

ARTICLE VI.

PRESIDENT HARPER'S LECTURES.

BY HOWARD OSGOOD.

PRESIDENT HARPER, of the Chicago University, delivered in Chicago, during the winter of 1894, a series of lectures on the earlier chapters of Genesis. They aroused a great deal of interest and some severe comments. These lectures have now been published in the issues in 1894 of the *Biblical World*, of which President Harper is the editor. They fill between 130 and 140 pages of the periodical, and are easily accessible to all who have an interest in learning his views on a very important part of the Bible.

By great natural abilities, indefatigable labor, and his un-failing geniality, President Harper has reached a high position among the educators of America. He has done a great work in arousing an interest in Semitic studies by his enthusiasm and power in teaching, and has won to his following large numbers of bright young men who have come within his influence. He stands at the head of the chief seat of learning in one of the greatest centres of the life and wealth of our land. In the boundless labor of directing and building up that new and promising university, he ought to have the sympathy and aid of all who believe in the higher education. The large generosity which founded and maintains the institution will be supplemented by untiring effort and all the resources of his fertile mind.

The ardor of his youthful professorship has not deserted him in his more mature years. In taking the high office he now fills, he could not consent to lay aside the work of

teaching, but to the work of President, enough for any man, he adds that of professor in the Semitic department. When such a man comes forth to give his thoroughly considered opinion on any subject, both his ability and his position lend all their influence to make that opinion of interest to thinkers; and when the subject on which he speaks is the most important that ever engages the attention of men,—the revelation of God, and man's relation to God,—both position and ability are enhanced by the dignity of the subject.

These lectures are set before the public for its calm judgment upon them. The appeal is constantly made to the reasonableness of the views maintained. "I have presented you a reasonable view. It is based upon scientific evidence. It has come from an examination of the facts. It covers the facts as does no other hypothesis" (Dec.). This is a call upon hearers and readers to prove that what is said, is reasonable, based upon scientific evidence, in accordance with and covering all the facts.

No scientific or critical student can logically object to criticism of himself. It is only by free discussion that the truth can be maintained. It is proposed in this article to examine the statements of these lectures only on what is said in them to be fundamental positions, that it may be clearly seen what are their teachings on these points. These lectures are not free from very severe strictures upon Dr. Green by name, and upon others, who do not agree with the views here set forth. If no answer is made, many may think that no answer can be made. But while criticism is exercised upon these lectures, there is not the first spark of heresy hunting. Sooner or later, only a fair, impartial, large decision will be accepted in matters of supreme moment. We are to consider the opinions, and not the man. If there is any special pleading, any misjudgment of a passage or the context or the thought, it is not intentional, and will be withdrawn when pointed out. It ought to be, and it is, pos-

sible to discuss the very foundations of faith without heat or malice.

These lectures follow the chapters (Gen. i.–xii.) in order, and comment upon special points as they occur in the text. The statements on what is said in them to be fundamental are scattered through the twelve discourses. To gain a clear view of the teaching on these fundamental questions, we must bring together the scattered statements.

GEN. I.–XII.—FUNDAMENTAL TO THE OLD AND NEW
TESTAMENTS.

In summing up in the November lecture the previous discussion, it is said, "No one will deny the intimate relationship of these chapters with the remainder of the Pentateuch or Hexateuch. This relationship is not only literary but logical. . . . It is not the character of the earlier stories of Genesis that is in debate, but that of the entire Hexateuch. . . . This same line of argument applies also to the Old Testament as compared with the New. As has been said so many times, the two are inseparable; they are bound together by ties which may not be broken. . . . The material of Gen. i.–xii. is preparatory and fundamental to the whole plan of salvation as revealed by God in the Old and New Testaments." "It is only necessary to note that the plan which runs through the entire Bible would have no beginning, and would be utterly inexplicable without these earliest steps. . . . One need only to make the effort to conceive this plan without the earlier portion of it to understand how impossible is such a conception." We very fully agree with these statements.

THE DATES OF THE TEXT AND THE WRITERS.

