

The Princeton Theological Review

JANUARY, 1925

SOME RELIGIOUS IMPLICATIONS OF CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY

In 1864 Dr. James McCosh published a brief essay on "The Philosophic Principles involved in the Puritan Theology."¹ Our present world shows no marked interest either in Puritan theology or in its underlying philosophy, while Dr. McCosh himself is remembered more by the walk and the building called by his name in the University over which he once presided than by that philosophy of common sense he so firmly believed and so earnestly advocated. Nevertheless common sense has a curious way of mixing the obvious and the striking, and in the essay referred to there will be found a statement and an exhortation worthy of remembrance—Philosophy is of great importance to theology, but Biblical theologians as such should always avoid identifying their systems with any peculiar metaphysical system.

The statement is obvious; the exhortation is more often honored in the breach than the observance; and sixty years have brought some striking changes. The term theology is for many obsolescent and is being replaced by the term religion; again *Biblical* Theologians are notably few, and systematizers of religion are very many. Religion has no need of philosophy, argue some; philosophy must produce a new substitute for decaying Christianity, assert others. In this essay we shall attempt to give some account of the latter effort, but let us remember our text: Philosophy is of use to

¹ This was part of the Introduction to the Complete Works of Stephen Charnock, B.D., pp. vi-xlviii of *The Works of Stephen Charnock* (Nicol's Series of Standard Divines. Puritan Period). Edinburgh, 1864.

A MODERNISTIC VIEW OF JEREMIAH
THE BAIRD LECTURE FOR 1922*

It is now thirty-five years since the volumes of the *Expositor's Bible* began to issue from the press. Among the early volumes of the series were those on *The Book of Isaiah* by Rev. George Adam Smith. It was no slight honor for a young man scarcely in his thirties to be associated in this great undertaking with his distinguished teachers at Edinburgh, Principal Rainy and Professor Blaikie, as well as with such men as Bishop Alexander, Dean Farrar, Principal Edwards, Principal (later Bishop) Moule, Professors Denney, Dods, Findlay, Milligan, Dr. Maclaren of Manchester, and others. Yet it is probably safe to say that no one of the contributors to this widely used commentary, did more to enhance its popularity or his own reputation than he. Within two years of the publication of the *Isaiah*, the author was called to Glasgow to succeed Principal Douglas as Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in the Free Church College. In 1909 he was appointed Principal of the University of Aberdeen. He was knighted in 1916, and was in the same year Moderator of the General Assembly of the United Free Church of Scotland.

Professor Smith's position as a leading liberal theologian is too well known to require extended statement here. In briefly sketching the history of the Higher Criticism of the nineteenth century, Professor Briggs points out in his *Introduction*¹ that although Professor W. Robertson Smith was removed in 1881 from his chair at Glasgow "in order to the peace and harmony of the Church," his teacher Professor A. B. Davidson of Edinburgh, "who held essentially the same views" was left undisturbed, and in 1892 Dr. George Adam Smith was chosen "with full knowledge of the fact

* *Jeremiah: Being the Baird Lecture for 1922*. By the Very Rev. Sir GEORGE ADAMS SMITH, D. D., LL. D., Principal of the University of Aberdeen. 1924. New York: George H. Doran Company. 8°, pp. x, 394.

¹*General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture* (1899), p. 286.

that he held similar views" to be the successor of Principal Douglas "who had been one of the chief opponents of W. Robertson Smith." Professor Briggs was naturally and we think properly disposed to see in this an indication that "this contest gained liberty of opinion in Great Britain." What was true twenty-five years ago when Dr. Briggs wrote, is true today. There is undoubtedly a close general similarity between the views of these two distinguished pupils of Professor Davidson—W. Robertson Smith and George Adam Smith—both of whom may be classed as disciples also of Wellhausen. But that which especially distinguishes the younger disciple is his artistic temperament, human insight and sympathy, passion for social righteousness, religious ardor and homiletic instinct. Coupled with the scholar's love of knowledge, he has the insight of the poet and the fervor of the mystic; and it shows in every thing which he writes.

After thirteen years at Aberdeen Professor Smith was invited to revisit Glasgow as Baird Lecturer for 1922. He chose for the theme of this course of six lectures "Jeremiah" and speaks of them as "the accomplishment of a work the materials for which were largely gathered" during the years of his professorship there. The reader will recognize the truth of this statement. The new volume does not differ essentially from *The Book of Isaiah* or *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*; and it will doubtless be warmly welcomed by Professor Smith's many admirers. Despite its comparative brevity (it is less than half the size of the *Isaiah*) and the disproportionate emphasis placed upon metrical and critical questions, the reader will find in it that literary charm, vivid imagination and religious fervor, which have made Professor Smith's other commentaries such fascinating and stimulating reading. But it is characterized also by the same freedom amounting even to ruthlessness in the critical manipulation, or rather mutilation, of the text, the same narrow view of prophecy, and the same setting of prophet over against priest (an antithesis with most serious New Testament implications), which has been characteristic of

Professor Smith's writings from the first. Such being the case the appearance of the *Jeremiah* furnishes a suitable occasion to call attention once again to these serious defects and destructive tendencies which appear in the work of this outstanding representative of the Higher Criticism, even though it be at the risk of repeating what has already been better said by others. We shall therefore state our criticisms of this volume under the following three heads: 1) The Text of Jeremiah; 2) Jeremiah and Prophecy; 3) Jeremiah, the Cultus, and the Cross.

I. THE TEXT OF JEREMIAH

The first question regarding the text of Jeremiah concerns the relative merits of the Massoretic Hebrew text and the Septuagint version. As to this Professor Smith hesitates to express a definite judgment. After remarking that there is much difference of opinion among modern critics he goes on to say, "But the prevailing opinion, and, to my view, the right one, is that no general judgment is possible, and that each case of difference between the two witnesses must be decided by itself."² In support of this he quotes the words of Professor A. B. Davidson, "The Hebrew is qualitatively superior to the Greek, but quantitatively the Greek is nearer the original. This judgment is general, admitting many exceptions, and each passage has to be considered by itself." These two statements would seem to justify us in expecting that in this volume the Hebrew and the Greek will be treated at least with impartiality and that the author will be as ready to tell us on occasion that he is following the Hebrew as against the Greek as to point out that he is following the Greek as against the Hebrew. But such is not the case. When he follows the Greek as against the Hebrew Professor Smith frequently calls attention to it in a footnote. But when he

² P. 15. Wherever, as here, the page alone is given, the reference is to Professor Smith's *Jeremiah*.

follows the Hebrew as against the Greek, as he usually does, he only exceptionally makes mention of this fact.³

This gives the reader a decidedly false impression of the relative merits of the Hebrew and the Greek. Finding the Hebrew text so frequently criticized or rejected he may infer that it is quite unreliable and needs careful and even drastic revision; and so be disposed to give Professor Smith wider liberty as a textual critic than he would do if he knew how often he has rejected the Greek in favor of the Hebrew or rejected both because of metrical theory or theological preconception.⁴ It is decidedly inconsistent, to say the least, to call attention to the fact that in this or that place the translation follows the Greek as against the Hebrew and then, perhaps in the same verse, omit one or more words which are found in both Hebrew and Greek—omit them without a word of explanation, simply because he sees fit to do so. Despite his very moderate statements on the subject of metrics, his insistence, as against the extreme views of Professor Duhm,⁵ that Jeremiah used prose as well as verse, irregular as well as regular metres,⁶ Professor Smith is clearly far more influenced by metrical theory and applies it far more drastically to the text of Jeremiah, than a sound and rigidly objective study of text and versions would at all justify. And with all the caution and moderation of many of his statements there is manifest at times a confidence in his own ability to distinguish the genuine from the spurious, which is only matched by the contemptuous way in which he sometimes expresses his disrespect for those passages of the text which he rejects, or for the critics whose views differ from his own.

A man cannot be said to hold a reverent attitude toward

³ For confirmation of this statement the reader is referred to the Note at the end of this article (pp. 122 *infra*) where Professor Smith's treatment of the text of Jeremiah, especially with reference to metrical considerations, is considered in some detail.

⁴ *Ibid*, p. 128 *infra*.

⁵ *Ibid*, p. 128 *f. infra*.

⁶ Cf. especially p. 37.

Scripture who in rejecting considerable portions of the Book of Jeremiah speaks of them as "largely devoid of the style and the spiritual value of his undoubted Oracles and Discourses. They are more or less diffuse and vagrant, while his are concise and to the point. . . . We have in our Bible other and better utterances of the truths, questions, threats and hopes which they contain" (p. 21). And there is something almost brutal about such expressions as: "Hebrew uselessly adds" (pp. 57, 204), "betrays an editorial redundancy" (p. 91), "Hebrew is impossible" (p. 98), "later intrusions" (p. 180), "Hebrew adds *Jerusalem* with no sense and a disturbance to the metre" (p. 198), "Hebrew is hopeless" (p. 201), "addition . . . evidently wrong" (p. 243), "useless editorial addition" (p. 246), "Greek lacks the unnecessary remainder" (p. 247), "Greek again is devoid of the repetitions, etc., that overload the Hebrew" (p. 281), "One may eliminate the few words not found in Greek, and naturally suspect the liturgical clause in 11" (p. 291), "Hebrew adds the gloss . . ." (p. 294), "The whole seems a needless variant or paraphrase of 16" (p. 304), "Hebrew copyists senselessly repeat, *Thus saith the Lord of Hosts*; Greek omits" (p. 323). It is only to be expected, therefore, that Professor Smith would adopt somewhat the same tone in referring to the conclusions of scholars, even scholars of the critical school, when their conclusions differ from his own. He speaks of "a number of Duhm's emendations" as "not only unnecessary but harmful to the effectiveness of the verse" (p. 44), and uses such phrases as,— "drastic and often quite arbitrary" (p. 38), "padding the text" (p. 46), "objections . . . inadequate and even trifling" (p. 52), "merely on the grounds of his theory" (p. 82), "even for him, unusually arbitrary" (p. 194), "suggestion imaginary" (p. 243). Commenting on xxxi 7-9 he remarks: "It is singular how each of these three verses contains not four but five lines. Cornill, by using the introduction *Thus saith the Lord*, omitting *the remnant of Israel*, combining two pairs of lines and including the following couplet, effects

the arrangement of octastichs to which he has throughout the book arbitrarily committed himself. Duhm has another metrical arrangement" (p. 301). Clearly the "correct" text of Jeremiah and the laws of metrical arrangement are not yet an "assured result" of criticism.

But the Greek Version and the Metre while important are not the only criteria used by Professor Smith in his attempt to distinguish the genuine passages of Jeremiah from the spurious. Even when the Greek raises no difficulties and the metre is perfect, our author may hesitate to assert the genuineness of a passage. Of xxx. 12-15 he remarks, "If these Qinah quatrains are not Jeremiah's, some one else could match him to the letter and the very breath." But the most he ventures to say of it is that it is "more probably Jeremiah's" than verses 5-9 of which he is decidedly sceptical. How complicated the problem may become in the eyes of the critic is illustrated by the following comment on the latter part of chapter xxv. "The rest of the chapter, verses 15-38, is so full of expansions and repetitions, which we may partly see from a comparison of it with the Greek, as well as of inconsistencies with some earlier Oracles by Jeremiah, of traces of the later prophetic style and of echoes of other prophets, that many deny any part of the miscellany to be Jeremiah's own."⁷ Professor Smith suggests that "the substance of verses 15-23" may be "reasonably left to Jeremiah." The balance he describes as more doubtful.

The inevitable result of this constant attitude of sceptical criticism is shown in such a statement as the following. Speaking of the passage on the New Covenant (Jer. xxxi. 31f) which he describes as "a prophecy of Christianity which has hardly its equal in the Old Testament" he remarks: "The weaving, it is true, is none of the deftest, but whether this is due to the aged Jeremiah's failing fingers or to the awkwardness of the disciple, the stuff and its dyes are all his own." There is another possibility—that it is due to that

⁷ P. 182.

faultfinding propensity, which gradually becomes an obsession, of the "critical" student of the Bible.

