

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. II.

APRIL, 1898.

No. 2.

Doctrinal Theology.

THEOLOGY.

(Continued.)

ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

The attributes of God are INDIVISIBILITY, IMMUTABILITY, INFINITY, LIFE, INTELLIGENCE, WISDOM, WILL, HOLINESS, JUSTICE, TRUTH, GOODNESS, AND POWER. The first three of the series have been termed *negative, intransitive, quiescent*, or *immanent*, the rest, *positive, transitive, operative*, or *emanent*, attributes. Others have classified the divine attributes as *incommunicable* attributes, or *properties*, which are only in God and in no wise or measure in created things, and *communicable* attributes, or *perfections*, such as holiness,¹⁾ life,²⁾ etc., which may in a mode and measure be communicated to created beings, as men and angels.

INDIVISIBILITY.

God is indivisible inasmuch as he is not a compound being, not made up of component parts, or of a substance and of qualities inherent in such substance, but absolutely

1) Lev. 19, 2. 1 Pet. 1, 15. Matt. 25, 31.

2) Gen. 2, 7. John 10, 28.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM BETRAYS THE MASTER WITH A KISS.

Let all Christians heed the apostolic warning to beware of deceivers. These deceivers are sometimes themselves the deceived, which only makes them all the more dangerous. Being deceived they raise the cry of "No danger!" and thus throw the Christian off his guard. Such is the case with the higher criticism which is spreading its cancerous fibers through the press and literature of our times. It raises the cry of "No danger!" and pretends to defend the Bible, while it deliberately betrays the Word of God into the hands of proud and self-righteous Rationalism. It claims that, in order to defend the Bible over against the deeper-thinking and more enlightened moral sense of our times, the old claim that it is the Word of God must be given up; that is to say, that the Bible must cease to be Master and must itself be mastered by the deeper-thinking and more enlightened moral sense of our times. The Master is betrayed into the hands of proud and self-righteous Rationalism.

For, if the Bible is not the Word of God, bearing supreme authority in all matters of faith and godly life, whence is a Christian or anyone else to learn what to believe and how to live? It can only be from his own reason, or, perhaps, as the higher critics would say, from his purer Christian consciousness; or from some other man's reason, or Christian consciousness; or from some church council, or coterie of higher critics; or from the papacy; or from whatever other human source. In every case it is Rationalism. Human reason, the human mind, would out of itself decide what to believe concerning God and how to live to please Him.

Nor does the higher criticism recognize any higher source even for the contents of the Bible than human rea-

son, the human mind. Let us hear them. The quotations are here made from an article headed, "The Old and New Method of Biblical Study," by President Henry Morton, Ph. D. He discards "the old view that the Bible is the Word of God" and, speaking in the name of the "New Criticism," as he calls it, says: "The Bible contains among its volumes histories, poems, law codes, dramas, songs, legends, almost every variety of literary composition, and the authors of the various documents *wrote them out of their own minds*, and under all the limitations imposed by their environment of age and location, so that some of them had but limited information as to the events they described, and some had imperfect views as to many other questions, and all of them only the scientific knowledge of their early period." Further on the article referred to holds up to contempt and derision "The theory of the direct and divine authorship of the Bible."

What is this but Rationalism? Nor does the New Criticism gain anything by saying: "With all this, however, the New Criticism recognizes, that these writers (of the Bible) one and all, though in various degree, were so inspired as to include in their composition something contributing to such a revelation of God's nature and His relations to man as is found nowhere else, and could not have been derived from mere observation and reflection." What this is worth appears, when the Critic goes on to say: "This revelation, however, was gradual and progressive, and, therefore, in its early stages, imperfect, so that the views entertained and expressed by the earlier writers were inadequate and in this way incorrect." Now, who is to decide where in the whole precious Volume that "revelation of God's nature and His relations to man" is found, and when found, whether it is correct or "incorrect"? This is Rationalism pure and simple. Christ Himself, who says, "Search the Scriptures, for they are they which testify of me," must submit to the decisions of the human mind, and in nature and in office

only be what it allows Him to be. Instead of "casting down imaginations (Greek Text: reasonings) and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ," the higher criticism, as it calls itself, arrays itself on the side of the "high things" against the knowledge of God as given by inspiration, and deliberately betrays the Word of God, the Bible, into the hands of proud and self-righteous Rationalism.