None of the present text of the Old Testament, it is said, goes farther back than 950 B. C. (Mar.), for literary production was not possible in Israel until "the times following

those of Elijah, Elisha, and Jonah" (Dec.), i. e., after 900 B. C. (Dec.). The first writer following this period is called in these lectures, "the prophet," "the prophetic writer," and "J." After the prophet, at a date not specified, there follows "the priest," "the priestly writer," "P." These are the chief writers; though the prophetic writer incorporated into his work about twelve verses from another author (July). So that there are three writers (Sept.). Then following these three writers, there is one who is called "the author" (Jan., Feb., July); though "he is not the author; he is the compiler" (July), who, in the remaining lectures, is also called the redactor or editor. This editor unites these three writings into the present narrative.

THE INSPIRATION OF THE HISTORY AND THE RECORD,
FUNDAMENTAL.

"It ought to be clear that the more fundamental question is as to the inspiration of the history; in other words the presence in the history of a special supernatural element. For if this be true, the inspiration of the records which form a part of the history would naturally follow" (Nov.). On this point, which all will agree is fundamental to the whole discussion, there are many expressions equivalent to the quotations which follow. "The relation of the divine is fundamental." "The divine element is the force which regulates and controls the whole" (Nov.). "The divine element which overwhelms and controls the human, but without hiding it from view" (Sept.). Of the prophetic writer: "The spirit that directed the writer in gathering it [his material] together" (Mar.). "God who guided him in the writing of it," i. e., Gen. vi. 1-8 (June). The priestly writer, "led by the Spirit of God, is seeking to teach man certain truths which God would have man know." ". . . the wisdom which guided him was more than human" (Jan.). Of these two writers, and of the compiler, editor, author, it is specially said of each

one that he was "guided by the Divine Spirit," "guided by the Holy Spirit," "guided by the same Spirit" (Dec.). God is "the Author of the religious ideas which filled their hearts" (Oct.). "Prophets and priests acquainted with the principles of divine government undertake to illustrate these principles and in connection with the illustrations to formulate them. The truth imparted to them from on high is thus given objective form" (Dec.).

We understand from this that God overwhelmed and controlled all these writers; that he was the author of their religious ideas; that the Holy Spirit directed, guided, led the writers in gathering their material and in the writing of it; that the precious truths which God would have man know, they formulate and give to them objective form.

THE "OBJECTIVE FORM" OF THE DOCTRINE OF GOD.

"Each of these accounts was found to show . . . distinct theology" (July). "A change of style, matter, and theology." "Each division . . . has its own peculiar and widely different conception of God." "Their ideas of God, though communicated to them from heaven itself, were imperfect" (Sept.). "These differences relate . . . to the theological conceptions which characterize the writers" (Oct.). "Each division is marked also by a different conception of God, of man's relations to God, of the proper modes of worship, of God's action in history." "In one division a rigidly monotheistic spirit," "a lofty and dignified conception of God." "In the other a spirit which can scarcely be called monotheistic in the strictest sense"; and "which seems to border closely on polytheism. How is it possible for so low (this is the proper term) an idea of God to have been incorporated in the sacred Scriptures?" (Sept.) Of this writer it is said, "the anthropomorphic representations are many and very gross" (Feb.). "One writer represents" "sacrifices, altars, distinctions of clean and unclean, the name of Yah-

weh," as in existence; "the other does not. Both certainly cannot be right" (Sept., July).

The precious truth given these men by God, who is the author of their ideas and controls them wholly in gathering their material and in writing it down, when it receives objective form under their hands, appears in a widely different conception of God, of man's relations to God, of the proper modes of worship, of God in history. This difference is as great as between a rigid monotheism, with a lofty conception of God, and a low conception of God bordering on polytheism. Both of these writers cannot be right. The assertion of this fundamental difference and error is as bold and repeated as the assertion that these writers were given their ideas and truth by God, and were wholly controlled by him. We believe that the two representations, of God's controlling the authors, and of the different conceptions of God taught by these writers, form a fundamental contradiction of thought and statement. Were they not written down in these lectures we should say, as has often been said, that together they are absolutely inconceivable.

THE REVELATION OF GOD.

