

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

---

NO. 24.—APRIL, 1893.

---

I. THE DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION AS AFFECTED  
BY THE ESSENTIAL RELATION BETWEEN  
THOUGHT AND LANGUAGE.

Do we think in words? Do we think only in words? Do we always when we engage in thought employ for that purpose language? Is it possible to think fruitfully, to think to any advantage, to think at all in any other way? On the assumption that one can think without words, is it possible to express, even to one's self, to formulate,—to communicate one's thoughts, *i. e.*, convey them intelligibly to others,—through any other medium? Must there not be some medium or vehicle for every form whatever of thought-expression; and must or must not that medium be language?

Some of these and kindred questions are not merely of curious interest, but also of profound significance and consequence, and have accordingly not only awakened the attention and occasioned and stimulated the researches of the great body of philologists and logicians, and the specialists in physiology proper, and of course those in mental physiology and what is now known as physiological psychology, but have also occupied the minds of some of the wisest philosophers and greatest intellects the world has ever seen. But what is still more to the purpose at present, the answers given to some of these questions have an incidental bearing on the inquiry as to the fact and extent of an infallible inspiration.

It will be the aim of this essay to indicate and touch upon the main problems which arise from a consideration of the more important of the interrogatories just referred to, and then to point

that God must be the sole object of all philosophy, and as self-evidenced in all science. Hence we claim that the absolute philosophy disclosed a high aim and achieved a great advance toward a philosophical theism. That this view must be accepted seems certain on the authority of Erdmann, Ueberweg, Kuno Fischer, and Pfleiderer. But how about the tendency to pantheism? This tendency is conceded. It was inevitable at first as the unforeseen implication of a philosophy determined to exhibit God as the ground of all existence, and the pre-supposition of all knowledge. Immanence seemed for a time to obscure transcendence. This was soon seen to be a misrepresentation of the absolute philosophy, and Ulrici, Weisse, and last but not least, Lotze, have abundantly vindicated the transcendence of God while maintaining the fundamental conception of a unitary and personal ground of all reality.

From what has preceded, Monism, it will be seen, may embrace a great variety of speculations. We now replace the three divisions previously given by a somewhat different and a more explicit doctrinal classification, as follows: Monism may mean (*a*), materialism; (*b*), pantheism, of which Spinozism is the type; (*c*), an all-embracing, impersonal force, which view is commonly charged upon Spencer, and to which he has given both assent and denial; (*d*), the affirmation of one basal, personal spirit, in whom and by whom all things consist. The chief representative of the last form is Lotze. Monism is, therefore, many. Our author treats it as one. Hence, our contention is manifest. His article, we think, lacks a proper discrimination. All that part of modern philosophy which prevailed after the time of Kant, and which has been the ambition of our most learned scholars to understand and exploit, he lays under sweeping and unreflecting condemnation. Nevertheless, within proper limits, as has been already pointed out, his objections to Monism are, in the main, acceptable, and, we think, just.

In this volume there are many articles of great merit which we have no space to notice. In conclusion, we are satisfied it would be difficult, perhaps impossible, to find a book so many-sided, abounding in debatable subjects, and with so few errors. We hope Dr. Vaughan may be permitted to glean again in the literary workshop of his friend.

W. J. WRIGHT.

Fulton, Mo.

#### ROBERTSON'S EARLY RELIGION OF ISRAEL.

THE EARLY RELIGION OF ISRAEL, as set forth by the Biblical Writers and by Modern Critical Historians. The Baird Lecture for 1889. *By James Robertson, D. D., Professor of Oriental Languages in the University of Glasgow.* New York: ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH & CO.; Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1892. Pp xii., 524.