II. JEREMIAH AND PROPHECY

While Professor Smith attaches great importance to textual and literary (notably metrical) considerations as a means of determining the genuine utterances of Jeremiah, of even greater importance is his theory of prophecy. Our author believes that the Book of Jeremiah contains "a considerable, but not a preponderant, amount" of material which is due "to editors or compilers between his death soon after 586 and the close of the Prophetic Canon in 200 B. C." The criteria for the sifting out of such material he states as follows:

All Oracles or Narratives in the Book, which (apart from obvious intrusions) imply that the Exile is well advanced or that the Return from Exile has already happened, or which reflect the circumstances of the later Exile and subsequent periods or the spirit of Israel and the teaching of her prophets and scribes in those periods, we may rule out of the material on which we can rely for our knowledge of Jeremiah's life and his teaching.⁸

Such a statement as this should make clear to everyone the large claims which the critic is prepared to make for himself as an expert on prophecy and history, and the severe and searching test which any statement in the Book of Jeremiah must undergo before it can be accepted as genuine. "Obvious intrusions," "Exile well advanced," "later Exile," "return from Exile," "imply," "reflect," "spirit of Israel," "teaching of her prophets and scribes"—the more we ponder these words the clearer it becomes to us that it must be a very difficult task for a "critical" expert to separate the chaff from the wheat; and we cease to wonder that the critics differ so greatly among themselves. Such subtle shades of difference must be very hard to recognize. The difficulty would be great if for no other reason because of the meagre data at the critic's disposal upon which he must base his conclusions re-

⁸ P. 19.

garding so vague and intangible a thing as the "spirit of Israel" and the changes which it manifested during the course of the exilic and post-exilic periods. But the difficulty is greatly increased by the widely diverging opinions as to the extent of the evidence upon which the critic can rely.

Thus, among the passages of which Professor Smith feels entitled to say "In any case they reflect the situation and feelings of Israel in Babylonia about 540 B. C.," we find "parts of xxx and xxxi, especially xxxi. 7-14, the spirit of which is so much that of the Eve of the Return from Exile and the style so akin to that of the Great Prophet of that Eve that some take it as dependent on his prophecies."⁹ It will be noted at once that one reason assigned by our author for denying the genuineness of these utterances is that they reveal the spirit and style of the "Great Unknown," commonly called "Deutero-Isaiah." This is significant because for centuries no Christian questioned and today *most* Christians (the critics to the contrary notwithstanding) still believe that Isaiah was the author of the entire book which bears his name. Yet so sure is the critical scholar of the exilic date of Isaiah xl-lv, or, to be more exact, of its origin in the "later Exile," that he uses it as an argument for assigning portions of Jeremiah to the same period. And this is but an illustration of what the critics have been doing with all those passages which speak of a Return from captivity. Hosea iii.5, Amos ix.14, Micah ii.12, Isaiah x.21, Zephaniah iii.20, all speak clearly of a Return. We might suppose that this would make it impossible for the critic to deny the genuineness of the above mentioned chapters of Jeremiah, that if such prophets as Hosea, Amos, Isaiah and Micah who lived long before the time of the Babylonian supremacy could foretell a return from Exile, Jeremiah who lived to see the fall of Jerusalem could certainly have done so. Yet we find that every one of these passages is rejected by eminent critics and assigned to an exilic or post-exilic date. Thus, while admitting that Amos ix.14 refers definitely to the "fall of

⁹ P. 20.

Judah" and consequently to the return from Exile, Professor Smith rejects the passage and treats it as late. He maintains that it is "absolutely without a moral feature" and therefore unworthy of Amos, and that its "hopes" which he admits to be "legitimate" although he holds them to be unworthy of Amos, "are the hopes of a generation of other conditions and of other deserts than the generation of Amos." So is it also with Micah ii. 12-13. These verses are, Professor Smith tells us, the only ones in the first three chapters of this book, the authenticity of which the critics might be disposed to question. He rejects them because "they speak of a return from the Exile, and interrupt the connection between verse 11 and the first verse of chap. iii."¹⁰

These examples serve to show that passages which refer to a return from exile are regarded by Professor Smith and by the critics pretty generally as *ipso facto* of late i.e. exilic date. And the point to which he is prepared to carry this opinion is illustrated by his unwillingness to admit that Jeremiah even, who survived the fall of Jerusalem by some time, how long we do not know, could have predicted or, to put it more moderately, was likely to predict or refer to, the Return.

Now it is evident, that back of all these questions as to the way in which the Exile or the Return is referred to, the way in which the "circumstances" and the "spirit" of the later period are "implied" or "reflected" in this or that passage of Jeremiah as well as in such other prophetic utterances as on various grounds are assigned to a later period, there lies as a fundamental presupposition a more or less clearly defined conception of prophecy, a conception characterized by a minimizing if not a positive rejection of the predictive element.¹¹ The "critical" conception of the prophet has been

¹⁰ *The Twelve Prophets*, Vol. I, pp. 192 f., 360, 393.

¹¹ "In vulgar use the name 'prophet' has degenerated to the meaning of 'one who foretells the future.' Of this meaning it is, perhaps, the first duty of every student of prophecy earnestly and stubbornly to rid himself . . . Prediction of the future is only a part, and often a subordinate and accidental part, of an office whose full function is to declare the

well expressed in the familiar dictum of A. B. Davidson: "The prophet is always a man of his own time, and it is always to the people of his own time that he speaks, not to a generation long after, nor to us."¹² We notice at once the connection between this dictum and the "criteria" laid down by our author for determining the Jeremian material in the Book of Jeremiah. If the prophet is always a man of his own time and always speaks to men of his own day,¹³ then, of course, if we can identify the *period* we can date the prophecy. Consequently the "spirit" and "circumstances" become normative. To determine them is the great desideratum.

It is to be conceded at once that there is an important element of truth in this dictum. The prophets were not pillar saints or anchorites; they did not deliberately cut themselves off from human relationships. They were not visionaries who walked among men with eyes so holden by the vision splendid of a glory to come that they had no word of help or comfort, counsel or reproof, for their fellow men. The role which they played was a very different one. The very bitterness of the opposition which they incurred from their countrymen shows how potent was their influence and how much they were dreaded by the enemies of the Lord. Unquestionably they were men of the age in which they lived and they felt it their duty to speak in no uncertain terms to that age: to cry aloud and spare not, to show to Israel her transgressions and to Judah her sins.

But this must not hide from us the fact that *present* time is so emphasized in this dictum that it is easy to interpret it in terms of a denial of prediction which makes the prophets little more than preachers of righteousness. Professor Davidson did not indeed so restrict it. For he goes on to point out that

character and the will of God" (*The Twelve Prophets*, I, p. 11f). This is certainly not a very appreciative way to speak of what the Bible represents as an important function of the prophet. But it was true to Professor Smith's position twenty years ago and it is true of it today.

¹² Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, IV, p. 118b.

¹³ "His message is never out of touch with events" (*The Twelve*, Vol. I, p. 13).

for the prophet "on many, perhaps on all occasions, the most powerful means of exerting an influence on the mind of his time may be what he is able to reveal to it of the future, whether the future be full of mercy or of judgment." But even in admitting this the emphasis is again placed upon the *present*; for the writer continues "but whether he speaks of the present or the future the direct and conscious object of the prophet is to influence the people of his own generation." The natural result of the acceptance of such a conception is to reduce predictive prophecy to a minimum if not to eliminate it altogether as a supernatural revelation. For what concerns men most vitally is after all the immediate future. They may be curious about a distant future, they may enjoy speculating about it. But it is the bearing of tomorrow upon the perplexities and distresses of today which is the great concern of most of us. It will all come right in the end!—may be a challenge to faith, but is cold comfort to the impatient sufferer. "In the latter days"—Ezekiel's contemporaries became impatient with him because his words travelled to distant horizons and left them as they thought to solve their problems as best they could. Consequently while this dictum of Professor Davidson's definitely admits prediction as an important element in prophecy, it none the less manifestly tends so to limit it to the immediate future as to make the element of real prediction negligible. For supernatural revelation may not be necessary to read the future when it is close at hand. When the storm clouds are dark and threatening it is easy to predict the tempest; when the clouds are beginning to break it is not hard to foretell its ending. In speaking of the age which produced Jeremiah, Professor Smith tells us: "The same conditions prevailed out of which a century before had come an Amos, a Hosea, a Micah and an Isaiah. Israel needed judgment and the North again stirred with its possibilities. Who would rise and spell into a clear Word of God the thunder which to all ears was rumbling there."¹⁴

¹⁴ P. 77 f.

Elsewhere he has told us: "None of the prophets began to foretell the fall of Israel till they read, with keener eyes than their contemporaries, the signs of it in current history" and in contrasting them with Juvenal he pointed out that in Juvenal's day "there were no signs of the decline of the empire," whereas the prophets had "political proof of the nearness of God's judgment, and they spoke in the power of its coincidence with the moral corruption of their people."¹⁵ And he here draws a parallel between John Knox and Jeremiah which is calculated to give the impression that there was little if any essential difference between the two: both were men of "spiritual convictions" and read the future in terms of the moral government of God.¹⁶

The foreshortening of the perspective of prophecy encourages the tendency to regard the prophets as far seeing statesmen who could read the book of history understandingly and wisely interpret its lessons, as moral guides who knew the laws of the moral government of God and could interpret the future in terms of ethical inevitability, as religious geniuses in whom Israel's "specialty" in religion reached its highest development. Prediction as involving the supernatural may not be definitely denied. But all the same the tendency to reduce it to the minimum, to make it nearly if not quite negligible, is obvious. And the proof of it in the case of Professor Smith is found in the very facts which we have cited. If Jeremiah is to be denied the authorship of xxxi. 7-14, for example, because of the reference to the Return and the nature of the reference, it is evident that we are far along the road to a naturalistic, or in the case of one so religiously minded as Professor Smith, a merely religious or spiritual, interpretation of prophecy. The prophet shows a tendency to become a kind of religious poet-philosopher, the Wordsworth of his day, who is able to read the

¹⁵ *The Twelve*, Vol. I, p. 152.

¹⁶ P. 271f. cf. pp. 259f. where the difference between Jeremiah and the false prophets is explained as "moral" and "intellectual," and it is more than hinted that the "false" prophets are not given their full dues.

moral and religious meaning of the simple every day experiences of life, as well as a sagacious statesman who can read the future like an open book.¹⁷

There is no doubt something very attractive about such a conception and when it is portrayed to us by so skilful an advocate as Professor Smith, it undoubtedly makes a powerful appeal. But it must be recognized none the less that it is dangerously partial and represents a definite rejection of important elements of the Biblical teaching with regard to prophecy.

The question reduces itself simply to this: Should the Old Testament scholar formulate a theory of prophecy which by its minimizing of the supernatural will give the minimum of offense to that "bugaboo" of our age, the modern mind, fortify it by such Scripture texts as can be cited in its favor and then force the rest of Scripture to accept this interpretation? Or should our conception of prophecy be based upon a careful and thoroughly impartial study of all the relevant

¹⁷ Cf. *The Book of Isaiah*. Vol. II, p. 327f. Occasionally Professor Smith speaks as if there were a real difference between the "inspiration" of the prophets and the "illumination" of a truly spiritual man. But his whole tendency is to obliterate any such distinction. This is well illustrated by his language regarding the Immanuel prophecy (*The Book of Isaiah*, Vol. I. p. 132). He refers to "the awful conversation, in which Isaiah received from the Eternal the fundamentals of his teaching" as containing no reference to a Messiah. Such language seems to suggest a real *revelation* to the prophet. Yet on the next page we read, "If we consider the moment, chosen by Isaiah for announcing the Messiah and adding his seal to the national belief in the advent of a glorious Son of David . . ." The narrative on the contrary declares expressly (vss. 3, 7, 10) that Isaiah did not *choose* this moment but spoke because the *Lord spake to him*. In his *Jeremiah*, we find Professor Smith speaking of the prophet as "a master of observation" (p. 361), as "the one constant, rational, and far-seeing power in the national life" (p. 177), of his "searching eyes and detached mind" (p. 132), of his "political sagacity and military foresight" which "have their source in moral and spiritual convictions" (p. 271), of the "psychological differences" between him and the false prophets (p. 258). Such expressions as these have a definitely naturalistic ring which is not offset by such a phrase as "from a human point of view" (p. 333) or by the use of the words "Revelation" and "Divine impulse" (p. 185).

material? The one is the method of approach of the "higher critic;" the other is that of the evangelical expositor and theologian. The one is subjective and doctrinaire; the other is objective and scientific. The one stresses the "human side" of prophecy and so shortens its perspective as to empty it of much, if not all, of its Divine authoritativeness; the other emphasized the Godward side of prophecy and sees in its deep perspectives a proof that God has revealed His will to His servants the prophets. And the tragedy of Dr. Smith's position lies in his inability to see that as a critical scholar he is constantly engaged in undermining that Biblical conception of prophecy which should be most precious to him as a religiously minded man and as a Christian.

