

# PLUNDERING THE EGYPTIANS



THE OLD TESTAMENT AND  
HISTORICAL CRITICISM  
AT WESTMINSTER  
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY  
(1929-1998)

JOHN J. YEO

# **PLUNDERING THE EGYPTIANS**

---

*The Old Testament and Historical Criticism at  
Westminster Theological Seminary (1929-1998)*

---

**John J. Yeo**

**University Press of America,® Inc.**  
**Lanham · Boulder · New York · Toronto · Plymouth, UK**

**Copyright © 2010 by  
University Press of America,® Inc.  
4501 Forbes Boulevard  
Suite 200  
Lanham, Maryland 20706  
UPA Acquisitions Department (301) 459-3366**

Estover Road  
Plymouth PL6 7PY  
United Kingdom

All rights reserved  
Printed in the United States of America  
British Library Cataloging in Publication Information Available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2009937779  
ISBN: 978-0-7618-4959-9 (paperback : alk. paper)  
eISBN: 978-0-7618-4960-5

 The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1992

# **DEDICATION**

*To my parents, Woon Se Yeo (father) and In Hee Yeo (mother),  
with much love, honor, and affection.*

ישמח אביך ואםך ותגל يولרכך:  
(Proverbs 23:25)



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
Chapter One: INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter Two: OLD PRINCETON <i>REDIVIVUS</i>	7
2.1    Robert Dick Wilson: Life and Background	8
2.2    The Writings of Robert Dick Wilson	13
2.2.1    Wilson's Methodological Approach	15
2.2.2    The Typical Format of Wilson's Work	16
2.3    Scottish Common Sense Realism and the Evidential Method	16
2.4    Wilson's Traditional Defense of the Pentateuch	17
2.4.1    Evidences that Moses Authored the Pentateuch	18
2.4.2    Wilson's Arguments Against Pentateuchal Criticism	22
2.5    Wilson's Defense of the Book of Daniel	29
2.5.1    S.R. Driver's Critical Arguments for a Late Date of Daniel	30
2.5.2    Wilson's Refutation of Driver on the Book of Daniel	33
2.6    Wilson's Position Regarding Daniel's Place in the Hebrew Canon	41
2.7    Wilson's Position Regarding Daniel as Prophecy and History	45
2.7.1    Wilson's View of Darius the Mede as Gubaru/Gobryas	47
2.8    Wilson's Contributions	49
Chapter Three: TOEING THE LINE	93
3.1    Edward Joseph Young: Life and Background	94
3.2    The Writings of Edward J. Young	98
3.2.1    Semitic Grammars	99
3.2.2    Young and Wilson's Writings: Similarities and Dissimilarities	100
3.2.3    Young's Unique Approach	102
3.2.4    Young's Battle Against Neo-Orthodoxy	104
3.2.5    Young's Design of Old Testament Theology	110
3.2.6    Young's Traditional Defense of the Pentateuch	116
3.2.7    Young's Interpretation of Genesis One	120
3.2.8    Young's Stance on Isaiah	135
3.3    Young's Contributions	149
Chapter Four: A CHANGING OF THE GUARDS	207
4.1    Raymond Bryan Dillard	208

4.2	Plundering the Egyptians, Common Grace and Van Til's Antithesis	209
4.3	Dillard's Work on 2 Chronicles	212
4.3.1	Dillard's View of the Chronicler and Redaction Criticism	214
4.3.2	Dillard's Approach Toward Harmonization	216
4.3.3	Dillard's Advocacy of Genre Criticism	218
4.4	Tremper Longman III	219
4.5	Longman's Work on Literary Approaches	220
4.5.1	Longman's Literary Studies in Context	222
4.5.2	Longman's Literary Approach to Biblical Interpretation	223
4.6	Dillard and Longman's Views on the Old Testament	225
4.6.1	Genesis (Pentateuch)	226
4.6.2	Isaiah	232
4.6.3	Daniel	239
4.7	Dillard and Longman's Contributions	241
Chapter Five: CONCLUSION		279
5.1	Issues of Continuity	279
5.2	From Anti-Criticism to Criticism: Foe Becomes Friend	279
5.3	A Reappraisal of Philosophy and Tradition	282
5.4	Shifting Theology	284
5.5	Westminster and Beyond	288
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY		295
INDEX		315

## PREFACE

This book is a revised version of my doctoral dissertation which was originally presented to the faculty of the Toronto School of Theology, University of St. Michael's College in the University of Toronto in the fall of 2007. The topic for this study came about as a result of my interests in the study of the Old Testament from an evangelical and Reformed perspective. The pioneers of American Reformed Old Testament scholarship hailed predominantly from Princeton Theological Seminary from 1812 to 1929. Dr. Marion Ann Taylor, who served as my thesis advisor, is the only Old Testament specialist to write a full-scale monograph on the Old Testament faculty at the Old Princeton School. With her encouragement, Dr. Taylor and I decided that I should trace the Old Princetonian trajectory into Westminster Theological Seminary which was founded after Princeton's controversial reorganization in 1929. The subject matter stirred my interest because of Westminster's influence upon evangelical Old Testament scholarship and because it was personally relevant to the questions I faced regarding the interaction between Christian faith and the historical-critical study of the Old Testament. In the process of research and writing, what became exceptionally clear was that the Westminster scholars combined first-rate scholarship with sincere Christian faith without compromising one for the other. It is my hope that we in the ever-increasing "post-conservative evangelical" period of Christian scholarship would return to their exemplary faithfulness and reverential ethos.

My research for this work began in earnest in 2003, two years before the controversy began at Westminster Theological Seminary surrounding Dr. Peter Enns' controversial book, *Inspiration and Incarnation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2005) and his subsequent departure. I have purposely not commented on Enns' work due to my original intent to cover only those pertinent scholars who were not currently teaching at Westminster during the time of research and writing. Without wanting to sound cliché, my hope is that this present study will help shed light and not heat upon the current discussion especially with respect to the important changes that took place in the scholarship of the Old Testament faculty that immediately preceded Enns. I have included the relevant literature which has appeared since the completion of my original dissertation in 2007. The recent publications, in my estimation, do not necessitate significant changes in the overall scope and outlook of this work.



## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

It is my distinct privilege to take this opportunity to sincerely thank and recognize the following people who have helped to make this book a reality.

I would like to thank Dr. Marion Ann Taylor for her encouragement and valuable input throughout the research and writing of this study. Her tireless assistance as a "dialogue partner" was indispensable to the outcome of this study. I would also like to express my gratitude to the staff at the archives of the Speer Library at Princeton Theological Seminary; archivist, Mr. Wayne Sparkman, at the Presbyterian Church in America Historical Center; and especially, archivist, Ms. Grace Mullen, at the Montgomery Library at Westminster Theological Seminary. It is not an overstatement when I say that Ms. Mullen assisted me in every way possible to provide the necessary research materials for this present work.

I would also like to express my sincere thanks to Dr. Iain M. Duguid, Dr. D.G. Hart, Dr. Stephen T. Hague, Dr. J.V. Fesko, and Dr. Brian P. Irwin. Their invaluable interaction brought greater clarity and focus to this work. All of the deficiencies that remain are mine. A word of thanks is extended to the faculty, staff, and students of Reformed Theological Seminary, Atlanta. In particular, I would like to recognize and thank Mr. John T. Sowell, Dr. Bruce A. Lowe, and Mr. Jonathan Stuckert for their authentic comraderie.

To Simon and Samuel Yeo, my brothers, I express my thanks for their enduring support and encouragement. To my wife, Junna, words are insufficient to convey my love and gratitude for the way she has lovingly and faithfully stood by me throughout my studies and especially in the publication of this book. Indeed, I have found a good wife in Junna and have obtained favor from the Lord (Prov. 18:22). To Grace and Andrew, our two young children, I give my thanks for their patience and for being a constant source of love and joy to me. To my parents, Dr. Woon Se Yeo and Mrs. In Hee Yeo, I am grateful for their unconditional love and support as well as their much appreciated wisdom throughout the years. They have given me a multitude of gifts and blessings that I could never repay. It is to them that this book is warmly dedicated. *S.D.G.*

John J. Yeo  
Roswell, Georgia  
September 2009



# **Chapter One: INTRODUCTION**

From its inception in 1929, Westminster Theological Seminary was established in Philadelphia as an antidote to the perceived liberalism at Princeton Theological Seminary after its controversial reorganization.<sup>1</sup> Former Princeton Seminary professors, J. Gresham Machen, Robert Dick Wilson, and Oswald T. Allis,<sup>2</sup> founded the new seminary in order to continue the traditional Calvinist orthodoxy of the “Old Princeton Theology” and to defend the inspiration and authority of the Bible from modernism and radical historical criticism (or the so-called “higher criticism”).<sup>3</sup> In their approach to the Old Testament, the Westminster faculty generally followed their Princeton predecessors in Reformed, covenantal biblical interpretation and in their defense of the traditional views of dating and authorship of biblical books. Samuel G. Craig, in an address delivered on the occasion of Westminster Theological Seminary’s fifth Commencement, forthrightly stated,

Why is it that Westminster Seminary though probably the youngest Theological school in America, certainly the youngest of the Presbyterian type, is one of the most recognized? The answer is not difficult. It is because it was established to carry on and perpetuate the policies and traditions of Princeton Theological Seminary as that Institution existed prior to its reorganization by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in U.S.A. in 1929. That is why, unlike most educational institutions, it has no period of infancy and youth. . . . This means Westminster Seminary is a new Seminary in name only, that in reality it is one of the oldest Theological Institutions in America.<sup>4</sup>

Westminster Seminary began with only seven full-time professors and fifty students<sup>5</sup> and has flourished to become one of the most influential and respected evangelical, Reformed institutions in North America and the world. Like the Princeton of old, the intensive study of the Scriptures, in the original languages of both the Old and New Testaments, was part of Westminster’s didactic goals. This foundational priority in the training of their prospective ordinands mirrored Old Princeton’s concern to produce “sound biblical critics.”<sup>6</sup> This label was especially accurate in relation to the subsequent history and study of the Old Testament at Westminster Seminary.

This study will focus primarily on the scholarship of the Old Testament at Westminster Theological Seminary between the years of 1929 to 1998. More specifically, it will focus on the lives and academic labors of Robert Dick Wilson (1929-1930), Edward Joseph Young (1936-1968), Raymond Bryan

Dillard (1969-1993), and Tremper Longman III (1981-1998).<sup>7</sup> Although there were other notable figures in the history of Westminster's Old Testament faculty,<sup>8</sup> each of the aforementioned individuals are of particular significance because of their impact in changing the shape of Old Testament studies at the seminary through their introduction of novel scholarly tools and ideas which often revealed methodological and theological development. These particular scholars are also noteworthy because they dealt with central issues related to Old Testament methodology and theology within the context of their respective writings and teachings. The present work, therefore, will present their contributions at Westminster in the following manner: 1) each of their individual contributions in Old Testament studies will be elucidated and assessed; 2) each of their unique methodological approaches will be highlighted; 3) each scholar will be situated within their respective historical and theological contexts; 4) each scholar will be examined in relation to their place within the Old Princeton-Westminster trajectory, 5) each of their individual confrontations, debates, and interactions with critical scholarship will be presented; and 6) each of their learned defenses of the traditional Reformed approach to the study of the Old Testament with respect to the doctrine of inspiration will be discussed. To properly assess their contributions, their published and unpublished writings, extant lecture notes, and the class notes of their former students have been utilized.<sup>9</sup>

Concomitantly, a major part of this study will be to trace and document the paradigmatic shift that occurred over the course of seventy years of Old Testament scholarship at Westminster with regard to the attitudes and use of the methods and conclusions of historical criticism. Although historical criticism was perpetually viewed as a legitimate discipline throughout Old Princeton and Westminster's history, the antagonism against critical scholarship by those within the tradition emerged from their interactions with what they called "radical higher criticism." In response, the Old Princetonians and early Westminster scholars taught the kind of "biblical criticism" that rejected the anti-supernaturalism that had become commonplace in the academy. That does not mean, however, that they did not "plunder the Egyptians" and avail themselves of the best that historical-critical scholarship had to offer. As a result, the latter generation of Old Testament scholars at Westminster began to appropriate and accept critical conclusions that had been, heretofore, rejected by their Old Princeton-Westminster predecessors.

The present work will demonstrate that the process toward the acceptance of historical-critical scholarship within the Westminster School took place in three distinct stages which are associated with the academic tenures of: 1) R.D. Wilson, 2) E.J. Young, and 3) R.B. Dillard and T. Longman III. In the first stage, Wilson, who had recently left Princeton to begin Westminster, continued the traditional and defensive, anti-critical posture of Old Princeton at the nascent seminary. While he vigorously defended the conservative approach to the Old Testament, Wilson acknowledged that there may have been minor additions and revisions made to the Pentateuch by "later inspired redactors." In the second

stage, Young, akin to Wilson, continued in the defense of traditional views of the Old Testament, but in this phase there was a moderate accommodation to historical-critical methodology in the cautious use of some critical tools such as form criticism, genre identification, and comparative methods particularly in the work of Meredith G. Kline, Young's junior colleague. In the third stage, however, the shift in the Old Princeton-Westminster trajectory is clearly perceptible in Dillard and Longman's integrationist approach. They forthrightly conceded that the biblical text had a complex pre-history and began to employ and accept historical-critical methodologies and their conclusions that had been previously rejected by their predecessors.

Methodologically, the present study will address the individual approach of each scholar in light of their rejection or acceptance of the historical-critical method as it pertains to their views relating to the authorship of the Pentateuch, the authorship and dating of the book of Isaiah, the authorship and dating of the book of Daniel, and, as in the case with Dillard, an additional segment on Chronicles will be examined. Each of these major sections of Old Testament literature serve as important criteria for the following reasons: 1) they represent key books of the Old Testament that have been vigorously debated between conservatives and liberals, 2) they have historically served as litmus tests of orthodoxy among conservatives with respect to traditionally-held views of authorship and dating,<sup>10</sup> and 3) any concessive modifications made by Westminster Theological Seminary with regard to the authorship and dating of these particular books would have set precedence for the rest of evangelical biblical scholarship.

The all-important question of "later inspired redactors" will also be addressed in conjunction with the authorship and dating of the Pentateuch, the book of Isaiah, and the book of Daniel. As an intentional trajectory of Old School Princeton, Westminster sought to emphasize the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Shorter and Larger Catechisms, a scientific or inductive rational defense of the faith, and a fervent confidence in the authority and inspiration of Scripture. While Robert Dick Wilson and Edward J. Young generally followed their Old Princeton predecessors in this regard, they also made unique contributions to the field of Old Testament studies. Theologically, Wilson and Young acknowledged that, though the Pentateuch was essentially the product of Mosaic authorship, minor additions and editorial revisions had been made to the Pentateuch by "later inspired redactors." Subsequently, Raymond B. Dillard and Tremper Longman III expanded the concept to include other books of the Old Testament as well as certain historical-critical conclusions such as the existence of "II Isaiah."

The attitudinal shift in favor of historical criticism which occurred during the tenures of Dillard and Longman did not take place within an intellectual vacuum. The Old Princeton-Westminster trajectory was often informed and challenged by innovations made within Old Testament scholarship (especially during the twentieth century), which in time, gradually brought about Westminster's own sense of openness toward such critical innovations. It is in

this light that Dillard's understanding of “plundering the Egyptians” will be discussed and explicated. Thus, the present study will seek to show how the academic environment along with Dillard and Longman's changing understanding of the doctrine of inspiration contributed to their methodological departure from the Old Princeton-Westminster trajectory.

## NOTES

1. The historical accounts of the reorganization of Princeton Theological Seminary in 1929 and of the founding of Westminster Theological Seminary are well-documented and need not be rehearsed here. See, e.g., Darryl G. Hart & John Muether, *Fighting the Good Fight* (Philadelphia, PA: Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1995); John W. Hart, "Princeton Theological Seminary: The Reorganization of 1929," *Journal of Presbyterian History* 58, no. 2 (Summer 1980): 124-140; Bradley J. Longfield, *The Presbyterian Controversy: Fundamentalists, Modernists, and Moderates* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); Edwin H. Rian, *The Presbyterian Conflict* (Philadelphia, PA: Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1992); Ned B. Stonehouse, *J. Gresham Machen: A Biographical Memoir*, third edition (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1987).

2. See George M. Marsden, "Understanding J. Gresham Machen," *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 11, no. 1 (1990): 47.

3. In the "Constitution of Westminster Theological Seminary" which was adopted on May 6, 1930, the "Preamble" states, "we have established in the city of Philadelphia an institution to be known as Westminster Theological Seminary, to carry on and perpetuate the policies and traditions of Princeton Theological Seminary, as it existed prior to the reorganization thereof in the year 1929, in respect to scholarship and militant defense of the Reformed Faith." *Charter and Constitution of Westminster Theological Seminary* (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Theological Seminary, 1930), 15.

4. Samuel G. Craig, *Westminster Seminary and the Reformed Faith* (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Theological Seminary, 1934), 4.

5. *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary 1929-1930*, 5, 11. The initial student body also included six international students: three from Canada, one from Ireland, one from Korea, and one from Japan.

6. *The Plan of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, located in Princeton, New Jersey, adopted by the General Assembly of 1811*, second edition (Elizabeth Town, PA: Isaac A. Kollock, 1816), 14.

7. The latter two are considered together because of their mutual collaboration on respective books of the Old Testament.

8. Pertinent references to the colleagues of R.D. Wilson, E.J. Young, R.B. Dillard and T. Longman III are included in this study because of their general importance to the Old Testament department at Westminster Seminary. Oswald T. Allis (1929-1936) and Allan A. MacRae (1929-1936) are mentioned due to their close ties to Wilson as his former students and (later) colleagues at Old Princeton and Westminster. The contributions of Meredith G. Kline (1950-1965) and O. Palmer Robertson (1971-1982) are discussed in the chapter on Young, because they were Young's students and subsequently his colleagues at the seminary. Finally, Bruce K. Waltke (1985-1991) is highlighted within the chapter on Dillard and Longman because they served as colleagues together during Waltke's tenure at Westminster.

9. This study incorporates published and unpublished manuscripts including lecture notes and class notes obtained from the archives at the Montgomery Library at Westminster Theological Seminary (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania), the Speer Library at Princeton Theological Seminary (Princeton, New Jersey), and the Presbyterian Church in America Historical Center (St. Louis, Missouri).

10. Noll writes, “Conservative evangelicals have usually supported both high views of biblical infallibility and firm commitments to traditional views on the composition of the biblical writings. That is, Moses wrote virtually all of the Pentateuch, the prophet Isaiah wrote the entire book which bears his name, the book of Daniel dates from the fifth or sixth century B.C. . . . These conclusions rest on a straightforward, commonsensical reading of the relevant passages.” Mark A. Noll, *Between Faith and Criticism: Evangelicals, Scholarship, and the Bible in America*, second edition (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1991), 25. Richard Schultz also maintains, “Not too many decades ago, the authorial unity of Isaiah—that is, that there was only one Isaiah—was considered an evangelical litmus test of biblical orthodoxy, as was the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and the pre-Maccabean origin of Daniel.” Richard L. Schultz, “How Many Isaiahs Were There and What Does It Matter?” in *Evangelical & Scripture: Tradition, Authority, and Hermeneutics*, eds. V. Bacote, L.C. Miguélez, & D.L. Okholm (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 151.

## **Chapter Two: OLD PRINCETON *REDIVIVUS***

Even with the promise of a new school, Westminster Theological Seminary, like the Princeton of old, did not seek to break new ground.<sup>1</sup> Under J. Gresham Machen's leadership, Westminster had intentionally sought to conserve and continue the legacy of the "Old Princeton Theology" in regard to their Reformed traditions and perspectives on the Bible. This was especially true in their approach to the Old Testament. Former Princetonians, Robert Dick Wilson, Oswald Thompson Allis, and Allan Alexander MacRae, never relinquished their zeal to defend the Old Testament from what they perceived to be liberal attacks on the Bible and its history. The apex of their on-going defense centered on the Scriptures as the "inspired Word of God." These men were the traditional stalwarts of Old Princeton. They presupposed that the Judeo-Christian God had divinely inspired the Scriptures through the prophets and the apostles, had performed supernatural miracles in history, and had prophesied events beforehand. Indisputably, these conservative scholars were the preservers of the traditional Old Princeton approach to the study of the Old Testament which they brought with them to Westminster Theological Seminary.

In the first academic year, Robert Dick Wilson taught the bulk of Old Testament courses at Westminster Theological Seminary from 1929 to 1930. As Professor of Semitic Philology and Old Testament Criticism, Wilson brought twenty-nine years of solid biblical scholarship to the fledgling seminary. At the age of seventy-four, Wilson taught no less than seven courses including: "Elements of Hebrew" (with his assistant, Allan A. MacRae), "Advanced Hebrew," "Philological Premises of the Higher Critics," "Hebrew Syntax," "Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," "General Introduction to the Old Testament," and "Introduction to the Pentateuch."<sup>2</sup> Although his career at Westminster Seminary lasted only for that initial academic year, Wilson's enduring impact upon his fellow Old Testament colleagues and students was immense. Above all, as a faithful tradent of the "Old Princeton theology," Wilson sought to carry forward Princeton's conservative approach to the study and defense of the Old Testament Scriptures which had properly begun under noted Old Testament Professors Joseph Addison Alexander and William Henry Green. Indeed, in accord with J. Gresham Machen, Wilson did not desire to make the nascent seminary a "new" Princeton, but to reestablish and to preserve

the intent of the original through it. In other words, Westminster was, in the life and work of Robert Dick Wilson, Old Princeton *redivivus*.

## 2.1 Robert Dick Wilson: Life and Background<sup>3</sup>

Robert Dick Wilson was born on February 4, 1856.<sup>4</sup> One of ten children, Robert, was reared and educated in Indiana, Pennsylvania where his prodigious learning began at an early age. He was already able to read at age four. By the time Wilson was eight years old, he read George Rawlinson's weighty archeological work, *Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World*. Philip E. Howard, the publisher of *The Sunday School Times*, remarked that at age nine, Wilson, on a trip with his father and one of his brothers to a bookstore in Philadelphia, had "gathered about fifty volumes, including Prescott, Robertson, J.S.C. Abbott and similar standard works,—examples of the 'light reading' that these children enjoyed."<sup>5</sup>

After completing public school in Indiana, Pennsylvania, Wilson was ready to matriculate into the sophomore class at the College of New Jersey (later renamed Princeton University) when he was only fourteen years old. However, due to health reasons, Wilson was unable to enter that year, but had to wait until he was seventeen years old. Wilson explained the reason for the postponement of his studies: "I had a good deal of headache[s] between my fourteenth and twentieth years, and then typhoid. After that my headache[s] disappeared. I really couldn't half do my work before that."<sup>6</sup>

In his preparation for college, Wilson gave himself over to the acquisition of French, German, and Greek. In college, Wilson specialized in the study of language, psychology, and mathematics. Wilson was such an exacting student that he expressed humiliation when in one of his Bible courses he had received "a very low grade of 90, which pulled down my [grade] average."<sup>7</sup>

In 1876, Wilson graduated from the College of New Jersey with an A.B. (i.e., Bachelor of Arts degree). By 1879, he obtained his A.M. (i.e., Master of Arts degree).<sup>8</sup> Before Wilson began his seminary education, he balanced his time furthering his biblical language work while he concurrently served the church as an assistant to Alexander Donaldson and as a licentiate of the Kittanning Presbytery. He was involved with evangelistic services in Pennsylvanian towns such as Cherry Tree, Burnside, Bethel, Mechanicsburg, and Armagh.<sup>9</sup> In addition, Wilson and his brother devoted a year and a half to the work of evangelism in their hometown of Indiana, Pennsylvania that resulted in a "great numbers of souls led to Christ."<sup>10</sup> Wilson at this time began his personal study of Classical Hebrew. Walter C. Kaiser, Jr. notes that "While holding meetings at Cherry Tree, he purchased a Hebrew Bible and a Hebrew dictionary and grammar that were written in Latin."<sup>11</sup>

Upon entering Western Theological Seminary in Pittsburgh (Allegheny, Pennsylvania), his knowledge of the Hebrew language had become so proficient that he "took a hundred dollar prize in Hebrew when he entered the seminary."<sup>12</sup> When asked how he had prepared himself in learning such a vast array of languages, Wilson replied,

I used my spare time. When I went out for a walk I would take a grammar with me, and when I sat down to rest, I would take out the book, study it a little, and learn what I could. I made up my mind that I wanted to read the great classics in the originals, so I just learned the languages in order to do that. I would read a grammar through, look up the examples, making notes as I went along, and I wouldn't pass by anything until I could explain it. I never learned long lists of words, but I would read a page through, recall the words I didn't know, and then look them up. I read anything that I thought would be interesting to me if it were in English. I got so interested in the story that I was unconscious of the labor,—as a man is interested in his roses, and doesn't think of the thorns. So I learned Greek, Latin, French, German, Hebrew, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Biblical Aramaic, Syriac, Arabic, and so on.<sup>13</sup>

Through the use of a disciplined, inductive approach to language acquisition, Wilson went on to do formal training and research in Semitic languages at the University of Berlin between the years of 1881-83. Additionally, a brief respite in Heidelberg afforded him the opportunity to learn Babylonian. His studies in Germany also included Ethiopic, Phoenician, all of the Aramaic dialects, Egyptian, Coptic, Persian, and Armenian.

He studied in Berlin with [Eberhard] Schrader, who was [Franz] Delitzsch's teacher, called the father of Assyriology. He studied his Arabic and Syriac under [Eduard] Sachau, and Arabic under Jahn and Dieterichi; Hebrew under [August] Dillman and [Hermann] Strack, and Egyptian under Brugsch. He became conversant with some twenty-six languages in these years devoted to language acquisition.<sup>14</sup>

Wilson's resolute dedication toward learning numerous languages was the result of a dilemma he encountered while in seminary. On the one hand, Wilson's "seminary studies caused him to feel that there was a great need for a type of Biblical scholarship that was not so subjective as much of the teaching he heard, but objective and thorough in dealing with facts that could be known only by exhaustive research over the whole range of the ancient languages related to the Bible."<sup>15</sup> On the other hand, Wilson had witnessed the way in which God had so evidently blessed him in the work of ministry and wondered if he should go "in the highly attractive and necessary work of preaching in which he had been so greatly blessed."<sup>16</sup> Wilson, under the conviction that God was providentially guiding him, chose the life of a scholar whose unending labor would be performed in relative obscurity and isolation, in order to prepare himself for the sole purpose of the "defense of the Scriptures on the basis of linguistic and historical facts."<sup>17</sup>

While in Germany, Wilson also carefully planned a general outline of his life's work as a biblical scholar. Wilson divided the next forty-five years of his life into three groups of fifteen years. In the first fifteen years, Wilson would further devote himself to language study. The next fifteen years would be spent in biblical textual study in light of the findings of his philological studies. Finally, the last fifteen years would be devoted to "writing out his findings, so that others might share them with him."<sup>18</sup>

After his studies abroad, Wilson returned to Western Theological Seminary in 1883 where he served as an Instructor (1883-85) and then as Professor of Old Testament Languages and History (1885-90).<sup>19</sup> During this period, Wilson was also ordained as a Presbyterian minister in 1885 and obtained his Ph.D. degree from the College of New Jersey in 1886. As planned, Wilson continued to devote himself to the study and acquisition of languages and in 1891 published both, *Elements of Syriac Grammar by an Inductive Method* and *Introductory Syriac Method and Manual*.<sup>20</sup> Soon after in 1892, he wrote his brief *Notes on Hebrew Syntax*.<sup>21</sup>

In 1900, Wilson left his post at Western Theological Seminary in order to accept a call at Princeton Theological Seminary. He had been elected to the William Henry Green Chair of Semitic Philology and Old Testament Criticism which was so designated soon after Green's death earlier that same year. This appointment was a momentous occasion for Wilson because Professor Green had been known as the "great Presbyterian protagonist of the Biblical and historical view of the Old Testament Scriptures against the so-called Higher Criticism,"<sup>22</sup> "the Nestor of the conservative Old Testament School," and even as the "Athanasius against the [Higher Critical] world."<sup>23</sup> Indeed, to be appointed in Green's prestigious chair was itself a clear indication and testimony to Wilson's abilities and acumen as a burgeoning Old Testament scholar. In addition, much like his predecessor, Wilson also took seriously the ever-increasing and daunting task of "defending the Scriptures and confounding the critics."<sup>24</sup> Moreover, Edward J. Young, his successor at Westminster Theological Seminary, positively reckoned Wilson among Old Princeton's major players for his defense of the Old Testament Scriptures:

There [at Princeton Seminary] he [Wilson] found himself in the atmosphere of intelligent loyalty to the Bible which had always characterized that seminary. He stood in the line of men such as Joseph Addison Alexander and William Henry Green, and he carried on that line, plunging at once into the earnest and intellectual defense of the Old Testament.<sup>25</sup>

Wilson's academic career at Princeton Seminary spanned twenty-nine years. He was known as an exceptional teacher and his lectures were customarily filled with much enthusiasm and energy. A former student recalled that Dr. Wilson

held the chair in Hebrew. Certainly no chair could hold *him*. As he warmed to his subject (say, linguistic clues to the date of the Book of Daniel) he would spring from his chair, pace up and down, and then, leaving the platform, drive home his point by pounding the desks of one and another of the students who caught his eye. "Dr. Dick's" linguistic and textual erudition was fabulous, and to watch and hear him pulverize the higher critics was a memorable experience.<sup>26</sup>

His students were most impressed with Wilson's extensive knowledge and mastery of each subject. When answering a question or objection from the class,

Wilson would “pour out a wealth of information quite over-whelming to the inquirer or confounding to the caviller.”<sup>27</sup> This was primarily due to Wilson’s great learning and to his “remarkably retentive memory that made it possible for him to draw at will and without consulting lecture notes or card-index on the rich treasures of accumulated information which were his.”<sup>28</sup>

Although Wilson had not received his theological education at Princeton Seminary, he had become a stalwart defender of its theology and of its conservative stance on critical issues. Wilson’s expertise as a well-trained Semitic philologist, his comprehensive knowledge of ancient Near Eastern history, literature and archaeology, as well as his thorough understanding of contemporary Old Testament scholarship, enabled him to find new ways of defending the older traditional views of the Old Testament. From 1900 to 1929, as Green had done before him, Wilson skillfully defended many of the crucial subjects that continued to be on the forefront of evangelical biblical scholarship, such as the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and the early date of the composition of Daniel.<sup>29</sup> In fact, by the time Wilson left Princeton, he had published “thirty six [sic] major articles and fifteen book reviews in the *Princeton Theological Review* and at least four monographs on key critical issues of the day.”<sup>30</sup> Wilson had effectively maintained the defensive posture against the higher critics that Green had popularized within evangelical scholarship although their methodological approaches were very different.<sup>31</sup>

One major difference between Wilson and Green lay in their scope of influence. Most of Green’s monographs had been published by the prestigious printing company, Charles Scribner’s Sons of New York, and had enjoyed a broad distribution in the company’s vast circulation. However, by Wilson’s time, there were no major publishers willing to distribute his works to a wider audience.<sup>32</sup> Both of Wilson’s works, *Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?* (1922) and *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament* (1926), were published by The Sunday School Times Company of Philadelphia whose distribution was limited to a conservative, evangelical constituency. Marion A. Taylor clarifies that the reason Wilson was unable to find a major publishing company was due “to the narrowing of the sphere of influence of the Princeton OT school.”<sup>33</sup> Wilson’s “narrowing sphere of influence” was also seen in his interactions with the wider scholarly community, where he rarely received academic attention outside of his works on the book of Daniel. Mark A. Noll explains, “Academic essays appeared regularly [by Wilson] in the *Princeton Theological Review*, but rarely in professional journals. And only infrequently did other professionals review their work.”<sup>34</sup>

After the reorganization of Princeton Theological Seminary in 1929 and during the turmoil of the modernist-fundamentalist controversy,<sup>35</sup> Wilson could have remained at Princeton until his impending retirement much like his Old Testament colleague, Geerhardus Vos, had done.<sup>36</sup> Oswald T. Allis surmised,

He was already past the age for retirement. He might have continued teaching for a year or so and then have retired to spend his old age in literary work, with a pension sufficient for his needs and one of the greatest theological libraries in

America ready to his hand. . . . But he believed that to remain would be to countenance and tacitly approve a reorganization which he held to be destructive of the Princeton which he loved and where he had labored for nearly thirty years.<sup>37</sup>

According to Allis, Wilson, at the age of seventy-four, "left the scene of his best labors and most abundant successes and went forth to begin again and to begin at the new beginning, to lay the foundation of a new institution, which should, God willing, ever stand for that brave and uncompromising defense of the Bible as the Word of God to which he had devoted his life."<sup>38</sup> In 1929, Wilson, alongside J. Gresham Machen and Oswald T. Allis, parted ways with the newly reorganized Princeton in order to become one of the founding members of Westminster Theological Seminary. According to Wilson, the task of the professors at the new seminary was both positive and negative:

This then, as I understand it, is the great work that is incumbent upon us at Westminster Seminary. We are defenders of the Christian faith: negatively, by the removal of doubts and objections; positively, by the increasing of it [i.e., Christian faith] through showing the reasonableness of it, and more specifically, by presenting its content and its claims,—the subjective and objective evidence for it.<sup>39</sup>

Wilson never regretted leaving Princeton because he "loved Westminster Seminary and saw in the good hand of God upon her the evidence that his work of faith and labor of love had not been in vain."<sup>40</sup>

Robert Dick Wilson died on Saturday, October 11, 1930, however, after having served one year as Professor of Semitic Philology and Old Testament Criticism.<sup>41</sup> His last public appearance was on October 1, 1930 during the Opening Exercises of the second year of Westminster Seminary. Allis noted, "It was particularly fitting that his last words should be spoken as a teacher to students. For it was just fifty years since, as an instructor in Old Testament at Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, he entered upon the work of theological education to which he devoted half a century of fruitful service."<sup>42</sup> Two weeks after delivering his opening address, he was laid to rest at the place of his birth in Indiana, Pennsylvania.<sup>43</sup> During the time of Wilson's funeral, the newly reorganized Princeton Seminary sympathetically issued the following statement:

The hour of four o'clock having arrived, and having been informed that at this hour the funeral services of the Rev. Robert Dick Wilson, D.D., were being held in Philadelphia, Pa., the Board of Trustees suspended its regular order of business to stand in solemn tribute to him who had served the Seminary so long and faithfully as a teacher.<sup>44</sup>

Princeton's poignant tribute to Robert Dick Wilson was fitting owing to his long and productive career there. Yet Wilson's most indelible mark was left on the nascent Westminster Seminary:

He is, indeed, no longer with us in bodily presence. His great learning is with us only in his writings and in the knowledge of the Bible that he has imparted to his host of students throughout the world. But the power of his example will not be lost. Westminster Seminary, by God's grace, will ever be true to the Lord Jesus, as this beloved teacher was true. Trustees, faculty, and students will be moved always to sacrifice themselves for an institution to which Dr. Wilson gave so much.<sup>45</sup>

It is to this written legacy and Wilson's study of the Old Testament that we shall now turn.

## 2.2 The Writings of Robert Dick Wilson

As were most of the Princetonians, Robert Dick Wilson was a prolific author. He authored two articles and five book reviews for *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* (1882-1893), thirty-six articles and fifteen book reviews in *The Presbyterian Review* (1902-1929), two Syriac grammars (both published in 1891),<sup>46</sup> one Hebrew grammar (1908),<sup>47</sup> four monographs that dealt with significant critical issues of the day (see below), at least twenty-four entries in *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* (see below), and various magazine articles and theological leaflets.<sup>48</sup>

Out of a total of thirty-eight journal articles, Wilson devoted sixteen weighty articles defending the historicity and traditional views of the book of Daniel:

- “The Book of Daniel and the Canon,” *The Princeton Theological Review*, 13.3 (July, 1915): 352-408.
- “The Silence of Ecclesiasticus Concerning Daniel,” *The Princeton Theological Review*, 14.3 (July, 1916): 448-474.
- “The Title ‘King of Persia’ in the Scriptures,” *The Princeton Theological Review*, 15.1 (January, 1917): 90-145.
- “Scientific Biblical Criticism,” *The Princeton Theological Review*, 17.2 (April, 1919): 190-240 and 17.3 (July, 1919): 401-456.
- “The Word דָנִיאֵל in Daniel 12:3,” *The Princeton Theological Review*, 17.1 (January, 1919): 128-133.
- “Apocalypses and the Date of Daniel,” *The Princeton Theological Review*, 19.4 (October, 1921): 529-545.
- “Daniel Not Quoted,” *The Princeton Theological Review*, 20.1 (January, 1922): 57-68.
- “Darius the Mede,” *The Princeton Theological Review*, 20.2 (April, 1922): 177-211.
- “The Influence of Daniel,” *The Princeton Theological Review*, 21.3 (July, 1923): 337-371 and 21.4 (October, 1923): 541-584.
- “The Origin of the Ideas of Daniel,” *The Princeton Theological Review*, 21.2 (April, 1923): 161-201.
- “The Background of Daniel,” *The Princeton Theological Review*, 22.1 (January, 1924): 1-26.

- “The Prophecies of Daniel,” *The Princeton Theological Review*, 22.3 (July, 1924): 378-401.
- “Aramaisms in the Old Testament,” *The Princeton Theological Review*, 23.2 (April, 1925): 234-266.
- “Evidence in Hebrew Diction for the Dates of Documents,” *The Princeton Theological Review*, 25.3 (July, 1927): 353-388.
- “On the Hebrew of Daniel,” *The Princeton Theological Review*, 25.1 (April, 1927): 177-199.
- “Foreign Words in the Old Testament as an Evidence of Historicity,” *The Princeton Theological Review* 26.2 (April, 1928): 177-247.

He also published an extensive treatment on the Aramaic of Daniel in order to provide a counterattack against the critical school that assumed that the Aramaic of Daniel allegedly proved a late, second century B.C. composition for the book:

- “The Aramaic of Daniel,” in *Biblical and Theological Studies*, by the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary, (New York: Scribner, 1912), 261-306.

The monographs devoted to the defense of the traditional views of the Old Testament books in general and of the book of Daniel in particular included:

- *Studies in the Book of Daniel*, (Volume 1—New York and London: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1917; Volume 2—New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1938; reprinted in one volume by Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1972; reprinted in two volumes by Wipf & Stock Publishers, Eugene, OR, 2002).<sup>49</sup>
- *Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?* (Philadelphia: Sunday School Times Co., 1922; 62 pp. and at least ten editions through 1953).
- *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Sunday School Times Co., 1926; 225 pp.); (London: Marshall Brothers, 1926); (New York: Harper, 1929); (Chicago: Moody Press, 1959).

As is evident below, even Wilson’s contributions to the *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, were almost entirely related to the book of Daniel and to the post-exilic period:

- Numerous articles in *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, (Chicago: The Howard-Severance Company, 1915; revised edition, 1929). Wilson’s articles include: Abednego (vol. 1, pages 4-5); Ahasuerus (1.80-81); Arsaces (1.260); Artaxerxes (1.260); Ashpenaz (1.270); Belshazzar (1.433); Cambyses (1.546-47); Daniel (2.782-83); Daniel, Book of (2.783-787); Darius (2.788-89); Evil-Merodach (2.1043); Ezra (2.1082-83); Ezra-Nehemiah, Books of (2.1083-85); Melzar (3.2030); “Mene, mene, tekel, upharsin” (3.2032); Merodach-Baladan (3.2036-37); Nebuchadnezzar (4.2127-29); Nehemiah (4.2131-32); Sanballat (4.2681); Shadrach (4.2746); Sheshbazaar (4.2766); Tirshatha (5.2986-87); Tobiah (5.2990); Zerubbabel (5.3147-48). Note that even in the 1979 Eerdmans edition, many of

these entries remained essentially the same. They were either unaltered or partially edited.

### 2.2.1 Wilson's Methodological Approach

Wilson's inaugural address, which was subsequently published as *The Lower Criticism of the Old Testament as a Preparation for the Higher Criticism*,<sup>50</sup> was delivered at Princeton Theological Seminary on September 21, 1900 on the occasion of his installation as Professor of Semitic Philology and Old Testament Criticism. In this significant address, Wilson's entire approach to the study of the Old Testament was encapsulated and programmatically set forth.<sup>51</sup> Throughout the address, Wilson's high commitment to the study of the biblical and ancient Near Eastern languages is evident. Wilson desired to emphasize to each prospective exegete the value of a thorough acquisition of biblical Hebrew in regard to its vocabulary, grammar, and syntax due to its foundational import in the reading and critical evaluation of the Old Testament texts in their original languages.<sup>52</sup>

At the outset, Wilson defined "lower criticism" as the study of "grammar, lexicography and textual criticism."<sup>53</sup> "Higher criticism," was identified as "any literary criticism of the text or any systematic statements of truth, which may be derived from the purest possible text, in strict accordance with the rules of grammar and the most probable results of lexicography."<sup>54</sup> In relation to each other, Wilson underscored that, "A thorough knowledge of the principles of grammar, lexicography and textual criticism is necessary as a preparation for the critical study of the Scriptures along any line of thought, literary, historical or theological."<sup>55</sup> Thus, Wilson asserted that the work of lower criticism and its purpose in recovering the "purest possible text" was not solely preliminary to the work of higher criticism, but that it was a prerequisite in all aspects of biblical and theological studies. This perspective was in accord with what the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. had adopted in 1811 in its "Plan of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America."

Every student, at the close of his course, must have made the following attainments, viz. He must be well skilled in the original languages of the Holy Scriptures. He must be able to explain the principal difficulties which arise in the perusal of the Scriptures, either from erroneous translations, apparent inconsistencies, real obscurities, or objections arising from history, reason, or argument. He must be versed in Jewish and Christian antiquities, which serve to explain and illustrate Scripture. He must have an acquaintance with ancient geography, and with oriental customs, which throw light on the sacred records.—Thus he will have laid the foundation for becoming a sound biblical critic.<sup>56</sup>

Hence, Princeton Seminary's original objective of producing "sound biblical critic(s)" was exactly what Wilson had delineated in his address that lower criticism was a necessary prerequisite for higher criticism and theological research.<sup>57</sup>

### 2.2.2 The Typical Format of Wilson's Work

Wilson, throughout his career at Princeton and Westminster, modeled what he had advocated in his inaugural address.<sup>58</sup> Wilson's impressive facility of "all the departments of grammar and lexicography. . . . Phonics, paleography, the concordances, versions and cognates" is conspicuous in each journal article, monograph, and lecture.<sup>59</sup> Customarily, Wilson began each investigation by quoting verbatim the theory of a leading biblical critic. In most cases, Wilson took aim at Samuel R. Driver's work, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*,<sup>60</sup> due to the fact that it was "the best and clearest statement in English of the higher critical position."<sup>61</sup> Wilson would then proceed to proffer a comprehensive presentation of the evidence using various ancient versions of the biblical manuscripts (MSS) and ancient Near Eastern documents such as archaeological inscriptions from clay tablets, monuments, cylinders, obelisks, etc. Throughout his work, Wilson's mastery of foreign languages in general and the Semitic cognate languages in particular is clear.<sup>62</sup> This is most prominently displayed in his exhaustive concordance searches using Arabic, Syriac, Aramaic, Babylonian, Assyrian, Hebrew, Egyptian, Persian, and Greek texts.<sup>63</sup> After having synthesized copious amounts of biblical and extra-biblical data, Wilson's ultimate goal was to demonstrate by historical evidence<sup>64</sup> that the Bible's historicity was completely trustworthy. Wilson repeatedly chided the critics, claiming they had insufficiently performed their research. They ultimately failed to prove their theoretical assertions which, Wilson believed, actually revealed their biased positions against the historicity of the biblical text. Allis commented,

He [i.e., Wilson] would take an assertion here, a denial there, and subject them to an intense and searching scrutiny. He did not care how much labor this might involve. It might take months of study to settle a single important point. It might require twenty, fifty, a hundred pages of carefully collected facts and ordered argument to disprove a sentence or a paragraph of higher critical assertion. That did not matter. What did matter, what Dr. Wilson was supremely concerned to do was to show by example after example, test-case after test-case, that wherever they could be tested by the facts the allegations brought by the critics against the Bible were wrong and the Bible was right.<sup>65</sup>

### 2.3 Scottish Common Sense Realism and the Evidential Method

Wilson's decidedly evidentialist<sup>66</sup> approach was reminiscent of the Scottish Common Sense Realism that had long served as the epistemological foundation for the Princeton defense.<sup>67</sup> One of Common Sense philosophy's major proponents, Thomas Reid, taught: "All knowledge, and all science, must be built upon principles [i.e., the 'first principles of mankind'] that are self evident; and of such principles every man who has common sense is a competent judge, when he conceives them distinctively. Hence it is, that disputes very often terminate in an appeal to common sense."<sup>68</sup> This "self evident"<sup>69</sup> aspect of Common Sense Realism appealed to an external, objective investigation of facts

which were then systematically and logically-related using the inductive method.<sup>70</sup> Noll elucidates,

The Scottish philosophers regarded truth as a static entity, open equally to all people wherever they lived, in the present or the past. They placed a high premium on scientific investigation. They were deeply committed to an empirical method that made much of gathering relevant facts into logical wholes. They abhorred “speculation” and “metaphysics” as unconscionable flights from the basic realities of the physical world and the human mind. And at least some of them assumed that this approach could be used to convince all rational souls of the truth of Christianity, the necessity of tradition social order, and the capability of scientific methods to reveal whatever may be learned about the world.<sup>71</sup>

Moreover, George M. Marsden has cogently demonstrated that a correlation between Common Sense philosophy and the scientific study of the Bible was readily appropriated by the Princetonians. He writes,

Common Sense philosophy underlined the necessity of taking the humanity of the Bible seriously. Virtually all scholars, including the Princeton theologians, stressed this point. Crucial for understanding the Bible was the process of determining the original meanings of what the Biblical authors wrote. This was essentially a scientific question—a job for the philologist who studied closely the history of language. Once the original meaning was determined, it seemed to follow on Common Sense principles that the meaning of a [sic] Scriptures should be settled once and for all. Scripture would be speaking plainly—the anarchy of relativism and private interpretation would be avoided.<sup>72</sup>

Wilson embodied the Princeton apologetic.<sup>73</sup> The Scottish Common Sense philosophy undergirded Wilson’s inductive, evidentialist approach *in toto*.<sup>74</sup> His use of the empirical method in gathering the relevant “external and objective” data facilitated the production of the necessary evidence that he utilized in order to set forth his offensive and defensive arguments.<sup>75</sup> Along with the aid of scientific linguistic tools such as modern comparative philology and what he judged through “common sense” to be the “original meaning” of what was written by the biblical authors, Wilson consistently concluded that the historical, textual, and linguistic evidence argued in favor of the traditional views of the Old Testament books, especially in terms of their authorship and dates of composition.<sup>76</sup> Overall, Wilson sought to turn the tables on the critics and use scientific research in the service of substantiating the traditions about Scripture, instead, of undermining them.

## 2.4 Wilson’s Traditional Defense of the Pentateuch

Wilson’s comprehension of the critical view of the authorship and dating of the Pentateuch was extensive. His doctoral studies at the University of Berlin under the tutelage of Professors Sachau and Dillmann gave him first-hand knowledge of the critical theories that originated in Germany. Resembling his predecessors at Princeton Seminary, Wilson was thoroughly acquainted with the

Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis, i.e., the Documentary Hypothesis, which had postulated four disparate documentary sources identified by the sigla: J(ahwist), E(lohist), D(euteronomy), P(riestly code) whose origins were purportedly from four distinct periods of Israel's history. The approximate dates assigned to each of the documents were: J: ca. 840 B.C., E: ca. 700 B.C., D: ca. 623 B.C., and P: ca. 450 B.C.<sup>77</sup> These sources were then combined in 400 B.C. in order to produce the present "final form" of the Pentateuch, i.e., JEDP.<sup>78</sup> Wilson wrote concerning the critical position on the Hexateuch:<sup>79</sup>

That the first six books, that is, the Pentateuch and Joshua, were composed by at least a dozen redactors out of five or more other books (J, E, D, H[oliness code], and P), which were written from 900 to 450 B.C.; although, with the exception of Ezra, the authors and redactors of these five books are alike unknown to history, either as to name, time, or provenance. The sources of their information are also unknown to history, and consequently no one can rely upon the veracity of any statement in the Hexateuch. The books of Moses are simply a mythical and confused account of the origin of the people and institutions of Israel.<sup>80</sup>

Antithetically, Wilson contested, "That the Pentateuch as it stands is historical and from the time of Moses; and that Moses was its real author though it may have been revised and edited by later redactors, the additions being just as much inspired and as true as the rest."<sup>81</sup> Wilson's statement is significant and needs some unpacking. Firstly, it is clear that Wilson believed that the historicity along with the veracity of the Pentateuch was at stake if Moses was not its "real" author. Secondly, he supposed that the critical view of "unknown authors and redactors" was untenable because the proponents of the Documentary Hypothesis did not possess any verifiable historical evidence that substantiated such an assumption. Lastly, in contrast to the critical position of unknown redactors who allegedly employed various historical traditions, Wilson appealed to "later redactors" who wrote under the inspiration<sup>82</sup> of the Holy Spirit. These later hands were responsible for only minor additions and revisions made to the Pentateuch since the Pentateuch as a whole was deemed by Wilson to have been Mosaic.

#### **2.4.1 Evidences that Moses Authored the Pentateuch**

According to Wilson, the critics denied that Moses authored the Pentateuch because the biblical text did not explicitly claim that he was commanded by God to write anything but "the curse against Amalek and an account of the wanderings in the wilderness (Exod. 17:14; Num. 33:2). Besides these small portions of the narrative, he is said to have written the code of the covenant in Exodus 20-24, and a portion at least of Deuteronomy."<sup>83</sup> Conversely, Wilson maintained that Moses did not have to write every word found in the Pentateuch in order to have the work justifiably attributed to him. "Certainly, it cannot mean that to be the author Moses must have written his literary works with his own hand. Else, would Prescott not be the author of the *Conquest of Mexico*, or Milton of *Paradise Lost*, or the kings of Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, and Persia, of

their inscriptions, nor Jesus of the Sermon on the Mount.”<sup>84</sup> Wilson supposed that the inspired author(s) of the work clearly intended to attribute to Moses all of the divine visions, laws, and commands, in the same manner that the Code of Hammurabi<sup>85</sup> was attributed to the king whose name the work bears. Wilson wrote,

In fact, it may reasonably be inferred from Deuteronomy 31:9, 24-26; 4:44, 1, 5 [sic]; 28:58, 61; 29: 20, 26; and other passages, that the whole Pentateuch, or at least all of the legal portions, was intended by the writers of these passages to have been designated as having been written by, or for, Moses. But even if he did not write a word with his own hand, it is evident that whoever wrote the book meant to imply that the authorship of Moses extends to the laws and visions and commands that God gave him in the same manner that the Code of Hammurabi was the work of the king whose name it bears. That is, the laws came through him and from him. This is the fundamental authorship for which we contend and which we claim to have been impeached by all the testimony that has been produced, in the endeavor to impair our belief that, as John says: The law was given by Moses.<sup>86</sup>

Wilson further observed that it was customary in the biblical documents to name the author of the legislation. He noted that this same convention appeared among the other ancient Near Eastern documents as well: “As early as the fourth dynasty of Egypt, documents are dated and the name of the authors given, and in Babylon, as early as the dynasty of Hammurabi, documents are dated as to month, day, and year, and the names of the scribes and the principal persons engaged in the transactions recorded are given.”<sup>87</sup> In relation to the biblical text, Wilson referred to multiple examples where a distinction was made between the earlier legislation given by Moses and the newer regulations given through a prophet or king (e.g., Joshua 24:26; 1 Samuel 8:6-22; 1 Kings 8-11; 12:25-33; 14:7-16; 2 Chron. 19:5-11, 29:25-27; Neh. 12:45). At this juncture, Wilson attempted to demonstrate that the critical assumption of later laws retroactively ascribed to Moses was nowhere found in the biblical text, but rather, the converse was proven to be true. The Old Testament text, from different canonical sections, had repeatedly noted the distinct additions made to the Mosaic legislation including any departures or novelties introduced to it. Wilson declared,

Moreover, is it not marvelous that no example has been found in pre-Christian literature of the ascription to Moses of a law not found in the Pentateuch? You may be sure that if one such were known it would have been proclaimed by the traducers [i.e., critics] of the unity of the Pentateuch with a blare of trumpets, for it would be the unique specimen of direct evidence bearing on their alleged common use of the phrase to denote non-Mosaic authorship.<sup>88</sup>

On the topic of Moses as a literary prophet, Wilson adamantly maintained that Moses could have inscribed the Pentateuch using written sources because of the significant archaeological evidences which had been dated either in the pre-Mosaic or Mosaic period. Wilson cited the following reasons as evidence:<sup>89</sup> 1)

Abraham came from the area of Babylonia in which writing had been utilized for hundreds of years;<sup>90</sup> 2) Abraham lived during the period of Hammurabi from whose reign remain scores of letters, contracts, and other official records of which his code is most significant;<sup>91</sup> 3) Abraham would have used a "cuneiform system of writing, since this is known to have existed in Western Asia long before the time of Hammurapi, and the Amarna letters<sup>92</sup> show clearly that Hebrew was sometimes written in that script"; and 4) writing had been in existence for two thousand years or more in Egypt, "so that we can well believe that the family of Abraham, travelling from Babylon to Egypt and at last settling in Palestine, in between these two great literary peoples, had also formed the habit of conducting business and keeping records in writing."<sup>93</sup>

Wilson regarded his views as tenable because of two important archaeological proofs: 1) the Hebrew language was known to have existed in Palestine before the time of Moses because embedded in the El-Amarna letters were more than a hundred cognate words which were place names that were, to a large extent, in Hebrew; and 2) the geographical lists of the Egyptian Pharaoh, Thothmes III, and other Egyptian kings, recorded more than thirty Hebrew words in the form of names of cities that they conquered in Palestine and Syria.<sup>94</sup>

As noted above, Wilson employed his theory of Abraham's origin from an assumed literate region of Babylon in order to propose that Abraham may have been responsible for a portion of the sources Moses used to write the Pentateuch. In his article, "Babylon and Israel: A Comparison of the Leading Ideas Based upon their Vocabularies,"<sup>95</sup> Wilson sought to validate this premise by proving that key biblical words and doctrines had their origin in the time of Abraham. After making a comparison of Babylonian and Hebrew philological and cultic data,<sup>96</sup> Wilson firmly denied that the period of Babylonian influence upon the Hebrews was, as the critics claimed, during the time of the Babylonian exile. Instead, Wilson arrived at the conclusion that the period of time of Babylonian influence was most likely pre-Mosaic, and, more specifically, during the time of Abraham and his association with the city of "Ur of the Chaldees."<sup>97</sup>

The basis for Wilson's decision was in his discovery that Genesis 1 and 2 had the greatest affinity with Babylonian literature. Perceiving that Genesis 1 had been duly accounted for by the critics as a post-exilic document written by the Priestly writer (P) in the fourth century B.C., Wilson remarked that the critical designation of Genesis 2 to the Jahwist (J), a supposed ninth/eighth century B.C. document, was incompatible with the presence of clear Babylonian influences found in it.<sup>98</sup> To Wilson, this glaring contradiction was not only sufficient to prove that Genesis 2 did not originate in the post-exilic period, but that it opened the door to the time of Abraham as the most likely period of Babylonian influence. Wilson asserted,

That the presence of Babylonian terms in the first chapter of Genesis points to a time when Babylonian influence was predominant, no one will dispute; but the same influence is manifest in the second chapter. . . . This influence can easily be accounted for in all three instances on the supposition that the contents of

Genesis 1 and 2 were brought by Abraham from Babylon. . . . While it might be accounted for in Genesis 1 [a post-exilic, Priestly text], if it were composed at Babylon during or after the exile, how can it have influenced Genesis 2 [a Jahwist text], if, as the critics assert, it [J] were written somewhere between 800 and 750 B.C.?<sup>99</sup>

Moreover, Wilson believed that by attributing the authorship of the source documents behind Genesis 1-2 (Creation and Garden Building Accounts), Genesis 6-9 (Flood Narrative), and Genesis 14 (Kings of Sodom and Gomorrah Plundered by Eastern Kings)<sup>100</sup> to Abraham, that it best accounted for the Babylonian influence in terms of their linguistic and theological background in the early history of the book of Genesis and not in the latter history of Israel.

The fact that the stories of the creation and the flood, the existence of angels and of a Sabbath, the use of sacrifices and of the name Jehovah, are found on the monuments to characterize the age of Abraham, does not invalidate the Scriptures, but rather confirms them. The remarkable thing is that we find so many of the names and institutions of Genesis and so few of Exodus and Leviticus. As you recall the testimony that I have presented to you, could you have possibly expected stronger confirmation of the close pre-Mosaic relations of Babylon and Israel and of the later confirmed and continuous estrangement and hostility between the two?<sup>101</sup>

Hence, Wilson held that, alongside the linguistic, cultic, and archaeological evidence, the well-known deterioration of diplomatic relations between Israel and Babylon—*post-Abraham*—was further confirmation. Wilson insisted that by the post-exilic period, both Israel and Babylon would have already established their own distinct religious beliefs and cultic practices, and that the Israelites would have particularly deplored the abhorrent syncretistic practices that resulted in their exile. Moreover, Wilson believed that Israel's true ethnic and political identity had become inextricably linked to its cultic and religious relationship with "Jehovah," whose terrestrial temple-throne was located in the land of Israel on Mt. Zion. Wilson concluded,

All through that extended and extensive literature of the ancient Hebrews, all through those long annals of the Assyrians and Babylonians, wherever the Hebrews and the Assyrio-Babylonians were brought into contact, it was by way of opposition. The only exceptions were in the cases of some weakling, Jehovah-distrusting kings. But with these exceptions, prophets and kings and poets emphasize and reiterate the antagonism, essential and eternal, existing between the worship of Jehovah and the worship of the idols of Babylon. And when the children of Israel had been carried away to the rich plains of Babylon, so beautiful, so vast, was it as a Greek patriot to the Athens of his dreams, or a Scotsman to his "sin countrie?" Not thus. But they wept when "they remembered Zion."<sup>102</sup>

### 2.4.2 Wilson's Arguments Against Pentateuchal Criticism

The critical school believed that the following criteria displayed the presence of different sources in the Pentateuch:<sup>103</sup> 1) the disparate usage of the divine names Jehovah (J) or Elohim (E) and the particular literary characteristics associated with them,<sup>104</sup> 2) the presence of repetitions (and duplicate accounts),<sup>105</sup> and 3) the assumption that the authors of the documents wrote consistent and continuous accounts while, in contrast, the redactors, who were the tradition-keepers, edited and authored their work in an uneven and slipshod manner.<sup>106</sup> Wilson's personal views of redaction were far removed from those of the critics. Although Wilson did agree, in principle, with the general tasks of Lower (i.e., textual criticism) and Higher Criticism (i.e., historical criticism), he did not concur with the critical criteria that had been widely established.

#### 2.4.2.1 The Use of Divine Names in Source Criticism

In Wilson's response to the critical criterion of the disparate usage of divine names, he appealed to the overall narrative context and, more specifically, to the manner in which the divine name(s) functioned within each narrative. Oftentimes, the particular divine appellation used within the overall context of the narrative highlighted a specific attribute of the Deity. In his essay, "The Names of God in the Old Testament,"<sup>107</sup> Wilson endeavored to counter the critical view that the Hexateuch had been composed of three primary documents ([J]ahwist, [E]lohist, and the [P]riestly writer), two of which were based upon the divine name, Elohim (E and P), while the third, and allegedly the earliest document, was based upon the divine name Jehovah (J). These sources, which the critics theorized had been redacted together in the post-exilic era, could be detected in the Hexateuch contingent upon which divine name appeared. The critics also assumed that J revealed the name, Jehovah, early in the history of mankind (Gen. 4:26) whereas both E and P declared that Jehovah was not revealed until the time of Moses (Exod. 6:3). For this reason the critics supposed that E and P avoided the use of the name Jehovah and employed El Shaddai until the appellation was finally revealed in the Mosaic epoch.<sup>108</sup>

Wilson decided to put the critical theory regarding the usage of divine names to an empirical test. He recorded the number of occurrences of each divine name in the Pentateuch and Hexateuch (see table below), thereby, attempting to verify whether or not E and P had avoided the use of the name Jehovah and substituted El Shaddai prior to Exodus 6:3:

**Table 2.1 Simple Names for God<sup>109</sup>**

PENTATEUCH	Jehovah	Adonay	Elohim	Eloah	El	Elyon	Shadday
Genesis	146	7	164	0	3	0	1
Exodus	377	6	63	0	1	0	0
Leviticus	304	0	4	0	0	0	0
Numbers	389	1	9	0	9	1	2
Deuteronomy	<u>527</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	1743	14	278	1	15	1	3

**HEXATEUCH**

P	785	0	95	0	0	0	0
JE	579	14	157	0	13	0	3
D	<u>600</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	1964	14	292	2	17	1	3

Wilson contended that if the critical theory was true then verses which contained the names of Jehovah and El Shaddai should be distinct and separate since these supposedly reveal independent documents. In order to verify this premise, Wilson listed passages in Genesis and Exodus 6:2-3 that referred to a theophanic event in which El Shaddai occurred:

In the first, [Genesis] 17:1, "I am *El Shaddai* and I will do" so and so. In the second, [Genesis] 35:7-11, *Elohim* appeared unto Abraham and said: "I am *El Shaddai* and I will do" so and so. In the third, [Genesis] 48:3, Jacob says, *El Shaddai* appeared unto me and blessed me and said unto me I will do so and so. In Ex. 6:2, 3, "*Elohim* spoke unto Moses and said unto him: I am *Jehovah* and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, unto Jacob as *El Shaddai* and as *Shem-i Jehovah* I was not made known unto them.<sup>110</sup>

Wilson adduced from the evidence above that the divine names—*Elohim*, *Jehovah*, and *El Shaddai*—were not serving as markers of distinct sources. Rather, they were being used as different attributes for the same person. Wilson continued,

If . . . it appears that *Elohim* is *El Shaddai*, does it not appear, also, that *Jehovah* is *El Shaddai* and that *Elohim* is *Jehovah*? And does not P in Ex. 6:2, 3 say expressly that *Elohim* said that he was *Jehovah* and that he, *Elohim*, *Jehovah*, appeared unto the patriarchs as *El Shaddai*, a mighty God, thus asserting that *Elohim*, *Jehovah*, and *El Shaddai* were, in the opinion of the author of P, but the names, or titles, of the same person or of the different attributes, or aspects, or relations, of the same God? Again, if the author of P had meant to state in Ex. 6: 2, 3 that God appeared to the patriarchs under the name *El Shaddai*, how does it come that in one of the texts of P where *El Shaddai* is mentioned (Gen. 17:1) it is said that *Jehovah* appeared, in another (Gen. 18:1) that *Elohim* appeared, and in only one (Gen. 48:3) that *El Shaddai* appeared? If the critics answer by asserting that *Jehovah* of Gen. 17:1 and 35:11 should be changed to *El Shaddai*, the response is that there is just as much evidence for changing the *El Shaddai* of Gen 48:3 to *Elohim* or *Jehovah*, or for changing the *Elohim* of Gen 35:11 and the *El Shaddai* of 48:3 to *Jehovah*,—that is, no evidence whatever.<sup>111</sup>

Using the information derived from his chart, Wilson also wondered why P employed the name, *Elohim*, 95 times<sup>112</sup> and *El Shaddai* only 5 times (see chart above under "El" and "Shadday") before Exodus 6:3, if *El Shaddai* was considered by the author to have been the name of God known to the patriarchs.<sup>113</sup> It is also evident that the total number of occurrences of the name

Jehovah far exceeds the occurrences of the name Elohim in both the Pentateuch (J: 1743 to E: 278) and the Hexateuch (J: 1964 to E: 292). This is further confirmed in Wilson's division of the occurrences of each divine name in relation to each critical source, respectively. It becomes clear that P was not only uninhibited in the use of the name Jehovah, but that P's total usage of the name, Jehovah (785 times), out numbered both J and E's use of the name—combined (579 times).

In another article, "The Use of 'God' and 'Lord' in the Koran,"<sup>114</sup> Wilson once again contested S.R. Driver's source-critical views relating to the usage of divine names in the book of Genesis. Wilson took aim at Driver's claim that,

[in Genesis] 20:1-17 our attention is arrested by the use of the term *God*, while in c.[chapters] 18-19 (except 19:29 P), and in the similar narrative 12:10-20, the term *Jehovah* is uniformly employed. The term *God* recurs similarly in 21:6-31, 22:1-13 and elsewhere particularly in c. 40-42.45. For such a variation in similar and consecutive chapters no plausible explanation can be assigned except diversity of authorship.<sup>115</sup>

Wilson's refutation of Driver was dependent upon his proficiency as a Semitic philologist. In fact, in comparison to his other works, Wilson's expertise in Arabic along with his knowledge of the literature of the Koran is most evident in this significant essay. Methodologically, Wilson utilized the critical tool of "comparative literature" in order to show that similarities between the Koran and the Hebrew Bible clearly undermined Driver's source-critical analysis. More specifically, Wilson attempted to prove that the Koran had likewise employed the same literary convention of diversity in the usage of its divine appellations while unity of authorship remained unquestioned. Wilson explained,

That such an argument against the unity of the alleged documents is not to be depended upon, it is the purpose of the following tables to show by evidence derived from the use of *Allah* and *Rab* in the Koran. It is only necessary to inform the reader that *Allah* is the Arabic equivalent of *Elohim* and that *Rab* is the Arabic equivalent of *Kurios* and *Moryā*, the words by which the Greek and the Syriac versions respectively denote the *Jehovah* of the Hebrew Old Testament. The pertinency and force of the analogy are dependent upon the fact that in the case of the Koran no one can deny the unity of authorship.<sup>116</sup>

Wilson proceeded to present three sets of tables: a) the first table exhibited the number of times the names *Allah* and *Rab* occurred in each of the 114 suras (i.e., chapters) of the Koran (out of a total of 114 suras in the Koran: *Allah* occurs 2610 times, *Rab* occurs 965 times); b) the second table presented the occurrences of the words in each sura arranged according to the time of their promulgation (based upon the analysis and scheme of Sir William Muir); and c) the third table displayed the use and diversity of *Allah* and *Rab* (including other designations of the deity) in certain suras where both terms were used with

variations similar to those found in Genesis and elsewhere in the Pentateuch. An excerpt of Wilson's third table is provided below:

**Table 2.2 Sura XVII<sup>117</sup>**

Rab	8	13	18	21bis	23	24	25	27	29	30	32	35	40	41	42	44	49
Allah																	
Rab	56	57		59bis	62	67	68	81	82	87	89		94	96	97	98	99bis
Allah				58													

Rab                    102    104    107                    112  
Allah                101                                    110\*

\* The "Merciful," also 110. Total: *Rab* 31, *Allah* 12, "Merciful" 1.

Utilizing the significant evidence derived from the Koran, Wilson attempted to raise doubts upon a key tenet of source criticism, especially as applied to the Pentateuch. Namely, if the Koran—which is recognized for its unity of authorship—employed variations of the names for its deity (i.e., *Allah*, *Rab*, and the "Merciful"), why then could not the Pentateuch similarly be regarded as a unity while also using diverse divine appellations? Wilson averred,

The above tables show every kind of variation in the use of the designations of the Deity that is met with in the Pentateuch. In the case of the Koran the unity of authorship is undeniable. Why then should it be thought that "for such a variation in similar and consecutive chapters in the Pentateuch no plausible explanation can be assigned except diversity of authorship?" This is certainly an important question from the point of view of comparative literature, philology, psychology, and religion.<sup>118</sup>

#### 2.4.2.1.1 The Critical View of Exodus 6:3

In his essay, "Critical Note on Exodus 6:3,"<sup>119</sup> Wilson readdressed the critical view that before Exodus 6:3 the name of Jehovah had not yet been revealed to the Patriarchs but that God was only known to them as El Shaddai. Wilson desired to take up the issue once again in order to deal with specific exegetical elements found in Exodus 6:3 that clearly argued against the critical interpretation that El Shaddai should be interpreted as a proper name. Rather, Wilson affirmed that the divine name was being employed in a descriptive sense as a self-revelatory appellation.<sup>120</sup>

The salient points of Wilson's essay present the following exegetical arguments against the critical interpretation: 1) everywhere the Deity was said to have "appeared" in the documents J, E, D[euteronomy], H[oliness Code], and P—all instances occurs with the Niphal<sup>121</sup> of נִפְגַּשׁ "to see" which is the most common expression used to describe it; 2) the preposition בְּ which occurs before El Shaddai in Exod. 6:3 was called *Beth essentiae*<sup>122</sup> and is ordinarily translated by "as," "as being," or "in the character of"; 3) El occurs two hundred and twenty times in the Old Testament and it frequently takes an attributive adjective or a noun in construction—"Thus E represents El as jealous, D as great and terrible and merciful, JE as jealous, merciful, gracious and living; and J speaks

of a seeing God (*El Ro'i*) an eternal God (*El 'Olam*). . . . El was in use in all periods of Hebrew literature and . . . the limiting adjectives and genitives did not denote names of different gods, but were generally at least nothing but appellations of attributes or characteristics";<sup>123</sup> 4) due to the multiplicity of possible derivations, "the evidence clearly shows that the Hebrews who translated the Old Testament, or part of it, into Samaritan, Syriac, Greek, and Arabic, knew nothing of a god called Shaddai or of Shaddai as a name for God";<sup>124</sup> 5) the particle *Wau* usually meant "and," and comparatively seldom "but";<sup>125</sup> 6) if P did not think that the name "Jehovah" was never before heard before the time of Moses then it is "preposterous to suppose that the Redactor who put J and P together should have accepted P's opinion and then allowed the Jehovah of J to remain in Genesis as the ordinary name of God," otherwise, "the name meant the power, visible presence, honor, or repute, of the person named";<sup>126</sup> 7) the "knowing" in Exod. 6:3 is more than a mere knowledge of the word itself but as in Isaiah 19:21 ("And Jehovah shall be known to Egypt and Egypt shall know Jehovah in that day.") it indicates a self-revelation, "I was known," "I was made known," or "I allowed myself to be known"; and finally, 8) questions in Hebrew and other Semitic languages may be asked either with or without an interrogative particle, as is the case here.

On the basis of his exegetical investigation, Wilson concluded with the following proposed renderings for Exodus 6:3,

"And God spake unto Moses and said unto him; I am Jehovah and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob in the character of the God of Might (or mighty God) and in the character of my name Jehovah I did not make myself known unto them." Or, if the last part of the verse is to be regarded as a question, the rendering should be: "And in the character of my name Jehovah did I not make myself known unto them"? Either of these translations will bring this verse into entire harmony with the rest of the Pentateuch.<sup>127</sup>

#### **2.4.2.1.2 The Use of Repetition in Source Criticism**

In relation to the critical assumption that repetitions in the Hexateuch exposed seams of disparate sources, Wilson supposed that repetitions in the text were to be expected. For instance, he noted that the repetitions particularly in the Law of Moses were plausible due to Israel's forty year sojourn "from the arrival at Sinai to the final address of Moses at Shittim, [that] there was plenty of time for revision and adaptation of these laws to suit all probable variety of circumstances awaiting the people of God."<sup>128</sup> In fact, Wilson believed that the presence of repetitions did not argue against the unity of authorship, but for it. "That there should be repetition of the laws affecting the Sabbath, festivals, idolatry, and so forth, does not argue against unity of authorship."<sup>129</sup> Repetition was likely because "central facts of a new system are frequently emphasized by such repetition, as is manifest in almost every chapter of the Koran, and in almost every Epistle of the Apostle Paul."<sup>130</sup>

### 2.4.2.2 The Critical View of Redaction in the Hexateuch

In opposition to the critics, Wilson rejected the view that the alleged contradictions between the author(s) and redactor(s) revealed seams of source materials in the Hexateuch. Wilson denied that these proposed contradictions were actually present in the text. Wilson saw them as “errors of transmission” and explained that they were only “*apparent* contradictions” due to the updating of the language of the text when “the original was written in cuneiform and afterward transferred to an alphabetic system of writing.”<sup>131</sup> Wilson further conjectured that some of the supposed apparent contradictions were not discrepancies of historical facts, but actually “different persons and circumstances.” In Wilson’s mind, if these so-called contradictions were as real as the critics imagined, then,

we have a right to express our astonishment that such contradictions were not removed by one or another of those numerous and canny redactors, editors, and *diaskeuasts* (revisers), of unknown but blessed memory, whom the critics allege and assume to have laboured for centuries upon the elaboration of these laws. Surely, these alleged contradictions cannot have escaped their notice.<sup>132</sup>

As a consequence, Wilson also opposed the critical assumption that the redactors were mere tradition-keepers who left divergent traditions in the text. Rather, according to Wilson, the editors of the text who were responsible for its modernization would have removed them. Wilson, therefore, concluded that if real contradictions existed in the text, then it was “more likely that they were not in the ancient documents, and that they arose in the process of transmission through the vicissitudes of many centuries, that they should have been inserted in the time of Jeremiah, or of Ezra.”<sup>133</sup>

#### 2.4.2.2.1 Wilson’s View of the Inspired Redaction of the Pentateuch

Wilson’s notion of “inspired redactors” was admittedly just as historically unverifiable as the critical theory; but Wilson deemed that the best candidate in Israel’s history to have made these inspired revisions would have been “Ezra, that ready scribe in the Law of Moses.”<sup>134</sup> This is evident in Wilson’s assumption that Ezra was responsible for gathering the books of the Old Testament into a single canon in the 5th century B.C.:

Of course, a book could not have been canonical until it was written, but that raises a great many questions, because the view from the Jews and adopted by the Churches in general has always been till lately that the Canon of the Old Testament was gathered together by Ezra in the 5th century B.C., about the year 400 B.C. . . . We haven’t any direct evidence that Ezra sat down and approved of these books. Don’t go too far, but don’t let them [the critics] bluff you. A tradition of the Jews is what I have given you, and those books were certainly there at the time of Josephus and Philo.<sup>135</sup>

Furthermore, Wilson held that Ezra had collected and issued the Canon of the books of the Old Testament under divine inspiration: “We say the original

documents were inspired, the ones issued by Ezra, if you please. That was the inspired document, strictly speaking. Your English translation is not inspired, but all translations that are honestly made are good enough to save the world.”<sup>136</sup> This was not original to Wilson, however, but Archibald Alexander, Princeton Seminary’s first appointed professor, had also taught that Ezra gathered, corrected, and updated the Old Testament text under divine inspiration.<sup>137</sup> Marion A. Taylor notes,

More particularly, he [Alexander] argues in favor of the tradition that Ezra (in accordance with Jewish and Christian tradition) and to a lesser extent the men of the great synagogue (according to a Talmudic tradition) had the central role in the collecting, correcting and updating of the sacred books after the exile. Defending his reliance upon Jewish traditions about the completion of the canon, Alexander states: “Of this great synagogue and their critical labours some learned men are altogether incredulous, as it rests on no better authority than the Talmud. But certainly the thing itself is very probable as it shows the care which was exercised over the sacred books in collecting all that were inspired and rejecting all that were not, I see no good reason for discrediting this tradition.”<sup>138</sup>

Alexander, in this fashion, contended that the work of Ezra and/or the men of the synagogue were the inspired redactors/editors who ultimately carried the sacred responsibility for the linguistic modernization and editing of the Old Testament text. Taylor continues,

Of particular note is his [Alexander’s] understanding of the inspired work of the men of the synagogue whom he refers to as “the Society of Biblical Critics.” In his view, these men were inspired editors of the text at the time “before the lamp of inspiration was entirely extinguished.” Alexander cites four examples of authentically “inspired” late additions and corrections: (1) the account of the death of Moses in the last chapter of the Book of Deuteronomy; (2) additional notes which seem to be added to “almost all the sacred books intended to render plain what would otherwise have been obscure”; (3) the modernizing of obscure ancient names; and (4) books written after the death of Ezra before the age of *Simon the Just*.<sup>139</sup>

Similarly, Wilson noted that the revisions completed by Ezra in the inspired editing of the Hebrew Bible mostly pertained to the modernization of the language of the text, and, in all likelihood, included the updating of place-names.<sup>140</sup> To Wilson, these subsequent revisions and additions would not have posed a significant problem to the traditional view. Resembling W.H. Green, Wilson would have concurred that the trivial amount of later inspired editing would not have affected the authorship of the Pentateuch as being, in essence, the product of Moses. Green wrote,

It should further be observed, that even if it could be demonstrated that a certain paragraph or paragraphs were post-Mosaic, this would merely prove that such paragraph or paragraphs could not have belonged to the Pentateuch as

it came from the pen of Moses, not that the work as a whole did not proceed from him. It is far easier to assume that some slight additions may here and there have been made to the text, than to set aside the multiplied and invincible proofs that the Pentateuch was the production of Moses.<sup>141</sup>

Overall, the main distinctions between Wilson's ideas of redaction criticism and those of the critical school were both *qualitative* and *quantitative*. Qualitatively, the disparity between Wilson and the critics was based upon how each defined the *nature* of the redactional activity. On the one hand, Wilson supposed that all "post-Mosaica" were only minor additions to the biblical text for the purpose of modernization. The redactors, in his view, were never considered "authors." Thus, Moses alone remained its essential author throughout the updating process.<sup>142</sup> On the other hand, the critics deemed that the redactors did function as "authors." They collected and creatively pieced together various source documents in order to construct the history of Israel. Consequently, the narratives were often uneven due to the redactors' intent to preserve distinctive traditions that comprised each respective source.<sup>143</sup>

Quantitatively, the distinction between Wilson and the critics was more obvious. Wilson assumed, as did Green before him, that while the updating of language was admittedly a major endeavor, the goal was always to keep the fundamental Mosaic work intact and unchanged. Moreover, only essential redactional materials and revisions were included and none of the editorial work was considered to be superfluous. Wilson consequently affirmed that any textual additions made during the process of modernization were quantitatively few.<sup>144</sup> Conversely, the critics believed that the Hexateuch had been composed by a series of redactions that were, in the main, quantitatively extensive. According to the critics, the editorial activity was left in an uneven patchwork, which upon closer examination exhibited the seams of large blocks of independently-authored documents whose origins were entirely post-Mosaic. The final product, therefore, from the critical perspective, was the result of a wholesale compilation of sources that had been ultimately conflated into a unified work by a post-exilic redactor ( $R^{JEDP}$ ).

## 2.5 Wilson's Defense of the Book of Daniel

In Wilson's day, the majority of critical scholars opted for a late second century B.C. date for the book of Daniel rather than an early sixth-century B.C. date held by conservatives.<sup>145</sup> Yet, in 1927, J. A. Montgomery maintained, "While the majority of philological commentaries and standard articles upon the b[oo]k. now accept the late date for its origin, nevertheless this tendency may not arrogate to itself the whole of scholarship, as there still remain excellent modern scholars who vigorously defend the traditional position."<sup>146</sup> Montgomery, who did not himself advocate an early, sixth century B.C. date for Daniel, included in his list of "excellent modern scholars" the writings of Robert Dick Wilson.<sup>147</sup> This is noteworthy because Wilson's works on the book of Daniel were the only publications in which scholars outside of Protestant

evangelicalism interacted with him. Indeed, his work on Daniel kept him from virtual anonymity within the academy.<sup>148</sup>

Wilson's only major monograph on Daniel was entitled *Studies in the Book of Daniel: A Discussion of the Historical Questions*. In this volume, Wilson attempted to answer "objections made to the historical statements contained in the book of Daniel, and . . . [incidentally consider] chronological, geographical, and philosophical questions."<sup>149</sup> Wilson had scheduled the second volume "to discuss the objections made against the book [of Daniel] on the ground of philological assumptions based on the nature of the Hebrew and Aramaic in which it is written."<sup>150</sup> And in the third volume, Wilson planned to

discuss Daniel's relation to the canon of the Old Testament as determining the date of the book, and in connection with this the silence of Ecclesiasticus with reference to Daniel, the alleged absence of an observable influence of Daniel upon post-captivity literature, and the whole matter of apocalyptic literature, especially in its relation to predictive prophecy.<sup>151</sup>

However, according to Taylor, "The second volume was never written and the third was published first as a series of articles in the *Princeton Theological Review* and brought together in book form and published as *Studies in the Book of Daniel: Second Series* after his death."<sup>152</sup> Yet despite Wilson's unrealized plans for a three-volume series on Daniel, from the perspective of Princeton conservatism, Wilson was unquestionably still the greatest defender and proponent of the traditional position on the book of Daniel.<sup>153</sup> Throughout his career, Wilson tirelessly labored to make a rational case for the exilic, sixth century B.C. date of the book which is traditionally thought to have been written in Babylon by the historical prophet Daniel.