The fires of criticism still burn fiercely on the field of Old Testament literature. For some time the advanced critics seem to have had things pretty much their own way; Kuenen, Wellhausen, Dillmann, Stade and Renan on the continent, and Robertson, Smith Driver, Cheyne, Toy and Briggs among the Anglo-Saxon writers, have all written on the side of advanced historical criticism. Writers on the other side have not been found wanting; still it must be confessed that the advanced critics are bold and confident, and to a certain extent have secured a hearing from the public. In these circumstances it is refreshing to find a book like the one

before us, which so confidently calls in question the soundness of the results of this school of Higher Criticism. Professor Robertson, in this Baird Lecture, undertakes to vindicate in a very intelligent and satisfactory way the real historical nature of the account given in the Sacred Scriptures of the origin, nature and growth of the early religion of Israel. And while it cannot be said that our author holds very definitely to what is now termed the "traditional" theory, still we are satisfied that his treatise will serve to call a halt on the side of advanced criticism. Moreover, we are willing to say that even though at several points we are inclined to think that our author concedes too much to the critics, yet we are sure that criticism must answer this book before it can attempt to continue its victorious march. We, therefore, hail with joy a treatise which will do something to vindicate the historicity of the biblical account of the religion of the Israelites, and help men to look fairly at both sides of very perplexing questions.

Perhaps this review can do the reader no better service in this connection than to present an outline of our author's reasoning in support of what he terms the biblical theory of the early religion of Israel. In doing so a little criticism will be mingled with much commendation of a very effective discussion of the question.

In an introductory chapter it is shown that the English reader of the Bible is not necessarily so helpless in relation to these inquiries as is often supposed, and as the advanced critics would have us believe. He maintains, and with good effect, that scholarship and a technical knowledge of the Hebrew, however valuable in many respects, is not absolutely necessary in order to a proper estimate of the problems raised by historical criticism, for the appeal in most cases may very properly be made to an intelligent common sense. Our author proposes to conduct the discussion in such a manner that the ordinary reader may understand the reasonings; and there can be no doubt that he has succeeded well in his endeavor.

The first chapter treats of the religious character of the history of Israel. It is shown that Israel's place among the nations is unique. The peculiar features of its history are connected with its religion. The influence of that religion, in spite of adverse circumstances, is shown to have been world-wide, as appears in Judaism, Christianity and Islam. Then the real question in debate is stated thus: What is the essential difference between the religion of Israel and that of other nations, and how can that difference be determined? What is the origin of this peculiar religion, and how is its history to be understood?

The second chapter states the two contending theories which undertake to explain this remarkable history. The one is that of the Biblical writers, and the other that of modern historical critics. Of the main factors in each our author gives a concise and comprehensive statement. According to the Biblical theory the Israelitish people from the days of Abraham stood in a peculiar relation to God, according to which they received in various ways intimations of his will. They were brought to Egypt and fell into bondage there. By a signal display of divine power they were delivered from that bondage, brought safely through the Red Sea, and led up to Sinai. There they received from God in a miraculous manner the law and ritual, and were enjoined to observe the things which were commanded them by the Lord. They were thus constituted a holy nation, the people of Jehovah, but they never actually attained fully to the ideal set before them. For unbelief on the borders of Canaan they were doomed to wander in the wilderness till that generation all died. In due time under Joshua they entered

Canaan, and got possession of the most of it. During the subsequent period of the Judges they relapsed often into idolatry and were punished in various ways. During this period it is not easy to get at the exact state of affairs in Israel. Under David and Solomon the nation attained its greatest glory. Afterwards the nation was divided into the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel, and a period of conflict and declension followed, ending in dispersion and captivity. Then comes the restoration in Ezra's day, and the period of rigid Judaism leads up to the advent of the Messiah. Such is a brief outline of the Biblical theory which our author defends. The modern critical theory is stated in substance as follows: Some wandering Hebrew tribes came from the desert and settled in Canaan. Their tribal or national deity was Jehovah. They had certain religious traditions, but their religious faith and practices were not unlike those of surrounding tribes. They by degrees adopted many of the religious ideas and customs of these tribes. These customs gradually grew into laws, and their early legends became history. When history, strictly so-called, finds these people they were found to be practicing religious rites which had grown up in this way. The biblical books which relate this history, at least up to about the eighth century B. C., did not come into existence in their present form till long after the events occurred. These books were manipulated by later hands, and later ideas were thrown back to earlier times in a sort of fictitious way. The prophets then appear upon the scene to elevate and purify the religious ideas of Israel. They were the first to teach ethic monotheism. The result was that the fully developed legal and ritual system came last, from the days of Josiah on to Ezra and the exile. The last is the real starting point of mature Mosaism, out of which arose modern Judaism. The whole progress is purely naturalistic, and takes place according to the principle of continuous natural development from animism to monotheism, from simple native customs to elaborate Mosaism. This is the modern critical theory in general which our author proceeds to criticise and set aside. The religious history runs through a course of development, and the question is as to the explanation of that development. The method our author proposes to follow is to deal with the period from Moses up to the time when, as is admitted on both sides, we find the writing of some of the contemporary prophets. The starting point is from the first *writing* prophets, and from this period our author works his way carefully backwards to the age of Moses. The two theories are to be tested by historical inquiries instituted concerning this period. Our author evidently shows a good deal of skill in the choice of the battle-ground, and yet even his opponents cannot fairly find fault with the way in which the lines of conflict are laid down.