The higher criticism says, "it has no message to those who take the Word of God for granted on its own evidence, but only for those who do their own thinking and have enjoyed more or less of that training in science, which stimulates the mind towards investigation, or the grasping of the reason of things, who can not accept this 'taking for granted' method, who understand and remember what they read and must of necessity reason out the problems they encounter." What is this but the proud conceit, that their thoughtfulness and superior scientific training have raised them so high, as to be far above the Bible and those who take it for granted as the Word of God. For these they have no message. These they dismiss in the proud spirit of the Pharisees, saying: "Have any of the rulers or the Pharisees believed on Him? But only this people who know not the law are cursed."

These higher critics complain that the Bible record of the creation of the world does not agree with the teachings of astronomy and geology; therefore, they say, the Bible cannot be the Word of God. But in the name of science I ask, what can science teach concerning the creation of the world? At best, nothing but hypotheses, suppositions. And of our present system of astronomy Humboldt says: "It is nothing more than a hypothesis;" and how changeably suppositional the many of teachings of geology are everybody knows that knows anything about them. These would-be deep thinkers are, therefore, guilty of the most

unscientific act of placing a hypothetical theory, a supposition, over against a clear and authentic statement of facts. They place there "It might have been so, or so, or so," over against the "It was so" of the Creator Himself.

These higher critics also complain of a discrepancy between the first and the second chapters of Genesis. But if they would only think a little deeper, they would certainly find that what from the first chapter is repeated in the second is here given with a different object in view, and their imagined disagreement would disappear at once. *Qui bene distinguit, bene docet*, is true also in regard to thinking.

Again, they claim to "find duplicate and in part conflicting accounts of the deluge (as in one case two and in another seven of the clean animals are preserved)." Here, too, the difficulty is not in the text, but only in the critic's mind. In one case in the account of the deluge pairs or twos not only of the "clean" but of all animals are preserved for the purpose of preserving the species; in the other case the additional direction is given to take seven of the "clean" animals into the ark for the purpose of food and sacrifice. Where is the conflict?

Again, the critics are offended when they "read about the Lord who 'smelled a sweet savor' from the burnt offering, and about Jehovah 'who came down to see the city and tower' of Babel which the children of men builded." But we ask, when the Holy Spirit gave the Seer to see that God was pleased and propitiated by Noah's sacrifice, what better expression could He use than that God smelled a sweet savor? It was so good and so expressive that the apostle Paul, who was concededly a deep thinker, used it when speaking of the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ (Eph. 5, 2): "Christ hath given Himself for us an offering and sacrifice to God for a *sweet smelling savor*."—And so when the Holy Spirit gave the Seer to see the direct intervention of God in the affairs of men at the building of the tower of Babel, what more appropriate and expressive words could He use

than "that the Lord came down to see?" We know that such expressions as these are anthropomorphisms, and we understand and interpret them as such in the light of Scripture itself. If the critics are not sufficiently up in Hermeneutics to do this, we cannot help it.

The critics are, furthermore, shocked, as they say, by the "savagery and low morality" contained in the Bible. For instance, their "moral sense is shocked by such a law as this (Exod. 21, 20. 21): 'If a man smite his servant or his maid with a rod, and he die under his hand, he shall be surely punished; notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished; for he is his money.'" To pretend a shock to the moral sense at such a law as this, is due either to self-righteous arrogance or to ignorance—it is hard to tell which. Do these higher critics really know nothing of the three kinds of law contained in Moses' writings? Here they are for their benefit, if they are capable of receiving any from such an humble source: The Moral Law; the Levitical or Ceremonial Law; and the Civil Law. Anyone without being a lawyer can see that this piece of law belongs to the civil law code. And does not everybody but, perhaps, a selfrighteous higher critic, know that the civil law can never come up to the standard of the moral law? Has not every state laws of the same kind, allowing and regulating things which are not sanctioned by the moral law? Christ expressly refers to the civil law of Moses as not coming up to the standard of the moral law (Matt. 19, 8): "Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives." Now, where is the shock to the moral sense of any intelligent being?