This difference, which is a vital one, is illustrated by Dr. Smith's comment on Jeremiah xxxi. 15ff.—

The next poems no one denies to Jeremiah; they are among the finest we have from him. And how natural that he should conceive and utter them in those quiet days when he was at, or near, Ramah, the grave of the mother of the people. He hears her century-long travail of mourning for the loss of the tribes that were sprung from her Joseph, aggravated now by the banishment of her Benjamin; but hears too the promise that her travail shall be rewarded by their return. The childless old man has the soul of mother and father both—now weeping with the comfortless Rachel and now, in human touches unmatched outside the Parable of the Prodigal, reading into the heart of God the same instinctive affections, to which, in spite of himself, every earthly father is stirred by the mere mention of the name of a rebellious and wandered son. The most vivid details are these: *after I had been brought to know*, which might also be translated *after I had been made to know myself* and so anticipate *when he came to himself* of our Lord's Parable; *I smote on my thigh*, the gesture of despair; and in 20a the very human attribution to the Deity of surprise that the mere name of Ephraim should move Him to affection, which recalls both in form and substance the similar question attributed to the Lord in xii.9.¹⁸

Here we have the issue clearly presented. Our author compares this passage to the Parable of the Prodigal; he undoubtedly regards it as one of the greatest utterances of the Old Testament. But what is his explanation of it? Jeremiah is "childless" and "old." Jeremiah has the "soul of mother

¹⁸ P. 302f.

and father both." Jeremiah has the "human" touch. So we find him "*reading into* the heart of God—the *same instinctive affections*—to which in *spite* of himself—*every* earthly father—is stirred by the *mere* mention of the *name*— of a *rebellious* and *wandered* son." In other words man, *every* earthly father is so loving, so forgiving that God must be equally good. And Jeremiah, because human nature is so exquisitely developed in his personality, is capable of "*reading into* the heart of God" the *instinctive* affections of man.

Now it is perfectly true that the anthropomorphic argument is a legitimate one, that human fatherhood at its best and highest is a type of the Divine. But as based on the goodness of man, there are serious weaknesses in this argument. It is not true that "*every* man" has an inextinguishable love even for a good, not to say an erring, son. If there are unnatural sons, there are also inhuman fathers. And it is not the case that even a loving father will always forgive and forget and save. If the prodigal insists on remaining in the far country, the father is powerless. There are sins which close the door to the prodigal. There are times when even the most loving father must disown a son. If we are to judge of God by comparing Him with "every earthly father," we will have a fickle and feeble Heavenly Father. The thing which gives to this great passage its preciousness is not that it represents a generalization, based on thorough study of human relations and "sublimated" in the heroic personality of Jeremiah, that God must be as good as man. That which gives this passage its meaning is exactly what gives the Parable of the Prodigal its wonderful appeal. It is a *revelation from God of the love of God*. The Parable is a beautiful story, too good to be true of this wicked sin-cursed world, too simple to satisfy a heart burdened with the guilt of sin and deeply troubled with the question, How shall a man be just with God? The sinner cannot believe it until he realizes that it was uttered by One who spake as never man spake and therefore carries with it the stamp and the authority of Deity. And this passage as interpreted by Professor Smith

may be set aside as the utterance of a gentle, fond, soft hearted old man, a grandfatherly sort of figure, a message which can be contrasted to its own disadvantage with the stern utterances of an Amos or a John Baptist. It is only when we observe that these verses in Jeremiah are introduced by "(thus) saith the Lord" and that this phrase is repeated *four* times in the brief compass of seven verses that we realize the true meaning of this wondrous picture of forgiving love. If, as this phrase clearly implies, what we have here is *the word of the Lord* to the prophet Jeremiah, the picture of God as a loving and forgiving father becomes exceeding precious. But in his metrical rendering of the passage Professor Smith three out of five times omits the prophetic formula, "saith the Lord," and in commenting on the passage he tells the reader that the prophet Jeremiah *read* these things *into* the heart of God. The very language employed suggests the uncertainty of the inference. In the last analysis, Professor Smith invites us to exchange human speculation and inference for divine revelation.

As a further illustration of this tendency to stress the human side of prophecy, the call of the prophet may be cited. While affirming that the account of Jeremiah's call was not recorded by the prophet till some twenty-three years after he received it and may have been expanded "in terms of his intervening experience," Professor Smith is inclined to magnify the significance of this event, to believe that Jeremiah early had "the forebodings at least of a task so vast as that of *prophet to the nations*." Yet he gives an account of Jeremiah's reluctance to respond to the call which suggests that in Professor Smith's opinion this was due to very secondary considerations, that the prophet considered the form of his message as more important than its substance:

No wonder that Jeremiah shrank from such a task: *Ah, Lord God, I know not to speak, I am too young*. His excuse is interesting. Had he not developed his gift for verse? Or, conscious of its rustic simplicity, did he fear to take the prophet's thunder on lips, that had hitherto moved only to the music of his country-side? In the light of his later experience the second alternative is not impossible. When much practice must have

made him confident of his art as a singer, he tells us how burning he felt the Word of the Lord to be.¹⁹

Is this the explanation of Jeremiah's reluctance? Was he afraid that his metres would not pass muster, that his rhythm might be thought clumsy? Was he asking for a little longer time to study Hebrew prosody and master the difficult art of improvisation? It might seem so. Were the utterances of the prophets the products of conscious art, or were they the word of the Lord at their lips? To say that the prophet speaking under the inspiration of the Almighty might be expected to use language worthy of the Author of his message, is one thing. But to make the form so important as to be a prime qualification, as Professor Smith seems to do, is again to emphasize the human side of prophecy out of all proportion to its importance. And this is characteristic of the school to which our author belongs.

We have already called attention to the fact that Professor Smith rejects considerable portions of Jeremiah because they presuppose the conditions of a later age. We have seen that he regards the literary form as important enough to make Jeremiah hesitate to stand forth as a prophet. It is also to be noticed that Professor Smith feels that he knows quite definitely how Jeremiah's "revelations" came to him, or rather how they did not come to him. This appears in his comment on xxxi.26.²⁰ The bulk of this chapter he regards apparently as genuinely Jeremian. But he encloses verse 26

On this I awoke and beheld
And sweet unto me was my sleep

in brackets to indicate that it is suspicious; and he adds the following footnote: "Doubtful. Jeremiah had nothing to do with dreams as means of prophecy." How does Professor Smith know this? He accepts as genuine the inaugural *visions* of the almond tree and the seething cauldron.²¹ He

¹⁹ P. 82. Of course this is only one phase of Jeremiah's "reluctance," though it is stated here as if it were an important matter. Professor Smith elsewhere makes much of Jeremiah's temperamental "revolt" against his prophetic vocation (cf. especially Lecture VII).

²⁰ P. 306.

²¹ Pp. 84f, 351.

also accepts the *vision* of the two baskets of fruit.²² Yet he denies that Jeremiah could have had *dreams*. Does Professor Smith understand the difference between visions and dreams so clearly that he can assert that Jeremiah had the one and did not have the other? If so he is a past master in Biblical psychology. To us the distinction which he draws seems arbitrary in the extreme. And again we ask the question, What is the correct way to study so important a subject as Old Testament prophecy? Are we to believe that God revealed Himself to Jeremiah in dreams because this verse says so? Or shall we reject this verse because the same statement is not made elsewhere? If a statement is false because it is only made once, would repetition of the falsehood make it true? How many times must the Bible make a statement in order that a "higher critic" may be induced to accept it as credible?

III. JEREMIAH, THE CULTUS, AND THE CROSS

It is a well established fact that in the modern reconstruction of the Old Testament as represented by the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis, the problem of ritual sacrifice occupies a central place. According to this theory it is clearly taught in the writings of the great prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries that ritual sacrifice as practised in Israel had no Mosaic authorization and did not form an essential element in religious worship. Such passages as Amos iv.4, v.21; Hosea iv.6, viii.11; Isaiah i.10; Micah vi.6; Jeremiah vii.22 are appealed to in proof of it. The exact meaning and scope of this prophetic protest against ritual sacrifice has been variously interpreted. All members of the school would agree with Graf²³ that Jeremiah vii.22-23 proves that the "middle part of the Pentateuch" which contains the bulk of the priestly writing (P) could not have been known in his days. But there is difference of opinion as to the exact nature of the opposition of these prophets to sacrifice. The more mod-

²² P. 238.

²³ *Der Prophet Jeremia* (1862), p. 122.

erate view is that while opposed to the cultus as practised in their days because they regarded it as a fosterer of vice and the enemy of pure spiritual religion, while denying that it had any such divine imperative back of it as the potent name of Moses implied, the prophets were not opposed to sacrifice *as such*. Wellhausen appeals to Jeremiah xvii.26 as indicating that Jeremiah "is far from hating the cultus"²⁴ and Canon Driver is another outstanding representative of this "tolerant" position if we may so describe it.²⁵ But this position is one which is very hard to defend. If, in the face of the many passages in the Old Testament which directly connect the priestly ritual with the name of Moses, the critic feels that he is in a position to deny to it any Mosaic authorization, the question at once emerges, Has it any real authority back of it at all, or is it rather to be regarded simply as the survival in Israel of a primitive cult, "a universal and immemorial habit," which though particularly dear to the heart of the Semite, was essentially primitive and pagan both in its nature and origin? If this latter view be adopted, as is done by Professor Smith, the prophet appears in the light not of a reformer and restorer of the ancient and divinely ordained religion of Israel, but as the exponent, we may even say the discoverer of a new conception of religion, a religion without sacrifice.

Now while this conception of "prophetic religion" as of a religion without sacrifice is in some respects an attractive one, especially when we view it with the abuse of ritual which characterized their age as a foil, it is open to most serious objection. First of all, it is to be noticed that this teaching is, on the critics' own admission, far from being representative of the prophets as a whole. The critics are forced to distinguish between the "great" prophets, who represent this viewpoint, and the others who do not. Joel, Ezekiel, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi must be and are regarded as inferior, even renegade, prophets because of their zeal for the temple

²⁴ *Prolegomena* (Eng. Trans.) p. 59.

²⁵ *Jeremiah* (1906) p. 44.

and its worship. Wellhausen has called Ezekiel the "priest in prophet's mantle"; and McFadyen describes him as a "prophet with a priestly heart." Furthermore the "great" prophets themselves do not testify as clearly in favor of "prophetic religion" as the critics could desire. Jeremiah xvii. 19-26, xxxi. 14, xxxiii. 11, 18 have to be denied to the prophet Jeremiah; Isaiah lvi. 7, lx. 7, lxii. 9, lxvi. 20 can no more be conceded to the "Great Unknown" than to the genuine Isaiah. And no less a critic than Stade has said of Hosea: "For him a relation to Yahweh without external worship, without priest and offerings, is inconceivable." Clearly the conception of "prophetic religion" as a religion without sacrifice does not lie on the surface of the Prophetic Books of the Old Testament.

