

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

THE  
CHURCHMAN

---

SEPTEMBER, 1899.

---

ART. I.—THE WITNESS OF THE HISTORICAL SCRIPTURES TO THE ACCURACY OF THE PENTATEUCH.

No. II.

IN the last paper stress was laid on the fact that we have learned nothing from historians of the critical school beyond the fact that little, if anything, is known about the development of Israel's religion. They claim, indeed, to have established the fact that the Law, as we have it, was not given in the wilderness, but that its most important features were gradually evolved during the after-history of the Jewish people. But of the successive steps of that evolution the German school has no information to give. Their statements are vague, and, what is more, they tend to become more vague as time goes on. As has already been stated in the first paper of this series, the Germanizers of the English school have definitely withdrawn from the position occupied by Wellhausen and Kuenen. The result is that the definite historical conclusions of these writers are no longer offered for our acceptance. In the place of them we have nothing but absolute uncertainty. We cannot explain how Moses acquired the character history has hitherto invariably assigned him of being the founder of the Israelite polity. We do not even know when the so-called "Book of the Covenant" originated. We are altogether in the dark about the history of Judaism, with its lofty ethics, its noble conception of God as a righteous Father and King, its system of centralized worship at the one sanctuary, beyond some suggestions that it somehow—nobody knows how—evolved itself from fetichism and animism, through polytheism, and that this development was in some way aided by a discovery of a volume in the Temple,

of the origin of which no man knows anything for certain, but which was somehow—again, no man knows how or why—mistaken for the original law of Moses. It has escaped the notice of the critics that the ready reception in the reign of Josiah of this volume as the work of Moses, if such reception be indeed an historical fact, distinctly proves that a tradition was prevalent at the time that Moses *had* given a law of the kind contained in Deuteronomy, and thus, so far as it goes, supplies an argument against the very theory of development the incident is supposed to establish. Anyhow, I repeat, we are at present without any clear information concerning the course of this alleged development, or of the previous religious condition of a country which could produce such a volume as Deuteronomy at the time it is declared to have been composed, or have secured its reception at the time when it is supposed to have been received. We are, in fact, absolutely without information as to the religious belief of the twelve tribes in the days of the judges of Samuel and of the early kings. All we know for certain is that we must not believe what the Bible tells us. In other words, though we dismiss our existing accounts as unhistoric, we have nothing but speculation to substitute for them.

Nor is this the only uncertainty in which modern discovery has left us. In silence and secrecy, as we have seen—for not a single hint has been given of the serious modifications of the theory to which I now draw attention—the English followers of Wellhausen and Kuenen have been making a strategic movement to the rear. Professing to accept the guidance of these critics on some most important points, they have quietly repudiated it.<sup>1</sup> There is no ambiguity in the attitude of the German and of the Dutch critic. The former regards the whole story of the tabernacle in the wilderness as an invention, Deuteronomy as a fabrication in the reign of Josiah, the Priestly Code as developed during the Exile, and published shortly afterwards. The latter says, in language which cannot be misunderstood, that Ezekiel was “the first designer, so to speak, and in so far the founder of Judaism” as we now have it. This can only mean that the religious system of the Pentateuch was not in existence at the time when Ezekiel lived. Professor Driver is somewhat reticent about the tabernacle. Apparently, he has hardly made up his mind whether it is historical

<sup>1</sup> Professor Robertson (“Early Religion of Israel,” Preface, pp. ix, x) has not failed to note the significance of these modifications. And he adds: “Statements such as those I have quoted amount, in my opinion, to a set of critical canons quite different to those of Wellhausen, and Dr. Driver would have been no more than just to himself if he had (as König has done) accentuated the difference.” The italics are mine.

or not.<sup>1</sup> The Priestly Code, according to him, is no longer to be attributed to Ezekiel as its author. It is a codification of "pre-existing temple usage."<sup>2</sup> This course gives him a considerable advantage in controversy. If it is shown—as it can be shown—that a considerable part of P was in existence before the Exile, the critic is enabled triumphantly to retort, "Have I not said it?" But then the whole theory on which P has been elaborated depends on the assumption that its contents were *not* in existence before the Exile. What evidence but its previous non-existence can we have for its post-exilic publication?