### **2.5.1 S.R. Driver's Critical Arguments for a Late Date of Daniel**

Wilson's primary antagonist on the issue of the date and authorship of the book of Daniel was S.R. Driver. Driver's analysis was highly influential due to the fact that his eleventh chapter on "Daniel" (pp. 488-515) from his *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* was the only adequate critical study of the book of Daniel in his day.<sup>154</sup> T.K. Cheyne declared, "[With the exception of Driver's *Introduction*] there existed in English no commentary on Daniel sufficiently critical to be referred to."<sup>155</sup> Moreover, Driver's commentary, *The Book of Daniel*,<sup>156</sup> was viewed by many conservatives as the primary work upon which the battle over the book of Daniel was to be fought and won:

The appearance of Professor Driver's *Book of Daniel* [in the "Cambridge Bible Series"] marks an epoch in the Daniel controversy. Hitherto there has been no work in existence which English exponents of the sceptical hypothesis would accept as a fair and adequate expression of their views. But now the oracle has spoken. The most trusted champion of the Higher Criticism in England has formulated the case against the Book of Daniel; and if that case can be refuted—if it can be shown that its apparent force depends on a skilful

presentation of doubtful evidence upon the one side, to the exclusion of overwhelmingly cogent evidence upon the other—the result ought to be an “end of controversy” on the whole question.<sup>157</sup>

Hence, Driver’s *Introduction* and his formidable commentary, *The Book of Daniel*, became Wilson’s primary objects of attack.<sup>158</sup>

### **2.5.1.1 Arguments from Internal Evidence Against the Traditional View**

In his *Introduction*, Driver emphatically claimed that the authorship of the book of Daniel could not be the work of Daniel himself. Driver asserted, “Internal evidence shows, with a cogency that cannot be resisted, that it must have been written not earlier than c. 300 B.C., and in Palestine; and it is at least *probable* that it was composed under the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, B.C. 168 or 167.”<sup>159</sup> More specifically, his late dating of Daniel was based upon the following salient reasons: 1) Daniel’s position in the Jewish Canon was found not among the Prophetic books but with the *Hagiographa* (i.e., the Writings); 2) Jesus, the son of Sirach (writing c. 200 B.C.) mentioned Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and (collectively) the Twelve Minor Prophets, but was silent regarding Daniel; 3) Daniel’s statement in 1:1f. that Nebuchadnezzar had besieged Jerusalem and carried away some of the sacred vessels in “the *third* year of Jehoiakim” is doubtful because not only is the Book of Kings silent, but Jeremiah in the following year (i.e., “the *fourth* year of Jehoiakim,” cf. Jer. 25) is unaware of the Chaldaean military campaign; 4) the term “Chaldaeans” in Daniel 1:4; 2:4 ff., are synonymous with the caste of wise men and (according to E. Schrader) the word was not used until after the end of the Babylonian empire indicating a post-exilic composition of Daniel; 5) Daniel claimed Belshazzar was the king of Babylon and that Nebuchadnezzar was his father, but Driver asserted that Nabonidus (Nabu-nahid) was the last Babylonian king and that he was not related to Nebuchadnezzar but had a son named Belsharuzur; 6) Darius, son of Ahasuerus (Heb. form Xerxes), a Mede, was supposed to have been “made king over the realm of the Chaldaeans” in Daniel 5:31; 6:1ff.; 9:1 and 11:1, but Driver insisted that Cyrus was the immediate successor of Nabu-nahid; 7) in Daniel 9:2 the text claimed that Daniel ‘understood by *the books* (בְּסֶפְרִים)’ the number of years that Jeremiah proclaimed Jerusalem would lie in ruins, but Driver doubted the existence of the *collection* of sacred books before 536 B.C.; and 8) the circumstantial improbabilities found in book, such as Daniel as part of the class of Chaldaean ‘wise men’ (Ch.1; 2:18), Nebuchadnezzar’s edict after 7 years of insanity, and the absolute terms in which Nebuchadnezzar and Darius recognize the supremacy of Daniel’s God (4:1-3, 34-37; 6:25-27).<sup>160</sup>

### **2.5.1.2 Linguistic Arguments Against the Traditional View**

Driver’s linguistic arguments included: 1) the number of Persian words in the book (especially in the Aramaic section) since Daniel would not have used Persian words before the conquest of Cyrus; 2) the three Aramaic words—

קִיחְרָם פָּסֶנְטְּרִין, פָּסֶנְטְּרִין, clearly have either a Greek background or origin which would date the text (or its sources) after the conquests of Alexander the Great; 3) the Aramaic of Daniel (which Driver believed was identical with that of Ezra) is a *Western Aramaic dialect*, of the type spoken in and around Palestine and not brought back from Babylon;<sup>161</sup> and 4) the Hebrew of Daniel, according to Driver, fell within the “intermediate stage”<sup>162</sup> of Hebrew development which exhibits a roughness of style both in its vocabulary (e.g., a mix of words of Aramaic origin, occasionally Persian, and some in the “New Hebrew” of the Mishnah [200 A.D.]) and syntax (e.g., the ease, grace and fluency of the earlier writers was absent).<sup>163</sup>

### **2.5.1.3 Driver’s Understanding of the Purpose and Form of Daniel**

However, according to Driver, the implications of a late dating of the book of Daniel did not necessarily call into question the historicity of the person of Daniel.<sup>164</sup> Rather, the anonymous author, writing during the second century B.C., most likely employed historical sources dealing with the Jewish exiles living in the Babylonian empire during the sixth century B.C. Driver noted, “These traditions are cast by the author into a literary form, with a special view to the circumstances of his own time.”<sup>165</sup> Hence, the author was not writing “predictive prophecy” *per se*, but a comprehensive interpretation of world history that is formulated to imitate earlier prophetic predictions. Driver believed the unidentified author was, in reality, answering the most crucial and pertinent question that the Jews had been struggling with during the second century B.C.: “*When* would the heathen domination cease?” Driver explained, “That the past (to a certain point) is represented by the future, is a consequence of the literary form adopted by the author for the purpose of securing the unity of his picture.”<sup>166</sup>

Driver further argued that Daniel’s lack of the predictive element(s) as in the earlier prophetic books did not rule out the fact of its revelatory status. The criterion for such a judgment regarding its divine origin must be “determined only by the evidence which it affords itself respecting the period at which it was written.”<sup>167</sup> Once again, Driver explicated that the *form* of the literature must be taken into account in order to critically discern its inspired status, which, as a necessary corollary, led to the text’s proper interpretation.

In interpreting the prophets, it is, moreover, always necessary to distinguish between the *substance* of a prophecy and the *form* under which it is presented; for the prophets constantly clothe the essential truth which they desire to express in imagery that is figurative and symbolical (e.g., Isa. 11:15f., 19:16ff., 23:17f., 66:23). And the element in the Book of Daniel which, upon the critical view of it, are predictive in appearance but not in reality, are just part of the *symbolic imagery* adopted by the writer for the purpose of developing one of the main objects which he had in view, viz., the theocratic significance of the history.<sup>168</sup>

## 2.5.2 Wilson's Refutation of Driver on the Book of Daniel

Wilson's response to Driver on the book of Daniel focused on three main areas: 1) the provenance of the Aramaic of Daniel, 2) the position of Daniel in the Hebrew canon, and 3) the historicity and interpretation of the details found in Daniel (e.g., the identity of Darius the Mede and the traditional interpretation of the four kingdoms of Daniel 2).

### 2.5.2.1 Wilson's Position Regarding the Aramaic of Daniel

In the edited volume *Biblical and Theological Studies* issued by the members of Princeton Theological Seminary in 1912, Wilson contributed an essay entitled, "The Aramaic of Daniel."<sup>169</sup> In it, he disputed S.R. Driver's conclusions regarding the Aramaic of the Book of Daniel in his *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (1910 edition). On pages 502-4, 508 of his *Introduction*, Driver claimed that: 1) the Aramaic of Daniel was Western; 2) the Aramaic of Daniel was identical to that found in the Book of Ezra; 3) the Aramaic of Daniel was closely related to the Aramaic of the Targums<sup>170</sup> of Onkelos<sup>171</sup> and Jonathan<sup>172</sup> and to the Aramaic of the Nabateans and Palmyrenes; and 4) the Aramaic of Daniel was not imported from Babylon but spoken in and around Palestine during a period after Alexander's conquest of Palestine.<sup>173</sup>

As was his custom methodologically, Wilson set out to re-examine the claims set forth by Driver and to proffer a careful analysis of the subject matter in dispute. Wilson noted, "Such an undertaking necessarily involved as complete an investigation as was possible of the documents which constitute the extant literature of these [Aramaic] dialects, in so far as they bear upon grammar and lexicography."<sup>174</sup> His analysis included the dialects of: 1) Northern Aramaic, including all inscriptions known outside of Egypt down to 400 B.C., 2) Egyptian-Aramaic, 3) Daniel, 4) Ezra, 5) the Nabatean inscriptions, 6) the Palmyrene, 7) the Targum of Onkelos, 8) the Syriac,<sup>175</sup> 9) the Mandean, and 10) the Samaritan.<sup>176</sup> The works Wilson consulted were the most recently discovered inscriptions of his day as well as the foremost authorities in the fields of Aramaic and ancient Near Eastern studies, these included: "the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum* and the works of De Vogué, Euting, Pognon, Sayce-Cowley, Sachau, Littman, Cooke, Lidzbarski, Brederek, Nöldeke, Petermann, Kautzsch, Strack, Marti, Brockelmann, Norberg, Levy and Dalman. The invaluable Sachau papyri<sup>177</sup> (Leipzig: Heinrichs, 1911) arrived in time to be made available in their bearing upon most of the points discussed."<sup>178</sup> As is readily manifest, unlike a few of his Princetonian predecessors, Wilson did not merely resort to doctrinal and theological arguments that had no real evidential basis.<sup>179</sup> Instead, as a competent biblical critic and skilled Semitic philologist, Wilson was able use the modern critical tools of the day and fight Driver blow for blow.

In response to Driver's first point, i.e., that the Aramaic of Daniel was Western, Wilson began by responding to Driver's allusion to the work of Theodor Nöldeke, the highest recognized authority on the Aramaic language at

the time. Nöldeke's distinction between Eastern and Western Aramaic depended upon two philological features: 1) the particular preformative<sup>180</sup> used in the third person masculine of the imperfect<sup>181</sup> was either *n*<sup>182</sup> or *l*<sup>183</sup> for the Eastern type and *y*<sup>184</sup> for the Western; and 2) "the Eastern ceased to attach the sense of the definite article to the ending *ā* of the status emphaticus."<sup>185</sup> Wilson was in complete accord with Nöldeke's assessment when it came to all the works that had been written after 200 A.D. However, Wilson asserted,

all the documentary evidence that we possess shows that in earlier times, down at least to 73 A.D., the Eastern Aramaic did not differ in these two respects from the Western. According to Nöldeke himself the evidence of the Babylonian Talmud does not go back beyond the period from the fourth to the sixth century A.D., and the Mandeans writings belong to a somewhat later period.<sup>186</sup>

Furthermore, Wilson noted that the most recently discovered and earliest Syriac inscription found on the tomb of Manu, near Serrin in Mesopotamia, also had all of its imperfects of the third person with preformative-*y*. Wilson concluded regarding the use of *y* in the East that,

it is certain that as late as the end of the 1st century A.D., the preformative that has hitherto been looked upon as at all times a characteristic of the Western Aramaic was also in use in the Eastern. . . . That is, if Manu, son of Darnahai, used it in 73 A.D., Daniel *may* at least have used it in 535 B.C., despite the fact that from the second century A.D. on, other forms are found to have been used universally and exclusively in all the East-Aramaic documents that have been discovered.<sup>187</sup>

Wilson added that all of the old Aramaic names that were published in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum* (hereafter CIS) also contained the third person masculine imperfect form of the verb with preformative-*y*. Examples provided by Wilson of the names that originated from the regions occupied by the Eastern Arameans included: *Yirpeel* from the eighth or seventh century B.C. (CIS<sub>77</sub>), *Neboyirban* (CIS<sub>39</sub>) from 674 B.C., and *Yibcharel* (CIS<sub>47</sub>) from the seventh century B.C.<sup>188</sup> Finally, Wilson stated that the Behistun Inscription<sup>189</sup> published in 1911 by Prof. Sachau of Berlin, showed that the third person masculine of the imperfects consistently used preformative-*y*.<sup>190</sup>

In terms of using the third person masculine of the imperfect with preformative-*n* to distinguish its geographical origin, Wilson asserted that *n* was "never employed by any of the oldest Arameans, East or West," and thus, "the assertion that the book of Daniel (whether it was written in the second or in the sixth century B.C., is not here the question) was written in a Western dialect and the consequent implication that it cannot have been written in Babylon, are both shown to be without any foundation in the facts as known."<sup>191</sup> Moreover, with respect to preformative-*l*, Wilson believed that the use of the prefix in the jussive form<sup>192</sup> of the imperfect in the Hadad Inscription from the 8th century B.C. confirmed the possibility of its use in the 6th century B.C. He also noted

that Preformative-*I* only occurred in later portions of the Babylonian Talmud and in the Mandeans which coincided with the evidence that Daniel was written in the East rather than in the West.

With respect to whether the *ā*-ending was used to denote the definite or emphatic state (e.g., as used in Western Aramaic,) or that the *ā*-ending had come to employ the emphatic in the same sense as the absolute<sup>193</sup> (e.g., as in Eastern Aramaic), Wilson presented evidence from *CIS* that showed that the Aramaic inscriptions stemming from the 8th through the 6th century had used the *ā*-ending to designate the emphatic state with the absolute sense.<sup>194</sup> Thus, Wilson declared, "There is therefore no evidence that in the 6th century B.C., either of these two features, which at a later time [would] make the distinction between the Eastern and Western Aramaic, was in existence; and hence it is wrong to say that the book of Daniel was written in Western Aramaic as distinguished from Eastern."<sup>195</sup>

Wilson was in complete agreement with Driver on his second point, i.e., the Aramaic of Daniel was identical to that found in Ezra. Wilson simply reasoned, "That is what we might have expected, if Daniel was written in the 6th and Ezra in the 5th century B.C."<sup>196</sup> Accordingly, if it was proven that Daniel was a late document, then, by necessity, Ezra was also to be dated late. In other words, one of the books could not be early and the other late: rather both books must have their provenance from the same temporal period.

Wilson devoted most of his energies, however, disputing Driver's third point (i.e., 29 out of a total 42 pages) concerning the relationship of the Aramaic of Daniel to the other known Aramaic dialects.<sup>197</sup> Driver had originally posited that the Aramaic of Daniel was more "nearly allied" to the Aramaic found among the late dialects of the 3rd and 2nd century B.C. which were located in the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan and in the Palmyrene and Nabatean inscriptions.<sup>198</sup> Wilson, on the other hand, argued that if the Aramaic of Daniel resembled the other Aramaic dialects from the 8th to the 5th century B.C., i.e., the Northern Syriac of the Sendshirli inscriptions,<sup>199</sup> Egyptian Aramaic, Mandeans, and Syriac, then "no conclusion as to the date of the Aramaic of Daniel could be drawn from its resemblances to these other Aramaic dialects."<sup>200</sup> Wilson continued, "If it can be shown that it more closely resembles the language of the ancient documents than it does of the later, there would be a strong presumption for an early date for the Aramaic of Daniel."<sup>201</sup>

Wilson proceeded by presenting a detailed, comparative analysis between the Aramaic of Daniel, representing the Eastern dialect, and those Aramaic dialects of the Western variety. After presenting Driver's inscriptional proof-texts taken from the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, as well as from the inscriptions of Palmyra and Nabataea, Wilson compared them to the Sendschirli inscriptions, the Egyptian Aramaic, the Mandeans, and Syriac. In one case, Wilson observed that Driver had taken the word, *מֶרְאָה* ("lord"), in order to show that in the Nabatean, as in the *Ketiv*<sup>202</sup> of Daniel 4:16, 21, that the word retained the final-*a*<sup>203</sup> and was, therefore, valid evidence that Daniel may have been late.

This was proposed in spite of the fact that the Aramaic of the Targums had all dropped the final-*a*. Wilson further noted,

The evidence with regard to the writing of מְרָא is as follows:

- a. In the Sendshirli<sup>204</sup> inscriptions [of Northern Syriac] we find it in the const. sing. מְרָא.
- b. In the Egypto-Aramaic, מְרָא in Sach.[au] . . . in the absolute; . . . in the construct.
- c. In Daniel, מְרָא in the construct.
- d. In Ezra, no form found.
- e. In Nabatean, מְרָא in the construct.
- f. In Palmyrene, מְרָא in the construct.
- g. In all the Targums, we have מְרִי in the construct but never מְרָא.
- h. In Syriac, Mandean, and Samaritan, the Aleph is always dropped.<sup>205</sup>

Hence, from the evidence, Wilson opposed Driver's view because, while a late writer may have used the word, מְרָא, as Daniel did (i.e., having retained the final-*a*), the universal use was generally against it, i.e., מְרִי. "The Nabateans and Palmyrenes in the central desert still employed it, but to the east, north and west of them it was dropped by all. Among the older writings, however, it was almost as universally employed, but one certain example of its omission being known."<sup>206</sup> Although the point was inconclusive for either an early or late date of Daniel, Wilson believed: 1) that the evidence generally comported with an exilic and early date of Daniel, and 2) that the evidence proved that Driver postulated his conclusions based upon insufficient philological evidence.

With regard to Driver's premise that the Aramaic of Daniel was that which was "spoken in or near Palestine," Wilson responded: 1) the Aramaic contained within the North Syrian inscriptions did not resemble Daniel because they contained "no Persian, no Babylonian, no Greek," 2) the Aramaic found among the writings of the Nabateans, who were also known to be an Arabic speaking people, did not resemble Daniel; 3) the language of the Palmyrenes was unlike Daniel; 4) the documents from the Syrians "only [date] to 73 A.D. and the next to 201 A.D. . . . as is well known, Syriac is not written in the dialect of Daniel"; 5) Driver's view that the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan originated from Palestine between the 4th and 6th century A.D. is unfounded because there have been no Aramaic inscriptions from Palestine found at anytime and the other Targums are later than those of Onkelos and Jonathan; 6) the Samaritan writings do not resemble the Aramaic of Daniel and "no one probably would contend that they reached their present form until long after the year 400 A.D."; and 7) the Aramaic of the Egyptians differs from Daniel in that it has no Hophal verbal pattern,<sup>207</sup> contains no Egyptian words, and the latest document from Egypt is from the year 400 B.C.<sup>208</sup> Hence, Wilson concluded that "any dialect resembling Daniel's was ever spoken by anybody *near* Palestine. Nor have we any evidence from *in* Palestine."<sup>209</sup>

Alternatively, Wilson proposed that "*Babylon is near Palestine*," in that the dialect of Daniel was most likely to have been spoken in Babylon and, thus, would best account for the peculiarities of the dialect. Wilson wrote, "This provenience and this alone would in our opinion suit the peculiarities of the dialect of the book of Daniel. This would account for the absence of Egyptian words. This would account for the Persian and Babylonian and Hebrew elements that mix in with the pure Aramaic to form this dialect."<sup>210</sup>

But what about the obvious Persian influenced words? Wilson hypothesized that since the Israelites had already been settled in the cities of the Medes for almost 200 years before the book of Daniel was written, and that these Israelites had been former residents of Assyria and Babylon where most, if not all, of the people spoke Aramaic—that these two facts accounted for the rich mix of Persian loan-words in Daniel. In the final analysis, Wilson held that the time of Daniel, during his captivity in Babylon scarcely before the Medo-Persian empire gained ascendancy, best accounted for the presence of foreign linguistic elements (i.e., Hebrew, Babylonian, Persian, and Greek) in the Aramaic dialect of Daniel.

No one can affirm with any evidence to support him that the words in Daniel called by us Persian might not rather be called Median. The difficulty arising from the way in which the author of Daniel writes a few of the sounds is more than offset by the fact that nowhere else than in Babylon at about the year 500 B.C. could such a composite Aramaic as that which we find therein have been written. Grammar and vocabulary alike can be best accounted for by supposing that the book was written by a Jew living in Babylon at about that time, that is, when Aramaic was the common language of the world of commerce and diplomacy and social intercourse, when Babylonian and Medo-Persian were contending for the universal dominion over the nations, and when Greek words were just beginning to appear in the Lingua Franca of international commerce.<sup>211</sup>

Wilson concluded that—although the evidence was inconclusive in regard to the orthographic evidence as in the case of every individual letter—the data overall (in terms of the evidence found in the forms, inflections, syntax and vocabulary) was in overwhelming support of an early date of the book of Daniel with an eastern provenience.<sup>212</sup>

#### **2.5.2.1.1 Driver's Response to Wilson**

Driver's defensive rebuttal of Wilson came in the ninth edition of his *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* published in 1913.<sup>213</sup> In it, Driver expressed much consternation at Wilson's alleged misrepresentations of his arguments and feared that "an uninformed or superficial reader" may have been convinced by Wilson's well-researched and persuasive "strictures."<sup>214</sup> Driver sharply protested,

Like many other [conservative] opponents of criticism, Wilson has not taken the pains to discover what the critic's position is; he has consequently found no

difficulty in refuting a position which I do *not* hold, but he has left wholly untouched the position which I *do* hold. Had I said that the Aramaic of Daniel "proves" it to be of the 2nd cent. B.C., his arguments against me would have been cogent: but I said nothing of the sort; I said only (p. 508) that it "permits" it to be of that date: and against this position his arguments are quite powerless. Again, if I had said that Aramaic, such as that of Daniel, appears *first* in the 2nd cent. B.C., I should equally have been open to his strictures: but I do not say this; I say (p. 503 f.) that many of the forms in which it differs from the Aramaic of the Targums, were actually in use in neighbouring countries *down to* [not "appear first in"] the 1st cent. B.C. I was quite aware of the various instances which he brings up against me of words found in Daniel occurring also in the earlier Aramaic of Zinjirli, Egypt, etc.: if these had *ceased* before the 2nd cent. B.C., an opponent would at once have replied that this was fatal to the date assigned by me to the book: what I had, if possible, to show, therefore, was that they *continue in use till* the 2nd cent. B.C.: for the works that I have cited, I have done this; and no evidence has been adduced to show that I have not done it.<sup>215</sup>

In his rejoinder to Wilson's criticisms, Driver appeared to distance himself from his own critical arguments regarding the inscriptional data on the Aramaic of Daniel. However, Driver claimed that he purposefully utilized broad expressions such as *permits* and *down to the 1st cent. B.C.* in order show the tenability of his own hypothesis and the probability that the Aramaic of Daniel was late. Driver further explicated,

Wilson does not always allow me the benefit which the Inscriptions give me. Thus he purports (p. 273) to give the "evidence" as to the writing of מֶרְאָה *lord* (not מֶרְאָה, as in the later Targums, etc.); but cites (p. 274) only four cases from Nabataean inscriptions and two from Palmyrene; in fact, it occurs some 24 times, 20 times in Nab . . . and four times in Palm. Both forms, מֶרְאָה and אִירְאָה, are thus attested copiously—in most cases by *dated* inscriptions—for the period beginning with A.D. 1, more than 160 years after the critical date of Daniel. But I do not quote either of these or any other words to "prove" Daniel to be of that date. I merely quote them to show that their occurrence in Daniel "permits" it to be of that date, or that it is compatible with that date. Nor do I even use the word (which in describing my position he repeatedly employs) "supports" that date, though I think that in one or two cases I might fairly have used it.<sup>216</sup>

Hence, Driver continued to maintain that the inscriptional information was more compatible with the critical dating of Daniel and that Wilson had been disproportionately reductionistic in his inclusion of all the relevant details. Similarly, Driver sharply objected to Wilson's misappropriation of his expressions, such as taking "nearly allied to" to mean "identical with," which speciously erected an illegitimate "straw man" to readily knock down.

Wilson finds great fault with me for having said (p. 503) that the Aramaic of Daniel is "nearly allied to" the Aramaic of the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, and to the Aramaic of Palmyra and Nabataea, of the 1st cent. B.C. to the 3rd cent. A.D.; and he repeatedly holds up the expression, in inverted

commas, for the wonder and reprobation of his readers. If I had said “identical with” instead of “nearly allied to,” I should naturally have laid myself open to his strictures: but the various instances which he cites of differences between the Aramaic of Daniel and the other Aramaic dialects referred to, appear to me to be reasonably included within the difference between “nearly allied to” and “identical with”. . . Wilson’s objections to “nearly allied to” are hypercritical and absurd.<sup>217</sup>

#### 2.5.2.1.2 H.H. Rowley Attacks Wilson

In 1929, H.H. Rowley completed a comprehensive response to Wilson entitled, *The Aramaic of the Old Testament: A Grammatical and Lexical Study of its Relations with Other Early Aramaic Dialects*.<sup>218</sup> At the outset of his work, Rowley explained the underlying motivation for the book:

In answer to these attacks [by Wilson] nothing of equal fullness has been published, so far as the present writer is aware. S.R. Driver himself added four pages to the ninth edition of his *Introduction*, in answer to R.D. Wilson, and while this rejoinder did not traverse anything like the whole of the ground covered in the Princeton Professor’s attack, it was abundantly sufficient to show that both his argument and the evidence he mustered needed most careful examination.<sup>219</sup>

In the main, Rowley agreed with Driver that the Aramaic of Daniel reflected a post-exilic, Maccabean date for the book.<sup>220</sup> Furthermore, Rowley insisted that Driver’s view represented the critical consensus within biblical scholarship, contra Wilson’s traditional view, which it deemed as untenable:

[J.A.] Montgomery, while pronouncing definitely against Wilson, is very cautious in his positive judgement, saying “the Aram. of Dan. is not earlier than within the fifth century, is more likely younger, certainly is not of the sixth century.” [W.] Baumgartner goes farther, and pronounces the Aramaic of Daniel to belong to the second or third century B.C., while [C.C.] Torrey makes this judgement equally of the Aramaic of Ezra, saying “All the Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra belongs to the dialect of the second and third centuries B.C.”<sup>221</sup>

Rowley’s principal attacks of Wilson’s arguments on the Aramaic of Daniel included: 1) the Aramaic of Daniel could not have had an Eastern provenience because “we have positive evidence that phonetic changes which were in progress in the West in the fifth century were only beginning in the East in the second century;”<sup>222</sup> 2) changes in orthography could not be explained away by “special pleading” or by assuming scribal alteration;<sup>223</sup> and 3) foreign loan-words such as “Greek terms are peculiarly difficult to account for on the theory that the book of Daniel was written in Babylon in the sixth century B.C., since two of them are not met with in Greek literature until a much later date,”<sup>224</sup> on the alternative view [the critical view] of the origin of the book both the general absence of Greek words and the presence of these particular Greek words are capable of a simple and natural explanation, and provide not embarrassment

whatever."<sup>225</sup> Thus, at the end of his extensive study, Rowley was able to conclude:

We have seen that in the Consonantal Mutations which mark the various groups of inscriptions and the Papyri, on which our evidence is not, as in the case of Vocabulary, fragmentary, but on the contrary full and sure, since they occur on every page and in almost every inscription, Biblical Aramaic differs decisively from the early groups, and agrees with Nabataean, Palmyrene, and the Targums—with the Aramaic of a later age, that is, and the Aramaic used in, or near, Palestine. . . . So far as Vocabulary is concerned, it is the loan-words which are the most interesting and significant, and here again we have found no reason to regard Biblical Aramaic as earlier than the Papyri, and several indications that it was later. And in particular we have found that the Greek words in Daniel mark the book as being almost certainly not of Babylonian origin in the sixth century B.C., but with peculiar likelihood of Palestinian origin and of the second century B.C. While many of the points, taken alone, could not be regarded as conclusive, their cumulative weight is conclusive, and in particular, the evidence of the consonantal changes alone is strong enough to sustain this judgement. Moreover, the fact that Wilson has no better way of escaping from the difficulties under which his theory labours than by suggesting that Daniel was a Spelling Reformer is the strongest possible testimony to the sureness of our conclusion. We may sum up the result of our inquiry, then, by saying that on linguistic grounds we are convinced that Biblical Aramaic is not Babylonian Aramaic, nor is Daniel contemporary with the events it purports to describe. We may safely say that it is not earlier than the fourth century B.C., and we may connect it with great probability with Palestine.<sup>226</sup>

However, contemporary biblical scholarship has concluded on the side of Wilson. John J. Collins notes that the Aramaic found in Daniel is similar to that found in Ezra and the Elephantine papyri which are all written in standard "Imperial Aramaic." This kind of Aramaic was known as the *lingua franca* of the Mesopotamian region and the official imperial language of the Persian Empire which was widely used between 500—200 BC. The attempt, therefore, to date the book of Daniel on purely linguistic grounds is futile. Collins has helpfully summarized the debate between Wilson and Rowley as well as noting the growing scholarly consensus against Rowley's argumentation:

Robert Dick Wilson was the first to study the Aramaic of Daniel in the light of the new evidence and concluded triumphantly that "we are abundantly justified in concluding that the dialect of Daniel . . . must have been used at or near Babylon at a time not long after the founding of the Persian empire." This position was refuted in detail by the extensive studies of Baumgartner and Rowley, both of whom held that the Aramaic of Daniel was demonstrably later than that of the papyri but earlier than the Nabatean and Palmyrene dialects, and that the evidence of the papyri essentially supported Driver's position. This debate was brought to its conclusion, however, by the influential essay of H.H. Schaeder in 1930. Following the lead of the Iranian scholar Josef Markwart, Schaeder affirmed the uniformity of *Das Reichsaramäische*, the official

administrative language of the western half of the Achaemenid Empire. The Elephantine papyri, Ezra, and Daniel are all instances of this standardized language, and attempts to date them precisely on linguistic grounds are futile. The designation of *Reichsaramäische*, or Imperial Aramaic, has been criticized. This kind of Aramaic was in use before it became the official imperial language in about 500 B.C.E. and continued in use down to approximately 200 B.C.E., and its use was not restricted to administrative business. Insofar as it bears on the dating of Biblical Aramaic, however, Schaefer's essay has been widely accepted, notably by Franz Rosenthal in his overview of Aramaic scholarship in 1939. Essentially the same conclusion is reached by K.A. Kitchen in his 1964 paper to the Tyndale Fellowship, which is constructed as a critique of Rowley, and by E.Y. Kutscher.<sup>227</sup>

Rowley's negative assessment of Wilson's traditional view was not due to Wilson's ignorance as a biblical scholar and expert linguist, but mainly, because of what he perceived to be Wilson's "Achilles' heel," i.e., his conservatism. Taylor elucidates, "Undoubtedly, Rowley took Wilson's prodigious learning seriously. Nevertheless, Rowley felt that Wilson's conservatism blocked his scholarship and this evidently lead him to lose respect for Wilson."<sup>228</sup> Wilson, who was never one to back down from a challenge, had studied Rowley's book during his last summer.<sup>229</sup> "But," as Taylor explains, "in spite of Wilson's promises [made to Oswald T. Allis] that his rejoinder to Rowley was almost ready for publication, neither his reply nor enough material to piece together his response was found after his death in 1930."<sup>230</sup> Allis surmised that either Wilson had been misunderstood (i.e., his reply had not yet been written) or that the manuscripts themselves were lost.<sup>231</sup>

## 2.6 Wilson's Position Regarding Daniel's Place in the Hebrew Canon

In his article, "The Book of Daniel and the Canon,"<sup>232</sup> Wilson argued against the critical view that the book of Daniel's position in the Hebrew Canon pointed "more or less decisively to an author later than Daniel himself."<sup>233</sup> This assumption was indicative of the works of S.R. Driver, A.A. Bevan, E.L. Curtis, A. Kamphausen, and J.D. Prince. Driver's quote from his *Literature of the Old Testament* was cited by Wilson in order to serve as a characteristic example,

the position of the Book [of Daniel] in the Jewish Canon, not among the Prophets, but in the miscellaneous collection of writings called the *Hagiographa* [lit. "Holy Writings"], and among the latest of these, in proximity to Esther. Though little definite is known respecting the formation of the Canon, the division known as the Prophets was doubtless formed prior to the *Hagiographa*; and had the Book of Daniel existed at that time, it is reasonable to suppose that it would have ranked as the work of a prophet, and have been included among the former.<sup>234</sup>

Wilson pointed out that there were eight fallacious assumptions driving the critical view including: 1) the position of the book in the Hebrew Canon determined the time of its writing, 2) the position of the book in the Hebrew Canon established the time of its admission, 3) the division of the Hebrew Bible

known as the "Prophets" was formed prior to the *Hagiographa*, 4) if the book of Daniel existed during the formation of the "Prophets," it is reasonable to suppose that it would have been placed within the prophetical corpus, 5) if prophets such as Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, and even Jonah were designated among the "Prophets" then the book of Daniel should have been also, 6) the book of Daniel never occupied a place among the prophetical books, 7) the corpus of prophetical books from which selections were read in the synagogues, was definitely closed before the *Hagiographa*, and 8) the greater portion of the *Hagiographa* were not used in the public services of the synagogue.<sup>235</sup> Wilson noted that these conjectures made by the critics were based upon limited knowledge respecting the formation of the Canon and that the critics themselves conceded this fact.

It will be observed that, while admitting that little is known, the critics indulge in such phrases and words as "doubtless," "reasonable to suppose," "not easy to reconcile," "inexplicable," "natural explanation," and so forth. All of these words and phrases are admission on the part of the critics that their theory with regard to the book of Daniel is not convincingly supported by the evidence, even themselves being witnesses.<sup>236</sup>

Wilson divided the textual data into two parts: 1) the various lists of divisions, numbers, and orders of the Old Testament books from the Apocrypha, the Rabbinic lists, Josephus, the New Testament, and the early Church Fathers; and 2) the conventional use of the *Haphtaroth*, i.e., selections from the prophetical books which were read on the Sabbath and feast days in the synagogues.<sup>237</sup> After having presented the vast array of evidence, Wilson elucidated their significance: 1) the order of the books in the Hebrew Canon corresponded to "the historical sequence of the events and of the supposed order of the codes of law contained in them" which is seen in the different systems of ordering given to the Pentateuch by Origen (mid. 3rd century A.D.—in their present order) and Melito, Bishop of Sardis (late 2nd century A.D.—who recorded "Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Leviticus, Deuteronomy"); 2) the great schools of Hebrew manuscripts, i.e., the Spanish, the German-French, and the Massoretic (including the Talmud); the *Editio Princeps* of Bomberg; the Peshitto Syriac version; the lists of Melito, Origen, and Jerome; the great Greek uncials, i.e., *Vaticanus*, *Sinaiticus*, *Alexandrinus*, and *Basiliano-Venetus*; the Greek and Latin Fathers and Synods—of the forty-three lists represented above—"no two present exactly the same order for the books comprising the Old Testament Canon;" and 3) only one witness puts the book of Daniel under another heading besides that of the Prophets—" [i.e.,] the Baba Bathra, a work not written till about A.D. 200, and deemed by the critics as so unreliable that they reject all that it says in the immediately succeeding context about the writers of the various books of the Old Testament."<sup>238</sup> Thus, Wilson surmised, "It is proper, therefore to conclude that the fact that the later Jews placed Daniel among the *Hagiographa* has nothing to do with the questions of its canonicity and date."<sup>239</sup>

Conversely, Wilson sought to constructively adduce the reasons for Daniel's current placement among the *Hagiographa* in the Hebrew Bible. For starters, Wilson acknowledged that there was an established consensus that acknowledged that the prophetic books had been canonized before 200 B.C. and also had been designated as the "Prophets." Wilson then asked, "Is there evidence to prove that the eight books named in Baba Bathra were then canonized, and called Prophets, and that afterwards no book, or part of a book, was ever added to, or taken away from, the eight that were thus canonized and named Prophets?" Wilson admitted that if this could be proven then he would have to concede that the book of Daniel could not have been among the Prophets. However, if, alternatively, it could be shown by external evidence, "that the division of the Old Testament Canon called the Prophets contained at an earlier time than that at which the Baba Bathra was written more books than the eight named in its list, it follows that Daniel may have been one of these books."<sup>240</sup> Thus, using a commonsensical argument based on probability, Wilson contended that the book of Daniel may have been removed from an earlier placement in the Prophets and that its present position in the *Hagiographa* did not necessitate that the book had not been in existence prior to 200 B.C.

Accordingly, Wilson presented five key witnesses which antedated the first writing of the Mishnah for a defense of his view: 1) Josephus wrote that there were twenty-two books in the Jewish Canon and he specified that the presence of five books of the Law and four "hymns to God and precepts for the conduct of human life" which were most likely the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs that would have left Joshua, Ruth-Judges, Samuel, Kings, Ezra-Nehemiah, Chronicles, Esther, Job, Isaiah, Jeremiah-Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the Twelve Minor Prophets as accounting for the thirteen others; 2) Luke in his Gospel, chapter 24 and verse 44, quoted Jesus as saying, "All things must be fulfilled, which are written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning Me," which would affirm Josephus' three-fold division thereby placing Daniel among the Prophets; 3) Philo Judaeus, who wrote around A.D. 40, said in describing the *Therapeutae*, "they receive the Law, and the Oracles uttered by the Prophets, and the hymns and other (writings) by which knowledge and piety are augmented and perfected," thus, confirming Josephus' order and placing Daniel among the Prophets; 4) the Prologue to the Greek translation of Jesus ben Sira, made by his grandson of the same name, was written in 132 B.C. and mentioned "the law, the prophets, and the other (books) which follow after them" appear once more to implicitly place Daniel among the prophetic books because "of the fact that never till the Talmudical period do we find Daniel placed anywhere else,"<sup>241</sup> and 5) Melito, the bishop of Sardis, at about A.D. 180, stated that he desired to accurately set forth the number and order of the books to which among the Prophets he included; Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Twelve, Daniel, Ezekiel, and Esdras. Wilson, therefore, summed up his argument,

All the direct evidence, then, that precedes the year 200 A.D., support the view that Daniel was in the earliest times among the Prophets. Further, this conclusion is supported by all the direct evidence outside the Talmud, which is later than A.D. 200. Thus, Origen, at A.D. 250, and Jerome, at A.D. 400, both of whom were taught by Jewish Rabbis and claim to have gained their information from Jewish sources, put Daniel among the Prophets and separate the strictly prophetical books from those which are properly called historical. And lastly, all the Greek uncials and the Greek and Latin fathers, unite in placing Daniel among the Prophets and in separating the Prophets from the Historical Books.<sup>242</sup>

Wilson, at the end of the article, concluded:<sup>243</sup> 1) the position of any book in the Hebrew Canon was not determined by the time at which it was written; 2) the position of a book in the list of the Mishnah, or the Hebrew manuscripts, versions, and editions, does not establish the time at which it was canonized; 3) all the earlier Hebrew sources, Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Armenian sources placed Daniel among the prophetical books; 4) the canonization of the book of Daniel was never disputed by ancient Jews or Christians; 5) there is no external evidence, direct or indirect, except the argument from the silence of Ecclesiasticus,<sup>244</sup> that Daniel was not composed until the time of the Maccabees; 6) the silence of Ecclesiasticus is offset by the silence of First and Second Maccabees, and all other sources regarding the origin of any book, or the existence of the author of any book, at the time of the Maccabees; 7) there is no direct evidence of a threefold division of the Hebrew canon prior to the prologue of Jesus ben Sira which was written in 132 B.C.; 8) the absence of any selection from Daniel in the *Haphtaroth*, i.e., the public readings of the synagogues, does not prove that the book of Daniel was not in existence, or acknowledged as canonical, when the readings were chosen;<sup>245</sup> 9) Daniel was always considered by Josephus and the New Testament writers to have been a prophet, and that his book was placed by the same authorities in the Prophets; 10) all the early Hebrew authorities which place Daniel among the prophetical books agree with the Mishnah regarding a threefold division of the Jewish canon; 11) the testimony that we currently possess does not prove that the second part of the canon, i.e., the Prophets, was closed before the third part, i.e., the *Hagiographa*, were all written; 12) the assumption that the division of the Hebrew canon designated the "Prophets" in the present Hebrew Bible was formed prior to the *Hagiographa*, is unfounded, because there is no evidence that this present division was extant before 200 A.D.; 13) although all witnesses agree with putting the Law first, Melito and Leontius alone changed the order of the books of the Law placing Numbers before Leviticus; 14) not one of the ancient witnesses put the five books of the *Megilloth* (i.e., Ruth, Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Esther) together, not even the Talmud; 15) in practically all the lists, the five poetical books (i.e., Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs) are placed together; 16) the only major difference between Philo, Luke, and Josephus, representing the earliest Hebrew arrangement, and the early Christian lists, arises from the fact that the former

placed the poetical books at the end of the Hebrew canon, while the latter placed them before the sixteen books of the prophetical corpus; 17) the books of the Old Testament canon were never authoritatively fixed in any specific order by either the Jews or Christians; 18) the order of the canon has nothing to do with the canonicity or even the date of a book; 19) the length, supposed authorship, subject-matter, convenience in worship, and the material upon which a book was written—were the potent factors in all the ancient arrangements of the books in the canon; 20) since modern Jews have changed the position of Ruth, Lamentation, and Esther in order to better suit their public service, there is every reason to believe that their so-called book of the Prophets was collected together into one for the same reason—and that the omission of the book of Daniel from this collection had nothing to do with either its age or canonicity, but simply from the fact that it was not utilized in these public services; 21) all the testimony that the Jewish and Christian sources give, regarding the time of the composition of the Old Testament books, is consistent in granting the claims of the books themselves as to their historicity, genuineness, and authority; 22) the major determining factor in the canonization of a book was its supposed age and author, and its agreement with the Law; 23) in accordance with the rules mentioned above, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Maccabees, and the other apocryphal books were excluded from the Old Testament Canon; and 24) those who reply upon documentary evidence (i.e., the Graf-Wellhausenian “documentary hypothesis”) cannot escape the conclusion that the indictment against the book of Daniel on the ground that it is not among the prophetical books is false, and in so far as the age and canonicity of the book of Daniel are assailed on the ground of its position in the canon, the old view stands approved.<sup>246</sup>

## 2.7 Wilson’s Position Regarding Daniel as Prophecy and History

Wilson, in his article “The Background of Daniel,”<sup>247</sup> claimed that there was sufficient evidence to prove the historicity and the early date of the book of Daniel. Wilson noted four key arguments: 1) the book of Daniel itself claimed it; 2) the book of Ezekiel in 14:14, 20 and 28:3 testified three times and confirmed that Daniel was a man of wisdom and righteousness; 3) the First Book of the Maccabees testified that the two most significant events in Daniel (i.e., the fiery furnace and the lion’s den) were known to the Jews because Mattathias had cited both stories in 169 B.C. and was delivered five years before the date at which the critics assigned the composition of the book of Daniel; and 4) Josephus testified that the book of Daniel was presented to Alexander the Great in 336 B.C.<sup>248</sup>

Conversely, Wilson rhetorically asked what kind of unequivocal proof did the critics have in order to justify a date of 164 B.C. for the composition of Daniel. Wilson declared, “Absolutely none. Not a single word, or intimation, or opinion, can be produced from any source before the third century A.D. in favor of the view that Daniel was written in Maccabean times.”<sup>249</sup> Instead, according to Wilson, “The New Testament in its references to Daniel the prophet and to the fiery furnace and the den of lions implies at least that Daniel is what it

appears to be, a record of historic facts enacted in the sixth century B.C. Josephus treats the book as reliable and the author as the Daniel of the book, and one of the greatest of the prophets.”<sup>250</sup> It was not until the time of the third century A.D. in the writings of Porphyry, “a heathen assailant of Christianity that we find the first expression of the *opinion* that the book may have been a fabrication, full of pseudo-predictions written *post eventum*.<sup>251</sup> Moreover, Wilson claimed that no Church Father or any scholars of the Jewish or Christian religion disputed the historicity of Daniel. This did not happen until after the Enlightenment during the 19th century A.D. when Bertholdt and Gesenius proposed that,

Daniel was neither authentic nor genuine, that its historical parts were a pure fabrication, and that its alleged predictions were written *post eventum*. These professors were both German rationalists of the most pronounced type. They based their opinion of Daniel upon the assumption that miracles and predictive prophecies are impossible, that the historical statements are largely false, and that the language, customs, and ideas are those of the age of Antiochus Epiphanes.<sup>252</sup>

This “anti-supernaturalism,” according to Wilson, was “the most insidious and treacherous attack” on Daniel. Wilson sharply contested,

It is insidious because it claims to be philosophical and scientific. It is treacherous in so far as it is made by professing Christians [e.g., Driver]. A philosopher who believes that God wound up the universe, like a clock, and then let it run its course without any interference [i.e., Deism], must refuse to accept the Book of Daniel as true. So, also, must one who thinks that nothing contrary to the ordinary course of human or natural events can be proved by testimony. A scientist . . . who thinks he knows that the laws of nature are binding on their Creator and that a modern chemist or psychologist or animal trainer can manipulate the elements, or the minds of men, or of lions, better than the Almighty, will not hesitate to reject Daniel because of the extraordinary events recorded there as having been wrought by God. But a Christian who necessarily accepts the principles of theism, and who consequently believes in God’s intervention in the affairs of men, and in predictive prophecy as well as miracle, cannot refuse to accept the Book of Daniel as historical and reliable, as authentic, genuine, and veracious, simply because of the *character* of its predictions.<sup>253</sup>

Hence, Wilson’s allegiance to the early date of Daniel was manifestly rooted in his underlying belief that the God of the Judeo-Christian religion had supernaturally predicted and foreordained the events written in the book (contra *post eventum*<sup>254</sup>), and that he, subsequently, intervened and acted in history to fulfill them.<sup>255</sup> Correspondingly, Wilson confronted the critics of their own deep-seated presuppositions which first emerged from the German Enlightenment (*Aufklärung*) and continued to propel their commitment of a “closed universe” which did not allow for miracles or predictive prophecy: “Denying the possibility and the fact of divine interventions in the affairs of this

world, the upholders of this view reject as unhistorical all records of miraculous events and of revelations from God to man.”<sup>256</sup> In the main, this is the fundamental reason in Wilson’s mind why the critics rejected the sixth century B.C. date for Daniel, and argued for a much later Maccabean one. Wilson, however, concluded that historically the book of Daniel had never been canonically disputed nor historically challenged until “predictive prophecy” was systematically denied by modern biblical critics on philosophical grounds.<sup>257</sup> Wilson emphasized that the early Jewish literature had never disputed the canonization of Daniel, e.g., *Yadayim* 4.5 stated that, “the Aramaic passages in Ezra and Daniel defile the hands,” i.e., they are canonical. Wilson, therefore, maintained,

No reference, or allusion is to be found either in the Talmud, or Josephus, or any other source, suggesting that any Rabbi, or Jew, of ancient times ever questioned the genuineness, authenticity, or canonicity, of the Hebrew portions of Daniel. . . . It remained for the heathen, Neo-Platonic philosopher Porphyry, at the end of the third century, A.D., to enunciate and elaborate this objection to the book of Daniel. It is a heathenish objection, resting simply on the philosophical assumption that there is no such thing as predictive prophecy.<sup>258</sup>

### 2.7.1 Wilson’s View of Darius the Mede as Gubaru/Gobryas

In his article, “The Prophecies of Daniel,”<sup>259</sup> Wilson addressed the controversial interpretation set forth by the critics that the fourth kingdom in Daniel’s vision was Greece and not the Roman Empire. Thus, the critics interpreted the conquering nations of Daniel’s vision as Babylon, Media, Persia, and Greece. The critics assumed that Daniel 2:31-34, 40-43; 7:9, 19-27; 8:9-14, 23-26; and 11:20-45 referred to events that had already taken place through Antiochus Epiphanes.<sup>260</sup> Critics, such as Prince and Bevan, further assumed that the second kingdom of Daniel was solely Median because of their construal that Daniel had allegedly interpreted Darius the Mede as the only ruler over the entire Babylonian empire before the accession of Cyrus, the Persian King.<sup>261</sup> Wilson, on the contrary, concluded that the historical evidence presented Darius the Mede as,

one of the hundreds of sub-kings who reigned over parts of the great empires of the Assyrians, Babylonians, Medes, and Persians, whose name has been rescued from oblivion because of his connection with the prophet Daniel. Who he was and what he was we may never definitely determine. Most probably, he was either the same as Gubaru to whom Cyrus entrusted the government of Babylon immediately after its capture, or a greater sub-king who ruled over Media as well as Assyria and Babylonia and Chaldea, or a subordinate of Gubaru who we know was governor of Gutium before he was given the government of Babylon. But, whoever he was and whatever the extent of his government, there is no intimation in Daniel, or elsewhere, that he ever ruled over an independent kingdom, or that he was ever king of the Medes, or that his kingdom intervened between that of Nabonidus and Cyrus.<sup>262</sup>

Wilson, therefore, held that Darius the Mede was either Gubaru or a sub-king who received the kingdom of Belshazzar (which included “Babylon, Accad, and Chaldea”).<sup>263</sup> To Wilson, Darius was never the sole king over Media but was given “kingship over that comparatively small part of the empire of Cyrus that had been ruled over by Belshazzar the Chaldean.”<sup>264</sup> This, accordingly, was confirmed in Daniel 8:20 where the text described the two horns of the ram as indicating a joint empire between the kings of Media and Persia.<sup>265</sup> Wilson concluded, “Having thus ruled out the supposititious Median empire, the four kingdoms of Daniel’s visions will be the Babylonian, the Persian, the Greek, and the Roman, as has been held by most of the ablest Christian interpreters from the earliest times to the present.”<sup>266</sup>

H.H. Rowley, however, accused Wilson of confusing the historical facts regarding Gobryas with the biblical statements regarding the kingship of Darius.<sup>267</sup> Rowley contested,

[Wilson] confuses the issue by implying that Gobryas was king, despite the admission already made that he was not—a confusion Wilson repeats when he explains the identification of Gobryas and Darius by the remark that many kings in ancient and modern times had two names. The fundamental difficulty is to equate a Gobryas who was certainly a governor, but not king, with a Darius who is certainly portrayed as a king, and not a mere governor. For if Darius were of lesser rank than king, how could he venture to issue a decree that for thirty days no one might ask any petition of god or man, save of himself? Whoever makes such a decree claims to be, not less than a king, but more.<sup>268</sup>

Accordingly, Rowley believed that Wilson’s explanation, ultimately, weakened the authority and historicity of the book of Daniel if Darius was, in fact, Gobryas. Rowley pointed to the first year of Gobryas’ governorship during Cambyses reign as king over Babylon, which, therefore, made Gobryas “the subordinate of a subordinate king.” Rowley continued,

See, then, to what narrow proportions the figure of Daniel himself shrinks. For instead of being the Prime Minister of an imperial monarch, as the simple reader would suppose, Wilson reduces him to the subordinate of the subordinate of a subordinate. Is the historical accuracy of the book of Daniel really saved by a theory that the author expressed himself in a way that could only give to his readers an utterly false idea of the events of his own time? If Daniel really lived in the sixth century B.C., and really knew that Cyrus was “king of lands,” and Cambyses sub-king of Babylon, and Gobryas his governor, and he himself Gobryas’ appointee and chief subordinate, and if he really wrote the words of Dn vi. 2-4 (E [nglish] V[ersion] vi. 1-3) to define his position, he could only be pronounced a hallow braggart, and instead of the historicity of the chapter being at issue, it would be the veracity of the author. The theory which endeavours to reconcile the book of Daniel with history by fathering on Daniel such disregard of the facts he is presumed to have known resolves itself into a serious attack on the character of Daniel.<sup>269</sup>

Although in 1959, John C. Whitcomb<sup>270</sup> attempted to revive Wilson's<sup>271</sup> (and Charles H.H. Wright's<sup>272</sup>) "Gubaru Theory," in 1965 Donald J. Wiseman effectively refuted Whitcomb by presenting Rowley's historically-based arguments against identifying Darius with Gubaru/Gobryas.<sup>273</sup> Wiseman concluded with Rowley, "the strongest point in favour of the identification of Darius the Mede with Gubaru is that he was a provincial governor with subordinate officials under him. There is no extra-biblical evidence to show that he was about sixty-two years of age, son of Xerxes, a Median, or called king of Babylonia as required by the book of Daniel."<sup>274</sup> However, unlike Rowley, who held that the Darius of Daniel was fictitious, Wiseman asserted that "even if the Gubaru theory is not accepted there is another [i.e., Wiseman's own 'Cyrus Theory'] which should at least keep the question of the historicity and identification of Darius the Mede in the book of Daniel open."<sup>275</sup> In his "Cyrus theory," Wiseman provocatively suggested that Daniel 6:28 could be translated, "Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius, even (namely, or i.e.) the reign of Cyrus the Persian."<sup>276</sup> In other words, Wiseman proposed that Cyrus the Persian king was taking the throne name of "Darius the Mede," thus, melding the two personages together.<sup>277</sup> In so doing, Wiseman sided with the traditional interpretation of the four world empires of Daniel contra Rowley:

If the interpretation of 6:28 given above is accepted it disposes of the view that the writer of Daniel was depending on a popular tradition and sought to distinguish a separate 'Median empire' on the basis of scattered biblical references. Here was no author granting the Medes a place to accord with biblical prophecy which led to the creation of fictitious 'Darius.' This new theory should lead to the re-examination of any interpretation of the four world empires which required a separate Median and Persian empire, since the writer could now be shown to maintain the view of a single Medo-Persian realm throughout.<sup>278</sup>

Wiseman, thereby, though disagreeing with Wilson's identification of Darius the Mede with Gubaru/Gobryas, was in complete accord with Wilson's defense of the traditional four-world empires including his view that Daniel was a non-fictional, historical person.<sup>279</sup>

## 2.8 Wilson's Contributions

Throughout his scholarly career at Princeton and Westminster, Robert Dick Wilson remained faithful to the Old Princeton defense of the Scriptures. As a biblical academic, his work furthered the already prestigious heritage of the Old Princetonians who had set forth the earlier defenses of the traditional views of the Old Testament in America. What was unique in Wilson's case was his vast comprehension and command of the Semitic languages combined with his meticulous knowledge of the various literatures and histories of the ancient Near East. Wilson, like his forebears, was well-educated in the historical-critical tools of German scholarship and he attempted to this knowledge in order to staunchly defend the historicity of the Bible as "the divinely-inspired Word of God." However, Wilson's methodology distinguished him from his predecessors in

that his primary objective was strictly "a scientific investigation of the facts." Wilson's defense of the traditional views of the Old Testament was strictly more philological and historical in approach than his predecessors, e.g., J.A. Alexander and W.H. Green. In other words, Wilson was not the prototypical Old Princetonian. Rather, Wilson's apologetic approach as a thoroughgoing historicist was to focus on the justification of the historical reliability of the biblical text in direct relation to the evidence found in the contemporary documents of the Hebrew Bible's ancient milieu. Wilson's primary goal in his use of the "laws of evidence" was to expose any unproven critical assumptions that were not based on solid, verifiable historical data, but on "hearsay."<sup>280</sup>

While it is true that Wilson's objective remained squarely on historical evidence, he too, was not exempt from "hearsay" and "special pleading" in the presence of lacunae in the historical data.<sup>281</sup> On these occasions, Wilson customarily pitted traditional views against critical ones and proceeded to argue in favor of the former, although, in the actual nature of the case, the historical evidence was lacking enough support to maintain either position. When Wilson resorted to such commonsensical tactics, it is apparent that his conjectures were based more upon probability and deductive reasoning rather than on the "facts" that had been the mainstay of his writings. Instead of attempting to explain away the difficulties, it would have been better for Wilson to allow the paucity of historical evidence to stand until further details were later revealed. Oftentimes, these attempts at "special pleading" were the result of his conservative presuppositions which emphasized the "harmonization"<sup>282</sup> of alleged contradictions (e.g., dates, regnal years, persons, places) in the text. To Wilson's credit, however, he did not attempt to harmonize all of the apparent contradictions in the Old Testament. For instance, Wilson believed that the numerical discrepancies of records found between parallel Old Testament texts could not legitimately be harmonized. He resigned himself to the fact that they had been the result of scribal error during the historical transmission of the text.<sup>283</sup>

Moreover, Wilson's restricted emphasis on scientific facts made his work theologically vacuous. His studies are devoid of any positive theological contributions that are characteristic of the publications of his Old Princetonian colleagues and predecessors. The central elements of a traditional Old Princeton, Reformed approach to the Old Testament are conspicuously missing, such as: 1) the Christ-centered emphasis in the interpretation of the Old Testament,<sup>284</sup> 2) the historiography of the Old Testament,<sup>285</sup> and 3) the nature and meaning of the divine covenants within the Old Testament.<sup>286</sup> In fact, as is clear from his last course at Westminster Seminary, "Introduction to the Old Testament," his lectures were based upon his publications which principally covered "textual criticism," "the canon of the Old Testament," "the historicity and early dating of the book of Daniel," and "the identity of Darius the Mede."<sup>287</sup>

Wilson's publications were often composed of extensive lists of philological information and references to ancient Near Eastern texts. His works were so technically dense and comprehensive in scope that they were often

intellectually out of reach for the average lay reader. Although his protracted presentations of the facts were necessary in order to establish his traditional views within the academic guild, Wilson often subordinated clarity and relevance for the sake of empirical completeness. In general, Wilson did not base his arguments upon lucid, exegetical interpretations of the biblical text, but on factual data primarily composed of comparative Semitic literature and philology. Wilson lacked the sophisticated kind of literary and theological understanding possessed by William Henry Green, who had remained sensitive to the theological shaping and literary coherence of biblical books—often defending his conclusions on the literary analysis of the book's inherent narrative structures.<sup>288</sup> Consequently, Wilson did not write a single commentary, publish any sermons, nor compose any devotional writings. Wilson's scholarship, therefore, understandably did not appeal to a wider audience outside of academic circles.<sup>289</sup>

Yet, with all the deficiencies that could be assessed against Wilson's career, he established himself as a proficient and technical Semitic specialist who combined sincere, religious faith with an abiding devotion toward outstanding biblical scholarship. His penchant for language acquisition as well as his extraordinary attention to detail made him a conservative voice to be reckoned with in his day. Yet, Wilson was regarded by many critics to have been “a very learned but highly idiosyncratic scholar whose alignment with conservatism seriously tainted his scholarship.”<sup>290</sup> In the present day, however, whenever his name is mentioned by contemporary scholarship, Wilson is generally appreciated for his erudition and ability as a Semitic philologist, grammarian, historian, and textual critic.<sup>291</sup>

With respect to Westminster Seminary, Wilson established a lofty academic standard that his Old Testament colleagues and successors sought to emulate and achieve. Wilson's abiding influence is reflected in the work of his collaborators, Dr. Oswald T. Allis and Dr. Allan A. MacRae, who became accomplished Old Testament scholars in their own right.<sup>292</sup> Both Allis<sup>293</sup> and MacRae<sup>294</sup> had been profoundly influenced and shaped by Wilson as their beloved teacher, esteemed colleague, and close friend. Indeed, the bulk of Wilson's teachings continued to be utilized by Allis and MacRae in their own work and, concomitantly, passed down to subsequent generations of Old Testament scholars at Westminster and beyond. This was most evidently displayed in their former student and subsequent colleague, Edward J. Young. No other Old Testament professor in Westminster's history carried forward Robert Dick Wilson's legacy as did Young.

## NOTES

1. Charles Hodge in an 1872 address at a special convocation held in his honor expressed: "I am not afraid to say that a new idea never originated in the [Princeton] Seminary. Their theological method was very simple. The Bible is the word of God. That is to be assumed or proved. If granted; then it follows, that what the Bible says, God says. That ends the matter." As cited in William K. Selden, *Princeton Theological Seminary: A Narrative History (1812-1992)* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 72. Additionally, Francis L. Patton, Princeton Seminary's first president, also remarked: "Now Princeton Seminary, it should be said, never contributed anything to these modifications of the Calvinistic system. She went on defending the traditions of Reformed Theology. You may say that she was not original: perhaps so, but then, neither was she provincial. She has no oddities of manner, no shibboleths, no pet phrases, no theological labels, no trademark. She simply taught the old Calvinistic Theology without modification: and she made obstinate resistance to the modifications proposed elsewhere, as being in their logical results subversive of the Reformed faith." Cited in Ned B. Stonehouse, *J. Gresham Machen: A Biographical Memoir*, third edition (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1987), 61-62.

2. *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia 1929-1930*, pp. 20-21. Allan A. MacRae, Instructor in Semitic Philology, taught, "Elements of Arabic" (p. 20), "Elements of Babylonian," and "Advanced Hebrew Reading" (21). Oswald T. Allis, Professor of Old Testament History and Exegesis, taught "Old Testament History," "Poetical Books," "Prophetic Books," and "The Religion of Israel" (21).

3. Biographical entries covering the life and work of Robert Dick Wilson are found in the following: Oswald Thompson Allis, "Robert Dick Wilson—Defender of God's Word," *Christianity Today* 1.7 (November 1930), 267; Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., "Robert Dick Wilson," in *Bible Interpreters of the 20th Century: A Selection of Evangelical Voices*, eds. W.A. Elwell and J.D. Weaver (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1999), 73-81; Marion Ann Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School (1812-1929)* (San Francisco, CA: Mellen Research University Press, 1992), 267-272; Robert Dick Wilson, *Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly? Clearly Attested Facts Showing That the Destructive Assured Results of Modern Scholarship Are Indefensible* (Philadelphia, PA: The Sunday School Times Company, 1922); Brian Nicks, "Life and Work of Robert Dick Wilson," *The Master's Seminary Journal* 19, No.1 (Spring 2008): 91-106; Edward J. Young, "Introduction: The Life and Ministry of Robert Dick Wilson," in *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament* (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1926, 1959), 17-22.

Portions of Wilson's significant contributions are discussed in historical studies regarding his place in the Old Princeton School. Other biographical information may be obtained through the various brief tributes and obituary notices that were written about Wilson posthumously. Wilson's biographical and primary materials are sparse in the respective archives at the Speer Library in Princeton Theological Seminary (Princeton, New Jersey) and at the Montgomery Library in Westminster Theological Seminary (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania). The majority of Dr. Wilson's works including a comprehensive bibliography may be obtained through the Presbyterian Church in America (Hereafter, PCA) Historical Center (St. Louis, Missouri) in the "Robert Dick Wilson Papers."

4. *Biographical Catalogue: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1815-1932* (Princeton, NJ: Trustees of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church, 1933), xxii.
5. Philip E. Howard, "Foreword," in Wilson, *Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?* 5-6.
6. *Ibid.*, 6.
7. *Ibid.*
8. Kaiser, "Robert Dick Wilson," 74.
9. *Ibid.*
10. Howard, "Foreword," 7.
11. Kaiser, "Robert Dick Wilson," 74.
12. Howard, "Foreword," 6.
13. *Ibid.*, 6-7.
14. *Ibid.*, 8-9. Kaiser also confirms, "He [Wilson] familiarized himself with twenty-six languages, including Assyrian and Babylonian cuneiform, Ethiopic, Phoenician, various Aramaic dialects, Egyptian, Coptic, Persian, Arabic, Syriac, and Hebrew." Kaiser, "Robert Dick Wilson," 75.
15. *Ibid.*, 7-8.
16. *Ibid.*, 8.
17. *Ibid.* Edward J. Young wrote, "This was the late Robert Dick Wilson, a man who was willing for the sake of Christ and His truth to live a comparatively obscure life in order that he might devote his time to the study and teaching of the Bible." Edward J. Young, *Psalm 139: A Devotional & Expository Study* (London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1965), 42.
18. *Ibid.*, 9.
19. Allis, "Defender of God's Word," 5; Kaiser, "Robert Dick Wilson," 75.
20. Robert Dick Wilson, *Elements of Syriac Grammar by an Inductive Method* (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1891); Robert Dick Wilson, *Introductory Syriac Method and Manual* (New York: C. Scribner's, 1891).
21. Robert Dick Wilson, *Notes on Hebrew Syntax* (Allegheny, PA.: n.p., 1892).
22. Allis, "Defender of God's Word," 5.
23. Marion Ann Taylor, "William Henry Green," in *Bible Interpreters of the 20th Century: A Selection of Evangelical Voices*, eds. W.A. Elwell and J.D. Weaver (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1999), 29.
24. Allis, "Defender of God's Word," 5.
25. Young, "Introduction: The Life and Ministry of Robert Dick Wilson," 18.
26. David B. Calhoun, *Princeton Seminary*, vol. 2 (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1996), 211. As quoted in the *Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 58 (1965): 50.
27. Allis, "Defender of God's Word," 4.
28. *Ibid.*
29. Throughout the twentieth century, the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and the early date of the book of Daniel continued to be regarded as vanguard issues among conservative Old Testament scholars. Conservative evangelical introductions on the Old Testament (e.g., Gleason Archer, *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction* [Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1964]; Roland K. Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1969]; Edward J. Young, *Introduction to the Old Testament* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1958]), monographs (e.g., Oswald T. Allis, *The Five Books of Moses* [Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1943]; Meredith G. Kline, *The Structure of Biblical Authority* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972]) and scholarly articles (printed in evangelical journals such as: *Bibliotheca Sacra*, *The Princeton*

*Theological Review*, *Bulletin/Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, and *Westminster Theological Journal*) frequently attacked the legitimacy of Pentateuchal source-criticism in order to defend the inspiration and inerrancy of the Old Testament.

However, critical scholarship had moved well beyond debating the validity of source-criticism—even before Wilson’s career began—due to the scholarly consensus established by the Graf-Wellhausen school. Rogerson writes, “As the [nineteenth] century drew to a close, the Wellhausen ‘school’ began to become the predominant critical ‘school.’ In so doing, it helped to promote the development of the tendencies that were to become dominant in Old Testament scholarship in the first decades of the twentieth century.” John Rogerson, *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century: England and Germany* (London: Fortress Press, 1985), 271. During Wilson’s day, critical scholarship had turned its attention to “form-criticism” (German *Gattungsgeschichte*) begun by Herman Gunkel (1862-1932). The pressing issue, as far as the critics were concerned, was the legitimacy of form criticism as a critical tool amid the Wellhausenian consensus. Clements writes, “In the prevailing dominance of Wellhausen’s views in Old Testament circles, it was only slowly that the real genius that was present in Gunkel’s studies came to be realized, and many of his insights only received their full and rightful recognition very late in his career. Only in his last years as a teacher was his true greatness honoured in Germany, when increasingly the wide relevance of suggestions and analyses which he had originally published long before came to be realized.” Ronald E. Clements, *One Hundred Years of Old Testament Interpretation* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976), 14.

30. Kaiser, “Robert Dick Wilson,” 75. Kaiser’s reference to the “key critical issues of the day” is in reference to Wilson’s defense of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and of the traditional dating of the book of Daniel. This is a clear example of the abiding significance that these “key critical issues” continue to have among conservative evangelical scholars to the present day. For his own recent defense of Mosaic authorship, see Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., *The Old Testament Documents: Are They Reliable & Relevant?* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2001), 15-25.

31. Wilson’s defensive posture centered upon objective facts and linguistic evidence, whereas W.H. Green’s approach was based more on contextual studies that dealt with literary and theological analyses. Taylor writes, “This [evidential, objective] method suited Wilson well because his strengths as a scholar lay in the arena of philology and grammar rather than in the areas of theology and literary studies. However, his fascination with facts also meant that Wilson passed over Green’s genuine insights regarding the intentional literary and theological shaping present in the OT texts.” See Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School*, 269. For an example of Green’s structural and literary analysis in favor of Mosaic authorship, see William Henry Green, *The Unity of the Book of Genesis* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1895).

32. By the beginning of the twentieth century, the dispute over the legitimacy of source-criticism had been largely played out before the American public in the published debates between William H. Green and Charles A. Briggs. The rapid acceptance of source-criticism as a valid discipline along the lines of Julius Wellhausen’s documentary hypothesis by American biblical scholars served to marginalize conservatives and their traditional views of the Old Testament to the periphery of the academy and, in turn, caused the major publishing companies to become disinterested in their views. Childs comments,

In the heated debate over historical criticism of the Old Testament which was waged both in Britain and America between the years 1875 and 1890, Wellhausen's book was given little attention at first. That is to say, the primary issue in the English-speaking world turned on the legitimacy of the critical method in itself rather than on Wellhausen's thesis respecting the Pentateuch. Thus the controversy differed sharply from that within Germany where the right of critical studies had already been firmly established. The evidence for this description can be clearly seen in the major American debate which was carried out between 1881 and 1882 in the *Presbyterian Review* and involved a cross section of the leading biblical scholars. W.H. Green represented the traditional conservative position, S.I. Curtiss and H.P. Smith a mediating position, and C.A. Briggs a liberal, critical stance. . . . The period between 1891 and 1925 marked an increased acceptance of Wellhausen's work. A younger generation of English-speaking scholars, such as B.W. Bacon, T.H. Robinson, J.A. Bewer, and R.H. Pfeiffer championed his position, usually in a slightly modified form (cf. J.B. Harford). The majority of popular textbooks of this period, such as those of C.F. Kent, represented some form of Wellhausen's position. (Brevard S. Childs, "Wellhausen in English," *Semeia* 25 [1982]: 84-85.)

33. Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School*, 358, n. 68. Noll writes, "Davis, Wilson, Allis, and a few other Old Testament Colleagues did not lack for learning, but their learning was not having much of an impact on American academic life of the time. Wilson published his *Scientific Investigation* and other scholarly works with the Sunday School Times Company in Philadelphia; similar in-house publishers brought out most of the books of these scholars." Mark A. Noll, *Between Faith and Criticism: Evangelicals, Scholarship, and the Bible in America*, second edition (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1991), 53.

34. Ibid.

35. See Chapter One of this study for an overview of the controversial reorganization of Princeton Seminary which took place within the tumultuous context of the modernist-fundamentalist controversy.

36. On Vos's decision to stay at Princeton, Stonehouse wrote: "Dr. [Caspar Wistar] Hodge, however, though never wavering in his outspoken commitment to the position which he had espoused, decided, like [Geerhardus] Vos and [William Park] Armstrong, to remain at Princeton. These decisions are not fully explicable, though Machen had grieved for months over their apparent inevitability and had sympathized with the men in the peculiar predicament in which they were placed. It is also clear that these decisions were not made with enthusiasm; rather it appears that the spirit manifested was one of sorrowful resignation. The wife of one of those concerned once told me, following the establishment of Westminster, that it was very difficult to work for one institution and pray for another." Stonehouse, *J. Gresham Machen*, 449-450. James T. Dennison, Jr. conjectures that although Vos admired Machen and the men who departed Princeton to form Westminster Theological Seminary, Vos could no longer stomach controversy. See J.T. Dennison, Jr., "Introduction," in *The Letters of Geerhardus Vos*, ed. J.T. Dennison, Jr. (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2005), 70-73.

37. Allis, "Defender of God's Word," 6.

38. Ibid.

39. Robert Dick Wilson, "The Study and Defense of the Bible in Westminster Seminary," *Christianity Today [original series]* 1, no. 2 (June 1930): 5.
40. Allis, "Defender of God's Word," 6.
41. *The Power of a Noble Example: Robert Dick Wilson, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D. (1856-1930)* (Philadelphia: Westminster Theological Seminary Memorial Bulletin, December 1930), 1. Although the author of the memorial is omitted, it bears much resemblance to O.T. Allis' tribute to R.D. Wilson entitled, "Robert Dick Wilson—Defender of God's Word" in *Christianity Today* (Nov., 1930).
42. Allis, "Defender of God's Word," 4.
43. Ibid.
44. "The Rev. Robert Dick Wilson, D.D. LL.D.," *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 24, no. 3: 26.
45. *The Power of a Noble Example*, 2. Perhaps Wilson's former student and junior assistant in Old Testament, Allan A. MacRae summed up best what Wilson meant to the Seminary: "It is a blow to the Seminary and a great loss to me in particular. I had looked forward to working with him a great deal this year. But when I think of the great amount that Dr. Wilson accomplished in his life and of the tremendous help he gave the Seminary by his testimony and personal assistance during its first year, I feel we should rather rejoice in his great usefulness." "Allan A. MacRae's Letter Regarding Dr. Wilson's Death," October 14, 1930, Robert Dick Wilson Papers, PCA Historical Center, St. Louis.
46. Wilson, *Elements of Syriac Grammar by an Inductive Method*; Wilson, *Introductory Syriac Method and Manual*.
47. Robert Dick Wilson, *A Hebrew Grammar for Beginners* (Leipzig: W. Drugulin, 1908).
48. For a select bibliography of Wilson's works, i.e., monographs and journal articles, see the bibliography. A complete bibliography of Wilson's materials including book reviews, short studies, and magazine articles may be obtained through the PCA Historical Center as part of the "Robert Dick Wilson Papers" entitled, "Bibliography of the Writings of Robert Dick Wilson [1856-1930]."
49. Most of Wilson's articles on the book of Daniel first saw the light of publication in *The Princeton Theological Review*. These were subsequently reprinted in vol. 2 of his *Studies in the Book of Daniel*.
50. Robert Dick Wilson, *The Lower Criticism of the Old Testament as a Preparation for the Higher Criticism* (Princeton, NJ: C.S. Robinson, 1901). On the origin of the terms "higher criticism" and "lower criticism," Ira V. Brown explicated, "The term 'higher criticism' was an unfortunate one. It originated in the late eighteenth century, as a result of the distinction between efforts to establish the original text of Scripture, free from mistranslations (textual or 'lower' criticism), and analysis of the origin of the various books of the Bible, their historical background, sources, authorship, literary characteristics, and reliability . . . Eichorn (*sic*) led the way with a critical introduction to the Old Testament (1783) and contributed the name 'higher criticism.'" Ira V. Brown, "The Higher Criticism Comes to America, 1880-1900," *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society* 38, no. 4 (December 1960): 193-195 *passim*.
51. Wilson's inaugural address and his final article submitted to *The Princeton Theological Review* at the end of his career were on the topic of lower or textual criticism. Wilson's defensive posture against the critical view of the Old Testament was fought based upon his findings related to textual criticism. It is fitting that the subject book-ended his career at Princeton Theological Seminary. See Robert Dick Wilson, "The

Textual Criticism of the Old Testament Text," *The Princeton Theological Review* 27 (1929): 36-59.

52. Wilson annually gave his famous "Cui Bono?" (i.e., "What's the Use [of Hebrew?]") lecture to his new students on the importance of acquiring biblical Hebrew. According to Allis, "it became an institution; upperclassmen who had heard the lecture once or twice already would come to hear Dr. Wilson enlarge upon a theme so dear to his heart." Allis, "Defender of God's Word," 4.

53. Wilson, *The Lower Criticism of the Old Testament*, 3.

54. Ibid., 3-4.

55. Ibid., 4.

56. *Plan of the Theological Seminary*, Article IV, Section 1: "Of Study and Attainments," 14.

57. It is important to note that conservative evangelicals even before the peak of the "fundamentalist-modernist controversy," generally acknowledged the validity of "higher criticism." For example, W.H. Griffith Thomas wrote, "We do not question for an instant the right of Biblical criticism considered in itself. On the contrary, it is a necessity for all who use the Bible to be 'critics' in the sense of constantly using their 'judgment' on what is before them. What is called 'higher' criticism is not only a legitimate but a necessary method for all Christians, for by its use we are able to discover the facts and the form of the Old Testament Scriptures. Our hesitation, consequently, is not intended to apply to the method, but to what is believed to be an illegitimate, unscientific, and unhistorical use of it. In fact, we base our objections to much modern criticism of the Old Testament on what we regard as a proper use of a true higher criticism." W.H. Griffith Thomas, "Old Testament Criticism and New Testament Christianity," in *The Fundamentals*, eds. R.A. Torrey, A.C. Dixon, et al. (Los Angeles, CA: Bible Institute of Los Angeles, 1917), 1: 128. As cited by Timothy P. Weber, "The Two-Edged Sword: The Fundamentalist Use of the Bible," in *The Bible in America*, eds. Nathan O. Hatch and Mark A. Noll (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 109.

58. This is evident by Wilson's last recorded lectures on the Old Testament at Westminster Seminary during the 1930 Spring Semester; the entire course centered on the Lower Criticism of the Old Testament and presupposed a thorough knowledge of biblical Hebrew. As a faithful tradent of Old Princeton, Wilson's junior-level course on the Old Testament followed William Henry Green's two-part division delineated in his *Introduction to the Old Testament: Canon and Text* (*General Introduction to the Old Testament: The Canon* [New York: Scribner, 1898]; idem, *General Introduction to the Old Testament: The Text* [New York: Scribner, 1899]). Although no general outline accompanied Wilson's lecture notes, the following outline has been discerned:

*Lecture 3: Textual Criticism: English Bible Versions and their Relation to the Biblical Manuscripts (MSS) and Parallel Versions*

*Lecture 4: Textual Criticism: The Accuracy of the Copies*

*Lecture 5: Textual Criticism: The Trustworthiness of the Old Testament Translations*

*Lecture 6: Textual Criticism: The Text of the Old Testament and the Dangers of Emendations*

*Lecture 7: Textual Criticism: Jerome's Textus Receptus and its Relation to the Autographa*

- Lecture 8: Textual Criticism:* The Kind of Variations Found in the MSS and the Versions
- Lecture 9: Textual Criticism:* Differences of Spelling Between the Hebrew MSS and the Greek Versions Are Due to Transmisional Mistakes (Scribal Mistakes of Sight [i.e., Copying] and Sound [i.e., Translation])
- Lecture 10: Textual Criticism:* The Trustworthiness of the Old Testament Text Based Upon Internal and External Evidence (e.g., proper names in their ANE context)
- Lecture 11: Textual Criticism:* The Four Great Sources of Objective Evidence to the Old Testament Text (1. The Manuscripts [MSS], 2. Massoretic Notes, 3. The Versions [Latin version, Aramaic and Syriac Targums, Samaritan Version, Greek Versions {including LXX}], 4. The Duplicated Passages Found in the Old Testament Itself); Discerning Scribal Errors in Transmission
- Lecture 12: Textual Criticism:* (Continuation of) Discerning Scribal Errors in Transmission
- Lecture 13: Textual Criticism:* Scribal Errors and the Trustworthiness of the Old Testament
- Lecture 14: The Canon of the Old Testament:* Canonical Authority Due to Divine Revelation and Inspiration
- Lecture 15: The Canon of the Old Testament:* The Divine Rule of Faith; Formation of the Canon
- Lecture 16: The Canon of the Old Testament:* The Canonical Dating of the Book of Daniel
- Lecture 17: The Canon of the Old Testament:* The Critical View and Dating of the Book of Daniel
- Lecture 18: The Canon of the Old Testament:* Objections to the Traditional View of Authorship Regarding the Book of Daniel
- Lecture 19: The Canon of the Old Testament:* The Defense of the Traditional Fifth Century B.C. Date and Its Relation to the Aramaic of the Book of Daniel; Responses to S.R. Driver and the Critical Second Century B.C. Date
- Lecture 20: The Canon of the Old Testament:* The Identity of Darius the Mede in the Book of Daniel
- Lecture 21: The Canon of the Old Testament:* (Continuation of) The Identity of Darius the Mede; Historical Veracity of the Old Testament Established by Archaeological Evidence
- Lecture 22: The Canon of the Old Testament:* (Conclusion of) The Identity of Darius the Mede and Its Relation to the Historicity of the Book of Daniel

Wilson, "Lecture Notes: Introduction to the Old Testament." Lectures 3-22, Westminster Theological Seminary, Spring Semester 1930, (Robert Dick Wilson Papers, PCA Historical Center, St. Louis, MO).

59. Edward J. Young said of Wilson, "His writings reveal the fact that he was a master of the Hebrew and Aramaic languages in which the Old Testament was written. But in addition to these he was familiar with most of the languages and dialects of the ancient Biblical lands. In his writings may be found frequent references to Arabic, Assyrian, Syriac, Ethiopic, and others. Coupled to this linguistic knowledge were the

patience and ability to do thorough research. One cannot but marvel at the encyclopedic knowledge which is displayed on the pages of Dr. Wilson's works." See Young's review of *Studies in the Book of Daniel*, Second Series, by Robert Dick Wilson, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, 1938 in *The Presbyterian Guardian* (July 1939): 130.

60. Samuel R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, ninth edition (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1913).

61. Allis, "Defender of God's Word," 5. Wilson gave the reason as to why, in most cases, he singled out S.R. Driver in his "Introduction to the Old Testament" lectures. "You will often hear me refer to Driver. Why? Because he wrote the best work written by any man of the Wellhausen or critical school. His work puts together in the best literary form the whole plan of attack upon the Old Testament, and if you have knocked Driver you have knocked them all. He represents the system of military tactics of the higher critics. Secondly, he is acknowledged as their leader, all over Great Britain and Ireland, Canada and the United States, and New Zealand, and, I am sorry to say, all over the mission field. . . . Some people are unkind enough to say I killed Dr. Driver. I did it to convert him, not kill him." Lecture 19, pp. 1-3 *passim*, in Wilson, "Lecture Notes: Introduction to the Old Testament." Wilson also wrote, "One of the men who wrote the last one [i.e., an encyclopedia article] was Dr. Driver. I would not believe any article of his at all just because he wrote it. You had better look to see who signed an article, and if you find it is by Dr. Driver, you can accept it if you want to, but he is no authority for me." Robert Dick Wilson, "Age of the Bible Told by Foreign Words It Contains," *Moody Bible Institute Monthly*, December 1922, 149.

As a moderate British evangelical scholar, S.R. Driver attempted to balance Christian faith and biblical criticism. Although Driver believed that the books of the Old Testament including the Pentateuch, Isaiah, and Daniel reflected composite authorship and late dates for their composition, he held that the New Testament text did not possess the same expansive, variegated transmission history as that of the Old Testament text. Thus, his views on the New Testament and the Person and work of Jesus Christ remained essentially orthodox with that of evangelical Protestantism. Driver defended his critical work in relation to the doctrine of inspiration by stating, "Criticism in the hands of Christian scholars does not banish or destroy the inspiration of the Old Testament; it *presupposes* it; it seeks only to determine the conditions under which it operates, and the literary forms through which it manifests itself; and it thus helps us to frame truer conceptions of the methods which it has pleased God to employ in revealing Himself to His ancient people of Israel, and in preparing the way for the fuller manifestation of Himself in Christ Jesus." See Samuel R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1862; reprint, New York: Meridian, 1956), xiii. The term "moderate" used to describe Driver's position on the theological pendulum is apt, since it is apparent that Driver was neither a radical critic nor a conservative traditionalist. According to T.K. Cheyne, Driver's *Introduction* was a "very 'moderate' textbook," and that Driver himself had "one moral and intellectual quality which might be expected to predispose such persons specially in his favour—the quality of caution. The words 'moderation' and 'sobriety' have a charm for him; to be called an extreme critic, or a wild theorist, would cause him annoyance." T.K. Cheyne, *Founders of Old Testament Criticism* (London: Methuen, 1893; reprint, Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003), 255.

