

abstractions which fall short of, or are one-sided descriptions of, objective realities. What is to hinder us from continuing to think of Christ after the fashion of a Paul or a John; or what is to prevent us from seeing in His concrete person that union of all opposites from which nothing but sin and evil are excluded. Green himself has taught us a better way of looking at personality than was current in other philosophies. We have only to follow him when he shows us the philosophical and

ethical truth of self-consciousness, to reach some conception of the truth of the personality of Jesus Christ. We have only to refuse to place personality under the iron mechanical rule of an impersonal idea to get rid of many things which he has rather inconsistently brought upon us. But of all things we are sure that, come what may, men will not give up the Christ, and if philosophy can exist only by attenuating Him to an idea, then so much the worse for philosophy.

Judaism and Higher Criticism.

BY THE REV. JOSEPH STRAUSS, PH.D., M.A., RABBI.

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of November there are some reflections on the future of Judaism, its relation to the Higher Criticism and to Christianity.

Its relation to the Higher Criticism is spoken of rather despondingly, as if Judaism could not accept the results of a true criticism of Holy Scriptures. My purpose is briefly to show that the criticism of Scriptures is nothing new to Judaism, and that it would long since have ceased to exist if it were not by virtue of its fundamental principles of religion and morality strong enough to survive ephemeral attacks. And surely the intrinsic value of passages and books which modern criticism places later than the common view assumed is not impaired thereby, even granted that some, certainly not all, modern theories are correct.

Philo, the Alexandrian Jewish philosopher, 54 A.D., who is responsible for much that Christianity possesses, treats many passages of the Bible allegorically or parabolically.

In the pages of the Talmud, 300 B.C.—600 A.D., we find critical views concerning the authorship of certain passages and books of Scriptures uttered with a boldness that will even astonish modern critics. This is the more remarkable, as the Talmud is considered a guide-book of religion by so-called orthodox Jews. To my opinion, however, it is one of the greatest works of reform that has been handed down to posterity. For its main task is to adapt the biblical laws and the Jewish religion to the circumstances and exigencies of the times and countries in which Jews resided after exile and dispersion. What a radical reform, for instance, is the rule laid down in the Talmud (and accepted by

all Jews irrespective of creed or section), which pronounces that the law of the land in which the Jew resides is the law that must be obeyed by him (דינה דמלכותא דינה).

Now, in the treatise of Bawbhaw Bathraw, several pages are devoted to the discussion regarding the authorship of some passages and books of the Bible. One Rabbi asserts that the eight last verses of the Pentateuch which report the death of Moses cannot have been written by Moses himself, but by Joshua.

Another doctor, speaking of Job, makes the daring assertion, "Job never lived, nor was he created"; but the book is a parable, *i.e.* a poem invented by a poetic mind (איוב לא היה ולא נברא) אלא מישל היה).

Of Isaiah, Proverbs, Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes, it is asserted that they were written by men of the great synagogue, which actually brings these books down to the time of the Maccabees.

I cannot give the whole extract here, which may be left for some other occasion, but the discussion in that treatise is highly significant.

Coming down to the dark Middle Ages, we meet with some of the greatest lights of Jewish scholarship and biblical criticism shining in the Pyrenean peninsula.

Ibn Ezra (born 1088, died 1167), the great scholar, thinker, and poet, whom Spinoza admiringly quotes, and who is therefore the forerunner of modern criticism, doubts the Mosaic authorship of (*a*) the verse, Gen. xii. 6, "And the Canaanite was *then* in the land"; (*b*) Gen. xxxvi. 31-43, and other passages.

The immortal Maimonides (born 1135, died 1204), in his wonderful work, *More Nebhuchim*—"the guide of the perplexed," is similarly free, and is in advance of many of our modern critics in treating of the anthropomorphic and anthropopathic expressions in Holy Scriptures.

Spinoza (born 1632, died 1677), who remained a Jew in spite of the attempts of his Protestant and Catholic friends to convert him; Moses Mendelssohn (born 1729, died 1786), and a number of Jewish scholars of our century, might be quoted as instances and proofs, that with the acceptance of the results of honest criticism, it is not only possible to keep within the fold of Judaism, but that it is

the duty of a Jew to "investigate well," and to "prove all things, and to hold fast what is good."

For this very reason, the modern enlightened Jew cannot accept the "Messiah" of St. Paul or any other apostle. He does not, however, look with contempt upon Christianity, as only ignorance or narrow-mindedness can assert, but he considers it sympathetically, and, with the great Moses ben Maimon, sees in it another form of Judaism, whose mission is to spread the worship of the Most High God among the nations, in order to verify and consummate the promise given to Abraham: "And in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed."

The Teaching of our Lord as to the Authority of the Old Testament.

BY THE RIGHT REV. C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

THE LORD'S TEACHING AS TO THE LAW.

I.

WE now proceed with the details of the appeal to Christ in reference to the Old Testament. This appeal, we have seen in the foregoing address that we are fully entitled to make; and we have further seen that the fulness of divine knowledge, which we must ascribe to our Lord and to His teaching, indisputably warrants our accepting as conclusive and final the answers to that appeal, whensoever they can be shown to be either included in, or legitimately deducible from, the recorded teaching of our Lord.

But first of all, What exactly is the tenor of our appeal? Is it not substantially this?—for guidance in our estimate of the view of the Old Testament that is now pressed upon us by modern teachers, and has been set before us, both in its full and in its modified form in a foregoing paper.

Such is the tenor of the appeal. Now in what form can the answer be given? Can it be otherwise than by the utterances of Christ in regard of the Old Testament, and the deductions that may legitimately be drawn from them? If this be so, then it will at once be seen that the utmost care must be taken in selecting out of the numerous

references of Christ to the Old Testament only those that bear directly, or by just and clear inference, on the subject-matter of the appeal. It cannot be too strongly urged that when we appeal to the words of Christ as authenticating the Old Testament, we must make it clear to demonstration what it is that they really do authenticate. The loose and popular way in which the appeal to Christ's words has often been made has greatly impaired, in many cases, the validity of the argument, and has raised prejudices against the whole nature of the appeal, from which, as we have partly seen in the preceding address, even writers of high character have not been able to free themselves. The *ad captandum* argument, bad always, is pre-eminently bad and reprehensible in momentous controversies like the present.

We shall have, then, to exercise the greatest care in our selection of the references of our Lord to the Old Testament, and especially to be on our guard against pressing them beyond what they will logically and exegetically bear. The references of our Lord which bear directly on our present controversy are confessedly few; but the references to the Old Testament, and the citations which He vouchsafed to make from it, are very numerous, and these references and citations do indisputably create impressions which are of great subsidiary