But even this is not all. The area of the above-mentioned indefiniteness is beginning to extend. In his Introduction Professor Driver has told us that "it is probable that the composition of Deuteronomy is not later than the reign of Manasseh."<sup>3</sup> He has already found it necessary to modify this assertion. In a more recent work he has spoken of Deuteronomy as a "compilation" of that date. It is true that he states in his Introduction that "the laws of Deuteronomy are unquestionably derived from pre-existent usage."<sup>4</sup> But he does not in that work go so far as to call Deuteronomy a compilation, though he admits that laws of pre-Palestinian origin are repeated in it—for what reason is not quite clear—and that even the law of the central sanctuary "only accen-

<sup>1</sup> "Introduction," p. 34.

<sup>2</sup> "Introduction," p. 135. Stade, he adds in a note, points to Lev. i.-vii., xi.-xv., Numb. v., vi., ix., xv. xix., together with the "Law of Holiness," as "embodying for the most part pre-exilic usage." But he says (p. 129) "the pre-exilic period shows *no indications*" (the italics are mine) "of the legislation of P as being in operation." Thus we have no historical evidence to guide us, and the critics are not agreed in regard to the pre-exilic portions of P. We shall see hereafter that Professor Driver's dictum is very wide of the mark, if we may rely on our authorities. But their statements, as we know, may be regarded as later additions whenever it is found convenient.

<sup>3</sup> "Introduction," p. 82. Doubt on this point seems to be increasing. Some recent critics of the German school are beginning to think that it must be referred to the closing years of Hezekiah. Professor Ryle has lately, as we have seen, suggested the reign of Ahaz as the period when it was composed. And, indeed, the strong admonitory tone of its contents, if we are no longer permitted to regard them as prophetic, would best fit in with a reign such as that of Ahaz. I do not know whether it is fancy, but I cannot help thinking that Mr. Ottley, in his recent volume on "The Hebrew Prophets," has dropped the secure tone of bold assertion with which the German theory of the origin of Deuteronomy used to be put forward, and seems rather to insinuate it in a manner which is half apologetic. Whether this be so or not, there are plenty of signs that criticism is beginning to reconsider its position in regard to the so-called "Books of Moses."

<sup>4</sup> P. 85.

tuates the old *pre-eminence* in the interests of a principle which is often insisted on in JE, viz., the segregation of Israel from heathen influences;" and this because "it was impossible to free the local sanctuaries from contamination by Canaanitish idolatry."<sup>1</sup> There are plenty of avenues here for retreat when hard pressed by the logic of facts. But it seems not unreasonable to suppose that Jehovah—especially if He be the Being to whom the writings of the Old and New Covenant alike bear witness—had foreseen these dangers, and had instituted the law of the central sanctuary, however ill that law might have been kept, in order to provide against them. This much, at least, is clear. If Deuteronomy is a "compilation," it must have been compiled from some previously existing authorities. Yet if we ask what these authorities or records were, what is their date, and what institutions or ideas they embodied which were older than Deuteronomy, we again get no reply. Thus, criticism has apparently not as yet "planted its foot" upon any solid "realities." At present it has but replaced a positive and definite history of the religion of Israel by a very negative and indefinite one indeed.