"God in his supreme wisdom saw fit to make to man a special revelation. This is found first of all in the history which was divinely conducted . . . and, still further, in the records which grow out of this history and which have in every respect the characteristics of the history. The history of [in?] the records of the book of Genesis . . . is part of this special revelation" (Jan., p. 4, Dec.). "The history of Israel is a specially ordered history in which God has manifested himself more clearly than in any other. . . . Is this premise capable of scientific demonstration? We answer, Yes. A careful study of the facts of Israelitish history, of the character of Israelitish people, and of a comparison of

this with other histories, furnishes data which, as we believe, are inexplicable upon any other hypothesis" (Nov.).

That is, God did make a special revelation, first in the divinely conducted, specially ordered history of Israel, and then in the records of that history, of which Genesis is a part. That God manifested himself more clearly in this history than in any other is capable of scientific demonstration.

THE SOURCES AND CHARACTER OF THE RECORDS.

"The great prehistoric events, among others, the fall, the deluge, and the stories of the beginnings of civilization, made so great an impression upon the primitive man as to have led to their transmission through many nations. . . . The Hebrews, among others, inherited these traditions" (Dec.). "The Hebrew and the outside stories are sisters from one source. . . . That source is not on the one hand a naturalistic myth . . . nor on the other hand is it an objective revelation from heaven. . . . That source in each case is an objective historical fact which impressed itself upon the minds of many nations" (Oct.). "These stories are not history, for the times are prehistoric times. . . . It is sacrilege to call them history. . . . They are stories, grand, inspiring, uplifting stories" (Feb.). These writers take, for the purpose of conveying religious truth (Feb.), the "stories common to all ancient nations." The writers were "ignorant of the real geographical and historical facts. It was not a part of the divine plan to reveal geography and history" (Mar.). "The sacred record can no longer be claimed to present a perfectly accurate account of these early times, for conflicting accounts stand side by side; changes have been arbitrarily introduced into the text; insertions and omissions have been made; the material cannot be called in a modern sense historical" (Sept.). "A total disregard of the common laws of history-writing in vogue to-day" (Dec.). Of the four chapters (vi.-ix.) on the deluge it is said, "Is it literal history?"

No. Nor is the book of Job history, nor the books of Chronicles, nor the books of Kings, nor the books of Samuel" (Aug.).

God is said to have made a special revelation in the history contained in the records of Genesis, yet it is also said that the source of the writers was not revelation, and the records are so far from being history that it is a violation of sacred things, sacrilege, to call them history. If there is no recorded history, how did God reveal himself in recorded history? If God did reveal himself in recorded history, how can it be sacrilege to call it history? How can stories common to all nations be a revelation of God to one nation? These are fundamental contradictions, for which these lectures offer no solution, and for which no solution can be found, because they are exclusive of each other.

CHARACTERISTICS COVERING ALL THESE RECORDS.

"The writers of these chapters believed in a creative day of twenty-four hours; represent light before the luminaries; the creation of the luminaries as they appeared to the eye, [chap. i.]; seem to represent the serpent as of different form and character before the curse. Eden was ideal, not real" [chaps. ii. and iii.] (Oct.). "There was here no history, no geography" (Mar.). The names, ages, and numbers of the patriarchs [chap. v.] are not real (May), and the account of the nations in chap. x. is not scientific (Oct.). The whole account of the deluge (chaps. vi.-ix.) is filled with contradictions as to God; as to the cause of the deluge, one making it natural, the other miraculous; as to the form of the ark; the duration and extent of the flood, etc., etc. (July). "Really it is nothing short of blasphemy to attribute these things to the Holy Spirit" (Oct.). "Let us be very careful not to credit to the Holy Spirit, who kindled the fire of inspiration, the ignorance and superstition of those in whose hearts the fire was kindled" (Feb.).

The representations of the writers, their ignorance and superstition, which it is blasphemy to attribute to the Holy Spirit, cover the whole of the subject of these lectures, from Gen. i. 4 to the end of chapter xi. They are so thoroughly part and bone and marrow of the record, that to take them away would leave a boneless and mangled corpse. If this is the true character of these narratives, then, since God is Truth, he could not have been the author of their ideas, nor wholly controlled the writers, led and directed them by the Holy Spirit, in gathering their material and in writing. Truth cannot deal falsely. God cannot lie or deny himself. If God controlled the writers in idea and expression, then, this characterization of the narratives is utterly erroneous, and it cannot be blasphemy to attribute the whole narratives to the Holy Spirit, "the Spirit of Truth," who "led," "guided," "directed" the writers.