In the second place, the religious history of Israel in later times must be looked upon as largely if not wholly a lamentable departure from the lofty prophetic ideal of a spiritual religion set before the people by the great prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries, as a return to those weak and beggarly elements which they so scornfully rejected. The critics do not attempt to deny that ritual and sacrifice held a prominent place in the religion of the Jews in the period after the Exile. On the contrary so certain are they of this that they assign to that period most of those references to ritual which are found in the writings of the men whom they regard as the great protagonists of prophetic, i.e. true, religion. Yet this strong and long continued reaction against the teachings of the prophets, as it is portrayed by the critics, certainly does not accord well with that frankly evolutionary theory of the religion of Israel which is the real basis of their reconstruction of it; and the explanation given by Wellhausen is obviously inadequate and inconsistent with the theory which he advocates. He treats the emphasis on the cultus in the later period as intended to preserve the identity of Israel as a race during that period when it was in the greatest danger of being absorbed by the great world power, Babylon:—

The cultus had no longer any real value for the Deity; it was valuable only as an exercise of obedience to the law. If it had been at first the bond connecting Israel with heathenism, now, on the contrary, it was the shield behind which Judaism retreated to be safe from heathenism. There was no other means to make Judaism secure, and the cultus was nothing more than a means to that end.²⁶

There is, it must be admitted, an element of plausibility in this explanation. The cultus was in a very real sense a national cultus and by emphasizing it the leaders of the Jews were stressing a national and racial institution which might justly claim the devotion and inspire the enthusiasm of their fellow-countrymen. This is perfectly true; and the argument is a valid one. But the important thing to notice is that it is not a valid argument for the critics. For the critics are themselves at pains to weaken this argument as much as possible. As a Mosaic institution the cultus was calculated to challenge the devotion of every devout Jew. But the critics tell us that sacrifice had no Mosaic authorization. As a system which was peculiarly their own and possessed unique features shared with no other race or nation, it might claim their enthusiastic support. But the critics are concerned to prove that the ritual features of Israel's worship were common to the Semitic peoples, shared by Israel with, even borrowed by them from, the neighboring peoples, notably Babylon. They are prone to regard as genuine elements in Israel's religious worship those perversions of the cultus against which the prophets fulminated as foreign additions and abuses of the true religion of Israel. Indeed, it has even been asserted that Jeroboam in introducing the calf worship into Northern Israel was merely playing the rôle, a slightly belated one, of "religious conservative." That this is substantially the view of Professor Smith is clear from the following statement:

The sacrificial system of Israel is in its origins of far earlier date than the days of Moses and the Exodus from Egypt. It has so much, both of form and meaning, in common with the systems of kindred nations as to prove it to be part of the heritage naturally derived by all of them

²⁶ *Prolegomena*, p. 499.

from their Semitic forefathers. And the new element brought into the traditional religion at Sinai was just that on which Jeremiah lays stress—the ethical, which in time purified the ritual of sacrifice and burnt-offering but had nothing to do with the origins of this.²⁷

Here we have the situation clearly presented. That which is distinctive of the religion of Israel both according to Moses and according to the “great” prophets was, the critics assure us, ethical not ceremonial. Moses, ignored sacrifice or we may better say tolerated or winked at it: the prophets repudiated it *in toto*. The sacrificial ritual of Israel was derived from the nations: it had been for centuries a connecting link with them. The “real,” “new,” distinctive religion of Israel was ethical, a religion without sacrifice. It was a teaching so new, so unique, so epoch-making, the critics tell us, that they can scarcely find words to express their amazement at the “sheer and magnificent originality” of an Amos and a Hosea, the “singular independence” of an Isaiah, a Jeremiah in proclaiming it. Yet the founder of this modern school assures us that exiled Israel elaborated and clung to the Law, a law which centered about the sacrificial cultus, in order not to lose its national existence. In other words Israel repudiated the “original” teachings of the prophets, teachings which the critics somewhat inconsistently trace back to Moses,²⁸ teachings which constituted Israel’s supreme contribution to religion, and took refuge in a slavish devotion to, a fanatical cultivation of, a cultus which was essentially the same as that of her enemies, and which she

²⁷ P. 158. Cf. *The Twelve*, Vol. I, p. 104 for a similar statement.

²⁸ The task of reconciling the critical view which tends to lay great stress on the “originality” of the prophets with the fact that the most severe charge which they brought against the people was their failure to follow the religion of their *fathers*, is a difficult one. Professor Smith has recognized the problem and made an effort to solve it (*The Twelve*, p. 96 f), but the explanation cannot be regarded as satisfactory. “Mosaic” and “original” are really mutually exclusive expressions. In so far as the teachings of the prophets were original they were not Mosaic; in so far as they were Mosaic they were not original. Professor Smith’s tendency like that of the critics generally seems to be to place the emphasis strongly on originality. Not to do this would be disastrous to their theory.

had originally derived in large measure perhaps from Babylon itself. How inconsistent and illogical!

Yet what other explanation can the critic give of this half-millennium long lapse into what he regards as a primitive conception of religion? He can of course call it just this, a lapse. And in doing so he can moralize over the tragic unresponsiveness of humanity, taken in the large, to the challenge of lofty ethical and religious ideals. But to admit this is to concede that the religion of Israel was not marked by progress and evolution nearly so much as by rebellion and deterioration. And if the post-captivity history of Israel is possible despite the prophetic repudiation of sacrifice in the days of Isaiah and Jeremiah, it becomes absurd for the critic to maintain that the Mosaic institution of the Law is impossible because it was later disobeyed and ignored. The latter lapse is surely no more difficult to explain than the former. And the latter is clearly taught in the Old Testament, while the former is the result of a critical theory of prophecy and its alleged repudiation of sacrifices which is not supported by the prophets themselves. Of course it is easy to say that the prophets were religious geniuses, pioneers, solitary figures, men of intuition and insight, men born out of due time, heralds of the dawn whose words passed into forgetfulness because they fell upon the deaf ears of a slumbering world. And it is easy to point out how bitterly the prophets were opposed by the men of their own age. But the same can be said of Moses who in this respect was the true pattern of the prophecy of the future. The generation which he brought out of Egypt perished through disobedience in the wilderness and he saw in it a type and prophecy of the generations yet to come.

But while the question of the relation between Prophetism, as understood by the critics, and later Judaism is an important one and presents we believe serious difficulties to the critic, a far more serious question is that of the relation between Prophetism and Christianity. If as is claimed the prophets repudiated sacrifice as such from their conception of true

religion, can the Christian who believes that Christianity is the fulfilment of prophetic religion continue to regard the Cross as the central fact of his religion? Can he still believe that Christ died "as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and reconcile us to God"? If the prophets who "laid the true foundations and proclaimed the essence of Jewish religion"; were "the implacable foes" of priestly ritual,²⁹ then the critic must conclude either that Christianity differs from Judaism as to what he has come to regard as Judaism's loftiest development, he must even say that as religions the two are essentially different; or accepting the oneness of the Old Testament and the New Testament he must assert that there is essential agreement between Prophetism regarded as the culmination of Old Testament religion and Christianity. As far as we are aware the critics would all be disposed to assert and even to stress the essential harmony between Prophetism and Christianity.

If then it be admitted that there is essential agreement between the prophetic religion of the Old Testament, as understood by the critics, and the religion of the New Testament, two courses of action are open to the critic. He may accept the obvious New Testament implications of his Old Testament theory of Prophetism. He may repudiate the preaching of the Cross as the tragic survival of that primitive "theology of the slaughter-house" against which, as he believes, the prophets fulminated centuries before the birth of the last and greatest of their line. He may appeal to the Parable of the Prodigal as expressing the essence of the religion of Jesus and the quintessence of Prophetism and repudiate the doctrine of the Cross as due to a Pauline perversion of the religion of Jesus. He may assure us that the Epistle to the Hebrews which quite unmistakably regards the Cross as the fulfilment of the typical ritual of the Old Testament, the fulfilment of the priestly conception of religion, was an elaborate attempt to explain how Christianity which is the fulfil-

²⁹ Professor McFayden has recently put this view very strongly in an article "Zionism" in the *Expository Times* (May 1924). p. 343 f.

ment of Prophetism could "discard" the "world-old custom" of ritual sacrifice.³⁰ The interpretation of the death of Christ in sacrificial terms becomes then merely a concession to human prejudice and conservatism, an attempt to mediate between two mutually exclusive positions. Jesus may be regarded as a prophet, even the last and greatest of them all, but the worship of the "Saviour-God of Paul, of Hellenism, of historical Christianity" becomes a perversion—an age-long perversion—of the religion of Jesus.³¹ To those who hold this view, who carry the inference of their theory of a fundamental antithesis between prophetic and priestly religion out to its logical conclusion, the lapse of post-captivity Judaism from the purely ethical teachings of the prophets is only surpassed by the lapse of the Christian Church from the religion of its founder and noblest advocate. To them it is the distinctive merit of the "higher critic" to have removed the offense of the Cross from the religion of Jesus. For the Cross is to them, as it was to Jew and Greek in Paul's day, a stumbling-block and foolishness. But contrariwise to every one to whom the blood of Christ is precious, the fact that this theory of prophecy, which is essential to the critical reconstruction of the Old Testament and has figured so largely in it, bears such apples of Sodom, becomes the clearest proof, the all sufficient proof, that it is false, dangerous and anti-Christian. The Cross is the great central fact of

³⁰ Cf. G. A. Barton, *The Religion of Israel*, p. 210. Professor Barton believes that the 51st Psalm "anticipates the parable of the prodigal son. The Father needs no propitiation except the penitence of the son for whom he has waited so long" (p. 215).

³¹ This view has recently been very strongly put by Professor Fagnani of Union Seminary, New York. Writing a few months ago in the *American Hebrew*, (April 18, 1924), he congratulated the Jews that even in the face of persecution they had throughout the centuries "steadfastly refused to believe that the Prophet of Nazareth was the Saviour-God of Paul, of Hellenism and of historic Christianity." He exhorted them to assert their "indisputable claim" to "Joshua ben Joseph of Nazareth" whom he described as the last and greatest of the prophets, and regarding whom he quoted with approval Rabbi Wise's eulogy of Jesus, "the man, the Jew, the prophet."

Christianity. Cut it out of Christianity and Christianity ceases to be a religion of redemption.

But can the critic, while accepting in its uncompromising form that theory of prophetic religion which is regarded as fundamental in critical circles, escape the conclusions regarding the New Testament religion, the religion of Jesus, which have just been stated? It will be objected at once that there are many Christians who accept the "assured results" of criticism and yet believe quite devoutly in the atoning death of Christ as a sacrifice for sin, or at least have never denied this precious article of the Christian faith. There are unquestionably men and women of this type, many of them. How then are they to be accounted for? In one or other of two ways, we think. Either they consciously or unconsciously refuse to think their critical views regarding the Old Testament through to their logical conclusion, in other words refuse or neglect to apply them to the New Testament; or else they must seek another foreshadowing of the Cross than the Old Testament ritual of sacrifice, an argument for it which will not conflict with the prophetic ideal of a religion without ritual sacrifice. There are many who follow the first of these two courses. Their position is, we believe, quite illogical; but it is better to be an illogical and inconsistent Christian than a logical unbeliever. Still it is impossible but that their views of the Old Testament should have some influence upon their Christian faith. They are in an unsafe because an inconsistent position. They are endeavoring to hold two mutually exclusive views as to matters of vital import to Christian faith. But it is with the other position that we are now concerned, with the attempt to find an Old Testament basis for the Cross which will not clash with that critical theory regarding prophetic religion which is now so popular.

The solution which is advocated by influential critics and notably by Professor Smith, both in his earlier writings and also in this his latest volume, is this. The prophets and notably Jeremiah we are told while rejecting the sacrificial

cultus *in toto*, while indignantly denying that God could have commanded the shedding of the blood of bulls and goats as an atonement for sin, themselves in their own sufferings with and for their people illustrated and typified the atoning death of Christ. This view is ably set forth by Professor Smith in the lecture entitled "The Story of His Soul." The lecture is divided into three heads: Protest and Agony; Predestination, Sacrifice. The first two are concerned especially with the question how Jeremiah achieved his sense of individuality, the critics being disposed to magnify Jeremiah as the discoverer of personality, especially in the religious sphere. It is the third which especially concerns us at present. The first paragraph reads thus:

But in thus achieving his individuality over against both his nation and his God, Jeremiah accomplished only half of the work he did for Israel and mankind. It is proof of how great a prophet we have in him that he who was the first in Israel to realise the independence of the single self in religion should also become the supreme example under the Old Covenant of the sacrifice of that self for others, that he should break from one type of religious solidarity only to illustrate another and a nobler, that the prophet of individuality should be also the symbol if not the conscious preacher of vicariousness. This further stage in Jeremiah's experience is of equally dramatic interest, though we cannot always trace the order of his utterances which bear witness to it.³²

The "one type of religious solidarity" referred to is clearly ritual sacrifice; Jeremiah as a true prophet breaks with it. At the same time he is himself the "symbol if not the conscious preacher of vicariousness," of the sacrifice of self for others. The meaning and implication of this is set forth more fully a few paragraphs later on where we read of Jeremiah in Egypt:

There, on alien soil and among countrymen who had given themselves to an alien religion, the one great personality of his time, who had served the highest interests of his nation for forty years, reluctant but unflinching, and whose scorned words, every one, had been vindicated by events, is with the dregs of his people swept from our sight. *He had given his back to the smiters and his cheeks to them who plucked out the hair; he had not hidden his face from the shame and the spitting. He was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. He was taken from prison*

³² P. 341.

and from judgment and cut off from the land of the living; and they made his grave with the wicked, though he had done no violence neither was deceit in his mouth. It is the second greatest sacrifice that Israel has offered for mankind.³³

Before examining this view we shall quote one more passage at the close of the chapter :

I may be going too far in interpreting the longing and faith that lie behind these words [xiv. 8, 9]. But they come out very fully in later prophets who explicitly assert that the Divine Nature does dwell with men, shares their ethical warfare and bears the shame of their sins. And the truth of it all was manifested past doubt in the Incarnation, the Passion and the Cross of the Son of God.