It is difficult to ascertain how the Old Princetonians viewed moderates such as Driver. While Wilson felt the need to try and “convert” Driver, John D. Davis, Wilson’s fellow OI colleague at Princeton Seminary, appeared to give a more sympathetic evaluation concerning Driver’s faith and career. “And among Dr. Driver’s favorite hymns were ‘Jesus, Lover of My Soul’ and ‘Just as I am, without one plea, But that Thy blood was shed for me’ . . . Dr. Sanday his colleague and intimate friend, gives a beautiful picture of his home life: ‘Absolutely simple, absolutely sincere, absolutely without guile, single-minded, the Bible and the Home were two centres of his being, and in both he had the fullest satisfaction . . . It was such a career as a scholar would wish for himself, such a career as those who loved him may rejoice to look back upon, now crowned and made perfect in death.’” John D. Davis, “Biographical Note: Samuel Rolles Driver,” *The Princeton Theological Review* 12 (1914): 486. For a recent biography of S.R. Driver, see Marion Ann Taylor, “Samuel Rolles Driver,” in *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters*, ed. Donald K. McKim (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998), 302-309. On the differences between British evangelical scholarship and Old Princeton, see Noll, *Between Faith and Criticism*, 72-90.

62. Although the majority of Wilson’s journal articles, monographs, and magazine essays contain linguistic analyses, the following are a few of his lesser known philological studies: Robert Dick Wilson, “Evidence in Hebrew Diction for the Dates of Documents,” *The Princeton Theological Review* 25 (1927): 353-388; idem, “Foreign Words in the Old Testament as an Evidence of Historicity,” *The Princeton Theological Review* 26 (1928): 177-246; idem, “On the Hebrew of Daniel,” *The Princeton Theological Review* 25 (1927): 177-199.

63. According to E.J. Young, Wilson did not have access to Ugaritic and Akkadian due to their respective discoveries late in his career: “It has been said that Wilson was at home in some forty-five languages and dialects, even including Armenian. Today that list would increase, for the languages of Ugarit, as well as the Akkadian of Nuzi and Mari must now be taken into account.” Young, “Introduction: The Life and Ministry of Robert Dick Wilson,” viii. The ancient city of Ugarit and its cuneiform writing system was discovered in 1928. The city has been under annual excavation since 1929. See Simon B. Parker, “Introduction,” in *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, ed. Simon B. Parker (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997), 1. While it is true that the excavations of the Akkadian archives of Nuzi and the letters of Mari postdated Wilson’s career (the archives of Nuzi were excavated between 1920-30 by R.F.S. Starr and the letters of Mari were excavated from 1933 by André Parrot and later Jean Margueron; see Victor H. Matthews and Don C. Benjamin, *Old Testament Parallels: Laws and Stories from the Ancient Near East*, second edition [New York: Paulist Press, 1997], 46, 318), however, it is doubtful that Wilson was unaware of the Akkadian language because Wilson knew Assyrian and Babylonian and since both are considered to be Akkadian. Semitic scholar, Sáenz-Badillo, notes, “In the northeast [i.e., Mesopotamia], Old Akkadian (*c.* 2800-1950 B.C.E.) was replaced by the Babylonian and Assyrian dialects in the second millennium; Akkadian spread over a vast area, until finally conceding entirely to Aramaic around the sixth century BCE.” Angel Sáenz-Badillo, *A History of the Hebrew Language*, trans. John Elwolde (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 12.

64. Wilson’s opening illustration in *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament* reveals how he approached the biblical text in regard to the historical evidence: “In the common law of England, which is followed in most of our American commonwealths, the presumption is that the accused is innocent of an alleged crime until he shall have

been proved guilty. It may be called the evidential system of jurisprudence. In contradistinction to this is the inquisitorial system in which the accused is supposed to be guilty unless he can establish his innocence. These two systems have their followers when we leave the forum of legal combat and enter that of Biblical literature and history." Robert Dick Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, third edition (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1959), 23.

65. Allis, "Defender of God's Word," 5.

66. Wilson revealed, that, "The method followed may be called the evidential method; because I have sought to follow the Laws of Evidence as applied to documents admitted in our courts of law. I presume that the *prima-facie* evidence of the documents of the Old Testament is to be received as true until it shall have been proven false." Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 8.

67. Taylor writes, "Scottish Common Sense Realism provided its Scottish and later its American proponents with a powerful weapon with which to defend Calvinist orthodoxy against deism, idealism, skepticism and later neology and radical biblical criticism." Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School*, 4. On the effects of Common Sense Realism upon the religious thought of America including the Princetonians, see Sydney E. Ahlstrom, "The Scottish Philosophy and American Theology," *Church History* 24 (1955): 257-272.

68. "Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man (1785)," in Thomas Reid, *The Works of Thomas Reid, D.D. Now Fully Collected, with Selections from his Unpublished Letters*, fifth edition, ed. William Hamilton (Edinburgh, 1858), 422. Quote cited in John W. Stewart, "The Tethered Theology: Biblical Criticism, Common Sense Philosophy, and the Princeton Theologians," (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1990), 248.

69. Charles Hodge wrote regarding "The Inductive Method": "He [i.e., "the man of science"] assumes the trustworthiness of his sense perceptions. Unless he can rely upon the well-authenticated testimony of his senses, he is deprived of all means of prosecuting his investigations. The facts of nature reveal themselves to our faculties of sense, and can be known in no other way." Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 1 (New York: Charles Scribner and Co., 1873; reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 9.

70. Hodge applied this same "inductive method" to theology: "The Bible is to the theologian what nature is to the man of science. It is his store-house of facts; and his method of ascertaining what the Bible teaches, is the same as that which the natural philosopher adopts to ascertain what nature teaches." Ibid., 10.

71. Mark A. Noll, ed., *The Princeton Theology, 1812-1921*, reprint edition (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1983, 2001), 31.

72. George M. Marsden, "Everyone One's Own Interpreter? The Bible, Science, and Authority in Mid-Nineteenth-Century America," in *The Bible in America: Essays in Cultural History*, eds. Nathan O. Hatch and Mark A. Noll (New York: Oxford, 1982), 91-92.

73. Taylor wrote that, "Wilson's approach stood firmly within the Old Princeton tradition which had been molded by Scottish Realism with its stress on scientific and objective research." Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School*, 269. Calhoun concurs with Taylor stating that, "Wilson's insistence that the students follow a strictly objective study of the biblical texts, without subjective presuppositions, stood firmly within the Princeton tradition of Scottish Common Sense Realism, which stressed scientific and objective research." Calhoun, *Princeton Seminary*, 212.

74. Wilson explicitly identified himself with the “School of Common Sense” which was active in France during his lifetime. As an epistemological tool, especially as it related to the discipline of literary criticism, it is evident that the French school functioned similarly to the Common Sense Realism from Scotland. Wilson stated, “Now you know the French are a pretty keen set, and there is a philosophy over there of history, called the School of Common Sense. You know, I had been practicing the principle of that school until I read the works of Neville [Naville]. In the case of documents the best evidence is the document itself. They call the school the School of Common Sense, ‘Bon Sant.’ It has travelled in French, in the discussion of the ‘Odyssey’ and the ‘Illiad’ [sic] and ‘Roland,’ and made a general principle of all literature, prima facie evidence is the best evidence, just as a written document in court stands as first-class evidence.” Lecture 14, p. 2 in Wilson, “Lecture Notes: Introduction to the Old Testament.” Wilson also in another lecture said, “Why do I belong to the modern French school of ‘Bon Sant,’ whose principle is that any document is to taken on it prima facie evidence? It is supposed to be true until proved to be false. I wish you could agree on that fair principle.” Lecture 21, p. 1, *ibid.*

75. Wilson revealed his “offensive-defensive method”: “We may take the purely defensive line and endeavor to show that the general and particular attacks upon the truthfulness of the Old Testament narratives are unsupported by facts. Or, we may take the offensive and show the Old Testament narratives are in harmony with all that is really known of the history of the world in the times described in the Old Testament records. . . . The best method, perhaps, will be to make an offensive-defensive, showing not merely that the attacks are futile, but that the events recorded, and the persons and things described, are true to history—that is, that they harmonise in general with what we learn from the contemporaneous documents of other nations.” Wilson, *Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?* 14.

76. Wilson’s main reason for using the evidential method was to offer his students a ready defense against the higher critics. “I try to give them such an intelligent faith in the Old Testament Scriptures that they will never doubt them as long as they live. I try to give them *evidence*. I try to show them that there is a reasonable ground for belief in the history of the Old Testament.” *Ibid.*, 9-10.

77. Ernest Nicholson, *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century: The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 11-21.

78. Julius Wellhausen dated J and E (his “Jehovistic document [JE]”) to the monarchical period before the appearance of the book of Deuteronomy which he held to have been during the late seventh century B.C. (*Ibid.*, 14.); “With regard to the Jehovistic document, all are happily agreed that, substantially at all events, in language, horizon, and other features, it dates from the golden age of Hebrew literature . . . the period of the kings and prophets which preceded the dissolution of the two Israelite kingdoms by the Assyrians. About the origin of Deuteronomy there is still less dispute; in all circles where appreciation of scientific results can be looked for at all, it is recognised that it was composed in the same age as that in which it was discovered, and that it was made the rule of Josiah’s reformation, which took place about a generation before the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans.” Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, trans. J.S. Black and A. Menzies (Edinburgh: 1883), 9. The original German edition was entitled *Geschichte Israels*, I, Marburg, 1878; second edition, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 1883. The subsequent English reprint was made in 1957 (New York: Meridian Books). On the Jehovistic work, Rogerson explained, “The

critics were agreed that J was written in the ninth century B.C. while E was written during the eighth century B.C. However, Wellhausen supposed that “the redactor (RJE, the editor who combined both the J-source and the E-source together during the divided monarchy to form the Jehovist work [JE]), was often an author, and as a result, it was often not possible to distinguish between J and E.” Rogerson, *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century: England and Germany*, 264. Driver also maintained that J and E had been redacted together to form JE during the eighth century B.C., but, nevertheless, emphasized the composite nature of JE. Cf. Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 116. The Priestly code was dated by Wellhausen between 500-450 B.C. due to his interpretation of Ezekiel 44:6-16, where Ezekiel appears to know nothing about the Priestly legislation that distinguished between priest and Levite (Num. 3): “That the prophet should know nothing about a priestly law with those tendencies he is in thorough sympathy admits of only one explanation—that it did not then exist. His own ordinances are only to be understood as preparatory steps towards its own exactment.” Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, 124. See also Nicholson, *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century*, 20-21.

79. On the reason to extend Pentateuchal source-criticism to the Hexateuch, Campbell and O’Brien write, “[Julius] Wellhausen believed that JE and P extended to the end of Joshua; hence one may legitimately describe this classical form of the hypothesis as applying to the Hexateuch, a position that remained virtually unchallenged until the work of [Martin] Noth.” Antony F. Campbell and Mark A. O’Brien, *Sources of the Pentateuch* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993), 6. Wellhausen asserted, “The five Books of Moses and the Book of Joshua constitute one whole, the conquest of the Promised Land rather than the death of Moses forming the true conclusion of the patriarchal history, the exodus, and the wandering in the wilderness. From a literary point of view, accordingly, it is more accurate to speak of the Hexateuch than of the Pentateuch.” Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, 6.

80. Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 11.

81. Ibid., 12.

82. It is apparent that Wilson aligned his views of inspiration with those of Charles Hodge and not Benjamin B. Warfield: “Some people get hold of a definition of inspiration, for example, and they all through the rest of their lives are worried by anything that they think cannot possibly be reconciled with their definition of inspiration. I think about the most explicit and narrow definition of inspiration that has ever been made by the Protestant Church was made by Professor B.B. Warfield, late of Princeton Theological Seminary, and more stringent than the Hodges. When I was called to Princeton Theological Seminary, Dr. Warfield wrote to me as to my views on inspiration. I wrote back that I agreed with Hodge but not with him, and he could hardly be reconciled to that. Remember that Professor Warfield brought out one of the best textual criticisms of the New Testament that we have, and he himself was accused of heresy one time, because he denied that the last part of the Gospel of Mark was written by Mark, on the basis of the textual criticism.” Lecture 10, p. 1 in Wilson, “Lecture Notes: Introduction to the Old Testament.”

Wilson’s statement is enigmatic in regard to the differences he saw between Hodge and Warfield, since Hodge also held to the inspiration and infallibility of the original authors as well as to the self-witness of Scripture: “If our Lord and his Apostles declare the Old Testament to be the Word of God; that what they said, the Spirit said; if they refer to the facts and to the very words of Scripture as of divine authority; and if the same

infallible divine guidance was promised to the writers of the New Testament, and claimed by themselves; and if their claim was authenticated by God himself; then there is no room for, as there is no need of, these theories of partial inspiration. The whole Bible was written under such as influence as preserved its human authors from all error, and makes it for the Church the infallible rule of faith and practice." Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, I: 182. Wilson similarly asserted, "If God meant to give a revelation to the world it is common sense that He would protect it. God's Spirit guided those fellows [i.e., the original authors] so that they wrote the truth. . . . The Jewish scribes from 916 (A.D.) down copied so well and made so few mistakes of any kind that you can, so far as the general purpose of the accuracy of the Old Testament is concerned, rest assured that you have the original text." Lecture 3, pp. 3-4 *passim*, in Wilson, "Lecture Notes: Introduction to the Old Testament." In 1928, Wilson also affirmed: "The Church has always held that these books were canonical from the time that they were written and that their authority depends upon the fact that they were written by inspiration of God . . . that the Scripture of 'divine origin and excellence' and 'inspired of God' were 'profitable, for doctrine, for reproof, for correction and for instruction which is in righteousness'. . . . Such works written by men inspired by the Spirit of God needed no council, nor senate, of great men to cause their acceptance. The people of God themselves recognized the works of the prophets and wise men as a part of the infallible rule of faith and life which God designed for them." Robert Dick Wilson, "The Rule of Faith and Life," *The Princeton Theological Review* 26 (1928): 425-427 *passim*.

The issue surrounding the Old Princeton theologians, particularly B.B. Warfield and A.A. Hodge, and their definition of inspiration (published in the *Presbyterian Review* 6 [April 1881]: 225-260) has been intensely debated. Ernest Sandeen (*The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism, 1800-1930* [Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1970] with Jack Rogers and Donald McKim (*The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: An Historical Approach* [New York: Harper & Row, 1979]) have argued that the Old Princetonians tightened up their doctrine of inspiration by appealing to the inerrancy of the original manuscripts (i.e., *autographa*), because no such idea allegedly existed prior to 1850. John Woodbridge and Randall Balmer (*Scripture and Truth*, eds. D.A. Carson and J.D. Woodbridge, [Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1983]) responded that the discussion of the inspiration and inerrancy of the original autographs was widespread in the early nineteenth-century Protestant works and not the invention of the Princeton theologians. Although Noll believes that Woodbridge and Balmer have correctly criticized Sandeen for insisting that Old Princeton invented the doctrine of biblical inerrancy; he also suggests that "a modified version of Sandeen's argument—that Princeton refined, clarified, and emphasized certain aspects of the common evangelical heritage concerning Scripture— is quite defensible. Sandeen's work on fundamentalism, as well as other standard treatments on the subject that document the eager fundamentalist use of Princeton's views on Scripture (e.g., George W. Dollar, *A History of Fundamentalism in America* [Greenville, SC: Bob Jones University Press, 1973]; George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1980]), suggests two things: (1) that fundamentalists recognized the Princeton formulation as a powerful statement of their sometimes inarticulate convictions, but also (2) that A.A. Hodge and Warfield were in fact highlighting in a new, effective way elements of an earlier, more amorphous confidence in Scripture." Mark A. Noll, "The Princeton Theology," in *Reformed Theology in America*, ed. David F. Wells (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1997), 34, n. 39. For an overview of the

debate see Peter Maarten van Bemmelen, *Issues in Biblical Interpretation: Sanday and Warfield*, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, vol. 13 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1987), 293-303; Marsden, "Everyone One's Own Interpreter? The Bible, Science, and Authority in Mid-Nineteenth-Century America," 97-98, n. 28; Mark S. Massa, *Charles Augustus Briggs and the Crisis of Historical Criticism* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1990), 59. For an incisive and compelling critique of Rogers and McKim from the perspective of the Dutch Reformed theologians (i.e., A. Kuyper and H. Bavinck) whom they claim reacted against Reformed scholasticism in general and the Old Princeton theology in particular, see Richard B. Gaffin, Jr., *God's Word in Servant Form: Abraham Kuyper and Herman Bavinck on the Doctrine of Scripture* (Jackson, MS: Reformed Academic Press, 2008).

83. Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 48.

84. Ibid. Reprinted from Robert Dick Wilson, "Scientific Biblical Criticism," *The Princeton Theological Review* 17 (1919): 211. Wilson's articles, "Scientific Biblical Criticism" Pt. 1, Vol. 17, No. 2 (April 1919); 190-240 and Pt. 2, Vol. 17, No. 3 (July 1919); 401-456 in *The Princeton Theological Review* served as the basis for his book, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament* (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1926).

85. Wilson curiously used both spellings "Hammurabi" and "Hammurapi." He employed the latter in *Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?* (1922) and the former in *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament* (1926). The standard spelling for the appellation is "Hammurabi" as seen in Theophile J. Meek's translation of "The Code of Hammurabi," in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts: Relating to the Old Testament*, revised and enlarged by James B. Pritchard (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1955), 163-180.

86. Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 48-49. In a footnote (n. 47), Wilson referenced William Henry Green's work, *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, p. 37, n. 1, as the source for his biblical citations. However, one passage, i.e., "Deuteronomy 4:44, 1, 5" is erroneous. A comparison of the passages by Wilson and Green prove Wilson miscopied the biblical reference. The passage should be read "Deuteronomy 1:5," as is evident from Green's quote, "'This law,' the words of which Moses is said to have written in a book until they were finished, cannot be restricted with Robertson Smith to Deut. 12-26, as is evident from 4:44, nor even with Dillmann to 5-26, as appears from 1:5; 28:58, 61; 29: 20, 27" (emphasis mine).

87. Ibid., 49.

88. Ibid., 50.

89. Wilson's argumentation remained unchanged even to the end of his career. In 1929, he similarly argued: "there is no doubt that systems of writing were in current use from the Black Sea to Ethiopia and from Susa to the Nile, for many centuries before the time of Moses; and that the Hebrew language was the common one in Palestine and known in Egypt, also, before the time when the books of Moses were written. The literary forms, both of prose and poetry, in which the Pentateuch is written were also used in Egypt, or Babylon, at a time antecedent to the composition of the works attributed to Moses. Further, the grammar of the Hebrew language is shown by the Hebrew words found in the inscriptions of Thotmes III and in the El-Amarna Letters to have been, by and large, the same as that found in the document of the Pentateuch." Wilson, "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament Text," 36.

90. Wilson held that the presence of words with the final syllable "ooth" (-ôth) or "n" (-ôn, -ân) in Hebrew literature, that did not have a known corresponding Aramaic

word or root, presented linguistic evidence of the early presence of the Hebrew language. Accordingly, words of this sort were found in the Tel el Amarna Letters and the Code of Hammurabi: "The Old Testament contains at least 140 words ending in 'n.' and many of them are translated into Aramaic words ending in 'n.' but, in the great majority of cases, these Aramaic nouns have entirely different roots and formations. Many Hebrew words have this ending, where Aramaic has no word whatever corresponding to them. And the Aramaic did take words directly from the Hebrew. Speaking in a general way, this ending is found throughout all Hebrew literature. It appears in Egypt, in the Tel el Amarna Tablets, and in the very earliest literary remains. It is noted in Babylonian, in the very Code of Hammurabi. These final syllables, 'ooth' and 'n,' instead of being modern, and proving modernism, go back to the days of Abraham." Horace D. Stanton, "Dr. Robert Dick Wilson's Lectures on the Historicity of the Old Testament—Part III," *The Presbyterian*, April 5, 1923, 26. Wilson concluded, in another study, that "the presence of words with endings *úth*, *ón*, and *án*, is no indication of the age in which a document was written." See Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 87-91.

91. However, in 1959, E.J. Young, a successor to Wilson at Westminster Seminary, pointed out that Wilson had mistakenly assumed that Abraham and Hammurabi were contemporaries. Using archaeological evidence that postdated Wilson's career, Young wrote, "Upon the basis of the chronology which the recently discovered (1935) texts from Mari demand, Hammurabi is to be dated about 1728 B.C., which would be considerably later than the time of Abraham." Yet, Young did not disagree with Wilson's general premise that the internal and external evidence pointed to Moses as author of the Pentateuch. Cf. Young's revised footnotes for Wilson's *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament* (revised edition, Chicago, IL, Moody Press, 1959), 26, n. 8, second paragraph.

92. E.J. Young, in his "Glossary" which was later appended to the end of the 1959 edition of Wilson's book, described the "Tel-El-Amarna Letters" in the following manner: "The Tel-el-Amarna or El-Amarna Letters were discovered in 1888 at Tel-el-Amarna in Egypt and date from the reigns of Amenhotep III and IV. They were written in cuneiform, mostly in the Babylonian language, from Babylon, Assyria, Syria, Palestine, and other countries, to the kings of Egypt, and some of them from the kings of Egypt in reply." See Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 190.

93. Wilson, *Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?* 15.

94. Ibid., 15-16. In another article entitled "The Date of Genesis X," published in *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* Vol. 1, No. 2 (April 1890): 252-281, Wilson attempted, "to show, from external evidence, that the genealogical tables of the tenth chapter of Genesis could have been, and most probably were, composed as early as the time of Menephtah I (i.e., the assumed Pharaoh of the Exodus) and Moses" (252). Structurally, Wilson divided his study into two parts: first, he examined the names of nations/places mentioned on the list which were known to have existed during the time of Moses (e.g., Tubal, Cush, Mizraim, Babel, Erech, Shinar, Assur, Ninevah, Sidon, Heth, Arvadite, Zemarite, Hamathite, Gaza, Gerar, Elam, Accad, Arkite, Calah), and, secondly, he examined the nations which have been purported as having been in existence prior to 1300 B.C. (e.g., Elishah, Tarshish, Kittim, Girgasite, Lud, Aram, Hul, Mash, Canaan, Phut, Tiras). Several examples from Wilson's study include: 1) the justification of the Semitic word for Egypt, *Mizraim* or *Mitsraim* (to which he deferred to the Tel-el-Amarna inscriptions which mentioned Egypt twelve times and always with the spelling *Mitsri* [in the genitive case], p. 253), 2) the place known as Babel (which was mentioned under the

name *Babili* as early as the kingdom of Agukakrimi whose reign, according to his dynastic tables, occurred before 1450 B.C., p. 253), 3) the land of Assur (which dates back to 1820 B.C. was proven by the mention of the Assyrian city of Nineveh in the Tel-el-Amarna inscriptions, p. 254), 4) the land of the Amorites (which is mentioned as early as the reign of Thothmes III, and thereafter, in the reigns of Seti I, Rameses II and III, p. 255), and Calah (which Wilson attempted to prove that the city had been only rebuilt by Assurnatsirabal and not founded by him, because, according to Wilson, the city had been first built by Shalmanassar, a contemporary of Menephtah I and the putative Pharaoh of the Exodus, p. 256-257). Ultimately, Wilson held that the evidence favored the justification of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and specifically the Book of Genesis by way of proving that Moses would have had sufficient knowledge of such nations as listed in Genesis, chapter ten, in the so-called Table of Nations.

95. Robert Dick Wilson, "Babylon and Israel: A Comparison of their Leading Ideas based upon their Vocabularies," *The Princeton Theological Review* (April 1903): 239-255. This essay was originally delivered by Wilson at the opening exercises of Princeton Theological Seminary in 1902. Allis recalled that it was a timely response to Friedrich Delitzsch's lecture "Babel und Bibel" earlier that year, but that it was "far above the head of an unsophisticated Junior [i.e., Allis himself], and the significance of which some of the Seniors even may have failed to appreciate fully." Oswald T. Allis, *The Old Testament: Its Claims and Its Critics* (Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1972), 346-347. On Wilson's impact on Allis, see John H. Skilton, "Oswald T. Allis," in *Bible Interpreters of the 20th Century: A Selection of Evangelical Voices*, eds. W.A. Elwell and J.D. Weaver (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1999), 123.

96. Wilson's philological arguments sought to disprove the general contention that among the four Semitic cognate languages (i.e., Babylonian, Hebrew, Biblical Aramaic, and Arabic), Babylonian and Hebrew possessed the greatest affinity in terms of vocabulary. Although biblical scholarship generally assumed the derivation of the latter from the former, in Wilson's extensive, comparative examination of the five cognate languages, he was surprised to find that "Hebrew and Aramaic are much more similar in root and meaning than either is like the Babylonian." (240). In addition, Wilson contended that "the nations or races which predominate over the thought and persons of others, influence the ideas and language of the subject peoples in such a marked way as to leave no doubt of this influence in the mind of the student of language. If Babylonian influenced the Hebrew in the degree which some claim, we should expect to find that the specific Babylonian ideas, and these ideas as embodied in recognizable forms of words, have been adopted by the Hebrews" (*ibid.*).

Wilson's point was simply, if Israel had in actuality borrowed from the Babylonians as a result of the exile in the sixth century B.C., then Israel's language, legislation, traditions, and religion would have evidenced in large measure extensive Babylonian influence. For example, Wilson noted areas of linguistic differences between Hebrew and Babylonian: 1) governmental vocabulary to which only the words **נָסִיךְ** ["ruler"] and **שֹׁפֵט** ["judge"] may be designated as common words among many that radically differ (e.g., "Sartenu and sukkalnu are not found in Hebrew; שְׁפָט and שְׁפַטְתִּים are not found in Babylonian" [247]); 2) the words for decrees and laws differ practically *in toto* with the exception of those laws that have been exerted over the Hebrews by the governments of Assyria and Babylon; 3) the words descriptive of the prophets also radically vary (e.g., "It is noteworthy that neither נָבִי and רָאֵה, nor חִזְקָה occurs in Babylonian, although the root

of the first named is found in common use. On the other hand, the Babylonians words for seer, *baru*, *sha'ilu*, *ashipu*, *asū*, *mushmashu*, *mushshakku*, *shabru*, and *mûdê térté-* are not found in Hebrew." [248-249]); 4) the words used for priest and worship are at variance (e.g., "The Arabic and the Aramaic agree with the Hebrew in the use of כהן. . . . But the Babylonian employs neither of these words, though it has an almost unlimited variety of hitherto unclassified terms for different kinds of priests, such as *kalu*, *shangu*, *shalu*, *pashishu*, *shaknu*, *ramku*, *shangamachchu*, *lagaru*, *nisakku*, *shukkallu*, *machchu*, *surmachchu*, *surru*, and *mucharbidu*. Not one of these names is ever found in the sense of priest at least, in Hebrew, Aramaic, or Arabic." [248]); 5) the words used for specific Hebrew sacrificial offerings are absent in the Babylonian sacrificial system (e.g., "The Babylonian recognized apparently a free-will offering, but they have no אֲלֵמָה, or sin offering; no בְּשֻׁרָה, or trespass offering; no רִבְעָה or vow offering; no הַזְּבֹחָת, or thank offering; no תְּרוּמָה or תְּקִבָּה, heave or wave offering; מִנְחָה or meal offering. Most of their [Babylonian] sacrifices consist of libations of oil, or water, or wine." [249]); and 6) their religious festivals are different in name and in design (e.g., "There is no גַּמְ�גֶּה, or pilgrim festival, among the Babylonians, a word and a thing so familiar to the Hebrews and the Arabs. There is no evidence of a feast of tabernacles, nor a day of atonement." [Ibid.]).

97. Wilson, "Age of the Bible Told by Foreign Words it Contains," 148.

98. Wilson noted Babylonian influences throughout Genesis 2 and correlated them with the Abrahamic period: "In my opinion the second chapter is not an account of creation at all. The only account of creation in the second chapter is the one verse which speaks of man having been made out of dust and having breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. The rest is not an account of creation. It is the account of the construction of a garden. We have an account or a description by Nebuchadnezzar of his making a garden and it resembles very closely the account in the second chapter of Genesis. The words for plants are Babylonian and are not the word used in the first chapter at all. The whole chapter bears the evidences of Babylonian origin and contains Babylonian and also Sumerian words, which you remember preceded Babylonian. Take the word for 'mist.' It is not the Semitic word or Babylonian, but the ordinary word in Sumerian for river or canal. We know they used an irrigating plant or watering canal, and water used to flow in all parts of the land. Go down to the time of the flood and here again we find Babylonian words. Come down to the life of Abraham. Was Abraham a myth? Take the proper names in the account of Abraham given in the Bible and compare them with the proper names found on the Babylonian monuments of this period. . . . Now this account of Abraham in the Bible contains a large number of proper names, and they exactly coincide with the composition of the proper names found in the Babylonian monuments of the time of Abraham." Ibid., 148-149. The main flaw of Wilson's argumentation here is that he utilized the analogy of Nebuchadnezzar's garden for Genesis 2, the exact period of Babylonian influence that he was trying to argue against.

99. Wilson, *Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?* 26.

100. Genesis chapter 14 is explicated at length in Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 24-26.

101. Wilson, "Babylon and Israel: A Comparison of their Leading Ideas based upon their Vocabularies," 254.

102. Ibid., 255.

103. These criteria of the critical school for determining source documents in a composite text were well-known to the Old Princetonians. The two most notable conservative publications prior to Wilson were: William Henry Green, *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895) and Geerhardus Vos, *The Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuchal Codes* (New York: A.C. Armstrong, 1886).

The "Nestor of Egyptologists" during the early twentieth-century, Edouard Naville, read an important essay before the Congress of Students of the Historical School in Paris in November 1923 entitled, "La methode historique dans l'étude de l'Ancien Testament." Oswald T. Allis, editor of *The Princeton Theological Review* and fellow OT colleague of R.D. Wilson at Princeton Seminary, reprinted a translation of Naville's work done by Professor John R. Mackay of the Free Church College, Edinburgh. It was published as "The Historical Method in the Study of the Old Testament," *The Princeton Theological Review* 22 (July 1924): 353-376. Naville's classic study was indicative of the conservative assessment of the critical criteria of delimiting source documents in the Old Testament. Due to Wilson's close affiliation with Allis and *The Princeton Theological Review* along with his acquaintance with the French School of Common Sense, Wilson would have been familiar with Naville's critique.

104. S.R. Driver wrote concerning the criterion of the disparate usage of the divine names, i.e., "Elohim" and "Jehovah," in source-criticism: "it was the varying use of Divine names in Genesis which first attracted the notice of Astruc in 1753 and led him to the conclusion that the book was of composite authorship . . . they [i.e., the early critics] recognized, viz., practically only *two* writers in Genesis, one who used the name *Elohim*, and another who used the name *Yahweh* ('Jehovah,'—the modern 'J'). It was Hupfeld who, in 1853, in his *Quellen der Genesis*, first showed definitely that (in addition to 'J') there were *two* writers in Genesis who, though differing materially in other respects, both agreed in using *Elohim*. These two writers are those now generally known as 'E' and 'P.' Historically, therefore, the varying use of the Divine names is a clue which has proved most useful, though not one which could under all circumstances be relied on: it is no *absolute*, or universal, criterion of authorship; as can readily be shown, it may often fail us, or be dispensed with, without loss. It is still probably, for an ordinary reader (as far as Ex. 6), the most conspicuous criterion for distinguishing the documents; and it is for this reason a convenient criterion to point to, as marking the source to which a passage belongs." Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, xxvi-xxvii. Hence, Driver did view the criterion as legitimate, but only insofar as the whole character of the document was taken into consideration (e.g., style, theological perspective, vocabulary) and not merely the presence or absence (particularly of 'P' after Ex. 6) of a specific divine name.

105. Driver asserted regarding the criterion of doublets, "And as soon as the book [of Genesis] is studied with sufficient attention, phenomena disclose themselves which show incontrovertibly that it is composed of distinct documents or sources, which have been welded together by a later compiler or redactor into a continuous whole. These phenomena are very numerous; but they may be reduced in the main to the two following heads: (1) the same event is doubly recorded; (2) the language, and frequently the representation as well, varies in different sections. Thus 11-24a and 24b-25 contain a double narrative of the origin of man upon the earth." Ibid., 8.

106. Driver commented upon the criterion of continuous source accounts and later redactional work in distinguishing sources in the following manner: "First, the two independent, but parallel, narratives of the patriarchal age, J and E, were combined into a

whole by a compiler whose method of work, sometimes incorporating long sections of each intact (or nearly so), sometimes fusing the parallel accounts into a single narrative, has been sufficiently illustrated. The whole thus formed (JE) was afterwards combined with the narrative P by a second compiler, who, adopting P as his framework, accommodated JE to it, omitting in either what was necessary in order to avoid needless repetition, and making such slight redactional adjustments as the unity of his work required." Ibid., 20. Driver also delineated the putative origins of J and E: "Critics of different schools—Dillman, Kittel, and Riehm, not less than Wellh.[ausen] and Kuen.[en]—agree in supposing that E was a native of the Northern Kingdom. . . . J is commonly regarded as having belonged to the Southern Kingdom." Ibid., 122.

107. Robert Dick Wilson, "The Names of God in the Old Testament," *The Princeton Theological Review* 18 (1920): 460-492.

108. Ibid., 480-481.

109. Ibid., 461.

110. Ibid., 480-481.

111. Ibid., 481.

112. Wilson miscopied the number of occurrences of the name Jehovah by P from his chart. Instead of 85 times, the correct number of occurrences of the name Jehovah used by P is 95 times. Ibid., 461.

113. Ibid., 481.

114. Robert Dick Wilson, "The Use of 'God' and 'Lord' in the Koran," *The Princeton Theological Review* 17 (1919): 644-650.

115. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 13.

116. Wilson, "The Use of 'God' and 'Lord' in the Koran," 644.

117. Ibid., 647.

118. Ibid., 650.

119. Published in Robert Dick Wilson, "Critical Note on Exodus 6:3," *The Princeton Theological Review* 22 (1924): 108-119.

120. Under the rubric, "The Critical Theory is Inconsistent," Wilson developed three arguments against the critical interpretation of Exodus 6:3. According to the critics, Exodus 6:3 must be assigned to P because P means to say that El Shaddai was the name of God known to the Patriarchs and not Jehovah. Therefore, the critics also assigned Genesis 17:1, 28:3, 35:11, and 48:3 to P due to the presence of the divine designation, El Shaddai. Wilson, however, in his first accusation of critical inconsistency asserted that El Shaddai occurred not only in P passages but also in J and E. Wilson challenged that if P, who is dated much later than J and E by the critics, had known that the patriarchs were unaware of the name Jehovah, then P should have replaced the name of Jehovah and inserted El Shaddai. He retorted, "It is to be observed, however, regarding these passages that, in 17:1, it is said that *Jehovah* appeared to Abram, saying, I am El Shaddai; and in 35:11 that *Elohim* appeared to Jacob, saying, I am El Shaddai. In 28:3 Isaac says to Jacob, El Shaddai bless thee; and in 48:3 Jacob says in the presence of Joseph and his two sons, El Shaddai appeared unto me. In a fifth passage, Gen. 43:14, Jacob uses this appellation in his prayer for his sons who are starting for Egypt. But this verse is assigned to E or J by the critics and the El Shaddai attributed to the Redactor. Is it not singular that if P thought El Shaddai was a proper name for God he should have used Elohim about seventy times before Ex. 6:3 and El Shaddai only four times? Is it not extraordinary that, if the writer of Ex. 6:3 meant that God 'appeared' to the patriarchs under the name of El Shaddai, only once in P should it be said that El Shaddai 'appeared,' just the same

number of times that P says Jehovah ‘appeared’ and that Elohim ‘appcared’? Jehovah alone (or Jehovah Elohim) is alleged to have occurred in J, and Elohim alone in E; but El Shaddai is found but four times in P and Elohim seventy times. . . . But did the Redactor (who inserted El Shaddai for Elohim [E] or for Jehovah [J]) also think that the patriarchs used El Shaddai rather than Jehovah? Why, then did he not cut out Jehovah and put El Shaddai into the text of J? Besides, if P alone thought that Shaddai was a specifically patriarchal designation, how about its use in Gen. 49:25 and Num. 24: 4, 16, which are assigned to J or JE? All of these questions will be appropriately answered if we take Shaddai and El Shaddai as appellation, ‘the Almighty’ or ‘a mighty God,’ and not as proper names.” *Ibid.*, 108-109.

Wilson’s second charge against critical inconsistency was that P was not in harmony with its sources and with earlier histories that were supposedly known to P. Wilson delineated the critical view regarding the sources of P (being dated before 550 B.C.): “According to datings advocated by the critics they could have been only J, E, D[euteronomy], H[oliness Code], and Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Amos, Obadiah, Nahum, Zephaniah, and parts of other books” (109). Wilson noted that the only sources or earlier works in which El Shaddai occurred were found in Ezek. 10:5, Gen. 49:25 (J), and in Numbers 24:4, 16 (JE). The blessing of Jacob found in Genesis 49:24-25 reads, “the arms of his hands were made strong by the hand of the Almighty One (**אֵל נָכַר**) of Jacob (from thence is the Shepherd, the stone of Israel) even by the God of thy fathers, who shall help thee, and by the Almighty (Shaddai) who shall bless thee.” The Samaritan Pentateuch, the Syriac, and the Septuagint, all read El Shaddai instead of Shaddai. In verse 18 of the same chapter, however, we read in this psalm of Jacob a clear reference to Jehovah in the phrase, “I have waited for Thee, O Jehovah.” Wilson, thus, objected, “if P got his information about El Shaddai in this psalm he would have known that Jehovah was used by the patriarch Jacob at least. Nothing is said in this psalm about either Jehovah or El Shaddai having ‘appeared’” (109-110). In regard to the reference to Shaddai in Numbers 24: 4, 16, Balaam used the phrase, “which saw the vision of the Almighty (Shaddai).” Since the reference to Shaddai occurred in a passage assigned by the critics to JE, Wilson objected, “P must have known, if he got his information here, that Shaddai was supposed by his sources to have been used after the declaration made in Exodus 6:3; for JE certainly places the episode of Balaam about forty years after the event recorded in Exodus 6:3” (110). Hence, Wilson saw that if the critics were to be correct that P viewed the name El Shaddai as a strictly patriarchal designation then P should have correctly replaced Jehovah or Elohim for Shaddai in Numbers 24: 4, 16. Wilson surmised, “These being the only places in the Old Testament where Shaddai occurs in the portions assigned by the critics to a date before 550 B.C., it follows that the critics’ interpretation of Ex. 6:3 makes P to be out of harmony with all its known sources” (110).

Wilson’s third objection was that the appellation El Shaddai never occurred after 550 B.C., but that Shaddai alone occurred thirty times in Job, Ruth 1:20-21; Isa. 13:14; Joel 1:15; and Psalm 68:15, 91:1. Wilson noted, “Not one of these passages refers to the patriarchs or to God as ‘appearing’ to them or to anyone else. In twenty-seven of them Shaddai is used as parallel to other names of God, to wit; nine times to **יְהֹוָה**, thirteen times to **אֱלֹהִים**, once to **עֶלְיוֹן**, and four times to **יְהֹוָה**. There is no intimation that Shaddai was a more ancient designation than these other terms” (110). Wilson, thus, concluded that based upon the absence of El Shaddai in the biblical literature assigned to the time of

P, i.e., Ezekiel, Job, J, E, H, D, Joel, Jonah, Deutero-Isaiah, Ruth, and the Psalms, as well as the late writings of Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Esther, Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah that “the author of P must have invented the whole conception [of the patriarchs knowing God only as El Shaddai].” Wilson asserted, “Whether we take the traditional view of the post-captivity literature, or the radical, there would therefore be no contemporary evidence to show that the hypothetical writer of P, provided that he lived in post-captivity times, was in his use of Shaddai in harmony with contemporaneous usage and ideas” (111).

121. The verb in the Hebrew (MT) reads, נִפְחַד, which is parsed: Niphal (stem), first (person), common (gender), singular (number), from the verb, har, “to see.” As in this case, the *Niphal* stem is sometimes used “like the *Hithpa’el* (§ 54 f) and the Greek *middle*, the meaning of the active, with the addition of *to oneself* (*sibi*) . . . [i.e., ‘I cause myself to be seen’].” See § 51 e, in Wilhelm Gesenius, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, rev. and enlarged by E. Kautzsch, trans. by A.E. Cowley (Oxford: Clarendon, 1910), 137. Similarly, Waltke and O’Connor explain that this particular application of the *Niphal* stem is comparable in use as the *Hithpael* stem as indicating the “causative-reflexive scheme in Hebrew. . . . In these verbs the subject causes the action to happen to himself; ‘X (subject) gets himself to be Y (verbal notion).’” See § 23.4h in Bruce K. Waltke and Michael Patrick O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 390-391.

122. Gesenius similarly categorized the syntactical use of the preposition בְּ in Exodus 6:3 as *beth essentiae*: “Also after ideas of *appearing*, *manifesting oneself*, *representing*, *being*, in the sense of *as*, *in the capacity of* . . . *consisting of* . . . , *tanquam*, the בְּ *essentiae* of the earlier grammarians . . . , e.g., Ex 63 *I appeared unto Abraham . . . בְּאֵל שָׁדָי as El Shaddai.*” See § 119 l, in Gesenius, *Hebrew Grammar*, 379. Waltke and O’Connor elucidate, “The *beth* of identity (*beth essentiae*) marks the capacity in which an actor behaves (‘as, serving as, in the capacity of’ ##27-28).” Accordingly, Waltke and O’Connor list Exodus 6:3 as example #27. See § 11.2.5e, *ibid.*, 198.

123. Wilson, “Critical Note on Exodus 6:3,” 113.

124. *Ibid.*, 114.

125. It is now commonly designated as the *Waw-adversative*. See § 8.3b in Waltke and O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 129.

126. Wilson, “Critical Note on Exodus 6:3,” 115-116.

127. *Ibid.*, 119.

128. Wilson, *Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?*, 37.

129. *Ibid.*

130. *Ibid.*

131. *Ibid.*

132. *Ibid.*

133. *Ibid.*, 37-38.

134. *Ibid.*, 38.

135. Lecture 15, pp. 1 and 4 *passim*, in Wilson, “Lecture Notes: Introduction to the Old Testament.”

136. Lecture 10, p. 3, *ibid.*

137. Wilson was well-aware of Alexander’s views as he referred his students at Westminster Seminary to two books on the Canon: Archibald Alexander’s *The Canon of the Old and New Testaments Ascertained; or The Bible Complete without the Apocrypha*

*and Unwritten Traditions*, revised edition (Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1851); and William Henry Green's *Introduction to the Old Testament: Canon* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898). Wilson advised, "If you want to get the view of the Presbyterian Church, the best little book was written by the first professor of Princeton, of a Presbyterian Theological Seminary, of Princeton. He has written a little book on the Canon of the Old and New Testaments. Anybody with intelligence can understand it and it will give you a very good idea on the subject. It is 25 cents at a second-hand book store. Then Dr. W.H. Greene [sic] has a book on the Canon which is one of the best books. He wrote it rapidly, so that it is not as finished as some of his other work, but it is sufficiently good in the discussion up to that time as to questions such as Daniel and the Roman Catholic Canon." In Lecture 14, p. 1, in Wilson, "Lecture Notes: Introduction to the Old Testament."

138. Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School*, 20.

139. Ibid., 20-21. Taylor cites the student lecture notes of Charles Hodge, "Critica Sacra, or Biblical Criticism, Princeton. Decem. 31st 1817" (APTS; Princeton, NJ) (unpaginated).

140. Wilson wrote, "Some of these [apparent contradictions] are doubtless due to errors of transmission, especially if, as seems probable, the original was written in cuneiform and afterwards transferred to an alphabetic system of writing. Some of them appear contradictory, but really relate to different persons or circumstances." Wilson, *Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly?* 37. Wilson, however, would have doubtlessly agreed with Green that if the place-name was referring to the same city/place but with a different name, then this phenomenon could only be explained by later editorial updating of the name of the city/place in question. Green wrote, "If the Dan of later times is here meant, the strong probability is that the older name was in the original text, and in the course of transcription one more familiar was substituted for it. The proofs of Mosaic authorship are too numerous and strong to be outweighed by a triviality like this. Critics whose hypothesis requires the assumption of textual changes of the most serious nature cannot consistently deny that there may be occasion for a slight correction here." Green, *The Unity of the Book of Genesis*, 202. Thus, it is likely that Wilson believed that either the place-name had been modernized or that it was referring to a different city/place altogether.

141. William Henry Green, *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895), 51-52.

142. On Wilson's view of essential Mosaic authorship, note his following comment: "But even if he [Moses] did not write a word with his own hand, it is evident that whoever wrote the book meant to imply that the authorship of Moses extends to the laws and visions and commands which God gave to him. . . . This is the fundamental authorship for which we contend." Cf. Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 48.

143. See R.N. Whybray's trenchant critique of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis in *The Making of the Pentateuch: A Methodological Study* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 43-93.

144. Duane Garrett writes, "one may confidently assume that the work has undergone post-Mosaic redaction. The main reason such a redaction would have taken place was not to substantially change the book in any way but in order to make it intelligible to a later generation of readers. . . . Genesis is written in standard Hebrew, archaic forms notwithstanding. Although one may well argue that the Pentateuch played

a major role in the development of standard Hebrew, there is no reason to think that there could not have been any revisions to keep up with semantic developments in the Hebrew language. In addition, the location of geographical settings by names that were common in a later period is an indication of redaction. The most well-known example is the reference to Dan as a place name in Genesis 14:14, an obvious anachronism. But it proves no more than that the text has undergone some revision. The same may be said of the reference to Israelite kings in Genesis 36:31.” Duane A. Garrett, *Rethinking Genesis: The Sources and Authorship of the First Book of the Pentateuch*, reprint edition (Ross-shire, UK: Christian Focus, 2000), 81.

145. Among those who were contemporaneous with Wilson and propagated a late date for the book of Daniel were: Anthony Ashley Bevan, *A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1892); Frederic William Farrar, *The Book of Daniel*, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll, *The Expositor's Bible* (New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1900); John D. Prince, *A Critical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1899).

146. James Alan Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel*, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1927), 58.

147. Montgomery also listed the conservative works of C.H.H. Wright (*Daniel and His Critics*, London: 1906), C. Boutflower (*In and Around the Book of Daniel*, London: 1923), H. Deane (*Daniel, his Life and Times*, London: 1888), and J. Kennedy (*The Book of Daniel from the Christian Standpoint*, London: 1898). *Ibid.*, n. 2.

148. Unlike his other works, the following monograph by Wilson on the book of Daniel was published by a major publishing company and received scholarly attention: Robert Dick Wilson, *Studies in the Book of Daniel: A Discussion of the Historical Questions* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1917).

149. *Ibid.*, iii.

150. *Ibid.*

151. *Ibid.*

152. Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School*, 269-270. The full bibliographic reference for Wilson's intended third volume published posthumously is: Robert Dick Wilson, *Studies in the Book of Daniel: Second Series* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1938).

153. Brevard S. Childs writes, “In America the last great defender of Daniel's traditional authorship was R.D. Wilson of Princeton, who continued the [E.B.] Pusey tradition of combining great learning with heated polemics.” Brevard S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 612. As referenced by Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School*, 359, n.77.

154. Driver's critical views were in line with the German critics who held to the late date of Daniel. For example, in his *Introduction*, Driver compared the traditional and critical views regarding the four empires of Nebuchadnezzar's dream regarding the colossal image (with a head of gold, chest and arms of silver, body of brass, legs of iron, and feet mixed with iron and clay) as recorded in Daniel 2. He explained that in the traditional scheme the four empires were believed to be: “1) Chaldaean; 2) the Medo-Persian (Cyrus); 3) (the belly) the Macedonian (Alexander), followed by the empires of the Seleucidæ at Antioch, and the Ptolemies in Egypt (the thighs); 4) the Roman, afterwards (the mingled clay and iron of the feet) divided into East and West (Constantinople and Rome), and ultimately further subdivided.” But from the perspective of modern-critical scholarship, the image consisted of: 1) the Chaldaean; 2) the Median;

3) the Persian; and 4) Macedonian, issuing in the often externally allied, but yet inwardly disunited, empires of the Diadochi (the Seleucidae and the Ptolemies). In a footnote, Driver listed the modern scholars who held the latter view: "So Eichhorn, v. Lengerke, Ewald, Bleek, Westcott (Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, s.v. "Daniel"), Delitzsch, Meinhold, Kucnen. In favour of the Median and Persian empires being reckoned separately, it is remarked that in the Book itself they are distinguished (68 &c.; 82), and the rule of 'Darius the Mede' (531-628) precedes that of Cyrus the Persian" (489).

Driver presented the life of Antiochus Epiphanes (the persecutor of the Jews in the second cent. B.C.) according to the Jewish historical records found in 1 Maccabees and suggestively compared them with the visions in the Book of Daniel. For example, Driver corresponded Antiochus to the "little horn" of Daniel 7:8; Onanias III's murder was compared to the "prince of the covenant" that would be destroyed in Daniel 11:22, and Antiochus was assumed to have been the "one who causes desolation" upon the Jerusalem temple in Daniel 9:26b-27a. Furthermore, following Ewald, Delitzsch, and Meinhold, Driver interpreted the "ten horns" (alongside the "little horn" representing Antiochus) as the subsequent Seleucid leaders: 1) Seleucus Nicator (B.C. 312-280); 2) Antiochus Soter (279-261); 3) Antiochus Theos (260-246); 4) Seleucus Callinicus (245-226); 5) Seleucus Ceranrus (225-223); 6) Antiochus the Great (222-187); 7) Seleucus IV Philopator (186-176); 8) Heliodorus (treasurer of Seleucus IV); 9) Demetrius Soter (son of Seleucus); and 10) Ptolemy VI (493). Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 491-492.

155. Cheyne, *Founders of Old Testament Criticism*, 363.

156. Samuel R. Driver, *The Book of Daniel*, CBC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900).

157. Sir Robert Anderson, *Daniel in the Critics' Den: A Reply to Professor Driver of Oxford and the Dean of Canterbury* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1902), v-vi.

158. Wilson mainly dealt with Driver's views which came from his *Introduction*. In a footnote introducing the section, "Authorship and Date," Driver himself in his commentary wrote, "The following pages are adapted, with some additions and modifications of form, from the writer's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, chap. xi." Driver, *The Book of Daniel*, xlvi, n. 1.

159. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 497.

160. Ibid., 497-500. In addition, Driver held that the book of Daniel contained more developed doctrines than any other Old Testament book which further supported a late date: "nevertheless, it is undeniable that the doctrines of the Messiah, of angels, of the resurrection, and of a judgment on the world, are taught with greater distinctness, and in a more developed form, than elsewhere in the OT., and with features approximating to (though not identical with) those met with in the earlier parts of the Book of Enoch, c. 100 B.C." Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 508.

161. Driver was explicit on this when he wrote, "The term 'Chaldee' for the Aramaic of either the Bible or the Targums is a misnomer, the use of which is only a source of confusion. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 503, n.\* (asterisk).

162. Driver's "intermediate stage of Hebrew" included the books of Chronicles, Ecclesiastes, Esther, and Daniel. The "old classical Hebrew" of JE, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Deuteronomy; and those books before the golden age of Nehemiah, was, in Driver's mind, the "great turning point of Hebrew style." Ibid., 504-505.

163. Driver's scheme for the history of Biblical Hebrew is discerned as follows: **Classical Hebrew** (JE to Zechariah 12-14 [*the age of Nehemiah= the transitional period*]) → **Intermediate Hebrew** (Chr., Ecc., Est., Dan. [*rough in style*]) → [close of the OT canon] **New Hebrew** (of the Mishnah [200 A.D.]). *Ibid.*, 505.

164. This is an example of Driver's moderation in that most critical scholars of his day viewed the historicity of Daniel as doubtful. An example of this fact is found in T.K. Cheyne's negative assessment of Driver's statement that adherence to a second century B.C. date did not necessitate that Daniel could not have been a real historical personality who lived during the sixth century B.C.: "I notice on p. 479 the same confusion which occurs elsewhere between 'tradition' and history. I do not think that any critic who agrees on the main point with Dr. Driver would maintain that 'Daniel, it cannot be doubted, was a historical person' except the newly-converted Delitzsch, who, as his article in the second edition of Herzog's *Encyclopaedia* shows, had not worked his way to perfect clearness. Listen to the late Prof. Riehm, who is now just obtaining recognition among us [critics]. 'The material of his narrative the author may partly have taken from folktales (*aus der Volkssage*), though at any rate in part he invented it himself. . . . And even if there was a folk-tale (*Volkssage*), according to which Daniel was a prophet living during the Exile and distinguished for his piety, yet the historical existence of an Exilic prophet Daniel is more than doubtful.'" Cheyne, *Founders of Old Testament Criticism*, 367-368.

165. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 511.

166. *Ibid.*, 513.

167. *Ibid.*, 514.

168. *Ibid.*

169. Robert Dick Wilson, "The Aramaic of Daniel," in *Biblical and Theological Studies*, ed. by the Members of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912), 262-306.

170. E.J. Young wrote, "There is only one targum, or translation, to the prophets in Aramaic, called the targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel." See under TARGUM in his "Glossary," in Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 190.

171. Concerning the Aramaic version known as "Onkelos," Young explicated that it was the "Name of the author of the best Aramaic version of the books of Moses. The version is named after him." "Glossary," *ibid.*, 188.

172. Similar to "Onkelos," Young explained that "Jonathan" was the "Name given the version of the pseudonymous author of a second Aramaic version of the books of Moses." "Glossary," *ibid.*, 187.

173. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 266-267.

174. Wilson, "The Aramaic of Daniel," 263.

175. Young defined "Syriac" as the "name given to the dialect of Aramaic spoken in Mesopotamia at Edessa. The common version is called the Syriac Peshitto, and is cited either as Peshitto, or Syriac." See his "Glossary," in Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 190.

176. Wilson, "The Aramaic of Daniel," 263-264. Wilson defined "Samaritan" as "the version of the books of Moses into the Samaritan dialect of the Aramaic. This version is still used by a small number of persons residing in the modern city of Nablous." "Glossary," in Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 189-190.

177. Young wrote concerning the "Sachau Papyri (or Papyrus)" that they "are Aramaic documents (mostly letters and contracts, but containing also a short edition of

the Behistun Inscription of Darius the Great, king of Persia, and part of a story of a man called Achikar) edited by Prof. Edouard Sachau of the University of Berlin." See "Glossary," in Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 189.

178. Wilson, "The Aramaic of Daniel," 264.

179. For example, Archibald Alexander often appealed to theological dogma when he was confronted by a genuine problem in the Old Testament text. Taylor writes, "For in spite of his [Alexander's] unquestionable allegiance to the language and categories of Scottish Realism and the theology of Reformed Confessionalism, his thinking was also ineluctably shaped by the forces of the enlightenment and to a lesser extant Romanticism. Hence he attempted to defend the authority and reliability of the Bible in a scientific manner; he entertained the notion of the humanity of the Bible; he was committed to the importance of contemporary investigations into ancient Near Eastern history and customs; and he sensed imaginatively what it would have been like to experience life in the old dispensation. But the various forces that were shaping Alexander's thought sometimes came into collision, Alexander's expressed openness to objective biblical scholarship, for example, often set him in opposition to the traditional approach which he was committed to defend. The resulting tension prompted him on occasion to express extreme disgruntlement with the whole critical enterprise. In practice though, Alexander's commitment to Scottish Realism and to a traditional understanding of the scriptures as the inspired word of God stymied his ability to be truly open and scientific in terms of his study of the OT. When he did confront a genuine problem, he solved it dogmatically." Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School*, 45.

180. The preformative is the abbreviated form of the personal pronoun which is placed *before* the stem (i.e., the tri-radical root) to indicate the Imperfect inflection (i.e., the second full inflection of the finite verb in Hebrew). See § 47, "The Imperfect and its Inflection," in Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, 125. Young defined the preformative in the following manner: "Semitic roots have commonly three consonantal letters. Many nouns and forms of the verb are formed from these roots by putting a consonant before or after. When placed before, the consonant is called a preformative; when after, a sufformative." See "Glossary," in Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 188.

181. According to Gesenius, the meaning and differences of the Semitic Perfect and Imperfect are as follows: "The Hebrew (Semitic) *Perf.* denotes in general that which is *concluded*, *completed*, and *past*, that which has happened and has come into effect; but at the same time, also that which is *represented* as accomplished, even though it be continued into present time or even actually still future. The *Imperf.* denotes, on the other hand, the *beginning*, the *unfinished*, and the *continuing*, that which is just happening, which is conceived as in process of coming to pass, and hence, also, that which is yet future; likewise also that which occurs repeatedly or in a continuous sequence in the past (Latin *imperf.*). It follows from the above that the once common designation of the *Imperf.* as a *Future* emphasizes only *one* side of its meaning . . . —In the formation of the two tenses the chief distinction is that in the Perfect the verbal stem precedes and the indication of the person is added afterwards for precision, while in the *Imperf.* the subject, from which the action proceeds or about which a condition is predicated, is expressed by a prefixed pronoun." Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, 125, n. 1.

182. The English letter "n" is a transliteration for the Hebrew letter נ (Eng. *nün*).

183. The English letter "l" is a transliteration for the Hebrew letter ל (Eng. *lamed*).

184. The English letter "y" is a transliteration for the Hebrew letter ' (Eng. *yōd*).<sup>1</sup>
185. Wilson, "The Aramaic of Daniel," 267. Attaching the sense of the definite article (i.e., "the") to the ending *ā* (by the postpositive article, *R*) in the *status emphaticus* is particularly common in Biblical Aramaic in the masculine singular and feminine singular forms. The Latin term *status emphaticus* is now commonly referred to as the "determined state." See Franz Rosenthal, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*, sixth, revised edition (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1995), 27.
186. Wilson, "The Aramaic of Daniel."<sup>2</sup>
187. Ibid., 267-268.
188. Ibid., 268.
189. Young described the Behistun Inscription in the following manner: "Behistun, the ancient Bagistana, is the name of a village on the highway between Babylonia and Ecbatana (Hamadan), the capital of Media. On the face of a rock 500 feet above the plain are inscriptions of Darius the Great in Persian, Elamitic, and Babylonian . . . An Aramaic recension of this inscription was found in Egypt and published by Edouard Sachau in his *Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka*, 1911. [Reviewed by the writer in the *PTR* for 1914.] It is to be found also in Cowley's *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*" See his "Glossary," in Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 185.
190. Wilson, "The Aramaic of Daniel," 268.
191. Ibid., 268-269.
192. The jussive is defined by Gesenius as "a shortened form (the *jussive*) of the imperfect. It occurs mostly with the 2nd and 3rd persons, and less frequently with the 1st person (which has usually the lengthened form of the imperfect called the *cohortative*). "The meaning of the jussive is similar to that of the cohortative, except that in the jussive the command or wish is limited almost exclusively to the 2nd or 3rd person." The jussive (and the cohortative) corresponds to the modal use of the imperfect which most often expresses the will of the speaker to have something happen. See § 48 *a-b* and *h*, in Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, 129-131 *passim*.
193. On the difference between the absolute, construct, and emphatic (or determined) state in Biblical Aramaic, Rosenthal notes, "Nouns [in Biblical Aramaic] have two genders, masc. and fem.; three numbers, sg., pl., and dual; and three 'states,' corresponding to the form without the definite article ('absolute state' = *abs. st.*), the form used before a depending noun that is in the position of our genitive ('construct state' = *estr. st.*), and the form with the definite article ('determined state' = *det. st.*)."<sup>3</sup> Rosenthal, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*, 27. On the use of the absolute and construct state in Biblical Hebrew see § 89 *a-f*, in Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, 247-248.
194. See p. 269 for the inscriptional evidence.
195. Wilson, "The Aramaic of Daniel," 270.
196. Ibid.
197. Wilson listed what he considered to be ten Aramaic dialects: "(1) Northern Aramaic, embracing all inscriptions found outside of Egypt down to the year 400 B.C., (2) Egypto-Aramaic, (3) Daniel, (4) Ezra, (5) the Nabatean inscriptions, (6) the Palmyrene, (7) the Targum of Onkelos, (8) the Syriac, (9) the Mandean, and (10) the Samaritan." Ibid., 263-264.
198. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 502-504, 508. As cited in Wilson, "The Aramaic of Daniel," 264-265.



218. Harold H. Rowley, *The Aramaic of the Old Testament: A Grammatical and Lexical Study of Its Relations with Other Early Aramaic Dialects* (London: Oxford University Press, 1929).

219. *Ibid.*, 1-2. Taylor correctly asserts, “Rowley’s thinking on the subject was often stimulated by Wilson’s comments. Statements like the following are scattered throughout Rowley’s book: ‘Here again Wilson has a note which calls for some examination.’” Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School*, 359, n. 86.

220. Unlike Driver, Rowley was skeptical of the historicity of Daniel and dated all of the putative sources of the book in the post-exilic period: “The present writer [i.e., Rowley] is not convinced, however, of the duality of authorship. He believes that Daniel was a legendary hero concerning whom popular stories were current in the post-exilic period, and that a Maccabean author worked up some of these stories and issued them separately in Aramaic for the encouragement of his fellows. Chapters 2-6 were thus issued. Later, chapter 7 was similarly issued in Aramaic. The author had now passed over, however, to a different type of literature, which was less suitable for popular circulation. This he recognized by writing subsequent eschatological visions of this type in Hebrew. When he collected his stories and visions into a book, he wanted a fuller and more formal introduction than he had used for the first story when it was issued separately. He therefore rewrote the first part of the story of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream, and since this was now intended as an introduction to the whole book, it was written in Hebrew, the language of the more recent sections. The point of transition was thus determined by the amount of the earlier material he desired to rewrite.” Rowley, *The Aramaic of the Old Testament*, 10, n. 1.

221. *Ibid.*, 11.

222. *Ibid.*, 15, n.1.

223. An example of Wilson’s “special pleading” was effectively argued by Rowley: “He [Wilson] suggests that Daniel was a Spelling Reformer, who introduced for the first time the use of ְ instead of ִ which was conventional in Daniel’s day]. He adds: ‘Being an educated man, the author used it consistently and exclusively.’ This remark might have had more force if the same consistency and exclusiveness had been displayed by this author on all points of orthography. It is clearly not a question of his being an educated Reformer, and since in other respects he reflects the varying usage of his age, it is more natural to assume that he here reflects the consistent usage of his time and locality. . . . The innovation would seem to have met with very indifferent success amongst the Reformer’s own fellow nationals, until the Nabataeans and Palmyrenes took it up with some enthusiasm several centuries after his death. Shyly it raised its head in Egypt more than a century after the death of the supposed Reformer, and not until two centuries later than that did it make its first appearance so near to the place where the reform is supposed to have begun as Lassan Kef. No sign of it appears in the Babylonian docketts of the fifth century B.C., but by the fourth century the fame of the reform had spread to far distant Asia Minor, and a beginning, albeit a modest one, had been made in the introduction of the reformed spelling.” *Ibid.*, 23.

Rowley also thought that resorting to scribal alteration to explain points of orthographic changes was to evade the evidence: “Moreover, we are constrained to ask how it came about that this hypothetical scribal revision, while so complete in so far as the substitution of ְ for ִ is concerned, did not also bring up to date the pronominal suffixes in Ezra. And did it happen that the repeated copying of Jer 10:11 left נְכָנָן and

אַנְגָּרָה standing side by side, precisely as in AP [i.e., A.E. Cowley's *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, 1923] 6? . . . That the text of the Old Testament has often suffered scribal alteration is a commonplace, but that an enthusiastic scribe decided to modernize the text of the Aramaic sections of Daniel and Ezra on one point only is as improbable an assumption as Wilson's theory that Daniel was the founder of a Reformed Spelling Society" (24). Rowley, *The Aramaic of the Old Testament*, 23-24. On the development of Proto-Semitic consonants (i.e., the original Semitic stock) and the development of corresponding phonemes from Proto-Semitic-δ (or δ) → Ugaritic d → Hebrew ת → Aramaic ז, see "zayin one" in Alger F. Johns, *A Short Grammar of Biblical Aramaic* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1972; sixth reprint edition, 1991), 5. Cf. also "III. Remarks on Phonology," § 17 in Rosenthal, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*, 18.

224. Rowley wrote, "Wilson is content to leave that problem unmentioned and unfaced. For of these three words, two do not occur in Greek literature until long after the alleged date of the book of Daniel. Thus φαλτήριον is first mentioned in Greek literature in Aristotle, two hundred years after the alleged occurrence in Daniel, and οὐμφωνία first appears in Greek in Plato, some century and a half after the suggested date of Daniel, but in the proper abstract sense of *harmony*, while as the name of the instrument, it is first found in Greek literature in Polybius, nearly four hundred years after the supposed date of Daniel." Rowley, *The Aramaic of the Old Testament*, 148.

225. Ibid., 152.

226. Ibid., 155-156. However, recent biblical scholarship has re-examined and critiqued Rowley's linguistic arguments in favor of a 2nd century B.C. date. "In 1965 [K.A.] Kitchen brought out the most thorough critique of Rowley's thesis written up to that time. In his study, based on both published and still unpublished observations, Kitchen concluded that it is not on linguistic grounds derived from DA [Daniel] that a definite date for the book should be established; in Kitchen's view, there is no way of fixing the date of composition of DA *on the ground of Aramaic* anywhere between broad boundaries of the late sixth and the second centuries B.C. Kitchen's conclusion on the question of the syntax was expanded and revised in much of the work by [E.Y.] Kutscher. Kutscher argued that BA [Biblical Aramaic] is an eastern type of the Aramaic language, and that Driver's publication of the Papyri is essential in establishing the existence of the eastern and western branches of OfA [Official Aramaic]. According to him, there are precise characteristics of the eastern type of OfA. One of the things for which Kutscher criticized Rowley was the latter's refusal to accept the modernization of the spelling in DA." Stefanovic, *The Aramaic of Daniel in the Light of Old Aramaic*, 21.

Regarding the occurrences of Persian loan-words in the Aramaic portions of Daniel that Rowley claimed to be proof of an post-exilic date, Kitchen writes, "If one compares the Persian vocabulary of Biblical Aramaic with what the Targums contain—as Rowley does in the interests of a second-century date for Daniel—one should also compare that vocabulary with what is found in Imperial Aramaic documents of the sixth-fifth centuries BC. . . . Of the 19 words accepted as Persian in the Aramaic of Daniel, 8 or 9 occur in Imperial Aramaic and contemporary sources . . . In other words, nearly half of the Persian words in the Aramaic of Daniel are attested (mainly in Aramaic itself) in the sixth-fifth centuries BC. Or, nearly half of the Persian words would speak *just* as much for a sixth-fifth century date as would the 13 words found in the Targums for a second-century date. . . . The occurrence of 4 or 5 of them in both Persian imperial documents and Targums

merely leaves the date of Daniel's Aramaic where it was before: in the sixth to second centuries BC." Kenneth A. Kitchen, "The Aramaic of Daniel," in *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel*, eds. D.J. Wiseman et al. (London: Tyndale, 1965), 37.

On the occurrences of Greek words in the Aramaic of Daniel that, according to Driver and Rowley, demanded a late date for Daniel, T.J. Meadowcraft states, "Kitchen took issue with Driver in 1965 when he demonstrated a number of linguistic features that could indicate an earlier date for the stories. . . . [P.W.] Coxon was cautious in his series of linguistic studies in the late 1970s but allowed that much of the evidence could point to an earlier date for the Aramaic of Daniel. Other work, by such as [E.M.] Yamauchi and [E.] Masson, casts doubt on the particular notion that the presence of Greek words in Daniel necessitates a late date. Fitzmeyer on the *Genesis Apocryphon* also points to an earlier date for the Aramaic of Daniel." T.J. Meadowcraft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 277-278. Meadowcraft quoting from Yamauchi ["Daniel and Contacts between the Aegean and that Near East before Alexander," *Evangelical Quarterly* 53 (1981), 47], writes, "[Yamauchi] concludes his essay with the hope that 'future commentaries will come to recognize that the Greek words in Daniel cannot be used to date the book to the Hellenistic age.'" Ibid., 278, n. 23.

227. John J. Collins, *Daniel*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1993), 14-15. Note that E.J. Young had similarly suggested that the orthography of Daniel had been updated a decade earlier to Kitchen's proposal in 1954: "That the book [of Daniel] may have undergone later editing is a possibility. Particularly is it possible that the orthography may have been changed to bring it up to date. That might account for the fact that the Aramaic is what is known as *Reich-Aramaic*, i.e., the language of the Persian period. At the same time, in the present writer's opinion, there is nothing in the language of the book which in itself might not come from the sixth century B.C." Edward J. Young, *The Messianic Prophecies of Daniel* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1954), 8-9. Note that "Official Aramaic" and "Imperial Aramaic" (Ger. *Das Reichsaramäische*) are used synonymously to refer to the same period in which it became the lingua franca of Mesopotamia, in general, and the official language of the Persian Empire, in particular. Cf., Johns, *A Short Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*, 1; Rosenthal, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*, 9-10.

228. Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School*, 271.

229. According to Allis, Wilson had spent his last summer examining Rowley's work and had almost completed his reply before his death. "It is fortunate that [Rowley's work] came to Dr. Wilson's hands in time for him to devote part of the last summer of his life to examining it. His reply was nearly ready when he died; and it will probably appear in *The Evangelical Quarterly* (Edinburgh) in the not too distant future." Allis, "Defender of God's Word," 5. As cited by Kaiser, "Robert Dick Wilson," 77.

230. Ibid. Taylor cites—O.T. Allis in the "Introduction" to Wilson's *Studies in the Book of Daniel: Second Series*, 3-4—as the source. Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School*, 359, n.88.

231. See Oswald T. Allis, "Introduction," in Robert Dick Wilson, *Studies in the Book of Daniel: Second Series* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1938), 4.

232. Robert Dick Wilson, "The Book of Daniel and the Canon," *The Princeton Theological Review* 13 (1915): 352-408. Republished in Wilson, *Studies in the Book of Daniel: Second Series*, 9-64.

233. Wilson, "The Book of Daniel and the Canon," 352.

234. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 497. As noted in Wilson, "The Book of Daniel and the Canon," 353.

235. Wilson, "The Book of Daniel and the Canon," 355.

236. *Ibid.*, 356.

237. The Haphtaroth were being used by the critics as evidence alleging that, since readings from the book of Daniel do not appear, it must prove that Daniel had not been in existence during the time of their selection.

238. Wilson, "The Book of Daniel and the Canon," 384.

239. *Ibid.*

240. *Ibid.*, 386.

241. *Ibid.*, 391.

242. *Ibid.*, 392.

243. *Ibid.*, 406-408.

244. Concerning the issue of the silence of Ben Sira in his Apocryphal book, Ecclesiasticus (or Wisdom of Jesus, Son of Sirach), on the historical Daniel, Wilson wrote: "For, first, let us suppose that the Book of Daniel was unknown to Ben Sira. What follows? Not necessarily, as Prince concludes, that there was no such book in existence. Here is a fallacy which few writers on Old Testament introduction seem able to avoid. They confound the time of the writing of an Old Testament book with the time of its assumption into the collection of the canon. The New Testament books were presumably all written before the close of the first century A.D. Their acknowledgment as canonical, and their collection into one book, took place many years afterwards. So, the books of the Old Testament may have been written centuries before they were recognized as canonical, or admitted into the collection of the sacred scriptures. Daniel, for example, may have been written in Babylon in the 6th century B.C., and may not have been received officially into the canon of the Palestinian Jews until after its predictions had been so significantly and accurately fulfilled in the events of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. To be sure, according to Josephus, the high priest Jaddua showed the predictions of the book to Alexander the Great in 332 B.C. To be sure, also, the author of First Maccabees represents Mattathias as inciting the Asmoneans to rebellion against Antiochus in 169 B.C., by citing the deliverance of the three children from the flames and of Daniel from the lions' den. But while Jaddua in the fourth century B.C. may have known of the book, and while Mattathias and his hearers may have known about the fiery furnace and the deliverance from the lions in 169 B.C., it may be possible that Ben Sira, who wrote his work about 180 B.C. was, as Prince and others have brought themselves to believe, entirely ignorant of both the book and the person of Daniel. . . . But all this does not prove that the book did not exist in the time of Ben Sira, or that the facts recorded in the Book of Daniel had not occurred. For the collection of the sacred books to which Ben Sira had access may not have contained the Book of Daniel; or, for reasons deemed sufficiently good by him, may not have been acknowledged by him as canonical." Robert Dick Wilson, "The Silence of Ecclesiasticus Concerning Daniel," *The Princeton Theological Review* 14 (1916): 463-464. Republished in Wilson, *Studies in the Book of Daniel: Second Series*, 90-91. See also his similar arguments on the silence of Ezra, Chronicles, and Ecclesiasticus to Daniel in Robert Dick Wilson, "Daniel Not Quoted," *The Princeton Theological Review* 20 (1922): 57-68. Republished in Wilson, *Studies in the Book of Daniel: Second Series*, 65-75.

On the formative influences of Ben Sira on Ecclesiasticus, D.A. deSilva notes, "A complete study of Ben Sira's use of the Old Testament is impossible here, since the

diction is imbued throughout with recontextualization and echoes of the Old Testament. The econium on the Jewish heroes (44:1-50:29), by itself, shows Ben Sira's familiarity with the bulk of what we now call the Hebrew Scriptures: the Pentateuch and all the Former and Latter Prophets are attested down to the mention of "the Twelve Prophets" (49:10), showing that the Minor Prophets had already begun to be conceived of as a single group. The only Writings alluded to in the whole are Job, Proverbs, and Psalms. Daniel is not mentioned, nor the book alluded to, anywhere in Ben Sira, as is also the case with Ruth, Esther, and Ezra." David A. deSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002), 162.

245. Regarding the *Haphtaroth*, Wilson stated that no one knew why or when the reading selections were actually made. The earliest mention of them in the Bible is found in Luke 4:16, where it described when Jesus read the passage of Isaiah, "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me," in the synagogue on the Sabbath. Wilson, however, averred that, "since the Jews of the first century A.D. certainly acknowledged Daniel to be a prophet, they cannot have failed to make a selection from his prophecy because they did not consider him to be a prophet" (403). Wilson believed, according to the research of "Büchler and others," that the passages recorded in the *Haphtaroth* once contained "three times as many passages" than today, and "that the limiting of the length to be read was late, and that passages from of the prophets from which there are at present no selection were once read. The evidence collected above goes to show that only such sections were selected as magnified the Law and the Sabbath and the nationalistic hopes and aspirations of the Jews. Most of them have some readily visible point of contact with the portion of the Law which was to be read on the day for which the particular Haphtara was selected. The Haphtaroth, then, were selected with a regard to the appropriateness of their contents for the occasion, and for the portion of the Law which they were meant to illustrate . . . But the fact remains that the selection of the Haphtaroth had nothing to do with the age or canonicity of the books nor, as far as we know, with the position of a book among the divisions of the Old Testament as they constituted at the time when these Haphtaroth were chosen." Wilson, "The Book of Daniel and the Canon," 403-404.

246. Wilson utilized the assumed critical date of the redaction of the sources (from Wellhausen's "documentary hypothesis") against the critics in order to show that their supposition regarding the position of a book in the canon did not always coincide or determine the time of its canonicity and of its composition. Wilson contended, "Again, according to the radical critics (e.g., C.H. Cornill, *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament* [London: Williams and Norgate, 1907], 474), the Hebrew Pentateuch was not finished till after the time when the translation of the Seventy was made [i.e., LXX, the *Septuagint*]. Dividing the main sources of the five-fold book of the Law into the Jehovistic, Elohistic, Deuternomistic, and Priestly portions, denoted respectively by J, E, D, and P, they place J somewhere between 850 and 625 B.C.; E at about 750; D, at or shortly before 621; and P, at 444 B.C. The canonization of D was made in 621 B.C., and that of P in 444 B.C. The whole work was put together in its present form about 400 B.C., though additions and corrections were made even subsequently to the time of the Seventy; that is, after 280 B.C. The redactor Rp, who is said to have put J, E, D, and P together, excluded from and added to the original documents whatever he pleased, and put them together in the order that seemed to him to be best. But this order, while chronological according to the time at which the books purport to have been written, is not chronological according to the time at which the critics say that they were written; for Rp puts the laws of P before those of D, although according to the modern critics of the

Wellhausen school, D was written about two hundred years before the writing of P. It will be noted, also, that even though the five-fold division of the Law cannot be traced back farther than Philo, and even though it may have existed only a short time before the time when the version of the Seventy was made, this does not affect the fact that in the Pentateuch as far back as we can trace it, the P laws preceded the laws of D in the document as it came from the hand of Rp. Further, since the critics claim that D was canonized before P, it follows that the position of a book in the canon, or in a part of the canon, was not always, or necessarily determined by the time of its canonization, or by the time of its composition. So, then, the position of Daniel in the present Hebrew Bible has not necessarily anything to do with the time of its composition or of its canonicity." Ibid., 378-379.

247. Robert Dick Wilson, "The Background of Daniel," *The Princeton Theological Review* 22 (1924): 1-26. Republished in Wilson, *Studies in the Book of Daniel: Second Series*, 233-257.

248. Wilson, "The Background of Daniel," 1.

249. Ibid., 3.

250. Ibid.

251. Ibid.

252. Ibid.

253. Robert Dick Wilson, "The Prophecies of Daniel," *The Princeton Theological Review* 22 (1924): 390.

254. Another phrase synonymous to *post eventum*, i.e., "after the event," is *vaticinium ex eventu*, i.e., a "prophecy after the event." John J. Collins defines the latter phrase in the following manner: "EX EVENTU PROPHECY, the prediction of events which have already taken place, is found in all the Jewish apocalypses which do not have otherworldly journeys (not necessarily in all units of these apocalypses); Daniel 7, 8, 9, 10-11. . . . Ex eventu prophecy is an old phenomenon in the Bible; an early example can be found in Gen. 15:13-16. The apocalyptic use of the form always leads to an eschatological conclusion. . . . Elsewhere the apocalyptic *ex eventu* prophecies fall into two types: periodization of history and regnal prophecy." John J. Collins, *Daniel with an Introduction to the Apocalyptic Literature*, Vol. 20, FOTL (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1984), 11; see also Edwin M. Yamauchi, *Persia and the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1990), 57.

255. Wilson's Christian faith informed his understanding and interpretation of the Old Testament. He declared, "For myself, I have always been of the belief and am today, that Jesus knew more about the Old Testament than the Jews of His day and than any, or all, of the wise men of all time; and this belief is based upon the conviction that God hath demonstrated Him to be the Son of God by His resurrection from the dead. And, if He is the Son of God, I can believe that He was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, crucified for my sins, and that He has ascended up on high, having brought life and immortality to light in His gospel. As my Lord and Teacher, I take what He has said *con amore*, *ex animo*, and without any mental reservation . . . In view of the character of Jesus as portrayed in the New Testament it seems to me that all Christians at least should accept His opinion as to the facts of the Old Testament, unless it can be proved beyond controversy that what He thought and said about these fact is false." Robert Dick Wilson, "Jesus and the Old Testament," *The Princeton Theological Review* 24 (1926): 161-165.

256. Robert Dick Wilson, "The Word **הזהיר** in Daniel 12:3," *The Princeton Theological Review* 27 (1919): 128. Wilson contrasted the theological concept of revelation, and, more specifically, "progressive revelation" against the critical tenet of "the evolution of ideas." Wilson noted that the date of the book of Daniel was not to be fixed or determined based upon the doctrines which are found in it, i.e., the doctrines of the resurrection, angels, Messiah, and the judgment of the world. Whereas Driver and the critics had their starting point in the "laws of the evolution of ideas," Wilson began with the doctrine of "progressive revelation." Wilson noted that any doctrine or truth that was given by God through "progressive revelation," was not to be denied because of its newness or lateness, nor should the time of its reception be fixed to a certain time. Wilson wrote, "[W]hen there is a development in the fullness and clearness of God's revelation of certain truths to man, there is no reason for contending that no revelation of an entirely new truth should ever be made, nor for attempting to fix the time at which the revelation of the new truth should be made" (162). While Wilson admitted that the laws of the evolution of ideas could be applied to human productions, however, when it came to a document which is said to be a revelation from God, Wilson believed that these evolutionary presuppositions did not apply. For instance, Wilson noted that in the case of the concept of the Messiah, it was a unique idea that was produced not from human desire and development, but from divine revelation that was temporally revealed according to the divine will and pleasure. See Robert Dick Wilson, "The Origin of the Ideas of Daniel," *The Princeton Theological Review* 21 (1923): 161-165. For a further defense of the doctrines found in Daniel, see also Robert Dick Wilson, "The Influence of Daniel," *The Princeton Theological Review* 21 (1923): 337-371.

Wilson, however, did not accept all unusual events in the Old Testament narratives as divine miracles. For example, in his article "Understanding 'The Sun Stood Still'" (in *The Princeton Theological Review*, Vol. 16 (1918); 46-54, reprinted in *Classical Evangelical Essays in Old Testament Interpretation*, compiled and edited by Walter C. Kaiser, Jr. [Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1972], 61-64), Wilson proved in Joshua 10:12-13, the sun did not stand still per se, but that the sun had been eclipsed by the moon and that the darkness was comprehended by the enemies of Israel as if there had been two days. "With this in mind, we can understand what Ben Sira means when he says that through Joshua the sun stood, one day becoming like two. He means apparently that the day of the battle had two *comings out* of the sun, one at sunrise and the other at midday, when it came out from behind the moon; and that it had two *goings-in*, one when it went in behind the moon and the other at sunset" (63). Wilson added, "It will be perceived that the translation suggested does away with the miraculous character of the event in so far as it involves the solar system and the law of gravitation. It is true, also, that it runs counter to Jewish exegesis and to all the ancient versions, except perhaps the Greek, which is somewhat ambiguous and difficult of explanation. Notwithstanding this, I confess to a feeling of relief, as far as I myself am concerned, that I shall no longer feel myself forced by a strict exegesis to believe that the Scriptures teach that there actually occurred a miracle involving so tremendous a reversal of all the laws of gravitation" (63-64).