The story of Eden is said in the March lecture to be "the beginning of history, that to which all history points back; also the foundation of history, that upon which all history rests." It is "the shaper of history." "This story gives us the starting-point of religion, contains an epitome of all religious as well as irreligious life, and even furnishes us the goal of all religious thought. If this be true of the religions of the world, it is true in the strictest sense of Judaism and Christianity." And yet it is blasphemy to attribute to the Holy Spirit the description of Eden because we now cannot exactly locate it. By parity of reasoning would it not be equally wrong to attribute to the Holy Spirit the description of the Lord's Supper or of the crucifixion because both the day of the one and the place of the second are not universally acknowledged?

It is declared that these statements of these chapters are disproved by the science of the present day, and therefore it is blasphemy to attribute them to the Holy Spirit. But we know that "science" is a word to conjure with. Who knows

what it means? What is called science by one learned man is denied to be science by another equally or more learned. Its most frequent use is to lend support to an expressed opinion. What one higher critic calls scientific "interpretation," another higher critic declares is not scientific at all. It does not require much reading in any direction, and especially among the masters of any department of learning, to see that, unless an opinion is fortified by proof of agreement with the vast majority of similar investigators, it is mere assertion, in place of evidence, to say that it is upheld by science. For instance, "the day of twenty-four hours." "Those for whom the narrative was first prepared [i. e., after 900 B. C.], and, indeed, all men until recently, understood this day, including the night, to be one of twenty-four hours. Marcus Dods has truly said, that rationalism may twist Scripture into any meaning it pleases, if it may put a geologist's meaning into the word day" (Jan.). On the other side, let either the author of these lectures or Marcus Dods show before the time of the Reformation, A. D. 1500, one writer who "understood this day, including the night, to be twenty-four hours." The Old Testament prophets, the literature of Egypt and Babylonia, the New Testament, and the writings of Greeks and Latins, the classics and the "fathers," Migne's Patrology, Greek and Latin, are open before the authors of this assertion to prove that they have spoken correctly. There are hundreds of pages in Philo and the Greek fathers on the Hexaemeron; it was a favorite subject for the greatest minds. Show us one who believed in a creative day of twenty-four hours. There is not one. And even as late as A. D. 1693 Charles Blount, the deist, finds fault with believers in the Bible for thinking that each day was one thousand years. "To prescribe the divine creation so short an epoch as the limits of six thousand years is what I never durst."¹ The

¹ Letter to Gildon, p. 73.

fact is, that the belief in a creative day of twenty-four hours is not three hundred and fifty years old.

As the Old Testament (Isa. lx. 19, 20) and the New Testament (Rev. xxi. 23; xxii. 5) declare that there shall be light after sun and moon have disappeared, the fact of light before the luminaries would not stumble one who believes that, as the Old and New Testaments say, God spoke the light into being. On the opinions of learned men as to the question whether light is to be distinguished from the luminaries we must refer the reader to the works of the Youngs, Langley, Proctor, Lockyer, and others.

As to the age of the sun compared with that of the earth, Faye, Pfaff, Braun, and the works quoted, state the present theories of learned men, who believe the sun and moon to be younger than the earth.

On the extent of the deluge, these lectures refer the reader to an article by Perowne, in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," written thirty or more years ago, for full proof that the deluge was not universal. What men of solid acquirements and cool judgment now say of such proofs as were offered in that article, and what they say of a deluge co-extensive with man, will be found in works like those of Prestwich, Dawson, Wright, Howorth, and others.

Whether the ark could not have contained all the animals for want of space, any one can decide for himself, by calculation of the average size of all animals of the land, the space required for them, and the size of one deck of the ark. The ocean steamers of the first rank could carry on one deck two of all land animals, birds, reptiles, insects, and seven each of the ten clean animals, and have plenty of space to spare for the crew to work the ship. Only two-thirds of one deck of the ark would have sufficed, by actual measurement of animals, for two of all land animals ever known on earth.