But whether Jeremiah had instinct of it, as I have ventured to think from his prayer, or had not, he foreshadowed, as far as mere man can, the sufferings of Jesus Christ for men—and this is his greatest glory as a prophet.³⁴

It is clear that we have here a very earnest effort to vindicate for the "liberal" Christian the right to call Jesus Saviour as well as Prophet. This is brought about by what we may call a process of "sublimation." The prophet, while rejecting animal sacrifice, experiences and exhibits in his own life of suffering with and for his people the sublimation of the idea which is crudely expressed in the rite which he rejects. And it would seem that in somewhat similar manner the sufferings of Christ represent the "sublimation" of the sufferings of the prophets. As an attempt to save the Cross this theory is commendable; and its appeal to those who feel obliged to accept the critical theory of the Old Testament with its rejection of ritual and yet desire to hold on to redemptive Christianity, must be very great. But we need not dwell upon its advantages. They are sufficiently obvious and are largely the explanation of its popularity. The question is this, Is it true? Can it be defended on Scriptural grounds? We believe that it cannot, and for the following reasons.

It is to be noted in the first place that the thought of the prophet as saviour in the sense of substitute is foreign to the

³³ P. 344. The italics are Professor Smith's, apparently used not for emphasis, but in accordance with our author's regular custom of putting Scripture citations in italics.

³⁴ P. 348. Cf. also pp. 6f, 113, 159, 373.

Old Testament, or rather, is expressly rejected in it. The impotence of the prophets to save their doomed compatriots is made very clear to us. It is expressly declared that even the greatest of Israel's leaders would be powerless to save their city from destruction, a destruction expressly foretold as the punishment of sin. "Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind could not be toward this people; cast them out of my sight, and let them go forth"—is Jeremiah's rebuke to any confidence in the goodness of man, in the good offices of even the best of men, in this time of desperate need. "Though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness, saith the Lord"—is Ezekiel's thrice repeated reply to a similar attitude of mind on the part of the Jews already in captivity. The merit of men, however good, however great their favor with God, will not avail Israel in her hour of doom. Furthermore we find that the prophet is forbidden to intercede for the people (vii.16, xi.14, xiv.11). As saviours of their people the prophets were decided failures. Amos and Hosea did not save the Northern kingdom from Assyria; Jeremiah did not save Judah from Babylon. They testified in vain to and against a stubborn and sinful people. And we nowhere read that the sufferings of these prophets atoned for the sin of the people. Rather is it made clear that the refusal of the people to hearken to the prophets, their harsh reception of them, deepened their guilt. It is this fact especially which makes it so necessary for us to interpret the 53rd chapter of Isaiah as strictly Messianic. The prophets were not able to atone for the sin of Israel; but this prophecy speaks expressly of One who could and would do this by His death.

We have seen that Professor Smith refers to the 53rd of Isaiah as setting before us a prophetic ideal which was first suggested by the life of Jeremiah and later applied to the Messiah. Yet this very passage points us to perhaps the clearest proof of the inadequacy of the theory we are discussing, viz., the failure of the Scriptures to attach any special signifi-

cance to the *death* of the prophet. It is true that the Old Testament records the martyr deaths of several prophets—Uriah the son of Shemaiah (Jer. xxvi.20), Zechariah the son of Jehoiada (2 Chron. xxiv.21)—and that in the New Testament the persecution even unto death which the prophets suffered at the hand of their countrymen is cited by the Lord (Matt. xxiii. 24f) and by His followers (e.g., Acts vii. 51f) as a signal proof of the rebellion and hardness of heart which had characterized Israel throughout the course of her history; and the treatment given to the servants is declared to be typical of that reception which the Son is to receive at their hands. James sets before the Christian believer the prophets as a heroic example of patient endurance. In Hebrews the triumphs of faith are described and we can read between the lines allusions to the sufferings of some, perhaps many, of those “men of God,” the faithful prophets. This is clear; but on the other hand it is to be noticed that no special significance, certainly no redemptive significance is attached to their death. Not merely is no express reference made to the death of any of the “great” prophets, as a matter of fact we do not know when or how they died. Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, Jeremiah—these are the men in whom the critics find the loftiest development of prophecy. Yet the Bible does not tell us how a single one of them met the last enemy. If Isaiah was “sawn asunder,” we know this only from tradition, not from any express statement in Scripture. And as for Jeremiah, what is emphasized in his case is that he did not die, that when Jerusalem fell, this faithful prophet was expressly singled out for life. The king and many of the leaders perished or were exiled; Jeremiah was spared and shown royal favor. When or how he died we do not know. The death of a true prophet did not differ *per se* from that of any other man. The peaceful close of the life of Elisha is described to us in a way which tempts us to apply to him the words of Isaiah, “taken away from the evil to come.” And Elijah, the great representative of prophetism, is distinguished not by his death, but by his failure to die. He alone

of all who have lived on earth since the days of the Flood is made an exception to the universal law of death; like Enoch (one of the heroes of faith mentioned in Heb. xi) he was translated that he should not see death. The prophets were messengers and representatives of God to men. Their faithful witness was doubtless often sealed with their blood. Their sufferings were typical alike of the sufferings of Christ and of those of His faithful followers and witnesses in every age. But death was not the aim and goal of their lives. They were not sent to die, but to be faithful even unto death.

On the other hand the life of the Lord Jesus Christ is set before us both in prophecy (Isa. liii) and historically in the Gospels and theologically in the Epistles as the life of one who come to *die*. All three of the Synoptists tell us that in connection with Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi, Jesus began to teach His disciples the necessity of His death (Matt. xvii.22, Mark viii.31, Luke ix.22). And each of the four gospels gives a detailed account of His passion, death and resurrection. Jesus' death was the climax of His life. His life was *prophetic*. His death was *priestly*. His life was one of testimony to, of suffering *with*, His people; His death was one of atonement *for* His people. In His earthly ministry He perfectly declared the will of God and perfectly illustrated it in His obedience to the Father. And the sufferings and persecution which the Divine Son endured in the days of His flesh and which had been endured by the prophets before Him were the supreme illustration and proof of the inability of the *prophet* even the Divine prophet to save a people dead in sin. Something more was needed, the *priestly* death of the Son of God for sinners.³⁵

³⁵ In thus contrasting the prophetic life and the priestly death of our Lord we have solely in view the question of *expiation* of sin. As a prophet Christ revealed to men by His Word and Spirit the will of God for their salvation; as a priest, He once offered up Himself a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and reconcile us to God. The difference is clear; and those who regard the prophets as the chief and most important Old Testament types of Christ will naturally tend to think of Him mainly if not solely as revealer and example, all the more since they

But important as is the fact that the death of the prophets is never set before us as a type of the sacrificial death of Christ, this is only the negative side of the argument. Of still greater moment is the fact that in the New Testament, the type and foreshadowing of the death of Christ is expressly and explicitly found in that very ritual of sacrifice which the critics regard as essentially pagan in its origin and as the object of the especial reprobation of the "great" prophets. The words of the Baptist, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," epitomize the teaching of the New Testament in this regard. It is the lamb of sacrifice, the paschal lamb especially, of which John speaks. It is as sacrifice for sin that he acclaims the world's Redeemer. And Jesus makes these words His own when He utters the words of institution of the Last Supper, that Communion feast which His disciples are to keep in remembrance of Him: "This is my body broken for you," "This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Here is no allusion, not the remotest, to the death of Jeremiah of which we know nothing or to the death of any man, be he prophet or otherwise, of whose death we know something. But we do have brought home to us irresistably the great teaching of the ceremonial Law, as summarized for us in the Epistle to the Hebrews: without the shedding of blood there is no remission. And this great truth that the atoning death of Christ is the fulfilment of the Old Testament ritual of sacrifice is further illustrated by the fact that this is the consistent representation of the New Testament writers. The three Synoptists and Paul give us the account of this solemn rite and make its remembrance a perpetual duty of the Christian Church, until He come. It is

ignore or reject the Levitical ritual with its emphasis upon expiation through death. But the distinction which we have drawn does not of course exhaust the meaning of either the life or the death of Jesus. His life, though prophetic, was also priestly in that His active obedience is imputed to the believer for righteousness. His death, though priestly, was also prophetic in that it was the supreme revelation of God's hatred of sin and love of the sinner.

natural therefore that Paul should exhort the Christians, "Purge out the old leaven that ye may be a new lump. . . . For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us" (1 Cor. v.7; cf. Acts xx.28, 2 Cor. v.21, Titus ii.14, etc.); that Peter should remind the Christian that he is "redeemed with the precious blood of Christ as of a lamb without blemish and without spot"; that John in the Book of Revelation should speak of Jesus as the *Lamb*, the Lamb that was *slain* and of the redeemed as washed in His *blood* (cf. 1 John iv.10); and that in the Epistle to the Hebrews the death of Christ should be repeatedly declared to be the fulfilment of the Old Testament ritual of sacrifice, *e.g.* in vii.27 where Christ is set before us as a high priest "who needeth not daily, as those high priests to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; for this he did once, when he offered up himself." That the death of Christ as an Atonement for sin was the fulfilment of the ritual sacrifices of the Law and was clearly foretold by the Prophets is definitely and repeatedly affirmed in the New Testament.

It is impossible to find in the New Testament any evidence of that break with ritual sacrifice as "one type of religious solidarity" and of that emphasis upon the vicarious suffering of the prophets as representative of another type, which Jeremiah is said to illustrate so clearly. If the ritual sacrifices of the post captivity period represent a lapse from the new and better standards of the great prophets, it is impossible to avoid the admission that this lapse, this pagan viewpoint, was characteristic of Christianity from the very first. Luke apparently deems it important to inform Theophilus that John the Baptist and Jesus were born and nurtured in homes which were zealous for the Law. The incident of Jesus' twelfth year and the fact that, during His public ministry, He apparently went up every year to the Passover, and also to other feasts is an indication that, despite His denunciation of its abuse, Jesus was no foe of the temple ritual as such. On the contrary we find Him repeatedly enjoining upon His disciples obedience to the Law.

There are we believe two reasons for this attitude of the New Testament writers; two reasons why they connected the death of Christ with the priestly ritual of atonement and not with the sublime and heroic sufferings of the prophets. The first of these is that they recognized no such antithesis between prophet and priest as is claimed by the critic of today. They regarded the Law as Mosaic and the ritual of sacrifice with which it was so largely concerned as of Divine authority. Consequently they were prepared to see in the death of Christ the fulfilment of this ritual. It became necessary for them to do this when Jesus expressly spoke of His death in sacrificial terms and in the Last Supper identified Himself with the Passover Lamb as its fulfilment. The attempt can of course be made with some measure of plausibility to magnify Jesus' denunciation of the perversion of the ritual by the scribes, Pharisees and hypocrites into a rejection of sacrifice as such. This is merely to repeat in the New Testament the tactics which the critic applies to the Old. It means to magnify a rejection of the perversion of sacrifice into a rejection of sacrifice as such. And the Old Testament critic who makes Jeremiah's Temple Address (Jer. vii) a rejection of all external rites and sites, despite the indignant emphasis upon the words "this house which is *called by My name*" (vss. 10, 11, 14), will of course by parity of reasoning ignore the force of Jesus' denunciation of those who have made "*My Father's house* a place of merchandise." But even the most destructive critic will find it no easy task to prove that Jesus shared the view of the "great" prophets, as critically interpreted, that the Old Testament ritual of sacrifice was essentially pagan and immoral.