257. According to Sidney Greidanus, Ernst Troeltsch's views were representative of the naturalistic presuppositions underlying the modern historical-critical method. Greidanus writes, "when one speaks of the historical-critical method today, one can with some justification speak of a specific historical-critical method which is informed and guided by a specific set of shared presuppositions. Although these presuppositions are

seldom acknowledged, in 1898 Ernst Troeltsch forthrightly brought some of them out into the open. In fact, without calling attention to it, Troeltsch actually laid bare two layers of presuppositions, the bottom layer supporting the upper layer. The upper layer he called ‘principles,’ of which there are three: criticism, analogy, and correlation. Troeltsch acknowledged that these principles were founded on two underlying assumptions: the ‘fundamental similarity’ of all historical texts, and the ‘fundamental similarity of all historical events.’ Elsewhere, in discussing supernaturalism, he insists that the historical-critical method once accepted, knows no boundaries but can be applied to the supernatural as well; however, ‘having been formed according to natural events, when the method is applied to the supernatural, it necessarily dissolves the latter into natural categories.’ As formulated by Troeltsch, therefore, the principle of correlation is unable to acknowledge a transcendent God’s acts in history; it has a built-in blind spot for divine causation in history. On this account, too, it must declare all reported miracles nonhistorical.” Sidney Greidanus, *The Modern Preacher and the Ancient Text* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988), 24-33 passim. Greidanus’ translation is from Ernst Troeltsch, “Geschichte und Metaphysik,” *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 8 (1898): 5.

In addition, Colin Brown explicates Troeltsch’s three principles of criticism in the following way: “Underlying Troeltsch’s approach were [sic] the three principles of criticism, analogy, and correlation. Criticism demands the critical weighing of all evidence and the recognition that all judgments are open to revision in the light of new knowledge. Correlation is the idea that every event in history is in principle connected with all others, and thus history is a network of interrelated events. Analogy is the key to criticism and correlation. In 1898 Troeltsch wrote a paper ‘On Historical and Dogmatic Method in Theology’ in which he stated the principle of analogy as the criterion by which events are identified and their historicity assessed:

For the means by which criticism first becomes possible at all is the application of analogy. Analogy with what happens before our eyes and comes to pass in us is the key to criticism. Deception, dubious dealings, fabrication of myth, fraud and party spirit which we see before our eyes are the means by which we recognize the same kind of thing in the material which comes to us. Agreement with normal, ordinary, repeatedly attested modes of occurrence and conditions, as we know them, is the mark of probability for the occurrences which criticism can acknowledge as having really happened or leave aside. The observation of analogies between homogeneous occurrences of the past makes it possible to ascribe probability to them and to interpret what is unknown in the one by the known in the other. This universal power of analogy includes the essential homogeneity [German: *Gleichartigkeit*]; it leaves all possible room for differences. However, on each occasion it presupposes a nucleus of common homogeneity, from which the differences can be understood and felt.

Colin Brown, *Miracles and the Critical Mind* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1984), 128-129. Brown’s translation is from Ernst Troeltsch, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 2, second edition. (Originally published in 1922; Darmstadt: Scientia Verlag Aalen, 1962), 732.

258. Robert Dick Wilson, “Apocalypses and the Date of Daniel,” *The Princeton Theological Review* 19 (1921): 544-545. In like manner, Wilson argued, “the undeniable fact is that history knows nothing of the alleged composition and publication and

canonization of the Book of Daniel in the Maccabean age. When it first emerged into historic view, it was already stamped with the same authority as the other books of the Old Testament. Its authenticity, genuineness, and veracity, have never been denied except by those who have disbelieved in miracle and predictive prophecy and by some weak-kneed Jews and Christians of these later decades who have thought that they were scientific when they were merely blind followers of the blind. Scientific? This word implies knowledge. And where did they get their knowledge? Let the critics produce it." Wilson, "The Prophecies of Daniel," 399-400.

259. Wilson, "The Prophecies of Daniel," 377-401. Republished in Wilson, *Studies in the Book of Daniel: Second Series*, 258-280.

260. Although the critical date of the composition of the book of Daniel generally falls during the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, critics were not agreed in its specific date: "De Wette-Schrader put the time of writing Daniel at between 167 and 164 B.C., Driver at sometime about 168 B.C.; and Cornill asserts that it must have been written between the end of December 165 and June 164, thus probably in January 164." Wilson, "The Prophecies of Daniel," 384.

261. Ibid., 377.

262. Ibid., 383.

263. Wilson similarly argues this case in his article, "Belshazzar," in Wilson, *Studies in the Book of Daniel*, 109.

264. Wilson, "The Prophecies of Daniel," 377.

265. Ibid.

266. Ibid., 383.

267. Harold H. Rowley, *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press Board, 1959), 27.

268. Ibid.

269. Ibid., 27-28.

270. John C. Whitcomb, *Darius the Mede* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1959). Cited in Yamauchi, *Persia and the Bible*, 58.

271. Wilson, *Studies in the Book of Daniel*, 128-220. Cited in D.J. Wiseman, "Some Historical Problems in the Book of Daniel," in *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel*, eds. D.J. Wiseman et al. (London: Tyndale, 1965), 10.

272. Charles H.H. Wright, *Daniel and His Prophets* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1906), 135-137. Cited in Wiseman, "Some Historical Problems in the Book of Daniel," 10.

273. Wiseman, "Some Historical Problems in the Book of Daniel," 10-12.

274. Ibid., 12.

275. Ibid.

276. Ibid.

277. Wiseman continued, "While the unusual nature of 'Darius (the Mede)' as an appellation of Cyrus the Persian could be a reason for the explanatory note in Daniel 6:28, it should be also noted that the description of the later Darius (II) as the 'the Persian' (Ne. 12:22) could imply the need to distinguish the king of that name from one who was already known in Babylonia as 'Darius the Mede.' The identification of Cyrus the Persian king with Darius the Mede accords well with the prophecies of Isaiah (13:17) and Jeremiah (51:11, 28), who saw in the Medes the conquerors of Babylon. My argument here, however, is directed to show that the traditional close connection of Medes and Persians under Cyrus by marriage, conquest or inheritance, and language

makes him a stronger candidate for the appellation ‘the Mede’ than Gubaru, for whom the argument for such a description is one of total silence.” *Ibid.*, 14.

278. *Ibid.*, 16.

279. For a fuller presentation of the present debate over the identity of Darius the Mede, see Yamauchi, *Persia and the Bible*, 58-59.

280. Assessing Wilson’s historical approach to the traditional defense of the Old Testament, Noll writes, “Robert Dick Wilson of Princeton Seminary . . . chose not to use prophecy or miracles to support his traditional conclusions about the Old Testament. Rather, he would use ‘the evidential method . . . the Laws of Evidence as applied to documents admitted in our courts of law . . . the evidence of manuscripts and versions and of the Egyptian, Babylonian, and other documents outside the Bible’ to demonstrate the truth of traditional opinions.” Mark A. Noll, *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994), 104.

281. One such example of “special pleading” by Wilson was in his defense of the possibility that Daniel was the Belshazzar who was mentioned in the fourth year of Cyrus (535 B.C.). If Daniel was the Belshazzar mentioned during the reign of Cyrus, then he would have been 85 years of age, and, apparently, he would have been taken to Babylon at around age fifteen. Wilson suggested that Daniel may have been the governor of the second year of Darius Hystaspis which would have made him approximately 100 years old. While admittedly using a personal anecdote, Wilson defended this view by referring to the longevity of his ancestors: “The author of this chapter [i.e., Wilson] is especially sceptical (*sic*) upon this argument based upon the impossibility of Daniel’s having come to Babylon in the year of the beginning of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar and yet having been alive and flourishing in the reign of Darius Hystaspis. For the sake of the bearing upon the case in discussion, he may be pardoned for saying that his great-grandmother Graham, *née* McCreery, died at the age of 99; a great grand-uncle, Thomas Dick, at the age of 101, two great-uncles, John Dick, and Robert at 92 and 94 respectively; and his great-grandfather, Joseph Wilson, at 105. This last mentioned the writer himself has seen, when he was more than 100 years old . . . A simple life, lived in the fear of God, is conducive to longevity; and so may it have been with Daniel.” Wilson, *Studies in the Book of Daniel*, 35, n. 2. While Wilson’s personal observations are clearly valid, the argument was based more upon probability and not upon historical evidence.

282. Although Wilson implicitly practiced the harmonistic method as did William Henry Green before him, it was explicitly and vigorously defended by Wilson’s former pupil and colleague, Oswald T. Allis. The method of harmonization went hand-in-hand with Old Princeton’s Common Sense epistemology: “There is nothing for which the critics seem to have such an aversion as a harmonizing interpretation; and very naturally, for it annuls all their work. And yet it is the plain dictate of common sense that the different parts of the same instrument should be interpreted in harmony, provided the language employed will in fairness admit of such an interpretation.” Green, *The Unity of the Book of Genesis*, 8.

283. With respect to the corruption of numeric figures during the transmission history of ancient texts, Wilson examined the Elephantine document that contained the Aramaic Behistun inscription of Darius Hystaspis and compared its numbers with those that appeared on the matching Babylonian inscription which he believed, contra Eduard Sachau, was a translation of the original Aramaic document. Not only did they differ from one another, but both recensions when compared to the Persian and Susian texts were also at numerical variance. Wilson concluded, “The difficulty of recording and

transmitting with accuracy numerical statements in the system of notation in ancient times is manifest from the fact that the Babylonian and Aramaic versions differ in numerous instances in the statement of these numbers. In one case the Aramaic has 5000 when the Babylonian has only 500. This difficulty of recording and reading the signs employed for numerical notation throws great light upon the any variations in numbers found in the text of the parallel passages of the Old Testament." Robert Dick Wilson, "The Papyrus of Elephantine," *The Princeton Theological Review* 12 (1914): 420.

284. William Henry Green published three articles emphasizing "the history of redemption" and the centrality of Christ in the interpretation of the Old and New Testaments: W.H. Green, "History of the Old Covenant," review of J.H. Kurtz, vol. 1, *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review* 23 (1851): 451-486; idem, "Theology of the Old Testament," *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review* 25 (1853): 103-120; idem, "The Relation of the Old to the New Dispensation," *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review* 23(1851): 635-649.

285. For example, Old Princeton's Joseph Addison Alexander published three significant works on Old Testament historiography: J.A. Alexander, "On the Correspondence between Prophecy and History," *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review* 25 (1853): 290-305; idem, "The Historical Scriptures and Old Testament History," *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review* 26 (1854): 484-504; idem, "The Plan and Purpose of the Patriarchal History," *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review* 27 (1855): 24-39.

286. Wilson's fellow colleague at Princeton, Geerhardus Vos, published widely upon the significance of the divine covenants of the Old and New Testaments. Many of these journal articles were collected and republished into a single volume, entitled *Redemptive History and Biblical Interpretation*, edited by Richard B. Gaffin (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1980). These essays include, "Hebrews, The Epistle of the Diatheke [Covenant]," 161-233; "The Doctrine of the Covenant in Reformed Theology," 234-270; "'Covenant' or 'Testament'?", 400-411. Vos's *magnum opus* focused upon the explication of the divine covenants in the Old and New Testament from a Reformed perspective: Geerhardus Vos, *Biblical Theology: Old and New Testaments* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1948).

287. Wilson, "Lecture Notes: Introduction to the Old Testament." Spring Semester 1930, transcript by Winifred Griffith Thomas Gillespie (St. Louis: "Robert Dick Wilson Papers" PCA Historical Center).

288. Taylor accurately writes, "his [i.e., Wilson's] work in exegesis was negligible. Wilson was neither able to develop Green's insights regarding the importance of being sensitive to the theological shaping of the texts (although he did assign Green's *Unity of the Book of Genesis* to his students)." Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School*, 272.

289. Taylor states, "Wilson's scholarship therefore was often highly technical, theologically barren and had little appeal to a general audience." Ibid. Taylor further comments that one major factor that contributed to Old Princeton's demise was its inability to relate their theologically and technically dense materials to a "general audience." For example, Taylor writes concerning Professor Geerhardus Vos, "his thick Dutch accent and rapid lecture style had a very negative effect on his teaching. Further, his copious writings were plagued by a heaviness in style and predominantly negative tone which blunted their effectiveness." Ibid., 266; 357-358, n.61. Taylor's point is

significant due to the fact that they had already been rejected by the wider academic community.

290. *Ibid.*, 272.

291. As documented above, noted biblical scholars such as J.A. Montgomery, W.F. Albright, and more recently, D.J. Wiseman and K.A. Kitchen have respected Wilson's work. Even in J.J. Collins' magisterial commentary on *Daniel* in the Hermeneia series (Fortress, 1993), he includes Wilson's arguments with respect to the 6th/5th century B.C. dating of the Aramaic of Daniel. All this proves that Wilson's arguments on the book of Daniel continue to have merit to the present day and that his work will remain within the history of interpretation as far as the biblical book of Daniel is concerned.

292. Since much of their major publications come after their years at Westminster Seminary and contemporaneous with Professor Young, the biographies and scholarly contributions of both Oswald T. Allis and Alexander A. MacRae will be considered and footnoted in the following chapter on "Edward J. Young."

293. Wilson's first and strongest impression on Allis was noted by Skilton: "The speaker at the opening exercises [of Princeton Seminary] in 1902 was Robert Dick Wilson, who studied in Berlin and took as his subject an issue that was being discussed there at the time. The address was entitled, 'Babylon and Israel: A Comparison of their Leading Ideas Based upon their Vocabularies.' This was an effective response to a lecture which Friedrich Delitzsch had given in Berlin in January of 1902. In this lecture, 'Babel und Bibel,' Delitzsch had attempted to show that a large number of the beliefs of Israel were derived from Babylon and that the law of Moses was greatly indebted to the code of Hammurabi. Such theories were part of the comparative religions movement that impinged upon the authority of the biblical revelation. They were to cause Allis concern till the end of his life." John Skilton, "Oswald T. Allis," in *Bible Interpreters of the Twentieth Century: A Selection of Evangelical Voices*, eds. W.A. Elwell & J.D. Weaver (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1999), 123. Allis himself commented that, "It was the privilege of the writer to study at Princeton Seminary under men who held firmly to the great tradition on which that institution was founded, men who not merely believed but gloried in that pervasive supernaturalism which alone can be called truly biblical. And he has felt that in striving to defend the heritage of unfeigned faith in the Holy Scriptures which dwelt in that noble succession of teachers, among whom Joseph Addison Alexander, William Henry Green and Robert Dick Wilson were so eminent, he was repaying in some measure the debt which he owed these mighty men of God." Oswald T. Allis, *The Old Testament: Its Claims and Its Critics* (Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1972), viii. As cited by Skilton, "Oswald T. Allis," 123.

294. MacRae wrote concerning the impact Wilson had over his life: "I myself had crossed the continent in order to study at the feet of these great defenders of the faith [i.e., Robert Dick Wilson and J. Gresham Machen], and had graduated from Princeton Seminary in 1927. Dr. Wilson had obtained for me a special fellowship in Semitic Philology and I had followed his desire that I study under the great linguistic scholars in Germany, as he himself had done. I had completed two years of graduate study at the University of Berlin and desired to stay there another year, but Dr. Wilson urged me to return and become his assistant in the new institution [i.e., Westminster Seminary]. Allan A. MacRae, "The Antecedents of Biblical Theological Seminary," (Hatfield, PA: Biblical Theological Seminary, circa late 1980s), 1. Francis Schaeffer wrote, "Dr. MacRae was the recognized outstanding student of the renowned Dr. Robert Dick Wilson of old Princeton. Dr. Robert Dick Wilson was considered by many to be the greatest scholar of

Semitic languages in the world in his day, and Dr. MacRae was, and is, a gifted follower of the same scholarship and tradition. . . . Dr. MacRae has carried on the tradition of Robert Dick Wilson." Francis A. Schaeffer, "Introduction," in Allan A. MacRae, *The Gospel of Isaiah* (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1977), 7-8.

## **Chapter Three: TOEING THE LINE**

Edward Joseph Young first appeared in a Westminster Theological Seminary catalogue during the 1932-1933 academic year as a “Middle Classman.”<sup>1</sup> He had matriculated a year after Robert Dick Wilson’s death, but Wilson’s legacy continued to live on in the ministry and work of his former pupils and colleagues, Oswald T. Allis and Allan A. MacRae. Both Allis and MacRae were responsible for Young’s entire Old Testament education throughout his years as a divinity student at Westminster. Young’s Old Testament courses consisted of: “Elements of Hebrew” (taught by MacRae), “Advanced Hebrew” (MacRae, co-taught with Allis), “Elements of Arabic” (MacRae), “Elements of Babylonian” (MacRae), “Supplementary Hebrew Reading” (MacRae), “The Old Testament in Light of the Monuments” (MacRae), “General Introduction to the Old Testament” (MacRae), “Old Testament History” (Allis), “Poetical Books” (Allis), “Introduction to the Pentateuch” (Allis), “Prophetic Books” (Allis), “The Religion of Israel” (Allis), and “The Exile and Restoration” (Allis).<sup>2</sup>

As a student, Young’s adept abilities in learning the Semitic languages did not go unnoticed. A year after his graduation from Westminster in June 1935, Young reappeared in the seminary catalogue for 1936-1937 as an Instructor of Old Testament. During that first year of instruction, Young taught courses in “Elements of Hebrew,” “Advanced Hebrew” (co-taught with MacRae), “Elements of Arabic,” “The Prophecy of Amos,” “Elements of Aramaic,” “Elements of Babylonian,” and “Advanced Aramaic.”<sup>3</sup> It is apparent that in Young, Westminster was able to retain Wilson’s emphasis on the biblical languages, but, throughout his lengthy career, Young continued to “toe the line” of Reformed orthodoxy in the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition.

In this chapter, Young’s life, perspectives, and scholarly works as an Old Testament professor at Westminster Seminary will be presented and analyzed. His continuation of the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition will be documented particularly with respect to the changing theological climate of his day. Young’s theological and exegetical differences with his younger colleague, Meredith G. Kline, will be examined in regard to the Adamic administration and the “days” of Genesis 1 and 2. Furthermore, his interaction with historical criticism along with his defense of the authorship, unity, and early dating of the Pentateuch and the book of Isaiah will be investigated. Lastly, Young’s place within Old Testament scholarship in general and the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition in particular will be considered and assessed.

### **3.1 Edward Joseph Young: Life and Background<sup>4</sup>**

Edward Joseph Young was born on November 29, 1907 in San Francisco, California. He was reared in the home of an architect with strong Christian convictions. By age fifteen, Young had already committed himself to prepare for the ministry in the Presbyterian Church. While attending Lowell High School, Young took Greek and planned to take Hebrew and the other Semitic languages in college so that he could concentrate his studies in the Old Testament.<sup>5</sup> During college, Young came under the care of a presbytery and spent one productive summer ministering in Nevada. In 1929, after graduating *cum laude* from Leland Stanford Junior University (presently Stanford University), Young decided to study in the Middle East (i.e., Palestine and Egypt) and in Europe (i.e., Germany, Spain, Italy, and England) for a couple of years.<sup>6</sup>

Upon his return to the States, Young spent a year at San Francisco Seminary, but decided to transfer to the newly-founded Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia. Young's decision was based upon Westminster's more conservative and Reformed-theological perspectives as well as the reputation of its well-known founder, J. Gresham Machen.<sup>7</sup> While at Westminster, Young came under the tutelage of two conservative and learned Old Testament scholars:<sup>8</sup> Oswald T. Allis, Professor of Old Testament;<sup>9</sup> and Allan A. MacRae, Assistant Professor of Old Testament.<sup>10</sup> Upon completion of his theological education at Westminster and his subsequent marriage to Lillian Riggs Borden<sup>11</sup> in July 1935, Young returned to San Francisco in order to be examined by the California Presbytery of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. (PCUSA). He successfully passed his examinations for licensure and ordination, but was never subsequently ordained to a particular ministry within the PCUSA.<sup>12</sup> Rather, Young opted to pursue ordination in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (hereafter, OPC) a year later. The OPC, at that time, had recently been formed under Machen as an antidote to the perceived theological liberalism of the PCUSA which now controlled Princeton Theological Seminary. Young's decisive move to the OPC was a clear sign of his solidarity with Machen in regard to his conservative theological and ecclesiastical convictions.<sup>13</sup>

With the financial backing of two prominent scholarships that were awarded to Young upon graduation, i.e., the Frank H. Stevenson Fellowship and the William Brenton Greene, Jr. Prize in Apologetics,<sup>14</sup> Young and his new bride made "the trip to Leipzig, Germany, a honeymoon as well as an opportunity to study under outstanding scholars."<sup>15</sup> His teachers at the University of Leipzig included Albrecht Alt, Joachim Begrich, and Karl Elliger.<sup>16</sup> Throughout his lifetime, particularly during his post-graduate studies in Leipzig and in Philadelphia, Young acquired at least twenty-six languages, paralleling the linguistic prowess of his predecessor, Robert Dick Wilson.<sup>17</sup> The *Bulletin of Westminster Theological Seminar* (Winter 1936) reported,

Dr. Young has an excellent command of languages learned from textbooks as well as from devious camel drivers and haggling innkeepers. Yet with him language is more than a routine study; it is a work of love. He has a speaking or reading knowledge of at least twenty-six languages, and most of these have been self-taught. He is able to pursue studies in Ugaritic, speak German fluently, and preach in Spanish. He reports that he finds use for every one of his languages in his Old Testament studies.<sup>18</sup>

John Murray also commented on Young's prodigious linguistic skill:

His linguistic talent was phenomenal. He was a master of Hebrew and Aramaic, and with the Semitic languages bearing upon Old Testament studies he was thoroughly conversant. But not only were the ancient tongues his province. He read with ease a great variety of modern languages and thus no significant phase of Old Testament study escaped his notice or failed to receive his assessment.<sup>19</sup>

While in Leipzig during the spring of 1936, Young was offered the opportunity to return to Westminster Seminary as an Instructor in Old Testament due to Allis's resignation and early retirement from classroom instruction.<sup>20</sup> Young accepted the position and began his teaching career in September 1936 until his death on February 14, 1968.<sup>21</sup> During Young's thirty-two year career at Westminster Seminary, he eventually taught every course offered in the Old Testament curriculum. With respect to his first year of instruction in 1936, Young had the auspicious opportunity to teach alongside his mentor and senior colleague, Allan A. MacRae. However, before the following school year had begun, MacRae, as Allis had done a year earlier, submitted his resignation due to personal reasons.<sup>22</sup>

Westminster would not hire another Old Testament faculty member until 1954, some seventeen years later.<sup>23</sup> For more than half of Young's career, he remained the only full-time Old Testament professor in residence. Although he utilized several assistants and instructors along the way,<sup>24</sup> as the only member of the Old Testament faculty, it was incumbent on him to teach the bulk of the department's course offerings. As a result, Young's workload throughout that extensive period was particularly heavy. For instance, he regularly taught most of the Semitic languages including: elemental and advanced Hebrew (also including "Exegesis of First Samuel I-XV"), elemental and advanced Aramaic, elemental and advanced Arabic, elemental Babylonian, a course on "The Cuneiform Languages of the Old Testament," an upper-division Semitic seminar course, an introduction to Syriac, and an introduction to Ethiopic.<sup>25</sup> His courses on the Old Testament proper encompassed: "Old Testament History," "General Introduction to the Old Testament," "Introduction to the Pentateuch," "Poetical Books," "Prophetic Books," "The Prophecy of Amos," "The Code of Hammurabi," "Seminar in Old Testament History," "The Dead Sea Scrolls," and "The Old Testament Since the Reformation."

Amidst a full teaching load, in 1943 Young successfully completed his Ph.D. studies in Semitic languages at nearby Dropsie College for Hebrew and

Cognate Learning in Philadelphia.<sup>26</sup> Although the school is now known as the Center for Advanced Judaic Studies in the University of Pennsylvania, Dropsie had been a Jewish College that was originally established to train specialists in Judaic studies.<sup>27</sup> Many prominent evangelical scholars including several of Westminster Seminary's Old Testament professors were educated there.<sup>28</sup> Young's dissertation, which formally dealt with the "history of interpretation" of the Hebrew Bible, was entitled "Biblical Criticism to the End of the Second Christian Century."<sup>29</sup> His supervisors as listed in his dissertation were Professors Joseph Reider, Solomon Zeitlin, and Solomon L. Skoss. In his thesis, Young examined the early biblical-critical approaches of various Gnostic and non-Gnostic sects within the first two centuries of the Christian Church. Young culminated his study in the writings of Celsus who had been an antagonist of Christianity and the Scriptures during the time of Origen.<sup>30</sup>

In 1954, Westminster finally employed another full-time Old Testament faculty member named Meredith G. Kline.<sup>31</sup> Kline, who had been a brilliant student under Young at Westminster, was also personally trained by Young as his teaching assistant since 1949.<sup>32</sup> Kline had been originally appointed Assistant Professor of Old Testament in order to assist Young in teaching a portion of the Old Testament core courses.<sup>33</sup> Under Young, Kline developed into a prolific and accomplished Old Testament scholar in his own right. He became full-time Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature on June 1, 1963.<sup>34</sup> However, by 1965, Kline felt it necessary to resign from Westminster and join the faculty at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary in South Hamilton, Massachusetts due to recurring conflicts with Young over key interpretative biblical issues.<sup>35</sup>

In the main, Young's interpretive stances were neither novel nor controversial. As an ardent tradent of Old Princeton, Young familiarized himself with the works of his predecessors and faithfully adhered to their convictions especially when it came to encountering critical views on the Old Testament. Harman writes, "He [Young] stood in the Princeton/Westminster tradition; and the influence of Joseph Addison Alexander, William Henry Green, B.B. Warfield, Robert Dick Wilson, and Geerhardus Vos is clearly discernible in his writings."<sup>36</sup> That influence is most apparent in Young's approach to the more controversial issues of Old Testament studies such as the authorship and dating of the Pentateuch and the books of Ecclesiastes,<sup>37</sup> Isaiah, and Daniel. In many ways, Young saw himself as continuing the Old Princeton tradition at Westminster which included maintaining their conservative views on the Old Testament. Geoffrey Thomas, a former student of Young's, recalled:

The course he gave on O.T. exegesis was characteristically on Genesis 1-11. His painstaking analysis of Isaiah in his course on O.T. prophecy showed his great familiarity with this book whose unity he so vigorously maintained. Similarly with the book of Daniel; whilst admitting that there were difficulties in holding that the book of Daniel was written in the sixth century B.C. by Daniel himself, and explaining carefully just what the difficulties were,

nevertheless he maintained that arguments generally adduced against that position were not of sufficient weight to overthrow it.<sup>38</sup>

Moreover, Young's attempt to tow the line of conservative, Reformed Orthodoxy is most evident in his writings. As an academician, "Young was a prolific writer, producing scholarly monographs, collected essays, commentaries, textbooks, even a grammar in Arabic."<sup>39</sup> Even so, Young never regarded his scholarly works as an end unto themselves but saw his work as an act of religious devotion. Throughout Young's extensive career, he remained profoundly committed to the doctrine of plenary inspiration, i.e., that the entire biblical Canon was divinely inspired in the original autographs. This fundamental doctrine served as his starting point. "Young believed that proper interpretation could take place only on the presupposition of Christian theism, which included a strong affirmation of the supernatural. . . . [H]e [Young] defended the view that the Bible is inherently canonical due to its inspiration and that the faithful recognized this by the inward testimony of the Spirit."<sup>40</sup> John Murray,<sup>41</sup> Young's former systematic theology professor and colleague, wrote of him, "The Bible, he believed, was revelation from God, always relevant and by the Holy Spirit sealed in our hearts to be what it intrinsically is, the inerrant Word of God. That this was the controlling factor in Dr. Young's thinking is evident in all of his writings. . . . He knew nothing of the antithesis between devotion to the Lord and devotion to the Bible."<sup>42</sup>

It is evident that Young neither lost sight of his faith nor of his vocation as a minister of the Gospel. He continually sought to combine his profound knowledge of Old Testament scholarship with his abiding Christian faith. Notable examples of this are found mainly within his devotional works that often combined scholarly expositions of the biblical text with spiritual encouragement.<sup>43</sup> In spite of a demanding teaching schedule, Young also managed to consistently contribute to the local church of his membership and the OPC denomination which he faithfully served. For example, OPC historians, D.G. Hart and J. Muether, note,

In 1938 the [Presbyterian] *Guardian* started a young people's page which was regularly supplied by Edward J. Young, professor of Old Testament at Westminster Seminary and chairman of the committee on young people's work. His lessons featured instruction on biblical topics such as the person of Christ and messianic prophecies. Later lessons were written by different pastors and professors at the seminary.<sup>44</sup>

Young also served as moderator of the OPC's general assembly in 1956 and, as a student of hymnody, took part in the production of the Trinity Hymnal in 1961.<sup>45</sup>

Young also spent time outside of Westminster Seminary and the OPC in order to lecture and encourage the faith of Christians within the broader evangelical church. Harman notes, "In the year before his death he spoke at a Lutheran conference in Minnesota, at Toronto Baptist Seminary, and at L'Abri Fellowship in Switzerland. He wrote popular articles on Christian subjects,

many of them for the *Presbyterian Guardian*. In addition to being a prominent Old Testament scholar, he was a popularizer who wrote with cultivated simplicity.<sup>46</sup> Although Young is rarely read or quoted today,<sup>47</sup> the fact that “so many of his books are still in print is itself a testimony to the usefulness of his labors for the Christian community.”<sup>48</sup> It is to the analysis of Young’s writings that we shall now turn.

### 3.2 The Writings of Edward J. Young

As a seasoned Old Testament scholar and author, Edward J. Young was highly productive. John Murray declared, “Dr. Young was an untiring worker. His literary output was prodigious. Those acquainted with his many contributions to Old Testament studies soon discovered the thoroughness of his preparation and the breadth of his scholarship.”<sup>49</sup> Young wrote some forty-five journal and magazine articles on the Old Testament and published ninety-six book reviews that appeared in the *Westminster Theological Journal* between May 1949 (volume 2) to May 1965 (volume 27).<sup>50</sup> Although Young wrote on eclectic topics covering the Pentateuch,<sup>51</sup> the authority of the Old Testament,<sup>52</sup> and various aspects of Old Testament scholarship<sup>53</sup>—the bulk of his articles, however, dealt with the book of Isaiah:

- “The Interpretation of יְהוָה in Isaiah 52:15,” *Westminster Theological Journal*, 3.2 (May 1941): 125-132.
- “The Study of Isaiah Since the Time of Joseph Addison Alexander, part I,” *Westminster Theological Journal*, 9.1 (November 1946): 1-30.
- “The Study of Isaiah Since the Time of Joseph Addison Alexander, part II,” *Westminster Theological Journal*, 10.1 (November 1947): 23-56.
- “The Study of Isaiah Since the Time of Joseph Addison Alexander, part III,” *Westminster Theological Journal*, 10.2 (May 1948): 23-56.
- “Of Whom Speaketh the Prophet This?,” *Westminster Theological Journal*, 11.2 (May 1949): 135-155.
- “The Origin of the Suffering Servant Idea,” *Westminster Theological Journal*, 13.1 (November 1950): 19-33.
- “בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל (Isaiah 63:3),” [senior author: Cyrus H. Gordon] *Westminster Theological Journal*, 14.1 (November 1951): 54.
- “The Immanuel Prophecy Isaiah 7:14-16, part I,” *Westminster Theological Journal*, 15.2 (May 1953): 97-124.
- “The Immanuel Prophecy Isaiah 7:14-16, part II,” *Westminster Theological Journal*, 16.1 (November 1953): 23-50.
- “Professor Nyberg on Isaiah 53,” *Papers Read at the Seventh Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, Dec. 29-30, 1954*, ed. By John F. Walvoord. Dallas: The Evangelical Theological Society, 1954.
- “The Dead Sea Scroll of Isaiah,” *Christianity Today*, March 17, 1958, 16-18.
- “Isaiah’s Message for Today: Part I, Isaiah’s Majestic Prophecy; Part II, The Promise of a Saviour-King,” *The Seminary Review*, 8.1 (Fall 1961): 3-49.

- “Isaiah’s Message for Today: Part III, The Suffering Servant of the Lord,” *The Seminary Review*, 8.2 (Winter 1962): 53-74.
- “Isaiah 34 and its Position in the Prophecy,” *Westminster Theological Journal*, 27 (May 1965): 93-114.
- “The Authorship of Isaiah,” *Themelios*, 4.3 (1967): 11-16.

Moreover, as an ardent advocate of the Old Princeton-Westminster, Reformed Orthodoxy, Young’s monographs were mainly dedicated to the defense of the traditional views of the Old Testament books (especially the book of Isaiah):

- *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949, reprinted June, 1989).
- *The Prophecy of Daniel: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949).
- *My Servants the Prophets* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952; tenth printing November, 1979).
- *The Messianic Prophecies of Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954).
- *Studies in Isaiah* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954).
- *Daniel’s Vision of the Son of Man* (London: The Tyndale Press, 1958).
- *Who Wrote Isaiah?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1958).
- *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament* by Robert Dick Wilson with revisions by Edward J. Young (Chicago: Moody Press, 1959).
- *Studies in Genesis One* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1964).
- *Old Testament Prophecy* (Toronto: The Gospel Witness, 1965). Lectures delivered in Toronto Baptist Seminary; March 22-26, 1965.
- *The Book of Isaiah: The English Text, with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Volume 1—Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965; Volume 2—Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969; Volume 3—Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972; reprinted in three volumes by Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI, 2001).

### 3.2.1 Semitic Grammars

Young published his first Semitic grammar, *Arabic for Beginners*, in 1949.<sup>54</sup> The grammar was dedicated to Dr. Solomon L. Skoss, a member of his dissertation committee at Dropsie, for his assistance in learning Arabic. By 1960, Young privately published, *Old Testament Hebrew for Beginners*,<sup>55</sup> which served as a basic Hebrew grammar and workbook for use in his elementary Hebrew course at Westminster. In his dedication, Young wrote, “To all who have been my instructors in this strange and beautiful language I owe a deep debt of gratitude.”<sup>56</sup> His former Westminster Hebrew professors, Oswald T. Allis and Allan A. MacRae, were dutifully acknowledged and recognized. Young’s former student, Geoffrey Thomas, described the usage of the Hebrew primer during the first-year course:

Dr. Young wrote his own *Introduction to Hebrew Grammar* with a transliterated Hebrew text for the first 30 lessons so that with the aid of the language laboratory and tape-recordings at Westminster one was plunged immediately and as painlessly as possible straight into reading and translating

Exodus. And all the tedium of learning and chanting the various moods of the Hebrew verb before one was allowed to read a Hebrew Testament was avoided.<sup>57</sup>

Thomas's statement could be misconstrued to suggest that Young did not adequately cover the Hebrew verbal system. On the contrary, Young's approach did take seriously the learning and proper acquisition of the Hebrew verbs. Towards the end of his dedication, Young personally thanked Cyrus H. Gordon, his distinguished professor from Dropsie for expounding the importance of the Hebrew vowel charts.<sup>58</sup> From the frequency at which the vowel charts appear in Young's works, it is apparent that he regarded the acquisition of the Hebrew verbal system as an essential element in learning the language:

At the heart of the grammatical approach to the language lie the vowel charts offered in this volume. The importance of these charts will become more and more apparent as one progresses. In the study of Hebrew the accent and the nature of the syllable are all-important. This little work seeks to focus attention upon that importance.<sup>59</sup>

Young reproduced the vowel charts in the first volume of his magisterial commentary, *The Book of Isaiah*,<sup>60</sup> as well as in the "Appendices" section of his 1959 revision of Wilson's *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*.<sup>61</sup>

### **3.2.2 Young and Wilson's Writings: Similarities and Dissimilarities**

While Young treasured the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition in general, he especially esteemed the legacy of his predecessor, Robert Dick Wilson. Young's detailed "Introduction" on Wilson's life and work reveals that Young was well-acquainted with the greater part of Wilson's scholarly career.<sup>62</sup> Young regarded Wilson as a model to emulate and follow. When referring to Wilson, Young utilized elevated expressions to describe him such as, "a hero of the faith,"<sup>63</sup> or "so great a warrior."<sup>64</sup>

It is doubtless that one of the major reasons for Young's great admiration for Wilson was his comparable passion for the study of the Semitic and modern languages. In fact, Young was the only other scholar within the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition on a par with Wilson's extraordinary linguistic capabilities to acquire an impressive array of foreign languages and dialects. Young wrote concerning Wilson:<sup>65</sup>

It is true that a sight-reading knowledge of Hebrew prose may be obtained in a year or so, but the ability to read the entire Old Testament comes only as a result of long and arduous labor. Dr. Wilson had mastered this difficult language. One who wishes to do thorough work in the Old Testament must know Hebrew—that goes without saying; but he will be greatly aided in his task if he has a competent knowledge of some of the languages and dialects which are cognate to Hebrew. It has been said that Wilson was at home in some forty-five languages and dialects, even including Armenian. Today that list would increase, for the languages of Ugarit, as well as the Akkadian of Nuzi and Mari must now be taken into account.<sup>66</sup>

Yet, what Young admired most about Wilson was his indefatigable defense of the historicity and veracity of the Old Testament using all of his scholarly gifts and diligent labor: "*A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament* is a work in which the result of Dr. Wilson's studies are presented. Almost every statement in the book is based upon long and patient research. For this reason the book may be a bit difficult to read. Its reading, however, will be amply rewarding to the man who wishes to understand how strong is that evidence which corroborates the Old Testament."<sup>67</sup> As a tribute to Wilson's legacy, Young declared,

Only one who has done similar work himself can appreciate the tremendous amount of toil which the following pages represent. But anyone who will read these pages carefully will soon come to see that the Old Testament is capable of scholarly defense and that Robert Dick Wilson was one of its most scholarly defenders. Because of his painstaking research many have been strengthened in their faith and many ministers have preached with greater earnestness and devotion than would otherwise have been the case. For it is on men such as Wilson, men who have not feared hard work, who have not shirked the difficult problems, and who have been willing to join the battle with the enemy that God has built His Church. May the triune God be praised for having given to His people so great a Warrior as Robert Dick Wilson.<sup>68</sup>

Harman aptly observes, "In many ways he [Young] resembled Robert Dick Wilson of Princeton and Westminster, and it was altogether fitting that he revised Wilson's *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*. While the main text was left intact, Young added an introduction, some additional footnotes, appendices, and a glossary."<sup>69</sup> Young and the publisher, Moody Press, intentionally preserved the main text without editorial revisions or modifications because they believed that the content of Wilson's work had stood the test of time—at least up to 1959. Furthermore, they regarded Wilson's work as having been validated through recent archaeological discoveries since its original publication in 1926. The publisher noted,

Desiring to leave Dr. Wilson's work intact for the present reader, Dr. Young has brought the subject matter up to date. . . . He has also added extensively to existing footnotes. The reader will be impressed with the fact that practically none of Dr. Wilson's conclusions has been changed. Most of the new information [i.e., archaeological discoveries] has served to strengthen conclusions which were reached by the author.<sup>70</sup>

Like Wilson, Young also published two commentaries on the book of Daniel. They were entitled, *The Prophecy of Daniel: A Commentary*,<sup>71</sup> published in 1949 and, *The Messianic Prophecies of Daniel*,<sup>72</sup> published in 1954. The year before, in December of 1953, Young had contributed a lengthy entry on "Daniel" in *The New Bible Commentary*.<sup>73</sup> In 1958, Young published his last monograph on the book which was a concise work entitled *Daniel's Vision of the Son of Man*.<sup>74</sup>

Unlike Wilson, however, Young's writings covered the broad spectrum of the entire Old Testament canon. In 1949, Young published his well-known, conservative classic, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (hereafter *AIOT*),<sup>75</sup> which integrated modern biblical scholarship with traditional perspectives on the authorship and dating of the Old Testament books. Later in 1958, Young produced a helpful up-to-date monograph outlining the various contemporary works on Old Testament theology entitled, *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today*.<sup>76</sup> Although, he did not work extensively within the Historical or Wisdom books (which he summarily addressed in *AIOT*), Young did publish widely in the areas of the Pentateuch and the Prophetical books. In these latter areas, his works included: *Studies in Genesis One*,<sup>77</sup> *My Servants the Prophets*,<sup>78</sup> *Studies in Isaiah*,<sup>79</sup> *Who Wrote Isaiah?*,<sup>80</sup> and his major, three-volume commentary in the New International Commentary of the Old Testament (NICOT) series, *The Book of Isaiah: The English Text, with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*.<sup>81</sup> Whereas Wilson's writings were predominantly scholarly and defensive in posture, Young wrote several sermonic texts that were more popular and inspirational in both nature and appeal. These included: *Isaiah Fifty-Three: A Devotional and Expository Study*,<sup>82</sup> *Psalm 139: A Devotional and Expository Study*,<sup>83</sup> and *Genesis 3: A Devotional and Expository Study*.<sup>84</sup>

### 3.2.3 Young's Unique Approach

Young's prodigious language abilities and his proficiency in handling the Semitic literature of the ancient Near East afforded him the opportunity to become conversant with biblical scholars on an international level over the recent literature and archaeological discoveries of his day.<sup>85</sup> In his more technical works, Young regularly commented on contemporary scholarly works written in German, French, Dutch, Spanish, and modern Hebrew—which he regularly cited verbatim within his footnotes.<sup>86</sup>

Regarding the preponderance of German works in his writings, Young declared, "I make no apology for including references to so many German works. The serious student cannot afford to neglect what is written in German and it is hoped that what is here mentioned will prove of help to those who wish to study further."<sup>87</sup> Young's writings clearly manifested his expertise in the vast field of Old Testament scholarship.<sup>88</sup> He had thorough command of various disciplines including Semitic and modern languages, ancient Near Eastern literature, history, and archaeology.<sup>89</sup> Accordingly, Young found respect within the academy, and not solely within the conservative, evangelical wing.<sup>90</sup>

Yet, what primarily separated Young from the rest of his Old Princeton-Westminster forebears was his winsome posture especially toward those with whom he disagreed, i.e., the critical school. Young modestly proposed,

The conservative must oppose the modernist. He must do it, however, in love. He may do it forcefully and strongly and he must do it clearly. He must, however, do it in love. He has no right to stoop to abuse, or in any other way to do evil in order that good may come. It is through speaking the truth in love,

thus exhibiting an earnest concern for the truth of God, that God uses him and makes the truth known.<sup>91</sup>

Young modeled what it meant to “speak the truth in love.” He intentionally did not employ the same style of polemical rhetoric against the critics that had been characteristic of Wilson, Allis, and MacRae. For that reason, Young was never ostracized by his fellow colleagues, nor considered “idiosyncratic” for his conservative perspectives. In fact, H.H. Rowley, who had been one of Wilson’s more recalcitrant rivals, held Young in high esteem.<sup>92</sup> In a personal letter, Rowley disclosed to Young,

As I believe you know, I still adhere to the critical school though I am by no means tied to its results . . . [however] I do not start with any anti-supernatural assumptions or any evolutionary assumptions; and I do not think that the fullest and most critical study of all the evidence available to us threatens in the slightest degree the foundations of the Christian faith.<sup>93</sup>

Thus, it is apparent that although Rowley did not share Young’s personal convictions regarding the Bible as “the inerrant Word of God,” Rowley admired Young’s careful scholarship and cordial disposition toward those with whom he differed. Furthermore, Rowley wrote in a book review concerning Young: “The author [Young] is well acquainted with the work of critical scholars, whom he treats with courtesy and fairness even where he parts company with them decisively.”<sup>94</sup> In concurrence, F.F. Bruce similarly commented: “Like all the author’s works, this is marked by strong conservatism, sound scholarship, and charity towards those of opposing views.”<sup>95</sup> Hence, in Young, we see a major shift from the older defensive posture of the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition toward one of winsome conservatism. Longman accurately observes, “His [Young’s] work may be seen as *transitional* from the highly defensive, apologetic approach to biblical studies championed by Machen to the more constructive exegetical approaches to be found in the major evangelical commentary series of today.”<sup>96</sup>

The upshot of Young’s engaging attitude helped to bring evangelicals within the fold of the academy. Evangelicals were now gaining the respect of their critical colleagues and were often regarded as competent in their field. An example of this change in the scholarly climate was discernable in Francis I. Andersen’s book review of Young’s work on *The Book of Isaiah*. Although he had disagreed with Young’s traditional analysis of the book, nevertheless, Andersen accorded Young’s work with a sense of courtesy and approbation. Andersen wrote, “With his [Young’s] conservative presuppositions there is likely to be much dissent from his results, but the happier ecumenical spirit of our times enables the convictions of all to be heard with respect.”<sup>97</sup>

During his professional career, Young was given “a seat at the table” of academia. He was able to successfully carry on the tradition of Old Princeton in the halls of Westminster Seminary and to mount a popular defense of the traditional views of the Old Testament without the customary hostility or

antagonism of previous generations. On the contrary, Young was able to befriend his critical colleagues within the guild while disseminating his conservative views to another generation of students and potential scholars within the evangelical church. Longman, in regard to Young's influence on subsequent evangelical scholars, writes, "Young's teaching influenced the next generation of conservative biblical scholars. Through his writings and his teaching, he furthered their understanding of the Bible and encouraged them to be as learned as he was."<sup>98</sup>

### **3.2.4 Young's Battle Against Neo-Orthodoxy**

Most of Young's major publications were written at a time (some two decades after Wilson) when the stronghold of the older modernism of Wilson's day was in steady decline. Young himself discerned the shift within biblical scholarship:

Today, modernism, in its older form, appears to be on the wane. The heart has been taken out of it. This is not to say that it does not linger on here and there, but the "older" modernism, with the force that it presented in the decade 1920-30 [i.e., during Wilson's career], is no longer present. Today, an entirely different climate of opinion is about us. It is the fashion at present in some circles to decry evolution, and to place great stress and emphasis upon the importance and significance of doctrine. Theology once again is being regarded as the queen of the sciences.<sup>99</sup>

Young believed that the influence of Karl Barth was, in large measure, responsible for the shift in emphasis within the critical school from the anti-theological stance of the "older" modernism toward one of growing acceptance in things spiritual and theological. Young wrote, "Barth and others have really caused us to see the importance of theology."<sup>100</sup> However, Young's accent on the waning "older" modernism with its strict historicism was a veiled, but implicit reference to the "newer," theologically-friendly, form of modernism. Young's former teacher and colleague, Cornelius Van Til,<sup>101</sup> had coined the phrase, the "new modernism," twelve years earlier to refer explicitly to the theological innovations of Karl Barth and Emil Brunner.<sup>102</sup> More recently, biblical scholars, John Hayes and Frederick Prussner, have also credited Barth for the initial reemergence of theological inquiry within biblical studies,<sup>103</sup>

The impact of cultural turmoil, embodied in the First World War, the loss of nerve by optimistic progressives and the growth of widespread pessimism, and the continuing scientific and philosophical reduction of theology shattered the liberal theological consensus. It was in this context that a theology with strong emphasis on the Bible, revelation, and supernaturalism burst on the scene. Especially associated with Karl Barth (1886-1968), this theology has gone under numerous labels—theology of the word, crisis theology, dialectical theology, neo-orthodoxy, and neo-Reformation theology.<sup>104</sup>

### 3.2.4.1 Young's View of Scripture Contra Barth and Brunner

While Barth and Brunner did not hold to Young's understanding of "plenary inspiration," nevertheless, they placed the spotlight once again on the subject of theology proper, i.e., the study of the doctrine of God, and on the doctrine of Scripture as containing the revelation and "Word of God." Young's underlying presupposition throughout his writings was that the Bible is the divinely-revealed, inspired (lit. "God-breathed"), and inerrant Word of God in the original autographs.<sup>105</sup> This was most evidently stated by Young in his popular tome, *Thy Word is Truth*, written in 1957 on the doctrine of inspiration. In it, Young delineated his perspective on the nature of the Bible's inspiration,

What Paul wishes to assure Timothy [in 2 Timothy 3:16] is that the Bible is the product of the Divine breath, and it is this fact of being breathed out by God that constitutes the very heart and core of the Biblical doctrine of inspiration. If then the Scriptures are breathed out by God, it is clear that they find their origin in Him. Indeed, the language of the Apostle is but a vigorous way of stating and asserting the Divine origin of these Scriptures. They did not come into existence because men of genius in moments of inspiration composed them. They did not arise because God chose the best that men had written and then imparted to this somewhat of the Divine. They did not come into being because the ideas which they contained were somehow ideas of which God approved. Not in any of the above-mentioned ways did the Bible have its origin. The Scriptures came into existence in an utterly unique way. They, and they alone of all writings, were breathed out of the mouth of God. Could words be found to make clearer the Divine origin of the Bible?<sup>106</sup>

Young did not add anything innovative in his stance on inspiration. It unequivocally represented the seamless continuity between Old Princeton and Westminster. On the one hand, it was, in essence, a fresh restatement of the identical position on biblical inspiration that B.B. Warfield and A.A. Hodge had articulated earlier in 1881.<sup>107</sup> On the other hand, Young's purpose was to provide a contemporary defense of the doctrines of "inspiration" and "inerrancy" in the midst of the turbulent theological climate of his day.

Karl Barth, contra B.B. Warfield and A.A. Hodge, held that the Bible was not "a body of divinely communicated doctrines or truths but primarily [based] on a solitary event, namely the death and resurrection which transformed Jesus into the Christ of Christian faith. That event is not even historical in nature but 'supra-historical' and can, therefore, be understood only through faith."<sup>108</sup> For in Barth's conception of revelation, the Bible was not the Word of God in terms of *plenary inspiration*, but only *contained* the prophetic and apostolic "word and witness" to the Christ event.<sup>109</sup> In other words, the Bible served only as a *witness* to Christ and was not to be considered "inspired," "infallible," or "inerrant" in all its parts. Thus, according to Young, the Bible for Barth "is the Word of God . . . only in so far as God speaks through it."<sup>110</sup> Barth claimed, "When we say that the Bible is the Word of God, we express our faith in an act of God's redemption of man in the present. The Bible becomes the Word of God in this

event and it is with respect to its being in this becoming that the little word *is*, in the sentence that the Bible is the Word of God, refers.”<sup>111</sup>

Similar to Barth, Emil Brunner also rejected the idea that revelation was to be identified with the actual words of the Bible itself, i.e., Orthodoxy’s “static” idea of revelation.<sup>112</sup> Rather, Brunner held that revelation was dynamic and “accomplishing.”<sup>113</sup> According to Brunner, in its essential character, revelation was God’s activity in salvation:

“[D]ivine revelation” always [means] the whole of the divine activity for the salvation of the world, the whole story of God’s saving acts, of the ‘acts of God’ which reveal God’s nature and His will, above all, Him in whom the preceding revelation gains its meaning, and who therefore is its fulfillment: Jesus Christ. He Himself is the Revelation. Divine Revelation is not a book or a doctrine; the Revelation is God Himself in His self-manifestation within history. Revelation is something that *happens*, the living history of God in His dealings with the human race: the history of revelation is the history of salvation, and the history of salvation is the history of revelation.<sup>114</sup>

For Brunner, then, the “Christ-event” was the self-disclosure of God to human in a personal, “divine-human encounter” in a dynamic and “saving way.”<sup>115</sup> Although the self-manifestation of God happens within history, the Bible for both Barth and Brunner was not necessarily “historical.”<sup>116</sup> Because the Bible was neither an inerrant nor infallible text,<sup>117</sup> Barth and Brunner could fully endorse the enterprise of historical criticism.<sup>118</sup> Barth and Brunner’s notions of revelation, therefore, were revolutionary because they skillfully and creatively combined the best of both the critical and the conservative worlds.<sup>119</sup> From the latter, they could speak of the Bible as a revelatory divine witness to the Christ-event, and yet, from the former, continue to affirm the science of historical criticism due to the alleged linguistic, historical, and scientific inaccuracies that remained in the Bible as being the fallible product of a “humanly-authored” text.

Young, by contrast, believed that Barth and Brunner had not gone far enough with respect to the objective nature of the divine-origin of the Bible’s inspiration. Moreover, Young believed that at the core of their understanding of Scripture, there was an inescapable subjectivity as to what they deemed was the “Word of God.”

If the Word of God is not to be identified with or equated with the words of the Bible, we may well ask, Who is to identify this Word of God? How are we to know this Word when we meet it? It is brought to us in connection with the words of the Bible and yet it is not itself to be equated with those words. What then is this Word, and how shall we know it when we meet it? In answer to these questions we are told that when we read the Bible, the truth of God, or the Word of God, finds us. It may be, however, that a certain passage of Scripture actually does not inspire us. We turn therefore to something else, and suddenly our souls are inspired. The Truth has met us. Another person, however, turns to the passage of the Bible which we have not found inspiring. To him this passage becomes meaningful. Here the Word of God has found him. In reading one passage of Scripture, one man is inspired; the Word of God found him. In

reading the same passage, another person is not found of the Word at all. Is not this subjectivism? Is not, in the last analysis, man himself the judge of that which is and that which is not the Word of God?<sup>120</sup>

Young, therefore, attempted to ascertain how one could know what was truly “inspired Scripture” and what was not, if the major criterion was principally based upon one’s subjective experience. In fact, Young continued that the radical distinction between the “words of the Bible” and the “Word of God” was impossible to consistently maintain, even for Barth himself. Young contended,

Those who are most vociferous in defence [*sic*] of the position that the Word of God and the words of the Bible are not to be equated, themselves in actual practice refuse to make the distinction. They constantly appeal to the *words* of the bible as though those words were authoritative. . . . One need but examine the large indices to the writings of Karl Barth, for example, who vigorously disclaims any belief in verbal inspiration, to make the discovery that in his actual procedure he acts as do the staunchest advocates of verbal inspiration. The disjunction between the Word of God and the Words of the Bible is one that is impossible to make.<sup>121</sup>

In contrast, Young believed that the Bible was authoritative because the biblical books were “immediately inspired of God,” and therefore, “were recognized as such by His people from the time when they first appeared.”<sup>122</sup> How did God’s people recognize the inspired nature of the canonical books? Young appealed to the subjective, inner witness of the Holy Spirit:

The writings of the Bible claim to be the Word of God, and their contents are in entire harmony with this claim. The Christian recognizes the Scripture are inspired, because they are such, and bear in themselves of the evidences of divinity. Basic, therefore, to any consideration of how man comes to recognize the Bible as God’s Word is the fact that it is indeed divine. . . . Hence men recognize the Word of God, because God has told them what His Word is. God has spoken to them of His truth. He has identified it for them. Of great importance, therefore, for a proper understanding of the entire problem is the doctrine of the inward testimony of the Holy Spirit.<sup>123</sup>

### **3.2.4.2 Young’s Critique of Critical Old Testament Theology**

Barth and Brunner’s lasting effect in the field of Old Testament theology became evident in Old Testament scholars,<sup>124</sup> such as: Otto Eissfeldt,<sup>125</sup> Walther Eichrodt,<sup>126</sup> Wilhelm Vischer,<sup>127</sup> Dietrich Bonhoeffer,<sup>128</sup> and George E. Wright.<sup>129</sup> Through the impetus of their work, these scholars spawned the neo-orthodox “biblical theology movement” of the 1940s and 50s.<sup>130</sup> However, according to Hayes and Prussner,

Conservatives . . . never bought into the new approaches and saw neo-orthodox theology as just as ‘unbiblical’ and a lot more dubious than older forms of liberalism. During the 1950s conservative or evangelical theology became more self-conscious and more aggressive in its opposition to other positions. This

resurgence can be seen in the formation of the Evangelical Theological Society in the United States (1949), in the inauguration of the journal *Christianity Today* (1956), and in the growing influence of the Tyndale Fellowship in the British Commonwealth.<sup>131</sup>

Hayes and Prussner's observations concerning the conservative, evangelical reaction to "neo-orthodoxy" precisely characterized Young's career. As "the leading evangelical Old Testament scholar in America"<sup>132</sup> of his day, Young had been a valued charter member of the Evangelical Theological Society<sup>133</sup> as well as a recurring contributor to *Christianity Today*.<sup>134</sup> Above all, however, Young remained deeply suspicious of the ongoing influence of neo-orthodox theology within the field of Old Testament studies.<sup>135</sup>

Young was expressly disturbed about how neo-orthodox, Old Testament theologians were defining the historicity of the Old Testament narratives. Young asserted,

With respect to the account of the Fall, it would seem that some are willing to regard it as part of the content of *Heilsgeschichte*, and yet to deny its true historical character. This raises the question, Are the great saving events of *geschichte* in fact historical events or are they not? It is our answer, that answer would have to be no. In reality, the question is often evaded, and no clear-cut reply is given to it. But it calls for, indeed it demands, an answer, and we have every right to insist upon an answer being given.<sup>136</sup>

In particular, Young took aim at G. Ernest Wright's theological contribution in which he based his work around the theme, "the acts of God" within history. Wright's intent was to show that biblical theology was a "confessional recital of the redemptive acts of God in a particular history, because history is the chief medium of revelation."<sup>137</sup> Wright, however, did not understand "the acts of God" as chronicled within Israelite history as objective, divinely-inspired revelation. Instead, Wright held that "the acts of God" were testimonies which had been subjectively perceived by the Israelite community as God working for them (e.g., Israel's deliverance from Egypt). This subjective aspect, in Young's mind, was highly problematic to the study of a bona fide *theology* of the Old Testament, since *theology* had to do with authoritative, divinely-inspired interpretations of the objective "acts of God" in history and not merely subjective inferences about them. In other words, Wright emphasized the "humanness" of the biblical witness. Young, conversely, took the word *theology* literally and emphasized the "divine" character of Scripture. The Old Testament, in Young's mind, must be an objective record of God's "acts in history" as "either authentication and description or explanation and interpretation of God's redemptive action."<sup>138</sup> Young wrote,

Perhaps the key to what Wright is saying is found in the thought that the knowledge of God had been *inferred* from what had in fact happened in human history. The force of this statement will become apparent if we consider one of the great "acts of God" to which attention is today being devoted, namely, the

Exodus from Egyptian bondage. We are told that in the events connected with the Exodus the Israelites saw the hand of God. From these acts they inferred that God was present, and that it was their own God, Yahweh, who was bringing them out of the house of bondage. . . . It was this conclusion to which the Israelites came. God Himself—their God, Yahweh—was working for them. They saw His hand in action, and they believed that He had delivered them from Egypt. . . . The all-important question is this, Was Israel's inference true to fact or was it not? . . . Was Israel drawing a true inference from what she experienced, or was she simply deceived? If Israel . . . was mistaken in her inference, then it is of little importance whether we study the theology of the Old Testament or not.<sup>139</sup>

Having found Wright's theological methodology wanting, Young took aim at Gerhard von Rad. Young respected von Rad's erudition as one of the leading contemporary Old Testament scholars of the twentieth century. He singled out von Rad as, "one of the most competent writers,"<sup>140</sup> and praised him for his depth of scholarship and clarity of presentation. However, Young felt that the same criticisms that he had leveled against Wright were also applicable to von Rad. Young held that von Rad, in his weighty, two-volume work, *Old Testament Theology*,<sup>141</sup> had not essentially composed an Old Testament "theology" *per se*, but rather, a diachronic, "history of traditions."<sup>142</sup> These traditions consisted of Israel's experiential testimonies and were, on the whole, subjective interpretations of what she believed God had done on her behalf in the form of sacred history (i.e., *Heilsgeschichte*).<sup>143</sup> Young stated,

Despite its title, however, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, the work is not a theology of the Old Testament. If, as Von Rad asserts, we are to study only what Israel herself, in one way or another, had to say about what she thought God (Yahweh) had done for her, we are not studying theology. If we assume that the framework of the Hexateuch, for example, has given us an incorrect picture of the early history of Israel, and that about the only thing which we can positively assert concerning the ancestors of Israel in the pre-Mosaic or patriarchal period is that they engaged in that form of worship which the late Albrecht Alt called the worship of the "God of the fathers", we have, in reality, expressed a skepticism concerning the early books of the Bible which precludes any proper study of theology.<sup>144</sup>

By contrast, Young believed that a proper definition of "Old Testament theology" was "the study of God in His self-revelation in the Old Testament. In the study of Old Testament theology, therefore, we are basically concerned with a study of God Himself."<sup>145</sup> Accordingly, Young held that Old Testament theology must be based methodologically "upon patient grammatico-historical exegesis"<sup>146</sup> and on what he identified as "true *Heilsgeschichte*." Although he expressed the latter in terminology akin to Wright and von Rad, Young asserted that since "God [had] acted in history," a genuine divine encounter between God and his people must have taken place within the context of real history, i.e., "salvation history" (*Heilsgeschichte*). Otherwise, there could be no authoritative,

objective revelation from God, and, consequently, no true “theology” of the Old Testament. Young continued,

It is at this particular point that a truly Scriptural Old Testament theology will part company with those approaches which do not receive the Scriptures as the authoritative revelation of God [i.e., Wright, von Rad, et al.]. If our study is to be truly biblical, it must come to grips with the fact that God—the living and true God, the triune God—did in fact reveal Himself to Moses at the burning bush. The revelation took place in history. . . . It will desire to ascertain where this particular revelation fits into God’s covenantal dealings with His people, where it applies in the history of redemption. It will desire to see where this revelation belongs in a true *Heilsgeschichte*. . . . It is a history of God’s revelations unto His people and of His encounters with them. It is a history which will glorify and exalt God as the Creator and Sovereign over all. But it is history, history that took place upon this earth.<sup>147</sup>

### **3.2.5 Young’s Design of Old Testament Theology**

In Young’s book, *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today* (1959),<sup>148</sup> he proceeded to develop the lines of his concept of Old Testament theology from a particular variation of classic Reformed, federal theology.<sup>149</sup> Young held that before the fall of man, God had established a covenant with Adam in order to bring him into an elevated state of blessedness. This stage of “confirmed righteousness” was to be conferred upon Adam contingent upon his perfect obedience to the prohibition God had made with him regarding the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Young explicated,

Man is to obey the command of the Lord, and the outcome, if he obeys, will be for man’s blessedness, but if he disobeys, for his ruin. It is true that the command is stated in the form of a prohibition, but, in the light of subsequent events and the remainder of Scripture, we are warranted in saying that, had man obeyed God, he would have passed from a state of probation into one of higher blessedness. What God had done in entering into covenant was something that was intended for man’s higher good and blessedness . . . God drew near to man in the state of innocence and entered into covenant with him, a covenant which was designed to bring him greater blessing. But He also drew near to man in his fallen state and again entered into covenant, a covenant which was designed to bring man life and salvation through a Redeemer.<sup>150</sup>

#### **3.2.5.1 Grace Versus Works in the Adamic Administration**

Young systematically spoke of two separate covenantal arrangements between God and Adam. The first prelapsarian (i.e., pre-Fall) administration involved Adam’s innocent but probationary status before God which was ultimately intended to lead him into a state of confirmed blessedness (i.e., righteousness) upon faithful obedience; while the second postlapsarian (i.e., post-Fall) covenant was unilaterally set forth by God to bring life and salvation to the fallen man through God’s gracious provision of a Redeemer (cf. Gen. 3:15).<sup>151</sup> Classically in Reformed, federal theology, these covenants have been

known as the “covenant of works” and the “covenant of grace,” respectively. According to Old Testament theologian, Ralph Smith,

Some earlier biblical and systematic theologians such as Francis Roberts in 1657 spoke of a covenant with Adam . . . Roberts anticipated [Johannes] Cocceius and the Dutch Federal theology . . . Even so, whole systems of Old Testament theology have been built on the idea of a covenant of works before the fall and a covenant of grace after the fall. Gerhard [sic] Vos, Edward J. Young, John Murray, and J. Barton Payne, all from the Princeton and Westminster Seminary tradition, follow the Federal theologians and argue that there were in fact these two covenants before and after the fall. The covenant of grace (after the fall) was a monergistic covenant—that is, completely the work of God. (See Vos, *Biblical Theology*; E.J. Young, *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today*, 61-78; J. Barton Payne, *The Theology of the Older Testament*).<sup>152</sup>

While Smith is accurate in stating that most Reformed, federal theologians separated the “covenant of works” and the “covenant of grace” as a prelapsarian administration in the former and a postlapsarian administration in the latter; Smith is mistaken, however, in his claim that “all from the Princeton and Westminster Seminary tradition, follow the Federal theologians and argue that there were in fact these two covenants before and after the fall.” Both Murray and Young openly and categorically rejected the language of a “covenant of works,” although they agreed, in principle, to the federal and probationary aspects of God’s original administration with Adam.

In his writings, John Murray—Young’s former Systematic Theology professor who had also taught the course on “Old Testament Biblical Theology” during his formative seminary days<sup>153</sup>—denied the presence of 1) a “covenant” between God and Adam, and 2) the notion of a “covenant of works.” Murray claimed,

This [Adamic] administration has often been denoted “The Covenant of Works.” There are two observations. (1) The term is not felicitous, for the reason that the elements of grace entering into the administration are not properly provided for by the term “works.” (2) It is not designated a covenant in Scripture. Hosea 6:7 may be interpreted otherwise and does not provide the basis for such a construction of the Adamic economy. Besides, Scripture always uses the term covenant, when applied to God’s administration to men, in reference to a provision that is redemptive or closely related to redemptive design. Covenant in Scripture denotes the oath-bound confirmation of promise and involves a security which the Adamic economy did not bestow.<sup>154</sup>

Jeong K. Jeon, writing on Murray’s view of the uniqueness of the Adamic administration, explains,

Murray’s focal point, in the Adamic epoch, is to prove that there is no covenant of works as classical Reformed covenant theologians have rendered it because the Adamic administration was not a covenantal formulation or engagement. In this regard, Murray criticizes the classical Reformed understanding of the

Mosaic Covenant. He emphasizes the uniqueness of the Adamic administration and radically separates it from the Old Covenant, which the Reformed tradition sometimes designated the *foedus legale* or *feodus operum* in relation to the original covenant of works in a limited sense. It applied the law as the governing principle of the Theocratic Kingdom of Israel by blessing and curse, ultimately pointing to the eschatological heavenly blessing and eternal spiritual death. Murray's thesis is that there is a radical antithesis between "the Adamic administration" and the Mosaic Covenant. The former was governed by the law as a means of *eschatological glory*, whereas the latter was to be understood only in the light of the covenant of grace.<sup>155</sup>

Thus, Murray asserted,

Whether or not the administration is designated covenant, the uniqueness and singularity must be recognized. It should never be confused with what Scripture calls the old covenant or first covenant (cf. Jer. 31:31-34; 2 Cor. 3:14; Heb. 8:7, 13). The first or old covenant is the Sinaitic. And not only must this confusion in denotation be avoided, but also any attempt to interpret the Mosaic covenant in terms of the Adamic institution. The latter could apply only to the state of innocence, and to Adam alone as representative head. the view that in the Mosaic covenant there was a repetition of the so-called covenant of works, current among covenant theologians, is a grave misconception and involves an erroneous construction of the Mosaic covenant, as well as fails to assess the uniqueness of the Adamic administration. The Mosaic covenant was distinctly redemptive in character and was continuous with and extensive of the Abrahamic covenants. The Adamic had no redemptive provision, nor did its promissory element have any relevance within a context that made redemption necessary.<sup>156</sup>

Murray acknowledged the federal headship of Adam in regard to his disobedience through which sin and death entered the world (i.e., the imputation of Adam's sin unto his posterity).<sup>157</sup> Murray, however, did not believe that God was obligated by necessity to grant the "reward of blessing" had Adam passed the probationary test with perfect obedience. Mark Karlberg elucidates,

Murray is concerned to stress the gracious nature of the Adamic Covenant, in order to guard against the idea that the reward of blessing and confirmation is bestowed on the ground of man's obedience, while agreeing that perfect and complete obedience is essential. Whereas the principle of works, "perfectly legal reciprocity," comes to bear in the order of creation, the first state of man as made in the image of God, the principle of (nonsoteric) grace informs the entire, subsequent covenant arrangement in such a decisive manner that the concept of works is wholly irrelevant and misleading as a description of the covenant order. Although the principle of works is always binding by virtue of man's creaturely status, the concept of the covenant cannot be considered in legal terms.<sup>158</sup>

Murray emphasized that the proper characterization of the divine covenants in Scripture was one of "grace and promise."<sup>159</sup> Young, in essential agreement, wrote,

My colleague [and former teacher], Professor John Murray, has defined a divine covenant as "a sovereign administration of grace and promise. It is not compact or contract or agreement that provides the constitutive or governing idea but that of dispensation in the sense of disposition." If this definition does justice to the Scriptural data, and I believe that it does, we may expect to find the elements of a covenant present, even when there is no express usage of the word itself. Such is, indeed, so.<sup>160</sup>

Moreover, Young followed Murray in claiming that God's prelapsarian administration with Adam was based upon "grace" and not "works" because eternal life was ultimately offered in it. Young averred,

Had man obeyed God he would, as it were, have passed a test. He would have shown that, even though he might not have understood the reason for God's prohibition, nevertheless, inasmuch as God had given the prohibition, he had chosen to obey it. Such a resolve would have been made out of love to God and out of a desire to do his will. Does it not then follow that if disobedience had brought death, obedience would have brought life; and since disobedience brought everlasting death, obedience would have brought everlasting life?<sup>161</sup>

While Young, in contrast to Murray, had no qualms about categorizing the Adamic administration as a "covenant,"<sup>162</sup> yet he, like Murray, grew particularly reticent about the traditional language of "works" in the prelapsarian administration where grace was clearly offered on the basis of mutual love between the Creator and the creature. Consequently, in his book, *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today* (1959), Young freely employed the phrase "covenant of grace," while conspicuously avoiding the use of the "covenant of works." The absence of the latter phrase is revealing due to the expected "works-grace" contrast (much like the antithesis between "Law and Gospel" in classical covenant theology) that would have been expected within a traditional Reformed and federal theology—especially in a monograph where he was presenting his mature ideas on "Old Testament theology." Furthermore, in an edited volume entitled, *Scripture and Confession* (published posthumously in 1973), Young wrote an article called, "Confession and Covenant," in which he explicitly acknowledged his difficulty with the phrase "covenant of works."<sup>163</sup> The article served as a concise commentary on chapter 7, section 2 of the *Westminster Confession of Faith* regarding "God's Covenant with Man." The Confession reads, "The first covenant made with man was a covenant of works, wherein life was promised to Adam; and in him to his posterity, upon condition of perfect and personal obedience." Young, while agreeing with the essence of the Confession, did not reckon the expression "covenant of works" as satisfactory, but replaced it with the phrase "covenant of life":

For our part, we are inclined to believe that the language of the Confession at this point has not gone beyond the Scriptures. Here is an administration that in its origin, establishment, arrangement, and disposition is of God. Furthermore, it is an arrangement that concerns a man and his posterity. Surely it does bear

the characteristics of a divine covenant, and we, for our part, have no hesitation in designating it a covenant. On this particular point, we believe the Confession speaks in accordance with the Scriptures. For our part, *we prefer to call this covenant a covenant of life*, as does the shorter Catechism, *for that word indicates the grand design of the covenant.*<sup>164</sup>

Hence, Young, like Murray, saw the overall thrust of the divine covenants of Scripture as one of “life” and “grace.” Although Young and Murray did acknowledge that “righteousness based on works” was operative in the prelapsarian state as the means of “eschatological justification and life” as originally articulated within the Adamic “covenant of works,” yet they would not accept the utilization of “works” terminology. Young was adamant that the first covenant with Adam was grace-oriented in that eternal life was truly offered in it through the loving obedience owed by Adam as a creature of the divine Creator. Consequently, for Young, the entire history of God’s sovereign plan of redemption for man could be subsumed under the overarching, theological umbrella of the “covenant of grace”:

Not only, then, does Old Testament theology concern itself with a study of the revelation of God made to man in his un fallen state in the Garden, but it also deals with the unfolding of the plan of salvation to fallen man. And the foundational verse, upon which all subsequent revelation builds, is this protovangelium in Genesis iii, 15. This protovangelium is the first administration of the covenant of grace. At the same time, systematic theology has been true to Scripture in also speaking of a covenant of redemption between the Father and the Son. The very fact that the Lord predicts the outcome of the struggle between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent, makes it clear that the outcome was something that had already been determined. In this prediction there is an intimation of the fact that God has already determined upon the salvation of His people. The covenant of redemption is usually thought of as that covenant made in the councils of eternity between the Father and the Son, wherein the Father promised to the Son an innumerable multitude if the Son would deliver this people from its sin. On the other hand, the covenant of grace is usually identified as the covenant made between God and fallen man. This distinction is perhaps useful, yet we must remember that the two are, in fact, one [i.e., one covenant of grace].<sup>165</sup>

### 3.2.5.2 Promise, Fulfillment, and the Covenant of Grace

Young concluded his presentation of Old Testament theology building upon the outworking of the “covenant of grace” as displayed in the Messianic promise of Genesis 3:15.<sup>166</sup> He first addressed the progressive nature of the unfolding of God’s plan of redemption particularly in the sovereign call of Abraham, the patriarchs, and in the subsequent redemption and formation of Israel as a nation.<sup>167</sup> The major emphases at this juncture of Young’s Old Testament theological survey are: 1) God’s promise of a Redeemer is fulfilled by grace alone and not by human works, and 2) salvation history takes place within real human history. For example, Young believed that God’s promise to Abraham of

a son took place in real space and time, and whose fulfillment under ordinary human circumstances was impossible. Young wrote,

In the call of Abraham God was laying the foundation for His Church. He was teaching the patriarch that the promised deliverance could not come as the result of human works or efforts, but was to be a gift of Divine grace alone. For this very reason, it is necessary to insist upon the historicity of the patriarchs. We cannot relegate them to some nebulous realm and speak of a worship of the "god of the fathers" (A. Alt), for to do so would be to reject entirely an extremely important epoch of biblical revelation. The unfolding of the covenant of grace has to do with historical events. If the patriarchs are not historical, we do not learn the lesson that the promised salvation was truly to be of grace.<sup>168</sup>

These two inexorable and unmitigated factors—i.e., historicity and divine grace—constituted for Young the essential elements of biblical "salvation history." Therefore, the proper content for Old Testament theology was to discern "salvation history" unfolded within the context of the "covenant of grace." Young forthrightly declared, "Old Testament theology is concerned with the study of genuine revelations which the true God gave to Israel. These revelations had to do with His purposes in the salvation of mankind. His plan of salvation may be subsumed under the word covenant. It is, therefore, with the covenant of grace that Old Testament theology is concerned. This is its true content; this is its true subject-matter."<sup>169</sup>

The promises and prophecies of the "covenant of grace" are recorded in the Old Testament. The books of the New Testament then witness to their fulfillment and redemptive significance. According to Young, the ultimate realization of the Old Testament promises (e.g., Gen. 3:15, 17:16, 49:10; Num. 24:17; Isaiah 9:10a, 11:10, 53; Amos 9:11; Micah 5:2) within the "covenant of grace" were fulfilled in the person and work of Jesus Christ.<sup>170</sup> This is most evident in Christ's vicarious sufferings as written in Isaiah 53:5. Young noted, "It is precisely this same conception of the saving work of the Servant which is also found in the New Testament."<sup>171</sup> Young then alluded to New Testament passages such as Matthew 26:28; Galatians 2:20; 2 Corinthians 5:21; and Romans 3:25-26 as proof texts that reveal the theological significance of Christ's redemptive sufferings.<sup>172</sup> Young concluded that, "If there is anything that is clear from the New Testament, it is that the picture of Jesus' saving work which the New Testament offers is one that is in complete harmony with that offered by the Old Testament."<sup>173</sup>

Analogous to his defense of the divine-inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible, Young was faithfully carrying forward the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition of a Reformed, biblical-theological approach to the Old Testament.<sup>174</sup> However, Young's rejection of the language of the "covenant of works" stood in stark contrast to his colleague and former student, Meredith G. Kline,<sup>175</sup> who had employed the language and governing principle of the "covenant of works" within his presentation of biblical theology.<sup>176</sup> Longman affirms, "In terms of his [Young's] theological insights into the text, one can sense the influence of his close friend, the systematician Murray, rather than, say, the great biblical

theologian, Geerhardus Vos, whose influence at Westminster can be seen more in the work of Meredith Kline.<sup>177</sup> Although Young and Murray have long been held in high regard as “orthodox” Reformed theologians, they are, nevertheless, deemed as “revisionists” with respect to their understanding of the *foedus operum*, i.e., “covenant of works.”<sup>178</sup> By contrast, on account of Kline’s unabated efforts to maintain the traditional language of the “covenant of works” (in keeping with the Westminster Confession), Kline has been commonly regarded within Reformed, evangelical circles as more consistent to classical Reformed, federal theology, in general, and to the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition, in particular.<sup>179</sup>

### 3.2.6 Young’s Traditional Defense of the Pentateuch

Throughout his career at Westminster Seminary, Young defended the traditional view of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. True to Young’s objective to stay within the bounds of the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition, he continued to employ similar arguments for Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch that his predecessors had proffered before him. For example, Young, Allis,<sup>180</sup> and MacRae<sup>181</sup> continued to propagate Robert Dick Wilson’s concept of the “inspired redactor”:

Traditionally, by both Jews and Christians, Moses has been regarded as the author of these books. We believe that tradition is in this point correct, and that the essential authorship of the Pentateuch may be maintained. There may indeed be certain few minor additions, such as the account of Moses’ death, which were inserted into the Pentateuch under divine inspiration by a later editor, but this by no means runs counter to the common tradition that Moses is the author of these books.<sup>182</sup>

Young also reemployed Wilson’s argumentation that Moses did not necessarily have to have written every word of the Pentateuch in order to be rightly considered its author since the same situation could be applied analogously to Jesus and the Sermon on the Mount, Hammurabi and his Code, and Milton and his *Paradise Lost*:

When we affirm that Moses wrote, or that he was the author of, the Pentateuch, we do not mean that he himself necessarily wrote every word. To insist upon this would be unreasonable. Hammurabi was the author of his famous code, but he certainly did not engrave it himself upon his stele. Our Lord was the author of the Sermon upon the Mount, but He did not write it Himself. Milton was the author of *Paradise Lost*, but he did not write it all out by hand.<sup>183</sup>

Thus, Young concluded with Wilson that the Pentateuch was “substantially and essentially” Mosaic. “The witness of sacred Scripture leads us to believe that Moses was the fundamental or *real* author of the Pentateuch. In composing it, he may indeed, as Astruc suggested, have employed parts of previously existing written documents. Also, under divine inspiration, there may have been later

minor additions and even revisions. Substantially and essentially, however, it is the product of Moses.”<sup>184</sup>

### **3.2.6.1 The Self-attestation of Scripture Regarding Mosaic Authorship**

In the spirit of Green,<sup>185</sup> Young argued that the self-attestation of the Bible regarding its own internal testimony proved the traditional position that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. Young divided his biblical presentation into three parts:<sup>186</sup> a) “*The testimony of the Pentateuch*” (Exodus 17:14, 24:4-8; 34:27; Numbers 33:1,2; Deuteronomy 31:9; 31:22), b) “*The testimony of the remainder of the Old Testament*” (Joshua 1:7, 8; 8:31; 11:15, 20; 14:2; 21:2; 22:9; Judges 3:4; 1 Kings 2:3; 8:9, 53-56 ; 2 Kings 14:6; 21:8; 22:8; 23:25; Ezra 3:2; 6:18; Nehemiah 8:1-8; 13:1; 2 Chronicles 34:14; 23:18; 25:4; 35:12; Daniel 9:11-13; Malachi 4:4), and c) “*The testimony of the New Testament*” (Matthew 8:4; 19:8; Mark 1:44; 7:10; 10:5; 12:26; Luke 5:14; 20:37; 16:31; 24:27, 44; John 5:47; 7:19; Acts 3:22; 13:39; 15:5-21; 26:22; 28:23; Romans 10:5, 19; 1 Corinthians 9:9; 2 Corinthians 3:15; Revelation 15:3). According to Young, each of these biblical passages from both Old and New Testaments substantiated the claim that the human author of the Pentateuch was none other than Moses. Young asserted, “On the question of the authorship of the Law, the Pentateuch and the remainder of the Old Testament know of only one human author, and that author is Moses . . . Like the Old, the New Testament bears witness to a writing known as the Law, and regards Moses as its author. In fact, in the New Testament the words ‘Moses’ and ‘law’ are equivalent.”<sup>187</sup>

### **3.2.6.2 A Thorough Knowledge of Pentateuchal Criticism**

Young, following in the footsteps of Green,<sup>188</sup> Allis,<sup>189</sup> and MacRae,<sup>190</sup> presented a detailed and comprehensive historical account of the literary criticism of the Pentateuch in *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (1949, revised 1964).<sup>191</sup> His study of Pentateuchal criticism began with the Gnostic groups of the second century A.D. and extended up to 1955 in the modern period. Young noted all of the major hypotheses that took root within the discipline, including:<sup>192</sup> 1) the “earlier documentary hypothesis” (i.e., two documents in Genesis) of Astruc (1753), Eichhorn (1780-83; J E), Ilgen<sup>193</sup> (1798; E<sup>1</sup> E<sup>2</sup> J); 2) the “fragmentary hypothesis” (i.e., covering the entire Pentateuch) of Geddes (1800), Vater (1802-5), De Wette (1806-7), Hartmann (1831); 3) the “supplementary hypothesis” (i.e., basic document E supplemented from other sources) of Ewald (1830; Hexateuch), von Bohlen (1835; Genesis), Bleek (1836; Genesis), Staehlin, von Lengerke, Delitzsch, Tuch (1843-58); 4) “crystallization hypothesis” of Ewald (1840-45; five narrators, three final redactors), Knobel (1861; E, Book of Rights, J D), Schraeder (1869; E<sup>1</sup> E<sup>2</sup>—worked over by J—D); 5) the “modified documentary hypothesis” (i.e., P—Hupfeld’s E<sup>1</sup>—E J D) of Hupfeld (1853; E<sup>1</sup> E<sup>2</sup> J D); 6) the “development hypothesis” (i.e., the basic Elohistic document is the latest, not the earliest document) of Graf (1866, E J P D or J E D P), Kuenen (1869-70), Kayser (1874), Wellhausen (1876-77); 7) the “new documentary hypothesis” (i.e., two

Jehovists—Smend) of Eichrodt (1916), Eissfeldt (1922; L—Smend's J<sup>1</sup>—J E D P); a) "Priestly Code" Studies of von Rad (1934; J E D P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup>); b) "Studies in Deuteronomy" of Hoelscher (1923; post-Josianic), Oestreicher (1923; pre-Josianic), Welch (1924; pre-Josianic), Moeller (1925; Mosaic), von Rad (1929; post-Josianic); and c) the "E document" of Volz, Rudolph (1933, J D P).