In chapter III. our author enters at once on his task. As already indicated he begins with the early writing prophets. These are Amos and Hosea, about 850-750 B. C. From a study of the writings of these prophets some hints are gathered regarding the condition of Israel in their day, and during the age immediately preceding it. Starting from the fact of the *existence* of these writings they are considered as mere *literary* products and as *religious* compositions. Regarded as literary productions he concludes that the writings of Amos and Hosea show a very considerable degree of literary activity and attainment. Language was well developed, and it was written and read as well as spoken. It was in fact a literary age with a reading and writing community of considerable extent. Considered as religious compositions the writings of Amos and Hosea imply a very considerable

degree of religious intelligence and education. These writings also indicate an antecedent religious culture of no mean degree, for if there were no such culture the people would not have understood the utterances of the prophets. Our author makes some pertinent references to these writings in support of his view, and concludes by saying, that surely Amos and Hosea knew better where they got their religious education than half a dozen modern professors can tell us, and that these prophets clearly indicate in their day no mere infantile condition of religion in Israel.

The fourth chapter gives a very good account of the earlier prophets and their work. Here an attempt is made to discover the nature of that literary activity and religious culture which the admitted writings of the eighth and ninth centuries imply the existence of, and, further, an attempt is made to find out what the antecedent literary and religious condition of Israel really was. It is shown that writing existed in various countries from very early times, and that possibly written compositions existed long before the ninth century B. C. In connection our author gives a very reasonable account of the guilds or schools of the prophets, and of the part they played in developing the literary and religious character of the people in the centuries immediately before Amos. The attempt of the critics to separate Samuel and Amos from these prophetic circles is ably resisted; and the accuracy of the oldest writings in matters of topography justifies the conclusion that we have here real history and not mere traditions and myths. This chapter is a very satisfactory one.

The fifth chapter considers the testimony of the ninth and eighth centuries to the antecedent history. Inquiry is made as to whether it is possible from the admitted writings of this period to determine the main facts of the previous history. In making this inquiry our author appeals to what he calls the consciousness of the nation, rather than to the order of the composition of the books. In a very satisfactory way he shows that Amos and Hosea hold in substance, for the period succeeding Moses, the same scheme of history which modern critics pronounce to be late and unhistorical. In regard to the history of the time of the patriarchs, the allusions made by these prophets agree, so far as they go, with the narratives in the Pentateuch. In this discussion our author deals the critics some very hard blows, and shows that their theories, especially that of Wellhausen, are "nebular hypotheses of the early history." In a solid satisfactory manner he reaches the conclusion that the eighth century is a time of broad historic daylight, when Israel had a definite account to give of herself and her early history. Up to this point our author has dealt with the literary, religious and historic character of that period, and has shown that it was real and not mythical, and thus the biblical theory is confirmed.