The second reason which is a more general one is found in the peculiar appropriateness of the Old Testament ritual to prefigure and typify the atonement of Christ and the danger which attaches to such a use of the sufferings of the prophets. In the case of animal sacrifice the inadequacy of the type, save as type, is obvious. The New Testament makes it clear that "it is impossible that the blood of bulls or goats

could take away sin," *impossible* in the very nature of things. It was accepted by God as a substitute, because He had been pleased to accept it as a type of the perfect sacrifice to come. Of course there was a tendency in Israel, following the lead of other nations to strive to make the sacrifice adequate in itself. Hence we have human sacrifice in Israel, the offering of the first born to Molech, as well as the multiplication of animal sacrifice,—hecatombs and rivers of oil. But the simplicity, even frugality, if we may so describe it, of the Old Testament ritual was designed to show that the offering owed its adequacy not to any sufficiency in itself, but to God's grace in accepting the offering of His people when made in faith and repentance in the manner of His appointing. It is shown that they prefigured a better and more perfect offering. But in the types it was in the death of the innocent victim, the shedding of the blood, which is the life, that the act of atonement was clearly typified. Not its sufferings, which were relatively slight, but its death! And this was not a matter of inference. It was clearly taught in the Law, that "it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." In the Old Testament ritual the necessity of expiation by blood is made inescapably plain. And it is in the language of this ritual and as the express fulfilment of its types that the death of Christ is set before us in the New Testament.

When on the contrary the sufferings of the prophets are made typical of the saving work of Christ, two dangers at once emerge. There is first the tendency so to magnify the type as to make it almost equal to the antitype, to regard the sufferings of the prophets as almost equal to the sufferings of Christ, as differing from His only in degree. We see this very plainly in Professor Smith's statement as quoted above. Not merely does he apply to Jeremiah the language of the 53rd of Isaiah, language which the Apostolic Church regarded as distinctly Messianic, he even goes on to say of the life of Jeremiah as therein set forth: "It is the second greatest sacrifice that Israel has offered for mankind." And a little later on in speaking of the inevitable obligation of suf-

fering for his people which comes to a man who has "the Divine gifts of a keener conscience and a more loving heart than his fellows," Professor Smith tells us:

This spiritual distress Jeremiah felt for the people long before he shared with them the physical penalties of their sins. Just there—in his keener conscience, in his hot shame for sins not his as if they were his, in his agony for his people's estrangement from God and in his own constantly wounded love—lay his real substitution, his vicarious offering for his people.³⁶

These words, "second greatest sacrifice," "real substitution," "vicarious offering" show with unescapable plainness the disastrous tendency of this theory. But this is not its only weakness. There is coupled with it the danger of so comparing the death of Christ to the death of the prophet, as to regard the Crucifixion as merely incidental, as the probable and under given circumstances inevitable, but by no means inherently necessary, result of His faithful witness as a messenger of God. If the greatest of the Old Testament prophets did not as far as we know seal his testimony with his blood, death cannot be the goal of the prophet's mission. Consequently in so far as the prophet is a type of Christ the death of Jesus is to be regarded as a martyrdom. The emphasis is shifted from the atoning death to the suffering life of our Lord.

As we have just seen Professor Smith's own language with regard to the sufferings of Jeremiah illustrates very clearly how great is the danger which inheres in it of so magnifying the sufferings of the prophets as practically to deny that there is any real difference save of degree between them and the sufferings of Christ. The expressions we have quoted "second greatest sacrifice," "real substitution," "vicarious offering" show this plainly. And apparently because he recognizes this danger, Professor Smith at the close of the chapter inserts as we have seen the qualifying words "foreshadowed, as far as mere man can." Clearly he feels the danger of the position in which he has placed himself by what almost amounts to an apotheosis of Jeremiah.

³⁶ P. 347.

He has used words of a mere man which the Christian believer has reserved for Deity. But the very words which he uses to save himself from the one error increase the danger in which he stands of falling into the other. "Foreshadowed, as far as mere man can"—does not this phrase of itself point in the direction of a minimizing or rejecting of the Cross? If death played an important, a necessary part in the work of atonement, could this not have been foreshadowed in the martyr deaths of Amos, Hosea, Micah, Isaiah, Jeremiah? Does not the failure even to mention the death of any one of these great prophets indicate that death is not the all important thing in the career of the One whose coming they foreshadowed? If Jeremiah "foreshadowed, as far as mere man can" the redemptive work of Christ, how can we attach supreme value and importance to His death?

Professor Smith has never, as far as we are aware, denied the necessity of the atoning death of Christ. On the contrary he has referred to it in language which goes beyond the mere moral influence theory of the Atonement. We are glad to think that he believes that Jesus' death was not exemplary but expiatory, not incidental but necessary, not the conclusion merely, but the goal, the climax of His life. But there are many who are today using the theory, which Professor Smith has so ably defended, to avoid the offense of the Cross by making it merely the sublime illustration of that law of vicarious suffering which runs through the Universe. And if Professor Smith is willing in the interest of a modern theory to reject the Old Testament teaching regarding the necessity of expiation, he should not be surprised if many who accept his arguments draw from them inferences which he must greatly deplore. For if the prophets rejected the ritual sacrifices in which the thought of substitutionary expiation was so prominent, if in their lives they exhibited the law of vicarious suffering, and if their deaths are mentioned if at all merely to tell us that they knew how if need be to die for their convictions, and if in all this they were types of Christ, then it is natural to see in Him the greatest of the

prophets, Israel's supreme illustration of the law of vicarious suffering, but to deny that He is the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.

How much better it would be to revise the critic's theory, to admit that the prophets were foes of the abuse of sacrifice but not foes of sacrifice as such, that the prophetic and the priestly religions of the Old Testament are both alike elements and essential elements in the one true Religion of Revelation, that the theory of a fundamental antagonism between them is a myth. History offers the critic an instructive lesson if he will but heed it. It is nearly a century since Baur propounded at Tübingen his theory of a conflict between Paul and Peter, between Gentile Christians and Jewish Christians in the Early Church. For a time it seemed as if this theory would destroy the authority of the New Testament. The books of the New Testament were condemned or approved according to the side which they were supposed to take in the alleged controversy. Paul's genuine epistles were reduced to four. But now the Tübingen hypothesis has run its course and even critical scholars have largely won back what Baur threw away in the interest of a theory. And every one who believes that the Bible is the Word of God is entitled to believe that the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis will sooner or later follow the Tübingen to the limbo of forgotten theories and that the "priestly" religion of the Old Testament which it scorns will be restored to its true and proper place and once more recognized as the great Old Testament type of the Gospel of Reconciliation.

The volume which we have been examining illustrates very clearly the difficult and unfortunate position in which a student of the Bible is placed who believes that the Bible contains the Word of God, that it is a priceless treasure house of inestimable religious values, and yet feels obliged to pass every statement, every gem of truth which it contains through the crucible of a rationalistic philosophy which forces him to reject large portions of it as false and even

vicious and to retain other portions only at the expense of placing on them a meaning which is clearly not the one originally intended. We have in Professor Smith a combination of contradictions. He is a devoted student of the Scriptures; but he does not hesitate to reject or correct any statement with which he does not agree. He regards the message of the prophets as of supreme religious value, yet is constantly engaged in the effort to prove that "Thus saith the Lord" means "I (Amos) have discovered," "I (Jeremiah) have reached the conclusion." He believes in the Atonement of Christ, but rejects as essentially pagan that ritual of sacrifice which figures so largely in the history of Israel from beginning to end, and which is described in the New Testament as typical of the Death of Christ for human sin; and he magnifies the sufferings of the prophets until they almost equal the sufferings of Christ and obscure the necessity of His death. One moment he speaks with the fervor of a Luther and we feel in him the spirit of the ancient prophets burning with moral earnestness and aglow with the consciousness of the might and majesty, justice and mercy of the Lord God Almighty. The next he speaks with the cold dogmatic scepticism of one who is prepared to measure all things with the yardstick of his finite understanding, who knows both what man is and what God is, knows it profoundly and intimately, and who is therefore able to set bounds, definite and impassable, to the actions and activities of both.

We have endeavored to point out what seem to us the most serious defects in this most recent work of a well-known scholar. There are other matters—e.g. Jeremiah and Deuteronomy, Jeremiah and Life after Death—which might well be discussed did space permit. In closing we call attention to a statement which seems to us to illustrate with unusual clearness the fatal weakness of Professor Smith's attitude toward those Scriptures of which he has been for many years one of the foremost of living interpreters.

We have seen that to Professor Smith the acceptance of the view that the great prophets rejected *in toto* the ritual of

sacrifice is indispensable to the proper understanding of their writings and of the Bible as a whole. One of the key passages which are depended on to establish this, is Jeremiah vii. 21-23. Professor Smith says of it that "there is no good reason for denying it to Jeremiah." Yet he is of course aware that other critics question it, so after citing the passage in full he goes on to say:

Whether from Jeremiah or not, this is one of the most critical texts of the Old Testament because while repeating what the prophet has already fervently accepted, that the terms of the deuteronomic Covenant were simply obedience to the ethical demands of God, it contradicts Deuteronomy and even more strongly Leviticus, in their repeated statements that in the wilderness God also commanded sacrifices.³⁷

Whether from Jeremiah or not!—a startling way to speak of one of the passages of the Old Testament which is most vital to the "critical" reconstruction of Old Testament religion and upon which for half a century the Wellhausen School has relied as a convincing argument that the bulk of the Law cannot be Mosaic. Suppose it is not from Jeremiah—Professor Smith is not willing to deny this possibility—what guarantee have we that it is true? If it contradicts Deuteronomy and Leviticus why not reject it as a later unauthorized insertion? Professor Smith, as we have seen, does not hesitate to reject other passages which do not suit him. Why accept this one as true, *whether from Jeremiah or not?* There is only one answer. Our author accepts it, because it harmonizes as he thinks with his theory of the Old Testament. Otherwise he would reject it as he does other passages. And in this his attitude is typical of the Wellhausen School. It would be a natural thing for the conservative scholar to do the same, to reject this and the few other passages, which the critics cite most confidently as proving their theory of Prophetic Religion. Our author should be the last to object that such a method is drastic or arbitrary. It is his own method. He would be helpless without it. The conservative scholar does not adopt this seemingly easy course because he reveres the

³⁷ P. 156.

Bible, the *whole* Bible as the Word of God, and is seeking to interpret every passage not in terms of a preconceived theory but in the light of the Bible as a whole. And he has his reward. For while he may not realize it, our author because of his arbitrary methods must rest his case for his *Jeremiah* ultimately on a confident, "Thus saith the critic"; he is his own authority and guide. But the Bible Christian is able to say, "Thus saith the Lord," and to appeal to an Authority other and greater than his own. Professor Smith is constantly finding difficulties and alleging errors and contradictions in the Bible; he cannot really trust it, if he would. But the Bible Christian, who believes that "the infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself," not some subjective and destructive theory about it, is increasingly impressed with the unity, harmony and Divine authority of that precious volume which God has given to man to be a lamp unto his feet and light unto his path.

Princeton.

OSWALD T. ALLIS.

NOTE ON THE TEXT AND METRES OF JEREMIAH

It has been pointed out above¹ that Professor Smith shows a very marked disposition to contrast the Hebrew text of Jeremiah with the Greek version in such a way as to indicate to the reader that the one is decidedly less reliable than the other. As an illustration of this we quote his metrical version of viii. 14—ix. 1, (p. 63 f.), together with the appended footnotes.² This passage is of especial interest partly because he speaks of the latter part of it as "the incomparable elegy" (p. 197), partly because he gives us a second version of it (p. 200f) with variations which are not without interest.

For what sit we still?
Sweep together,
And into the fortified cities,
That there we may perish!
For our God^a hath doomed us to perish,

¹ P. 85 *supra* of this REVIEW.

² To avoid confusion Professor Smith's footnotes are designated by letters of the alphabet.