These points are mentioned as types of what are said to be scientific errors which it is blasphemy to attribute to

the Holy Spirit. To assert that science finds an error is one thing; to prove the error is quite another. True science is, as Huxley says, only learning; others say it is nothing more than investigation. It is not yet a finality. It certainly is not perfect in any department. To prove or disprove the Bible by science to-day is, in either case, to make it the laughing-stock of to-morrow's better science. When the Bible and nature are perfectly interpreted, they will perfectly agree; for God made them both, and he does not contradict himself.

THE AUTHOR, COMPILER, EDITOR.

The descriptions already quoted concern principally the three assumed writers, P, J, and the unknown. We now turn to the description of the "compiler," "editor," "author" of these three writings. "It is true that in the Hebrew narrative there are fragments of three works . . . and there was an editor whom some great purpose or influence led to make these three already great, still greater by the union" (Sept., p. 187). "Manifestly if there were two [?] writers, and the work of both is now one piece, some one must have joined the two. In doing this he acted in accordance with the spirit of his times, as regulated by his purpose in making the combination. His spirit is far from being a critical one. He did not hesitate to use his material in any way which would best subserve his aim. He inserted and omitted; changed and arranged. He handled the sources used as freely as if he had been the author" (Sept.). This description of the editor is taken from *Hebraica*, vol. v. p. 68, word for word (whence also the most of these ten (Jan.-Oct.) lectures are taken and to which we are referred), and on page 70 this further description is given, "If it is composed of different stories of the same event, joined together by an editor who did not have insight sufficient to enable him to see that he was all the time committing grave blunders, and yet felt no hesitation in altering the originals with which he was working, it is not histor-

ical in the ordinary sense of that term." Of this editor we are told in the final lecture (Dec.) that he was "filled with the same general purpose and guided by the same spirit," i. e., the Holy Spirit (Dec., pp. 411, 412), as the prophet and priest. "There being two or more writers in the Pentateuch, the method of composition being therefore compilation, we have harmony as to method between this portion of Sacred Scripture and all other portions (e. g., Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and even the Gospels of the New Testament). It is true that compilation is to-day regarded as the lowest order of composition. The mere compiler is not treated as an author. . . . Now if this was the method employed as far down as New Testament times, it is difficult to believe that a higher method was employed so far back as the time in which the Pentateuch is asserted to have had its origin" (Sept.).

This editor, compiler, was guided by the Holy Spirit, some great purpose or influence, to unite the three writings. He acted in accordance with the spirit of his times. He inserted and omitted; changed and arranged as if he had been the author, which he was not. He did not have insight sufficient to enable him to see that he was all the time committing grave blunders, and yet felt no hesitation in altering the originals. His work was the lowest order of composition, but it was just the same work we find in the Gospels.

The insuperable difficulty in this is that the Holy Spirit is said to have guided him. Guided him in ideas? Then how could he be deficient in insight to perceive his immoral course? Guided him in writing? In acting as if he were author when he was not? This connection of the Holy Spirit with want of conscience and immoral action is such a confusion and contradiction of thought and words that it is stated without further remark. What possible value can attach to the result of this editor's work, not as a revelation from God, but as a mere human work? There are similar instances of

conscienceless editing in the Christian centuries, but no one attaches the least historical value to the result.

. THE MORAL IDEAS OF THE WRITERS.

“Just as there was a marked imperfection in their ideas of morality, an imperfection which could only be removed by degrees, so their ideas of God, though communicated to them from heaven itself, were imperfect, far short of what they afterwards attained; far different from the ideas taught in the New Testament. They could not comprehend the real truth. They were children in religious faith, and even God himself must deal with them as such and not as men. This removes the many ‘moral difficulties’ of the Old Testament.” “We do not expect to find at this early period [i. e., after 900 B. C.] the highest standards of morality, or the highest conceptions of God” (Sept.).

Their morality was imperfect, and this removes the many moral difficulties of the Old Testament, but it can only do so by removing these so-called moral difficulties upon God, who, according to these lectures, was the author of their religious ideas, and led these authors in their writing by the Holy Spirit.

THE WORD OF GOD.