In chapter VI. the key to the critical position is considered. That key is to be found in the answer to the question, whether the early writing prophets were *originators* or *reformers*? The biblical theory says that they were reformers, that of modern criticism holds that they were originators of religious ideas. Assuming the literary, religious and historic status of these prophets, our author raises the pertinent question: How can the modern critical theory explain the pre-prophetic religion? Or, if the critics deny the reality of the pre-prophetic religion, how can they account for the sudden rise of the religion of the age of the first writing prophets? In a very able manner our author shows that the biblical theory gives

a far better explanation of the facts than that of the modern critics. The status of the writing prophets of the eighth and ninth centuries can only be understood upon the supposition that there was a long and gradual preparation for it, such as the narratives of the Bible, regarded as real history, present. Wellhausen and Stade come in here for careful and effective criticism. Then the three points which the critical theory must make good before it has made out its case are stated: First, it must be shown that the pre-prophetic religion of the Israelites was on the same level as that of the tribes about them; secondly, the factor in the religion of Israel which differentiates it from that of the other tribes must be clearly pointed out; thirdly, the process, stage by stage, of the development, of the Israelitish religion must be traced out. The five succeeding chapters of the treatise before us are devoted to these three important questions, and this constitutes the heart of the discussion.

Four chapters are devoted to the first question, and along several lines the low tone of the pre-prophetic religion of Israel is discussed. The critics insist that the earliest religion of Israel differed in no essential respect from that of the other tribes. A brief reference to Kuenen, Pfeleiderer, Stade and others confirms this statement, and it may be taken in general as that of modern advanced criticism.

The seventh chapter treats of the names applied to deity in pre-prophetic times. The critics argue from these names to the low tone of Israelitish religion. Our author examines the reasoning based on the name of Baal, and shows that Baal is a general appellative term whose use gives no good ground for the conclusions of the critics. He also shows at length that this whole mode of reasoning proceeds on a false view of the nature of mythology, and at the same time it fails entirely to adduce the historical proof that is absolutely necessary to confirm the theory. This is a very satisfactory and suggestive chapter.

In the eighth chapter the dwelling place of deity and its meaning in regard to the pre-prophetic religion is considered. The critical theory holds that the original home of Jahaveh was Sinai, that he went with the people to Canaan and there had many sanctuaries in the land. The worship of pre-prophetic Israel was that of the high places. In reply to all this and much more of a like nature, our author shows that reasoning from the case of other nations and their worship is really begging the question; that the theory puts a forced meaning on metaphorical language, that superstition is no proof of the non-existence of a pure faith; and that an appeal to the early books of Scripture shows that the critical theory receives no just support from what is said about the dwelling place of deity.

The ninth chapter deals with the visible representations of deity in the pre-prophetic age. Here the critical theory makes much of the calf-worship and of the ephod, claiming that these were representations of deity, and elements in the Jahaveh worship of early times. The views of Vatke and Kuenen are those which our author chiefly discusses. He shows that their reasonings are often contradictory, and always far-fetched and uncertain.

In the tenth chapter three topics are considered in their bearing on the status of the pre-prophetic age: Molech-worship, human sacrifices, and fire-worship. Concerning these matters, the critical school, as represented by Kuenen Daumer and Ghillany, maintains that Jahaveh-worship was at first fire- or sun-worship, in which at times human sacrifices were offered. Our author takes up four or five points in order, and patiently considers them one by one in criticising the theory of the

critics. He points out that the critics, with all their bold pretensions, succeed in proving very little; that they mix up events of early and late date in a way inconsistent with their development theory; and that the critics, by showing the low tone of the pre-prophetic religion, make it very difficult for them to explain the sudden rise of the prophetic form of religion with its admitted maturity of ideas and rites.

The eleventh chapter proceeds to show what the Jahaveh religion of Israel really was. The two points raised for discussion are its *origin*, and its *specific meaning*. Concerning the first, our author concludes that it is not Indo-Germanic, nor Assyro-Babylonian, nor Egyptian, nor Kenite, nor Canaanite, but distinctively Israelitish in its genesis. In regard to the second question, our author presents and defends the biblical theory. He insists that there is no evidence that Jahaveh was a tribal deity; that no reason can be given by the critics for the substitution of the name Jahaveh for El; and above all, the conclusion is reached and well supported, that the higher qualities associated with the nature of Jahaveh were present from the first. Thus the pre-prophetic conception of Jahaveh was much loftier than the notion of deity held by the tribes of Canaan. These four chapters unite in giving the answer to the first question to the effect that the tone of religious thought and life in pre-prophetic times in Israel was different from, and higher than, that of the surrounding nations.