Nor is the uncertainty in which this criticism leaves us as to the actual history of religion in Israel the last consideration we have to urge against it. I have elsewhere pointed out the precisely similar methods adopted by modern German criticism in the case of the New Testament—the breaking up of Gospels and Epistles into fragments; the assignment of almost every single book to later dates and other authors than those to which tradition has uniformly assigned them; the wholesale repudiation of the early authorities quoted in their favour. The principle assumed by critics of this school in Old Testament and New Testament alike is that facts may be manipulated by subjective criticism into any shape the critic pleases. I remarked on the manner in which the assailants of the New Testament had been driven step by step backward until there was no longer any practical difference between them and their antagonists in regard to the date of the documents of which they treated, and I called attention to the fact that Old Testament critics were being driven back from their positions in precisely the same way.<sup>2</sup> But since then a rather sensational event has occurred. Professor Harnack, who a short time ago published a volume in which he endeavoured to show that the creed of Christendom was a later development of the original Gospel of Christ, has since very candidly confessed that this view cannot be maintained. Professor Sanday, in commenting on this remarkable surrender, has fairly enough pointed out that,

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 86, 87.

<sup>2</sup> "Principles of Biblical Criticism," pp. 183-185.

as the case of the Old Testament is by no means identical, it would be premature to assume that the same result is to be expected in the latter case. But the Professor has overlooked one important fact : he has forgotten that Professor Harnack's open confession inculcates not only the *results*, but the *methods*, of the criticism the conclusions of which he has renounced. Thus, the principles adopted by Wellhausen and his followers in their criticism of the Old Testament are discredited by Professor Harnack's admission, and the critics of the subjective school can only maintain their position in the face of that admission by the abandonment of their purely subjective method, and by the production of some positive evidence in favour of their conclusions.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Professor Ramsay's words on this point are deserving of careful study. He says : "For a time the general drift of criticism was to conceive the book [the Acts of the Apostles] as a work composed in the second century with the intention of so representing (or misrepresenting) the facts as to suit the writer's opinion about the Church questions of his time. . . . Such theories belong to the pre-Mommsenian epoch of Roman history : they are now impossible for a rational and educated critic ; and they hardly survive except in popular magazines and novels of the semi-religious order." "St. Paul the Traveller," p. 10 : "Warned by the failure of the older theories, many recent critics take the line that Acts consists of various first-century scraps put together in the book as we have it by a second-century redactor. The obvious signs of vivid accuracy in many of the details oblige these critics to assume that the redactor incorporated the older scraps with no change except such as results from different surroundings and occasional wrong collocation. Others reduce the redaction theory to a minimum. . . . In the latter form the redaction theory is the diametrical opposite of the old tendency theories ; the latter supposed that the second-century author coloured the whole narrative, and put his views into every paragraph ; while, according to Spitta, the redactor added nothing of consequence to his first-century materials except some blunders of arrangement" (*ibid.*, p. 11). If we put "Pentateuch" here for "Acts," is not the reasoning precisely the same ? Is it reasonable to suppose that the logic which applies to the New Testament is inapplicable to the Old ? Are critical theories more likely to retain their position permanently in consequence of the fact that Professor Driver, for instance, combines together in one the *two* exploded theories of the Acts mentioned—and rejected—above, and of which Professor Ramsay writes (*ibid.*, p. 12) that one "disproves the other" ? Then, alluding to Clemen's dissection theory, which, rejecting the "bald scissors and paste" theory" of Spitta, elaborates one of six narratives, combined or expanded by three redactors—only a trifle more complicated, be it observed, than the Wellhausen-Kuenen-Cheyne-Driver theory, which it is the object of these pages to controvert. Professor Ramsay says (*ibid.*, pp. 12, 13) : "We shall not at present stop to argue from examples in ancient and modern literature that a dissection of this elaborate kind cannot be carried out. . . . A partition between six authors, clause by clause, sentence by sentence, paragraph by paragraph, of a work which seemed even to bold and revolutionary critics like Zeller and Baur in Germany, and Renan in France, to be a model of unity and individuality of style, is simply impossible." He appeals to "the recognised principle