“The records are imperfect from a literary point of view; the histories, imperfect models for the writing of history. . . . But it is true that the history given us here is perfect in the sense that it was the best literature which almighty power, acting in consistency with other divine attributes, could inspire in the hearts of people dragged down with sin, and the literature is perfect in the sense that it is the best literature almighty power, acting in consistency with other divine attributes, could inspire in the hearts and minds of a people of Semitic blood living at that period of the world’s history” (Jan.). “It is true that to Israelitish history, God sustained a peculiar relation. As has been said, he entered

into this history in a unique way. It was in a true sense divine history; the best history Almighty Power, acting in consistency with other attributes, and working in the hearts of the people dragged down by sin, could inspire. The same may be said of Israelitish literature; God sustained to it a peculiar relation. It was the best literature Almighty Power, acting in consistency with other attributes, could inspire in the hearts of a people of Semitic blood, living in that period of the world's history; and yet it is imperfect, including different and differing accounts of the same event; what from the point of view of history and science are errors and inconsistencies; what is certainly a total disregard of the common laws of history-writing in vogue to-day. What now shall we say concerning these chapters and the others? That they contain the word of God? This is not sufficient. In the truest, fullest sense, they *are* the word of God. They are and constitute the word of God. . . . The history and the word, each considered as a manifestation of the divine purpose and action, and as a revelation of principles covering faith and duty, are perfect and infallible" (Dec.).

These records are imperfect as history and as literature, including different accounts of the same event, errors and inconsistencies, a total disregard of the common laws to-day of the writing of history. Yet they are perfect as history and literature because they were the best that God could do with the sinners and Semites of their day, that is, after 900 B. C., after David, Solomon, Elijah, Elisha, Jonah, and others. It is not sufficient to say that these imperfect-perfect records contain the word of God; in the truest sense they *are* the word of God. Both the history and the word, the records, as a revelation of principles covering faith and duty are perfect and infallible. How an imperfect history can be perfect simply because it was the best one could write; or how a perfect history filled with God, controlled by him in idea and

writing, can be imperfect, are propositions one would not care to waste time in discussing.

If God could do no better with the men he had made twenty-five hundred years ago, then he could not do as well with men who have continued for twenty five hundred years more in the deepest degradation of every vice and crime. But the cannibals of the Pacific, to whom no revelation has come till this century, have been by God, by the Holy Spirit, changed into the noblest missionaries of Jesus Christ. To say that God could do no better than this history which is not history, than these men of degraded morality and of contradictions of God and man, is to put God under the creature of his hand: he is not the almighty and all holy; but is conditioned by the sin of man. There is still one step beyond even this. It is to assert that this record which is imperfect in its teachings of God, of man's relation to God, imperfect in morals, i. e., in man's relation to his fellows, a warp and woof of ideas it is blasphemy to attribute to the Holy Spirit—this record, as a revelation of principles covering faith and duty, is perfect and infallible. Self-contradiction and contradiction of the Bible can go no further.

THE NEW TESTAMENT AND JESUS CHRIST.

Great as are the differences and discrepancies of the Old Testament, "a still more interesting field for comparison is that furnished by the Gospels of the New Testament. Here [in the New Test.] the difficulties and differences are even more numerous and more perplexing. It is evident to a candid student that in all this we see the human factor. It cannot be disguised, it ought not to be ignored. If we grant a large human element all is explained. If we deny it, we certainly assume a grave responsibility in attributing to the Holy Spirit that which is dishonorable and degrading" (Oct.). That is, whatever difficulties, and they have been overwhelming, have been asserted of the Old Testament, the New pre-

sents far greater; the very Gospels contain accounts dishonorable and degrading which must not be attributed to the Holy Spirit.

"The fact of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, not any record of it, is the foundation of the believer's belief in his own resurrection. The record of the transaction does not prove it to have taken place. Its occurrence without any written record may be satisfactorily proven" (Dec.). In other words, the New Testament is not a conclusive witness on the main facts asserted by it; and though there is no other record or witness of the resurrection, it is said, that it may be otherwise satisfactorily proven.