The twelfth chapter takes up the second and third questions and seeks to point out the element in the religion of Israel which marks it off from the other religions of that early time. That distinctive element is that of *ethic monotheism*, and this gives the subject for an exceedingly able and interesting chapter. Our author deals with two topics in this chapter. In the first place, he shows the necessity there is of postulating moral elements in Jahaveh's character; and, in the second place, he indicates how the transition to ethic monotheism is effected. He shows that the critical theory can give no satisfactory account of the origin and growth of the moral elements which enter into the notion of Jahaveh, as presented in the early religion of Israel. Jahaveh-worship was never mere nature-worship, and the attempt of the critics to transform nature-worship into ethic monotheism utterly breaks down, and this failure at the outset means failure all the way through. Our author further shows that the conception of Jahaveh which the early prophets exhibit was not a new one, but was a return to and re-expression of what really existed from the beginning of Israelitish history. But no outline such as can be given here does the faintest justice to this splendid chapter. The critics must meet and answer its reasonings, else their progress is blocked.

The limits of this review forbid that anything more than a hasty glance can be given to the remaining six chapters of the treatise before us. Two of these chapters deal with the authoritative institutions of Israel, and discuss in a somewhat thorough manner the legal and ritual system of the Israelites. The reasonings of the critical school concerning the various so-called codes—covenant, deuteronomic and priestly—are examined with care, and the conclusion is reached that a norm or law outside of the prophets and superior to them was acknowledged, and the presumption is that this was Mosaic.

In the fifteenth chapter there is a very complete discussion of the three main positions of the critical school in regard to the codes: First, that there are three distinct codes; secondly, that they are far apart in time; and thirdly, that they are

inconsistent with each other. At several points it may be that our author concedes too much to the critical school, still, the main positions of that school are assailed with great success. Two following chapters treat of the law books and of law and prophecy, but we cannot even outline the contents of these useful chapters. We shall only say that the discussion of the inversion of the order of law and prophecy which the critical theory makes is most satisfactory. Law is first, prophecy follows and is in harmony with law.

In concluding, our author justly claims to have made good these two positions: First, that the earliest writing prophets, Amos and Hosea, give clear evidence that the ethic and spiritual elements of the religion of Israel were firmly grasped in their day and long before it; and, secondly, that there existed in the earliest literary age certain books which were ascribed to Moses and regarded as authoritative, and which set forth specific religious institutions relating to sacrifice and ritual as well as to idolatry and morals. Summing up his examination of the modern critical theory, our author claims that he has made good against it such points as the following: It professes to be a thorough-going theory, but still it does not do justice to the facts of the case; its treatment of the books and writers of the Old Testament is arbitrary; its great weakness appears when great crises or turning points in the history are to be explained; it does not go to the core of the religion of Israel, but dwells on details; it rejects the supernatural and yet is itself unnatural; on its literary side it is not as strong as it appears; and it fails to give as good an explanation of the development of the religion of Israel as does the biblical theory.

At some length we have tried to give the reader a general idea of the line of reasoning pursued by our author in his critique of the modern theory of the early religion of Israel, and of the solid manner in which he supports the biblical theory of the origin and growth of that religion. The importance of the subject in itself at the present day, and the ability and thoroughness of our author's treatment of it must be our apology for such an extended notice. While, perhaps, there is not much in the discussion that is really new to those who are familiar with the subject, yet our author shows real skill in both the plan and performance of his work. Even though at times what may be regarded as undue concessions are made to the critical school, still in no case, so far as we can judge, does he betray his cause to the foe. Perhaps the fairness and conciliation of the treatment will secure for this treatise a hearing all the more readily, even in critical circles. Our author, in our judgment, is right when he seizes hold of the historical development of the religious life of the nation of Israel as the real core of the discussion, and he has kept to this line of discussion all the way through. If doing this seems to narrow the discussion too much, it certainly cannot be said that the treatment of it by our author is not deep and thorough. The critical school must give a more profound philosophy of the religion of Israel in its relation to other religions than it yet has given, and it must reckon with this treatise in particular, before it can cherish any hope of winning its way among thoughtful men. These theories dazzle not a few, but are not yet demonstrated; they may fascinate some minds, but they cannot fortify our religious faith.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

*Columbia, S. C.*