernatural element in divine truth. Some, indeed, were avowed anti-supernaturalists.

As might be expected, higher criticism was readily used as an instrument of attack on the authority of God's Word. So continued has been the attack, and so arrogant the claims of some higher critics, that considerable anxiety has been awakened in reverent minds as to the result.

The appearance of this volume from the pen of Dr. Green will, therefore, be gladly welcomed, for he is known to be one of the foremost Hebrew scholars and thoroughly conversant with the entire field of investigation.

What is the Old Testament, and what is its structure? are the fundamental questions that define the point of view from which any and every critical enquiry must begin. Dr. Green holds that "the Old Testament is a product of the Spirit of God, wrought out through the instrumentality of many human agents, who were all inspired by Him, directed by Him, and adapted by Him to the accomplishment of his own fixed end." Then, the structure of the book as to the origin, aim and purpose of each of its constituent parts, with their relation to the whole, is exhibited in such a way as to make its unity unmistakable, and that cannot fail to lend new interest to the study of the Old Testament as an organism.

It is only when a clear view has been gained regarding the whole volume of the Old Testament, that the Pentateuch, its first part, can be rightly considered. Then, too, the plan and contents of the Pentateuch must be understood before questions of minor criticism can be profitably discussed. The theme of the Pentateuch is "The establishment of Israel to be the people of God." It shows the Genesis of Israel as a nation. This is history. It also exhibits the organization of the nation in a peculiar relation to God. This is legislation. The legislation is based upon the history and in-

*"The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch." By William Henry Green, D.D., LL.D. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York; Wm. Briggs, Toronto. 8vo. cloth. 184 pages. Price \$1.50.

terwoven with it. It is only by a careful analysis of the contents of the books that their plan is fully exhibited, and the advance in divine revelation, as required by the succeeding stages in the development of national life, clearly seen. Such an analysis is here given, and cannot fail to prove highly enlightening.

The Pentateuch is shown to have but one theme from first to last, and the alleged gaps in the history are adequately accounted for by reference to the plan of the writer.

Having cleared the ground thus far, we are next to enquire who is the author of the Pentateuch. Was Moses the author? This is the nerve of the matter. Many higher critics say no; Dr. Green unhesitatingly affirms that he was. That this decision has been arrived at, after adequate consideration of all the issues involved, is clear, for he says (p. 32): "Its credibility is, of course, not absolutely dependent upon its Mosaic authorship. It might all be true though it were written by another than Moses, and after his time. But if it was written by Moses, then the history of the Mosaic age was recorded by a contemporary and an eye-witness, one who was himself a participant and a leader in the scenes which he relates, and the legislator from whom the enactments proceeded. It must be confessed that there is in this fact the highest possible guarantee of the accuracy and truthfulness of the whole."

That Moses wrote the Pentateuch is evidenced by an array of arguments with which opponents have got to deal very seriously. There is no room to avoid the main issue. Some of these arguments may be met with elsewhere, but nowhere are they arranged and combined with such cumulative effect. Objections from alleged anachronisms and inconsistencies are fairly met and fully answered, and the whole supported by Scripture reference with abundant archaeological illustration. It is worthy of note that Prof. Sayce, who formerly held the view of the divisive critics, now holds to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and to this conclusion he has arrived from recent researches in Assyriology and archaeology, a field in which he is an acknowledged expert. Evidently what divisive critics need is more information.

The form of the Pentateuch is considered after its contents. The main objections to its Mosaic authorship lie against its form. The question of its unity is really the battleground of the critics to-day, and to its discussion a large portion of the book is devoted. Dr. Green thus states the issue (p. 61): "Now the question respecting the unity of the Pentateuch is, whether it is a continuous production from a single pen, whatever may have been the sources from which the materials were taken, or whether it is a composite production, made up from various writings woven together, the several portions of which are still capable of being distinguished, separated, and assigned to their respective originals." The former view he holds firmly, the latter he discusses with keen and searching analysis. His argument is masterly, and never weakened by concession or compromise. To dislodge Dr. Green from this position would be to remove Gibraltar.

The Document, Fragment, Supplement, Crystallization and Modified Document hypotheses are carefully reviewed in order, and their fallacies exposed. The grounds of partition are separately scrutinized point by point, and their radically defective character clearly pointed out. The *reductio ad absurdum* mode of argument is skillfully employed in a division of the parables of "The Prodigal Son," and "The Good Samaritan," after the style of the divisive critics, and scholarly use is made of the absurdities of the Wolfian hypothesis regarding the Homeric poems and the Catiline orations, as well as Seherer's division of the Faust Prologue.

As we follow this discussion point by point, the conclusion becomes irresistible that the method of the divisive critics might be applied in the same way to any other

writings than the Pentateuch. For theirs is an argument calculated to prove everything. But an argument which proves everything proves nothing whatever.

The final objections to the unity of the Pentateuch, viz., the triplicity of the legal codes, and the non-observance of the laws, traverse the field of Biblical archaeology. Here Dr. Green is *facile princeps*, and makes such an exposure of the absurdity of critical allegations against unity as cannot fail to change the drift of public opinion, by leading intelligent people henceforth to demand something more than unproved assertions. He is not oblivious of the benefits of divisive criticism, and thus states them: "While the hypothesis has proved futile as an attempt to account for the origin of the Pentateuch, the labor spent upon it has not been entirely thrown away, and it has not been without positive advantage to the cause of truth. (1) It has demonstrated the impossibility of such a partition. The experiment has been tried in every way that the utmost ingenuity can devise, but without success. (2) It has led to the development of a vast mass of positive evidence of unity, which would not otherwise have been so diligently sought for, and might not have been brought to light. (3) It has led to the elucidation and better understanding of the Pentateuch, from the necessity thus imposed of minute and thorough investigation of the meanings and bearings of every word and sentence, and of the mutual relations of every part. It verifies the fable of a field which was dug out for chimerical purpose, but the labor thus expended was rewarded by an unlooked-for harvest, sprung from seed which lay unsuspected in the soil."

This has been the result in the case of the Tuebingen criticism of the New Testament, and there is no doubt that it will be so in the case of the Old Testament also.

This calm reasoned statement of the grounds of the orthodox belief will have a steadying effect on the minds of many who have been disturbed by the large claims and confident tone of some who deny the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. The author is a higher critic, the peer of any living, but he stands for unity, not division, and holds that "the Bible stands upon a rock from which it can never be dislodged." It is a brief statement designed for popular use, and as such it is of the highest value.

Students of the original who wish to pursue the discussion beyond this stage are referred to an accompanying volume prepared for their use, "The Unity of the Book of Genesis," and the consideration of the later books given in "Hebraica," which we may hope to see in book form before very long.

Uxbridge.

THE PROPOSED LITURGY.

MR. EDITOR,—In common with many of your readers, your correspondent regards with some suspicion the wisdom or expediency of introducing liturgical services, as sanctioned by the last General Assembly. That there is too great diversity in the services at the present time is conceded, but whether read prayers would be an improvement, is open to question. There is something suggestive in the reasons urged by the mover and seconder of the motion in the Assembly, viz., a return to Reformation practice backed by the assertion, that while, as a church, we need not fear competition, so far as preaching is concerned, so much cannot be said for the devotional part of the services.

This word "competition," it is to be feared, gives the key to the grievance complained of. Is it true that our church services as presently practised, have not for their sole object, the ingathering of sinners and the edification of believers? Is it true that the devotional exercises are not characterized by a devout spirit, in earnestly and reverently invoking the Divine blessing on the services in which individual congregations, the Church at large, and other evangelical churches are engaged? As