In the final analysis, however, Young derided the critics for their inability to construct a better solution than the traditional view of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Young chided, "More than two hundred years of exhaustive study have been unable to produce a satisfactory substitute for the time-honoured biblical view that Moses himself was the human author of the Law. Hence, we cannot do better than to regard the Pentateuch as the product of the great lawgiver of Israel."<sup>194</sup> Young believed that this was the proper conclusion because no one in Israel's history was better suited than Moses to have written the Pentateuch. "He [Moses] had the time and also the training and learning to do so. Also, as [the] human founder of the theocracy, he had the information that was requisite. The Pentateuch exhibits an inner plan and structure that betray a great mind. Who, better than Moses, could have produced such a work?"<sup>195</sup>

### 3.2.6.3 Young's Apologetic Against Alleged Post-Mosaica in the Pentateuch

Young employed many similar arguments that had been utilized by his Old Princeton-Westminster predecessors in dealing with the supposed *post-Mosaica* found in the Pentateuch. In his *Introduction*, Young answered each suspected case of "redactional interpolation" as they occurred in the Pentateuch, book-by-book. The following is a sample of Young's apologetic toward each of the alleged *post-Mosaicum*:

- 1) Genesis 14:6—This verse mentions the "Horites," whose historicity as long been challenged by the critics as unsubstantiated. Young claimed, "They are now known as the Hurrians, a people who played a most important role in the second millennium BC."<sup>196</sup>
- 2) Genesis 12:6b and 13:7b—Both passages mention that the Canaanites were "then in the land" and are taken to be anachronistic by the critics. With respect to the former passage, Young claimed that the immediate context did not indicate that at the time of composition that the Canaanites were no longer in the land, but that "the phrase is simply used to emphasize the greatness of God's promise. The land was promised to Abram, but the presence of the Canaanites made the promise seem unbelievable. Despite their presence, however, Abram believed." Regarding the latter passage, Young contended that the passage is referring to an earlier period before the Canaanites came into the land, because "the statement simply makes it clear that there was not room for both Abram's and Lot's cattle."<sup>197</sup>
- 3) The reference to Dan in Genesis 14:14 is said to be a later revision due to the supposed connection with the place of Dan alluded to in Judges 18:29. But Young, in keeping with Green, asserted, "The mention of Dan (Gn.

14:14) is no argument against Mosaic authorship. It may not be the Dan of Judges 18:29, or, if it is, is it not possible that in the course of repeated copying the later, more familiar name may have been inserted?"<sup>198</sup>

- 4) The record of Edomite kings in Genesis 36:31 has been recognized as an obvious case of anachronism that must have been interpolated by a later editor after the establishment of the monarchy in Israel, "And these are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel." While, on the one hand, Young recognized that some conservative scholars had admitted that this statement may have been written under divine inspiration at a time later than Moses, he, on the other hand, asserted that the assumption was unnecessary. Employing Green's apologetic, Young asserted, "In the first place, there is no evidence that any of these Edomite kings was later than Moses' time. Furthermore, kings had been promised (*cf.* Gn. 17:6; 35:11). Since the kingship had been prophesied (*cf.* also Nu. 24:7; Dt. 17:14 ff.), it is perfectly possible that Moses could have written this verse."<sup>199</sup>
- 5) With respect to the phrase "before the testimony" in Exodus 16:34 which is allegedly to have been written anachronistically before the actual giving of the tables of the Law, Young addressed this problem as well as the question of the post-Mosaic statement found in v. 35 that the manna stopped when the Israelites came to the border of the land of Canaan. Young explained, "How, it is asked, could this reference to the tables of the Law have been written by Moses before the Law was actually given? But, since this is the principal passage concerning the manna, why may not Moses have written it at a later time and inserted it here? Verse 35 is also said to point to a time beyond Moses. But his verse merely states that the Israelites ate manna until they came to an inhabited land. It says nothing about the termination of eating manna or about their practice after they entered the inhabited land. Hence, it is perfectly possible that Moses, while reviewing the Pentateuch in the plains of Moab, may have inserted this verse."<sup>200</sup>
- 6) "It has been claimed that [Numbers] 12:3 must be post-Mosaic, for Moses would not write of himself in the third person nor would he speak of himself in the terms herein employed [*i.e.*, referring to himself as the most humble man upon the earth]. But Moses speaks of himself elsewhere in the third person (*e.g.* Ex. 6:27; 7:1, 20; *etc.*). There is nothing unusual in this use of the third person."<sup>201</sup>
- 7) The phrase in Deuteronomy 1:1, "beyond the Jordan," has been understood by the critics as indicating the vantage point of the writer being in Palestine and not in the "plains of Moab." This phrase apparently militates against Mosaic authorship since Moses was prohibited to cross into Palestine west of the Jordan River. But Young asserted, "The objection is an old one, having been raised by Ibn Ezra [twelfth-century A.D.] and later by Spinoza. It is true that the phrase means, 'beyond the Jordan', but evidently it had somewhat of a technical sense, exactly like the modern equivalent 'Transjordania'. It is perfectly possible for a person

who lives east of the Jordan today to speak of himself as being in Transjordania.”<sup>202</sup>

- 8) Deuteronomy 34 has been considered by critical scholarship as an obvious later redaction to the life of Moses. The general critical consensus is that Moses did not pen his own obituary. Jewish writers such as Philo and Josephus both believed that Moses did, in fact, write the account of his own death. However, Jewish tradition assigned the authorship of the chapter to Moses’ successor, Joshua, e.g., *Baba Bathra* 14b and Ibn Ezra. Young, in step with the Old Princeton-Westminster School, wrote, “It is perfectly legitimate to regard this brief account of Moses’ death as having been written by a later hand under divine inspiration and then appended to the book of Deuteronomy.”<sup>203</sup>

### **3.2.7 Young’s Interpretation of Genesis One**

Young’s views on Genesis 1 were first published in a series of articles for the *Westminster Theological Journal*.<sup>204</sup> They were subsequently republished in book form as *Studies in Genesis One*.<sup>205</sup> In this technical monograph, Young set out to present a scholarly exposition of the first chapter of the book of Genesis. One of his primary objectives was to give a detailed presentation of the six days of creation, over and against those views that claimed to be based upon the Bible, yet were, in Young’s opinion, driven externally by scientific concerns. Young claimed, “I have simply endeavored to take the Bible as it stands. . . . In so doing I wish to make it plain that I am no foe of science, but I believe that the facts of the created universe, when rightly interpreted, will prove to be in harmony with the revelation which God has given us in the first chapter of Genesis.”<sup>206</sup>

Young, however, did not believe that it was legitimate that Christian interpreters should allow scientific data to obscure the plain meaning intended in the text. After all, “the Bible is not a textbook of science,” asserted Young. But those interpreters who wished to integrate the scientific evidence with the first chapter of Genesis seemed to make the former, “a pretext for treating lightly the content of Genesis one.”<sup>207</sup> This approach to Young was untenable and amounted to “scientific eisegesis.” The main targets of Young’s criticisms were the proponents of the so-called “framework hypothesis” who, in Young’s mind, relegated the biblical text to the findings of science in order “to rescue the Bible from the position of being in conflict with the data of modern science.”<sup>208</sup>

#### **3.2.7.1 The Proponents of the Framework View**

The major proponents of the “framework” view were:<sup>209</sup> Arie Noordzij (University of Utrecht),<sup>210</sup> Nicolaas Herman Ridderbos (Free University of Amsterdam),<sup>211</sup> Bernard Ramm (Baylor University),<sup>212</sup> and his fellow colleague at Westminster Seminary, Meredith G. Kline.<sup>213</sup> These scholars were evangelicals, who did not believe that the recent findings of modern science—which indicated an extremely old earth and universe—were in tension with the Scriptures. Conversely, in their minds, only a rigid, overly literalistic interpretation of Genesis 1 accomplished that. Ramm, in particular, desired to

harmonize the scientific data found in astronomy, geology, biology, and anthropology with the theology of the Bible. He asserted, "If we believe that the God of creation is the God of redemption, and that the God of redemption is the God of creation, then we are committed to some very positive theory of harmonization between science and evangelicalism."<sup>214</sup> Ramm categorized those who would not pay due respect to the truths found in both science and Scripture as being "hyper-orthodox." He also labeled those who defended the six day, 24-hour view of creation as holding to the "naïve-literal view."<sup>215</sup> Ramm classified himself as a "progressive creationist," i.e., the view that God first created matter *ex nihilo* and then subsequently formed it using "secondary laws of causation."<sup>216</sup> While rejecting the Darwinian evolutionary view of origins, Ramm, however, did not consider "theistic evolution" as being outside the bounds of Scripture or the pale of evangelical orthodoxy. Ramm noted,

there are evangelical Christians who have espoused theistic evolution, and see no incompatibility between this acceptance and Christian faith. Asa Gray, James McCosh [of Princeton University], James Orr, and A.H. Strong were all evangelical believers who accepted theistic evolution. Benjamin Warfield [of Princeton Seminary] in a carefully guarded statement seemed to teach that if evolution were properly defined, he would not be adverse to it.<sup>217</sup>

Similar to Ramm, N.H. Ridderbos held that one's view of Scripture should never contradict the conclusive facts of modern science. He forthrightly stated, "it is true that natural science may not at any point decree how Scripture should be interpreted. Still, we may not in our exegesis ignore the results of natural science."<sup>218</sup> This was further echoed by Meredith G. Kline who wrote, "I have advocated an interpretation [i.e., "framework"] of biblical cosmogony according to which Scripture is open to the current scientific view of a very old universe."<sup>219</sup> Kline conceded that while his interpretation did not refute the possibility of a Darwinian, evolutionary theory of origins, he made certain that the reader should be cognizant of his unconditional acceptance of the historicity of the biblical text—particularly in regard to the origin of man as revealed in Scripture. "I at the same time deem commitment to the authority of scriptural teaching to involve the acceptance of Adam as an historical individual, the covenantal head and ancestral fount of the rest of mankind, and the recognition that it was the one and same divine act that constituted him the first man, Adam the son of God (Luke 3:38), that also imparted to him life (Gen 2:7)."<sup>220</sup>

Arie Noordtijz, the first published advocate of the framework view, also had a similar commitment to the Scriptures as the "Word of God." In his work called *The Old Testament Problem*,<sup>221</sup> Noordtijz attacked the presuppositions of the Wellhausenian system of historical criticism and defended the traditional doctrine of Scripture regarding the supernatural origin and inspiration of the Old Testament. In so doing, Noordtijz affirmed both the divine and human elements in Scripture: "these [divine] acts of revelation are recorded and that life is depicted in writings which came forth, under the leading of God's Spirit, out of men's minds, and thus bear the characteristics of their time, and are not

essentially different, from the human standpoint, from other writings of the ancient East.”<sup>222</sup> Hence, from the vantage of point of their own writings, it is evident that the proponents of the framework interpretation were far from “treating lightly” the biblical text.<sup>223</sup> Rather, they desired to be faithful to the divine revelation as found within the pages of Scripture and also within the findings of modern science.

### **3.2.7.2 Kline’s Explanation of the Framework View**

While Noordzij and Ridderbos initially published and propagated their views of the “framework” hypothesis in the Netherlands, Ramm and Kline gave rise to the view in America.<sup>224</sup> Kline’s significant article, “Because It Had Not Rained,” published in the *Westminster Theological Journal*, gave the fullest and most detailed explanation of the view to date.<sup>225</sup> Based upon his exegesis of Genesis 2:5, Kline rejected the traditional, chronological understanding of the creation days of Genesis 1. At the crux of the issue was whether or not “the *modus operandi* of divine providence was the same during the creation era as that of ordinary providence now.”<sup>226</sup> In other words, Kline was questioning whether the Scriptures justified the traditional assumption that “extraordinary providence” occurred during the creation era after the supernatural “act of absolute beginning” and between each new and successive, supernatural act of creation.<sup>227</sup> Lee Irons (in consultation with Kline) explains,

Genesis 2:5-6 establishes the principle of continuity between the mode of providence during and after the creation period. But a sequential interpretation pits Genesis 1:1-2:3 against Genesis 2:5-6 in numerous ways. Both the 24-hour view<sup>228</sup> and the day-age view<sup>229</sup> must invoke *extraordinary* providence at certain points to maintain a sequential interpretation, in contradiction to Genesis 2:5-6, which teaches that God employed *ordinary* providence during the creation period.<sup>230</sup>

According to Kline, Genesis 2:5-7 provided the true chronology of the creation account, as opposed to Genesis 1 which was arranged topically. Having rejected any alleged source-critical contradictions between chapters 1 and 2,<sup>231</sup> Kline desired to forestall any suspicion that his views were “Liberal or Barthian”: “Though Genesis 1 be epic in literary style, its contents are not legendary or mythical in either a Liberal or Barthian sense. The semi-poetic style, however, should lead the exegete to anticipate the figurative strand in this genuinely historical record of the origins of the universe.”<sup>232</sup> Genesis 2:5-7, thus, presented the correct understanding to the historical sequence of creation.

In regard to his exegesis of Genesis 2:5-7, the two-pronged explanation stated in Genesis 2:5b answered the problem posed by 2:5a, i.e., the clarification as to why no plant or herb of the field had yet appeared. In other words, the reason that there was no vegetation upon the earth/land as recorded in 2:5a was because: 1) “the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth,” and 2) “there was not a man to till the ground” (2:5b).<sup>233</sup> Accordingly, God did not create plant life due to the fact that there was no rain and no man to till the

ground in order "to construct a system of artificial irrigation . . . [which] can make the desert bloom as the rose."<sup>234</sup> Kline affirmed that this obviously pointed to "ordinary providence" and not to the kind of "extraordinary means" as proffered by the chronological ordering of the 24-hour and day-age views:

The Creator did not originate plant life on earth before he had prepared an environment in which he might preserve it without by-passing secondary means and without having recourse to extraordinary means such as marvelous methods of fertilization. The unargued presupposition of Gen. 2:5 is clearly that the divine providence was operating during creation period through processes which any reader would recognize as normal in the natural world of his day.<sup>235</sup>

Kline proceeded to demonstrate that verses 6-7 "correspond respectively to the two clauses in verse 5b and relate how the environmental deficiencies there cited were remedied."<sup>236</sup> In verse 6, Kline argued that the report of "the emergence of a new natural phenomenon," i.e., "the flooding waters [that] began to rise from the earth and watered all the face of the ground," was "the necessary preliminary to the creation of the flora described in verse 5a."<sup>237</sup> Thus, the key to verse 6 was the "inceptive nuance" of the first Hebrew verb in the sentence. Kline explained,

The first verb is a Hebrew imperfect and the inceptive nuance—"began to"—is legitimate for that form and is required in this case if verse 6 is not to neutralize the first clause in verse 5b. The English versions of verse 6 convey the impression that there was an ample watering of the earth during the very time which verse 5 describes. If that were so, the explanatory statement of verse 5, "for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth", would be stranded as an irrelevance.<sup>238</sup>

Thus, for Kline, the introduction of "the flooding waters"<sup>239</sup> in verse 6 is the answer to the first deficiency—"no rain." Verse 7 then culminates in the answer to the second deficiency, i.e., the creation of man. While Kline readily admitted that mankind was not essential for the general preservation of plant life since adequate irrigation had been already established in verse 6, yet, he reasoned that if horticultural exploitation was to reach its full potential, mankind's presence would then be an absolute necessity.

Kline, therefore, effectively argued that the chronology of Genesis 2:5-7 implicitly acknowledged that "the *modus operandi* of the divine providence was the same during the creation period as that of ordinary providence at the present time."<sup>240</sup> That is, both the subterranean waters and man were needed in order to effectively maintain and cultivate plant life upon the earth which was preparatory for the temptation narrative in the Garden of Eden of Genesis 3. Accordingly, Kline believed that, based upon the exegetical data of Genesis 2:5-7, Genesis 1 must be reinterpreted—not in the traditional literal, chronological manner—but in a figurative, literary framework. The framework, according to Kline, has been theologically-shaped into a topical scheme that represents an historical, sabbatical pattern. Kline elucidated, "As has been frequently

observed, a succession of correspondences emerges when the contents of ‘days’ one to three are laid alongside the contents of ‘days’ four to six. Another literary interest at work within this parallelism is that of achieving climax, as is done, for example, in introducing men after all other creatures as their king.<sup>241</sup> The result is the production of two parallel triads, the first triad (Days 1-3) consists of the “creation kingdoms,” while the second triad (Days 4-6) consists of the “creature kings” who exercise dominion over those kingdoms. Based upon the analogy of the two triads, the uniqueness of the seventh day presents the “Creator King enthroned in His heavenly Sabbath rest over all creation.”<sup>242</sup> This symmetrical, literary structure may be diagrammed as follows:<sup>243</sup>

<b>Creation kingdoms</b>		<b>Creation kings</b>	
<i>Day 1</i>	Light	<i>Day 4</i>	Luminaries
<i>Day 2</i>	Sky	<i>Day 5</i>	Sea creatures
	Seas		Winged creatures
<i>Day 3</i>	Dry land	<i>Day 6</i>	Land animals
	Vegetation		Man
<b>The Creator King</b>			
<i>Day 7</i> Sabbath			

Kline stood on the shoulders of Noordtijz and Ridderbos in this regard. Noordtijz, who was the first to publish his insights on the dual triadic structure of Genesis 1, wrote, “the six days of Genesis 1 are obviously intended as the sum of two tridiums which consequently reveal a clearly pronounced parallelism.”<sup>244</sup> Ridderbos also affirmed and propagated Noordtijz’s view of the parallel triadic, literary structure:

when we examine the order in which the works of creation are related to us, we must conclude that it is certainly possible to speak of a literary framework. It is well to emphasize that if indeed the author placed the works of creation in an artificial framework he must certainly have been concerned to distribute them over six days. By this means he would bring out that creation culminates in the Sabbath. Should one adopt Noordtijz’s framework-theory it is advisable to adhere to the scheme of six and to subordinate the division into two tridiums.<sup>245</sup>

Moreover, the climax of the double triadic structure in the sabbatical, seventh day or “the six-one ratio” is also literarily significant. Since the six days of creation encompassed the “forming” of the various *creation kingdoms* (e.g., light, air, sea, and land) and their subsequent “filling” and dominion by *creature kings* (e.g., luminaries, fish, birds, land animals, and man), the seventh day—God’s Sabbath rest—is, according to Kline, the *Creator King’s* “heavenly enthronement.” In other words, the literary structure of Genesis 1 is presenting in theological terms that God as the Creator of the created order, universally reigns as “King of kings and Lord of lords.” Hence, the “seventh day is not an earthly day of rest for man, but the heavenly rest of God Himself. Because it is synonymous with God’s heavenly enthronement, the seventh day argues for the

upper-register<sup>246</sup> [i.e., heavenly] nature of the creation week, and as an eternal day, it argues for the nonliteral nature of the creation days."<sup>247</sup>

Furthermore, the fact that "the seventh day" in Genesis 2:2-3 does not contain the oft-repeated refrain "there was evening and morning" present within days 1-6, also signaled to Kline that the seventh day (*yōm*) was different. On analogy from Hebrews, chapter 4, Kline concluded that the seventh day was eternal: "'And God rested on the seventh day from all His works.' . . . So there remains a Sabbath rest for the people of God. For the one who has entered His rest has himself also rested from his works, as God did from His" (Hebrews 4:4, 9-10).<sup>248</sup> The Sabbath rest is, therefore, the eschatological, heavenly rest whereby God's people are to enter by faith. The figurative, eternal nature of the seventh day was, from a biblical standpoint, unassailable to Kline. He even found that the common objection that the Fourth Commandment (Exodus 20:8-11) decreed that mankind should literally follow the exemplary pattern set forth by God in his six days of work and one day of Sabbath rest<sup>249</sup> as insufficient to overturn the figurative nature of the seventh day. Kline asserted,

Of greater significance for the life of man than these merely literary devices is the Sabbathic pattern of the over-all structure of Gen. 1:1-2:3. For the Creator's way in the day that he made the earth and the heavens must be the way of his image-bearer also. The precise ratio of man's work to his rest is a matter of following the chronological structure of the revelation in which God was pleased to record his creation revelation in which God was pleased to record his creation triumph. The aeons of creation history could have been divided into other than six periods. For temporally, the "days" are not of equal length (*cf.* e.g., the seventh "day" which is everlasting), and logically, the infinitely diversified creative works were susceptible of analysis into other than six divisions. But the Creator in his wisdom, adapting the proportions of the ordinance, it would seem, to the constitutional needs of man, chose to reveal his creative acts in terms of "six day" of work followed by a seventh "day" of rest. . . . The comparison there [in the Fourth Commandment] drawn between the divine original and the human copy is fully satisfied by the facts that the in each case there is the Sabbathic principle and the six-one ratio. The argument that Genesis 1 must be strictly chronological because man's six days of labor follow one another in chronological succession forces the analogy unnecessarily.<sup>250</sup>

Accordingly, Kline concluded that the days of the creation week must be viewed as figurative within the overall semi-poetic form of Genesis 1. The exegetical evidence thus warranted a non-literal interpretation of the word "day" since, "The word 'day' must be figurative because it is used for the eternity during which God rests from his creative labors. The 'day's' subordinate elements, 'evening' and 'morning', must [also] be figurative for they are mentioned as features of the three 'days' before the text records the creation of those lights in the firmament of heaven which were to divide the day from the night. Purely exegetical considerations, therefore, compel the conclusion that the divine author has employed the imagery of an ordinary week to provide a figurative chronological framework for the account of his creative acts."<sup>251</sup> In

turn, the figurative character of Genesis 1 allowed Kline the necessary latitude to acknowledge the role of “general revelation” with respect to mankind’s investigation of the created order through the use of modern science. Kline believed that God’s “general revelation” as revealed in creation did not contradict his “special revelation” as revealed in Scripture (e.g., Genesis 2:5). In other words, “general revelation,” as explored and investigated through geology, astronomy, biology, and physics was not intended to deceive people in relation to its appearance of age or time.<sup>252</sup> Thus, Kline surmised,

if the exegete did not have the light of Gen. 2:5, he would certainly be justified in turning to natural revelation for possible illumination of the question left open by special revelation. And surely natural revelation concerning the sequence of developments in the universe as a whole and the sequence of the appearance of the various orders of life on our planet (unless that revelation has been completely misunderstood) would require the exegete to incline to a not exclusively chronological interpretation of the creation week.<sup>253</sup>

### **3.2.7.3 Young’s Rebuttal to the Framework View**

Young denied a figurative, abstract interpretation of Genesis 1, because he believed that the Bible must always be taken at face value. He asserted that, “the events recorded in the first chapter of the Bible actually took place.”<sup>254</sup> He unequivocally rejected any attempt to limit the Bible’s historicity by means of what mankind could know through scientific investigation alone.<sup>255</sup> After all, said Young, “Our knowledge of the events of creation we receive through the inscripturated revelation of God.”<sup>256</sup> Young then pointed to New Testament passages that appeared to take the creation account literally, such as:<sup>257</sup> Hebrew 11:3 (“creation is attributed to the Word of God”); 2 Peter 3:5b (“Peter refers to the emerging of the earth as something that had actually taken place”); 2 Corinthians 4:6 (“There is no question in Paul’s mind about the historicity of God’s first fiat”); Hebrews 6:7 (“seems to reflect upon the bringing forth of herbs on the third day”); Acts 17:24 (“the work of filling the earth with its inhabitants”); 1 Corinthians 11:7 (“man is the image of God”); and Matthew 19:4 (“creation is specifically mentioned”).

In Young’s mind, the teaching of Scripture on creation was clear. He believed that the modernist notion that the Bible should bow to the findings of modern science was untenable. He averred, “Whenever ‘science’ and the Bible are in conflict, it is always the Bible that, in one manner or another, must give way. We are not told that ‘science’ should correct its answers in the light of Scripture. Always it is the other way around.”<sup>258</sup> Young, therefore, repudiated the alleged “answers” which modern scientists had frequently, but insufficiently modified throughout the course of their investigations. “The ‘authoritative’ answers of pre-Copernican scientists are no longer acceptable; nor, for that matter, are many of the views of twenty-five years ago.”<sup>259</sup> Conversely, Young maintained that God’s revelation in nature and in Scripture did not conflict. He held that the Bible, i.e., God’s “special revelation,” should interpret the phenomenon mankind encountered in nature, i.e., God’s “general revelation.”

Young adamantly advocated the priority of the Scriptures in the interpretation of nature because mankind, in his unregenerate state, could not “properly understand himself and his relation to the world.”<sup>260</sup> This theological concept was known as “the noetic effects of sin,” which was widely taught by Young’s colleague and former apologetics professor, Cornelius Van Til.<sup>261</sup> Young explicated, “It is true that the heavens declare the glory of God, but the eyes of man’s understanding, blinded by sin, do not read the heavens aright. The noetic effects of sin lead to anti-supernaturalistic presuppositions and inclinations.”<sup>262</sup> Therefore, human beings, as rational creatures, must rely upon divine word-revelation in order to correctly interpret nature-revelation: “Fallen man must read general revelation in the light of Scripture, else he will go basically astray.”<sup>263</sup> Regarding the proper relationship of the Bible to science, Young affirmed: “The Bible is not a textbook of science, but the Bible is necessary properly to understand the purpose of science. Perhaps one may say that it is a textbook of the philosophy of science. And on whatever subject the Bible speaks, whether it be creation, the making of the sun, the fall, the flood, man’s redemption, it is authoritative and true.”<sup>264</sup> Because the Bible’s authority and veracity was foundational to Young’s hermeneutical approach to Genesis one, he could not grant modern science equal footing with it. Rather, in regard to the correct interpretation of Genesis one, Young encouraged his readers to: 1) understand it as special revelation from God, 2) view it as actual history, and 3) interpret it without the influence of science, but rather, interpret nature by Scripture, “science” by the Bible.<sup>265</sup>

In particular, Young challenged Kline’s non-chronological, topical construal of Genesis 1 based upon his junior colleague’s interpretation of Genesis 2:5-7. Young did not regard Genesis 2 to be a second account of creation. Rather, Genesis 2 is “a sequel to the creation narrative of Genesis one and a preparation for the history of the fall contained in chapter 3. . . . The section of Genesis beginning with 2:4 is an account of those things which are begotten [תַּולְדוֹת] of heaven and earth. This is not to say that it is silent on the subject of the heaven and earth themselves, but it is not an account of their origin. It deals rather with what was begotten of them, namely, man, whose body is of the earth and whose soul is of heavenly origin, inbreathed by God himself.”<sup>266</sup> Thus, according to Young, the primary referent of Genesis 2:5 is “to man, not to the creation, and the purpose of chapter 2 is to manifest the goodness of God in giving to man a paradise for his earthly dwelling.”<sup>267</sup>

Moreover, Young proposed that Genesis 2:5ff. was a telescopic account of God’s creative actions during the creation week. Since the overall theme of Genesis 2 was the divine preparation of a lush garden for mankind to dwell in, Genesis 2:5-7 summarily contrasted the waterless wasteland of its location before the divine work had been completed.<sup>268</sup> The land (**הָרָקֶב**), therefore, was not a reference to the entire earth, but the regional area of ground (**הָרָקֶב**) from where the man (**מִצְבֵּחַ**) was taken and upon which he was to dwell.<sup>269</sup> Kline’s exegetical argumentation that God had employed ordinary providence in Genesis 2:5-7 as the *modus operandi* during the creation week was, in Young’s

estimation, particularly unconvincing. Young countered that if God had: 1) watered the surface of the ground with “subterranean waters,” and 2) created man so that horticultural exploitation could occur; then a) the former was a unique act of divine providence never to be repeated, and b) the latter was obviously not ordinary providence, but “special supernatural activity, namely, the divine forming and the divine inbreathing.”<sup>270</sup> Young argued that if Genesis 2:5 was a reference to the entire world, then it only applied to the third day and described the “dry land” of the third day. This, however, was not proof positive that the *modus operandi* of ordinary providence prevailed on the third day, since, according to Young, “At the most it teaches that God watered the ground by means of an **TN** that kept rising from the earth.”<sup>271</sup> By contrast, Young held that Genesis 2:5 ff. simply described God’s preparation of the garden—not to be confused with the appearance of “dry land” on the third day—but the unique events that describe God planting a garden for mankind on the *sixth day*.<sup>272</sup> Young deduced, therefore, that Kline’s ultimate appeal to Genesis 2:5*a*, that the *modus operandi* during the days of creation had been one of ordinary providence, did not have substantial exegetical validity. Young underscored the fact that the events recorded on the third day in Genesis 1:9-15 along with the creation of man in Genesis 2:7—all described the work of God’s “supernatural intrusion.” Hence, Young concluded:

Even apart from any consideration of Genesis 2:5, therefore, it cannot be held that the present *modus operandi* of divine providence prevailed on the third day, nor does the appeal to Genesis 2:5 prove such a thing. On the contrary, all that is stated of the third day (Gen. 1:9-15) shows that the works of that day were creative works and not those of ordinary providence. An appeal to Genesis 2:5 therefore does not support the position that the days are to be taken in a non-chronological manner.<sup>273</sup>

Furthermore, Young challenged the notion that there was an exact parallelism between the first three days of creation and the last three. Although he acknowledged that there was “a certain amount of parallelism cannot be denied,”<sup>274</sup> he did not agree with the framework’s view that days 1 and 4, days 2 and 5, and days 3 and 6 were adequately analogous. Whereas Kline and the other proponents of the framework view contended that days 1 and 4 were essentially the same act of creation, Young respectfully declined, “The light of day one and the light-bearers of day four may be said to sustain a relationship with one another, but they are not identical. They are not two aspects of the same thing.”<sup>275</sup> Accordingly, Young’s literal exegesis of Genesis 1, gave the following reasons as to deny the exact correspondence between days 1 and 4: 1) the light of day one was called “day” (בָּיִם), whereas the heavenly bodies were created to rule over the day and evening, 2) the creation of light on the first day was by fiat, whereas, the light-bearers were made by God, 3) the light of day 1 was not given a particular function and it shined upon the primitive waters, whereas the light-bearers of day 4 were created for the purpose of dividing between day and night in order to give light upon the earth, and 4) the light-

bearers of day 4 were placed in the “firmament of heaven” that was brought into existence on the second day.<sup>276</sup> Young continued to do the same kind of extended, expositional treatment on days 2 and 5 and days 3 and 6 where he attempted to disprove the exact correlation between these days, respectively. Ultimately, Young concluded that the framework’s view that there was an alleged one-to-one correspondence between the realms (i.e., the creation kingdoms) and their rulers (i.e., the creation kings) was untenable. He asserted,

The sphere of the sea creatures of day five is not the firmament of day two but the seas (verse 22) of the earth, and the sphere in which the birds rule is also the earth (verse 22). The same is true of the land animals and man; the spheres in which they rule is not merely the dry land of day three, but the entire earth, including the fish of the sea, which God has prepared for them. The matter may be set forth in tabular form as follows:

	RULER	REALM
day four	light-bearers	the earth
day five	sea creatures	seas of earth
	Winged fowl	earth
day six	land animals	earth
	Man	earth

Thus, the view that days one, two and three present the realm and days four, five and six the ruler in that realm, is contrary to the explicit statements of Genesis.<sup>277</sup>

Young’s apparent overly-literalistic approach to Genesis 1 was not the result of a fundamentalist commitment to “wooden-headed literalism.”<sup>278</sup> As Bernard Ramm has noted, “It must be made clear that the mainline Reformation scholarship—Anglican, Reformed, Lutheran—has no part with that kind of Biblical interpretation that runs rough-shod over literary genre and interprets Scripture with a grinding literalism. Rather, in the best of philological tradition, it recognizes that no book can be intelligently assessed and interpreted without first noting its literary genre.”<sup>279</sup> The consideration of literary genre was also true of Young’s Reformed approach to biblical interpretation.<sup>280</sup> He acknowledged that, “without warning, the biblical writer may deviate from a chronological order and arrange his material artificially.”<sup>281</sup> This is how he justified his interpretation of Genesis 2 as a topical, “partly non-chronological” arrangement around the theme of “the garden” in contrast to the sequential “order of events” in Genesis 1.<sup>282</sup> Young explained,

Genesis two will serve as an example of a passage of Scripture in which chronological considerations are not paramount. This will be apparent if we simply list certain matters mentioned in the chapter.

1. God formed man (verse 7).
2. God planted a garden (verse 8a).
3. God placed the man in the garden (verse 8b).

4. God caused the trees to grow (verse 9a).
5. God placed the man in the garden (verse 15a).

It is obvious that a chronological order is not intended here. . . . Clearly enough Moses here has some purpose other than that of chronology in mind.<sup>283</sup>

In effect, Young had turned Kline's approach to Genesis 1 and 2 on its head. On the one hand, Kline maintained that the chronology found in Genesis 2:5-7 served to establish the actual sequence of events during creation, transforming Genesis 1 and its numeric ordering of the creation week into a well-structured, literary edifice. Hence, Kline concluded that Genesis 1 was figurative, semi-poetic, and ultimately, non-chronological. Young, on the other hand, believed that the main intent of Genesis 2 was not to continue the "order of events" of creation in Genesis 1, but begin, in topical fashion, to prepare the scene for the temptation and fall of mankind in the Garden of Eden as depicted in Genesis 3. Young explained,

First the ground is watered and then man is created. For man the garden is made, God's garden, and man is placed therein. The garden, however, is a place of exquisite beauty, and trees are made to grow therein. Thus we are prepared for the prohibition not to eat of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. . . . He [Moses] emphasizes just those points which need to be stressed, in order that the reader may be properly prepared to understand the account of the fall.<sup>284</sup>

W.H. Green also believed that Genesis 2 was a narrative link that logically unified the creation of "the heavens and the earth" to the temptation and fall of Adam and Eve. Anticipating challenges to the chronological harmony of Genesis 1 and 2 as in the views of Kline, Green rejected the view that Genesis 2 contradicted Genesis 1 in its claim that mankind was created before the "general vegetation." Green averred that the vegetation mentioned in Genesis 2 had to deal with the planting and forming of Eden alone.

Ch. ii. alleges nothing respecting the relative priority of man or plants. It does not deal with the general vegetation of the globe any further than to carry us back to a time when it did not exist. Of its actual production ch. ii. says nothing. Its positive statement is restricted to the trees of the garden of Eden (vs. 8, 9), and we are nowhere informed that these were brought into being at the same time with vegetation elsewhere. Nothing is said of the origin of grass and herbs, or of trees, outside of Eden, except in ch. i.<sup>285</sup>

Thus, it is clear that Green rejected the view that the purpose of Genesis 2:5-7 was to establish chronological priority of the creation account over and against the figurative narrative of Genesis 1. Green affirmed, "As there was plainly no intention to note the strict chronological succession of events [in Genesis 2], it cannot in fairness be inferred from the order of the narrative [in Genesis 2:5-7] that man was made prior to the trees and plants of Eden, much less that he proceeded those of the world at large, of which nothing is said here."<sup>286</sup> Thus,

Young, following Green, also supposed that Genesis 2 was “partly non-chronological,” and that it did not impinge upon how Genesis 1 should be interpreted as straight-forward history. Young asserted, “Genesis one must be interpreted upon its own merits.”<sup>287</sup>

### 3.2.7.4 Young’s Literal, Chronological View

With respect to his interpretation of Genesis 1, Young believed that God had completed the creation and forming of “the heavens and the earth” in six, chronological “days.”<sup>288</sup> However, his literalist view was not due to a strict adherence to a faulty fundamentalist “litmus test” of orthodoxy. But through a detailed and occasionally stilted exegesis of Genesis 1, Young too acknowledged that the Hebrew word for “day,” *yôm*, could not be restricted to a 24-hour period of time. Young wrote that, “The Hebrew word יֹם is used in two different senses in Genesis 1:5. In the one instance it denotes the light in distinction from the darkness; in the other it includes both evening and morning. In Genesis 2:4b the word is employed in yet another sense, ‘in the day of the Lord God’s making.’”<sup>289</sup> Moreover, Young held that the first three “days” could not be “solar” days since the sun, moon, and stars were created on day four. He remarked, “The length of days is not stated. What is important is that each of the days is a period of time which may legitimately be denominated יוֹם (‘day’). The first three days were not solar days such as we now have, inasmuch as the sun, moon, and stars had not yet been made.”<sup>290</sup> Thus, it is apparent that Young himself held that the days were not necessarily 24-hour periods.

Young, however, added a caveat with respect to the long ages assigned by modern science for the origin of the earth and the universe since, in his opinion, these were also unwarranted from the biblical text. Young, quoting from Allis, noted that, “Scientists, who speak in terms of light years, and add cipher to cipher in estimating the time of the beginning of things, ridicule the idea of twenty-four-hour days. But when they multiply thousands to millions and millions to billions and billions to trillions, figures practically cease to have any meaning, and they expose their own ignorance.”<sup>291</sup> Allis was evidently more moderate than his Old Princeton predecessors, W.H. Green and B.B. Warfield, as well as his own colleague at Westminster Seminary, Allan A. MacRae.<sup>292</sup> Allis contended that while the word “day” in Genesis 1 was not necessarily defined as a 24-hour period of time, he also averred that it did not mean “limitless time.” Allis stated, “The word ‘day’ is used in various senses in Scripture. Exodus xx. 8-11 suggests days of twenty-four hours; but Psalm xc. 4 and 2 Peter iii. 8 declare such an inference to be unnecessary. We cannot be sure, and must not be dogmatic. We need to remember, however, that limitless time is a poor substitute for that Omnipotence which can dispense with time.”<sup>293</sup> It is clear from Young’s own remarks that he had adopted Allis’ more moderate view regarding the length of the days of creation. Allis’ influence on Young is evident in Young’s dedication of his book, *Studies in Genesis One* (1964), to his former teacher. “[This book is] DEDICATED TO OSWALD T. ALLIS who has so influenced my thinking on the Old Testament.”<sup>294</sup> Resembling Allis, Young at

times appeared to side with the six day, 24-hour view of creation rather than allowing for long, indeterminate periods of time: “the light of the stars, we are told, traveling at the rate of about 186,000 miles per second, in some instances take years to reach this earth. Hence, men conclude it would have been impossible for the days of Genesis to have been ordinary days of twenty-four hours each.”<sup>295</sup> In reality, however, Young did acknowledge and embrace the view that the days of creation were not 24-hour periods—even as far as entertaining the possibility that the creation days were figuratively employed—albeit in a chronological, historical sequence. “If the word ‘day’ is employed figuratively, *i.e.*, to denote a period of time longer than twenty-four hours, so also may the terms ‘evening’ and ‘morning’, inasmuch as they are component elements of the day, be employed figuratively. It goes without saying that an historical narrative may contain figurative elements.”<sup>296</sup>

According to Young, the underlying purpose for the chronology of the six days of Genesis 1 was to present how God gradually changed the formless, uninhabitable earth of verse 2 into the well-ordered habitation of verse 31. Furthermore, Young claimed that the overall intention of Genesis 1:1-2:3 was *doxological*, *i.e.*, “to exalt the eternal God as the alone Creator of heaven and earth, who in infinite wisdom and by the Word of his power brought the earth into existence and adorned and prepared it for man’s habitancy.”<sup>297</sup> Young concluded that Genesis 1 was “trustworthy history,” just as much as the rest of the book of Genesis. He declared, “Genesis one is not poetry or saga or myth, but straight-forward, trustworthy history, and, inasmuch as it is a divine revelation, [it] accurately records those matters of which it speaks.”<sup>298</sup> In order to justify this claim, Young gave the following three reasons: 1) the book of Genesis presupposes the creation account in the use of the ten-fold “These are the Generations” formula; 2) the characteristics of Hebrew poetry are missing in Genesis 1 particularly when compared to those poetic accounts of creation; and 3) the “New Testament regards certain events mentioned in Genesis one as actually having taken place.”<sup>299</sup>

### 3.2.7.5 A Comparison Between Young and Kline

Young’s overall interpretive objective with respect to Genesis 1 and 2 was—like the rest of his writings on the Old Testament—to allow the divinely-inspired Scriptures to speak for themselves and to uphold the supernatural elements contained therein. Accordingly, Young was hesitant to infer more than what he deemed the text expressly stated. For example, he could not account for the exegetical data concerning the three distinct meanings for the Hebrew word *yôm* (יּוֹם), *i.e.*, “day,” which occurred all within the same literary context of Genesis 1:1-2:3 (*i.e.*, 1:5 [2x]; 2:4b). Although he agreed with Kline that the word “day” may have been employed figuratively in a “semi-poetic” manner (especially with respect to the first three days), he remained, nevertheless, equivocal as to its literary purpose and to its temporal duration. Moreover, in his earlier analysis of Genesis 1 (as seen in his *Introduction*), Young clearly granted credibility to the literary parallelism contained within the double triadic

structure. Yet, within the context of his debate with Kline, he revised what he had published earlier and, instead, adopted a more literalistic reading of Genesis 1 in order to attempt to dismantle any legitimate parallelism between days 1-4, 2-5, and 3-6. This apparent contradiction in Young's analysis of Genesis 1 stemmed from his unyielding desire to preserve the chronological order of the creation days. In this respect, it is evident that Young was closer to the six days, 24-hour view than any of the other positions that required longer periods of time. However, there are two major reasons as to why Young did not formally adopt the former view: 1) Young himself claimed that Genesis 1 lacked the exegetical specificity needed in order to allow such a rigid view, and 2) Young's loyalties were to his Old Princeton-Westminster predecessors who clearly denied the viability of the six days, 24-hour position of creation. In point of fact, Young's interpretation of Genesis 1 and 2 was an amalgam of the exegetical insights of both, W.H. Green and O.T. Allis. Although Young did present many plausible observations in support of a chronological reading of Genesis 1, in the final analysis, however, he failed to present a unified, coherent presentation of his own view. Ultimately, Young's major weakness was that he did not adequately demonstrate how his interpretation was exegetically superior to the other non-chronological views which were clearly more literally and theologically sensitive, e.g., Kline's framework interpretation.<sup>300</sup>

Moreover, the debate between Young and Kline had more to do with their attitudes towards the use of form-critical studies and generic analyses than their respective views of Scripture since both scholars were recognized biblical inerrantists. Young, in particular, was not open to academic novelty, especially when it came to adopting the various historical-critical methodologies of his day. Throughout his career, Young had resisted the use of critical methodology and consciously confined himself within the parameters set forth by his Old Princeton-Westminster forerunners. It is well-known that Green, Wilson, and Allis distrusted their "higher-critical" antagonists including their critical approaches. Hence, at the outset, they established within the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition a resistance toward the modern use of historical criticism in all its various forms, e.g., source (or literary) criticism, form criticism, redaction criticism, tradition-history criticism, and the comparative-religions approach. This was due in part because of their perception that the underlying anti-supernaturalism had undermined the validity of the entire historical-critical enterprise.

Young similarly stood shoulder to shoulder with his predecessors and adamantly opposed the use of higher-critical methodology in general and form criticism specifically. For instance, in a review article, Young questioned the validity of form criticism because of the inescapable subjectivity that he found inherent in its methodology. He stated, "Is not this [form-critical] method basically subjective? Are there really such clear-cut and definite characteristics inherent in and connected with each unit that it can be classified into types? Or is not the element of *Gattungsforschung* in the 'history of tradition' school a most subjective process? For that matter, is not every aspect of the method

subjective?"<sup>301</sup> Furthermore, in his book, *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today* (1959), after having briefly surveyed the pioneering work of George E. Mendenhall on the ancient Hittite, suzerainty treaties,<sup>302</sup> Young concluded that the utilization of form-criticism in comparing the Hittite treaty forms with the Israelite treaties of the Hebrew Bible was unwarranted and illegitimate. Young asserted,

It would be a mistake, however, to proceed from such a survey of the covenant among the Hittites and other peoples and to conclude that a similar form must have appeared also among the Hebrews. Our study of the covenant in the Old Testament must rather be one which is based upon the Old Testament itself. In the course of such a study we may also consider what relationship, if any, exists with the covenants of other ancient nations.<sup>303</sup>

Kline, on the other hand, believed that form criticism, when employed with discernment, could be used positively, as a functional literary tool within evangelical, Old Testament scholarship.<sup>304</sup> Contra Young, Kline sided with Mendenhall in his attempt to demonstrate that the book of Deuteronomy was sufficiently parallel to the Hittite, suzerain treaty form of the second-century millennium B.C. In so doing, Kline endeavored to use form criticism to prove that the book of Deuteronomy plausibly originated from the time of Moses and not necessarily the seventh-century B.C. as held by critical scholarship.<sup>305</sup> Kline wrote,

It is then with this issue of the structural unity and integrity of Deuteronomy that the present investigation is concerned. The question resolves itself into one of literary genre and *Sitz im Leben* [setting in life]. We believe it can be shown that what Mendenhall tentatively suggested concerning biblical history and law in general is certainly true in the case of Deuteronomy. . . . The position to be advocated here is that Deuteronomy is a covenant renewal document which in its total structure exhibits the classic legal form of the suzerainty treaties of the Mosaic age. . . . It will be useful to have a simple outline of the matter before us: 1. Preamble (1:1-5). 2. Historical Prologue (1:6-4:49). 3. Stipulations (5-26). 4. Curses and Blessings or Covenant Ratification (27-30). 5. Succession Arrangements or Covenant Continuity, in which are included the invocation of witnesses and directions for the disposition and public reading of the treaty (31-34).<sup>306</sup>

Moreover, Kline also attempted to draw the implications of understanding the entire Old Testament as a treaty document and thus recognizing its inherent canonical authority.<sup>307</sup> William Dyrness elucidates, "The treaty, once validated, must not be tampered with or changed under pain of serious punishment. If the relationship was changed, the treaty was not altered; it was simply destroyed and a new one drawn up. Thus the covenant form was ready at hand for the Lord to use. The OT in its entirety, Kline believes, can be understood as a treaty document."<sup>308</sup>

In the final analysis, Moisés Silva's assessment was accurate when he observed, "Though his [Young's] writing was not characterized by the

originality some of his colleagues displayed, he more than compensated for it through a masters [*sic*] of vast amounts of information, thoroughness in the details of scholarship, and sheer volume of output.<sup>309</sup> By contrast, Kline was breaking new ground for evangelicals, particularly in the use of form criticism and the comparative method.<sup>310</sup> In this way, Kline was unique among his Old Testament predecessors and contemporaries at Westminster.<sup>311</sup> Silva once again aptly noted, “Without weakening for a moment his commitment to the full authority of Scripture, Kline’s invigorating studies consistently challenged his readers to think in new ways and to consider fresh options.”<sup>312</sup> As a result, Kline’s studies on the “framework interpretation” of Genesis 1-2 and his use of form criticism to defend the historicity of the book of Deuteronomy presented new ways to defend the old traditional views. As an evangelical critic, Kline demonstrated that evangelicalism and historical criticism were not necessarily mutually exclusive when prudently employed.<sup>313</sup>

### 3.2.8 Young’s Stance on Isaiah

Young’s first major work on Isaiah, entitled *Studies in Isaiah*,<sup>314</sup> was a compilation of eight scholarly articles that were originally published in the *Westminster Theological Journal*.<sup>315</sup> Young began his analysis of Isaiah with an extended history of the interpretation of the book. His starting point was the great Old Princeton, biblical scholar, Joseph Addison Alexander,<sup>316</sup> whose two-volume commentary on Isaiah was indisputably the most erudite American work on Isaiah at that time.<sup>317</sup> Young’s nine-page exposition of Alexander’s work reveals his affinity with Alexander’s skillful use of philology and exegesis for the defense of the unity and supernatural character of the book of Isaiah.<sup>318</sup> Moreover, Young also noted Alexander’s in-depth and comprehensive analyses of the critical arguments against the unity of the book. Young observed, “Alexander goes to some length in discussing the opinions of [Wilhelm] Gesenius and proceeds to refute the arguments which were generally introduced to deny the Isaianic authorship of these latter chapters [40-66] (pp. xi-xxv). These arguments are: a) alleged allusions to the Babylonish exile and b) the assertion that the diction, phraseology and style are not those of Isaiah.”<sup>319</sup> Therefore, Young agreed with Alexander that the critical hypothesis regarding the dual authorship of Isaiah was based more on speculation than real evidence. Young found Alexander’s following arguments for Isaiah’s unity much more tenable:

These are: a) “That a writer confessedly of the highest genius, living at one of the most critical junctures in the history of Israel, when the word of God began to be precious and prophetic inspiration rare, should have produced such a series of prophecies as this, with such effects upon the exiles and even upon Cyrus as tradition ascribes to them, and then have left them to the admiration of all future ages, without so much as a trace of his own personality about them, is a phenomenon of literary history compared with which the mystery of Junius is as nothing” (p. xxv); b) How did these anonymous writings come to be attached to those of Isaiah when they had scarcely anything in common? Why is it that two thousand years passed before higher criticism discovered that they were

first the work of many authors, then of one, and that this one was not Isaiah? (p. xxxvi); c) The “ancient and uniform tradition of the Jews”; d) The “testimony of the general title”; e) The “influence exerted by these prophecies” on Cyrus; f) Ecclesiasticus’ recognition of the entire book as Isaiah’s; g) The “indiscriminate citation of its different parts in the New Testament”; h) The writer represents himself as living before some of the events which he describes; i) The “obvious allusions to Jerusalem and Judah as the writer’s home”; j) The historical allusions to the state of the world are precisely similar to those in the genuine Isaiah; k) “The very structure of the prophecies relating to the exile” is “clear enough to be distinctly verified, and yet not so minute as a contemporary writer must have made them”; l) The “identity of Messiah here described with the Messiah of the undisputed prophecies” (pp. xxvi-xxvii).<sup>320</sup>

Above all, Young praised Alexander’s commentaries for their emphasis on the interpretation of the biblical text itself. Young regarded the commentaries’ exegetical work as Alexander’s greatest crowning achievement. This, in Young’s mind, gave Alexander’s commentaries their true significance over and against the other critical studies which were based more upon “the emendation of the text and about questions of introduction and historical background.”<sup>321</sup> Young challenged, “Let anyone compare [Ferdinand] Hitzig<sup>322</sup> and Alexander, for example, and this will be immediately apparent. In Alexander’s work exegesis is upon the throne. Here is manifest a conscious striving to discover the true meaning of the prophet, and all else is made subservient to the accomplishment of this one high end.”<sup>323</sup>

### 3.2.8.1 Young’s Assessment of the Work of Bernard Duhm

Young, however, did not focus his historical study upon the conservative Alexander as the principal figurehead within Isaianic scholarship. That distinction went to Bernard Duhm and his revolutionary interpretation of Isaiah with the appearance of his influential commentary in 1892.<sup>324</sup> This fact is made plain by Young’s thorough treatment of Duhm’s work which occupies some twenty-two pages while only sixteen pages are devoted to the works of Duhm’s critical predecessors<sup>325</sup> and successors<sup>326</sup> combined. Young’s justification for his sustained and concentrated efforts on Duhm’s work was simply due to the fact that he regarded Duhm’s critical dissection of Isaiah into three separate sections as *the watershed moment* in Isaianic scholarship. Thus, Young—in the spirit of Alexander—endeavored to faithfully outline and unpack Duhm’s argumentation against the unity of Isaiah in order to, ultimately, defend the book’s unity.

According to Young, Duhm posited that the compilation of the book of Isaiah had taken three major steps:<sup>327</sup> a) the collection of chapters 1-12 (“The Book of Isaiah” [*Das Jesaiabuch*]) and chapters 13-23; b) the uniting of the groups: chapters 1-12, chapters 13-23, chapters 24-35 and their completion through the addition of chapters 36-39; and c) the addition of chapters 40-66. Each step was not necessarily the work of one individual, and each collection may have had a long compositional history. All of the independent sections were pieced together by different redactors who were not at liberty to arrange the materials as they thought best in chronological or logical order because they

thought it necessary to respect the disposition of the material. Conversely, Duhm assumed that the final redactor of chapters 1-12 tied the various narrative and prophetic strands together and placed them in a discernable chronological order, “beginning with the nearer future and concluding with more remote eschatological subjects.”<sup>328</sup> Duhm alleged that this redactor labored around the first century B.C.

With respect to the work of Deutero-Isaiah, Duhm was the first to restrict this section to chapters 40-55. In fact, not all of the fifteen chapters were attributed to Deutero-Isaiah alone. The well-known Servant passages<sup>329</sup> were deemed to be later, but not as late as chapters 56-66. The task of Deutero-Isaiah, according to Duhm, was the proclamation of Yahweh’s future return through the wilderness to Palestine leading the way for an emancipated Israel. Hence, the people were to prepare their way back from exile. Deutero-Isaiah is thought to have composed his work around 540 B.C. and lived, not in Babylon as was widely held, but in Lebanon or northern Phoenicia.<sup>330</sup>

Duhm’s seminal contribution to Isaianic scholarship was the designation of chapters 56-66 to a “Third” Isaiah or Trito-Isaiah. This unknown author agreed with Deutero-Isaiah regarding his promises which speak of the advancement and the future glory of Jerusalem. Duhm alleged that Trito-Isaiah was composed by someone who lived in Jerusalem just before the reforms of Nehemiah. Therefore, Trito-Isaiah is believed to have written during a period when the land was still inhabited and the city built, but “all was in tragic shape.”<sup>331</sup> There were no foreign allies such as Cyrus to improve conditions, only enemies and false brethren of the Jerusalem community who desired to build a rival temple. Yet the day of revenge was to come and Jerusalem’s walls would be rebuilt. Young concluded that Duhm’s principal contributions were: “his introduction of the ‘Third’ Isaiah, his reducing the compass of ‘Second’ Isaiah by one-half, his unique views of the four great Servant passages and his attributing the authorship of chapters 40-66 to persons who lived in Palestine or Syria.” Young continued, “These views were so novel and startling that their widespread influence is easily understandable.”<sup>332</sup>

### 3.2.8.2 Young’s Commentary on Isaiah

As was true for much of Young’s views on the Old Testament, he closely adhered to the traditional views as held by his Old Princeton-Westminster predecessors, especially in regard to those forebears whose works were considered conservative standards in the field. When it came to the book of Isaiah, Young found himself profoundly indebted to the work of J.A. Alexander. Harman accurately notes, “There can be little doubt that Young modeled his own exegetical work on Isaiah after that of Joseph Addison Alexander of Princeton. . . . There are clear links between Alexander and Young in qualifications, [reverent] attitude toward the biblical text, intention, and exegetical approach.”<sup>333</sup> Young’s own meticulous expositional analysis of Isaiah is found in his three-volume commentary, *The Book of Isaiah*.<sup>334</sup> This comprehensive work represents Young’s *magnum opus* and was completed

towards the end of his life.<sup>335</sup> It was published in the New International Commentary on the Old Testament (NICOT) series for which Young himself served as its first General Editor.<sup>336</sup> Since then, Young's work has been replaced by John Oswalt's two-volume commentary on Isaiah<sup>337</sup> and the late Roland K. Harrison and Robert L. Hubbard, Jr. have succeeded him as subsequent general editors of the series, respectively.<sup>338</sup>

Young's methodological procedure in his commentary on Isaiah was not to unfold "textual questions and problems," nor to "trace the history of each verse in the manner of some works."<sup>339</sup> Rather, Young's goal was to provide "commentary upon the Masoretic Hebrew text and the meaning of that text."<sup>340</sup> Thus, his hermeneutical approach was to stay as literal as possible to the meaning of the Masoretic Text [MT] through careful exegetical analysis and exposition. Young remained committed to the MT as the principal Hebrew text throughout his commentary, even though he did make frequent use of the ancient versions. However, the ancient witnesses were never employed to correct the reading of the MT, even in cases where 1QIs<sup>a</sup> and the Septuagint [LXX] agreed against the MT.<sup>341</sup> On the one hand, the commentary was intended to serve the needs of the church, especially ministers and Adult Sunday school teachers who did not possess a requisite knowledge of biblical Hebrew. When Young deemed that the linguistic nuances of the Hebrew text were significant to the interpretation of a passage, Young provided helpful English transliterations of Hebrew words and phrases along with their parallel translations in order to further elucidate their contextual and literary meanings. Young stated, "The few exceptions are mainly examples of paronomasia and alliteration, which I have given in a loose transcription so that one unfamiliar with Hebrew will be able to understand them."<sup>342</sup> On the other hand, the commentary did include technical material in the footnotes, special notes within the main body of the text, and excurses in the appendices for "ministers, teachers, and students who do know the Hebrew language."<sup>343</sup> The footnotes and special notes also "included material, such as archaeological discoveries, which throw light upon the sacred [text]."<sup>344</sup> In the appendices, Young presented useful resources for the study of the book of Isaiah, including a lucid presentation on the various manuscripts of Isaiah, an extensive historical study of Isaiah from the Early Church period to the modern era (up to 1952), and a critique of the so-called "Enthronement Festival" hypothesis as it came to prominence within Old Testament scholarship during Young's day.<sup>345</sup>

Most of Young's colleagues within the academy gave his commentary on Isaiah high marks on his use of philology and his thoroughgoing knowledge of the vast literature on modern Isaianic scholarship. One reviewer wrote, "Y.[oung] shows himself very sensitive to the nuances of Hebrew and other Semitic languages and ought to be consulted for his translation."<sup>346</sup> Another reviewer positively declared, "Y. gives a careful, intelligent, interesting, and devout commentary. . . . Philological comments are offered to clarify the meaning, with recourse at times to cognates in Arabic, Akkadian, Syriac, Ugaritic, and even Egyptian."<sup>347</sup> However, they were also generally disparaging

of his “extreme” conservative views. Even noted evangelical scholar, D.F. Payne of the Queen’s University of Belfast, negatively commented,

The least satisfactory treatments, to the reviewer’s mind, are the discussion of 7:14 ff., and the appendix on “The Festival of Enthronement”. The former does not really explain how the prophecy could have been any sort of “sign” to Ahaz, if (as Young maintains) it had no contemporary reference at all; nor is the linguistic discussion of ‘almah quite adequate. As for the so-called Festival of Enthronement, it is good, to be sure, that writers should from time to time emphasize how flimsy the basis for crediting its existence, but nevertheless E.J. Young has made it too much a matter of black and white; it is quite unnecessary to maintain, for instance, that any such festival would inevitably have been polytheistic in character. And what of the “covenant festival” hypothesis? It deserved at least a mention in such a context. Here, as elsewhere, it might have been more helpful if Professor Young had allowed the possibility that his own view was extreme, and ventured an alternative exegesis for the benefit of those who inclined to other opinions.<sup>348</sup>

Although Young’s impressive knowledge of all of the major works in Isaianic scholarship was generally recognized, Carroll Stuhlmueller of the Catholic Theological Union in Chicago observed,

Notable gaps show up. Never once does Y.[oung] refer to: authors such as Auvray-Steinmann, in the *La Sainte Bible de Jérusalem*; M. Dahood’s many observations on Is, frequently in *CBQ* [Catholic Biblical Quarterly], a magazine never cited; G. Fohrer, one of the most prolific writers on the prophets, whose first volume of Is appeared in 1960 (<sup>2</sup>1966); O. Plöger’s study of Is 24-27 in *Theocracy and Eschatology* (1968; German eds., 1959, 1962); C. Westermann; O. Kaiser; O. Eissfeldt’s *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. Y. is not conscious of the second, and notably revised, edition of E.J. Kissane, *The Book of Isaiah*, Vol. I (1960), where the interpretation of Is 7, 14 is revised, now reading, “the Messianic interpretation . . . is to be based on the typical, not the literal sense of this prophecy” (p. 86).<sup>349</sup>

Yet for all of its shortcomings, Young’s colleagues believed that his three-volume commentary on Isaiah was a valuable addition to the growing literature in Isaianic scholarship. John J. Schmitt favorably affirmed, “Y.[oung]’s commentary is a monumental work, the first English commentary by an individual on the whole Book of Isa in several decades. . . . Despite the erudition of its author, this commentary will not replace the standard commentaries. But it merits a place near them on the reference shelf, for conservative scholarship has a unique contribution to make in the spectrum of scripture study.”<sup>350</sup>

### **3.2.8.3 Young’s Traditional Views on Isaiah**

As a conservative evangelical scholar, Young affirmed the authorial unity of Isaiah. He asserted, “Isaiah is regarded as the author of the entire prophecy, and the purpose is to let him speak and to endeavor to understand what he says.”<sup>351</sup> But because Young had dealt with issues of authorship elsewhere, he

did not feel the need to rehash the subject matter at any great length within his commentary.<sup>352</sup> However, in relation to the key controversial texts in Isaiah such as 7:14, 9:2-7, and the fourth Servant Song of 52:13-53:12, Young claimed that only when the prophecies were taken at “face value”—as historically spoken by Isaiah the prophet—could the true meaning of the passages be ascertained.

Young’s interpretations of Isaiah 7:14 were traditional in that he regarded: 1) the Hebrew word, ‘almah, as referring to a young, unmarried woman, and 2) her child, called “Immanuel,” as the prediction of the messianic virgin birth of Jesus Christ.<sup>353</sup> Young averred,

In any interpretation of this passage [7:14] there are three points which need to be stressed. (1) The birth must be a sign. (2) The mother of the Child is one who is both unmarried and a good woman. This fact simply cannot be glossed over, and in itself rules out those interpretations which regard the mother as a married woman. (3) The very presence of the Child brings God to His people. . . No one else in the Old Testament bears this name [Immanuel]. For these reasons, the prophecy must be interpreted only of that One to whom these conditions apply, namely, Jesus the Christ, the Son of the Virgin and the Mighty God.<sup>354</sup>

Similarly, Young held that the prophecy regarding Isaiah 9:2-7 was speaking of the “Child” earlier referred to in 7:14. Young noted, “Upon this Child the government with all its responsibilities lies. Like a burden it rests upon His shoulders. Isaiah had earlier inveighed against child rulers; one of the punishments which was to come upon Judah was that children would be its princes (3:4). Here, however, not only is a Child to be the ruler, but the entire responsibility for the good administration of the government is said to rest upon His shoulders. The Child is to be a King, a Ruler, a Sovereign.”<sup>355</sup> Young regarded the messianic titles bestowed upon the Child as exclusively divine in character and, therefore, not in reference to a mere earthly king. In contrast to George Adam Smith, who deemed that the Messiah was an earthly king and not a “separate Divine personality,” Young maintained that “a proper exegesis of this passage [9:2-7] does present a Messiah, who although a legitimate heir to the Davidic throne, is, nevertheless, a ‘separate Divine personality.’”<sup>356</sup> Young interpreted the prophecy of 9:2-7, as he did with 7:14, in light of the New Testament and its authoritative claim that Jesus was the true Davidic Messiah whose work was primarily spiritual. Young contended, “In the New Testament . . . the work of salvation is spiritual. If therefore our understanding of Jesus’ [Messianic] work is truly spiritual, we shall be less inclined to appeal to the prophecies of Isaiah as proof of His deity. This thought, however, is simply wishful thinking representing a liberalism which wished to remove as much as possible of the supernatural from the Bible. Certainly v. 6 makes it clear that the work of the Messiah is spiritual in nature.”<sup>357</sup>

Young’s repeated emphasis on the Servant Songs, and especially to the fourth Song in 52:13-53:12, displayed his incessant interest in the identity of the Suffering Servant. In fact, Young published two scholarly articles (“Of Whom Speaketh the Prophet This?”<sup>358</sup> and “The Origin of the Suffering Servant

Idea”<sup>359</sup>) in the *Westminster Theological Journal* which dealt with various theories surrounding the identity and origin of the Servant idea, especially against the background of the ancient Near Eastern Baal texts from Ugarit.<sup>360</sup> He also dedicated an entire book to the fourth Servant Song entitled, *Isaiah Fifty-Three*, which was a popular tome dedicated toward defending “the time-honored belief that this chapter refers to the atonement of Jesus Christ.”<sup>361</sup> This type of popular apologetic was paramount to Young because he firmly believed that the fourth Servant Song prophesied of the suffering of the Messianic Servant who would propitiate the sin of humankind. Young declared that chapter 53 is “what it claims to be and what the New Testament says it is, a prophecy concerning God’s Servant who was to deliver mankind from the guilt and pollution of sin.”<sup>362</sup> Hence, according to Young, the Servant’s suffering and death were vicarious and his atonement was substitutionary in nature:

When the servant bore the guilt of our sins, we are saying that he bore the punishment that was due to us because of those sins, and that is to say that he was our substitute. His punishment was vicarious. . . . Inasmuch as the vicarious suffering is for those who had transgressed God’s holy law, and inasmuch as the vicarious punishment of the servant actually sets us free in the sight of a holy God, we may say with assurance that there is only One of whom these words may be spoken, namely Jesus the Christ.<sup>363</sup>

### 3.2.8.4 Young’s Defense of the Unity of Isaiah

Young’s emphasis upon viewing the messianic prophecies of Isaiah in light of the ministry and life of Jesus Christ came from his interpretation of the Old Testament from the perspective of the New. Young claimed,

At the outset it should be noted that the heading (Isaiah 1:1) is not the only passage of Scripture which asserts Isaianic authorship. What settles the question once and for all is the witness of the New Testament, a witness so strong that it merits detailed consideration. The New Testament quotes more from Isaiah than from all the other Old Testament prophecies combined, and it always attributes the prophecy to Isaiah.<sup>364</sup>

Young entered Matthew 3:3 as evidence: “For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.”<sup>365</sup> Young noted that the prophecy given in Matthew 3:3 was the well-known prophecy found in Isaiah 40:3 which had been regarded by critical scholarship as belonging to “Second” Isaiah. Young, however, contended that the author of Matthew’s Gospel “does not refer to the book of Isaiah but to the man [i.e., the eighth-century prophet, Isaiah] himself.”<sup>366</sup> Accordingly, this manner of quoting from Isaiah was characteristic of the New Testament and was the predominant method employed by its authors. Young observed, “As a result we frequently meet with such phrases as ‘Isaiah the prophet,’ ‘The prophet Isaiah,’ ‘Isaiah said again,’ ‘Isaiah said . . . saw . . . spoke,’ ‘Isaiah cries,’ ‘Isaiah says,’ ‘As Isaiah said before,’ ‘Isaiah becomes bold and says,’ ‘Well spake the Holy Ghost through Isaiah the

prophet.”<sup>367</sup> Young further noted that the New Testament’s emphasis upon the human author of the prophecy rather than the prophecy itself also seemed to answer the critical theory that the designation “Isaiah” was nothing more than the identification of a group of prophecies. “Some of the prophecies were indeed from the prophet himself, but he had disciples who not only gathered together his own writings, but added to them from time to time. Consequently, it is maintained, the name Isaiah really amounts to little more than a library tab, serving to identify a certain group of prophecies.”<sup>368</sup> But, in Young’s mind, this “Isaiah school”<sup>369</sup> hypothesis was invalidated by the way in which the New Testament authors quoted from all the various parts of the prophecy as if these parts had been spoken by Isaiah himself.

That this is the case may be seen from the fact that the following passages of the book are definitely attributed in the New Testament to Isaiah himself: 1:9; 6:9-10; 29:13; 10:22-23; 11:5; 40:3; 42:1, 53:1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10; and 65:1. It is of unusual interest that so many passages from the second part of the prophecy, and notably from chapter 53, are ascribed to the man Isaiah. There can be no escaping the conviction that the writers of the New Testament believed the passages which they quoted were the work of the great eighth-century prophet himself.

To add weight to his previous assertions, Young diagrammed the New Testament evidence in regard to the various parts that were quoted from the book of Isaiah:<sup>370</sup>

<u>NT Passage</u>	<u>Manner of Introducing Quotation</u>	<u>Passage Quoted</u>	<u>Source</u> (1st, 2nd, or 3rd Isaiah)
Matt. 3:3	“the prophet Isaiah”	40:3	2
Matt. 8:17	“Isaiah the prophet”	53:4	2 (3)
Matt. 12:17	“Isaiah the prophet”	42:1	2
Matt. 13:14	“the prophecy of Isaiah”	6: 9, 10	1
Matt. 15:7	“Isaiah prophesied”	29:10	1
Mark 1:2	“in Isaiah the prophet”	40:3	2
Mark 7:6	“Isaiah prophesied”	29:13	1
Luke 3:4	“in the book of the words of Isaiah the prophet”	40:3-5	2
Luke 4:17	“the book of the prophet Isaiah”	61:1, 2	3
John 1:23	“the prophet Isaiah”	40:3	2
John 12:38	“Isaiah the prophet”	53:1	2 (3)
John 12:39	“Isaiah said again”	6:9, 10	1
John 12:41	“Isaiah—said—saw—spake”	53:1; 6:9, 10	2
Acts 8:28	“reading Isaiah the prophet”	53:7, 8	2 (3)
Acts 8:30	“reading the prophet Isaiah”	53: 7, 8	2 (3)
Acts 8:32	“the passage of the Scripture”	53: 7, 8	2 (3)
Note that the background of this incident illustrates and fulfills Isa. 56:3-7 (3)			
Acts 28:25	“Well spake the Holy Ghost through Isaiah the prophet”	6: 9, 10	1
Romans 9:27	“Isaiah cries”	10:22, 23; 11:5	1

Romans 9:29	"As Isaiah said before"	1:9	1
Note: Romans 9 and 10 contain many allusions to and echoes of the language of Isaiah			
Romans 10:16	"Isaiah says"	53:1	2 (3)
Romans 10:20	"Isaiah becomes bold and says"	65:1	3

The New Testament evidence, according to Young, was simply insurmountable.<sup>371</sup> As a faithful tradent of the Old Princeton-Westminster, Reformed orthodoxy and a firm proponent of the traditional view that the Bible is the infallible, inerrant, and authoritative Word of God, Young believed that—from the perspective of the New Testament authors—the matter of Isaianic authorship was settled. "The question, however, may arise: 'Granted that the New Testament does regard Isaiah as the author of this prophecy, what does it prove?' The answer is: It proves everything. It settles the questions once and for all. . . . It is His revelation, to which we must give implicit obedience. When, therefore, the New Testament speaks on any matter, that matter is settled. When it tells us that Isaiah is the author of his prophecy, the question is settled."<sup>372</sup> Thus, ultimately, Young's belief in the unity of Isaiah's authorship was based upon, what he alleged, as the Bible's internal, self-attestation regarding the prophet Isaiah as the author of the entire canonical prophecy. But, true to form, this was not original to Young. His dogmatic resolution to the problem of Isaianic authorship was in keeping with the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition. Young's predecessors had also marshaled the same New Testament evidence in support of the unity of Isaiah.<sup>373</sup>

Young affirmed that all who studied the Bible seriously and investigated matters such as the dating and authorship of biblical books were to be called "critics." Young classified all such "critics" of Scripture into two main groups: 1) "negative critics" consisting of those scholars "who do not submit their minds and judgments to Scripture. . . . The critic prefers his own judgment or the judgment of some man to the express declaration of the written Bible.>"; and 2) "believing critics" consisting of those scholars who "submit their judgment to the express statements of the Bible. . . . Believing criticism must be guided at every point by the teaching of the Bible."<sup>374</sup>

Young's own defense of the unity of the book of Isaiah as a "believing critic" was based upon the linguistic, historical, and thematic elements of Isaiah itself; the books of the canonical prophets which alluded in part to Isaiah's prophecy; the extra-biblical documents that shed light upon Isaiah's authorship, and the historical background of ancient Near East during the eighth century B.C. The following is a sample of Young's apologetic in defense of the unity of the authorship of Isaiah:

- 1) The apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus (also known as Ben Sira, The Wisdom of Sira, or more commonly, Sirach) which dates from the second century B.C. appears to support the unity of the book of Isaiah. Young attempted to show that the writer of Ecclesiasticus knew of Isaiah's prophetic ministry and the book in which his prophecy was recorded. Young explained, "After enumerating some of the virtues and

accomplishments of Isaiah, he says, ‘He [i.e., Isaiah] comforted them that mourned in Zion. He shewed the things that should be to the end of the time and the hidden things or ever they came (49:17-25).<sup>375</sup> One who reads these verses in their context will receive the impression that the writer had before him the book of Isaiah in the very form we possess it today. And in speaking of Isaiah’s comforting those that mourned in Zion (not, incidentally, in Babylon), the son of Sira employs the same Greek word ‘comfort’ (*parakalein*) that is used in the Greek translation of Isaiah 40:1 and 61:2, 3. In like manner the Hebrew original employs the same Hebrew word for comfort (*wayyinnâchēm*) as Isaiah.’<sup>376</sup>

- 2) The great Isaiah scroll (IQIs<sup>a</sup>), found among the manuscripts in the caves near Wady Qumran at the northwest area of the Dead Sea, appears to corroborate the testimony of Ecclesiasticus. The Isaiah scroll dates approximately around the same time as Ecclesiasticus composed sometime during the second century B.C. According to Young, “An examination of the manuscript will be of interest regarding the relationship between chapters 39 and 40 of Isaiah. Chapter 39 concludes just one line from the bottom of the page, and on the same line there remain spaces for about eight letters. Chapter 40 begins on the last line of the page, and there is no special indentation. There is thus no unusual break between the two chapters. The only place in the manuscript where there is a break (of about three lines) is after chapter 33. This break, however, whatever its purpose, does not indicate a diversity of authorship.”<sup>377</sup> Young concluded that the scroll of Isaiah supported the position that the book existed in the second century B.C. as a unit. It further militated against the idea that the second portion of the book (chapters 40-66) originated from another Isaiah, and nullified Duhm’s theory that the book of Isaiah found its present final form in the first century B.C.<sup>378</sup>
- 3) Young opposed three major critical views:
  - a) Karl Budde<sup>379</sup> proposed that Isaiah’s writings (chapters 1-39) and those of the “great Unknown” (i.e., Deutero-Isaiah) had no relationship with one another. At this time the prophetic books were divided into the categories of large, medium, and small. The two large books, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, were written on a single roll. The twelve small prophetic books were also written on one roll. The two medium-sized books, one by the eighth-century Isaiah, and the other anonymous (i.e., Deutero-Isaiah of chapters 40-66). Budde appealed to *Baba Bathra* 14b for support. However, Young rebutted that Budde’s theory lacked any objective evidence. Young also asked “Why was the second *medium* book anonymous? When the editors, according to criticism, were placing headings upon every other prophetical book, even one as short as Obadiah, why did they not give a heading to this greatest of all prophecies? And why did editors give to Isaiah 13 the heading, ‘The burden of Babylon, which Isaiah the son of Amoz did see?’?”<sup>380</sup>
  - b) According to Young, the most widely held theory in his day was that each of the three Isaiah responsible for the present form of the book

had a circle of disciples.<sup>381</sup> However, each successive Isaiah influenced the other, i.e., Second Isaiah was influenced by First Isaiah, and Third Isaiah had been influenced by Second. Later editors compiled all the utterances into a single book under the name Isaiah. Young, however, criticized the view claiming that it was merely based on guesswork and speculation. He asserted, "if the editors collected so many utterances which really were spoken by various persons, and issued them under the name of Isaiah, they did a very dishonest thing."<sup>382</sup> For the heading (1:1) which these editors prefixed to the book is, as we have seen, very specific, and gives the impression that the entire book is the vision which Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning specific subjects and at a specific time."<sup>383</sup>

- c) E.J. Kissane<sup>384</sup> maintained that a prophet who lived in Babylon collected all the prophecies of Isaiah which are now found in chapters 1-34. He added the historical section, chapters 36-39, and for the benefit of the exiles in Babylon produced chapters 40-66 employing the ideas of Isaiah in his own language. The motivation behind Kissane's hypothesis was to unite both parts of Isaiah into a logical unity. The prophet set out to write chapters 40-66 in order to reapply Isaiah's original prophecy of chapters 1-34 to a generation that no longer believed they were applicable. Hence, Kissane proposed that the prophet's repetition of Isaiah's former prophecy along with the hope of return for those in exiles would be to their benefit.<sup>385</sup> Young, however, contended that Isaiah 40-66 was far more than a repetition of the earlier teachings of chapters 1-34, but a development of its teachings. In addition, new themes and ideas were introduced in chapters 40-66 upon which chapters 1-34 were silent. These new ideas were so significant at the time that the name of the exilic author should have been appended to the book rather than Isaiah. Also, according to Young, chapters 40-66 also contained denunciation as well as hope. These arguments along with the fact that anonymity is contrary to the nature of prophecy rounded out Young's rebuttal. In regard to the latter, Young stated, "The identity of the prophet had to be known, in order that they be received as an accredited spokesman for the Lord . . . when the prophet *wrote* for the benefit of those with whom he might not have personal contact, it was essential that his identity as a prophet be known in order that his message might be received as the authoritative declaration of an accredited spokesman of the Lord. It is contrary to the whole genius of the biblical teaching to postulate the existence of anonymous writing prophets."<sup>386</sup>
- 4) According to Young, the author of Isaiah 40-66 was a Palestinian and not held as a captive in Babylon. Young observed, "The author does not show a familiarity with the land or the religion of Babylon such as we might expect from one who dwelt among the captives. But he does speak of Jerusalem and the mountains of Palestine, and he mentions some of the trees that are native to Palestine, e.g., the cedar, cypress, oak (44:14; 41:19). In 43:14 the Lord speaks of sending to Babylon, a passage which is clearly addressed to those who are not in Babylon. In 41:9 the prophet addresses Israel as the seed of Abraham which the Lord has taken from the

ends of the earth. Such a phrase as ‘ends of the earth’ could only have been employed by one who was writing in the promised land. The same may be said of 45:22. In 46:11 such phrases as ‘from the east’ and ‘from a far country’ are more understandable when spoken from a Palestinian viewpoint than from a Babylonian one. But 52:11 is conclusive. The phrase ‘from thence’ clearly shows that this passage was not uttered in Babylon.”<sup>387</sup>

- 5) Young insisted that there are passages within chapters 40-66 that did not fit the time of the Babylonian exile. Young noted, “In 62:6 the walls of Jerusalem are standing. In 40:9 the cities of Judah, as well as Zion, are yet in existence. How could such a passage as this have been penned during the exile?”<sup>388</sup>
- 6) The phrase “Holy One of Israel,” as a designation of God reflects the majestic vision the prophet Isaiah saw in the Temple. The recurrence of this key phrase, in Young’s mind, argued for the book’s unity. “So indelible is this impression that in 1-39 Isaiah uses the phrase twelve times and in 40-66 he employs it fourteen times. Elsewhere in the Old Testament it occurs only five times.”<sup>389</sup> Young also believed that chapters 36-39 served as a connecting bridge that linked the earlier Assyrian period with the later Babylonian and served as an introduction to the last great section of the book.<sup>390</sup>
- 7) Chapters 13-14 point to the deliverance from Babylon and, in Young’s mind, form a prelude to the latter section of Isaiah (chapters 40-66). The heading of these chapters is “The burden of Babylon, which Isaiah, the son of Amoz, did see” (13:1). According to Young, those who deny Isaianic authorship face a dilemma as to how these chapters came to be placed in their present position. Young wrote, “why would a later editor have attributed them to Isaiah, the son of Amoz? Because of the Babylonian background, critics of the negative school deny these two chapters to Isaiah.<sup>391</sup> They cannot explain, however, the present position of the chapters. We are usually told that a later editor arranged the book as we now have it.”<sup>392</sup> But Young noted that the epilogue of the oracle against Babylon found in 14:28-32 was generally acknowledged by the critics to be authentically Isaianic. Young rebutted by stating that adding epilogues to prophecies was characteristic of Isaiah (cf. 8:1-4 with chapter 7; 16:13 ff. with 15, 16:12; 20 with 18-19; 22:15ff. with 22:1-14). Young also alleged that chapters 13 and 14 were employed by later prophets such as Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Ezekiel, and Jeremiah. Young contended: “Let the reader compare Isaiah 14:4ff. with Habakkuk 2:6ff.; 13:9, 11 and 14:13ff. with 11:9; 13:3 with Zephaniah 1:7 and 3:1; 13:20, 21 with 11:31-15; 13:7 with Ezekiel 7:17 and 21:12; 13:8 with 21:3; and 14:6 with 32:12 ff. Compare also Jeremiah 50 and 51. A careful comparison will make clear that Isaiah 13 and 14 are to be regarded as pre-exilic and were at hand for Jeremiah’s use.”<sup>393</sup> Young concluded, “Our point has been that Isaiah did as a matter of fact speak of Babylon. If he did so in chapter 13, why not in later portions of his prophecy? If chapter 13 be denied Isaiah, it is practically impossible to explain its position in the prophecy. Why would a later editor have thought that Isaiah had prophesied concerning Babylon?”

Why would he ever have inserted a heading such as 13:1 over the prophecy? These questions demand an answer.<sup>394</sup>

- 8) Young cited George Adam Smith's comments on the Cyrus prophecy (44:24-45:4): "Cyrus, in short, is not presented as a prediction, but as the proof that a prediction is being fulfilled. Unless he had already appeared in flesh and blood, and was on the point of attacking Babylon, with all the prestige of unbroken victory, a great part of Isa. 41-48 would be utterly unintelligible."<sup>395</sup> Young in response claimed that Oswald T. Allis had effectively answered this critical objection to the supernatural prophecy of the eighth-century prophet of Jerusalem some 160 years before the time of Cyrus.<sup>396</sup> Young delineated Allis' exposition of 44:24-28 by breaking up the prophecy into 3 separate strophes.<sup>397</sup> The structure of the first strophe (i.e., 44:28) was arranged in the following manner:<sup>398</sup>

I am the LORD,  
that maketh all things,  
that stretcheth forth the heavens alone,  
that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself.