And given us poison to drink,
 For to Him^a have we sinned.
 Hope for peace there was once—
 But no good—
 For a season of healing—
 Lo, panic.^b
 From Dan the sound has been heard,^c
 The hinnying of his horses;
 With the noise of the neighing of his stallions
 All the land is aquake.
 For that this grief hath no comfort,^d
 Sickens my heart upon me.
 Hark to the cry of my people
 Wide o'er the land—
 'Is the Lord not in Sion,
 Is there no King there?'^e

 Harvest is over, summer is ended
 And we are not saved!
 For the breach of the Daughter of my people
 I break, I darken,
 Horror hath seized upon me,
 Pangs as of her that beareth.^f
 Is there no balm in Gilead,
 Is there no healer?
 Why will the wounds never stanch
 Of the daughter of my people?
 O that my head were waters,
 Mine eyes a fountain of tears,
 That day and night I might weep
 For the slain of my people!

^a Greek;³ in both cases Hebrew adds *the Lord*.

^b This verse is uncertain; for Hebrew בַּעֲתָה read with the Greek בַּהֲלָה. For another arrangement see above, p. 51.

^c So Greek; Hebrew omits *sound*. ^d This line is uncertain.

^e Greek. ^f So Greek; Hebrew omits this line.

Verse 14. *Sweep together* is a picturesque but farfetched substitute for "assemble yourselves" (AV). Both Hebrew and Greek add "and *let us come* into the fortified cities." This is suggested by the rendering of the next line *And into the fortified cities*. But no mention is made of the omission. *For our God hath doomed*, etc., Hebrew, "For the LORD our God"; Greek, "For the God," etc. Here neither Hebrew nor Greek is followed exactly. Yet the footnote seems to imply that it is the Greek. In the other rendering (p. 200), we read "For the Lord our own God." There but for the word "own" the Hebrew is exactly followed; but no footnote calls attention to this. *For to Him have we sinned*. On p. 200 a footnote reads: "Hebrew, *the Lord*."

³ It is to be noted that when Professor Smith uses the word "Greek" he is apparently referring primarily to the Vatican MS (Codex B) of the LXX (as given for example in Swete's *The Old Testament in Greek*), which many of the critics regard as the best text. Occasionally reference is made to other versions, e.g. pp. 96, 152, 245, 255, 258.

Verse 15. *Hope for peace there was once*, etc. On p. 200, this verse is rendered:—

Hoping for peace?
'Twas no good,
For a season of healing?
Lo, panic.

and a footnote at the end reads: "So Greek. The verse is another instance of the two-stresses-to-a-line metre; see p. 46." If the metre is two-stress, "Hope for peace there was once" does not indicate it: "Hoping for peace?" is better. The parallel passage xiv.18 gives us a third rendering (p. 51).

Hoped we for peace—no good,
For time to heal—and lo panic!

This certainly does not bring out a two-stress metre. *Panic*. The footnote, "This verse is uncertain; for Hebrew בַּעֲתָה read with the Greek בַּהֲלָה," is rather remarkable. This noun is found only here and in xiv. 19. The verb means "to fall upon, startle, terrify" (Gesenius-Brown). "Panic" would seem to be a good rendering. And its correctness is favored by the Greek (παράχη) of xiv.19. Yet apparently because in this passage the Greek has σπουδή, which twice elsewhere renders the word בַּהֲלָה, Professor Smith insists on correcting the Hebrew text. But to do this is to overlook one of those very indications of poetic form, namely the alliteration, which so ardent a metricist as Professor Smith should regard as decisive. The use of the unusual word "panic" (בַּעֲתָה) is clearly favored by the context "for a season (לְעֵת) of healing—Lo, panic (בַּעֲתָה)." In like manner the alliteration in Psalm lxxviii. 33 "Therefore their days did he consume in vanity (בַּבְּהִלָּה) and their years in trouble (בַּבְּהִלָּה)" argues for the correctness of the text of that passage. Professor Smith appeals to this feature in the case of ii.12 (p. 93), which he renders "Be heavy, O heavens, for this" (lit. "be aghast"), because of the Hebrew *shommû shamaim*.

Verse 16. *From Dan the sound has been heard* (cf. p. 200 where "bruit" is used instead of "sound" and the footnote reads: "So Greek."). The footnote reads: "So Greek; Hebrew omits *sound*." True, but it might be well to point out that this does not necessarily indicate any difference in text. And if Professor Smith is desirous of being exact about details should he not add that in rendering "has been heard" he is following the Hebrew, since the Greek has "we shall hear."⁴ *With the noise of the neighing of his stallions* follows the Hebrew (cf. AV "at the sound of the neighing of his strong ones") more closely than the

⁴ This does not imply any difference in the consonantal text or even in the pointing. The Hebrew word can be translated either way.

Greek which has "at the voice of the thunder (lit. neighing) of the driving of his horses," which is to say the least pleonastic.

Verses 16b, 17, which are here (p. 64) omitted as probably a later insertion are rendered on p. 201 as follows:

He comes, he devours the land and her fullness
 The cities and her dwellers.
 For behold, I am sending upon you
 Basilisk-serpents
 Against whom availeth no charm
 But they shall bite you.

These verses are found in both Hebrew and Greek and a footnote says regarding the tense of the verbs of the first line, "So Greek," despite the fact that the Hebrew might also be so rendered. At the end a note is added: "Hebrew adds *Rede of the Lord*." Why not say, "Greek omits"?

Verse 18. *For that this grief*, etc. Pg. 201 this verse is rendered:

Ah! That my grief is past comfort
 Faints on me my heart,

and there the footnote to the first line reads: "After the Greek. Hebrew is hopeless," a considerably stronger statement than "This line is uncertain." Whether the Hebrew is "hopeless" or not, Professor Smith has not followed the Greek. How he can get his rendering of verse 18 out of *ἀνίστα μετ' ὀδύνης*, which certainly seems to mean "(they shall bite you) unhealably with pain," it is difficult to see. And he might at least point out that "sickens my heart upon me" follows the Hebrew as against Greek *καρδίας ὑμῶν ἀπορομένης*. Furthermore we will do well to consider Professor Smith's words "Hebrew hopeless" in the light of the following statement: "And in all this textual criticism we must keep in mind, that the obscurity of the present text of a verse, so far from being an adequate proof of its subsequent insertion, may be the very token of its antiquity scribes or translators having been unable to understand it" (*The Twelve*, Vol. I., p. 142). Perhaps it is not the Hebrew which is hopeless, but our knowledge of the Hebrew which is inadequate to solve the difficulties of this verse.

Verse 19. *Hark to the cry of my people*. Pg. 201 it is more accurately rendered "Lo, hark," etc., following the Hebrew and Greek. Both Hebrew and Greek also read "cry of *the daughter of my people*." Professor Smith makes no mention of this fact, but shortens the verse arbitrarily for the sake of the metre. But in the line *Is there no King there?* he points out that he follows the Greek as against Hebrew: "Is not her King in her?" Pg. 201, the line is rendered "Is there no King?" and the footnote "So Greek" is added despite the fact that the Greek says "Is there no king *there* (*ἵε ἐκ*). Just why he should call special attention to the Greek which may represent only a slightly different reading of the Hebrew is not clear. The rest of verse 19, "Why have they provoked me to anger with their graven images, and with strange vanities?" is

omitted despite the fact that it is found in both Hebrew and Greek. Pg. 201, it is allowed to remain although enclosed in brackets and the margin remarks: "The couplet seems an intrusion breaking between the two parts of the people's cry."

Verse 21, *For the breach of the Daughter of my people I break, I darken*. Here the Hebrew is followed as against the Greek, which omits "I break." *Horror hath seized me* also follows Hebrew against Greek: "In horror seized me pains as of her that beareth." But Professor Smith sees fit only to mention the fact that the Hebrew "omits" the last line, which is by no means essential to the sense.

ix. 1, *O that my head were waters*, etc. This follows the Hebrew. The Greek, "O that there were to my head water" is much weaker.⁵ *For the slain of my people*. Both Hebrew and Greek read, "For the slain of the daughter of my people."

That the passage we have been examining is a fair example of Professor Smith's method is indicated by his treatment of chapter xxxi. Thus in verse 1 where the phrase occurs "I shall be God to all the families of Israel" a note in the margin points out that the word rendered "families" is singular in the Greek ("Greek, *family*"). This would naturally be regarded as indicating painstaking accuracy on the part of the author. But on comparing the Greek we find that it reads, not as we might expect "all the family," but simply "the family" (τῆς γένεως). No mention is made of the fact that the Greek also omits the word "all."⁶

Verse 2 is rendered thus:

Grace have they found in the desert,
The people escaped from the sword;
While Israel makes for his rest from afar
The Lord appears to him:

Here Professor Smith has followed the Hebrew throughout as against the Greek,⁷ except in the last line where he reads "him" as against "me" of the MT. But while adding a footnote "So Greek" to call attention to this *one* instance, in which he has followed the Greek as against the Hebrew, he makes no mention of the instances in which he has followed the Hebrew as against the Greek. This cannot fail to give a reader who does not have the Hebrew and Greek before him a very erroneous im-

⁵ Perhaps, however, the Greek should be rendered "O that it were to my head (to be) waters," which would then be the exact equivalent of the Hebrew.

⁶ Perhaps the Greek rendering "the family" i.e. *race* is intended to cover "all the families" or *clans*. If so the Greek and Hebrew are essentially the same.

⁷ Viz., l.1, Gk., "heat" (חם) instead "grace" (חן); l.2, Gk., "with those destroyed by the sword" (reading probably שרר instead of שרר; l.3, Gk., "go ye and destroy not Israel;" l.4, Greek follows Hebrew verse division "The Lord from afar appeared to him," and differs in reading "him" instead of "me."

pression as to the relative merits of the two as represented in Professor Smith's rendering.

Verse 7, it is pointed out regarding the rendering "The Lord hath saved His people" that the Greek and Targum are followed ("So Greek and Targum"). The Hebrew has "Lord, save Thy people." And regarding the first part of verse 9,

With weeping forth did they go,
With consolations I bring them.

we are told twice that the Greek is followed. But no mention is made of the fact that in verse 8 the Hebrew is followed as against the Greek.

Behold from the North I bring them,
And gather from the ends of the earth;
Their blind and their lame together,
The mother-to-be and her who hath borne
In concourse great back they come together.

Except that the Hebrew has "land of the North" Professor Smith follows the Hebrew fairly closely. On the other hand the LXX differs materially, "Behold I am bringing them from the North and will gather them from the end of the earth in the feast of the Passover; and thou shalt bear a great multitude and they shall return hither." The Greek text is here slightly shorter than the Hebrew (a characteristic which the critics are disposed to regard as a proof of superiority), yet Professor Smith follows the Hebrew. And while it is true that the Greek does not differ as much from the Hebrew as might be at first supposed, Professor Smith makes no mention of the fact that there is any difference and does not state that he follows the Hebrew as against the Greek. This would be more excusable if he had not three times in the

⁸ Between "lame" (*pisseh*) and "passover" (*pesah*) the difference is only one of pointing. As regards the phrase "in the feast of the passover," Professor R. D. Wilson has suggested to the writer that the Greek may have read *כמוער* instead of the *כנס עור ופסח* of the MT.

⁹ The note on the phrase "unafraid at the coming of heat" (Jeremiah xvii.8) which reads, "So Greek and Vulg.; Hebrew has *he shall not see*," illustrates this. It is decidedly misleading. The text is *ירא* which might properly and very naturally be read "he shall not fear" (*yîra'*). The Massorettes have regarded it as a defective writing of "he shall not see" (*yir'eh* *ראה*). Professor Smith's quarrel is not with the Hebrew text itself (the *Kethibh*), but with the Massoretic pointing of the text (the *Qeri*). That he should have no hesitation in changing the pointing which is later by many centuries than the consonantal text, is not strange. But it is significant that he should speak of this Massoretic pointing (the *Qeri*) as "the Hebrew," reject it in favor of the Greek, and ignore the fact that the Hebrew consonantal text agrees with the Greek and is consequently supported by it. Cf. p. 328 for a similar example. Yet when the Greek is at fault he shows a tendency to apologize for it, cf pp. 220, 269, 287.

immediate context called attention to his preference for the Greek as against the Hebrew.