I might say a good deal about the intrinsic improbability that the Hebrew history should have been refashioned in the manner postulated by the critics, that the history so refashioned should have been accepted by the Hebrew nation, and that the earlier and more authentic records should have so entirely disappeared. But I will not repeat here what I have said elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> I will only add a few words on the effect of this kind of criticism on the estimation in which the Bible and the Christian religion are held by men capable of drawing a rational conclusion from the premises before them. The Bible as a whole will be generally felt to be discredited if it is believed to be so fabricated and patched together. On January 31, 1897, an American Sunday newspaper displayed the opening words of Genesis in the various colours in which certain recent critics have thought fit to array it. The heading was as follows: "It is a mere patchwork, and is not the first book of the Bible." And an aged working-man wrote to me in despair because his son had been led, by arguments such as these, to abandon public worship and the profession of Christianity, because, as he expressed it, the Bible he had been taught to reverence was "all a make-up."<sup>2</sup> It is not to be wondered at. If the Italian Mission in this country is tortuous in its methods and unscrupulous in its statements, it is very largely because its claims are founded on forged decretals, and a religion founded on a fraud, however pious, is a religion on an insecure moral basis. So with Christianity. If the statements of the critics be true, the Old Testament history is largely founded on forgeries— forgeries no doubt resorted to with the very best of motives, but forgeries all the same. For "idealized history," as the history of Israel has been called, is not only, according to the plain meaning of words, the opposite of real history, but it

---

of criticism, that where a simple theory of origin can be shown to hold together, properly complicated theories must give way to it." It would be going too far, of course, to pretend that the Pentateuch, or any particular book of the Pentateuch, displayed features of "unity and individuality" at all comparable to those which characterize St. Luke's treatise. But there is quite enough in the story of the Pentateuch, when examined by anyone who approaches it free from preconceived ideas, to make the dissection theory extremely improbable. Well may the *Spectator* (January 11, 1899, p. 38) say that "destructive criticism is blundering criticism, and that the legends of history usually rest on some solid basis." We who have striven to arrest the tide of destructive criticism of the Old Testament have for years been despised and ignored. But we may appropriate the words of Disraeli in his first speech in the House of Commons: "You will not hear us now, but a time will come when you *will* hear us." That time is now close at hand. I should add that the italics in the quotations from Professor Ramsay are mine, not his.

<sup>1</sup> In my "Principles of Biblical Criticism," ch. v.

<sup>2</sup> A "pious make-up," as Wellhausen felicitously expresses it.

also is a very different thing even to the embodiment of tradition existing when the history was drawn up. To idealize is to create; to record tradition is to relate. The authors of the existing histories of Israel did not, so we are told, confine themselves to handing down the traditions of earlier times; they designedly refashioned them in order to confirm the impressions they desired to produce on the minds of the men of their own generation. Now this, whatever its motive, is plain falsification. And we use the writings which contain it in our approaches to God. What effect will this produce on our characters? When we hear the Old Testament read, we shall continually, on this hypothesis, be compelled to correct the statements read in our ears. When we are invited to sing the Psalms in the course of our Church's offices, we must do so with a mental reservation. We now know, if the critics are right, that God did *not* "establish a testimony in Jacob" nor "appoint a law in Israel." He did *not* "command the fathers to make it known unto their children." There was no "tabernacle" for Him to "forsake" or "refuse." The solemn feast-days of which we read in the later books were *not* "statutes for Israel" nor "ordinances of the God of Jacob"; they were *not* "appointed to Joseph for a testimony" when he went forth from Egypt.<sup>1</sup> There was a "certain germ" of moral teaching and ceremonial enactment, and no more. The "Book of the Covenant" might have been in existence, but the "law" of which the Psalms speak as existing from the beginning was evolved at a later period. Such a religious position does not conduce to transparent truthfulness. It seems likely to promote a habit of mental accommodation which has hitherto been confined to the Church of Rome. Nor does it make our position any better to be obliged to admit that the writers whose words we use when we approach God in the language of devotion knew as well as we do that they were stating what was false. Of course, if all this be demonstrated fact, we must perforce accept it, and either cut the Old Testament adrift altogether or make the best—and a very bad best it must needs be—of its imperfect morality and lack of scrupulous honesty and veracity. But those of us who value truth above all things may be excused for desiring to wait until these conclusions have been established beyond all possible risk of mistake, and even for hoping and believing that they may never be established at all.

