

ing to his own showing, and how much of the anxiety which numerous believers cherish regarding the Bible would pass away, or disappear, were due attention to be extended to his own asseverations concerning the purpose and influence of the higher criticism! It will not be disputed by any intelligent Christian that the plan which Canon Driver and other higher critics follow is altogether anomalous, and indeed without a precedent or a parallel in the whole range of the world's literature. Driver allows himself to believe that several codes, as he calls them, were employed in the preparation of the Pentateuch or Hexateuch. It devolves on the higher critics, with their real or imaginary sagacity to determine the code from which even a few verses in any given chapter were taken. "I have followed the guidance of my own judgment as to what was probable or not." Such is the clear admission of Driver regarding the course which he is pursuing in his endeavor to ascertain the authorship of the Pentateuch or Hexateuch. Other critics can pursue a similar method with all the freedom and wisdom which Driver evinces; and such being the case, it may safely be predicted that the higher critics will never be of one mind, or arrive at similar conclusions with regard to the composition of the Pentateuch or Hexateuch. It may be held, therefore, as an able thinker affirms, that the Apologist is not called upon to accept the results of modern criticism or to constitute himself an advocate of its claims to scientific certainty. It is far enough from having reached that stage as yet. Not only is there conflict between critics and different schools regarding the relative priority of the Deuteronomic and priestly codes, but instances are not unknown of the same critic changing his mind on the question. The higher criticism accordingly reaches no certainty; its field lies in the realm of probability; it appeals to subjective considerations; it reasons on a low plane, the plane of personal insight and judgment.

The theory of the Post-Exilic origin of the Mosaic Legislation involves difficulties of the most serious kind. We are right in supposing that Jesus Christ and His inspired apostles held the traditional belief regarding the authorship of the Pentateuch. It is abundantly evident that the historical character of the Pentateuch and its Mosaic origin and authorship are involved in each other. If we are heedful of the veracity of the Son of God and of His apostles we must confess that they bear unequivocal testimony to the historical character of the Pentateuch and of its Mosaic origin and authorship. What is known as the theory of accommodation can be easily refuted. It is opposed to the best feelings of Jesus the Christ. It is inconsistent with the Divine inspiration of the first teachers

of Christianity. It involves the whole of the New Testament in uncertainty. The attentive student of the Pentateuch can observe, with the greatest facility, that Moses, if he was the author of the books that comprise the Pentateuch, was entirely free from vanity and egotism. Were the books that bear his name written by some other author, then must it be conceded that, beyond and apart from the Bible, Jewish or Hebrew patriotism has nowhere treated the great legislator with so little admiration and praise. We must acquiesce in the statement that such a representation of Moses is perfectly intelligible as proceeding from Moses himself. But what in him was humility was obtuseness in an antagonist, such as is not found in the account of other great men, nor in the notices of Moses in other books.

It may be safely contended that, whatever benefits the higher criticism is destined to confer on the books that form the Old Testament, it will never succeed in overthrowing the traditional belief that Moses wrote the books that bear his name. I am not aware that enough has been made, in connection with the books of Moses, and with the time at which they were written, of the argument which is deducible from the schools of the Hebrew prophets. If discoveries that are continually made regarding the ability and doings of men and nations that flourished in the far-off ages are to receive due consideration, we are to infer that the men of those ages were the peers of the men of subsequent generations, so far as mental ability and powers of reasoning and of collecting and weighing evidence are concerned; and, such being the case, those Hebrews who belonged to the school of the prophets, naturally enough, were at pains to make themselves familiar with all the evidence that was available to determine the date and authorship of the various books of the Old Testament. It has been truthfully asserted that the preservation of the books of the Bible was probably due to the prophetic college. The prophets formed a large and organized community, thoroughly conversant with one another's writings, trained up in the study of them, anxiously searching out their meaning, comparing statement with statement. The ancient Hebrews were not a literary people; they produced few, if any, books save those that go to form the Old Testament. I am confident that a strong argument against the conclusions of the higher critics, and in favor of the authenticity of the books of Moses, can be elaborated from the care and natural sagacity which the schools of Hebrew prophets brought to bear on their sacred and inspired writings.

"The Bible gives us the material for all ages and leaves to man the noble task of shaping the material so as to

suit the wants of his own time. Neither the writers nor the thinkers of any age can exhaust the fulness of the Bible. Time passes on, but the Bible ages not. So long as the Church shall last, so long will it be the voice of God speaking to it; and that not as a thing of the past, but as a thing of the present. It is in keeping with our own enlightened view of the truth of God and of His Christ that the visible Church of one age is never essentially the same as that of the next."

Professor Charteris has defined with sufficient accuracy the relative position and functions of what I may characterize as the lower and the higher criticism. "Criticism has to settle the text of the sacred writings so as to come as nearly as possible to the *ipsissima verba* of the sacred writers, both in the Old Testament and in the New." Literary Criticism deals with the several books of Scripture—their historic origin and authorship, their integrity, their form, their design, and their relation to one another and to consistency. The Canon having been settled, the contents come before the student of our day as substantially one book.

Much can be advanced in favor of the belief that the languages of the Bible were prepared by Divine Providence as the most suitable languages for declaring the Divine Revelation to mankind.

Any one who has ever undertaken to translate one language into another can be well aware that no translation can take the place of the original language. So minute are the details and so many are the peculiarities of all languages that it is simply impossible to do justice to them by rendering them into another language. The learned scholars who prepared the revised version of the New Testament were fully cognizant of the great difficulty which must always obtain in the endeavor to translate the phrases and idioms of one language into another language. We thus read in the preface to the revised version of the New Testament: "All endeavors to translate the Holy Scriptures into another tongue must fall short of their aim, when the obligation is imposed of producing a version that shall be alike literal and idiomatic, faithful to each thought of the original, and yet, in the expression of it, harmonious and free."

Exegetical theology has to do especially with the sacred Scriptures, their origin, history, character, composition, doctrines, and rules of life.

The work of exegetical theology will always continue to be very important. Each age has its own peculiar phase or department of truth to elaborate in the theological conception and in the life. An enthusiastic student of the Bible maintains that exegetical theology is a science whose premises and materials are no less clear and tangible than those with which any other science has to do, and whose results are vastly more im-