It is difficult to avoid the impression that the disparaging attitude taken by Professor Smith toward the Hebrew is intended to make the impression upon the reader that the Hebrew text is quite corrupt and unreliable,⁹ and that he is abundantly justified in making such changes as he sees fit, without being under the necessity of proving his right to do so. That these changes are very frequently made for metrical reasons seems plain. Professor Smith is clearly very desirous to restore what he believes to have been the original metres in which many of Jeremiah's utterances were cast. He does not indeed hold that all of Jeremiah's utterances were in metre. On the contrary he is strongly opposed to the extreme view of Duhm who would reduce the genuine utterances of Jeremiah to "some sixty short poems in a uniform measure" (p. 40). Consequently he is not obliged either to reject as much of the book as does Duhm as non-Jeremian, or to attempt to "restore" ordinary prose or rhythmic prose to a metrical form in order to save it for Jeremiah, or to regard all irregularity of metre as indicative of textual corruption. But all the same the tendency is strongly manifest to attach great importance to metrics and to make changes in the text whenever metrical considerations favor this. Believing as Professor Smith does that Jeremiah used prose as well as verse, that in writing verse he made use of more than one metre, that as an Oriental he would have "an aversion to absolute symmetry" (p. 35) he cannot well afford to attach much significance to metrics as a tool for the textual critic; and yet the samples which we have given indicate that he makes very extensive use of it and feels justified in introducing radical changes in the text largely if not solely because of it.

The whole subject of Hebrew metrics is a particularly thorny subject for the student of the Old Testament. It is only within the lifetime of scholars of Professor Smith's generation—Julius Levy's epoch-making *Grundzüge* appeared in 1875—that we have attained to anything like a clear understanding of it. It is perfectly clear that as Professor Smith points out there is in Hebrew poetry a parallelism or balance, first of thought, and then of metrical phrasing, a rhythm produced by "the observing of a varying proportion between stressed or heavily accented syllables and unstressed" (p. 33). But when the question comes up as to

¹⁰ xv. 110 is an instructive instance. A fenced brazen wall" (AV) is rendered "an impassable wall" (p. 325). The margin tells us: "Omit of bronze for the metre's sake; it is a copyist's error of 1, 18. Cornill omits impassable instead". Here the Hebrew has *two* words, where the metre, according to Professor Smith can admit only *one*. The two-word reading is supported by Greek, Vulgate, Targum, Syriac, and Arabic. But this does not deter Professor Smith from saying that it *is* a copyist's error. Yet he rather naïvely points out that Professor Cornill omits the word which he retains and retains the word which he omits. This would seem to indicate some uncertainty as to which is the copyist's error.

the exact nature of the balance in thought, the requirements of the balance in rhythm, the differences at once emerge. Some scholars like Duhm and Rothstein insist that the metrical laws in Hebrew poetry are very rigid; and they regard every variation from what they consider the correct metre, to be an indication of a corrupt text. To them metrics is primarily a "tool" of the critic; its chief value is as a means to the restoring or correcting of the text.

An obvious objection to such a method as that of Duhm and Rothstein is that it is based upon three unproved assumptions: that Hebrew poetry employs only uniform metres, that these metres are now sufficiently clearly understood to make them the basis of a revision of the text, and that the difference between poetry and prose is so clear that there can be no reasonable doubt that a given passage is poetic in form. Each one of these positions is as we have said improved.

Thus, the line of demarcation between poetry and prose is not clear. As an illustration of this we cite the first part of the story of Joseph (Gen. xxxvii.2-35). In Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* (1913) this is treated as simple prose. In the following year Erich Weber published a metrical arrangement of this passage, arrived at by means of a process of liberal textual editing. This was not particularly remarkable in itself and the methods were not more drastic than those adopted by others. But he endeavored to analyze it on the basis of metrics into two recensions of the story, the one written in three accent, the other in four accent metre. It is interesting to note that this metrical analysis does not agree with the documentary analysis (J E) as generally accepted by the critics. Consequently Weber made only very casual reference to the latter. Had it been closely agreed with the J E analysis, it undoubtedly would have been widely acclaimed as a striking confirmation of the documentary hypothesis.

Turning again to the *Biblia Hebraica* we notice that the chapter containing the long prayer offered by Solomon at the Dedication of the Temple is printed almost entirely as prose. But in verse 12-13 Professor Kittel identifies a poem which we may render as follows:

[(Though) the sún hath established in héaven] Jehóvah,
 He hath sâid in dárkness thick he would dwéll;
 I have cértainly built thee a résidence hóuse
 A pláce for thy dwélling foréver.

The words "(Though) the sun hath established in heaven" do not occur in the MT, the Targum of Onkelos, the Vulgate, the Peshitto. They are not found in Codices A & B of the LXX. They are apparently supplied largely, if not wholly, conjecturally. Yet there are other verses in Solomon's prayer which with a little revision could be reset in metrical form; the simple reason being that the tendency toward balance in thought and diction is noticeable even in ordinary prose and becomes at times very marked when the words are expressive of lofty emotion. For example verse 8. can be arranged metrically although it is clearly simple prose.

Naught was in the ark save two tables of stone
 Which Moses placed there at Horeb
 When the Lord covenanted with the children of Israel
 When they went out from the land of Egypt.

Similarly, verse 21. shows a certain rhythm :

And I put there a place for the ark
 Which the covenant of the Lord was there
 Which he made with our fathers
 When he brought them from the land of Egypt.

Professor Kittel makes no effort to find poetical passages in the book of Ruth. But Ruth's immortal words to Naomi show balance and rhythm to no slight degree :

Urge me not to leave thee,
 To return from following thee
 For whither thou goest, I go
 And where thou lodgest I lodge
 Thy people my people
 And thy god my god.
 Where thou dies, I die
 And there buried I'll be.
 So do the Lord to me
 And so increase may he
 If death separation make
 Between me and between thee.

This is the language of lofty emotion. The presence of balance and rhythm is unmistakable. It is fully as poetic as Nathan's parable of the Rich Man and the Poor Man. Yet Professor Kittel treats the one as simple prose the other as a decidedly halting kind of verse. Is it because he feels a prophet should express himself in verse, but this is too much to expect of an ignorant Moabitess?

The reader will think perhaps that the passages we have just cited as examples of rhythmic or balanced *prose* are aside from the point either because they are *not* really poetry or because they *are*. We have cited them for just this reason, because they show how vague is the dividing-line between prose and poetry in Hebrew and how easy it is at times to find balance in thought and phrase in passages which are plainly prose. We have pointed out that Kittel makes Nathan's rebuke of David poetic. If mere balance and rhythm constitutes poetry then verse 15 of the same chapter begins with an excellent couplet.

And Nathan went to his house
 And Jehovah smote the lad.

Yet it is part of a simple prose narrative. The metricist is constantly tempted to regard a prose passage as metrical, or to force a strict metre upon a passage of rhythmic prose. There is no serious objection to a metrical arrangement as such, if only it does not obscure the meaning

of a passage.¹¹ In fact it may be a very effective means of increasing the clearness and beauty of the rendering. But to venture upon textual emendation and to do this even against the testimony of the versions is as dangerous as it is arbitrary.

There is one further matter which must be mentioned before we close this discussion of the text. In considering Professor Smith's metrical versions of viii.14ff we have seen that he takes exception to the word which he renders "panic" and substitutes another word on the basis, as he tells us, of the Greek. The arbitrariness and ruthlessness of our author shows itself most clearly perhaps in such a verse as xxxi.22 f—

For the Lord hath created a new thing on earth,
A female shall compass a man.

This couplet he encloses in brackets, as suspicious. In the margin we read: "*Compass* or *change to* (?). This couplet has been the despair of commentators. Its exilic terms, *created* and *female*, relieve us of it." In this wise the critic brushes aside difficulties which generations of reverent scholars have patiently sought to solve. But the method of the critic is as unsound as it is arbitrary. It is not true even from the standpoint of the critics that "create" is an "exilic term." It is found in Deuteronomy (iv.32 D) and in Amos (iv.13), which should be pre-exilic. It is also found frequently in Isaiah xl ff. and in P (not to mention other passages) which are exilic or post-exilic only because the critics are determined to have it so. "Female" is also not obviously an "exilic term." It is found of course in P, but it also occurs Genesis vii.3, 9, in J (or J²) and only preserves its standing as an exilic word (Aramaism?) by being treated as a gloss. In verse 16 of the same chapter it is only saved for P by mutilating the verse. Yet Professor Smith calmly assumes that these words are exilic and in this way avoids the necessity of attempting a serious explanation of a much discussed verse.¹²

Now it would be different if Professor Smith were never guilty of the violation of critical canons himself. But in reality he is a grievous sinner in the matter of diction. In his translations of Jeremiah's verse he uses such words as the following: sans care, remede, fere, falsing, bruit, eke, keening, healless, condolement, staith, wight, rede, no one of which is in common use in the English of today, and most of which

¹¹ In 1848 James Nourse published his *Paragraph Bible* in which large sections of the prophets were printed as blank verses. He used the *Authorized Version* and made no changes in it. The book is of interest as a proof that many of the changes introduced by the critics are unnecessary even from the standpoint of the metricist, unless he is prepared to insist in imposing certain definite and stereotyped metres upon this or that portion of the text, regardless of the difficulties it may involve.

¹² Similarly he insists that "Jacob" as the name of the nation is indicative of "the end of the Exile" (p. 300); and describes "holy mount" as a "late term" (p. 306).

are listed in *Murray's Dictionary* as *archaic* or *obsolete*. The use of sans in such hybrid combinations as "sans care" is described as "Shakespearean." "Keening" is derived from "keen" the name of the "Irish lament for the dead." "Wight" as used of a hero (the etymological meaning of וַיִּגַּר) is Chaucerian; the word is now generally used with the opposite connotation of weak, unfortunate, hapless. But the best example is "rede." The expression "saith the Lord" (נֹאֵם יְהוָה) is a common one with the prophets. We find it most frequently in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, but also in Isaiah, Hosea, Amos, Micah, etc., i.e. in all the *great* prophets as the critics regard them. Now in his *Isaiah* (1889-90) and in *The Book of the Twelve* (1896) Professor Smith renders this phrase by "oracle of Jehovah," or by "saith the Lord." But here in the *Jeremiah* it is translated "rede of the Lord." This seems to be the uniform rendering here and it occurs some 50 times. Of the word "rede" Murray says: "The word is very frequent in O E. and early M E., and remained in literary use till the beginning of the 17th century. After that date it is rarely found until revived in archaic and poetic diction in the 19th century." If we were to apply to Professor Smith's lectures on Jeremiah the same canons which he insists on applying to the Book of Jeremiah, it would be easy to argue that the *Jeremiah* cannot be by the author of the *Isaiah*. Surely a Biblical exegete who in 1889 rendered נֹאֵם by "oracle" would not change to "rede" in 1922. Consequently if the *Isaiah* is by Rev. G. A. Smith, the *Jeremiah* must be by pseudo-Smith. The use of archaic and obsolete words points to an early date; and the use of the word "keening" points, if Murray's standard work can be relied upon, to an Irishman rather than a Scotchman as the author, to Belfast rather than Glasgow-Aberdeen as the provenance.

Absurd! the reader will say, perfectly absurd to speak of "pseudo-Smith." Nothing is more certain than that the book was written by the Very Reverend Sir George Adam Smith, D.D., LL.D., Principal of Aberdeen University. Of course it would be absurd. But it would be no more absurd than to argue as the critics do, as Dr. Smith does, for or against the genuineness of a verse or passage in the Book of Jeremiah on the basis of a single word or phrase the history of which they know if at all only very imperfectly. Professor Smith as a translator permits himself the use of rare and obsolete words, of peculiar almost ungrammatical phrases, such as "thy follow of Me," "the wherefore," in order to keep close to the thought and metre of the original. But he holds Jeremiah very strictly to account for his use of language and with an assurance which is simply amazing professes to tell us exactly what Jeremiah could have said and what he could not have said. The situation would be amusing were it not so tragically serious. Professor Smith has an unusual mastery of English. His vocabulary is very copious. He can take liberties which one less skilful would hesitate to venture upon. We would think then that he might allow to Jeremiah in the use of his native Hebrew something of the liberty which he claims for himself in the use of his native English. But he does not.

O. T. A.