Another consideration which makes against them is not unworthy of notice. The history of the Christian Church is opposed to it. There is, so to speak, a family likeness between Judaism and Christianity. Both have the same

---

<sup>1</sup> Ps. lxxviii., lxxxii.

marked features, and come from the same Almighty Hand. In each case we meet with a law which far transcends both the mental and moral capacities of those to whom it is given. Centuries elapse in each, on the traditional theory, during which the law given is very imperfectly kept. And yet, by their very failures, the people of God are gradually brought to a higher appreciation of the beauty and dignity of that law than they ever had before. Every advance which Christianity has made has been, not an evolution, but a reformation—that is to say, it has proceeded from an appeal to truths *already revealed*, not to discoveries made by the light of nature, deductions from a scanty and insufficient “germ” of truth. Nor have we in history any instances of such moral and spiritual evolution as is postulated by the German critics in the history of Israel. Teachers of religion there have been in various nations, such as Zoroaster, Confucius, Buddha. Reformers, too, there have been—men who have recalled to the minds of men in a degraded age the purer conceptions of days long past. But the general tendency of mankind, apart from revelation, has been rather to religious retrogression than religious advancement. From all which we may safely draw the inference that if men like Hezekiah, Josiah, Jeremiah, and the prophets at large, had been religious discoverers instead of religious reformers—men who pointed to the neglected precepts of a law given by God—their whole position and history would have been a solitary exception in the history of mankind. But if such a picture of the Divine education of man and its results as the Old Testament Scriptures give us is unique, it is because the Israelites, and the Israelites alone, were under the special training of the Almighty. Progress of a certain kind there doubtless was among heathen nations; but it was not progress in the evolution of religion. If ever there was a time when religious conceptions had completely collapsed on all sides, when men had only to choose between the barest and blankest Atheism and the grossest, most irrational, and most inconsistent superstition, it was the period when God Incarnate came down to save a lost and benighted world. Thus, the conception of education by revelation, as distinguished from the religious education of man by the light alone of his own nature, is confined to the pages of the Bible. It is to be found only in Judaism and Christianity. Both Judaism and Christianity are thus marked out as successive stages of God’s special training of mankind. Cast aside the Old Testament as untrustworthy history, and you find you have relapsed into the Marcionite heresy. Christianity no longer appears before us as the last and crowning stage of the Divine development of man, but is a sudden, abnormal, astonishing interruption of the hitherto

unbroken course of God's dealings with His creatures. While Christian neglect of and resistance to the Divine Law, instead of being the normal result of fallen man's incapacity to understand the ways of God, becomes an altogether new feature in the relations between God and man—an altogether unwonted and not easily explainable step in his spiritual evolution.

Let me now turn to another view of the question. I have been immensely struck of late with the amazing similarity between the methods of controversy adopted by the new critics and those of the Church of Rome. There is the same tendency to dogmatism, the same preference of authority to fact, the same incapacity to see any side except their own, the same lofty disdain for opponents, the same impatience of contradiction, the same *penchant* for ultra-refinements of argument of the *Nisi Prius* order, the same habit of ignoring the main points of the discussion, of leading opponents to diverge into some side issue, scoring a victory upon that, and then posing as victors on the whole question. As Canon Gore says of Roman Catholic controversialists, "candour, an attempt fairly to produce the whole case [I venture to transpose two words in this sentence], a love of the whole truth—this seems to have vanished from their literature, and its place is taken by an abundant skill in making the best of all that looks Romewards in Church history and ignoring the rest."<sup>1</sup> *Mutatis mutandis*, these words apply to Biblical critics of the German school. There is no disposition to treat those who are unable to abandon the traditional view of Bible history as fellow-workers in the cause of truth. If these last venture to discuss, to question, to suggest difficulties, they are annihilated by a sarcasm, an insinuation, or, as in one or two recent instances, are treated with downright insolence. If the work of Biblical students of this school, who may be presumed to have at least *some* knowledge of their subject, *some* desire to contribute to the elucidation of a difficult question, is quoted, it is quoted only to be misrepresented or sneered at.<sup>2</sup> If they desire to ascertain the