Here is another thrust at the morality of the Bible. They read that David was a man after God's own heart, and have in mind his raid against the Geshurites, where he left neither man nor woman alive, lest they should inform against him to his protector, Achish (1 Sam. 21, 9—12), and many other acts of "savagery and low morality." So

their moral sense is shocked that God should call such a man as David a man after His own heart. But does God thereby say that David was not a man of his times, and that all David did was right? Did not David himself live in repentance for his many sins which he humbly confessed, and did he not sing: "Blessed is the man whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered; blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no guile" (Ps. 32.) Was it then not by grace through faith and not by the merit of works that David was a man after the heart of God? But this is something which the pharisees could never see, but they always "murmured and said, This man receiveth sinners and eateth with them."

"Again, when in 2 Sam. 21, 1—14 the higher critics read the account of the "propitiatory human sacrifice" of the seven innocent sons of Saul, represented as called for and directed immediately by Jehovah, their moral sense is shocked. But it seems that if they had a very fine moral sense they would not read into the text what is not there. In the text there is nothing said of "a propitiatory human sacrifice." An oath given by the children of Israel to the Gibeonites had been broken by Saul, king of Israel. After his death, when David was king, the children of Israel felt the judgment of God in a long famine. David inquired of God as to the cause; and it was revealed to him, that the wrong done to the Gibeonites was not yet righted, and that was the cause of God's displeasure. David thereupon called the Gibeonites and asked them what they required for the righting of the wrong done them; and it was the Gibeonites who required the death of the seven sons of Saul. There is nothing said of a propitiatory human sacrifice called for and directed immediately by Jehovah. All that God did was to punish the wrong. All that the children of Israel did was to acknowledge the wrong. The heathen Gibeonites dictated the punishment to Israel for having broken a solemn oath of treaty.

But, we are told, these higher critics are well-meaning people. What if they were? But we have seen that their claim of "a higher sense of morality and a more adequate conception of the divine nature" is a mere conceit; but men are subject to conceits, and deceits, too. I drop that in the bottomless pit beneath their vaulting ignorance. They congratulate themselves, "that they have removed the Bible from a false position in which there was claimed for it what it nowhere claimed for itself and can not support, when calmly and honestly interrogated, and have placed it where it can sustain the full light of the most searching investigation, without detriment to its true dignity and authority." What dignity and authority? Of a bundle of productions written "out of their own mind" by men ignorant as to many things they wrote about, into which a little inspiration is here and there admitted, but to be mastered by this proud and self-righteous Rationalism into whose hands they have betrayed the Master?

The dignity and authority the Bible must have, or it has none at all, is this, that it is the infallible Word of God written by direct and most complete inspiration of God. And this is what the Bible claims for itself and is fully able to support and to sustain against the most searching investigation, not to mention the superficial and pharisaical fault-finding of these higher critics. It would carry us too far into detail to point out what each holy Writer claims for himself; it is enough to know what Jesus Christ, the personal Word of God, says of them all. Does He not again and again appeal to Moses and all the prophets and the psalms as to the Word of God, "the Scripture which can not be broken"? He places the writings of Moses on a par with His own words, when He says (John 5, 46. 47): "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me. But if ye believe not Moses' writings, how shall ye believe my words?" St. Paul asserts: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." St. Peter (2 Pet. 1, 19—21): "We have a more

sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well to take heed as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day star arise in your hearts: knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." And all the Apostles declared: "Which things we speak not with words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." It is clearly seen what the Bible claims for itself and what authority and dignity it must have, if Christ is to be our Master. Now what is it, when these higher critics come saying, "Hail Master," with the kiss of reverence on their lips, pretending to save the Bible from its own position? What is it? It is the Judas' kiss with which they betray the Master into the hands of proud and self-righteous Rationalism.

C. J. OEHLSCHLAEGER.