Young noted, "The phrases 'that maketh,' 'that stretcheth forth,' and 'that spreadeth abroad' are all translations of participles from the Hebrew. Each of these is dependent upon the introductory phrase 'I am the LORD.' Note that the first phrase is general, referring to God as the Creator of all; the second phrase describes Him as the One who brought the heaven into existence and the third has reference to this particular earth."<sup>399</sup> The arrangement of the second strophic structure (i.e., 44:25-26a) was as follows:<sup>400</sup>

That frustrateth the tokens of the liars,	and maketh diviners mad;
That turneth wise men backward,	and maketh their knowledge foolish;
That confirmeth the word of his servant,	and performeth the counsel of his messengers.

Young again noted that there was a Hebrew participle that began each line just as in the first strophe. However, in the case of the second strophe, each line also had a corresponding finite verb. "Furthermore, in the original Hebrew this finite verb (it is the imperfect in each case) is always the last word of the line. We may thus render a line in literal fashion: 'The frustrator of the signs of the liars and the diviners he makes mad.'<sup>401</sup> The arrangement of each line, therefore, was chiastic. The verbal idea is presented first, followed by the object. In the second half of the line, the order is reversed with the object first proceeded by the verb.<sup>402</sup>

verb	object	.....	object	verb
a	b		b	a

This arrangement is found in each of the three lines of the second strophe. In the third and final strophe (44:26b-28), Young, following Allis, diagrammed the following.<sup>403</sup>

That saith to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be inhabited;	and to the cities of Judah, Ye shall be built,	and I will raise up the decayed places thereof:
That said to the deep, Be dry,	and I will dry up thy rivers:	
That saith of Cryus <i>He</i> is my shepherd,	and shall perform all my pleasure:	even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built;
		and to they temple, Thy foundation shall be laid.

The resulting arrangement is like the first two, in that, the first word of each line in the Hebrew is a participle. The first line consists of three parts or members; the second line consists of two parts and the third line of four parts. Young observed, "As was the case in the second strophe, the last word of the line in the Hebrew is a finite verb in the imperfect. The first strophe contains three members or parts; the second six and the third, nine." The arrangement may be diagrammed as follows:<sup>404</sup>

<i>STROPHE ONE:</i>	I am the LORD	
	*	
	*	
	*	
		3
<i>STROPHE TWO:</i>	*	*
	*	*
	*	*
	*	
		6
<i>STROPHE THREE:</i>	*	*
	*	*
	*	*
	*	*
	*	*
	*	
		9

Young believed that Allis' "numerico-climactic" structural arrangement of the tri-strophic poem found in the Cyrus prophecy was striking in what it had revealed.<sup>405</sup> He declared, "The first strophe refers to events of the past, indeed, of the very remote past. It takes us back to creation itself, the origin of all things. The purpose of this first strophe is to make it clear that the LORD is the sovereign God who reigns over all. The second strophe concerns the present, contemporary events. It shows the superiority of the God of Israel to soothsayers and gods of the nations, in that God controls the soothsayers and their predictions. They cannot contravene His will for

He can turn their wisdom into folly. The third strophe points to the future and, inasmuch as the first referred to the distant past, indeed, to the most remote past, it is to be expected that the third strophe will refer to the remote future.”<sup>406</sup> These were the basic lines of Allis’ original argument against the critical interpretation of the Cyrus prophecy.<sup>407</sup>

### 3.3 Young’s Contributions

Throughout his distinguished, thirty-two year career as an Old Testament scholar, Edward J. Young intentionally labored to carry on the Old Princeton tradition that had been firmly established at Westminster Theological Seminary. Young was the first and only Old Testament professor to teach at Westminster who had been trained by the previous Old Princeton faculty, such as J. Gresham Machen (New Testament) and Oswald T. Allis (Old Testament). The other professors at Westminster during Young’s days as a divinity student were also graduates of either Princeton Seminary or University, including Allan A. MacRae (Old Testament), John Murray (Systematic Theology), Cornelius Van Til (Apologetics), Ned B. Stonehouse (New Testament), and Paul Woolley (Church History).<sup>408</sup> It is readily apparent that Young, during his early years at Westminster, eagerly imbibed all aspects of the traditional Reformed Orthodox education he had received there.

As an early member of Westminster’s faculty,<sup>409</sup> Young attempted to continue Old Princeton-Westminster tradition in everything he taught and published. He consciously identified himself with the procession of scholars that represented this conservative trajectory. Young, therefore, earnestly familiarized himself with the Old Testament works of William Henry Green, Joseph Addison Alexander, Geerhardus Vos, Robert Dick Wilson, and Oswald T. Allis. In fact, in every subject that his predecessors wrote on, Young, in the main, held similar stances. Consequently, he based much of his defense of the traditional positions of the Old Testament on one or more of their works. For example, on the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, he used Green and Allis; on the unity of the book of Isaiah, he used Alexander and Allis; on the doctrine of the inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture, he used B.B. Warfield and A.A. Hodge; on the character of redemptive history within the “Covenant of Grace,” he used John Murray (and indirectly Geerhardus Vos); on the defense of the doctrine of “plenary inspiration” against “the new modernism” of neo-orthodoxy, he used Cornelius Van Til; on the early date of the book of Daniel based upon its Aramaic vocabulary, he used Wilson; and on his defense of a chronological interpretation of the “days” of Creation, he used Green and Allis. As is evident, Young remained committed to the traditionalism that was characteristic of the Old Princeton-Westminster School. However, Young’s application of these works was not simply due to a blind loyalty that was indicative of fundamentalism’s tendency toward “anti-intellectualism.”<sup>410</sup> Rather, Young believed that the works of his predecessors were rational well-reasoned explanations of the traditional views which took seriously the Bible’s divine and human qualities.<sup>411</sup> Young, therefore, desired to champion—in an up-to-date fashion—the

traditional views of the Old Testament within the academy and sought to pass on these older views to a new generation of evangelical scholars within the church.

Young's most ardent and traditional defense of the Old Testament came in his writings on the book of Isaiah. Although J.A. Alexander had earlier provided a comprehensive treatment on Isaiah during his career at (Old) Princeton Seminary (1846-1847), Young devoted his efforts in bringing about a fresh, contemporary defense of Isaiah's unity in response to Duhm's landmark work (1892) and the other significant critical theories which promulgated the multi-authorship view of Isaiah's composition. In this regard, Young seemed to address the gaps left by his predecessors in order to fortify areas which were vulnerable against attacks made by "negative critics."<sup>412</sup> In this way, Young seemed to pick and choose his battles carefully. For example, though Young wrote several works and even a commentary on the book of Daniel, he did not tackle the problematic issue of the authorship and date of the book. Instead, his treatment of the subject was very brief and relegated much of the linguistic arguments in favor of an early, sixth-century date to Wilson's earlier work. The same could be said of Young's defense of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch which had been recently and heavily fortified by Wilson and Allis.<sup>413</sup> Standing firmly on Wilson's shoulders, Young did not hesitate to suggest that there may have been later inspired redactions and/or additions made to the Pentateuch and possibly to the book of Daniel.<sup>414</sup> These inspired editorial modifications may have included the modernization of the book's orthography for the purpose of keeping the language up-to-date, the modernization of place names, as well as the addition of terse narrative information (e.g., Deuteronomy 34).

Young's personal interpretive approach is most apparent in his expositional writings such as found in his commentaries and monographs. The standard form of his writings followed that of W.H. Green's and J.A. Alexander's exegetical works, even though Young was not as literarily sensitive as the former. Young typically gave a verse-by-verse exposition, often accenting nuances in the Hebrew text which he deemed essential to the correct meaning of the text; while equally emphasizing the text's historical content and setting. In other words, the "historical-grammatical method" of biblical interpretation was the hermeneutical foundation of all of Young's work.

Moreover, Young's approach to biblical interpretation did not rule out genre studies. In fact, Young freely acknowledged that the genre of a text could reveal the author's intent to lead the interpreter away from a literal reading of the text toward a figurative one. However, the intersection between genre and historicity for Young became especially muddled in his studies on Genesis 1-2. Young could not accept Kline's figurative reading of the days in Genesis 1 as proposed in his "framework interpretation." Kline based his literary analysis upon the dual triadic structure of the first three days which represented the creation realms and the second three which represented the respective inhabitants of those realms. Although the poetic structure was clearly visible in the account, Young could not accept that the genre was leading him to a non-sequential order to the

Creation days. Rather, Young responded with a strong historical reading of the text. In the final analysis, he maintained that the order of the days of Creation was sequential, but also affirmed that the repeated phrase, “evening and morning,” must be figurative because the sun and moon did not appear until day four.<sup>415</sup>

Even as Young’s dependence upon the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition has been duly acknowledged, there are, however, aspects of his scholarship that uniquely bear his stamp. While Young continued to distrust the critics and their historical-critical methodologies, he conducted himself and his critiques against his opponents in a winsome and cordial manner. In striking contrast to the often polemical works of Wilson, Allis, and MacRae, Young’s reviews of the critics were often seasoned with admiration and respect. In fact, Young was the first Old Testament scholar from Westminster to write in a manner reminiscent of the present-day commentaries and reference works that employ the positive contributions of all scholars no matter their theological makeup. As an active member within the academy, Young was also able to utilize his linguistic abilities as well as his immense knowledge of Old Testament scholarship in order to take part in the ongoing research and scholarly interaction within the academic guild. Moreover, Young maintained amiable relationships with noted scholars, such as H.H. Rowley, who did not necessarily identify with his brand of conservatism.

As a conservative biblical scholar, Young was often predictable in his defense of many of the traditional positions on the Old Testament. Yet, on rare occasions, Young ventured outside “traditional” or “conservative” positions if the evidence seemed to lead in other directions. For example, there are occasional comments sprinkled throughout Young’s writings where he corrected or abandoned the premise of an earlier view espoused by one of his forebears. For example, Wilson in his book, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament* (1926), asserted: “The names of Chedorlaomer and his confederates [in Genesis 14] are written in Hebrew as follows: Amraphel (אַמְרָפֵל), Chedorlaomer (כְּדֻרְלָעֹמֶר), and Arioch (אֲרִיוֹחַ), Tidal (תִּדְאֵל). The first name is undoubtedly meant to denote Hammurabi, king of Babylon, and is to be divided into ‘ammu, rapi and ili. The first syllable is usually written in Babylonian *ha* but there are cases where it is written ‘a.’”<sup>416</sup> But Young, in a footnote which he appended in the 1959 updated revision of Wilson’s work, respectfully contested:

The identification of Amraphel and Hammurabi must now be abandoned. For one thing Amraphel must be placed earlier than Hammurabi by some 300 years, and second, the two words are not etymologically related. What Dr. Wilson has written about Babylonian names ending in *-ilu* is of course correct, but there is no evidence to show that this applied to the great king. There are two points which rule out the identification; (1) The final *l* in Amraphel, and (2) the *u* vowel in the syllable *mu* in Hammurabi. If the Babylonian word were transcribed in Hebrew, we should expect it to be written as *ham-m<sup>e</sup>-ra-bi* or ‘am-m<sup>e</sup>-ra-bi.<sup>417</sup>

However, Young's most surprising concession was to suggest that Solomon did not author the book of Ecclesiastes. Young deemed that the book had been written by a post-exilic writer during the time of the prophet Malachi in the mid-fifth century B.C. This anonymous author had employed a literary convention that placed words into Solomon's mouth.<sup>418</sup> Although W.H. Green had also struggled with this same perplexing issue,<sup>419</sup> he was unwilling to concede that Ecclesiastes was non-Solomonic. Marion A. Taylor observes,

Green defended the traditional position regarding the authorship of the book [of Ecclesiastes]. However, he did so against the views of many unbelieving scholars and even 'some of the soundest and ablest of Evangelical interpreters (e.g., Hengstenberg, Keil, and of our own scholars, Moses Stuart),' conceding the 'exceedingly perplexing' nature of the whole question of authorship in general and the forcefulness of the argument against Solomonic authorship based on the language and style of the book in particular. . . . Perhaps he [Green] felt that if he conceded on this point, he would open the way toward even greater concessions. Undoubtedly Green's deep sense of loyalty to tradition overruled his personal attraction to the scholarly consensus that Solomon did not write this particular book.<sup>420</sup>

It is apparent that while Young was genuinely dedicated to the traditional views, as a biblical scholar, he was also committed to exploring and understanding the thornier historical problems of the Old Testament.<sup>421</sup>

As was indicative of Wilson and the majority of his predecessors, Young's scholarly competence can be objectively quantified by the sheer volume of his academic works and in the overall erudition of their content. However, in contradistinction from his predecessors, Young's focus did not lie primarily within the scholarly guild. Rather, Young's ministerial commitment to educate men and women in the wider Protestant church is another distinguishing aspect of his career. In keeping with his desire from adolescence to prepare himself for the Christian ministry and "to use his talents in the service of his Lord,"<sup>422</sup> Young continually sought to make the Old Testament palatable for the average layperson. Unlike Wilson in particular, Young published several monographs and magazine articles that were popular in nature and sermonic in format. Young had an uncanny ability to relate difficult Old Testament texts in order to make them comprehensible for the non-technical reader. Hence, Young sought to bring his specialization as an Old Testament scholar in the service of the church. It is fitting, therefore, that all throughout Young's career he endeavored to combine both scholarship and ministry in order that he might make a positive contribution to both the academy and the church.

## NOTES

1. *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary Philadelphia 1932-1933*, 9. E.J. Young was incorrectly listed as a "Middle" classman during his first year at Westminster Seminary since he is subsequently listed as a "Middle" classman the following year in 1933-1934 [*Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary Philadelphia 1933-1934*, 10] and then as a "Senior" in 1934-1935 [*Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary Philadelphia 1934-1935*, 8]. Young's first year should have been his "Junior" class year.

2. *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary Philadelphia 1930-1931*, 24-25. During Young's period of seminary studies from 1932 to 1935, there was little change in the Old Testament course offerings.

3. *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary Philadelphia 1936-1937*, 26-27.

4. Biographical entries covering the life and work of Edward Joseph Young are found in: "Edward J. Young," *Banner of Truth* 54 (March 1968): 1-6; "Edward Joseph Young," *Presbyterian Guardian* 37, no. 2 (Feb. 1968): 18; Richard B. Gaffin, "Young, Edward Joseph (1907-1968)," in *Dictionary of Christianity in America*, eds. Daniel G. Reid, et al. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1990), 1298-1299; Allan Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," in *Bible Interpreters of the 20th Century: A Selection of Evangelical Voices*, eds. W.A. Elwell & J.D. Weaver (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1999), 189-201; Tremper Longman, III, "Young, E (dward) J (oseph) (1907-1968)," in *Dictionary of Major Biblical Interpreters*, ed. Donald McKim (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2007), 1068-1072. The "Edward J. Young Collection" located in the archives of Montgomery Library at Westminster Theological Seminary contains a large quantity of his personal letters and professional correspondences. The most complete bibliography of Young's writings was compiled by John E. Brueckmann in "A Partial Bibliography of the Published Writings of Edward Joseph Young, 1907-1968," Montgomery Library, Westminster Theological Seminary (Philadelphia, PA: unpublished, n.d.), 1-14.

5. *Banner of Truth*, "Edward J. Young," 6. As cited by the *Bulletin of Westminster Theological Seminary*, Winter 1966.

6. Harman's biography states that Young "traveled and studied in Europe and the Far East for two years." Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 189. However, the correct destinations for his post-graduate excursions were Europe and the "Middle East"—as made evident in the *Bulletin of Westminster Theological Seminary*, Winter 1966, (reprinted in *The Banner of Truth*, "Edward J. Young," 5-6). The *Bulletin* claimed (*ibid.*, 5):

Following his graduation from Stanford University in 1929, he spent a year in Palestine where he taught school in Bethlehem and studied Syriac with a priest of the Syrian Church. To save money, he adopted Arab customs—his bed was roll of rope! During this same year, he crossed the Sinai desert with another American guided by two Arabs. The trip took a month and was made by camel. His second year abroad was spent traveling through Europe with just the clothing on his back and a beret. He was learning more and more languages,

seeing the places where Paul preached, studying in Germany and Spain, cycling through England. The total cost of the two years—only \$1600!

Longman also notes that, “He [Young] traveled and studied abroad for two years, pursuing his interests in language while in Italy, Spain, Palestine, and Egypt.” Longman, “Young, E (dward) J (oseph) (1907-1968),” 1069.

7. Longman, “Young, E (dward) J (oscph) (1907-1968),” 1069.

8. Harman, “Edward Joseph Young,” 189. Longman writes, “While he studied at Westminster, Old Testament courses were taught by one senior and one junior Old Testament professor. The former was Oswald T. Allis, who had come with Machen from Princeton Seminary to found Westminster. The latter was a young but highly educated scholar, A. MacRae.” Longman, “Young, E (dward) J (oseph) (1907-1968),” 1069. The *Westminster Theological Seminary Catalogue (1930-31)* recorded on p. 5 that prior to October 14, 1930, Oswald T. Allis had been Professor of Old Testament History and Exegesis and Allan A. MacRae had been Assistant Professor of Semitic Philology and Old Testament Criticism.

9. Biographical information on the life and work of Oswald Thompson Allis may be found in: J. Alan Groves, “Allis, O(swald) T(hompson) (1880-1973),” in *Dictionary of Major Biblical Interpreters*, ed. Donald McKim (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2007), 110-114; John H. Skilton, ed., *The Law and the Prophets: Old Testament Studies Prepared in Honor of Oswald Thompson Allis* (Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1974); Skilton, “Oswald T. Allis,” 122-130; Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School*, 272-279.

Oswald Thompson Allis was born on September 9, 1880 in Wallingford, Pennsylvania [G.H. Todd, “Oswald Thompson Allis,” in *The Law and the Prophets*, 8]. Allis’ Old Testament theological education began at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1902 under the guidance of John D. Davis, Robert Dick Wilson, and Geerhardus Vos. After his studies at Princeton Seminary, Allis also obtained a M.A. degree in philosophy from nearby Princeton University in 1907 [Skilton, “Allis,” 124]. Having received two academic fellowships, Allis pursued further graduate studies in archaeology and Assyriology at the University of Berlin under the tutelage of Friedrich Delitzsch, Eduard Sachau, and Jakob Barth [Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School*, 273]. He later obtained the Ph.D. degree in Assyriology in 1913. Allis served on the Old Testament faculty of Princeton Seminary from 1910 to 1929 with Professors John D. Davis, Robert Dick Wilson, and Geerhardus Vos. He was also the editor of the *Princeton Theological Review* from 1918 to 1929. Upon the reorganization of Princeton Seminary in 1929, Allis along with Machen and Wilson left Princeton to found Westminster Theological Seminary. He served at Westminster as Professor of Old Testament History and Exegesis from 1929 to 1936. After his early retirement, Allis continued to write scholarly monographs on critical issues surrounding Old Testament and served as a contributing editor of the original series *Christianity Today* from 1938 to 1948 and as an associate editor of the *Evangelical Quarterly* from 1929 to 1973 [Skilton, “Allis,” 129]. Among his most notable works are: *The Five Books of Moses* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1943); *The Unity of Isaiah* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1950); *God Spake by Moses* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1951), and *The Old Testament: Its Claims and Its Critics* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1972). Allis was known for his trenchant defense of “the supernaturalism of the historic

Christian faith as found in the Scriptures." Groves, Allis, O(swald) T(hompson) (1880-1973), 113.

Young acknowledged his former teacher, Oswald T. Allis, as the single-most important influence upon his thinking on the Old Testament. "Above all, I am indebted to my former teacher, Dr. Oswald T. Allis, who had deeply influenced my views of the Old Testament." Edward J. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, revised edition (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964), 13. As cited by Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 189.

10. Biographical information including a complete bibliography of the works of Allan Alexander MacRae may be found in: R. Laird Harris, Swee-Hwa Quek, and J. Robert Vannoy, eds., *Interpretation & History: Essays in Honour of Allan A. MacRae* (Singapore: Christian Life Publishers, 1986).

Allan A. MacRae was born in Calumet, Michigan on February 11, 1902. In 1922, MacRae graduated from Occidental College in Los Angeles as valedictorian of his class having majored in history with a minor in English. Later in the spring of 1923, he also completed a Master of Arts degree there. During the academic year of 1923-1924, MacRae attended the Bible Institute of Los Angeles (BIOLA) where he studied biblical studies under Dr. R.A. Torrey. However, after only a year at BIOLA, Torrey encouraged MacRae to go to Princeton Theological Seminary. At Princeton, he studied under Robert Dick Wilson and J. Gresham Machen and became convinced that the inspiration of the Scriptures needed to be defended through scholarly excellence and rigorous toil. Thus, in order to accomplish his goal, MacRae simultaneously enrolled in another master's program in Semitic Philology at Princeton University. Upon graduation from Princeton Seminary with a Bachelor of Theology and from Princeton University in 1927, MacRae was awarded a fellowship to continue his studies in Semitics at the University of Berlin. In Berlin, MacRae studied Babylonian Cuneiform, Egyptian Hieroglyphics, Arabic, and Syriac. During his second year at the University of Berlin, MacRae made a four-month excursion to Palestine where he met the well-known archaeologist, Sir Flinders Petrie, studied in the American Schools of Oriental Research under William F. Albright, and together with Albright and two other students, discovered the site of the Biblical city of Ham mentioned in Genesis 14. In 1929, Robert Dick Wilson invited MacRae to join him on faculty at the newly formed Westminster Theological Seminary. With some hesitancy, MacRae agreed to interrupt his doctoral program at Berlin and return to the States to take up his assistant professorship in Old Testament. While at Westminster, MacRae transferred his doctoral studies from Berlin to the University of Pennsylvania under Ephraim A. Speiser. His completed dissertation was entitled, "Semitic Personal Names at Nuzi." In the summer of 1937, due to disagreements with Westminster's stances on eschatology and Christian liberty, MacRae left Westminster in order to join Carl McIntire to found Faith Theological Seminary in Wilmington, Delaware. In 1971, MacRae left Faith Seminary to found, in collaboration with Jack W. Murray and Bible Evangelism, Inc., the Biblical School of Theology, now called Biblical Theological Seminary located in Hatfield, Pennsylvania. Robert J. Dunzweiler, "Tribute to Allan A. MacRae," *Interpretation & History*, eds. R.L. Harris, S.H. Quek, and J.R. Vannoy (Singapore: Christian Life Publishers, 1986), 25-29. Among his notable publications are: *The Gospel of Isaiah* (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1977); *JEDP: Lectures on the Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, eds. S.T. Hague and R.C. Newman (Hatfield, PA: Interdisciplinary Biblical Research Institute, 1994); co-authored with I.J. Gelb & P.M. Purves, *Nuzi Personal Names* (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago, 1943), 281-318. On the

historical background of MacRae's initial hire at Westminster Seminary, see Stonhouse, *J. Gresham Machen*, 449.

11. The Banner of Truth, "Edward J. Young," 5.
12. There are conflicting accounts surrounding E.J. Young's alleged ordination in the PCUSA. Harman records that Young was denied ordination because his views were too orthodox; yet *The Presbyterian Guardian* (Feb. 1968) wrote, "Ordained in the ministry in San Francisco in 1935 by the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., Dr. Young became a minister in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church in 1936." See "E.J. Young," 18; Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 189. However, based upon a letter (dated Tuesday, September 3, 1935) from E.J. Young's wife, Lillian, to her parents, he had passed his examinations for licensure (30-7) and ordination (21-16) before the PCUSA presbytery in San Francisco. Commenting upon the letter, Dr. Richard Gaffin, Jr., who married E.J. Young's daughter, Jean, doubts that Young was ever ordained to a particular ministry within the PCUSA. Instead, Young was subsequently ordained into the newly-formed Orthodox Presbyterian Church a year later in 1936. Richard B. Gaffin, Jr., personal correspondence, May 24, 2006.
13. The OPC was formed in June 1936 by Machen after contesting liberalism in the PCUSA denomination especially in the areas of foreign missions and Presbyterian polity. D.G. Hart and John Muether elucidate, "The OPC originally consisted of thirty-four ministers and seventeen elders. Machen was elected its moderator and immediately affirmed the principles for which he and other conservatives had been fighting since the 1920s. The new church would maintain and defend the Bible 'as the Word of God,' the Westminster Confession of Faith 'as the system of doctrine taught in Holy Scriptures,' and the principles of Presbyterian church government 'as being founded upon and agreeable to the Word of God.'" D.G. Hart and John R. Muether, *Fighting the Good Fight: A Brief History of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church* (Philadelphia, PA: Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1995), 37-38.
14. Longman, "Young, E (dward) J (oseph) (1907-1968)," 1069. The Frank H. Stevenson Fellowship for 1935-1936 was a lucrative \$1500 and its purpose was "to provide opportunity for students of Westminster Theological Seminary to have a year of study abroad after their graduation." The William Brenton Greene, Jr. Prize in Apologetics was for \$50 "for a thesis on the subject: A Comparison of the Christian and non-Christian Concepts of and Argument for Immortality." See *Catalogue of Westminster Seminary Philadelphia, 1935-1936*, pp. 38-39 *passim*.
15. "The Banner of Truth, "Edward J. Young," 6.
16. Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 189.
17. Walter C. Kaiser, Jr. writes, "He [Wilson] had familiarized himself with twenty-six languages, including Assyrian and Babylonian cuneiform, Ethiopic, Phoenician, various Aramaic dialects, Egyptian, Coptic, Persian, Arabic, Syriac, and Hebrew." Kaiser, "Robert Dick Wilson," 75.
18. As cited in the *Bulletin of Westminster Theological Seminary*, Winter 1966, reprinted in The Banner of Truth, "Edward J. Young," 6.
19. *Ibid.*, 2.
20. Oswald T. Allis' resignation came upon the heels of a widespread controversy between members of the Westminster Seminary board of trustees, its faculty, and the Presbyterian Church in the USA. The perceived liberalism of the PCUSA's Board of Foreign Missions by Machen and some of the Westminster's members of the board of trustees and its faculty members allegedly forced them to form the Independent Board for

Presbyterian Foreign Missions after attempts at reforming the original Board had failed. The general assembly of the PCUSA in 1934 issued a mandate that the members of the PCUSA resign from the Independent Board or come under discipline. The members of the Westminster board of trustees and faculty refused to resign from the Independent Board. This caused consternation among the members of the board of trustees, led by Dr. Samuel G. Craig (editor of *Christianity Today*) and one member of the faculty, i.e., O.T. Allis, because they "felt that the Independent Board and Westminster Seminary should continue as separate institutions, and that sympathy with the seminary did not mean agreement with the establishment of the Independent Board. . . . Dr. O.T. Allis, a member of the faculty, was out of agreement with the other members of the faculty and resigned, stating, 'I am taking this step voluntarily in the hope that the Seminary may be saved or at least be enabled to continue. . . . At a specially called meeting of the board on January 7, 1936, thirteen members of the board and Dr. O.T. Allis of the faculty presented their resignations, and a statement was adopted by the board for release to the papers, which declared that the seminary would pursue its original purpose and policy of teaching and defending the Word of God." Edwin H. Rian, *The Presbyterian Conflict*, reprint edition (Philadelphia, PA: The Committee for the Historian of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1992), 63-64 passim. In the "Statement of the Board of Trustees of Westminster Theological Seminary," the Board expressed "its profound sense of loss which the institution has sustained through the resignation of Dr. Oswald T. Allis, who has rendered distinguished service of quite incalculable value as Professor of Old Testament." *Ibid.*, "Appendix: Note 5," 212.

21. Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 189. It appears that Westminster's invitation to Young stemmed from O.T. Allis' resignation. Longman writes, "Young first appears in a Westminster catalogue in the 1936-1937 school year as instructor of Old Testament. At the end of the previous school year, Allis had retired, and so it appears that Young was his replacement on the faculty." Longman, "Young, E (dward) J (oseph) (1907-1968)," 1069.

22. MacRae lamented the changes that surrounded him at Westminster in 1937, "The new seminary began with high hopes. A fine group of students worked hard to learn how to make their lives count for Christ. But eight years later I found myself greatly disappointed. By that time both Dr. Wilson and Dr. Machen had died and Dr. Allis had resigned (this was every member of the teaching staff of Westminster, who had been on the Princeton seminary faculty in the year before Westminster began). I soon became convinced that the new institution had departed in a number of ways from the original ideas of its founders. In 1937 many of the Westminster faculty talked loudly about 'Christian Liberty.' By this term they seemed to have meant their right to smoke tobacco and drink alcoholic liquor . . . I knew that the overwhelming majority of the seminary's supporters were both keenly aware of the dangers of using liquor and tobacco and felt that a Christian should oppose these evils. I also felt it necessary to resign because of the attitude toward premillennialism. . . . A third change from the historical stand of Princeton was equally important to me, namely that the teaching at Westminster had completely abandoned the strong emphasis on the value of factual evidence for Christianity that had characterized the work of Wilson and Machen and had put in its place a very strong emphasis on Presuppositional Apologetics, which denies the value of evidence." Allan A. MacRae, "The Antecedents of Biblical Theological Seminary" [Unpublished Article for Historical Display-Portfolio for Biblical Theological Seminary],

Gift from the Class of 1989 [organized and completed in 1991 by Stephen Hague], Biblical Theological Seminary, Hatfield, Pennsylvania, 1-2.

In response to MacRae's resignation, R.B. Kuiper, Chairman of the Faculty at Westminster Seminary, issued his response, "I have received through the courtesy of the newspapers a copy of the resignation of the Rev. A.A. MacRae, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Old Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary. Professor MacRae labored faithfully in this institution and we are grateful for his past services." However, Kuiper went on to defend the Seminary's practice regarding liberty in eschatological viewpoints among faculty members and recognizing the "tremendous evils of intemperance." See Rian, *The Presbyterian Conflict*, "Appendix: Note 6," 212-213 *passim*.

23. The Westminster Seminary catalogues from 1937 to 1954 reveal that Young had remained the only Old Testament professor during this extended period. Young's mentor and colleague, Allan MacRae, left Westminster in 1936 which is evidenced by his absence in the catalogue of 1937. Seventeen years later in 1954, Westminster Seminary hired Meredith G. Kline as Assistant Professor of Old Testament.

24. Young's Assistants and Instructors of Old Testament included: Robert Edgar Nicholas (1938-1939), Charles Alan Tichenor (1943-1945), David Westlake Kerr (1946-1948), and Meredith George Kline (1949-1953). Taken from the *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia* from 1938 to 1953, p.5. In addition, Instructor of New Testament, John Skilton occasionally taught "Elements of Hebrew" and Professor of Systematic Theology, John Murray, taught "Old Testament Biblical Theology." Cf. *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, 1940*, 23.

25. Although Young was well-versed in Ugaritic (see his exposition of Aqhat i: 20-21; 30, 32 in Edward J. Young, *Studies in Genesis One* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1964), 36, n. 36, he never formally taught the language as an independent course at Westminster. It was first introduced into the Westminster Seminary curriculum by Special Lecturer in Old Testament, John Miller Zinkand, in 1965. *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, 1965-1966*, p. 30.

26. On Young's academic education, *Christianity Today* wrote, "Edward J. Young has pursued his interest in the Old Testament and in the Hebrew language in both the Old and New Worlds. He holds a Ph.D. degree from Dropsie College, Philadelphia, with additional study in Newman School of Missions in Jerusalem, *Centro de Estudios Históricos* in Madrid, and [the] University of Leipzig." Edward J. Young, "Old Testament Studies in 1962," *Christianity Today*, February 1, 1963, 409.

27. Dropsie College was established in 1907 through the will of Moses Aaron Dropsie. After World War II the college added the departments of Jewish philosophy, Hebrew language and literature, the history of Semitic civilization, and comparative religion. Dropsie also founded and published the *Jewish Quarterly Review* in 1910. See Dan Cohn-Sherbok, "Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning" in *The Blackwell Dictionary of Judaica* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1992), 121-122. Internationally, Dropsie College became the first state-accredited academic institution to confer Ph.D. degrees in Jewish Studies. As a research center, Dropsie possessed one of the largest and finest Judaica libraries in the western hemisphere with 180,000 volumes, 6000 rare books, and hundreds of manuscripts. Its faculty included noted scholars as Max Margolis, Solomon Zeitlin, Cyrus Gordon, and Theodore Gaster. Its graduates also included E.A. Speiser, Harry M. Orlinsky, and Nahum M. Sarna. In 1986, Dropsie was

reconfigured as the Annenberg Research Institute and in 1993 the Institute merged with the University of Pennsylvania and is now called the Center for Advanced Judaic Studies.

28. Dropsie has trained significant evangelical leaders including: Richard Averbeck, Kenneth L. Baker, Barry J. Beitzel, Raymond B. Dillard (Westminster), R. Laird Harris, James Price, George Klein, Meredith G. Kline (Westminster), Gary Smith, Edward J. Young (Westminster), and Ronald F. Youngblood.

29. Edward J. Young, "Biblical Criticism to the End of the Second Christian Century" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1943). Technically speaking, "biblical criticism" as a modern enterprise was not recognized until after the Enlightenment. Biblical scholarship in general has deemed the period before the Enlightenment as "pre-critical."

30. The fourth chapter of his dissertation was reprinted in Edward J. Young, "Celsus and the Old Testament," *Westminster Theological Journal* 6, no. 2 (May 1944): 166-197.

31. Meredith G. Kline was born on December 15, 1922 in Copley, Pennsylvania. He graduated from Gordon College in 1944 with the A.B. in theology, the Bachelor of Theology and the Master of Theology degrees from Westminster Theological Seminary in 1947, and obtained the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Assyriology and Egyptology from Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning in 1956. His dissertation was entitled "The Ha-bi-ru" which was subsequently published in the *Westminster Theological Journal* in three parts as "The Ha-bi-ru: Kin or Foe of Israel?" from 1956-1957. Kline had been ordained as a minister of the gospel in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church in 1948. Kline taught at Westminster from 1948 [sic]-1965, and Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary from 1965-1993, while serving as Visiting Professor of Old Testament at Westminster from 1968-1971 and 1978-1981. He also taught as Visiting Professor at the School of Theology in Claremont, California from 1974-1975 and at Reformed Theological Seminary in Jackson, Mississippi from 1981-1983. Kline is currently Emeritus Professor of Old Testament at Westminster Seminary California in Escondido, California and Emeritus Professor of Old Testament at Gordon-Conwell. Howard Griffith and John R. Muether, eds., *Creator, Redeemer, Consummator: A Festschrift for Meredith G. Kline* (Greenville, SC: Reformed Academic Press, 2000), 9. His most notable works include *Treaty of the Great King: the Covenant Structure of Deuteronomy, Studies, and Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1963); *By Oath Consigned a Reinterpretation of the Covenant Signs of Circumcision and Baptism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1968); *The Structure of Biblical Authority* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972); *Images of the Spirit* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1980); *Kingdom Prologue* [combined one-volume edition] (South Hamilton, MA: Privately published, 1986); *Glory in Our Midst: A Biblical-Theological Reading of Zechariah's Night Visions* (Overland Park, KS: Two Age Press, 2001); and most recently, *God, Heaven, and Har Megedon: A Covenantal Tale of Cosmos and Telos* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2006). Kline's biblical-theological works are an extension of the work begun by Old Princetonian, Geerhardus Vos. In fact, on the dedication page, Kline devoted his work, *Glory in Our Midst*, "to Geerhardus Vos (1862-1949) pioneer of the biblical theology way."

32. *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, 1949*, p. 5.

33. During Kline's fourteen-year teaching career at Westminster, he taught the following courses: "Studies in Old Testament Biblical Theology," "Advanced Hebrew," "The Aramaic Language," "The Arabic Language," "The Egyptian Language," "The Code of Hammurabi," "Old Testament History," "General Introduction to the Old

Testament," "The Pentateuch," "Poetical Books," "The Prophecy of Ezekiel," and "The Prophecy of Zechariah." See the *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia*, from 1949 to 1965 *passim*.

34. *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, 1965*, p. 5. For an exhaustive bibliography of Kline's work up to the year 1999, see Griffith and Muether, eds., *Creator, Redeemer, Consummator*, 21-30. See footnote 28 above for Kline's recent work from 2000 to 2006. Many of Kline's books are still in print due to the fact that he continues to have a profound and lasting influence within the American, evangelical Reformed community.

35. Longman, "Young, E (dward) J(oseph) (1907-1968)," 1069. Longman writes, "While Kline was Young's longest-serving colleague in a small department, they had a number of differences of opinion when it came to interpretation, and eventually Kline felt it propitious to teach at another institution, though his influence at Westminster has arguably had a longer effect than that of Young." Ibid. The most charged interpretive disagreement between Kline and Young was over the interpretation of Genesis 1 and 2. This central conflict over Kline's "Framework Interpretation" will be dealt with at length below.

36. Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 190. Although it is true that Young was familiar with and appreciated Vos's biblical-theological methodology, Young's overall approach was not consistently redemptive-historical. Longman correctly writes, "In terms of his theological insights into the text, one can sense the influence of his close friend, the systematician Murray, rather than, say, the great biblical theologian, Geerhardus Vos, whose influence at Westminster can be seen more in the work of Meredith Kline." Longman, "Young, E (dward) J (oseph) (1907-1968)," 1071.

37. In his *Introduction* (revised 1964 edition), Young declared, "The language and diction of the book [of Ecclesiastes] apparently point to a time later than that of Solomon . . . In all probability the book is to be dated about the time of Malachi. The political background is satisfactory, and this period would also satisfy the linguistic phenomena." Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 349. Young's unexpected conclusion regarding the non-Solomonic authorship of the book of Ecclesiastes has been well-documented by subsequent Westminster scholars. Harman writes, "The one surprising position [of Young's] is the acceptance of a non-Solomonic authorship of Ecclesiastes. Listing factors which point to an author other than Solomon, he believes that the background and language of the book suggest a time probably around that of Malachi." Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 195. Longman states, "Even so, Young was not afraid to disagree with the conservative consensus when he felt that the evidence compelled him. For instance, he concluded that Ecclesiastes was not authored by Solomon, a view that he thought was consonant with what the Bible itself claimed, though his fellow conservative scholars came to question him on this matter." Longman, "Young, E (dward) J (oseph) (1907-1968)," 1071. Moisés Silva, former editor of the *Westminster Theological Journal*, notes, "It is no secret that E.J. Young, who was uncompromisingly conservative on virtually every higher-critical issue, came to the conclusion that the Book of Ecclesiastes was not composed by Solomon, even though that appears to be the claim of the book itself." Moisés Silva, "Old Princeton, Westminster, and Inerrancy," in *Inerrancy and Hermeneutic: A Tradition, A Challenge, A Debate*, ed. Harvie M. Conn (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988), 76. Silva adds, "The revised 1964 edition omits the strongest paragraph, but it is clear that his position had not changed in spite of the fact that not a few feathers had been ruffled by it" (76, n. 13).

The 1949 [first] edition of Young's *Introduction* contained the following sentence that was later edited out of the 1964 edition: "The author of the book, then, was one who lived in the post-exilic period and who placed his words in the mouth of Solomon, thus, employing a literary device for conveying his message" (349). As cited by Peter Enns, "Bible in Context: The Continuing Vitality of Reformed Biblical Scholarship," *Westminster Theological Journal* 68 (2006): 209, n. 13. Enns believes that the subsequent deleted sentence was partly due to the fact that, "he [Young] wished to adopt a more cautious, less controversial tone at a later point in his career" (*Ibid.*). Enns also claims that W.H. Green and E.W. Hengstenberg (much earlier than Young) also came to the same conclusion that the book of Ecclesiastes was authored in the postexilic era. Enns observes, "Green—as well as E.J. Young—came to the historical conclusion that Ecclesiastes was not written by Solomon in the early first millennium B.C., but several hundred years later, in the postexilic period." Enns, "Bible in Context," 208. Green's and Hengstenberg's rejection of Solomonic authorship explains Young's own freedom to deny Solomonic authorship of Ecclesiastes since Young held these "orthodox Protestant scholars" in such high regard. Although he does not mention Green and Hengstenberg by name, it is certain that he knew of their respective positions on the issue. Young asserted that "the Solomonic authorship is not widely held, and is rejected by most orthodox Protestant scholars." Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 347.

38. Geoffrey Thomas, "Edward J. Young," 4. A separate section of Young's views on the book of Daniel will not be proffered due to the limitations of this present study. Although Young's contributions to the study of Daniel are significant from a theological and historical standpoint, his writings do not concentrate on any extended defense against the critical late dating of the book of Daniel. Moreover, Young's views on these pertinent issues do not differ substantively from Wilson's earlier defense. The only notable difference would pertain to the identity of Darius the Mede. Whereas Wilson believed that Darius may have been Gubaru or a sub-king who received the kingdom of Belshazzar (cf. Wilson, *Studies in the Book of Daniel*, 109), Young held that "it does not yet seem possible to identify Darius with any known historical person. On the other hand, the arguments against the historicity of Darius are not convincing. It is best therefore, candidly to admit that we do not know who Darius was, apart from what is related of him in Scripture, and to await further light upon the subject." Young, *The Messianic Prophecies of Daniel*, 8.

39. Longman, "Young, E (dward) J (oseph) (1907-1968)," 1069.

40. *Ibid.*, 1069-1070 *passim*.

41. John Murray was born on October 14, 1898 and was reared and educated near Bonar Bridge in the Highlands of Scotland. After graduating from Dornoch Academy, Murray enlisted in the Royal Highlanders to fight in World War I (April 1917) but was wounded in 1918 while serving in France when he was struck by shrapnel and permanently lost sight in his right eye. Honorably discharged, Murray entered the University of Glasgow and graduated with an M.A. degree in 1923. Upon his declaration to enter the ministry within the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, he was assigned a ministerial tutor named Donald Beaton of Wick because the denomination did not maintain a theological seminary. Beaton perceived Murray's academic facilities and made the suggestion that he be sent to Princeton Theological Seminary in America in order to receive training to become a tutor in the Free Presbyterian Church. From 1924 to 1927, Murray studied under Caspar Wistar Hodge, Oswald T. Allis, Gerhardus Vos, and J. Gresham Machen. At the time of graduation, the *Princeton Seminary Bulletin* had

recognized Murray as an outstanding student: "Few Students have maintained as high a level of scholarship as did Mr. Murray during his seminary course." He returned to Scotland with the expectation to enter the pastorate. However, when a dispute broke out in the church, Murray took advantage of the Gelston-Winthrop Scholarship he had received from Princeton in order to do postgraduate work at New College, Edinburgh. During this time, Caspar Wistar Hodge invited Murray to serve on faculty at Princeton. Murray agreed to do so, but for only one year from 1929 to 1930. However, during 1929, Machen, Allis, Robert Dick Wilson, and later Cornelius Van Til, along with some fifty students, left Princeton in order to form Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia in order to maintain the biblical orthodoxy of Old Princeton. Murray joined the faculty in 1937 and taught systematic theology until his retirement in 1966. Sinclair B. Ferguson, "John Murray," in *Handbook of Evangelical Theologians*, ed. W.A. Elwell (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1993), 168-181.

Murray's first appearance in the *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary* was during the 1930-1931 academic year. He is listed as "John Murray, M.A., Th.M., Professor-elect of Systematic Theology" (*ibid*, 5). Murray was also initially enlisted to teach the course on "Old Testament Biblical Theology" (OTBT) due to Allan A. MacRae's resignation from the Old Testament department (23). Murray continued to teach "OTBT" from 1937-1955, 1958-1959, 1965-1968. His formal training in Biblical Theology came from his Princeton Seminary professor, Geerhardus Vos. John Murray's more notable works include: *The Covenant of Grace* (London: Tyndale, 1954); *The Epistle to the Romans*, 2 vols. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960, 1965); *Principles of Conduct* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1957); *Redemption—Accomplished and Applied* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955; London: Banner of Truth, 1961); and *The Collected Writing of John Murray*, 4 vols. (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1976-1983).

42. "Edward J. Young," 2. As cited in Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 200.

43. See for example, Edward J. Young, *Genesis 3: A Devotional and Expository Study* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1966); Edward J. Young, *Isaiah Fifty-Three: A Devotional and Expository Study* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1952); Young, *Psalm 139: A Devotional & Expository Study*.

44. Hart and Muether, *Fighting the Good Fight: A Brief History of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church*, 155.

45. Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 190.

46. *Ibid*.

47. Longman, "Young, E (dward) J (oseph) (1907-1968)," 1071.

48. Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 200.

49. John Murray, "Edward J. Young," 2. Along with being an author, Young also served as the editor of *The Westminster Theological Journal* and of *The New International Commentary on the Old Testament*. Cf. "E.J. Young," 18. [*The Presbyterian Guardian*]

50. John E. Brueckmann, "A Partial Bibliography of the Published Writings of Edward Joseph Young, 1907-1968," (*Westminster Theological Seminary*, 1969), 1-14. M. Silva notes, "Young stands out as the most prolific contributor to WTJ [*Westminster Theological Journal*], with nearly twenty articles and over ninety books reviewed." Moisés Silva, "A Half-Century of Reformed Scholarship," *Westminster Theological Journal* 50, no. 2 (Fall 1988): 251.

51. E.g., Edward J. Young, *In the Beginning: Genesis Chapters 1 to 3 and the Authority of Scripture* (Edinburgh [etc.]: Banner of Truth Trust, 1976).

52. E.g., Edward J. Young, *Thy Word Is Truth: Some Thoughts on the Biblical Doctrine of Inspiration* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1957).
53. E.g., Edward J. Young, *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today* (Westwood, NJ: F. H. Revell Co., 1959).
54. Edward J. Young, *Arabic for Beginners* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1949). The work is better described as a workbook and not a textbook *per se*. In the “Preface” (n.p.), Young thanked “Rev. Eric F.F. Bishop, of the Newman School of Missions in Jerusalem, for help and encouragement in the study of Arabic.” Young was also indebted to Mr. Siman Dibuny for his assistance in learning the rudiments of the Arabic language, as well as, to his later professors, Eric Bräunlich and August Fischer of Leipzig and, as mentioned, Professor Solomon L. Skoss of Dropsie.
55. Edward J. Young, *Old Testament Hebrew for Beginners* (Philadelphia, PA: self-published, 1960).
56. Ibid., “Preface,” n. p.
57. Geoffrey Thomas, “Edward J. Young,” 4.
58. Young, *Old Testament Hebrew for Beginners*. Young also thanked professors Albrecht Alt of Leipzig and Joseph Reider of Dropsie. Young also co-authored a brief one-page journal entry with Professor Gordon relating to Hebrew verbs containing both the prefix of the imperfect and the suffix of the perfect. See Edward J. Young and Cyrus H. Gordon, “**מִלְאָקֶת** (Isaiah 63:3).” *Westminster Theological Journal* 14, no. 1 (November, 1951): 54.
59. Young, *Old Testament Hebrew for Beginners*, “Preface,” n.p.
60. Edward J. Young, *The Book of Isaiah: The English Text, with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*, 3 vols. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1965, 1969, 1972), I: 482-483. As cited by Harman, “Edward Joseph Young,” 191, n. 7.
61. Cf. Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 164-167.
62. Young, “Introduction: The Life and Ministry of Robert Dick Wilson,” 17-22.
63. Young, *Psalm 139: A Devotional & Expository Study*, 42. As cited by Harman, “Edward Joseph Young,” 190.
64. Young, “Introduction: The Life and Ministry of Robert Dick Wilson,” 22.
65. Both Wilson and Young were known to have accumulated the familiarity and use of twenty-six languages. See Kaiser, “Robert Dick Wilson,” 75; and the *Bulletin of Westminster Theological Seminar* (Winter 1936) as cited in “Edward J. Young,” 6.
66. Young, “Introduction: The Life and Ministry of Robert Dick Wilson,” 21-22.
67. Ibid., 21.
68. Ibid., 22.
69. Harman, “Edward Joseph Young,” 190.
70. Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 5. As cited in the “Publisher’s Preface” of the 1959 revised edition.
71. Edward J. Young, *The Prophecy of Daniel, A Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1949).
72. Young, *The Messianic Prophecies of Daniel*.
73. Edward J. Young, “Daniel,” in *The New Bible Commentary* (London: InterVarsity Fellowship, 1953).
74. Edward J. Young, *Daniel’s Vision of the Son of Man* (London: Tyndale Press, 1958). According to Harmon, this terse monograph was reprinted in Edward J. Young, “Daniel’s Vision of the Son of Man,” in *The Law and the Prophets: Old Testament Studies Prepared in Honor of Oswald Thompson Allis*, ed. John H. Skilton (Nutley, NJ:

Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1974), 425-451. See Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 192, n. 14.

75. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*.

76. Young, *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today*. "The book consists of four lectures which he gave at the opening of new premises for London Bible College in May 1958." Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 199.

77. Young, *Studies in Genesis One*.

78. Edward J. Young, *My Servants the Prophets* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1952).

79. Edward J. Young, *Studies in Isaiah* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1954).

80. Edward J. Young, *Who Wrote Isaiah?* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1958).

81. Young, *The Book of Isaiah*.

82. Young, *Isaiah Fifty-Three: A Devotional and Expository Study*.

83. Young, *Psalm 139: A Devotional & Expository Study*.

84. Young, *Genesis 3: A Devotional and Expository Study*.

85. Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 189-190. See also Longman, "Young, Edward J (oseph) (1907-1968)," 1070-1071.

86. A brief perusal of Young's more specialized work, *Studies in Genesis One*, provides ample evidence of his command of both ancient Semitic and modern languages. In addition, Moisés Silva, in an anecdotal account regarding Young's personal library, writes, "Some time after his death, I shared part of the responsibility of going through many of Young's books that had been donated to the Westminster library. Because a large number of these volumes consisted of grammars in various languages, we decided to sort them by language. Before we were finished, we had nineteen different piles (though he was in fact acquainted with some thirty-five to forty languages). Curiously, one of the books contained a slip of paper with his to-do list for a certain day. It is a testimony, not only to his linguistic abilities but even more to his great self-discipline, that this list included, in addition to such mundane matters as the need to polish his shoes, a reminder to review Syriac on that day." Silva, "A Half-Century of Reformed Scholarship," 251, n. 7.

87. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, "Preface," 13. As referenced by Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 189.

88. Cf. Young, "Old Testament Studies in 1962," 409-411; idem, "Survey of Old Testament Literature," *Christianity Today*, February 9, 1962, 409-411. Young kept abreast of the recent developments within Old Testament studies throughout his long and prodigious scholarly career. Examples of his comprehensive knowledge of Old Testament scholarship can be seen in his major book reviews. The following representative review articles are a sample of his diligence: E.J. Young, Review of *From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Books*, by William Foxwell Albright, *Westminster Theological Journal* 27, no. 1 (November, 1964): 34-37; idem, Review of *Messias Moses redivivus Menschensohn*, by Benten Aage, *Westminster Theological Journal* 11, no. 2 (May, 1949): 189-190; idem, Review of *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*, by Frank Moore Cross, Jr., *Westminster Theological Journal* 21, no. 2 (May, 1959): 239-243; idem, Review of *The River Jordan: Being an Illustrated Account of Earth's Most Storied River*, by Nelson Glueck, *Westminster Theological Journal* 9, no. 1 (November, 1946): 122; idem, Review of *The Babylonian Genesis: The Story of the Creation*, Second edition, by Alexander Heidel, *Westminster Theological Journal* 14, no. 1 (November, 1951): 108-109; idem. Review of

*Deutero-Isaiah: A Theological Commentary on Isaiah 40-55*, by George A.F. Knight, *Westminster Theological Journal* 28, no. 2 (May, 1966): 170-173; idem, Review of *He That Cometh*, by Sigmund Mowinckel, *Westminster Theological Journal* 20, no. 1 (November, 1957): 83-89; idem, Review of *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible*, by Roland E. Murphy, *Westminster Theological Journal* 20, no. 1 (November, 1957): 107-108; idem, Review of *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah: An Historical and Critical Study*, by Christopher R. North, *Westminster Theological Journal* 7, no. 1 (November, 1949): 76-80; idem, Review of *The Old Testament World*, by Martin Noth, *Westminster Theological Journal* 29, no. 2 (May, 1967): 191-195; idem, Review of *Introduction to the Old Testament*, by Robert H. Pfeiffer, *Westminster Theological Journal* 5, no. 1 (November, 1942): 107-115; idem, Review of *Theologie des Alten Testaments. Band I: Die Theologie der geschichtlichen Überlieferungen Israels*, by Gerhard von Rad, *Westminster Theological Journal* 20, no. 2 (May, 1958): 235-240; idem, Review of *The Old Testament and Modern Study: Essays by Members of the Society for Old Testament Study*, by H.H. Rowley, *Westminster Theological Journal* 14, no. 2 (May 1952): 188-190; idem, Review of *Genesis: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, by E.A. Speiser, *Westminster Theological Journal* 28, no. 1 (November, 1965): 43-47; idem, Review of *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development*, by Artur Weiser, *Westminster Theological Journal* 25, no. 1 (November, 1962): 62-65; idem, Review of *Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics* (English translation edited by James Luther Mays), by Claus Westermann, *Westminster Theological Journal* 26, no. 2 (May, 1964): 177-180; idem, Review of *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel*, by D.J. Wiseman, et al., *Westminster Theological Journal* 28, no. 2 (May, 1966): 173-174; idem, Review of *The Message of the Scrolls*, by Yigael Yadin, *Westminster Theological Journal* 21, no. 2 (May, 1959): 239-243; idem, Review of *An Introduction to Modern Arabic*, by Farhat J. Ziadeh and R. Bayly Winder, *Westminster Theological Journal* 21, no. 1 (November, 1958): 115-117.

89. A prime example of Young's extraordinary linguistic and scholarly abilities is his erudite work, *Studies in Genesis One* (Phillipsburg: P&R, 1964). In it, Young employed an array of Semitic, classical, and modern languages including: Hebrew, Babylonian, Ugaritic, Arabic, Syriac, Latin, classical Greek, German, Dutch, and French. He also interacted with the vast scholarly literature in the field often siding with the more conservative and traditional views.

90. Longman avers, "Young was one of the few conservative scholars one finds quoted in the work of critical scholars at this time." Longman, "Young, E (dward) J (oseph) (1907-1968)," 1070.

91. Young, *Psalm 139: A Devotional & Expository Study*, 108.

92. Longman writes, "Indeed, he [Young] maintained relationships with non-conservative scholars, most notably H. H. Rowley with whom he carried on an extensive correspondence. His writings display a good knowledge of and interaction with scholars with whom he disagreed." Longman, "Young, E (dward) J (oseph) (1907-1968)," 1070.

93. H.H. Rowley, Manchester, to Edward J. Young, Philadelphia, April 29, 1949. Edward J. Young Archives, Montgomery Library, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia. Cited in John Halsey Wood, Jr., "Oswald T. Allis and the Question of Isaianic Authorship," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 48, no. 2 (June 2005): 261.

94. H.H. Rowley, Review of *Isaiah 53: a Devotional and Expository Study*, by E.J. Young, *Eleven Years of Bible Bibliography* (ed. H.H. Rowley; Indian Hills, CO: The Falcon's Wing, 1957), 519.
95. F.F. Bruce, Review of *The Messianic Prophecies of Daniel*, by E.J. Young, *Eleven Years of Bible Bibliography*, 673.
96. Longman, "Young, E (dward) J (oseph) (1907-1968)," 1071(emphasis added).
97. Francis I. Andersen, "Book Review: Edward J. Young's *The Book of Isaiah, Vol. I (Chs. 1-18)*," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 85 (Sept. 1966): 383.
98. Longman, "Young, E (dward) J (oseph) (1907-1968)," 1071.
99. Young, *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today*, 8.
100. Edward J. Young, "What Is Old Testament Biblical Theology?" *The Evangelical Quarterly* 31 (1959): 136.
101. Cornelius Van Til was Professor of Apologetics at Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia from 1929 to 1972. On the life and work of Cornelius Van Til, see: John M. Frame, "Cornelius Van Til," in *Handbook of Evangelical Theologians*, ed. Walter A. Elwell (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1993), 156-167; idem, *Cornelius Van Til: An Analysis of His Thought* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 1995); Wesley A. Roberts, "Cornelius Van Til," in *Reformed Theology in America: A History of Its Modern Development*, ed. David F. Wells (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1997), 173-186.
102. See Young, *Thy Word Is Truth*, 227, n. 12. Van Til wrote concerning Barth and Brunner: "Taking a survey of the main argument we conclude that the dialectical theology of Barth and Brunner is built on one principle and that this principle is to all intents and purposes the same as that which controls Modernism. The Theology of Crisis [of Barth and Brunner] may therefore be properly designated as 'The New Modernism.' The new Modernism and the old are alike destructive of historic Christian theism and with it of the significant meaning of human experience." Cornelius Van Til, *The New Modernism: An Appraisal of the Theology of Barth and Brunner*, second edition (Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1947), xx. More sympathetically, Kurt Richardson writes concerning Van Til's attacks against Barth: "His [Van Til's] animus toward Barth spans three decades, and his bibliography shows that he made himself into the watchdog of evangelicalism against Barth. We should not be surprised that such extensive output would result in something like what Bernard Ramm expressed, that it became 'the official Evangelical interpretation of neo-orthodoxy.' Contrary to Barth's own direction and the preponderance of those who both accepted and rejected his program, Van Til accused Barth of being essentially Schleiermacherian. For Van Til, there is no difference between the liberalism attacked by his mentor, J.G. Machen, and the theological product of Karl Barth." Kurt Anders Richardson, *Reading Karl Barth: New Directions for North American Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2004), 70-71.
103. It is altogether fitting that Hayes and Prussner gave pride of place to Barth. In fact, Paul Jewett averred that Brunner, who had been trained as a theological liberal, had initially been convinced and inspired by Barth's work on the book of Romans. Jewett explained, "No sooner did Karl Barth publish his *Commentary on Romans* (1919)—which fell 'like a bombshell on the playground of the theologians'—than Brunner openly avowed himself to be of this new theological persuasion in an enthusiastic review of Barth's book. He [Brunner] soon emerged as a leading exponent of Barth's theology and was appointed a *Privat-dozent* (an unsalaried lecturer) on the theological faculty of the

University of Zurich.” Paul K. Jewett, *Emil Brunner: An Introduction to the Man and His Thought* (Chicago, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1961), 15.

104. John H. Hayes and Frederick Prussner, *Old Testament Theology: Its History & Development* (Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1985), 154.

105. Throughout his career, Young remained committed to the idea that the Bible was a product of divine revelation that had been inscripturated through the work of inspired men who were kept from error by the superintendence of the Holy Spirit as they wrote using their own literary style and historical sources. Accordingly, the Bible, in Young’s mind, was authoritative because it was God’s inspired Word from beginning to end (i.e., the doctrine of plenary inspiration). On his defense of the Old Testament as having a divine origin, see Edward J. Young, “Are the Scriptures Inerrant?” in *The Bible: The Living Word of Revelation*, ed. Merrill C. Tenney, Evangelical Theological Society Publication (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1968), 103-122; idem, “The Authority of the Old Testament,” in *The Infallible Word*, ed. Members of the Faculty of Westminster Theological Seminary (Philadelphia, PA: The Presbyterian Guardian Publishing Corporation, 1946), 53-87.

106. Young, *Thy Word is Truth*, 23.

107. B. B. Warfield and A. A. Hodge, “Inspiration,” *Presbyterian Review* 6 (April 1881): 225-260.

108. Hayes and Prussner, *Old Testament Theology: Its History & Development*, 156.

109. On Barth’s view of revelation and the Bible, see Geoffrey W. Bromiley, *Historical Theology: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978), 405-421; Herbert Hartwell, *The Theology of Karl Barth: An Introduction* (Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press, 1964), 41-95; Bruce McCormack, “Historical Criticism and Dogmatic Interest in Karl Barth’s Theological Exegesis of the New Testament,” in *Biblical Hermeneutics in Historical Perspective: Studies in Honor of Karlfried Froelich on His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. M.S. Burrows & Paul Rorem (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991), 332-338; David L. Mueller, *Karl Barth* (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1972), 53-61; A.D.R. Polman, *Barth*, trans. C.D. Freeman (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1960); Bernard Ramm, *After Fundamentalism: The Future of Evangelical Theology* (San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row, 1983), 116-125; Cornelius Van Til, *Has Karl Barth Become Orthodox?* (Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1954).

110. Young, *Thy Word Is Truth*, 227.

111. Ibid., 228. As translated by Cornelius Van Til in *Has Karl Barth Become Orthodox?*, 140. Barth’s original statement is found in Karl Barth, *Die kirchliche Dogmatik*, vol. I, part 1 (Zollikon-Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1932), 113. On Barth’s understanding of the Bible as the “Word of God,” Barth declared, “The Bible is God’s Word so far as God lets it be His Word, so far as God speaks through it. By this second equation as little as by our first (‘Church proclamation is God’s Word’) can we abstract from God’s free act in which and through which here and now He lets it be true in us and for us, that man’s word in the Bible is His own Word. The statement, ‘The Bible is God’s Word,’ is a confession of faith, a statement made by the faith that hears God Himself speak in the human word of the Bible.” Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics: The Doctrine of the Word of God*, vol. I, part 1, reprint edition, trans. G.T. Thomson (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1969), 123. G.W. Bromiley, a well-known scholar of Barth’s theology, trenchantly critiqued Barth’s subjectivistic view of Scripture: “It is all very well to say that we are dependent on God Himself speaking in His Word, but the fact remains that if inspiration is not complete until it takes place in the individual, then God does not speak unless He

speaks to me, and this means in practice that the only real or important act of ‘inspiration’ takes place subjectively in the recipient. For a true objectivity it is necessary to insist that although there has to be the speaking to me, God has in fact already spoken: ‘men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.’” G.W. Bromiley, “Karl Barth’s Doctrine of Inspiration,” *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* 87 (1955):80.

112. On Brunner’s view of revelation and the Word of God, see: J. Edward Humphrey, *Emil Brunner* (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1976); Paul K. Jewett, *Emil Brunner: An Introduction to the Man and His Thought* (Chicago, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1961); idem, “Emil Brunner and the Bible,” *Christianity Today* 1 (January 21, 1957): 7-9; idem, *Emil Brunner’s Concept of Revelation* (London: James Clarke & Co. LTD., 1954); Robert L. Reymond, *Brunner’s Dialectical Encounter* (Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1967).

113. Reymond, *Brunner’s Dialectical Encounter*, 10.

114. Ibid. Excerpted from Emil Brunner, *Revelation and Reason*, trans. Olive Wyon (Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press, 1946), 8.

115. Ibid, 12.

116. Young wrote, “It would seem that when Barth places the creation account in the realm of *Geschichte* [in contrast to *Historie*, i.e., actual history] he is in actual fact denying that Genesis one is a reliable and factual account of what actually transpired.” Cf. Young, *Studies in Genesis One*, 24. Cf. Young’s full critique of Barth’s distinction between *Geschichte* and *Historie* found on pp. 20-26 in the same work. Young contended, “Neo-orthodoxy offers a dualism in that it makes a distinction between the historical [*Historie*] and the supra-historical or supra-temporal [*Geschichte*]. In this latter realm it places the all the great truths of Christianity . . . These views are usually set forth in orthodox terminology, but once they are stripped of their biblical clothing and Christian language, there remains only a barren dualism. The supra-temporal world of some modern writers bears a strong resemblance to the noumenal world of Immanuel Kant. In fact they are blood relatives. It is the old area of myth and legend. The ideas of Christianity are present, but the realities are gone. This is a shadow or phantom Christianity; it is not the real thing.” Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 12.

On Brunner’s view of history, Jewett wrote, “Therefore in his view of revelation and history, Brunner seeks a way out of the either-or of liberalism and orthodoxy. He is neither liberal nor orthodox, but neo-orthodox. He discovers his clue in defining revelation, not as a book of infallible propositions in human words, but as God himself, entering into history in the person of Jesus Christ to perform once for all the decisive act of all history. In Jesus Christ the impossible happens: the Infinite becomes finite; the Eternal, temporal; the Divine, human. Revelation is a wonder that breaks into the world from beyond the world. For this reason, it is neither idea nor history as such. It is an event in the most brutal sense of the word, yet it has not even its ‘eventness’ in common with other events. The revelation of God in the person of Jesus Christ is the point in time which is tangent to eternity; it is a qualification of the stream of time from the perspective of eternity. It is, as Brunner sometimes called it in his earlier writings, ‘primal history.’” Jewett, *Emil Brunner: An Introduction to the Man and His Thought*, 20-21.

117. Barth stated, “If God has not been ashamed to speak through the Scriptures with its fallible human words, with its historical and scientific blunders, its theological contradictions, with the uncertainty of its transmission and above all with its Jewish character, but rather accepted it in all its fallibility to make it serve Him, we ought not to be ashamed of it when with all its fallibility it wants anew to be to us a witness; it would

be self-will and disobedience to wish to seek in the Bible for infallible elements." As cited in Young, *Thy Word Is Truth*, 227. The translation is by Cornelius Van Til, *The New Modernism*, 286. Barth's original statement may be obtained in Karl Barth, *Die kirchliche Dogmatik*, vol. I, part 2 (Zollikon-Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1932), 590. Similarly, Brunner believed that the Orthodox view of infallibility would lead to scientific obscurantism. Paul Jewett explained, "The answer to Relativism [i.e., 'Historicism'], however, is not a return to the infallible Bible of Orthodoxy. Brunner shares with the other leaders of the Neo-Supernaturalistic school, the conviction that in the light of Biblical criticism, such a procedure would be hopeless scientific obscurantism that could only widen the breach between the modern mind and the Christian faith." Jewett, *Emil Brunner's Concept of Revelation*, 9.

118. Hayes and Prussner, *Old Testament Theology: Its History & Development*, 156. Old Princeton and Westminster did not eschew the scientific investigation of the Bible and were not, therefore, against historical or textual criticism *per se*. However, Old Princeton and Westminster did reject the anti-supernaturalism inherent within the modern use of the historical-critical method.

119. One prominent evangelical who was greatly influenced by Karl Barth's view of Scripture was Bernard Ramm who left fundamentalism as a result. Vanhoozer writes, "Ramm thought that Barth had grasped the inner structure of evangelical theology in a way that made it a relevant and viable option in the modern world. Barth's way of correlating biblical criticism and divine revelation, inspiration, and authority represents the best modern attempt to unify science and Scripture." Kevin J. Vanhoozer, "Bernard Ramm," in *Handbook of Evangelical Theologians*, ed. W.A. Elwell (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1993), 306.

120. Young, *Thy Word Is Truth*, 228-229.

121. Ibid., 229-230 passim.

122. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 37.

123. Ibid., 32

124. A.A. Anderson has aptly captured the neo-orthodox view of Scripture in relation to the study of Old Testament theology: "Most [Old Testament] scholars seem to be agreed that revelation involves both divine and human elements, and wherever the human factor is present, infallibility and inerrancy are out of the question. The Bible itself is not the revelation but rather a human, although inspired, record of revelation, as well as an account of what men did with it and because of it. . . . That is to say that it was not God who did not reveal himself perfectly but the selfgiving of God was conditioned by the limitations of the receiver." A.A. Anderson, "Old Testament Theology and Its Methods," in *Promise and Fulfilment: Essays Presented to Professor S.H. Hooke*, ed. F.F. Bruce (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1963), 11.

125. According to Herbert Hahn, Otto Eissfeldt in his article, "Israeltisch-jüdische Religionsgeschichte und alttestamentliche Theologie," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XLIV (1926): 1-12, proposed, "Drawing the distinction between historical method and theological interpretation quite clearly, he suggested that both be recognized as legitimate, each in its own sphere, but that the two be kept strictly apart to operate on different planes. Knowledge of the historical movement was necessary to an understanding of the development of ideas in the Old Testament, but the eyes of faith were also needed to read the revelation of eternal truth in those ideas. Knowledge and faith together were necessary for an adequate appreciation of the meaning of the Old Testament." Herbert F. Hahn, *The Old Testament in Modern*

*Research*, expanded edition (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1966), 231-232. Hayes and Prussner state that Eissfeldt's allowance of theological interpretation as a separate but important discipline alongside historical criticism was due, in part, to Barth's influence. "Eissfeldt's essay, published in 1926, was very controversial and quite expressive of the expanding influence of Barthianism." Hayes and Prussner, *Old Testament Theology: Its History & Development*, 158.

126. In Walther Eichrodt's article, "Hat die alttestamentliche Theologie noch selständige Bedeutung innerhalb der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft?" *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XLVII (1929): 83-91, Hahn claimed that Eichrodt, "Instead of divorcing the historical method from theological interpretation, as Eissfeldt had done, Eichrodt maintained that a fruitful combination of the two was possible." Hahn, *The Old Testament in Modern Research*, 232. Eichrodt culminated his theological approach centered around the idea of the "covenant" in his magnum opus, Walther Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, trans. J.A. Baker, 2 vols., The Old Testament Library (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1961-1967).

127. Hayes and Prussner attribute the Christological readings of the Bible by Vischer and Bonhoeffer to Barth's emphasis on the centrality of the Christ-event. "Growing out of the Barthianism of the time, the messianic-christological reading of the Scriptures reminds one somewhat of the older position of Hengstenberg. The two most significant voices advancing Christological exegesis were Wilhelm Vischer (1895-) and Dietrich Bonhoeffer (1906-1945). Even for Barth the Hebrew Scriptures witness primarily to Christ or at least to the 'primal history' or the centrality of the pre-existence of Christ. For most Christians, and especially for Barth, it was difficult to speak of the message and value of the Old Testament without reference to Christ and Christianity." Hayes and Prussner, *Old Testament Theology: Its History & Development*, 161-162. In his work, *Das Christuszeugnis des Alten Testaments*, 2 vols. (Zürich: A.G. Zollikon, 1934-1942) = *The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ I. The Pentateuch* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949), Vischer explicated his view that "The Old Testament is like an arch, where the whole is understood in light of the parts and the parts in the light of the whole, and that arch is the Christ." Hayes and Prussner, *Old Testament Theology: Its History & Development*, 162.

128. Although, technically-speaking, Dietrich Bonhoeffer was not an Old Testament scholar, but rather, a theologian and ethicist, his Christological approach to the Old Testament, nonetheless, "was also heavily indebted to Karl Barth." Hayes and Prussner, *Old Testament Theology: Its History & Development*, 164. According to Hayes and Prussner, in Bonhoeffer's work, "Schöpfung und Fall. Theologische Auslegung von Genesis 1-3" (Münich: Chr. Kaiser, 1937 = *Creation and Fall: A Theological Interpretation of Genesis 1-3* (London: SCM Press, 1959)), Bonhoeffer insisted that "there must be a movement from the Old Testament to the New Testament and from the New Testament to the Old and both movements must interact." This was important because the "conflict over the role and place of the Old Testament in the church was eventually to color much of the later depictions of Old Testament theology in Germany. As early as 1938, for example, Gerhard von Rad could pose the issue as a matter of either-or: 'Either the Old Testament speaks 'with the New of the Christ revelation of God . . . or we deny that; then in spite of its highly noteworthy particularities we must assign it to the remaining religions . . . but *tertium non datur*.'" Ibid. As cited in Martin Kuske, *The Old Testament as the Book of Christ: An Appraisal of Bonhoeffer's Interpretation* (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1976), 33.

129. George Ernest Wright was influenced by Emil Brunner and Gerhard von Rad in his approach to biblical theology as the "acts of God." "Quoting from Brunner, Wright wrote, "The relation between God and man and between man and God is not of such a kind that doctrine can adequately express it in abstract formulas . . . It is not a timeless or static relation, arising from the world of ideas—and only for such is doctrine an adequate form: rather the relation is an event, and hence narration is the proper form to describe it. The decisive word-form in the language of the Bible is not the substantive, as in Greek, but the verb, the word of action . . . God 'steps' into the world, into relation with men . . . He acts always in relation to them, and He always acts" [The original appears in Emil Brunner, *The Divine-Human Encounter* (Philadelphia, PA: 1943), 47 f.]. In agreement, Wright concluded, "The Biblical interest in man is thus not in man's *nature* [as in doctrine], but in what he has done; and what he has done is understood as his response to or over against the action of God. It is difficult, therefore, to speak of a Biblical doctrine of the nature of man, except when doctrine is conceived in terms of theology as recital." G. Ernest Wright, *God Who Acts: Biblical Theology as Recital* (London: SCM Press LTD, 1952), 90-91. Thus, Wright maintained that biblical theology was "recital" because at "the centre of biblical theology was a confession of a particular type. . . . The answer is clear that the Bible relates a certain history in a confessional manner, because the recounting of this history is the central religious act of the worshipping community. Hence it is here maintained that biblical theology is the confessional recital of the redemptive acts of God in a particular history, because history is the chief medium of revelation." Wright, *God Who Acts*, 12-13. The idea that the Old Testament contains the earliest confessions of faith which are recitals of the saving acts of God was originally developed by Gerhard von Rad, *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, trans. E.W. Trueman Dicken (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966). For Wright's detailed explication of von Rad's understanding of *Heilsgeschichte*, cf. *God Who Acts*, 70 ff. Wright himself acknowledged von Rad's influence upon his own thought and work, "Nevertheless his [Gerhard von Rad's] starting point in the credos, his concern with 'cultic memory and cultic celebration,' his resultant preoccupation with *Heilsgeschichte*, and the fact that he was the first to develop his theology around the credo or theme of 'the mighty acts of God.'" G.E. Wright, "Old Testament Scholarship in Prospect," *Journal of Bible and Religion*, 28 (1960): 182-193, as cited in G. Ilenton Davies, "Gerhard von Rad Old Testament Theology," in *Contemporary Old Testament Theologians*, ed. Robert B. Laurin (Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1970), 74.

130. Hayes and Prussner, *Old Testament Theology: Its History & Development*, 158-166. According to Steven J. Kraftchick, the use of the term "biblical theology movement" was somewhat misleading; it "was never an organized movement of scholars. The term was coined by Brevard Childs in *Biblical Theology in Crisis* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970), 9. It is simply a shorthand to point out the particular form of protest that arose in the United States. . . . Childs's use of the phrase is rejected by James Smart in *The Past, Present, and Future of Biblical Theology* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1979), 10-12. Smart's reaction is an overreaction prompted by his confusion of the questions that biblical theologians were trying to answer with the answers that group of scholars provided. Childs recognized the multifaceted nature of the movement but still was able to see enough similarities to justify the term." Steven J. Kraftchick, "Facing Janus: Reviewing the Biblical Theology Movement," in *Biblical Theology: Problems and Perspective, in Honor of J. Christiaan Beker*, eds. C.D. Myers, S.J. Kraftchick, Jr., and B.C. Ollenburger (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1995), 298, n. 11.

During the 1940s and 50s, the neo-orthodox "Biblical Theology Movement" reached its zenith. J. Barton Payne cogently summarized the prevalence of the neo-orthodox influence in Old Testament studies throughout this 20-year period: "Neo-Orthodoxy has swept the scene. . . . An outstanding work is Pedersen's *Israel, Its Life and Culture*, 1926-40 (English translation, Vol. I by Mrs. Aslaug Moller [London: Oxford University Press, 1926], Vol. II by Annie I. Fausholl [London: Oxford University Press, 1940]), the method of which has been carried forward by the recent German theology of Gerhard von Rad (1957) . . . In England the leading spirit in the neo-orthodox movement has been H.H. Rowley. His pioneering work, *The Relevance of the Bible* (1941), pointed the way of the new trend by its very title. Britain was soon flooded by a host of brief, neo-orthodox studies. Among the more significant of these are the works of Rowley, A.G. Hebert, Christopher B. North, G.E. Phillips, W.J.T. Phythian-Adams, Alan Richardson, Norman H. Snaith, and H.F.D. Sparks. To date the only publication approaching a complete survey has been Rowley's *The Faith of Israel* (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1956). In America, too, neo-orthodoxy has rapidly caught fire. In the January 1943 issue of the *Journal of Religion*, there appeared an article by J.D. Smart entitled, 'The Death and Rebirth of Old Testament Theology.' The next year G. Earnest Wright published *The Challenge of Israel's Faith* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1944). Similar works have followed by Wright, John Bright, Robert C. Dentan, L. Hodgson, and Paul Minear." J. Barton Payne, *The Theology of the Older Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Academie Books, 1962), 37.

131. Hayes and Prussner, *Old Testament Theology: Its History & Development*, 231. Evangelicals in particular did not agree with Barth's influence on the neo-orthodox, biblical-theology movement's view regarding "God acting in history": "Conservatives had long pointed out that neo-orthodox theology had evaded the question of the real historicity of God's intervention in history and had created a smokescreen by using terminology taken over from the realism of the biblical narratives which their descriptions of events in naturalistic categories denied." Hayes and Prussner, *Old Testament Theology: Its History & Development*, 241.

132. Payne, *The Theology of the Older Testament*, 40. J. Marcellus Kik said of Young, "A worthy successor [to Robert Dick Wilson and Oswald T. Allis] is Professor Edward J. Young of Westminster Theological Seminary of Philadelphia. His written works have earned him the reputation of being the leading conservative scholar in the field of Old Testament today." Young, *Studies in Genesis One*, iv. R.B. Gaffin, Jr. writes, "He was widely regarded as the leading evangelical Old Testament scholar of his day, giving direction especially to the reasoned defense of the authority and integrity of the Scripture (*Thy Word is Truth*, 1957) against destructive criticism." Gaffin, "Young, Edward Joseph (1907-1968)," 1298.

133. In the Evangelical Theological Society's edited volume by Merrill C. Tenney entitled *The Bible: The Living Word of Revelation*, Young ("Are the Scriptures Inerrant?", 103-122) was chosen as part of "ten authors . . . [who represent] different church affiliations. . . . Nevertheless they agree that the written Word must be the accepted basis for their faith, however they might differ in its detailed interpretation." Young, "Are the Scriptures Inerrant?," Preface.

134. Edward J. Young, "The Dead Sea Scroll of Isaiah," *Christianity Today* March 17, 1958, 16-18; idem, "Old Testament Studies in 1962," 409-411; idem, "Survey of Old Testament Literature," *Christianity Today* February 9, 1962, 409-411.

135. Young wrote, "Neo-orthodoxy, with its low view of the Bible, is, I believe, a foe of true exegesis and biblical study." Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 12. Longman correctly surmises, "he [Young] was not only suspicious of traditional liberal theology, but also of neo-orthodoxy, which was becoming more popular during his lifetime. He felt that neo-orthodoxy's call back to the Bible was to a Bible that was filled with errors." Longman, "Young, E (dward) J (oseph) (1907-1968)," 1069-1070.

136. Young, *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today*, 20.

137. Ibid., 21. The original statement appears in Wright, *God Who Acts*, 13. Wright's approach to Old Testament theology was in contrast to other systematic treatments of God's nature, attributes, etc. "The 'classical' arrangement God-Man-Salvation may be a useful one but it appears to have been forced upon the Old Testament rather than derived from it. G.E. Wright points out that in the Bible the various doctrines, such as God, man, sin, etc., are 'so interrelated in a historical context that they cannot be separated and examined entirely as independent objects of reflection' (Wright, *God Who Acts*, 111)." Anderson, "Old Testament Theology and Its Methods," 15.

138. Richard B. Gaffin, "Geerhardus Vos and the Interpretation of Paul," in *Jerusalem and Athens*, ed. E.R. Geehan (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1971), 231. Gaffin explicates Geerhardus Vos's understanding of the Bible as "redemptive history" taken from Geerhardus Vos, *Biblical Theology: Old and New Testaments* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1948; reprint edition, The Banner of Truth Trust, 1975), 24. This concept of the Bible as "redemptive history" remained constant throughout Old Princeton beginning with Vos and extending to the present time at Westminster Seminary through Murray, Young, Kline, and Gaffin.

139. Young, *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today*, 21-24 passim. Emphasis added.

140. Ibid., 20.

141. [ET] 2 vols., trans. D.M.G. Stalker (New York: Harper & Row, 1962, 1965). For an overview of Gerhard von Rad's life and work, see Clements, *One Hundred Years of Old Testament Interpretation*; James L. Crenshaw, *Gerhard von Rad*, ed. Bob E. Patterson, Makers of the Modern Theological Mind (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1978); Davies, "Gerhard von Rad *Old Testament Theology*," 63-89; D.G. Spriggs, *Two Old Testament Theologies*, Studies in Biblical Theology, 2nd Series, vol. 30 (Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1974).

142. Young carefully delineated von Rad's view of "tradition-historical criticism": "Von Rad aligns himself at once on the side of what is today called the traditio-historical method of investigation, and takes issue with the older literary criticism. This older literary criticism, he says, believed that standing more or less immediately behind the present literary form of the books there was the historical course of events, at least, in their essentials, and that literary criticism could grasp this course of events. We now know, however, he says, that such is not so. At best, we can simply find definite conceptions and representations of old traditions which go back to different circles. In studying each unit of tradition we must apply the method of Form Criticism. The individual narrative units which we find in the documents J and E have a long history behind them. At first, says Von Rad, they stood alone, independent, but in course of time they came to be incorporated in the great blocks of tradition, and these blocks of tradition were themselves later joined together in accordance with a definite theological picture of sacred history (*Heilsgeschichte*)."<sup>12</sup> Young, *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today*, 12.

Young also negatively assessed von Rad's historical-critical approach to the early history of Israel, particularly as it related to the "Sinai Tradition" and the so-called "little credo" of Deuteronomy 26: 5b-9: "In the discussion of these questions Professor Gerhard von Rad of Heidelberg University has taken a prominent part. The last one hundred and fifty years of critical historical scholarship, he tells us, have destroyed the picture of Israel's history which the church had derived from its acceptance of the Old Testament. According to critical historical scholarship we can no longer regard it possible that all of Israel was present at Sinai or that as a unit the whole nation crossed the Red Sea or achieved the conquest of Palestine. The picture given to us in Exodus, to be frank, is unhistorical. The account of Israel's origin given in the Old Testament, we are told, is extremely complicated, being based upon a few old *motifs* around which a number of freely circulating traditions have clustered. Both these ancient *motifs* and the separate traditions were pronouncedly confessionalistic in character. We thus have two pictures of Israel's history, that which the faith of Israel has reconstructed and that which modern historical scholarship has reconstructed. It is this latter which tells of 'the history as it really was in Israel', for this latter method is rational and 'objective' in that it employs historical method and presupposes the similarity of all historical occurrence." Cf. Edward J. Young, "The Call of Moses, Part I," *Westminster Theological Journal* 29, no. 2 (May 1967): 118. On von Rad's view of history, see especially chapter III, "The Question of History, History of Tradition, Salvation History, and Story," in Gerhard Hasel, *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*, fourth edition (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991), 115-138.