<sup>1</sup> Gore, "Roman Catholic Claims," fourth edition, pp. 13, 14. See also the passage cited by him from Newman's "Tracts Theol. and Eccl.," III., pp. 88-91, 96, in regard to Hippolytus: "I grant that that portion of the work which relates to the Holy Trinity as closely resembles the works of Hippolytus in style and in teaching as the libellous matter which has got a place in it is incompatible with his reputation." One fancies one is reading Wellhausen, or Kuenen, or Professor Driver. The theory is first assumed, and then the facts are squared into accordance with it.

<sup>2</sup> Thus Mr. Harford-Battersby supposes himself to have annihilated "Lex Mosaica" in a sentence (see *Guardian*, November 11, 1896) by calling it a "monumental mass of irrelevant reasoning." But, to judge from appearances, though he may have skimmed through some of its pages, he has never *read* a line of it. At all events, he has not the

principles on which a complex question like this is to be discussed, their challenge is not accepted. The sole test of competence for the task of investigating Bible history is assumed to be an acquaintance with the latest theory—some persons would say eccentricity—of the latest German school of Biblical criticism. I venture respectfully, but most emphatically, to say that though these methods are admirably adapted to win the adhesion of the unthinking multitude, they are *not* the methods which should be used in the interpretation of any historical document—certainly not those on which we ought to deal with records which lay claim to Divine inspiration, and that on no slender grounds. It is true that there has been a time when honest efforts in the direction of a freer criticism were met by violent and vociferous abuse. That time has now entirely gone by. The recent advocates of the new criticism among us have been treated with marked courtesy and respect. Their right to inquire has been universally conceded. Their industry, ingenuity, good faith, sincere religious earnestness, have been repeatedly recognised. It is only exemption from criticism which has been denied them. But if they are told that the task of minute analysis they have set themselves is one in which it “passes the wit of man” to attain to certainty, or any near approach to certainty; if any attempt is made to analyze their analysis, to criticise their criticism, they regard it as an affront, and turn on those who dare to question their infallibility with ill-disguised anger or withering scorn. Now, there is really no reason whatever why we should lose our tempers in dealing with these matters. Fair and reasonable criticism, free and full discussion, are absolutely necessary to the attainment of truth; for no one is infallible, everyone may make mistakes. And if any mistakes are pointed out to us in a becoming spirit, we ought to be thankful to those who have done so. Any display of sensitiveness suggests, not that we are conscious of the strength of our position, but that we are in reality a little uneasy in our minds about it. Patience,

---

slightest idea of what, in the first page or two, it professes as its object. He imagines the question with which “*Lex Mosaica*” undertakes to deal to be “at what time the Pentateuch was written.” This is not the case. “*Lex Mosaica*,” as its introduction plainly states, was written to show that the German theory of the “working over” of the whole history in the interests of a later development of religion, and the substitution for that reason in our present books of unhistorical for historical statements, will not bear investigation. It is shown to be contrary to the phenomena presented by Israel at every step of its history. But to investigators of Mr. Harford-Battersby’s stamp there is no need to read what is said on the other side. “*Lex Mosaica*” is a big book, and it is written in defence of views he has been taught to consider exploded. Therefore, of course, it is a “monumental mass” of irrelevance, if not worse.

modesty, courtesy to fellow-labourers in a good cause, sound principles, and unimpeachable methods, are as necessary as ingenuity, industry and erudition, in the great work of investigation into the history of revealed religion.