"If there is an analysis, and Moses did not write the Pentateuch [both of which are maintained in these lectures], the New Testament authorities, among others Jesus himself, who seem to say that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, or at any rate to imply this, either must have been ignorant of the facts in the case, or knowing them, must have consciously taught falsely, or accommodated themselves to the literary suppositions of their day. Each of these possibilities is attended with difficulties" (Sept.).

To sum up what has been said; the Gospels belong to "the lowest order of composition," compilation. The New Testament is more full of difficulties and discrepancies than the Old; it contains matter dishonorable and degrading and not to be attributed to the Holy Spirit. The record of the resurrection of Christ does not prove it. It is possible that Jesus Christ himself must have been ignorant of the facts of the Old Testament (the chief subject of his teaching), or consciously taught falsely, or accommodated himself to the literary suppositions of his day; though there are difficulties attending these possibilities. After nine hundred years the history and the record, according to these lectures, did not improve. The discrepancies of the New Testament are more perplexing than those of the Old. And the chief character

of the New Testament, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, is left under a statement of adverse possibilities which, if true, would destroy the character of any intelligent teacher. The only reserve made respecting these possibilities is that difficulty attends them. There is no endeavor to clear away this cloud from him, who is all our salvation and desire.

This is the doctrine of these lectures on the most fundamental points of man's thinking. The complete self-contradiction of this doctrine is placed before intelligent readers. It is not asked that what has been here said shall be taken as final; but let each one interested in this subject compare this review with the lectures, and decide if it is not far within bounds of what might have been justly said.

In the preface to these lectures in the *January Biblical World* we are told that these lectures are to be "the work of higher criticism," and, "as every intelligent man to-day knows, without the methods of higher criticism no results of value may be secured." Higher criticism is perfectly well defined by its leaders; in Holland, Kuenen, Oort, Hooykaas, Knappert, Wildeboer; in Germany, Wellhausen, Dillmann, Kayser, Stade, Kautsch, Baudissin, Cornill, Budde, Riehm, Smend, Giesebrecht, Holzinger, Kittel, Schultz, König, Marti, *et al.*; in France, Reuss, Westphal, Bruston, Piepenbring; in England, Robertson Smith, Cheyne, Driver; in America, Toy, Bacon. There is not one of these men who would acknowledge the doctrine of inspiration of the writers and of Scripture set forth in these lectures as bearing any relation to higher criticism but contradiction. These lectures are as antagonistic to higher criticism as they are to the confessions of all Christian churches. Higher criticism teaches that Genesis is legend, myth, saga; that there is no revelation from God and certainly no supernatural inspiration in the Genesis stories. Dr. Toy, a very logical and self-consistent as well as learned writer, calls them legends. Dr. Bacon calls them "myths," "saga," "cosmogonic myths," "ætio-

logical folk-tales," "coarse clan-legends," "repulsive legend," "the dim region of cosmogonic, ethnological and ætiologic myth." "In the circles, from which the Priestly law-book comes to us, the spirituality of ethical religion, and the idea of direct relations of man to God, seem to have died out." That is the way higher criticism talks of Genesis and of all the parts it assigns to it. Higher criticism denies that there is the first sign of God's inspiration in Genesis.

If any one wishes to know in short compass what higher criticism is, what it teaches, whither it must and desires to go, let him read Crooker, "*The New Bible and its Newer Uses*" (Boston, 1894). It is a little book, but brimful of higher critical information, written with great spirit and force, in thoroughly good temper. It will be easy to compare the steady onward flow in logical nexus of that sound statement of higher criticism with the veering vane of these lectures. Mr. Crooker says, in accord with the great majority of higher critics, that there is not in any part of the Bible, or in Jesus Christ, supernatural revelation or inspiration.

That "science," "higher criticism," "modern scholarship," are often used to avoid the too frequent repetition of the capital I has frequently been surmised. But the author of these lectures acknowledges it fully in his case. "A specialist in any department regards as scholarly and scientific only what he himself accepts. The difficulty with this procedure is that the opinion of the individual in each case becomes synonymous with scholarship. . . . I accept the procedure, and in what I say, I shall give what in my opinion modern scholarship has established; in other words, what I think about the Old Testament."

These lectures give us not what science, or higher criticism, or modern scholarship, or the Bible, teaches of the Bible, but simply what their author thinks of the Bible.