143. Longman writes, "His [Young's] concern to defend the historicity of the Old Testament text may also be seen in his writings on Old Testament theology. He is deeply critical of the work of his contemporary Gerhard von Rad, whose concept of *Heilsgeschichte*, Young believed, relegated the events of Scripture to a fantasy world." Longman, "Young, E (dward) J (oseph) (1907-1968)," 1070.

Anderson also noted, "Yet the *Heilsgeschichte* [of von Rad] is not identical with the facts of history, and the acts of God can hardly be separated from the Israelite world of faith. We are not presented with bare historical data but with history interpreted theologically and therefore it is difficult to avoid contact with the realm of religious concepts." Anderson, "Old Testament Theology and Its Methods," 15-16.

144. Young, *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today*, 44. Although Albrecht Alt had been one of Young's former teachers in Germany, Young did not agree with Alt's skeptical view of patriarchal history. Young gave a full critique of Alt's *Der Gott der Väter: Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte der israelitischen Religion* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1929) in an article-length book review, Edward J. Young, "The God of the Fathers," *Westminster Theological Journal* 3, no. 1 (Nov., 1940): 25-40. Young wrote, "The subjectivity of Alt's thesis appears, however, not only in its postulation of the documentary analysis, but also in the assumption that we today can go behind the text to determine the original nature of the tradition. Not only, therefore, is it assumed that we are able to identify the various documents of which Genesis is thought to be composed, but also to detect the nature of the early sagas and traditions which are believed to lie latent in them. One of these traditions, according to Alt, is that which has to do with the worship of the 'God of the Fathers.' From it we are supposed to learn that Abraham was the first one to whom the God of Abraham appeared, and that he was the founder of the cult of this divinity. We are also supposed to learn that Isaac and Jacob had similar experiences with individual divinities. The fact that Professor Alt is the first to arrive at

such a view of patriarchal religion, is in itself an evidence of the subjectivity of the method employed." Ibid., 32.

145. Young, *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today*, 28.

146. Ibid., 29.

147. Ibid., 30-31.

148. Allan Harman is correct in noting that, "Very little of Young's writing deals directly with the subject of Old Testament theology. While a foundation of biblical theology underlies his other work, it is only in *The Study of the Old Testament Theology Today* that he spells out the framework of thinking which is implicit in all his writings." Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 199. For Young's perspective on the Prophets and their significance in Old Testament theology, cf. Edward J. Young, *Old Testament Prophecy* (Toronto: The Gospel Witness, 1965).

149. On the Reformed emphasis of federal theology see: Michael Horton, *God of Promise: Introducing Covenant Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2006); Jeong Koo Jeon, *Covenant Theology: John Murray's and Meredith G. Kline's Response to the Historical Development of Federal Theology in Reformed Thought* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc., 1999); Meredith G. Kline, *By Oath Consigned: A Reinterpretation of the Covenant Sign of Circumcision and Baptism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1968); idem, *Kingdom Prologue: Genesis Foundations for a Covenantal Worldview* (Overland Park, KS: Two Age Press, 2000); John Murray, *Collected Writings of John Murray*, vol. 2: Systematic Theology, reprint edition (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1984); idem, *Collected Writings of John Murray*, vol. 4: Studies in Theology (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1982); idem, *The Covenant of Grace*, reprint edition (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1988); Payne, *The Theology of the Older Testament*; O. Palmer Robertson, *The Christ of the Covenants* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1980); idem, "Current Reformed Thinking on the Nature of the Divine Covenants," *Westminster Theological Journal* 40, no. 1 (Fall 1997): 63-76; Geerhardus Vos, *Biblical Theology*; idem, "Doctrine of the Covenant in Reformed Theology," in *Redemptive History and Biblical Interpretation: The Shorter Writings of Geerhardus Vos*, ed. R.B. Gaffin Jr. (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1980), 234-267.

150. Young, *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today*, 66-68 passim.

151. Young had no qualms about employing the discipline of Systematic Theology within his study of Biblical Theology. In fact, he saw these disciplines as complementary. "Somehow the impression has been created that the idea of system is not Biblical, and there is a tendency today to label the modern mood as Biblical. But, to reject Systematic Theology in the interests of a supposed Biblical Theology is really to render impossible the study of true Biblical Theology." Young, "What Is Old Testament Biblical Theology?" 140.

152. Ralph L. Smith, *Old Testament Theology: Its History, Method, and Message* (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1993), 153.

153. In the *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary* during the 1937-1938 academic year, Murray had been enlisted to teach the course on "Old Testament Biblical Theology" due to Allan A. MacRae's resignation from the Old Testament department. Murray, however, continued to teach this course from 1937-1955, 1958-1959, 1965-1968 (cf. *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary* from 1937 to 1968). Murray's formal training in Old Testament Biblical Theology came from his Princeton professor, Geerhardus Vos. In addition, J. Barton Payne, who also had Murray as his teacher,

dedicated his work on Old Testament theology to him: "This volume is gratefully dedicated to PROFESSOR JOHN MURRAY orthodox scholar, Biblical theologian, and Christian gentleman, who first introduced the writer to the thrill of true Biblical theology and in conversation with whom, at Westminster Seminary in the fall of 1948, was suggested an organization of Old Testament theology around the theme of the testament." Payne, *The Theology of the Older Testament*, Dedication. Interestingly, however, Payne did not follow Murray's denial of the "Covenant of Works." Ibid., cf. especially 91-93.

154. Murray, *Collected Writings of John Murray*, 2:49.

155. Jeon, *Covenant Theology*, 107.

156. Ibid., 107-108. Cited from Murray, *Collected Writings of John Murray*, 2:50.

157. According to Murray, Adam's first sin was imputed unto his posterity (cf., Romans 5:12-21; i.e., the Augustinian doctrine of "original sin"). He claimed, "If we say that the trespass of Adam is imputed to posterity, all we can strictly and properly be regarded as meaning is that the sin of Adam is reckoned by God as the sin also of posterity. The same sin is laid to their account; it is reckoned as theirs." John Murray, *The Imputation of Adam's Sin* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1959), 72.

158. Mark W. Karlberg, *Covenant Theology in Reformed Perspective* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2000), 45. Karlberg, commenting on Murray's view of the doctrine of justification in relation to the Adamic administration, writes, "In the original state of creation, as long as righteousness and justification were maintained by means of man's obedience this state was of perpetual duration. There could be no lessening of this mutable, noneschatological condition. By the grace and condescension of God, he was pleased to enter into covenant with man, whereby he could be elevated to the state of glory and confirmation. This reward could never be granted on the basis of man's works (merit). Such works could only merit in strict justice momentary justification and life. Repeatedly, Murray insists that 'even perfect inwrought righteousness cannot ground the reward of eternal life' . . . What is demanded is a God-righteousness, as opposed to the human righteousness. The gift of eternal life is granted to Adam on the basis of the faithfulness of God, a God-righteousness. This is an ultimate confusion of the orders of creation and redemption." In other words, Karlberg claims that Murray confused the covenant of works with the covenant of grace in that Murray insisted that Adam must have a "God-righteousness" (i.e., covenant of grace) and not a "human righteousness" (i.e., covenant of works). Hence, if the Adamic administration was that of a covenant of works, then Adam was in a probationary arrangement whereby he could have attained a "human righteousness" and merited for himself the state of glory and confirmation. Cf. ibid., 56, n. 128.

159. Murray, *The Covenant of Grace*, 30-31, as cited in Robertson, "Current Reformed Thinking on the Nature of the Divine Covenants," 74.

160. Young, *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today*, 63. Murray's original quote may be found in his, *The Covenant of Grace*, 85, n. 5.

161. Young, *In the Beginning*, 115.

162. Young, *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today*, 63.

163. Young, earlier in his career (i.e., 1949), did not have a problem using the expression "covenant of works" to describe the Adamic arrangement, but still held that it was based upon divine grace: "In addition, the chapter [Genesis 2] calls attention to the two trees and to the covenant of works which God in grace made with Adam." Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 50.

164. Reprinted in the “Appendix,” Young, *In the Beginning*, 117. Emphasis added. The original entry may be found in Edward J. Young, “Confession and Covenant,” in *Scripture and Confession*, ed. John H. Skilton (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1973), 31-66.

165. Young, *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today*, 76.

166. Ibid., 92-94.

167. Ibid., 78-85.

168. Ibid., 81.

169. Ibid., 84.

170. Ibid., 92-98.

171. Ibid., 99.

172. Ibid., 98-99.

173. Ibid., 98.

174. On the use of “redemptive history” by the Old Princetonians, Joseph Addison Alexander, William Henry Green, and Geerhardus Vos, cf. Peter J. Wallace, “Old Testament Theology at Old Princeton,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 59, no. 1 (Spring 1997): 41-69.

175. Although Murray had studied under Geerhardus Vos, the “father of a Reformed biblical theology” [cf. Richard B. Gaffin, “Introduction,” in *Redemptive History and Biblical Interpretation*, ed. Richard B. Gaffin (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1980), xiv.], he did not follow Vos in his adherence to the “covenant of works.” Vos, in comparing the Reformed to the Lutheran view of Adam’s original state, gave a classic Reformed definition of the “covenant of works”: “It [the Reformed view] sees man not as being placed in eternal bliss from the beginning [the Lutheran view], but as being placed in such a way that he might attain to eternal bliss. There still hovers above him the possibility of sin and death which is given with his mutable freedom. He is free to do the good out of his good nature, but he has not yet attained the highest freedom which can do good only. The latter is placed before him as an ideal. The means of obtaining it is the covenant of works. Here too the state of grace is again ultimately determined by the idea of man’s destiny in the state of original uprightness. What we inherit in the second Adam is not restricted to what we lost in the first Adam; it is much rather the full realization of what the first Adam would have achieved for us had he remained unfallen and been confirmed in his state.” Geerhardus Vos, “Doctrine of the Covenant in Reformed Theology,” in *Redemptive History and Biblical Interpretation*, ed. Richard B. Gaffin Jr. (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1980), 243.

176. Kline’s main argument was that Adam must have been placed under a divinely-sanctioned “covenant of works” because Christ as the Second Adam was placed under the same covenantal arrangement in order that his successful completion of it might be imputed unto his people as a “covenant of grace” (cf. Kline, *Kingdom Prologue*, 108 ff.). Similarly, national Israel in the Sinaitic Covenant was also placed under a republication of the “covenant of works.” According to Kline, the principle “do this and live” (cf. Lev. 18:5) reveals that the Mosaic economy was based upon a works arrangement representing a separate typological strand for the “national election of Israel” which was placed over the foundational stratum of the “covenant of grace” as revealed in the Abrahamic Covenant (Gen. 15:9-21; Gen. 22:16; Heb. 6:13-18). Whereas the former strand accounts for the inexplicable termination of the typological kingdom of Israel through the stipulated curses of the Sinaitic Covenant, the latter represents the promise of grace and

reveals the purpose and program of the individual election in Christ which ultimately leads to salvation and the heavenly inheritance to which the typological Canaan merely pointed in provisional form (cf. Meredith G. Kline, *God, Heaven and Har Magedon: A Covenantal Tale of Cosmos and Telos* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2006), 96-97. Kline explices, "Also contradicting the contention that no divine covenants have ever been governed by the works principle is the irrefutable biblical evidence that the Mosaic economy, while an administration of grace on its fundamental level of concern with the eternal salvation of the individual, was at the same time on its temporary, typological kingdom level informed by the principle of works. Thus, for example, the apostle Paul in Romans 10:4ff. and Galatians 3:10ff. (cf. Rom 9:32) contrasts the old order of the law with the gospel order of grace and faith, identifying the old covenant as one of bondage, condemnation, and death (cf. 2 Cor 3:6-9; Gal 4:24-26). . . . Had the old typological kingdom been secured by sovereign grace in Christ, Israel would not have lost her national election." Kline, *Kingdom Prologue*, 109. Previous Reformed interpreters—Charles Hodge, Abraham Kuyper, Herman Bavinck, Louis Berkof, and Geerhardus Vos—similarly observed in the Sinaitic Covenant a legal element operating within the symbolic-typical sphere of Israel's covenant life. Cf. Karlberg, *Covenant Theology in Reformed Perspective*, 41-49.

177. Longman, "Young, E (dward J (oseph) (1907-1968)," 1071.

178. See, for example, Jeong K. Jeon's balanced assessment of Murray's (and, therefore, Young's) response to federal theology: "Murray suggests some modification of the classical Reformed covenant theology of the 17th century because biblical-theological study does not prove the concept of the *foedus operum*: 'Biblical-theological study will show that the traditional formulation of covenant theology, especially that associated with the 17th century, needs modification. This revision does not in the least degree interfere with the centrality of covenant administration in the history of redemption. In fact it only serves to accentuate the significance of the covenant concept' (Murray, *Collected Writings*, 4:322-323). In this regard, Murray is a revisionist covenant theologian. We will see, however, that Murray's theology is fully compatible with the *antithesis* between the covenant of works and grace because he utilizes all the theological benefits and motifs of bipolar covenant distinction hermeneutics, namely the covenant of works and grace even though he rejects the term *foedus operum*." Jeon, *Covenant Theology*, 103-104.

Westminster Seminary's founder, J. Gresham Machen, maintained the language of a "covenant of works" in the Adamic administration, while also, like Murray and Young, affirming grace within it: "That issue was placed before man in accordance with what the Shorter Catechism calls the 'covenant of life' into which God entered with Adam. That same covenant is also sometimes called the 'covenant of works.' It is rightly so called because by the terms of it man was to have life or death in accordance with what he did. By the terms of the covenant man was placed on probation. No absolute promise of life was given him; but he was to have life only if he obeyed perfectly the commandments of God . . . It was a temporary probation, and if it had been passed through without sin it would have been followed by an assured blessedness. Thus that covenant of works into which God entered with man was a gracious thing. It contained, indeed, a possibility of death, but it contained also the promise of assured and eternal life." J. Gresham Machen, *The Christian View of Man* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1937), 158-160 *passim*.

179. For recent approbations of Kline's biblical theology from the Reformed academic community, cf.: Horton, *God of Promise*, 83-110; Lee Irons, "Redefining Merit: An Examination of Medieval Presuppositions in Covenant Theology," in *Creator*,

*Redeemer, Consummator: A Festschrift for Meredith G. Kline*, eds. H. Griffith and J.R. Muether (Greenville, SC: Reformed Academic Press, 2000), 253-269; Jeon, *Covenant Theology*, 279-328; Karlberg, *Covenant Theology in Reformed Perspective*, 357-377. Although not dealing specifically with Kline's work, see the following edited volume which defends Kline's basic position of the republication of the covenant of works in the Mosaic covenant: eds. Brian D. Estelle, J.V. Fesko, David VanDrunen, *The Law is Not of Faith: Essays on Works and Grace in the Mosaic Covenant* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2009). On Kline's classical covenant-theological exposition and defense of the Adamic administration as strictly a "covenant of works" based upon merit and not of grace (contra Murray and Young), cf. Meredith G. Kline, "Covenant Theology under Attack," *New Horizons* 15, no. 2 (1994): 3-5; idem, *Kingdom Prologue*, 107-117; idem, "Of Works and Grace," *Presbyterian* 9 (1983): 85-92. Kline asserts, "A principle of works—do this and live—governed the attainment of the consummation-kingdom proffered in the blessing sanction of the creation covenant. Heaven must be earned. According to the terms stipulated by the Creator it would be on the ground of man's faithful completion of the work of probation that he would be entitled to enter the Sabbath rest. If Adam obediently performed the assignment signified by the probation tree, he would receive, as a matter of pure and simple justice, the reward symbolized by the tree of life. That is, successful probation would be meritorious. With good reason then covenant theology has identified this probation arrangement as a covenant of works, thereby setting it in sharp contrast to the Covenant of Grace." Kline, *Kingdom Prologue*, 107. For a defense of Murray contra Kline, see Tim J.R. Trumper, "Covenant Theology and Constructive Calvinism," *Westminster Theological Journal* 64, no. 2 (Fall 2002): 387-404.

180. Allis referred to Wilson's statement on "later inspired redactions" of the Pentateuch as the "conservative position." Cf. Oswald T. Allis, *The Five Books of Moses*, second edition (Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1949), 306, fn. 15.

181. MacRae also affirmed and specifically referenced Wilson's "later inspired redactions": "Or some writer might insert a sentence, one hundred, two hundred, or three hundred years later, speaking of the condition remaining as it became at that time. Such an insertion at a later time does not disprove the Mosaic authorship of the book as a whole. Dr. Robert Dick Wilson expressed this in his book on the scientific introduction to the Pentateuch. He explained what he considered Mosaic authorship to be. I find his definition quoted in other books, showing that most feel that he expressed it very well." Allan A. MacRae, *JEDP: Lectures on the Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, eds. S.T. Hague and R.C. Newman (Hatfield, PA: Interdisciplinary Biblical Research Institute, 1994), 54. Note that MacRae viewed any inspired, post-Mosaic additions to have been minor editorial clarifications, such as an explanatory sentence peppered throughout the essentially Mosaic narrative. Contra Professor G. Charles Aalders of the Free University of Amsterdam and his book, *A Short Introduction to the Pentateuch* (Chicago, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1949), MacRae wrote, "They [post-mosaica] are not matters which, like the [higher] criticism, involve a complete rearrangement; they are matter of individual statements which could conceivably be interpolations. I do not think it is necessary to consider that they are . . . they are isolated statements which do not prove anything about the rest of the book. If they could not be by Moses, these individual statements, of which there are not many, could be insertions at a later date, though I see no reason to think that they are." MacRae, *JEDP*, 282. The book by Dr. MacRae is a

slightly edited transcription of his lectures in the course “Introduction of the Pentateuch” that was taught in the spring of 1952 at Faith Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.

182. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 33. Conspicuously, Young did not refer to Wilson’s earlier quote found in Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 12. Only later on p. 46 when Young actually utilized Wilson’s quotation on the possibility of “inspired redactors” for some of the minor additions and revision of the Pentateuch did Young explicitly reference Wilson.

183. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 45. Once more, Young did not reference Wilson’s work, cf. Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 48.

184. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 45. The emphasis is original to Young. On Wilson’s view that the Pentateuch remains the “fundamental” work of Moses, cf. Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 48-49.

185. Cf. Green, *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, 31-58.

186. Cf. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 42-45.

187. Ibid., 45.

188. Green, *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, 59-133.

189. Although Allis’ *The Five Books of Moses* (1943), as a whole, is a refutation of the historical-critical approach to the Pentateuch (which includes some of its interpretative history), Allis utilized both traditional and critical bibliographic sources on the history of Pentateuchal criticism: “For a fuller discussion of the history of the higher criticism, cf. W.H. Green, *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch* (1895), J. Orr, *The Problem of the Old Testament* (1909), H. Holzinger, *Hexateuch* (1893), A. Westphal, *Les Sources du Pentateuque* (1888-1892), Cornill, *Introduction*, (1907). For details of analysis and dating compare the works on *Introduction* by Driver, Cornill, Gray, Creelman, Eissfeldt, Oesterley and Robinson, Pfeiffer, and also the discussions in Brightman’s handy volume, *The Sources of the Hexateuch*.” Allis, *The Five Books of Moses*, 307, fn. 17.

190. MacRae outlined the necessity of understanding and knowing the historical development of Pentateuchal criticism: “Your success in the course does not depend on your having an absolutely perfect understanding of the arguments against the higher criticism that I shall give, but I will insist that you have an absolutely perfect knowledge and understanding of the principal details of what the theory is and how it has developed. If you do not have that, you will not be in a position to discuss it or to understand the arguments against it.” MacRae, *JEDP*, 12.

191. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 107-154.

192. Ibid., 152.

193. MacRae was critical of Young’s overemphasis of Ilgen’s contribution which received an entire page whereas, in MacRae’s estimation, the more important Eichhorn received only eight lines. MacRae commented, “(It is very interesting that Edward J. Young in his *Introduction to the Old Testament*, gives Eichhorn eight lines and Ilgen an entire page.) It was Eichhorn who was really the father of the higher criticism and tremendously important in its development . . . So I would say that in a conservative book Ilgen certainly would not be worth over four or five lines and Eichhorn ought to have a page.” MacRae, *JEDP*, 93.

194. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 153.

195. Ibid.

196. Ibid., 58.

197. Ibid., 58-59. Green, borrowing from the works of Witsius (*Miscellanea Sacra*, 2nd edition, 1736, I., ch. xiv., "An Moses auctor Pentateuchi") and Carpzov (*Introductio ad Libros Canonicos Veteris Testamenti*, Editio Nova, 1731, I., pp. 57 ff.) wrote, "'The Canaanite was then in the land' (Gen. xii. 6) states that they were in the country in the days of Abraham, but without any implication that they were not there still." Green, *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, 50. Green also contended that Genesis 12:6 and Genesis 13:7 "are not later glosses, since they are closely connected with the paragraphs in which they stand, as has been already shown; nor are they indications of the post-Mosaic origin of the narrative. They contain no implication that the Canaanites and Perizzites had passed away. It is quite as natural to say, 'The Canaanites were then in the land as they still are,' as to say, 'The Canaanites were then in the land, but are there no longer.'" Cf. Green, *The Unity of the Book of Genesis*, 195.

However, not everyone from the Old Princeton-Westminster School required that the phrase "the Canaanite was then in the land," to have been from the pen of Moses. Allan MacRae said, "I do not think there is any real difficulty in believing Moses wrote all of them, but if you do not think Moses wrote 'the Canaanite was then in the land,' I would have no objection to supposing that an inspired writer, studying the Pentateuch five hundred years later, reading the statements and realizing that the people of his day would not understand what that would mean, inserted an explanatory remark such as 'the Canaanite was then in the land' to make clear the reason for Jacob's anxiety. Such an insertion would not affect belief in the Mosaic authorship in the least." MacRae, *JEDP*, 64.

198. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 59. Note the similarity of Young's argumentation as compared to Green's original statement: "There is no proof that the 'Dan' of Gen. xiv. 14 is the same as that of Judg. xviii. 29; or if it be, there is no difficulty in supposing that in the course of repeated transcription the name in common use in later times was substituted for one less familiar which originally stood in the text." Green, *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, 51. Oswald T. Allis also argued that the "Dan" of Genesis 14:14 was different from the place of the same name mentioned in Judges 18:29 based upon recent archaeological evidence: "It is by no means certain that the Dan of Gen. xiv.14 is the same as the Dan of Jgs. xviii. 29. Garstang has recently accepted Petrie's argument that the former lay south of Jerusalem and may be the Dannah of Josh. xv. 49." Allis, *The Five Books of Moses*, 306, fn. 16.

199. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 60. On the Edomite kings of Genesis 36. Green asserted Mosaic provenance: "The kings of Edom who are enumerated in Gen. xxxvi. were pre-Mosaic; and Moses remarks upon the singular fact that Jacob, who had the promise of kings among his descendants (Gen. xxxv. 11), had as yet none, and they were just beginning their national existence, while Esau, to whom no such a promise had been given, already reckoned several." Green, *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, 51. In his *Introduction*, Young alluded on p. 60, fn. 21 to Green's more extensive discussion found in his book, *The Unity of the Book of Genesis*, pp. 425-428. Earlier in 1943, Allis also wrote against a monarchical date of Genesis 36:31: "The words 'before there reigned any king over the children of Israel' (vs. 31) undoubtedly suggest the time of the monarchy. But Gen. xvii. 16 contains the promise of kings in Israel (cf. Deut. xvii. 14f. also xxviii. 36), a promise which Israel's bondage in Egypt and wanderings in the wilderness might seem to contradict, and these words of Gen. xxxvi. 31 would then indicate that Moses was not unmindful of the seeming failure of the promise. Furthermore it is difficult to see any sufficiently compelling reason for inserting

a long list of Edomite duke-kings into the text of Genesis. That Chronicles should include it in the genealogical material which it took over from Genesis would be natural. But it is highly unlikely that such a list would be inserted in Genesis from Chronicles in the post-exilic period." Allis, *The Five Books of Moses*, 306, fn. 16. MacRae surmised that a monarchical provenance of the passage was possible but unnecessary: "Some say this could not have been written until there was a king of Israel. This is not a necessary conclusion, but if you want to think that somebody in the days of Saul or David made up a correct list of the Kings of Edom and inserted it into the Pentateuch at the place where it tells about Esau, it would not affect the main question. The Lord might have led an inspired writer to insert it there" MacRae, *JEDP*, 65.

200. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 73. Green believed that Exodus 16:35 was Mosaic and not a later redacted insertion. He tersely commented that, "There is nothing in Ex. xvi. 35 which Moses could not have written" Green, *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, 51.

201. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 86. On Numbers 12:3, Green appealed to 1 Corinthians 15:10 and 2 Corinthians 11:5, 12:11 to show that the Apostle Paul also referred to himself as, by the grace of God, having worked harder than any of the other apostles, as well as being just as qualified as those who considered themselves "super apostles." Green, *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, 51. MacRae suggested that Moses' statement regarding his own meekness in the third person was the result of not having stood up for himself while Miriam and Aaron criticized him about his marriage with a Cushite woman. Since Moses kept quiet, the Lord intervened, and thus the statement was a parenthetical explanation as to why Moses did not defend himself. "There is no reason in the world why Moses, knowing how his pride had been the cause of condemnation by the Lord, and knowing that he had his faults as others do, should not explain that in the particular incident he had shown a very unusual attitude, that he had stood by quietly as hardly anybody else would have done." MacRae, *JEDP*, 284. Similarly, Young also noted that Moses' use of the third person gave the statement a certain objectivity which was not motivated by self-pride. "Moses was the meekest of all men, because Moses had been exalted in position by God as had no other man. He occupied a place in the Old Testament dispensation that was utterly unique [God's servant, e.g., "My servant"]. For this reason, he abstains from all self-defense, and also does not call out to God for vengeance, but leaves the entire matter in the hands of God." Young, *My Servants the Prophets*, 44-45.

202. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 105. Young's statement is parallel to Green's earlier statement: "'Beyond Jordan' (Deut. i. 1), said of Moses's position east of the river, does not imply that the writer was in the land of Canaan, as is plain from the ambiguity of the expression. . . . Canaan was 'beyond Jordan' to Israel encamped in the plains of Moab; and the territory east of the river was 'beyond Jordan' to Canaan, the land promised to their fathers, and which they regarded as their proper home." Green, *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, 50.

203. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 105. Princeton Seminary's first professor of biblical studies and theology, Archibald Alexander, claimed that Deuteronomy 34 was written by a later hand under divine inspiration, cf. Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School*, 20-21. Allis, in the same vein, adamantly declared that Deuteronomy 34 was a unique chapter and that proponents who claimed that Moses had prophesied his own death could not be correct since the chapter was written as history and not prophecy. Allis concluded, "Its contents seem obviously to

require another author than Moses. The inclusion of the account of a man's death in his autobiography would not prove that he did not write the account of his life. The two are so different that such an inference would be unjustified." Allis, *The Five Books of Moses*, 12. Conversely, MacRae believed that although "it is entirely possible that Joshua or someone else wrote the statement about Moses' death," MacRae saw "no reason to feel that it *must* be so, because it does not contain anything that Moses did not know." MacRae concluded, "Moses wrote the facts in advance exactly the way the Lord told him they were going to happen." MacRae, *JEDP*, 55-56 passim.

204. Edward J. Young, "The Relation of the First Verse of Genesis One to Verses Two and Three," *Westminster Theological Journal* 21, no. 2 (May 1959): 133-146; idem, "The Interpretation of Genesis 1:2," *Westminster Theological Journal* 23, no. 2 (May 1961): 151-178; idem, "The Days of Genesis, Part I," *Westminster Theological Journal* 25, no. 1 (November 1962): 1-34; idem, "The Days of Genesis, Part II," *Westminster Theological Journal* 25, no. 2 (May 1963): 143-171. For Young's popular, non-technical treatment of Genesis 1, cf. Young, *In the Beginning*.

205. (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1964).

206. Young, *Studies in Genesis One*, v.

207. Ibid., 43.

208. Ibid., 44.

209. Blocher gave a fuller presentation of the proponents of the "framework theory": "The pioneer, around 1930, was probably A. Noordtijz of the University of Utrecht, and since World War II the main proponents have been N.H. Ridderbos of Amsterdam, B. Ramm of California, M.G. Kline of New England, D.F. Payne of Britain and J.A. Thompson of Australia. There is no questioning their competence or, generally speaking, their respect for Scripture." Henri Blocher, *In the Beginning: The Opening Chapters of Genesis*, trans. David G. Preston (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1984), 50.

210. Arie Noordtijz, *Gods Woord En Der Eeuwen Getuigenis: Het Oude Teswtament in Het Licht Der Oostersche Opgravingen* (Kampen: 1924).

211. N.H. Ridderbos, *Is There a Conflict between Genesis 1 and Natural Science?* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1957). Not to be confused with his father Jan Ridderbos who was professor of Old Testament at the Theological School of the Reformed Churches of the Netherlands in Kampen or his well-known brother, Herman N. Ridderbos, who taught New Testament at the same institution.

212. Bernard Ramm, *The Christian View of Science and Scripture* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1954). On Ramm's non-chronological, progressive-creationist interpretation of Genesis 1, Kevin Vanhoozer explicates, "The six days are not to be construed as chronological, as if each paragraph in Genesis 1 corresponds to a geological epoch, but as pictorial and theological. This is not to relegate theology to the backseat of cosmological discussion. On the contrary, both geology and theology have something to contribute: Genesis is about the First Cause, and geology is about the secondary causes which God used to form the earth." Vanhoozer, "Bernard Ramm," 295-296.

213. Meredith G. Kline, "Because It Had Not Rained," *Westminster Theological Journal* 20, no. 2 (May 1958): 146-157. More recently, Kline with other evangelical scholars have defended the "Framework Interpretation": Blocher, *In the Beginning*; Mark D. Futato, "Because It Had Rained: A Study of Gen 2:5-7 with Implications for Gen 2:4-25 and Gen 1:1-2:3," *Westminster Theological Journal* 60 (Spring 1988): 1-21; Lee Irons with Meredith G. Kline, "The Framework View," in *The Genesis Debate: Three Views on the Days of Creation*, ed. David G. Hagopian (Mission Viejo, CA: Crux Press, 2001).

217-256; Meredith G. Kline, "Space and Time in the Genesis Cosmogony," *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 48, no. 1 (April 1996): 2-15.

214. Ramm, *The Christian View of Science and Scripture*, 25.

215. Ibid., 120 ff.

216. Ibid., 76-79. For a more recent presentation of "progressive creationism" by an evangelical scholar, cf. Robert C. Newman, *Genesis One & the Origin of the Earth* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1977).

217. Ibid., 186.

218. Ridderbos, *Is There a Conflict between Genesis 1 and Natural Science?* 46.

219. Kline, "Space and Time in the Genesis Cosmogony," 15, n. 47.

220. Ibid.

221. Arie Noordzij, *The Old Testament Problem*, trans. Miner B. Stearns (Dallas, TX: Dallas Theological Seminary, 1940-1941).

222. Ibid., 457.

223. It is widely acknowledged that Bernard Ramm later became a vigorous proponent and defender of Karl Barth and of his views on Scripture. However, at the time of its publication in 1954, *The Christian View of Science and Scripture*, Ramm still considered himself as a conservative evangelical. In fact during this time, Ramm was employed by conservative, evangelical institutions including Los Angeles Baptist Theological Seminary (1944-45), Bible Institute of Los Angeles (BIOLA; 1945-51), Bethel College and Seminary (1951-54), and Baylor University (1954-1959).

Ramm began reading Barth during the 1950s after he had completed his doctoral studies at the University of Southern California. In 1957-1958, Ramm spent a pivotal, sabbatical year in Basel, Switzerland, where he studied with Barth at his home during his Saturday-afternoon, English-language seminars. These sessions with Barth had a profound influence on Ramm's personal theological perspectives. Kevin Vanhoozer, writes, "We may need, therefore, to speak of a turn in Ramm's theological development, occurring sometime after 1957." Vanhoozer, "Bernard Ramm," 292. Ultimately, Ramm viewed his early days as an evangelical as "intellectually bankrupt" and "defensive," but found freedom in Barth's theological methodology. Cf. Richard A. Muller, "The Place and Importance of Karl Barth in the Twentieth Century: A Review Article," *Westminster Theological Journal* 50, no. 1 (Spring 1988): 140.

Evangelist, Billy Graham, defended Ramm's view of the Bible's inspiration as presented in *The Christian View of Science and Scripture*. In a personal letter, Graham wrote, "Its [i.e., the newly proposed evangelical periodical] view of Inspiration would be somewhat along the line of the recent book by Bernard Ramm, which in my opinion does not take away from Inspiration but rather gives strong support to our faith in the Inspiration of the Scriptures." Billy Graham to Harold Lindsell, January 25, 1955. As cited in George M. Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987), 158.

224. Kline agreed in large measure with Ramm's non-chronological, figurative interpretation of Genesis 1, but developed it further than Ramm himself, cf. Meredith G. Kline, "Book Review: Bernard Ramm's *Christian View of Science and Scripture*," *Westminster Theological Journal* 18, no. 1 (Fall 1955): 49-55. This review article became the basis upon which Kline wrote and published, "Because It Had Not Rained," some three years later in the *WTJ*.

225. Kline duly cited both Ramm's and Ridderbos's volumes before entering into his own exegetical presentation of Genesis 1 and 2:5-7, cf. Meredith G. Kline, "Because It Had Not Rained," *Westminster Theological Journal* 20 (1958): 146, n. 1.

226. Ibid., 146.

227. Ibid., 148.

228. The "24-hour view" of creation claims that God created in six literal, 24-hour days. Proponents of this view follow the chronology of Genesis 1 as literal, sequential, and historical. See e.g., J. Ligon Duncan III & David W. Hall, "The 24-Hour View," in *The Genesis Debate*, ed. D.G. Hagopian (Mission Viejo, CA: Crux Press, 2001), 21-66.

229. The "day-age view" of creation claims that God created in six sequential and (unspecified) long periods of time. Proponents claim that their view integrates the biblical and scientific data by: a) believing the literal, chronological ordering of creation as presented in Genesis 1, and b) holding to the recent findings of modern science which claim that the universe and earth are very old. See e.g., Hugh Ross & Gleason L. Archer, "The Day-Age View," in *The Genesis Debate*, ed. D.G. Hagopian (Mission Viejo, CA: Crux Press, 2001), 123—163.

230. Irons with Kline, "The Framework View," 230.

231. Historical-critical scholarship has classically assigned Genesis 1 to the post-exilic, Priestly Writer (P), while Genesis 2 has been classically assigned to the ninth-century BC historian, the Jahwist (J). Cf. Norman C. Habel, *Literary Criticism of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1971), 18-42. Kline contrasted the difference in interpretation between the "orthodox" scholar and the "higher critic" with respect to the literary differences of Genesis 1 and 2: "To the divisive higher critic this might mean only that there is another item to add to his list of alleged contradictions between the two variant creation accounts he supposes he has discovered in Genesis 1 and 2. But the orthodox exegete, having been confronted with the evidence of ordinary providential procedure in Genesis 2:5 will be bound to reject the rigidly chronological interpretations of Genesis 1 for the reason that they necessarily presuppose radically different providential operations for the creation period." Kline, "Because It Had Not Rained," 153-154. Kline held to the traditional view of Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, in general, and of the book of Genesis, in particular. Cf. Meredith G. Kline, "Genesis," in *The New Bible Commentary*, eds. D. Guthrie and J.A. Motyer (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1970), 79.

232. Kline, "Because It Had Not Rained," 156.

233. Ibid., 149-150.

234. Ibid., 150.

235. Ibid., 149-150.

236. Ibid., 150.

237. Ibid., 151.

238. Ibid.

239. On the identification of the source of "the flooding waters," Kline wrote, "The meaning of the Hebrew טַהַר is uncertain. It probably denotes subterranean waters which rise to the surface and thence as gushing springs or flooding rivers inundate the land . . . The word טַהַר appears elsewhere in the Old Testament only in Job 36:27. That passage is difficult; but אֶתְנָר there seems to denote the underground ore, as it were, from which the raindrops are extracted and refined, i.e., by the process of evaporation in the cycle of cloud formation and precipitation. The Hebrew טַהַר is probably to be derived from the

Akkadian, *edû*, a Sumerian loanword which denotes overflowing waters." Ibid., 150, n. 9. In his article, "Genesis" (1970), Kline also wrote, "The uncertain *mist* (Heb. 'ēd) probably refers to subterranean waters springing up over the ground." Kline, "Genesis," 83.

In 1996, however, Kline subsequently revised his view of *TN* arguing that, "Whatever the meaning of the Hebrew 'ēd (traditionally 'mist'), this verse [Gen. 2:6] cannot be describing another circumstance adverse to plant life (like chaotic flood waters), for the effect of the 'ēd was beneficial watering." Instead, Kline proposed, following Mitchell J. Dahood (cf. M. Dahood, "Elbaite *i-du* and Hebrew 'ēd, 'Rain Cloud,'" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 43 (1981): 534-538), that "the identification of the Hebrew 'ēd with the Eblaite *i-du*, 'rain-cloud'" was the more likely interpretation, due to passages such as Job 36:26-33 and Job 38:25-30 which appeared to use 'ēd within the meteorological cycle of evaporation and precipitation. Kline, "Space and Time in the Genesis Cosmogony," 12-13. Mark D. Futato, a former student and colleague of Kline's, further developed the connection between 'ēd as "rain-cloud" in Genesis 2:5-7 in his article, "Because It Had Rained: A Study of Gen 2:5-7 with Implications for Gen 2:4-25 and Gen 1:1-2:3," *Westminster Theological Journal* 60 (1998): 1-21.

However, the scholarly consensus sides with the view that 'ēd is the upswelling of subterranean waters, i.e., Kline's original view. A. Dillman (1892), W.F. Albright (1939), E.A. Speiser (1955), Francis I. Andersen (1987), Gerhard F. Hasel, and Michael G. Hasel (2000) have defended this interpretation. Andersen asserted, "Efforts to prove that Genesis 2:6 is a scientific description of the process of evaporation from both land and water are completely misguided." Cf. Francis I. Andersen, "On Reading Genesis 1-3," in *Backgrounds for the Bible*, eds. M.P. O'Connor and D.N. Freedman (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1987), 139. For a comprehensive examination and discussion of the Hebrew 'ēd within the context of Genesis 2:6, cf. Gerhard F. Hasel and Michael G. Hasel, "The Hebrew Term 'Ed in Gen 2,6 and Its Connection in Ancient Near Eastern Literature," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 112, no. 3 (Oct. 2000): 321-340.

240. Kline, "Because It Had Not Rained," 151.

241. Ibid., 154.

242. Irons with Kline, "The Framework View," 224. Cf. also Kline, "Genesis," 82-83.

243. Ibid.

244. Noordtijz, *Gods Woord En Der Eeuwen Getuigenis: Het Oude Teswtament in Het Licht Der Oostersche Opgravingen*, 116 ff. As cited by Ridderbos, *Is There a Conflict between Genesis 1 and Natural Science?*, 32.

245. Ridderbos, *Is There a Conflict between Genesis 1 and Natural Science?*, 32-33.

246. In 1996, Kline further developed his understanding of the creation narrative of Genesis 1 with respect to the comprehensive phrase, "the heavens and the earth," as a "two-register cosmology" on analogy with the dualistic cosmology of the ANE creation myths. Kline stated, "Theological differences aside, the cosmology of mythology is analogous. Indeed, mythology may be defined formally precisely as a portrayal of human affairs in terms of a dynamic interrelating of divine and human realms." Kline, "Space and Time in the Genesis Cosmogony," 14, n. 3. Accordingly, Kline separated the two-tiered created order by what was created invisible and visible in accordance with Colossians 1:16. Irons elucidates, "The upper register is the invisible dwelling place of God and his holy angels, that is, heaven. The lower register is called 'earth,' but includes the whole visible cosmos from the planet Earth to the star-studded sky (Col. 1:16)." Irons

with Kline, "The Framework View," 237. As a result, Kline discerned the following pattern of the upper and lower registers in Genesis 1 (cf. Kline, "Space and Time in the Genesis Cosmogony," 6):

	<u>Verse 1</u>	<u>Verse 2</u>	<u>Days 1-6</u>	<u>Day 7</u>
<u>Upper Register</u>	heaven	Spirit	fiats	God's Sabbath
<u>Lower Register</u>	earth	deep	fulfillments	Sabbath Ordinance

Kline's two-register cosmology provided his explanation for how he understood Genesis 1 as being topical (or thematic), and yet, historical. The days are, therefore, topically arranged: days 1 and 4 = light and luminaries; days 2 and 5 = sky, seas and sea creatures, birds (two kingdoms and creature kings in an inverted parallelism); and days 3 and 6 = land, vegetation and animals, man. Thus, "Day 4 returns to the scene pictured on Day 1 to provide a more detailed explanation of *how* God produced daylight on the earth and separated the light from the darkness. This is what the framework interpretation maintains: Day 1 related the results; Day 4 goes back and informs us regarding the physical mechanism God employed to produce those results. That physical mechanism is, of course, our solar system." Irons with Kline, "The Framework View," 229-230. Therefore, Kline's non-literal hermeneutic of Genesis 1 combines the multivalent nature of the Hebrew word *yôm* with the dualistic cosmology of the ANE (i.e., upper and lower registers) in order to show that the time frame of the days along with their narrative sequence is not what is important in the chapter, but the Sabbath theology to which it points.

247. Irons with Kline, "The Framework View," 245.

248. Ibid.

249. Cf. Duncan and Hall, "The 24-Hour View," 37-38. Terence Fretheim also asserts, "*The references to the days of creation in Exodus 20:11 and 31:17 in connection with the Sabbath law make sense only if understood in terms of a normal seven-day week.* It should be noted that the references to creation in Exodus are not used as an analogy—that is, your rest on the seventh day ought to be like God's rest in creation. It is, rather, stated in terms of the imitation of God or a divine precedent that is to be followed: God worked for six days and rested on the seventh, and therefore you should do the same. Unless there is an exactitude of reference, the argument of Exodus does not work. . . . The occasional appeal to Hebrews 4 cannot be sustained, not least because the language is eschatological. The text simply does not address the question of the length of the seventh day of creation (though it might be noted that 'day' is used in the normal way in verses 7-8) or how the seventh day is related to God's eternal rest." Terence E. Fretheim, "Were the Days of Creation Twenty-Four Hours Long? Yes," in *The Genesis Debate: Persistent Questions About Creation and the Flood*, ed. Ronald F. Youngblood (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1990), 19-21 *passim*.

250. Kline, "Because It Had Not Rained," 154-155. On the eternality of the Sabbath, Henri Blocher underscored the fact that Jesus, who was accused of working on the Sabbath, claimed that the Father was working even until now, cf. John 5:17-19. "Jesus stresses, 'My Father worketh even until now' (RV); God's Sabbath, which marks the end of creation but does not tie God's hands, is therefore co-extensive with history. Our Lord

himself did not see the seventh day of Genesis as a literal day.” Blocher, *In the Beginning*, 56-57. John Collins believes that the days of Genesis 1 are broadly chronological, logically-ordered, and are of unspecified length (since they are “God’s workdays” which are understood to be analogous to human work), as seen in the eternal nature of the Sabbath. Cf. C. John Collins, *Genesis 1-4: A Linguistic, Literary, and Theological Commentary* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 2006), 122-129.

251. Kline, “Because It Had Not Rained,” 156.

252. Evangelical, “young-earth creationists” like Whitcomb and Morris have emphasized the “appearance of age” in every created thing, including atoms, rocks, man, and the universe itself. “If God actually created anything at all, even the simplest atoms, those atoms or other creations would necessarily have an appearance of *some* age. There could be no *genuine* creation of any kind, without an initial appearance of age inherent in it. . . . there is no reason why He could not, in full conformity with His character of Truth, create a whole universe full-grown.” John C. Whitcomb and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood: The Biblical Record and Its Scientific Implications* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1961), 238. Antithetically, Davis A. Young, a Christian geologist and the son of Edward J. Young, challenges “mature creationists” by noting that, “Complex fossil remains exists in rocks that are nearly one billion years in age. Very simple one-celled fossil organisms have been discovered in rocks in excess of two billion years of age. . . . The mature creationist must find some explanation for these enormous ages of fossiliferous rocks.” Davis A. Young, “Some Practical Geological Problems in the Application of the Mature Creation Doctrine,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 35, no. 3 (Spring 1973): 278-279. Noll adds that creation science is not real science, but an unwarranted dogmatism that is projected onto our understanding of the created order: “By holding so determinedly to our beliefs concerning how we concluded God had made nature, we evangelicals forfeited the opportunity to glorify God for the way he had made nature. In a mirror reaction to the zealous secularists of the twentieth century, evangelicals have gone back to thinking that we must shut up one of God’s books if we want to read the other one.” Noll, *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind*, 199. Cf. Whitcomb’s review of Young’s article in John C. Whitcomb, Jr., “The Science of Historical Geology: In the Light of the Biblical Doctrine of a Mature Creation,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 36, no. 1 (Fall 1973): 65-77; and Young’s rejoinder to Whitcomb in Davis A. Young, “Another Look at Mature Creationism” *Westminster Theological Journal* 37, no. 3 (Spring 1975): 384-389. Young also published a 2-part series entitled, “Scripture in the Hands of Geologists (Part One),” 49, no. 1 (Spring 1987): 1-34; and “Scripture in the Hands of Geologists (Part Two),” *Westminster Theological Journal* 49, no. 2 (Fall 1987): 257-304.

253. Kline, “Because It Had Not Rained,” 157.

254. Young, *Studies in Genesis One*, 50.

255. By contrast, E.J. Young’s son, Davis A. Young, in his *Westminster Theological Journal* article, “Scripture in the Hands of Geologists (Part Two),” rejected a literalistic reading of Genesis 1 based upon empirical scientific data. D.A. Young declared, “*In future wrestling with ‘geologically relevant’ texts such as Genesis 1-11, evangelical scholars will have to face the implications of the mass of geological data indicating that the earth is extremely old, indicating that death has been on earth long before man, and indicating that there has not been a global flood*” (295, emphasis original). He further declared, “Any approach to creation [e.g., mature creationism] which entails creation of illusory history ultimately undermines all scientific effort and should be rejected by the

evangelical community" (302). As a result of his scientific views of creation, D.A. Young (with the aid of Old Testament scholar, John Stek) in 1987 proposed the following reading of Genesis 1, and anticipates Kline's two-register cosmology (which he published in 1996): "The decrees of the divine King are recorded as a set of 'minutes' or 'transactions' by analogy with the decrees of earthly kings. Thus we may view the days not as the first seven earthly days or periods of time, but as 'days' of royal divine action in the heavenly realm. If we receive an impression of chronology from the chapter, it is a divine 'chronology,' not an earthly one. Perhaps God's creative work is portrayed in the form of a group of seven days to signify completeness and perfection, thus establishing the weekly pattern of six days of work and one day of rest for Israel as a copy of the divine 'week'" (255).

256. Young, *Studies in Genesis One*, 51.

257. Ibid.

258. Ibid., 53.

259. Ibid.

260. Ibid., 54.

261. Ibid., 53. Cf. Cornelius Van Til, *The Defense of the Faith* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1955). John Frame, a former student and successor to Van Til at Westminster, helpfully explains the concept of "the noetic effects of sin" in the following manner: "The fall means that all our decisions and actions are directed against God rather than motivated by the desire to glorify him. Thinking is one of those actions. Just as there is godly thinking, trying to think God's thoughts after him, so, as a consequence of the fall, there is universal ungodly thinking, rejecting God's revelation and seeking to oppose his plan for us. Hence the biblical antithesis between the wisdom of the world and the wisdom of God (the Book of Proverbs; 1 Cor. 1:18-2:16)." Frame, "Cornelius Van Til," 164.

262. Young, *Studies in Genesis One*, 53.

263. Ibid., 54.

264. Ibid.

265. Ibid.

266. Ibid., 59-60.

267. Ibid., 61.

268. Ibid., 61-63.

269. Ibid., 63, n. 51.

270. Ibid., 63.

271. Ibid., 64. Young rejected the notion that the נֹתָר referred to a mist that arose from the ground (in a global sense) which then produced enough evaporation for rainfall, since it was "difficult to understand how it [the process of evaporation] could have provided rainfall sufficient for the entire earth. And if the reference is local, how can evaporation have arisen from a land in which there had been no rain or dew, and how on this interpretation can Genesis 2:5 be fitted into the third day of Genesis 1? These considerations support the view that the נֹתָר designates subterranean waters, waters which may have entered the earth when the division between seas and dry land was made" (65, n. 54).

272. Cf. the argument of C. John Collins who asserts that the events of Genesis 2:5-7 took place on the "sixth day," but that "this event on the sixth day took place some unknown number of years after the plants first sprouted on the third day." Collins,

*Genesis 1-4*, 127. Collins views the נָשָׁה, similar to Kline and Futato, as a mist or “rain cloud,” but harmonizes Genesis 2:5-7 with the chronology of Genesis 1:1-2:3 similar to Young.

273. Young, *Studies in Genesis One*, 65.

274. Cf. for example, Young’s earlier literary analysis of Genesis 1 in his *Introduction* (1949, 1958, 1960, 1964) which, interestingly enough, included the parallel triadic structure: “The work creation of is comprised in a hexameron, or period of six days, coming to a majestic climax in the resting of the Creator on the seventh day. The length of these days is not stated but a certain correspondence between some of them may be observed: Thus:

- |                                  |                  |
|----------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Light                         | 4. Luminaries    |
| 2. Firmament, division of waters | 5. Birds, fishes |
| 3. Dry land, vegetation          | 6. Animals, man  |

The name *Elohim* is particularly appropriate for this chapter, since the chapter exalts God as the mighty Creator.” Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 48.

275. Young, *Studies in Genesis One*, 70.

276. Ibid., 70-73. Young further clarified, “The light and the darkness between which the light-bearers are to make a division are already present. They have manifested themselves in the evening and morning which closed each day. How a division was hitherto made between them we are not told; it is merely stated that God divided between them (1:4). From the fourth day on, however, the division between them is to be made by light-bearers” (96, emphasis original).

277. Ibid., 72-73.

278. Since the modernist-fundamentalist controversy of the 1920s, fundamentalists have largely come under criticism for their overly literal interpretation of the Bible without due regard to the different genres found in biblical literature. This is especially evident in their interpretation of prophetic texts. “It has been pointed out more than once that the pronounced literalism in exegesis of prophetic and apocalyptic passages of many of the Fundamentalists contradicts the very allegorical way in which they interpret the Tabernacle, its priesthood and its offerings. In addition to this in many of their devotional commentaries they unconsciously or unwittingly do a great deal of allegorizing or spiritualizing in order to discover the devotional possibility of a text of Scripture.” Bernard Ramm, *Protestant Biblical Interpretation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1970), 147, n. 5.

279. Ramm, *Protestant Biblical Interpretation*, 146-147.

280. On Young’s stance on genre and authorial intent, Longman notes, “It [The Bible] does not require a literal interpretation but a grammatical-historical interpretation that seeks the author’s intention and takes into account the genre of the text in order to discern that intention (Young 1963, 138). While he was open to the question of genre, he strongly defended the historicity of the biblical text in those cases where he discerned a historical intention on the part of the author.” Longman, “Young, E (dward) J (oseph) (1907-1968),” 1070.

281. Young, *Studies in Genesis One*, 73.

282. O.T. Allis also recognized that biblical narratives could be *dischronologized* for literary purposes. He noted, “One of the noteworthy features of Biblical narration—a feature which is by no means limited to sacred literature—is the tendency to complete a

topic or subject, carrying it forward to its conclusion or a logical stopping-place and then to return to the point of departure and resume the main thread of the narrative." Allis, *Its Claims and Its Critics*, 97. As cited by Irons with Kline, "The Framework View," 221. Irons with Kline, correctly cite Genesis 2 as an example of a specific type of dischronologization known as "temporal recapitulation." They agree with Young that, "Moses recapitulates the placement of man in the garden to provide more detailed information about his covenant probation as it relates to the tree of the knowledge of good and evil." Irons with Kline, "The Framework View," 223.

283. Young, *Studies in Genesis One*, 74.

284. Ibid., 74-75.

285. Green, *The Unity of the Book of Genesis*, 23. Young cited Green: "Cf. W.H. Green: *The Unity of the Book of Genesis*, New York, 1895, pp. 7-36, for an excellent discussion of the nature of Genesis 2." Young, *Studies in Genesis One*, 74, n. 69.

286. Green, *The Unity of the Book of Genesis*, 24-25. Green interestingly anticipated and addressed some of Kline's arguments for a non-chronological view of Genesis 1 in favor of a chronological reading of Genesis 2:5-7: "The suggestion that if the land had just emerged from the water, rain would not be needed, leaves out of view that according to i., 9, 10, the separation of land and water was complete, and the earth was dry land, before any plants appeared upon its surface. A well-watered garden with ever-flowing streams was to be the abode of man; in anticipation of this it was natural to refer to the need of rain. And there is no implication that man was made prior to the existence of vegetation, contrary to i. 12, 27." Ibid, 22-23.

287. Young, *Studies in Genesis One*, 76.

288. Young interpreted Genesis 1:1 as an independent clause (as opposed to the view that v. 1 is a dependent clause with בְּאֵשׁ taken to be in construct with the following verb בָּרַא, [Qal/G stem, third person, masculine, singular] which has been emended as an infinitive construct בְּרֹא and rendering the translation of v. 1 as: "When God began to create the heaven and the earth.") as the declaration of the beginning of "absolute creation." Young believed that v. 1 was a complete narrative and stood independently of vv. 2-31. Hence, according to Young, "Verse two then states the [chaotic] condition of the earth as it was when created and until God began to form from it the present world." Ibid., 11.

289. Ibid., 104.

290. Ibid.

291. Allis, *God Spake By Moses*, 10 f. As cited by Young, *Studies in Genesis One*, 102, fn. 116.

292. While defending the historicity of the book of Genesis, W.H. Green of Old Princeton did not hold to a literalist understanding of the genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11, in opposition to Ussher and Lightfoot who contended that Adam was born in 4004 B.C. Green held that the antiquity of man as well as of the earth could not be computed by adding up the respective genealogies in Genesis. Rather, Green asserted that the genealogies of Genesis were compressed, thereby allowing for much longer human and geological age spans. Hence, Green vindicated the discoveries and investigations of modern science in relation to anthropology and geology. Cf. William Henry Green, "Primeval Chronology," *Bibliotheca Sacra* (April 1890): 285-303. With respect to the meaning of the creation "days," Green believed that the term "day" was synonymous with the word "time." Green wrote, "The form of expression, 'In the day that Jehovah

God made earth and heaven,' has given occasion to cavil, as though that was here assigned to one day, which ch. i. divides between the second and third creative days. It might as well be said that Num. iii. 1, 'In the day that Jehovah spake unto Moses in Mount Sinai' implies that all the revelations given to Moses at Sinai were made within the compass of a single day; or that 'the day of adversity' means a period of twenty-four hours. The use of 'day,' in the general sense of 'time,' is too familiar to require further comment." Green, *The Unity of the Book of Genesis*, 22. Standing on his colleague's shoulders, B.B. Warfield argued that Genesis should not be taken in a woodenly-literal fashion. Noll and Livingston write, "It is crucial to underscore that Warfield's architectonic defense of biblical inerrancy did not prevent him from adopting a non-literal interpretation of the early Genesis narratives . . . Although Warfield wrote extensively on human origins, he believed that the issue of the antiquity of the human race was theologically neither interesting nor significant [cf. B.B. Warfield, "On the Antiquity of the Unity of the Human Race," *Princeton Theological Review* 9 (1911): 1-25; reprinted in *The Works of Benjamin B. Warfield*, Vol. 9: *Studies in Theology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1932; Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth, 1988), 235-260]. M.A. Noll & D.A. Livingston, "Introduction: B.B. Warfield as a Conservative Evolutionist," in B. B. Warfield, in *Evolution, Science, and Scripture: Selected Writings*, eds. Mark A. Noll and David A. Livingston (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2000), 39.

From Westminster, Allan MacRae also held that the days of Genesis 1 were not literal 24-hour days, but indeterminate periods of time in which God performed his creative activity. MacRae explained, "the word day really indicates simply a period of time. It is very commonly used for a twenty-four hour period, but this by no means exhausts its uses. Which use is involved in the six days of Genesis 1 is nowhere clearly stated . . . the terms evening and morning are used figuratively, and simply mean beginning and ending. Evening is the end of a period of light. Clearly the first day could not begin with the end of a period of light . . . If He chose, God could have speeded up the process so that a tree would grow as much in twenty-four hours as it normally does in a hundred years, if He chose. . . . The natural interpretation of the passage is a process which might easily have consumed thousands or millions of years." Allan A. MacRae, "The Principles of Interpreting Genesis 1 and 2," *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society* 2 (Fall 1959): 4-5 passim.

293. Oswald Thompson Allis, *God Spake by Moses: An Exposition of the Pentateuch* (Nutley: NJ, Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1958), 11.

294. Young, *Studies in Genesis One*, ii.

295. Ibid., 101.

296. Ibid., 104. On the sequential ordering of the "days" of Genesis 1, Young emphatically stated, "The six days are to be understood in a chronological sense, that is, one day following another in succession. This fact is emphasized in that the days are designated, one, two, three, etc." (103).

297. Ibid., 105.

298. Ibid.

299. Ibid.

300. Longman, who is known for his expertise in literary approaches, deems Young as literally insensitive. Longman observes, "He [Young] was not particularly sensitive to the literary style of the biblical authors." Longman, "Young, E (dward) J (oseph) (1907-1968)," 1071.

301. Edward J. Young, "Book Review: Sigmund Mowinckel's *Prophecy and Tradition: The Prophetic Books in the Light of the Study of the Growth and History of the Tradition*," *Westminster Theological Journal* 11, no. 1 (Nov. 1948): 84.

302. Cf. George E. Mendenhall, "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition," *Biblical Archaeologist* 17, no. 2 (1954): 50-76.

303. Young, *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today*, 62-63. By the end of Young's career, however, he apparently changed his thinking with respect to the formal covenantal similarities between the Hittite treaties and those found in the Hebrew Bible. Meredith Kline's influential study regarding the generic parallels between the covenant shape of the book of Deuteronomy and the Hittite suzerainty treaties most likely convinced Young. In 1965, Young, citing the work of Kline, wrote, "The Hittite suzerainty treaties began with an appeal to the elements. This same framework is found in Deut. when the sovereign God approaches the people to give to them His covenant. The value of these formal similarities with Scripture is that they tend to support the early date of Deut. . . . Cf. Huffmon, 'The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets,' *J [Journal of Biblical] Literature*, December, 1959, Part IV, pp. 285-95; Kline, *Treaty of the Great King*, Grand Rapids, 1963." Young, *The Book of Isaiah*, 1: 36, n. 21.

304. Kline distinguishes between, what he regards as, negative and proper criticism. He writes, "It [negative criticism] has tried to trace the Old Testament books back into a pre-history of specific source units and generic types by the methods of divisive literary analysis and a fragmentizing abuse of form criticism, while by tradition-history techniques it has sought to explain the growth of supposed oral source units towards a late literary redaction. Little if anything in these reconstructed developments could be regarded as belonging directly to the 'canonization' of the literature involved. The discussion of the formation of the canon was separated from all the analysis for both logical and chronological reasons . . . [Rather] the nature and schema of the divine covenants account for both the authority quality of the Old Testament and to a large extent at least for the literary genres in which it took shape." Meredith G. Kline, "Book Review: Gleason L. Archer, Jr.'s *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*," *Westminster Theological Journal* 29, no. 1 (November 1966): 62. Hence, Kline's approach was to view the Old Testament canon within the framework or unifying concept of "the covenant."

305. Kline averred, "In fact, the customary critical seventh-century dating of Deuteronomy has been supported by appeal to some points of close correspondence in detail, specifically in certain series of curses, with seventh-century Assyrian treaties. On this matter, I would mention at once that the existence of the distinction between earlier and later forms of treaties and Deuteronomy's use of the second-millennium form have been cogently argued by K.A. Kitchen (cf. K.A. Kitchen, *Ancient Orient and Old Testament* (Chicago, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1966), 90-102.), who had independently arrived at an analysis of the treaty structure of Deuteronomy practically the same as mine." Meredith G. Kline, *The Structure of Biblical Authority* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972), 9. However, the 2nd millennium B.C. dating of Deuteronomy based upon its covenant, treaty form has been widely debated. For a concise overview of the debate, cf. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 207-208.

306. Meredith G. Kline, *Treaty of the Great King: The Covenant Structure of Deuteronomy: Studies and Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1963), 28. While Mendenhall had recognized the suzerainty treaty form in the Decalogue and in Joshua 24, he failed to apply it to the book of Deuteronomy. Kline stated, "Unfortunately, too, the

covenant described in Joshua 24 has been interpreted [by Mendenhall] on the horizontal level of a confederation of the twelve tribes with one another in an amphictyonic alliance rather than vertically as a renewal of Yahweh's lordship over the long since established theocracy. The very parallelism of the Joshua 24 covenant with the secular suzerainty treaties, as well as its clear continuity with and its obvious presupposing of the earlier Mosaic covenants [i.e., Decalogue; Deuteronomy], contradicts the interpretation of this event as the founding of the twelve tribe system in Israel" (*Ibid.*, n. 6).

307. But Kline's conservative, and often dogmatic, form-critical insights were not well-received within critical Old Testament scholarship. B.S. Childs, a well-known canonical scholar, commented, "Kline's basically dogmatic formulation of the history of the canon in terms of a divine inspiration which assured an inerrant transmission of the Word of God (23) reflects completely the pre-Semler, seventeenth-century understanding which has not even seen the historical problem. These issues are too complex simply to circumscribe by a strictly theological definition. Therefore, in spite of some excellent insights, the total impact of the book [*The Structure of Biblical Authority*] misses the intended goal." Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 56.

Childs' critique of Kline's dogmatic adherence to biblical inspiration derives from Kline's starting point in the authority of canonical Scripture: "The [covenant] community is inextricably bound up in the reality of canonical Scripture. The concept of covenant-canon requires a covenant community. Though the community does not confer canonical authority on the Scriptures, Scripture in the form of constitutional treaty implies the community constituted by it and existing under its authority. Canonical authority is not derived from community, but covenant canon connotes covenantal community." Kline, *The Structure of Biblical Authority*, 90. Conversely, Childs centers the canonical authority of the Scriptures not within Scripture itself but within the covenant community: "To take the canonical shape of these texts seriously is to seek to do justice to a literature which Israel transmitted as a record of God's revelation to his people along with Israel's response. The canonical approach to the Hebrew Bible does not make any dogmatic claims for the literature apart from the literature itself, as if these texts contained only timeless truths or communicated in a unique idiom, but rather it studies them as historically and theologically conditioned writings which were accorded a normative function in the life of this community." Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 73.

308. William Dyrness, *Themes in Old Testament Theology* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1979), 116.

309. Silva, "A Half-Century of Reformed Scholarship," 251. In this way, Young followed in the Old Princetonian-Westminster tradition in the mode of Robert Dick Wilson.

310. Cf. Tremper Longman, "Evangelicals and the Comparative Method," in *Creator Redeemer Consummator: A Festschrift for Meredith G. Kline*, eds. H. Griffith and J.R. Muether (Greenville, SC: Reformed Academic Press, 2000), 33-42. Iain Duguid correctly suggests that it is proper to say that there was a stark decrease in Kline's use of form criticism and critical scholarship after his book, *The Structure of Biblical Authority*, which was published in 1972 by Eerdmans. His earlier works, *By Oath Consigned* (Eerdmans, 1968) and *Treaty of the Great King* (Eerdmans, 1963), are clearly dependent upon and interactive with academic scholarship. However, his later works including *Images of the Spirit* (Baker Book House, 1980) and *Kingdom Prologue* (self-published 1981, South Hamilton, MA; reprinted by Wipf & Stock, 2006), et al., are more biblical-

theological in orientation and less dependent upon form criticism and interaction with biblical scholarship. This is made obvious in the fact that in his recent works, he does not cite other academic sources in his footnotes. Kline did, however, continue to use the comparative method in his works when attempting to bring out the ancient Near Eastern parallels and background of relevant Old Testament texts and concepts. Iain Duguid, personal correspondence to the author, May 15, 2008.

311. Kline's use of form criticism was unique to the Old Testament curriculum at Westminster Seminary, Philadelphia. Neither Allis nor Young had made use of the discipline. However, there is good reason to suspect that Kline had been influenced by his former New Testament professor and later colleague, Ned B. Stonehouse. Stonehouse's use of redaction criticism with the Gospels may have inspired Kline's use of form criticism within the Pentateuch. Silva expatiates, "While redaction criticism was formed in the womb of historical scepticism of the most severe kind, Stonehouse's [redactional] work was designed to strengthen confidence in the historical reliability of the gospels!" Moisés Silva, "Ned B. Stonehouse and Redaction Criticism: Part I: The Witness of the Synoptic Evangelists to Christ," *Westminster Theological Journal* 40, no. 1 (Fall 1977): 78. Analogously, Kline utilized form criticism to encourage confidence that the books of Exodus and Deuteronomy belonged to the Mosaic period, and therefore, should be considered historically trustworthy. In fact, Kline dedicated his first published book on the form criticism of the book of Deuteronomy to his late teacher, Ned B. Stonehouse. Cf. Kline, *Treaty of the Great King*, v.

312. Silva, "A Half-Century of Reformed Scholarship," 251.

313. Carl Armerding cites Kline's works on Deuteronomy (*The Treaty of the Great King* [1963] and *The Structure of Biblical Authority* [1975]) as an example of evangelical scholarship utilizing form criticism to make a fruitful contribution to biblical studies. Armerding writes, "Evangelicals have profited greatly from form-critical studies in the Psalms, and have themselves contributed several major form-critical studies, especially in Deuteronomy." See Carl E. Armerding, *The Old Testament and Criticism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1983), 18, n. 14.

314. *Studies in Isaiah* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1954).

315. Edward J. Young, "The Interpretation of יְהוָה in Isaiah 52:15," *Westminster Theological Journal* 3, no. 2 (May, 1941): 125-132; idem, "The Study of Isaiah Since the Time of Joseph Addison Alexander, part I," *Westminster Theological Journal* 9, no. 1 (November, 1946): 1-30; idem, "The Study of Isaiah Since the Time of Joseph Addison Alexander, part II," *Westminster Theological Journal* 10, no. 1 (November, 1947): 23-56; idem, "The Study of Isaiah Since the Time of Joseph Addison Alexander, part III," *Westminster Theological Journal* 10, no. 2 (May, 1948): 23-56; idem, "Of Whom Speaketh the Prophet This?," *Westminster Theological Journal* 11, no. 2 (May, 1949): 135-155; idem, "The Origin of the Suffering Servant Idea," *Westminster Theological Journal* 13, no. 1 (November, 1950): 19-33; idem, "The Immanuel Prophecy Isaiah 7:14-16, part I," *Westminster Theological Journal* 15, no. 2 (May, 1953): 97-124; idem, "The Immanuel Prophecy Isaiah 7:14-16, part II," *Westminster Theological Journal* 16, no. 1 (November, 1953): 23-50.

316. On the life of Joseph Addison Alexander, cf., J.H. Moorhead, "Joseph Addison Alexander: Common Sense, Romanticism, and Biblical Criticism at Princeton," *Journal of Presbyterian History* 53 (1975): 51-66; Thomas H. Olbricht, "Isaiah at Princeton One Hundred Fifty Years Ago and Now: Joseph Addison Alexander (1809-1860) and J.J.M. Roberts (1939-)," in *David and Zion: Biblical Studies in Honor of J.J.M. Roberts*, eds.

B.N. Batto and K.L. Roberts (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004), 388, n. 5.; idem, "Joseph Addison Alexander," *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*, ed. J.H. Hayes (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1999), 24-25; Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School*, 89-166.

317. Olbricht affirms, "It [Alexander's commentary] was by far the most erudite American commentary up to the time of its publication, as well as the most scholarly commentary on Isaiah by an English-speaking author." Olbricht, "Isaiah at Princeton," 389. Childs notes, "His [Alexander's] commentary represents the most complete and scholarly commentary on Isaiah in the English-speaking world during the mid-nineteenth century. Although Alexander was far less imaginative than [E.W.] Hengstenberg and in general would have been considered his epigone, he does offer an impressive thorough response to the historical critics' interpretation of Isaiah." Brevard S. Childs, *The Struggle to Understand Isaiah as Christian Scripture* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004), 266. Olbricht clarifies that Alexander's two-volume set on Isaiah, "Joseph Addison Alexander, The Earlier Prophecies of Isaiah (New York: Wiley and Putnam, 1846), and The Later Prophecies of Isaiah (New York: Wiley and Putnam, 1847)," was subsequently, "edited by John Eadie and republished as one volume under the title *Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah* (New York: Scribner, 1867); this later work in turn has been reissued [under the title *Commentary on Isaiah*], with a new introduction by Merrill C. [sic] Unger, by Kregel (Grand Rapids, 1992)." Olbricht, "Isaiah at Princeton," 387, n. 2.

318. Young wrote, "Alexander, as is evident, was not merely a linguist but a philologian, and his wide knowledge admirably fitted him for writing Biblical commentaries. He possessed, however, certain other qualifications which are indispensable for one who would expound the Scriptures. He had, as Charles Hodge pointed out, a sincere and humble piety coupled with firm faith in the Bible and reverence for the Bible as the Word of God." Young, *Studies in Isaiah*, 10. Young added, "Alexander's commentary is marked, by its fidelity to the Bible as the Word of God and by its consistent defense of supernaturalism." Ibid., 12.

319. Ibid., 15-16. The page numbers recorded by Young correspond to Alexander's *The Later Prophecies of Isaiah* (1847).

320. Ibid., 16.

321. Ibid., 17.

322. On the life and work of F. Hitzig, see Cheyne, *Founders of Old Testament Criticism*, 119-127; Rogerson, *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century*, 134-136. On Hitzig's work on Isaiah, Childs comments, "Ferdinand Hitzig (1833) offered a brilliant and radical application of a historical-critical literary analysis of Isaiah. He called into question many easy assumptions of Isaiah's literary unity as he exacerbated the presence of contradiction and tension within the prophetic text. In his highly subjective but remarkably imaginative commentary, he unearthed a host of problems previously unseen. Throughout his distinguished career he remained extremely hostile to traditional Christian interpretation, which he regarded as an enemy to genuine exegesis." Childs, *The Struggle to Understand Isaiah as Christian Scripture*, 265-266.

323. Young, *Studies in Isaiah*, 17.

324. Bernard Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaja* (Göttingen, 1892). Young documented that this same work also appeared as *Die prophetischen Bücher*, III. Abtheilung, I. Band, in the *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament*, which was edited by W. Nowack. Later editions were published in 1901, 1914, and 1922. Cf. Ibid., 39, n. 1.

325. Young presented a helpful summary of the growing scholarly consensus for a "Second" or "Deutero"-Isaiah. Accordingly, Young noted that August Knobel's commentary, *Der Prophet Jesaja erklärt* (edited by Ludwig Diestel) "robbed the eighth-century prophet of much of his work." Knobel's commentary, indeed, but represented the general attitude toward the authorship of Isaiah which was gaining greater prominence. The figure of the 'Second' Isaiah, the great 'Unknown' of the Babylonian exile, was looming larger and larger upon the horizon of Biblical scholarship." Ibid., 33. Young also displayed much fairness in his attitude toward the critics such as found in his review of T.K. Cheyne's work, *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, which appeared in 1880. Young praised Cheyne for his independent attitude, his restrain toward textual problems, and his reserved stance toward the existence of second Isaiah. Young commented, "The present writer does not hesitate to pronounce the commentary of 1880 a truly valuable contribution that must be taken into account in any serious study of the great eighth-century prophet." Young, *Studies in Isaiah*, 35. Young concludes this section leading up to Duhm with the works of Stade and G.A. Smith, cf. ibid., 36-38.

Young's starting point with Alexander is curious, since there were precursors to the modern study of Isaianic scholarship before Alexander's work. In his later work on Isaiah (1958), Young properly begins with Bishop Robert Lowth (1780), then Johann Christoph Doederlein (1789), Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (1819), Wilhelm Gesenius (1819), George Adam Smith (1888, 1890), and Bernhard Duhm (1892). Cf. Young, *Who Wrote Isaiah?*, 15-20. According to John F.A. Sawyer, Duhm's critical work on Isaiah was the culmination of many authors who are considered pioneers of modern biblical scholarship. "Most of the new scholars working on the biblical texts were Christians or at any rate working within the Christian tradition, even those were radical critics of it. This is surely one reason why so many of the pioneers of modern biblical scholarship, such as the Dutch Calvinist Campegius Vitringa (c. 1659-1722), the Anglican bishop Robert Lowth (1710-1787), the German orientalist and lexicographer Gesenius (1786-1842), and Bernhard Duhm (1847-1928), published outstanding single works on Isaiah." John F.A. Sawyer, *The Fifth Gospel: Isaiah in the History of Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 177-178.

326. According to Young, the post-Duhm era brought forth a spate of works, including those of: A.B. Davidson (e.g., "The Theology of Isaiah" in *The Expository Times*, vol. V [1893-1894]: 296-298, 369-374, 291-196, 438-442, 488-492; vol. VI [1894-1895]: 9-13), J. Skinner (two-volume commentary on Isaiah in *The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges* published in 1896 and 1898), Gerhard Füllkrug (*Der Gottesknecht des Deuterojesaja*, Göttingen, 1899), Karl Marti (*Das Buch Jesaja*, Tübingen, 1900), Robert H. Kenneth (*The Composition of the Book of Isaiah in the Light of History and Archaeology*, London, 1910), G.W. Wade (*The Book of the Prophet Isaiah with Introduction and Notes*, London, 1911, rev. ed. 1929), G. Buchanan Gray (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah I-XXXIX* [*The International Critical Commentary*], New York, 1912), T.K. Cheyne (*The Mines of Isaiah Re-Explored*, London, 1912), and Oswald T. Allis ("The Transcendence of Jehovah God of Israel: Isaiah XLIV: 24-28" in *Biblical and Theological Studies by the Members of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary*, New York, 1912), 579-634. Young also dealt at length with various form-critical studies on the book of Isaiah in a separate third chapter, see Ibid, 73-101.

327. According to Young, Duhm's internal criticism of Isaiah took the following logical progression. Duhm held that 2 Chronicles 36:22 ff. (= Ezra 1:1-4) clearly

attributed the Cyrus prophecy of Isaiah 44:28 to Jeremiah. At this juncture, Isaiah 40-66 was not reckoned as being of Isaianic authorship. The actual book of Isaiah concluded with chapter 39. However, Duhm believed that not all of chapters 1-39 were from Isaiah because 2 Chronicles 32:32 quoted Isaiah 36-39 as originating from the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel. Since the Chronicler was not fond of referring to Samuel and Kings, the Chronicler would appeal to secondary sources whenever possible. In this particular case, however, the author of Chronicles did not do so. Therefore, Duhm regarded chapters 36-39 as having been interpolated by the same redactor who collated chapters 1-35 into their present form. Within chapters 1-35, chapters 13-23 form a separate section because these prophecies bear the heading קְרֵב a title that does not appear elsewhere in the book. These chapters must have existed independently before being incorporated. Chapter 30:6 ff. must have also belonged to this group since this passage also bears the identical title. On the one hand, Duhm regarded chapters 1-12 as having a special heading (1:1) and a conclusion. This collection must have, therefore, had its own compositional history. On the other hand, Duhm thought that chapters 24-35 were without a particular heading or epilogue and also appeared less clearly defined than the other sections. This collection was probably assembled and inserted into the book when the entire collection was assembled. Duhm, therefore, believed that there was a basic threefold division. Chapters 1-12 dealt with Judah and Jerusalem, chapters 13-23 concerned the foreign nations, and chapters 24-35 were eschatological. Duhm deemed that the present arrangement was based upon an identical schema as found in the LXX of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Duhm declared that Ezekiel was the originator of this scheme and was later imitated by the redactor who gave Isaiah 1-35 its present form. Young, *Studies in Isaiah*, 40-42.

328. Ibid., 44. Young rebutted that the best answer against Duhm's "process of splitting up the text is to work carefully through the Hebrew text of these twelve chapters with a determination to let the prophet to speak for himself." Young asserted, "The prophet may not present his message as we think he should, but this is no reason for denying that one man could have produced these prophecies. Duhm's procedure can lead only to chaos, and subsequent study of Isaiah has shown that this is precisely what it has done." Ibid., 45, n. 21.

329. According to Young, Duhm held that the author of these four Servant passages or poems "appears to have lived after the book of Job was written and before the book of Malachi, but probably not during the exile. Quite likely these poems belonged to an original work, and were written in the margins or in blank spaces in Deutero-Isaiah's prophecy." Ibid., 46-47.

330. Just three years prior to Duhm, George Adam Smith, in 1889 popularized a view that claimed that "deutero" Isaiah was the greatest of all the prophets. Young further noted, "He [Deutero-Isaiah] proclaimed a monotheism that was pure and robust indeed. In the figure of the second Isaiah, many [critics] asserted, the religion of Israel had reached a pinnacle of its development." However, with the advent of Duhm's theory, Young believed that Deutero-Isaiah was dethroned. Duhm limited Deutero-Isaiah's work to only chapters 40-55 and did not credit the four "Servant of the Lord" passages to him, but to some other ancient poet. So Young, *Who Wrote Isaiah?* 19. However, H.H. Rowley, similar to G.A. Smith, declared, "Deutero-Isaiah seems to have thought of the nation Israel as called to a world mission, and this would seem to belong closely to some of his most characteristic ideas. No writer attained so explicit and formulated a

monotheism before him." Harold H. Rowley, *The Growth of the Old Testament* (London: Hutchinson & Co., 1950), 98.

331. Young, *Studies in Isaiah*, 46.

332. Ibid., 47.

333. Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 192-193. While Young did list Alexander's work as one those whose works were influential to him, however, he personally claimed Drechsler's work [E.g., Moritz Drechsler, *Prophet Jesaja* (Berlin: Gustav Schlawitz, 1851)] as the most significant to his thinking. "Before me loom the names of Alexander, Delitzsch and Drechsler, and from another viewpoint, Rosenmüller and Gesenius. And behind them all stands Calvin. . . . To all these men I am greatly indebted, and in particular to Drechsler, whose work has deeply influenced me." Young, *The Book of Isaiah*, 1: viii. Young further commented, "Moritz Drechsler (1845, 1849) has written what in the present author's opinion is one of the greatest, if not the greatest, commentary on Isaiah. The work exhibits a remarkable insight into the meaning of the prophecy" (Ibid., 1: 491).

334. Young, *The Book of Isaiah*. The three-volume commentary was published in 1965 (Vol. I: Chapters 1-19), 1969 (Vol. 2: Chapters 10-39), and 1972 (Vol. 3: Chapters 40-66). The commentary is still in print with the latest reprint occurring in 2001 by the original publisher, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

335. Although Young did not live to see the second volume of his commentary on Isaiah published, he had completed the second volume as well as the manuscript for the third volume. He had also made arrangements with several authors to contribute to the NICOT series as General Editor. Ibid., 2: 7.

336. Both NICOT and The New International Commentary on the New Testament (NICNT) published by the Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company have become distinguished series of commentaries on the Old and New Testaments. The New Testament series was launched before the series on the Old Testament. NICNT was originally edited by the distinguished biblical scholar, F.F. Bruce.

337. John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1-39*, New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1986); idem, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40-66*, New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998).

338. Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 192. Oswalt's second volume is dedicated to the memory of R.K. Harrison. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40-66*, v. Hubbard writes, "Professor E.J. Young 'planted' it forty years ago, enlisting its first contributors and himself writing its first published volume. Professor R.K. Harrison 'watered' it, signing on other scholars and wisely editing everyone's finished products. As General Editor, my hands now tend their planting, and, true to Paul's words, through four decades God has indeed graciously '[given] the growth.'" Ibid, ix. On the life and work of Roland Kenneth Harrison, see J. Glen Taylor, "R.K. Harrison," in *Bible Interpreters of the 20th Century: A Selection of Evangelical Voices*, eds. W.A. Elwell and J.D. Weaver (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1999), 312-328.

339. Young, *The Book of Isaiah*, 1: vii. As noted by Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 192.

340. Young, *The Book of Isaiah*, 1: vii.

341. Compare the comments by the following reviewers on Young's preference of the MT against the LXX and the ancient versions: John J. Schmitt, "Book Review: E.J. Young's *the Book of Isaiah: The English Text, with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*,

Vol. 1 (Chapters 1-18)," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 35, no. 1 (1973): 128; Carroll Stuhlmueller, "Book Review: E.J. Young's *the Book of Isaiah: The English Text, with Introduction, Exposition and Notes*, Vol. 2 (Chapters 19-39)," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 32, no. 3 (1970): 488.

On the historical authority of the MT, Emanuel Tov writes, "For many centuries  $\pi$  [MT] has served as the most commonly used form of the Hebrew Bible, since it came to be accepted as authoritative by all Jewish communities from the second century CE [Common Era] onwards, at first in its consonantal form only, and after some centuries, in conjunction with its vocalization, accentuation, and the apparatus of Masoretic notes. Because of this acceptance, first of the proto-Masoretic text by a central stream in Judaism and later, of  $\pi$  by all sections of the Jewish people,  $\pi$  is attested in a very large number of sources. More than six thousand manuscripts belonging to the group of  $\pi$  are known; in addition, all printed editions of the Hebrew Bible are based on  $\pi$ ." Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 23. On the comparison between 1QIsa (i.e., the great Isaiah scroll from Cave 1 which was copied in approximately 100 B.C.) and the MT of Isaiah, James Vanderkam notes, "Despite the fact that the Isaiah scroll was about a thousand years older than the Masoretic version of Isaiah, the two were nearly identical except for small details that rarely affected the meaning of the text" (126). Although Vanderkam acknowledges that the large majority of the Qumran scrolls belong to the same textual tradition as the MT, there are cases where the LXX and MT disagree with the Qumran Hebrew manuscripts agreeing with the LXX and not the MT (127). However, in the case of the variations between 1QIsa and the MT of Isaiah, there are only slight modifications and no exceptional variations to report. According to Vanderkam, "One interesting variation occurs in Isa. 6:3. In the Masoretic Text, the seraphim in the heavenly throne room call to one another: 'Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts'; the Isaiah scroll reads: 'Holy, holy is the Lord of hosts.' In some instances the Isaiah scroll seemed superior, in others the Masoretic Text did . . . The large majority of the new scrolls do belong to the same textual tradition as the Masoretic Text." James C. Vanderkam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994), 126.