I may add that, personally, nothing but a sense of duty would have led me to take the part I have taken in this discussion. I may appeal to the history of my whole life in support of this assertion. My desire from my earliest essay in authorship has always been to bring Christians together, to limit the area of controversy between them as far as possible. It is true, as I have said, that I do not believe either in the methods of German criticism or its results. It is too arbitrary, too self-confident, too fanciful, too unscientific, in my belief, to make any approach to certainty in its conclusions, and so far as I have had an opportunity of examining it, it is altogether one-sided. I therefore believe that the theories which now hold the field about J's and E's and D's and P's and redactors are doomed ultimately to disappear. Nor do I think that they add much to our reverence or even respect for the Bible. But even considerations such as these would not have induced me to enter into the controversy. I would willingly have left matters relating to the date, composition, and authorship of the books of the Bible to University professors and their pupils. And I should have done so, had they not asked us, on the basis of what I firmly believe to be as yet their very incomplete and one-sided researches, to believe in the falsification of Hebrew history by the writers of the Old Testament. I feel that such falsification as is imputed to those writers by our modern critics, however the conclusion may be disguised by special pleadings, however much in the circumstances of the time may be urged in palliation of it, was, if it ever occurred, an *immoral act*, and I am quite sure that English people will agree with me when the question at issue is fairly before them. I am further quite sure that the honour and reputation of the Hebrew Scriptures cannot be maintained among the English-speaking peoples if this view of their *genesis* be established. Consequently, if I think, as I do think, that this view has not been established, and never will be established, I feel bound to say so, in view of the grave evils which its acceptance appears to me likely to produce on the religion and morality of our country and race. I am growing an old man now, and would fain have done with controversy. And I would have done with controversy, had it not appeared to me that Englishmen were teaching their fellows that the Old Testament, as we now have it, rests on a system akin to that of the Forged Decretals.

There is yet one reason more which weighs with me in this

matter. It has been found impossible to dissociate the conclusions of the disintegrating critics from the doctrine of the Person of our blessed Lord—a most significant fact, especially as it is not the conservative critic who has raised this question, it is the *Lux Mundi* school, which having in an unguarded moment, as I must believe, committed itself to the theory of an “idealization” of Old Testament history for the furtherance of the object of a school of ethic monotheists existing at the period of the decline of the Jewish monarchy, has found itself compelled to support this theory by hazardous assertions concerning the person of Christ—theories opposed to the best traditions of the Catholic Church and contrary to the teaching of her wisest doctors. I will not now pursue this subject further than by saying that, though it does not seem that the manhood of Christ shared the full omniscience of the Godhead—indeed, there are well-known passages which show that this was not the case—yet our Lord displayed on many occasions a Divine wisdom which could hardly have failed to discern the fact, if it be a fact, that the Jewish Scriptures display the most obvious signs of having been tampered with in order to support a view of the Jewish history which is altogether unfounded. But whether I am right in this or not, I must at least think that a theory is open to grave suspicion which compels the scholars who adopt it to revise very considerably their conceptions of the Person of their Lord.

J. J. LIAS.



ART. II.—THE ALBIGENSES (*continued*).

THE decree of Lucius III. issued in A.D. 1181 against those who “falsely describe themselves as Cathari, Patarini, Humiliati, or Poor Men of Lyons, and whose errors mostly concerned the Sacraments,” throws no fresh light upon the Albigensian heresy, although it is a document of considerable interest, in that it specifies in greater detail than any previous authority the *methods* by which the heretics are to be detected and punished.

Two years later (A.D. 1183) we meet with a book whose title promises to the student of this question much fruit for his labour in perusing it. It is a book written by Alan de Insulis. His birthplace was Insulæ, in Flanders, although Demster states that he was a native of the island of Mona. A monk under the great Bernard of Clairvaux, he was made Bishop of Antissiodorensis in 1151, and was present at the third Lateran Council. The work with which we are now