342. Young, *The Book of Isaiah*, 1: vii.

343. Ibid.

344. Ibid.

345. Ibid., 481-499.

346. Stuhlmueller, "Book Review: E.J. Young's *the Book of Isaiah: The English Text, with Introduction, Exposition and Notes*, Vol. 2 (Chapters 19-39)," 488.

347. John J. Schmitt, "Book Review: E.J. Young's *the Book of Isaiah: The English Text, with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*, Vol. 1 (Chapters 1-18)," 128.

348. D.F. Payne, "Book Review: E.J. Young's *the Book of Isaiah: The English Text, with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*, Vol. 1 (Chapters 1-18)," *Evangelical Quarterly* 40, no. 3 (1968): 177.

349. Stuhlmueller, "Book Review: E.J. Young's *the Book of Isaiah: The English Text, with Introduction, Exposition and Notes*, Vol. 2 (Chapters 19-39)," 487.

350. John J. Schmitt, "Book Review: E.J. Young's *the Book of Isaiah: The English Text, with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*, Vol. 1 (Chapters 1-18)," 128. Cf. also the positive comments by Francis I. Andersen although he did not agree with Young's conservative stances in "Book Review: E.J. Young's *The Book of Isaiah*, Vol. 1 (Chapters 1-18)," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 85 (Sept. 1966): 383.

351. Young, *The Book of Isaiah*, 1: vii.

352. Cf. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 202-211; idem, *Who Wrote Isaiah?* Cited by Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 193.

353. See, for example, Young, *The Book of Isaiah*, 1: 283-294. Cf. also his extensive treatment in his chapter, "The Immanuel Prophecy: Isaiah 7:14-16," in Young, *Studies in Isaiah*, 143-198.

354. Young, *The Book of Isaiah*, 1: 291.

355. Ibid., 1: 330-331.

356. Ibid., 1: 341.

357. Ibid.

358. *Westminster Theological Journal* 11, no. 2 (May 1949): 133-155.

359. *Westminster Theological Journal* 13, no. 1 (Nov. 1950): 19-33. Both articles were reprinted in his book, *Studies in Isaiah*.

360. Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 193. Allis surveyed the four commonly-held interpretations with respect to the identity of the "Servant of the Lord" quoting from Christopher R. North's comprehensive study on the subject (in Christopher R. North, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah: An Historical and Critical Study* [London: Oxford University Press, 1956]): "North tells us in his preface that there are at present only four interpretations which 'still hold the fort.' They are (1) the historical individual theory, 'that the Servant was an anonymous contemporary of the Second Isaiah, a man who the Prophet believed, was destined to be the Messiah'; (2) the autobiographical theory; (3) the collective [Israel] theory which he [North] finds to be most widely held in England; and (4) the Messianic theory (3ff)." Oswald Thompson Allis, *The Unity of Isaiah: A Study in Prophecy* (Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1950), 104, n. 4.

361. Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 193.

362. Young, *Isaiah Fifty-Three: A Devotional and Expository Study*, 91. Cited by Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 193.

363. Young, *The Book of Isaiah*, 3: 348.

364. Young, *Who Wrote Isaiah?*, 9.

365. The text of Matthew 3:3 is cited by Young. Ibid.

366. Ibid.

367. Ibid., 10.

368. Ibid.

369. Rolf Rendtorff elucidates, "Mowinckel [in Sigmund Mowinckel, *Prophecy and Tradition: The Prophetic Books in the Light of the Study of the Growth and History of the Tradition*, ANAO (Oslo: Dybwad, 1946)] strongly emphasized the inward cohesion of the three parts of the book of Isaiah by assuming the existence of an 'Isaiah school,' to which Deutero-Isaiah (the author of chaps. 40-55) belonged, chaps. 56-66 begin written by a group of Deutero-Isaiah's pupils. In this analysis he explicitly declared that the question about the literary development of the present book was less important; it played no part in his viewpoint, which was orientated toward 'tradition history.'" Rolf Rendtorff, *Canon and Theology*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993), 146-147. See also J.H. Eaton, "The Origin of the Book of Isaiah," *Vetus Testamentum* 9 (1959): 138-157.

370. Young, *Who Wrote Isaiah?*, 12. Adapted from Young's chart entitled "Summary of the New Testament Evidence." The chart was also published in Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 206.

371. C.R. North, however, cast doubt upon the New Testament's testimony as it relates to the authorship of Isaiah: "That Isaiah was believed to be the author of the whole book is clear from the NT (Matt. xii. 17; Acts viii. 30), but as if to indicate that NT writers could be mistaken, or, it may be, casual about such matters, in Mark i. 2—according to the best manuscripts—a passage from Mal. iii. 1 is quoted as from 'Isaiah the prophet.'" Christopher R. North, *The Second Isaiah: Introduction, Translation and Commentary to Chapters XI-LV* (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), 2.

372. Young, *Who Wrote Isaiah?*, 13.

373. J.A. Alexander described the New Testament's view of Isaiah as an authoritative Prophet inspired of God: "We have seen already that our Lord and his apostles cite the whole book of Isaiah with more frequency than any other part of the Old Testament. . . . The simple fact that he is there so often quoted, when connected with another undisputed fact, to wit, that his writings, even at that early date, held a conspicuous place among the *Sacred Scriptures* . . . of the Jews, would of itself create a strong presumption that our Lord and his apostles recognised his inspiration and divine authority." Joseph Addison Alexander, *Commentary on Isaiah*, reprint edition (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1992), 22. After outlining the New Testament evidence in favor of Isaianic unity, O.T. Allis wrote, "Such evidence indicates with sufficient clearness that none of the New Testament writers 'dreamt' that the name Isaiah was of doubtful or ambiguous meaning. Such facts as these should carry weight with every Christian who values the testimony of the New Testament." Allis, *The Unity of Isaiah*, 42-43. In regard to the defense of the unity of Isaianic authorship, Young was particularly indebted to Allis. Within the "Acknowledgments" page, Young wrote, "I should also like to acknowledge my general indebtedness to Dr. Oswald T. Allis who, through his masterful exposition of the Cyrus prophecy, first showed me that the New Testament view of the authorship of Isaiah can be intelligently defended." Young, *Who Wrote Isaiah?*, 6. Allan MacRae stated, "To the believer of an inerrant Bible, the fact that the New Testament quotes this section [i.e., Deutero-Isaiah] as well as the earlier part of the book as being the words of Isaiah would seem to settle the matter (cf. Rom 10:16, 21; 9:27, 29)." MacRae, *The Gospel of Isaiah*, 177.

374. Young, *Who Wrote Isaiah?*, 15. Young, however, left out a growing third group that moderated between the "believing" and "negative" critics. Carl Armerding has identified three groups, including Young's former two: 1) the "Traditional Conservative," which corresponds to Young's "believing critic," 2) the "Rational Critic," which corresponds with Young's "negative critic," and 3) the "Evangelical Critic," which stands between Young's "believing" and "negative" critics. Armerding, *The Old Testament and Criticism*, 7-9 *passim*.

Armerding accurately places E.J. Young among the "Traditional Conservative" group (see *ibid.*, 5, n. 6). He describes these scholars as "true conservatives, in the best sense of the word, [they] are persons whose scholarly training and apparatus are second to none; they simply believe, on the basis of a high view of Scripture, that questions of style, authorship, and date can be settled in favor of very traditional positions. They often know a great deal about history, archeology, philology, and science, but their views on the nature of the Bible invariably produce a rejection of any form of what they feel to be [a] destructive critical endeavor. Even when they argue on purely rationalistic grounds, their conclusions are predictably conservative. . . . the very limited use of critical tools results directly from a conviction that these tools have been employed to the advantage of a wrongheaded theology" (5).

375. Young incorrectly cited the passage in Sirach as 49:17-25. The correct citation is 48:17-25.

376. Young, *Who Wrote Isaiah?*, 27.

377. Ibid., 28.

378. Ibid.

379. Karl Budde, *Geschichte der altehebräischen Literatur* (Leipzig, 1906), 156-159.

380. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 208.

381. On the motivation of modern Old Testament scholars to identify an “Isaiah school,” Williamson writes, “[These scholars see] a much closer connection between the various parts of Isaiah by way of postulating an Isaianic school of disciples, to which the authors of each of the later parts belonged. In terms of the history of scholarship, this seems to have been the earlier proposal by those who denied authorial unity to attempt to account for the development of the book as we now have it on internal grounds rather than as the result of a mere juxtaposition of originally unrelated works.” H.G.M. Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah's Role in Composition and Redaction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 6. The major proponents of this view were: Sigmund Mowinckel, *Prophecy and Tradition: The Prophetic Books in the Light of the Study of the Growth and History of the Tradition* (Oslo, 1946), 67-70; D.R. Jones, “The Traditio of the Oracles of Isaiah of Jerusalem,” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 67 (1955): 226-246; J.H. Eaton, “The Origin of the Book of Isaiah,” *Vetus Testamentum* 9 (1959): 138-157.

382. Williamson rebuts Young’s claim that the final editor(s) committed an act of “pious fraud” by reversing the charge of deception against Young’s own view. Williamson asserts, “again despite objections, weight must still be given to the view that we should take seriously the historical standpoint which the writer presupposes for himself. S.R. Driver’s classic formulation of this argument bears repetition: ‘In the present prophecy there is no *prediction* of exile: the exile is not announced as something still future; it is *presupposed*, and only the *release* from it is *predicted*. By analogy, therefore, [that is, with Jeremiah and Ezekiel] the author will have lived in the situation which he thus presupposes, and to which he continually alludes’ [S.R. Driver, *Introduction*, 237]. To deny the force of this point by suggesting that, without indicating what he was doing, an earlier prophet projected himself fully into the standpoint of far later readers seems to introduce an element of deception into his work that I should be reluctant to concede; it would appear to be quite reprehensible as that of which conservative scholars accuse those who hold to multiple authorship with regard, for instance, to the heading in Isa. 1:1.” Ibid., 3.

383. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 208.

384. Edward J. Kissane, *The Book of Isaiah: Translated from a Critically Revised Hebrew Text with Commentary*, vol. II (Dublin, 1943), lxi.

385. Young, *Who Wrote Isaiah?*, 32.

386. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 209.

387. Ibid.

388. Ibid.

389. Ibid., 210.

390. Cf. Young, *Who Wrote Isaiah?*, 35-40.

391. A.B. Davidson wrote, “The portions of the Book of Isaiah which have been denied to be Isaiah’s are these: *first*, the whole of the great prophecy of the Restoration,

chaps. 40-66, and, *second*, many sections in the first 39 chapters, such as 13-14:23, 21:1-10, (chap. 23) 24-27, 34-35, and 36-39. The parts admitted to be genuine are chaps. 1-12, 15-20, part of 21, 22, 28-33,—in all, about 26 or 27 chapters out of a total of 66.” A.B. Davidson, *Old Testament Prophecy* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1905), 245. Cited by Allis, *The Unity of Isaiah*, 44. Allis further commented that George Adam Smith had also denied the Isaianic authorship of chaps. 13-14:23, 24-27, 34-35 because Smith saw them as “containing no reference to Isaiah himself nor to any Jewish king under whom he labored, and painting both Israel and the foreign world in quite a different state from that in which they lay during his lifetime.” Smith said of chap. 13, “Only one of the prophecies in question confirms the tradition that it is by Isaiah, viz., chap. xiii., which bears the title, *Oracle of Babylon which Isaiah the son of Amoz, did see.*” To counter this difficulty, Smith wrote, “but titles are themselves so much the report of tradition, being of a later date than the rest of the text, that it is best to argue the question apart from them.” So George Adam Smith, *The Book of Isaiah*, vol. II, revised edition (London: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1927), 403. Allis, however, challenged the subjectivity of Smith’s conclusions; “In other words, if a passage has no heading or title, the critic is at liberty to determine its date solely on the basis of his view as to its probable situation. If it has a title, that title is to be ignored if it conflicts with the critic’s decision as to the situation. It is this arbitrary treatment of the evidence which is one of the greatest defects in the professedly *scientific* and *objective* method of the critics. It proves that it is neither objective nor scientific, but on the contrary decidedly subjective and arbitrary.” Allis, *The Unity of Isaiah*, 15, n. 36.

392. Young, *Who Wrote Isaiah?*, 41.

393. Ibid., 42-43. For more extensive examples of Young’s view on the dependence of pre-exilic prophecies on Isaiah 40-66, see Young, *Who Wrote Isaiah?* 44-48.

394. Young, *Who Wrote Isaiah?*, 43.

395. Smith, *The Book of Isaiah*, 2: 9.

396. Recent moderate evangelicals such as H.G.M. Williamson and C.R. North have accepted the Deutero-Isaiah theory while accepting supernatural, predictive prophecy. See Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah*, 2; and North, *The Second Isaiah*, 2.

397. Allis, *The Unity of Isaiah*, 62-80. Allis’ fifth chapter in *The Unity of Isaiah* on the Cyrus prophecy was first proposed in Oswald T. Allis, “The Transcendence of Jehovah, God of Israel: Isaiah 44:24-28,” in *Biblical and Theological Studies*, ed. B.B. Warfield (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1912), 579-634.

398. Young, *Who Wrote Isaiah?* 52.

399. Ibid., 52-53.

400. Ibid., 53.

401. Ibid.

402. Ibid.

403. Ibid., 54.

404. Ibid.

405. Allis also had a second diagram to illustrate what he called “the special climax” of the poem:

Strophe I	3			
Strophe II	3	3		
Strophe III	3	3	3	

Allis commented, "This diagram makes it clear that extra climax in the last strophe is secured within the numerical structure of the poem. It gives us the normal climax, which is 3, 6, 9; but it does not indicate that within this numerical structure a shift of members has been made for the purpose of securing an additional and special climax at the close of the poem." Allis, *The Unity of Isaiah*, 69. This is what Allis meant by "numerico-climactic structure."

406. Young, *Who Wrote Isaiah?* 55.

407. Allis wrote against the critical interpretation of the poem: "it is not surprising, in fact it was only to be expected that those who regard the words of this poem as the utterance of a contemporary of Cyrus, should either ignore or fail to recognize the numerico-climactic structure of the poem, despite the fact that it is so clearly indicated, and should endeavor to give to it an entirely different form. The arrangement which they (e.g., Duhm, Cheyne, Marti) prefer makes of vv. 24-28 a poem of ten lines which is composed of two stanzas of five lines each (vv. 24-25, 26-28), and each line of which has two members (the so-called *Qinah* or Pentameter verse). The three main objections to this arrangement are: that it destroys the symmetrical climax of the poem, that it cannot be carried through without mutilating the text, and that the places where those who attempt to change the climactic arrangement into the uniform *Qinah* form would be sure to encounter difficulty in bringing this about." Allis, *The Unity of Isaiah*, 79. For a fuller critique of the *Qinah* poem of two stanzas, see Allis' "Appendix V" in the same work, 131-134.

408. See Stonehouse, *J. Gresham Machen*, 449-452. Cf. also Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 199.

409. Longman accurately notes, "Young was an early student and, though not part of the founding faculty, came early in enough in the school's history to be considered part of the first generation of faculty. In later years, when people considered the early history of Old Testament studies at Westminster, they often thought of [E.J.] Young even more than R.D. Wilson or [O.T.] Allis, since the former taught only for a short period of time and the latter left the seminary when Machen was defrocked from the Presbyterian church and formed a new denomination, the Orthodox Presbyterian Church." Longman, "Young, Edward Joseph (1907-1968)," 1071.

410. On anti-intellectualism and its propagation within the fundamentalist movement, Noll writes, "fundamentalism hurt the effort to use the mind for the glory of God and for a better understanding of the world he had made by indulging in new forms of anti-intellectualism." Noll, *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind*, 123.

411. Young noted, "We have simply sought to make it clear, since they themselves also emphasize this fact, that the Scriptures are from God. It is, we have contended, necessary to recognize the Divine origin of the Bible, and the implications of such recognition. It is likewise necessary and important to do full justice to what the Bible has to say about its human side." Young, *Thy Word Is Truth*, 65. Longman succinctly writes, "Young argued that the Bible had a human side." Longman, "Young, Edward Joseph (1907-1968)," 1070.

412. On Young's view of "negative" or "destructive criticism," see his second chapter, "A Brief Survey of Negative Critical Opinion," in Young, *Who Wrote Isaiah?* 15-26.

413. See Allis, *The Five Books of Moses*; Allis, *God Spake by Moses*; Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*.

414. Young, *The Messianic Prophecies of Daniel*, 8-9.

415. Longman, “Young, E (dward) J (oseph) (1907-1968),” 1070.
416. Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 64-65.
417. Ibid., 65, n. 12.
418. See footnote 37 above for an overview. The core of Young’s beliefs on the authorship and date of Ecclesiastes are in the 1949 edition of Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 349. The reference to the post-exilic date had been edited out in the 1964 revised edition. See Enns, “Bible in Context,” 209, n. 13.
419. Enns claims that Green had conceded the non-Solomonic authorship of Ecclesiastes and supposed a post-exilic date with respect to its origin. But Enns does not provide any of Green’s citations from either primary or secondary sources to where he had allegedly made such claims. See Enns, “Bible in Context,” 208.
420. Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School*, 204.
421. In his lectures at Westminster, Meredith G. Kline also taught the non-Solomonic authorship of Ecclesiastes. He noted, “Identity of Qoheleth: Ancient view identified him [i.e., author of Ecclesiastes] as Solomon. Neither conservative nor critical [scholars] hold it any longer. Hengstenberg: place of Eccl. in canon reflects early tradition indicating Solomon not regarded as author. Placed in exilic, post-exilic books among the Hagiographa, between Lamentations, [and] Esther. 1:1 [was] used in support of Solomonic authorship. But if Solomon [was] intended as [its] author, why not give his name, as so done in Proverbs, Canticles? Furthermore, [the] name [of] Solomon does not appear anywhere else in the book. However, that person portrayed (the hero) intended to be Solomon, is clear here. 1) In 1:12, [it] says [that he] was king over [all] Israel in Jerusalem. Only Solomon of all the descendants of David ruled over all Israel in Jerusalem. 2) 1:13 speaks of applying his heart to seek out wisdom. 3) 2:9 describes his great wealth, riches. 4) 12:9 says of Qoheleth he set in order many proverbs. What we claim then here is that Qoheleth is a fictional autobiography. This literary device was used among the Egyptians; not something new under the sun. Arguments in favor of non-Solomonic authorship: 1) [Solomon’s] Name [is] not mentioned in [the] book. 2) Although generally he is [the] hero in view, yet certain things indicate [that he was] not writing it himself, e.g., 1:12 says he was king. But his kingship never ended during his life. This argument [is] weak. Term could imply nothing as to SUBSEQUENT events; only reference to previous events. So too in 2:19, 1:16. 3) Days of author said to be inferior to former days—7:10. [The] Whole time of Eccles. doesn’t fit [the] time of Solomon. In Eccle., [the] king is suffering under a foreign tyrant: 8:2; 9:14-16; 10:16, 17, 20. Oppression: 4:1-3; 5:8, 10:6,7. None of these arguments [are] decisive. However THE observation rejecting Solomonic authorship is [the] observation regarding [its] language. [The language is] Not classical Hebrew—in grammar, vocabulary, syntax. . . . [The] Most impressive argument is Phoenician influence whoever wrote it [was] strongly influenced by [the] Phoenicians. Cf. [author not cited] *Biblica*, vol. XXXIII, p. 30-52, 191-221. [The] Book is not [written in] Judean Hebrew. [It] Either comes from Judea but [is] post-exilic or outside [of] Judea and [is] earlier than [the] exile. Date of Authorship: Most conservatives make it post-exilic. Cf. Aalders, Young, Delitzsch. Critical scholars date it much later—some in 2nd cent. B.C.” Harvie M. Conn, Student Notes from Meredith G. Kline’s “OT 126: Poetical Books” Course (Westminster Theological Seminary, April 26, 1956, 45-47 [Philadelphia, PA: Montgomery Library Archives]).

422. Harman, “Edward Joseph Young,” 200.

## **Chapter Four: A CHANGING OF THE GUARDS**

Between 1969 and 1989,<sup>1</sup> a new generation of Old Testament scholars arose within the ranks at Westminster Theological Seminary. Though they had not been taught by the original faculty (i.e., Robert D. Wilson, Oswald T. Allis, and Allan A. MacRae), they continued in the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition carried forward by their teachers, Edward J. Young and Meredith G. Kline. Although the latter had left for Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary in June of 1965,<sup>2</sup> Kline continued to exert much influence at Westminster as Visiting Professor of Old Testament. He taught courses on “Old Testament Biblical Theology,” “The Prophecy of Zechariah,” “The Book of Daniel,” and “Studies in Old Testament Wisdom,”<sup>3</sup> “Prophetic Books,” “Studies in Old Testament Biblical Theology,”<sup>4</sup> and “Old Testament History and Theology.”<sup>5</sup> As an evangelical, Reformed scholar, Kline’s innovative approach to the Old Testament in utilizing the “comparative method” and form criticism had a considerable impact upon subsequent Old Testament scholarship at Westminster.<sup>6</sup> Accordingly, the next generation of Old Testament professors began to adopt and employ historical-critical methods with greater freedom and facility. This also happened in conjunction with the popularization of synchronic methods of biblical interpretation that revolutionized Old Testament scholarship during the 1970s and 80s. During this twenty-year period, the two most influential Old Testament scholars at Westminster were Raymond Bryan Dillard and Tremper Longman III.<sup>7</sup>

This chapter will focus on their life and work at Westminster Theological Seminary, especially in regard to their perspectives on historical criticism and its relation to the interpretation of the Old Testament. In particular, their work on the “essential” Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, the multiple authorship of Isaiah, and the book of Daniel will be critically assessed and evaluated. In addition, Dillard’s work on the book of Chronicles and Longman’s research into literary approaches to Old Testament interpretation will also be presented because they show first hand how they, as evangelical biblical critics, handled the historical-critical methods, on the one hand, and their “high view of the Bible as the Word of God,” on the other. In particular, this chapter will document and assess the significant shift within the Old Princeton-Westminster trajectory as seen in the works of Dillard and Longman.

#### 4.1 Raymond Bryan Dillard

Raymond Bryan Dillard was born on January 7, 1944 in Louisville, Kentucky. He graduated from high school in Fayetteville, North Carolina in 1962. Dillard received his B.A. degree from Bob Jones University in 1966, a B.D. degree (i.e., Bachelor of Divinity) from Westminster Theological Seminary (Philadelphia) in 1969, and was awarded the Ph.D. degree from the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning in 1975. He also studied at Temple University, the University of Pennsylvania, and the University of Tel Aviv.<sup>8</sup>

When Dillard was a seminary student at Westminster Theological Seminary, Meredith G. Kline, made a significant impact upon Dillard's thinking and fanned his interest in the Old Testament into a flame.<sup>9</sup> Accordingly, Dillard followed in the footsteps of his mentor and sought further graduate studies at Kline's *alma mater*, Dropsie College. In 1975 while at Dropsie, Dillard completed his doctoral dissertation, "Neo-Babylonian Texts from the John Frederick Lewis Collection of the Free Library of Philadelphia." His work was supervised by Nahum Waldham, Theodore H. Gaster, and Haim Geveryahu.<sup>10</sup>

Dillard began teaching at Westminster Theological Seminary in 1969, a year after Young's death in 1968. Dillard was first hired as an Assistant in Hebrew alongside Associate Professor of Old Testament, John Miller Zinkand; Visiting Professors Kline, Roberston, Pieter Adriaan Verhoef; and Special Lecturer in Old Testament (1969-1970), Donald J. Wiseman.<sup>11</sup> Dillard climbed the academic ladder becoming Instructor in Old Testament in 1971,<sup>12</sup> Assistant Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature in 1974,<sup>13</sup> Associate Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature in 1977,<sup>14</sup> and Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature in 1981.<sup>15</sup> His career at Westminster as Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature spanned twenty-four years until his death on October 1, 1993.<sup>16</sup> He taught courses in: "Elements of Hebrew," "Syntax of the Hebrew Scriptures," "Advanced Hebrew," "The Aramaic Language," "Political History of the Divided Monarchy," "Old Testament History and Theology," "Linguistics," "West Semitic Inscriptions," "General Introduction to the Old Testament," "Introduction to Akkadian," "I Chronicles," "II Chronicles," "Historical Geography of Israel," "Prophetic Books," "Joel and Micah," and "Critical Methodologies (co-taught with Longman)."<sup>17</sup>

Dillard was known as "an exacting scholar who eschewed the easy answer."<sup>18</sup> He was a "master of classroom drama" and "was sought after for his lecturing and preaching gifts . . . in the United States and Great Britain."<sup>19</sup> Outside of evangelical circles, Dillard was an active member within the Society of Biblical Literature and profited from his interactions with other scholars, particularly on the books of 1 and 2 Chronicles.<sup>20</sup> In fact, the Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah Section of the Society of Biblical Literature posthumously dedicated the edited volume, *The Chronicler as Historian*,<sup>21</sup> to his memory. The editors wrote: "The respect and admiration of committee members for Ray grew as the passed and Ray made his contributions to Chronicles research. He was known to all as a kind man of sincere Christian faith, a congenial and generous colleague,

and a diligent and insightful scholar. . . . As a tribute to Ray's memory, these essays are offered by his friends and colleagues with gratitude and affection." As a writer, Dillard published two important articles in the *Westminster Theological Journal* on the theology of Chronicles,<sup>22</sup> published a widely-respected commentary on 2 Chronicles in the Word Biblical Commentary series,<sup>23</sup> as well as a commentary on the book of Joel.<sup>24</sup> He was also a member of the translation team that produced the *New International Version* of the Old Testament. At the time of his death, Dillard had almost completed his manuscript for *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (co-authored with Tremper Longman III)<sup>25</sup> and had begun work on the book of Esther for the new critical edition of the Hebrew Bible, *Biblia Hebraica Diplomatica* (United Bible Societies).<sup>26</sup> His popular, devotional work, *Faith in the Face of Apostasy: The Gospel According to Elijah and Elisha*, was published posthumously in 1999.<sup>27</sup>

#### 4.2 Plundering the Egyptians, Common Grace and Van Til's Antithesis

In his courses at Westminster Seminary, Raymond Dillard was known to have frequently used the phrase: "plundering the Egyptians."<sup>28</sup> The expression was derived from the philosophical teachings of his former teacher and colleague, Cornelius Van Til. Van Til belonged to the school of Dutch Reformed thought. Unlike the early generation of Westminster professors (including J. Gresham Machen, Robert Dick Wilson, Allan A. MacRae, and Edward J. Young) who belonged to the Old Princeton segment of American Presbyterianism, Van Til influenced the latter generation at Westminster (including Old Testament faculty members: Meredith G. Kline,<sup>29</sup> Raymond B. Dillard, and Tremper Longman III) toward Dutch Neo-Calvinism which was decidedly influenced by the theology and philosophical epistemology of Abraham Kuyper.<sup>30</sup>

Machen, as founder of Westminster Theological Seminary, desired to continue the traditions of Princeton Theological Seminary. In order to accomplish this objective, "Machen had to accept also the Old Princeton allegiance to a particular anthropology and implied theory of knowledge and truth, that of a synthesized C[ommon] S[ense] R[ealism]."<sup>31</sup> Van Til, however, was critical of Machen's views of philosophy and apologetics at the very start of his career at Westminster. John C. Vander Stelt explains,

Under the leadership of J. Gresham Machen, not only was there an *institutional* break with P [rinceton] T[heological] S[eminary] in 1929, but also, under the teaching of Cornelius Van Til at WTS, a *philosophical* reorientation and critique of the elements of C[ommon] S[ense] P [hilosophy] in Princeton theology. As professor of apologetics, Van Til moved away from the epistemological presuppositions of Princeton apologetics and developed his own view that has come to be known as "presuppositionalism." Though Van Til continued to agree with Machen's theology, especially his view of the Scriptures, he strongly differed with Machen about the nature of philosophy and the role of apologetics.<sup>32</sup>

Van Til differed from Machen and Old Princeton in important areas, one of the most significant being epistemology. James D. Bratt cogently explains the epistemological differences between Van Til's (Kuyperian) Dutch Neo-Calvinism and the Scottish Common Sense Realism of Old Princeton:

First, Princeton theology, deeply beholden to Scottish Common Sense Realism, tended to minimize the effect of sin upon human reason. Second, it posited that Christianity—and Christianity alone—was a rationally demonstrable and coherent system, that any fair-minded person could and would see the same and be brought to faith accordingly, and that apologetics was therefore the theologian's highest labor. Dutch Neo-Calvinism, in contrast, joined continental dialectical Idealism to a radical Augustinian psychology. There simply was no religiously neutral rational faculty or middle ground, Kuyper insisted again and again. Reason, like every other faculty, impulse, or activity, proceeded from and worked to serve one's fundamental commitment—in Kuyperian parlance, one's (necessarily religious) "life-principle." Accordingly, the world could contain any number of relatively coherent worldviews, none of which could finally convince another of its own superiority on strictly rational grounds. Apologetics would therefore be the last concern of the theologian, who should work instead to elaborate the full complex of faith on its own presuppositions for the battle of world systems.<sup>33</sup>

According to Vander Stelt, Van Til believed that the Old Princeton approach to epistemology and apologetics was thoroughly inconsistent with Calvinism because of its ideas concerning the role of reason, the nature of fact, the essence of certainty, and the meaning of reality and revelation. Vander Stelt further comments, "What Van Til considers especially objectionable in this Arminian way of thinking is its appeal to individual and isolated facts, its method of (rational) argumentation, rather than (rational) confrontation, and its inductive arrival at the conclusion of the probability of God's existence. This Princeton approach to apologetics has expressed itself either in the form of overt Arminianism or in the form of a 'less consistent Calvinism.'"<sup>34</sup> Alternatively, Van Til believed that Kuyper's understanding of the "antithesis" was theologically consistent with his Reformed and Calvinistic theology. Bratt elucidates,

Kuyper had discerned an absolute antithesis in all of life (including all scholarly work) between believer and unbeliever. The consequences of the Fall is a radically abnormal world. Only the sovereign regenerating work of the Holy Spirit can overcome the rebellion of unbelief. Van Til used Kuyper's notion of the antithesis to develop his presuppositional apologetics. For Van Til unregenerate man actively suppresses his knowledge of God. Man is not ignorant, he is rebellious. Man is never neutral or objective in his evaluation of evidence. Rather, in every act of interpretation and understanding man acts either as a servant of God or as an unbeliever asserting his autonomy. A key task to apologetics is to show the inadequacies of non-Christian or inconsistently Christian thought. This perspective led Van Til to analyze not only what a theologian or philosopher said, but also what he should have said

according to the basic orientation of his views. Van Til pressed people to face the necessary extension of their views.<sup>35</sup>

Van Til's thought regarding the antithesis had a profound effect on the entire Westminster faculty. According to Bratt, "After Machen died, Van Til's apologetic system gained the enthusiastic support of the Westminster faculty."<sup>36</sup> This is especially evident in the way Van Til had a lasting effect on Raymond Dillard. In a memorial article written for Van Til, John R. Muether writes, "Old Testament Prof. Ray Dillard finds in Van Til's thought encouragement for his pursuit of the scholarly task. Van Til taught the antithesis between Christian and non-Christian thought."<sup>37</sup> The antithesis, therefore, gave Dillard the proper theological and philosophical foundation that as a Christian, Old Testament scholar he needed to make the basic distinction between Christian and non-Christian thought.

Van Til, however, did not advocate a wholesale rejection of non-Christian scholarship. On the basis of the Reformed doctrine of "common grace,"<sup>38</sup> Van Til believed that God had, on the one hand, given good gifts to all men and, on the other hand, he prevented the principle of sin to come to full fruition. Van Til asserted,

For it is not till after the consummation of history [i.e., the abrogation of common grace] that men are left wholly to themselves. Till then the Spirit of God continues to strive with men that they might forsake their evil ways. Till then God in his common grace, in his long-suffering forbearance, gives men rain and sunshine and all the good things of life that they might repent. The primary attitude of God to men as men is that of goodness. It is against this goodness expressing itself in the abundance of good gifts that man sins. And even then God prevents the principle of sin from coming to full fruition. He restrains the wrath of man. He enables him by this restraint to cooperate with the redeemed of God in the development of the work he gave man to do.<sup>39</sup>

One important aspect of these "good gifts" given to unbelievers by God's common grace includes the fact that unbelievers occasionally speak truthfully even though their understanding of "the facts" is basically flawed. John M. Frame explains,

Unbelievers do speak truth sometimes, but their overall understanding of the world is "basically" wrong. Nor can this basic wrongness always be demonstrated in a purely conceptual way. Is Einstein's relativity theory wrong because it was devised by a non-Christian? Is it "basically" wrong? To say so without further explanation would be misleading. The wrongness of an unbeliever's mentality is essentially a wrongness of the heart, and that wrongness of the heart may be expressed actively and conceptually in various ways. A non-Christian scientist may discover facts and report them accurately; the wrongness of his perspective may appear in his facts, or in his inner motivation for discovering them, rather than in his statement of them. His theory may be "basically right," although his overall outlook on life will be

"basically wrong." . . . Van Til himself learned much from non-Christian and non-Reformed thinkers, and he taught his students to do the same.<sup>40</sup>

Influenced by Van Til, Dillard taught that the doctrine of common grace obligated Christian scholars to understand non-Christian thought in order to exploit the truth in their works for the service and glory of God. Muether states,

Dillard also remembers Van Til's equal appreciation for the biblical teaching of common grace. God's common grace enables truth to come from non-Christian sources. Dillard's goal as a Christian scholar is to exploit that learning, to bring all thought into service to the Lord. "What Van Til means to me is that we not only hold forth the faith, but that we 'plunder the Egyptians,'" he says, invoking an Old Testament metaphor. "Van Til has taught me when Paul enjoins us to 'make every thought captive,' he is not mainly speaking of our personal lives, but he is primarily addressing the intellectual arena." We must bring down every argument and pretense of the world against God, and consecrate all truth to his glory.<sup>41</sup>

According to Dillard, therefore, the task of "plundering the Egyptians" involved two primary objectives: 1) the positive task, i.e., to employ the truth given in non-Christian sources for the glory of God, and 2) the negative or apologetic task, i.e., to "take every thought captive" and to bring down every false argument espoused by unbelieving scholars.

Dillard's use of the concept was widely known during his years at Westminster. Iain M. Duguid, a former student of Dillard, recollects that Dillard had mentioned the notion of "plundering the Egyptians" several times in class. Duguid explains that the concept "enabled you to use the methodologies of critical scholarship not merely by approaching the text without their presuppositions but by reshaping the material to fit within a Christian theistic worldview."<sup>42</sup> Hence, Dillard's use of critical scholarship was profoundly Van Tillian, and it functioned as part and parcel of his own formation and identity as a Christian, Old Testament scholar.

#### **4.3 Dillard's Work on 2 Chronicles**

In the "Introduction" to his commentary, *2 Chronicles*, Dillard revealed three foundational presuppositions that guided his interpretation of the book: 1) hermeneutics, 2) theology, and 3) exegesis. Hermeneutically, Dillard approached 2 Chronicles as an evangelical Christian with a high view of Scripture: "I write from the perspective of an evangelical Christian. The hallmark of evangelicalism, apart from its Christology, is its high regard for the Bible as the Word of God."<sup>43</sup> In order to further unpack his understanding of "the Word of God," Dillard utilized a familiar Christological comparison, which has been variously employed throughout Christian history, known as the "incarnational analogy."<sup>44</sup> The analogy states that the Bible as the Word of God is comparable to the Person of Jesus Christ who was both fully divine and fully human. Accordingly, Dillard affirmed,

It [the Bible] is divine in that it is the Word of God; as God's Word, it shares in the attributes of God. Just as God does not lie, so also the Bible does not lie; it does not deceive or mislead us. It is without error in all that it teaches. It is fully human in that it was revelation that did not set aside the human personalities that produced it; it was not dictated from above. The Bible is not in some sense supratemporal or supracultural; rather, it was produced by particular persons at particular historical moments, people who were influenced by their own cultures to the same depths as all other human beings. The human authors of Scripture addressed the needs of particular communities and used the literary genres and historiographical practices of their own day.<sup>45</sup>

Theologically, Dillard viewed Chronicles as a thoroughgoing theological treatise. The theological purpose of Chronicles, according to Dillard, was to describe the past in order to demonstrate "the validity of particular premises that addressed the needs of Israel in his [the Chronicler's] own day. Chronicles [therefore] is not only a writing of history; it is a [theological] tract."<sup>46</sup> Finally, from an exegetical vantage point, Dillard believed that the Chronicler as an historian was a person who interacted with a wide range of canonical and non-canonical texts. Dillard claimed, "he [the Chronicler] cites passages in canonical prophets, the Pentateuch, the psalms, Joshua, and preeminently Samuel-Kings. There is no compelling reason to doubt that he had access also to the wide variety of extrabiblical sources to which he so frequently refers to his readers."<sup>47</sup> Methodologically, the Chronicler "recasts, shapes, models, enhances, modifies, transforms, edits, rewrites" the material (especially the book of Kings) which he had before him in order to present his particular view of Israel's history.<sup>48</sup> Hence, Dillard acknowledged that the constant interplay of these three presuppositions—hermeneutics, theology, and exegesis—converged into a "hermeneutical circle" that basically formed his interpretive matrix for 2 Chronicles.

With respect to the question of historicity, Dillard believed that the Chronicler as a "theologian" did not mutually exclude the fact that the Chronicler was also an "historian." Dillard noted, "It is my own conviction that the Chronicler is a reliable and trustworthy historian; where we are able to check his record against extrabiblical data, the picture is that of a careful author."<sup>49</sup> I do not believe that the Chronicler was simply fabricating the data he needed to make his points. In most instances, however, we do not have the extrabiblical data by which to evaluate his historical information."<sup>50</sup> However, Dillard was also careful to note that, "The [evangelical] doctrine of Scripture should not be used in such a way as to make the Chronicler a modern historian operating under the influence of historical positivism."<sup>51</sup> Dillard did not want contemporary evangelicals to anachronistically impose their own modern canons of historiography upon ancient writers. This would inevitably "strike in a fundamental way at the incarnational analogy by abstracting the Chronicler from his own time."<sup>52</sup> Moreover, Dillard strongly contended that the Chronicler should be viewed as a product of his cultural milieu, who "wrote within the framework of culturally acceptable historiographic practices and genres. . . . We

cannot [therefore] deny to the Chronicler the liberties in the presentation of his data that his culture allowed.”<sup>53</sup>

#### **4.3.1 Dillard’s View of the Chronicler and Redaction Criticism**

Dillard’s scholarly perceptions of the Chronicler were the result of his extensive study of the primary texts of 1 and 2 Chronicles, as well as his familiarity with the expansive, secondary literature on Chronicles.<sup>54</sup> After many years of reflection, Dillard’s own mature views on Chronicles included the following salient points:<sup>55</sup> 1) the books of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah were not the product of the same author,<sup>56</sup> 2) the Chronicler’s theology was built around two major theological themes: “temple/cult” and “the Davidic Covenant,”<sup>57</sup> 3) the notion of “immediate retribution” was also central to the Chronicler’s message because 2 Chronicles 7:14 was a programmatic passage which illustrated God’s retributive justice in Israel’s history,<sup>58</sup> 4) Solomon represented the continuing messianic hope for the post-exilic community,<sup>59</sup> and 5) the Chronicler’s *Tendenz*<sup>60</sup> was not the result of changes and additions to his *Vorlage*<sup>61</sup> but that the *Vorlage* carried the Chronicler’s *Tendenz* and, thus, to copy it verbatim did not weaken his theological polemic.<sup>62</sup>

Methodologically, Dillard extensively employed redaction criticism.<sup>63</sup> Although redaction criticism as a discipline was largely rejected among evangelicals,<sup>64</sup> it should be noted that Dillard was not the first to make use of the methodology within Westminster’s trajectory. According to Moisés Silva, Ned B. Stonehouse, the late Professor of New Testament,<sup>65</sup> was the first to apply redaction criticism at Westminster to “the synoptic problem” of the New Testament:

One is surprised then, to discover that the late Professor Stonehouse had already applied that very approach [i.e., redaction criticism] (evinced by mature reflection, we should emphasize) to the Gospels of Matthew and Mark by 1944. More perplexing yet is the recognition that, while redaction criticism was formed in the womb of historical scepticism of the most severe kind, Stonehouse’s work was designed to strengthen confidence in the historical reliability of the gospels!<sup>66</sup>

From a distillation of Stonehouse’s writings, Silva discerned two presuppositions that justified Stonehouse’s use of redaction criticism: 1) a responsible use of modern critical scholarship, and 2) allowing the distinctive testimonies of each biblical author to have hermeneutical primacy rather than harmonizing their differences away. In relation to the former, Silva commented,

Stonehouse refuses to deal with the gospel material in isolation from contemporary critical scholarship. . . . The very structure of the book, moreover, reveals his sensitivity to the importance of critical research for a proper understanding of the biblical documents. This approach is worlds apart from the run-of-the-mill evangelical commentator who dismisses with astonishing ease, or ignores altogether, those kinds of issues which, precisely

because of their difficulty, affect at a fundamental level the interpretation of the text.<sup>67</sup>

Silva also perceived that Stonehouse, unlike the tendency of most evangelical scholars, did not approve of an overly excessive use of harmonization.<sup>68</sup>

Stonehouse speaks of the value of comparing the gospels with one another. Many readers may have interpreted that emphasis as a concern for harmonization. To a certain extent, it is true, Stonehouse thinks of harmonization as part of his responsibility, but a careful study of his book makes plain that it is only a secondary interest. For example, on page 189 he tells us that it is '*in pursuance of our effort to discover the distinctiveness* of the testimony of Matthew [that] our attention has been directed to certain features which come to conspicuous disclosure through a comparison of the disposition of this gospel with that of Mark' (my emphasis). In other words, his interest in comparing the gospels leads him to detect, not necessarily the identity of their testimonies (harmonization), but rather the differences.<sup>69</sup>

Silva is careful to point out that while Stonehouse did not identify himself with the redaction critics *per se*, he, nonetheless, had real sympathies for their scholarship. While Stonehouse was not against all harmonizations of the biblical text, in reality, he employed an eclectic methodology that included both harmonization and non-harmonization, a defense of the historicity of the Gospels while affirming portions of dischronologized material. Silva explicated, "While downgrading the importance of harmonization, he [Stonehouse] continued to harmonize difficult passages; while stressing that the gospels were not primarily historical, he used this insight to strengthen his readers' confidence in the historical trustworthiness of the evangelists. In my opinion, Stonehouse was justified in developing such a distinctive method."<sup>70</sup>

Dillard himself considered that the historical and textual differences between Samuel-Kings and Chronicles to be analogous to the differences found within the synoptic gospels. He wrote, "The relationship between the Deuteronomic history [Samuel-Kings] and the Chronicler constitutes the synoptic problem of the OT. The issues of redaction and textual history, the author's audience and theology, dates and principles of composition, historical reliability—all so familiar in the NT synoptic problem—are here exaggerated to a new intensity."<sup>71</sup> In approaching the alleged "synoptic problem of the Old Testament," Silva claimed that Dillard's controversial work was comparable to Stonehouse's redactional innovations. On the occasion of his presidential address at the 49th annual meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, Silva asserted,

If we simply retreat to a safe haven with regard to Matthew [unlike the work of Stonehouse], how can we expect to make any real progress with regard to the gospel of John, where the questions multiply and intensify? No less arduous is the challenge posed by 1-2 Chronicles. Most of us are content to pull out of the bag ad hoc solutions when individual problems come up. Here a textual variation, there a different meaning for 'elep, and then we sit down and hope

nobody asks any more questions. But where will you find a coherent explanation for the scores of problems raised by that narrative? I will tell you where: in Raymond Dillard's commentary on 2 Chronicles. You do not like his views on Biblical historiography? All right. But before you trash his work, show me a cogent alternative.<sup>72</sup>

In an extended footnote related to his comments on Dillard, Silva wrote,

I do not deny that valiant and partially successful attempts to defend a more traditional approach have been made, but significant parts of the argumentation stretch credibility; cf. esp. C. F. Keil's introductory essay in *The Books of the Chronicles* (C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament* [reprint Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, n.d.]) 38–45. On the other hand, I recognize that Dillard's approach is hardly impregnable; still, his pioneering work is far more promising than the standard fare.<sup>73</sup>

#### **4.3.2 Dillard's Approach Toward Harmonization**

In his article, "Harmonization: A Help and a Hindrance," Dillard cautioned, "Harmonization is used primarily as a tool for solving problems, however, it is not itself free of difficulties."<sup>74</sup> Dillard went on to warn how evangelicals, in their zeal to defend and promote the doctrine of Scripture, tended to abuse the method, and, ironically, minimize the credibility of the Scriptures in the process. Dillard continued,

Harmonizations are too often offered almost cavalierly. Hackles are raised by what appears to be ad hoc invoking of any set of circumstances that will reconcile passages; to those steeped in higher-critical methods, such special pleading is rejected because it lacks any particular methodological control beyond the need for a quick solution. Nor are harmonizations readily amenable to proof or disproof; they may have varying degrees of probability, some more convincing than others, and some altogether too ingenious to commend the solution they attempt.<sup>75</sup>

One prime example of Dillard's resistance to harmonization is found within the historical difficulties between Samuel-Kings and Chronicles, particularly with the reign of King Asa. Dillard described his understanding and resolution to the problem of dating Asa's reign in the following manner,

The Chronicler has reshaped the account he found in Kings by elaborating and reinforcing the divine favor enjoyed by an obedient king and by making explicit the nature of the transgressions that led to his disease and death. However, the characteristic of the Chronicler his treatment of Asa might be, a substantive problem remains. 1 Kgs 15:33 records that Baasha ruled for twenty-four years, while 1 Kgs 16:8 reports that Elah succeeded Baasha in the twenty-six year of Asa. It is obvious that Baasha could not have been alive in the thirty-six year of Asa's reign where 2 Chr 16:1 places him. Efforts to address this difficulty have followed basically one or two polar approaches. (1) One approach repudiates any harmonization pressure and regards the chronological notices as part and parcel with the Chronicler's imposition of his basic

retributive concerns of the narrative. The chronological data is simply a vehicle by which the author demonstrates again the validity of retribution theology . . . . (2) Another approach seeks to harmonize the chronological data in the various accounts. Harmonistic chronology is primarily associated with the work of E. Thiele (*The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan *{sic}*,<sup>76</sup> 1951, 1965, 1983]), though Thiele's suggestion for the Asa chronology was already known by Keil as the approach of the "older commentators." This approach conjectures that the dates in 2 Chr 15:19 and 16:1 are references to the date of the schism (931 B.C. for Thiele). Thus Thiele is able to deduct the twenty year of prior reigns (seventeen for Rehoboam, three for Abijah) from the references to Asa's thirty-fifth and thirty-sixth years,<sup>77</sup> so that they become instead the fifteenth and sixteenth years of his reign and harmonize quite nicely with the years of Baasha. . . . This solution is ingenious, but probably not acceptable without serious consequences for the Chronicler as a historian.<sup>78</sup>

Dillard's rejection of Thiele's harmonizations were due to the following reasons: 1) out of all of the data found in the chronology of the divided monarchy, this would be the first and only occasion that begins dating from the schism and is, therefore, an example of "special pleading," 2) Thiele ignored the plain reading of the text that these were the thirty-fifth and thirty-sixth years of Asa's reigns which is consistent with the formulae used throughout Chronicles to describe the reigns of the other kings as well, 3) Thiele's reconstruction would undermine the Chronicler's theological argument of "immediate retribution" since the foot disease would have come over twenty years after the offense.<sup>79</sup> Nevertheless, Dillard did concede that, "Thiele's dates for the individual reigns account for most of the chronological data in the MT with minimal textual difficulty, and they correspond to the dates derived from primarily Assyriological records and the Ptolemaic canon; though some problems remain. Thiele's dates are the best provisional basis for approaching the chronology of the divided kingdoms."<sup>80</sup>

Harvie M. Conn, the late Emeritus Professor of Missions at Westminster Seminary,<sup>81</sup> defended Dillard's overall theological approach to Chronicles rather than a strictly historical one. On the one hand, Conn readily admitted that Dillard "sees many positive values to harmonization . . . [and] makes use of it repeatedly . . . in his study of the chronology of the divided monarchy," but, on the other hand, Conn declared that, "[according to Dillard] it would appear that the Chronicler's distinctive treatment of the larger history and theology of his narratives creates an agenda almost too large to be handled by a methodology [i.e., harmonization] better suited for comparisons of more limited texts."<sup>82</sup> In this regard, Conn, like Silva, similarly viewed Dillard as standing on the shoulders of Stonehouse. Conn observed,

Like Stonehouse before him, Dillard is raising questions about a long evangelical tradition that had regarded the sayings of the biblical historians as simply reports of facts that are unrelated to the author's theological intentions [i.e., the Chronicler's *Tendenz*]. Also like Stonehouse, his final purpose is anything but liberal or radical. It is to explore the uniqueness of the Chronicler's literary purposes. At the same time, harmonization of another sort

is not totally missing. Another exegetical instrument Dillard uses allows him to search for what we might call harmonizations on a macro scale. With it he can speak of Moses and Joshua as paradigms, of parallels between Solomon and Bezalel and Paul, the Bezalel of the new covenant (1 Cor. 3:5-17). Such harmonization is the discipline of biblical theology, long a trademark of the Reformed community and Westminster's work.<sup>83</sup>

But one wonders how Dillard knew when to harmonize apparent contradictions between parallel texts and when to leave the discrepancies in tension. A generation earlier, Edward J. Young proposed that,

We as Bible believers are not called upon to offer an answer to all the problems in the Bible any more than we are called upon to offer an explanation of the doctrine of the Trinity. It is perfectly true that our responsibility is to study the Biblical difficulties in order, if possible, to understand and to harmonize them. To explain them to everyone's satisfaction, however, or to provide a harmony in every instance, is not incumbent upon us. Hence, if in the light of our present state of knowledge there are some passages which we cannot harmonize, we need not become overly discouraged.<sup>84</sup>

Young further advocated that evangelical scholars should be honest and candid enough to know when to admit that the answers to certain difficult passages were unknown, rather than "to employ strained and forced methods of harmonization," which, in Young's mind, was "not intellectually honest."<sup>85</sup> This was endorsed by Dillard, who affirmed, "E.J. Young's approach was essentially to wait patiently for better evidence and explanations and meanwhile to avoid making forced harmonizations. The history of biblical studies has frequently ratified this approach."<sup>86</sup>

As Dillard attempted to solve the "synoptic problem" between Samuel-Kings and Chronicles, it is evident that Dillard employed all of the critical methods that were available to him. He often rejected the traditional, facile answers which were often the results of what he deemed to be "special pleading" and forced harmonizations. In contrast, however, because of his rejection of the harmonization method, "he [Dillard] often found himself in turmoil as he wrestled with the issue of the Chronicler's picture of Israel's history."<sup>87</sup>

#### **4.3.3 Dillard's Advocacy of Genre Criticism**

In addition to his use of redaction criticism, Dillard employed genre identification in order to discern what type of text he was interpreting. Dillard encouraged fellow evangelicals that "better evidence and explanations" could be found in the present state of biblical studies through "genre criticism" rather than using forced harmonizations. He averred, "After sober study one could conclude that a book of narrative prose in the Old Testament belongs to some other literary genre in which historical canons are suspended or modified."<sup>88</sup> This approach, according to Dillard, was consonant with "affirmation 13 of the Chicago Statement on Biblical Hermeneutics, issued by the International

Council on Biblical Inerrancy: ‘We affirm that awareness of the literary categories, formal and stylistic, of the various parts of Scripture is essential for proper exegesis, and hence we value genre criticism as one of the many disciplines of biblical study.’’<sup>89</sup> Dillard proposed that in using genre criticism the interpreter could “make broad generalizations at the outset, while perfecting, modifying, and nuancing this identification through interaction with the phenomena of the text and through comparisons with other biblical literature and the literature of the geographically proximate and contemporary cultures.”<sup>90</sup> While Dillard admitted that genre criticism had “the potential of devouring much of the facticity of biblical historiography,” he believed that all appeals “to genre identifications must be evaluated for the strength of the argument, as with any other aspect of exegesis.”<sup>91</sup> Above all, Dillard cautioned that evangelical theologians in their engagement with historical-critical methodology should do so responsibly and employ them with the understanding that the “Scriptures and the Scriptures alone are the ultimate canon for truth and must not be subjected to some other standard.”<sup>92</sup>

Dillard’s goal of combining a high view of Scripture as the “inspired Word of God” with a responsible use of historical-critical tools such as genre identification was realized in his former student and colleague, Tremper Longman III. Foundational to Longman’s study and exposition of the Old Testament is his work in genre/form criticism as well as the more recent literary approaches to Old Testament interpretation. These “evangelical-friendly” hermeneutical tools focus upon the interpretation of the final form of the canonical text. Thus, Longman was able to anchor his interpretation within the text itself and not “some other standard.” With Dillard’s influence along with Longman’s doctoral research at Yale, Longman eventually became a leading expert in genre/form criticism and literary approaches to biblical interpretation within evangelical biblical scholarship. Hence, it is to Longman’s biography and work that we shall now turn.

#### **4.4 Tremper Longman III**

Tremper Longman III was born on September 8, 1952 in Princeton, New Jersey. Longman received his B.A. degree (major: Religion) in 1974 at Ohio Wesleyan University and then a M.Div. degree from Westminster Theological Seminary (Philadelphia) in 1977. During his studies at Westminster, Longman served as a Teaching Assistant in Biblical Hebrew (1976-1977) and was inspired to pursue further education in Old Testament studies due to the influence of his teacher, Raymond B. Dillard.<sup>93</sup> As a result, Longman and his wife<sup>94</sup> moved north to New Haven, Connecticut where he attended Yale University. In 1980, he earned the M.Phil. degree and, shortly thereafter, joined the faculty at Westminster Theological Seminary, first as a Lecturer from 1980 to 1981,<sup>95</sup> and then as an Assistant Professor of Old Testament from 1981 to 1983.<sup>96</sup> While enrolled as a Ph.D. candidate at Yale, Longman taught the following courses: “Old Testament History and Theology” (co-taught with Dillard and Kline), “Poetical Books,” “Apocalyptic Literature,” “Introduction to Ugaritic,” “I & II

Chronicles," "Introduction to Akkadian" (co-taught with Dillard), "Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes," "The Comparative Method: The Old Testament in its Ancient Near Eastern Setting."<sup>97</sup>

In 1983, Longman obtained the Ph.D. degree in Ancient Near Eastern Languages from Yale University after completing his dissertation, "The Validity, Procedure and Benefit of a Comparative Approach to Akkadian Autobiography," under the supervision of William W. Hallo.<sup>98</sup> In the published version of his dissertation, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography: A Generic and Comparative Study*, he publicly acknowledged Hallo's direction and encouragement: "Professor W. W. Hallo originally suggested the topic to me and has provided much advice along the way. His own work in comparative method and on the Akkadian apocalypses has had an obvious and profound impact on my thinking."<sup>99</sup> Longman continued to thank his former teacher and colleague, Raymond Dillard, for his inspiration and support: "I wish to thank Professor R. Dillard of Westminster Theological Seminary. As his student, I first became interested in Semitics in general and Akkadian in particular. As his colleague in the Old Testament department at Westminster Theological Seminary, I thank him for his support and understanding during the first few years of my career."<sup>100</sup>

After completing his doctorate, Longman climbed the ranks within the Old Testament department. He was Associate Professor from 1983 to 1986, Associate Professor with Tenure from 1986 to 1991, and then, Professor of Old Testament from 1991 to 1998. During this period of his career at Westminster, Longman also taught: "Hosea and Nahum," "Worship in Ancient Israel," "Old Testament Law," "Critical Methodologies," "General Introduction to the Old Testament," "Survey of Old Testament History and Theology," "Old Testament Poetics," and "Jonah and Nahum."<sup>101</sup> In 1993, Longman became the chairman of the Old Testament department (1993-1998). He held this position until his departure from Westminster. In 1998, Longman moved to Santa Barbara, California to occupy the Robert H. Gundry Chair of Biblical Studies and Professor of Old Testament in the Department of Religious Studies at Westmont College.<sup>102</sup>

#### **4.5 Longman's Work on Literary Approaches**

Longman is a prolific writer. The following is a representative compilation of his writings in the form of specialized journal articles and monographs, popular tomes, scholarly commentaries, and comprehensive textbooks:

- "A Critique of Two Recent Metrical Systems," *Biblica* 62 (1982) 230-254.
- "The Divine Warrior: The New Testament Use of an Old Testament Motif," *Westminster Theological Journal* 44 (1982) 290-307.
- "Form Criticism, Recent Developments in Genre Theory, and the Evangelical," *Westminster Theological Journal* 47 (1985).
- "Cuneiform Tablets from the Toledo Museum of Art," *Revue d'Assyriologie* 79 (1985) 17-41 (with M. Van de Mieroop).

- "The Literary Approach to the Study of the Old Testament: Promise and Pitfalls," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 28 (1985) 385-398.
- "Storytellers and Poets in the Bible: Can Literary Artifice be True?," in *Inerrancy and Hermeneutics* (edited by H. Conn; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988).
- "What I Mean by Historical-Grammatical Exegesis—Why I Am Not a Literalist," *Grace Theological Journal* 11 (1990) 41-58.
- Editor (with L. Ryken) of *A Complete Literary Guide to the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993).
- "Nahum," in *The Minor Prophets: An Exegetical and Expository Commentary* (edited by T. McComiskey; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993), 765-829.
- *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (with Raymond B. Dillard; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994).
- *God is a Warrior* (with Daniel Reid; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995).
- "Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation," in *Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation* (edited by M. Silva; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 95-196. Reprint of *Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987).
- *The Book of Ecclesiastes* (New International Commentary on the Old Testament; Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1998).
- *Daniel* (The NIV Application Commentary; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999).
- "Literary Approaches to Old Testament Study," in *The Face of Old Testament Studies* (edited by D. Baker and Bill Arnold; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999).
- "Evangelicals and the Comparative Method," in *Creator Redeemer Consummator: A Festschrift for Meredith G. Kline* (edited by H. Griffith & J.R. Muether; Greenville, SC: Reformed Academic Press, 2000), 33-42.
- *Song of Songs* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001).
- *Immanuel in Our Place: Seeing Christ in Israel's Worship* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing Co., 2001).
- *How to Read Proverbs* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, September 2002).
- "The Case for Spiritual Continuity," pages 161-95 in *Show Them No Mercy: Four Views on God and Canaanite Genocide* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003).
- "Israelite Genres in their Ancient Near Eastern Context," in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty First Century* (edited by E. Ben Zvi and M. Sweeney; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003): 177-95.
- *A Biblical History of Israel* (with Iain Provan and V. Philips Long; Louisville: John Knox/Westminster Press, 2003).
- *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, Second Edition (with Raymond B. Dillard; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006).

A brief perusal of his extensive bibliography will reveal Longman's range of scholarly and popular interests. His works encompass a broad spectrum of subjects including: *biblical theology* (monographs and articles on "Yahweh as

Warrior" and *Herem* warfare), *biblical studies* (monographs or commentaries on Genesis, Psalms, Proverbs, Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, and Daniel), *biblical history* (presents an historical "maximalist" position and defends "authorial intent" and the historicity of the biblical narrative texts), *comparative studies* (published his Ph.D. dissertation on fictional Akkadian autobiographies), and *literary/genre studies* (monographs and articles dealing with form-criticism, New Literary Criticism, formalism, structuralism, and deconstructionism).

Like Dillard before him, the majority of Longman's interests and work encompass the discipline of literary/genre criticism.<sup>103</sup> During the course of Longman's doctoral research, he needed to identify what generic type of Akkadian literature he was studying: "My dissertation was on fifteen Akkadian texts that I described as fictional autobiographies, and since many would not date the beginning of autobiography until Rousseau in the seventeenth century I needed to justify my genre identification."<sup>104</sup> According to Moisés Silva, this led Longman to "examine in considerable detail competing approaches to literary criticism."<sup>105</sup> From an academic perspective, this placed Longman in "the right place at the right time" during a period within biblical scholarship when literary approaches to the Bible, and especially the Old Testament, reached its zenith.

#### **4.5.1 Longman's Literary Studies in Context**

In his article, "The Rise and Current Status of Literary Criticism of the Old Testament,"<sup>106</sup> Paul R. House presents an historical overview of the newer literary approaches to biblical interpretation. Innovative synchronic methods began to challenge the more traditional diachronic approaches because, "Many thinkers concluded that historical criticism, the standard means of biblical analysis, had almost run its course."<sup>107</sup> House observes that, "numerous scholars began to recognize that some of the established approaches divide and atomize texts. . . . An overemphasis on historical detail cost readers a proper understanding of plot, theme, and character. Pre-textual matter subsumed textual issues. The achievements of historical criticism were appreciated, but new ways to illuminate the Bible were desired."<sup>108</sup> Accordingly, House divides the history of Old Testament literary criticism into three main representative eras: 1) 1969-1974: the roots of "rhetorical criticism" (e.g., James Muilenberg, J. Cheryl Exum, and Lawrence Boadt);<sup>109</sup> 2) 1974-1981: the rise of "structuralism" (e.g., Robert Polzin, Corina Galland, and David Robertson)<sup>110</sup> and "formalistic analysis" (e.g., David Clines, Philip Davies, and David Gunn);<sup>111</sup> and 3) 1981-1989: the flowering of New Literary Criticism (e.g., Robert Alter, Northrop Frye, Adele Berlin, Meir Sternberg, James Kugel, John Watts, Paul House, Peter Mischall, and Frank Kermode).<sup>112</sup>

Longman's doctoral research on literary studies came during this latter phase during 1981 to 1989, when literary approaches to the Old Testament were transforming the face of biblical scholarship. According to Longman, one book in particular revolutionized the guild.<sup>113</sup> The publication of Robert Alter's seminal book, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*,<sup>114</sup> in 1981 was a watershed moment within biblical scholarship.<sup>115</sup> Longman notes that Alter's work "attracted the

attention of the field in an unprecedented way and led to a renewed interest in the literary form of the biblical text.”<sup>116</sup> Longman notes several reasons that may account for Alter’s significant influence: 1) the supremacy of the historical-critical methods were on the wane yielding fewer new insights, 2) these historical methods tended to obscure the interpretation of the final form of the text rather than illuminate its meaning, and 3) source and form criticism of the Old Testament tended to focus on small units of the text and were more concerned with their prehistory.<sup>117</sup> This shift in emphasis within biblical scholarship from the more historical, diachronic approaches to the newer literary, synchronic ones was, according to Longman, a boon for evangelicals in regard to their gaining acceptance within the academy. Longman explicates,

Evangelical scholars, whose presence in the guild of Old Testament scholarship has been on the increase since 1980, were attracted to the literary approach because of its interest in the final form of the text and its tendency to treat biblical books as whole compositions rather than a collection of different sources. The literary approach allowed evangelical scholars to bracket the question of the historicity of narrative and carry on a conversation with their colleagues who did not share their views on the origin of the Bible. It also provided argument in favor of the unity of the biblical text whereas other scholars saw seams and breaks.<sup>118</sup>

Moreover, Longman believes that Brevard Childs’ canon criticism was also an important development for the acceptance of the literary approach because canon criticism also focused on the final form of the biblical texts and treated biblical books as literary wholes.<sup>119</sup> In turn, evangelical scholars profitably utilized Childs’ unified, canonical reading of the Old Testament. Whole evangelical works were written having adopted a form of Childs’ canonical perspective.<sup>120</sup> From a historical standpoint, the newer literary and canonical approaches engendered greater opportunities for evangelicals to actively participate within the scholarly guild, and to, ultimately, become a legitimate voice within its ranks.<sup>121</sup>

#### **4.5.2 Longman’s Literary Approach to Biblical Interpretation**

Longman’s expertise of the field is prominently displayed in his informative book, *Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation*.<sup>122</sup> Longman commences his study with an historical overview that gives the reader a good grasp of the origins of literary criticism, as well as to the current state of the discipline. From the literary sensitivities (or “insensitivities”) of the early church (e.g., St. Augustine and Jerome) to the more contemporary “movers and shakers” (e.g., R. Lowth, H. Gunkel, J. Muilenburg), Longman notes each significant advancement of the literary approach to the Bible up to the contemporary period.<sup>123</sup> Tying together the impact of new philosophical approaches upon biblical studies, Longman identifies the various schools of literary criticism: 1) *Author-Centered Theories* (e.g., the historical-critical method and the historical-grammatical method), 2) *Text-Centered Theories* (e.g., New Criticism and Structuralism), 3) *Reader-Centered Theories* (e.g., Marxist liberationist and

Feminist Readings), and 4) *Deconstruction* (associated with the work of J. Derrida who held a radical skepticism towards the act of literary communication).<sup>124</sup>

Longman aims to present a nuanced view of the discipline by presenting five pitfalls and three promises.<sup>125</sup> The pitfalls include: 1) the contradiction of different literary approaches (i.e., an over-emphasis of one theory causes imbalance and, therefore, a misinterpretation of the text); 2) literary theory is often obscurantist (i.e., each school of thought has its own esoteric, in-language); and 3) the theory may impose Western concepts on Ancient literature, the author is eliminated, and/or a denial of referential function to literature.<sup>126</sup> The promises consist of: 1) literary theory reveals the conventions of biblical literature (e.g., generic signals), 2) it stresses the text as a whole, and 3) it focuses on the reading process (e.g., contextualization and multiperspectival approaches to the text such as feminist readings).<sup>127</sup>

Methodologically, these points inform and undergird Longman's own interpretive approach to biblical texts. Longman advocates a multiperspectival approach that aims "to be eclectic" and takes constructive aspects from each of the critical methodologies. This is what Longman calls "plunder[ing] the Egyptians," a concept based upon the idea that the Christian scholar may glean truth from non-Christian scholarship due to God's common grace.<sup>128</sup> Like Dillard before him, Longman elucidates, "My basic theoretical beliefs are Christian, and any methodological insights that fundamentally conflict with those convictions must be rejected. But, due to common grace, helpful insights may be gleaned from all fields of scholarship."<sup>129</sup> Hence, Longman's basic approach in interpreting a biblical text is to use the historical-grammatical method alongside a host of literary (e.g., genre/form identification,<sup>130</sup> comparative literature, formalism), historical-critical (e.g., textual, source, redaction criticism) and theological approaches (e.g., biblical-theological analysis):

The above is what I mean by the historical-grammatical method. If there were time and interest I would describe the importance of establishing the text by means of a text critical analysis, the need for careful philological analysis based on a competence in ancient Near Eastern languages, the need for a sensitive study of the composition of the book and a kind of analysis which looks for its theological *Tendenz*. What I have described is the need to found the goal of our interpretation in a bridging of the horizons, to use [Anthony] Thistleton's phrase. The need to first of all ask after the impact of a passage in its original context. This includes a study of genre, a close reading based on a literary approach and often involves a comparative study. In the second place, it involves a biblical-theological analysis which asks how this passage anticipates Christ and then examines our own lives, our society, our church's situation in the light of the demands of the passage. All of this needs to be surrounded by prayer which submits ourselves before the Lord of the Word as we study his Word.<sup>131</sup>

In summarizing certain literary conventions of biblical narrative such as characterization, biblical repetition, parallelism, and other narrative and poetic devices,<sup>132</sup> Longman intends to introduce literary methodology to the wider evangelical community. From an apologetic perspective, he writes to provoke thought and consideration among evangelicals who may consider themselves too conservative to accept or find value in any form of critical theory. Moreover, Longman advocates a selective and responsible use of any and all historical-critical methodologies. In Longman's mind, therefore, the literary method is but one cog in the wheel of critical perspectives. With his commitment to historical-grammatical exegesis (including form and genre criticism), his denial to equate "history as fiction,"<sup>133</sup> and his desire to read the Old Testament as a unified canonical text, displays Longman's overall objective for an internal dialogue between the various critical approaches. Although, in the final analysis, Longman is partial toward the formalist approach,<sup>134</sup> his openness toward the more postmodern approaches such as deconstruction and reader-response theories (e.g., Marxist liberation and feminist readings) shows that even as an evangelical scholar, one need not be afraid of considering variegated views of the Old Testament text.<sup>135</sup>

#### **4.6 Dillard and Longman's Views on the Old Testament**

In *An Introduction to the Old Testament*,<sup>136</sup> Raymond Dillard and Tremper Longman presented their interpretations on each book of the Old Testament. While the former wrote the chapters on Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Esther, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, and Zechariah; the latter wrote the chapters on Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Ruth, Ezra-Nehemiah, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Daniel, Hosea, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, and Malachi.<sup>137</sup>

The authors identify themselves with the evangelical tradition: "I am thankful that this book was not a mere academic exercise. Ray and I believe that the Bible is God's Word."<sup>138</sup> However, the authors are also quick to point out that, "An evangelical doctrine of Scripture . . . does not answer all hermeneutical and interpretive questions, nor does it prevent us from learning from the tradition of historical criticism."<sup>139</sup> Reminiscent of Edward J. Young, the authors likewise avoid polemical language and caustic attitudes in their disagreements with critical scholarship: "Many of the issues that have divided evangelical and critical scholars are as contested today as in the past, but we appear to be entering a new era of communication and mutual respect about which we can all be grateful. This introduction will depart from many of the well-entrenched conclusions of critical study, but it will do so with respect and not with rancor."<sup>140</sup>

Methodologically, Dillard and Longman explain that as evangelicals they seek to honor the text as received by the church without "denying the possibility of sources and the history of development of individual biblical books."<sup>141</sup> The authors further remark that "the focus of this introduction will be squarely on the

finished form of the canonical text. This approach dovetails with recent interests in canonical theological and literary study of the Bible.”<sup>142</sup> Contextually, Carl Armerding’s category “evangelical critics” (in contrast to the “Traditional Conservative” and the “Rational Critical”)<sup>143</sup> precisely describes Dillard and Longman’s interpretive position. Armerding describes the “evangelical critic” in the following manner:

This third view sees the Bible as the Word of God in the words of men. There is really no distinction that can be made between the two—Scripture is totally the Word of God even as it comes totally in the words of men. This means that evangelical critics will desire, like traditional conservatives, to guard against setting aside marks of special revelation or supernatural intervention. It also means that, like liberal critics, they will be genuinely open to the flow of history, the cause-and-effect relationships of human progress, and the literary forms in which these are expressed.<sup>144</sup>

Therefore, according to Armerding, “Evangelical critics can and will use all the tools provided by literary and historical science, but they have definite controls.”<sup>145</sup> Such controls for the evangelical critic are based “in the belief that supernatural acts in history can and do take place, and that these are evidence of God’s Word in the world.”<sup>146</sup> In other words, evangelical critics will not share in the “positivistic presuppositions with the more rationalistic critics. . . . That kind of [rational] criticism looks at the narrative not to discover its history *since* the event, but to find out *how* the incident was invented and developed. . . . [But] their [evangelical] criticism is directed to discovering how and in what forms the narrative developed.”<sup>147</sup> In the main, Dillard and Longman’s *Introduction* exemplifies what Armerding intends as “evangelical biblical criticism,” in that they readily employ historical-critical tools without aligning themselves with rationalistic, anti-supernatural presuppositions.<sup>148</sup>

In the proceeding sections, the views of Dillard and Longman on the more controversial books of the Old Testament will be presented. These will include the books of Genesis (including the Pentateuch; Longman), Isaiah (Dillard), and Daniel (Longman).

#### **4.6.1 Genesis (Pentateuch)**

In his discussion on the authorship of the book of Genesis, Longman notes that the issue is “inescapably intertwined with the question of the composition of the entire Pentateuch.”<sup>149</sup> He then proceeds to explain that “this section on authorship will be longer than those found in other chapters, but it will serve as the basis for the following chapters [on Exodus, Number, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy].”<sup>150</sup> In keeping with Longman’s format, this section on Genesis will also deal with the other books of the Pentateuch that are germane to the discussion of Mosaic authorship.

Longman notes that, strictly speaking, “the Torah is anonymous. Nowhere do these five books explicitly or implicitly claim that Moses is their exclusive author.”<sup>151</sup> However, Longman points out that the early Jewish and Christian

traditions are unified in their respective ascriptions of Genesis through Deuteronomy to Moses. Longman avers,

Although a connection is never specifically made between Moses and the present Torah (in the Torah), there are a number of references to his writing activity. . . . God commands him to record certain historical events (Ex. 14:14; Num. 33:2), and laws (Ex. 24:4; 34:27) as well as a song (Deut. 31:22, see Deut. 32). While Moses is not identified as the author of much of the Torah, the text does witness to the fact that he was the recipient of revelation and a witness to redemptive acts. According to later biblical testimony, there was a book of the Law that was associated with Moses' name (Josh. 1:7, 8). Late in the history of Israel, the Israelites could refer to a "Book of Moses" (2 Chron. 25:4; Ezra 6:18; Neh. 13:1). These passages provide strong intrabiblical data for a Mosaic writing, while not being specific about its shape or scope. It is also clear that Jesus and the early church connected much, if not all, of the Torah with Moses (Matt. 19:7; 22:24; Mark 7:10; 12:26; John 1:17; 5:46; 7:23). This evidence has led to the belief that Moses wrote the Torah.<sup>152</sup>

Nonetheless, Longman explains that "this statement is always qualified by the admission that certain passages were added after Moses' death."<sup>153</sup> These qualifications, according to Longman, are the alleged *post-Mosaica* (i.e., material modified or added after Moses) and *a-Mosaica* (i.e., material not original to Moses) found in the Pentateuch. In regard to the former, Longman comments,

The most obvious of these so-called post-Mosaica is Deuteronomy 34, the narrative of the death of Moses. Although even this chapter has been attributed to Moses by some, most conservatives argue that it was a later addition, possibly added by Joshua . . . though more probably at a later date. Other passages that show indications of post-Mosaic origins include Genesis 11:31, which associates Abraham's Ur with the Chaldeans (a tribe that dominated southern Mesopotamia in the first millennium), and Genesis 14:14, which mentions Dan, an ancient city known by this name only much later (see also Gen. 32:32; 35:31; 40:15; Deut. 3:14; 34:1, 6, 10).<sup>154</sup>

The *a-Mosaica*, according to Longman, relate to those passages that "are awkward if they are ascribed to Moses. . . . For instance, Numbers 12:3 refers to Moses as the most humble man who ever lived, scarcely a statement the world's most humble man would make about himself."<sup>155</sup> Thus, Longman concludes that the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch has always been qualified by most evangelicals as containing relatively few *post-Mosaica* (e.g., cf. the views of R.D. Wilson and O.T. Allis). Reflecting the views of Robert Dick Wilson and Edward J. Young, Longman contends,

[T]o speak of Moses as author of the Pentateuch is not the same as saying that every word is the result of his work. Since there are what appear to be obvious later [inspired] additions, many conservatives speak in terms of the 'essential authorship' of Moses. This expression vigorously affirms Moses as the author

of the Torah, while also leaving open the possibility of later [inspired] canonical additions.<sup>156</sup>

As far as sources are concerned, Longman affirms that “sources have been used in the composition of the Torah. The sources are rarely explicitly cited (see Num. 21:14, the ‘Book of the Wars of the LORD,’ which was likely a post-Conquest document, and Exodus 24:7, ‘the Book of the Covenant’), but neither the biblical text nor the traditional doctrine of Scripture are contradicted by a widespread use of sources on the part of the biblical author.”<sup>157</sup> In the case of Genesis, Longman believes that, “The most blatant evidence for sources is the so-called *toledot* formulas. These are sentences that begin with the Hebrew phrase ‘elleh *toledot*, which has been translated in a number of ways, including ‘these are the generations,’ ‘this is the account.’”<sup>158</sup> Longman goes on to note that (with the exception of its first occurrence in Genesis 2:4) the phrase is always followed by a personal name and closes with the person’s death.

There are eleven such formulas, and these provide introductions to sections of Genesis that were likely original sources passed down the generations and included in the final book. These eleven *toledot* also structure the book and serve to define it as a prologue (1:1-2:3) followed by various episodes: the “generations of” Adam (5:1), Noah (6:9), Noah’s sons (10:1), Shem (11:10), Terah (11:27), Isaac (25:19), Esau (36:1, 9) and Jacob (37:2). That these sources were likely written by the time they came down to Moses may be seen in the references to the “book [*sefer*] of the *taleidat* of Adam.”<sup>159</sup>

Longman, however, acknowledges that the transmisional history of these sources is essentially unknown including their preservation as “largely written” or “partially oral and partially written” sources. In any case, Longman concludes, “if Moses was the author, he utilized sources in Genesis in order to learn about events that happened long before he was born.”<sup>160</sup>

As far as evangelical scholarship is concerned, Longman indicates that there has been a gradual acceptance of source-critical analyses among contemporary, evangelical, Old Testament scholars while, concomitantly, sustaining a commitment to the essential Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. He writes,

[T]he question of the composition of the Pentateuch is undergoing a subtle, but important shift. . . . Evangelical scholars recognize that the Pentateuch contains pre-Mosaic sources as well as post-Mosaic glosses. Indeed, some are willing to identify the sources along the lines of the older documentary hypothesis. [Gordon] Wenham . . . believes that P is an ancient source and that J is the final editor-author (and he implicitly allows that J is Moses). [Allen] Ross . . . reverses the sigla, arguing that J is the source and P is Moses.<sup>161</sup>

Additionally, in 1984, a year before he joined Dillard and Longman at Westminster Seminary, Bruce K. Waltke suggested that,

On the basis of the independent research of both types of literary criticism [i.e., 1) traditional source-criticism, and 2) the New Literary Criticism] I think it is

most reasonable to conclude that Genesis 1 and 2 consist of two accounts of creation which were probably originally isolated sources, and that these sources were later fused together to constitute complementary accounts about the creation. Moreover, I think it is fair to conclude that the analysis of literary critics contributes significantly to a more accurate exegesis of these chapters and also toward more profound reflection on divine matters. . . . In addition to these exegetical gains their analyses has heuristically placed us in the position to perceive more clearly theological truths that must be held in dialectical tension: in P God is transcendent, in J He is immanent; in P God is sovereign over the cosmos giving names to its life supportive systems—"Day," "Night," "Sky," "Earth," "Sea"—in J man, as God's responsible vice-regent over the earth, names all the animals. In P we feel comfortable, assured that God is in control, but uncomfortable because he seems remote. But in J we feel uncomfortable because we are uncertain about what man will do but reassured that God is with us. In P God calls upon man to subdue the earth, in J He places man in the Garden to tend it.<sup>162</sup>

Waltke, however, did not advocate the traditional-critical approach toward source criticism, but, in fact, went on to defend the essential Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.<sup>163</sup> He asserted, "Now if we can establish ancient material in the sources and cannot establish later material in them, and if the fusion could have taken place at a very early period we have no reason to reject out of hand the notion that Moses authored the essential core of the Pentateuchal material."<sup>164</sup> Thus, Waltke believed that Moses, in his composition of *proto/Ur-Genesis*, utilized independent sources that have been classically delineated by modern, source critics as J (i.e., the Yahwist) and P (i.e., the Priestly Writer). In his recent commentary on Genesis, Waltke, in agreement with Gordon Wenham, writes,

In sum, one may plausibly and most simply identify Moses as the author of the so-called J and hypothesize that he used fragments of diverse material, which have been traditionally denominated as P, to construct the skillfully unified Ur-Genesis. It is also possible that Moses himself later interpolated alleged D material into his finished composition (e.g., Gen. 26:5), even as Muhammad secondarily interpolated material into the Koran. In any case, the overall artistry of the whole and its parts, in spite of the few apparent contradictions, show that the author carefully used his sources in an integrated and sustained literary imagination, not as a redactor who crudely patched his material together. If one assumes the Mosaic authorship of Ur-Genesis, anachronisms such as the mention of Dan (14:14) and the reference to the kings of Israel (36:31) show that the scribes, the official revisers of the text, modernized and supplemented as needed the putative Ur-text of Moses.<sup>165</sup>

In his article, "Authorship of the Pentateuch" in the *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*,<sup>166</sup> T. Desmond Alexander has taken the evangelical view another step further with respect to source-critical analysis of the Pentateuch. Alexander believes that the Pentateuch had a long compositional history and that it was actually edited and redacted with original Mosaic

material, rather than having been essentially authored by Moses. Alexander provocatively writes,

In the light of the coherent narrative plot that runs from Genesis through Kings, which cannot be easily broken at either end of Numbers [i.e., the Tetrateuch] or Deuteronomy [i.e., the Pentateuch], it seems best to assume that all of the material in Genesis to Kings was brought together at one time to form the extended narrative that comprises these books. Given the diversity of materials and styles of presentation contained in Genesis to Kings, earlier traditions were clearly used to compose this complex literary collage. The books of Genesis to Kings were probably given their present shape shortly after 561 B.C., the date of Jehoiachin's release from prison (2 Kings 25:27).<sup>167</sup>

What appears to be a radical departure from an evangelical view of the compositional history of the Pentateuch and, more importantly, the doctrine of inspiration is, in Alexander's mind, not the case at all. In fact, Alexander claims that his perspective does justice to both the Pentateuch's compositional history and the concept of divine inspiration:

To suggest, even tentatively, that the Pentateuch reached its present form long after the time of Moses may appear to some readers to undermine its authority and challenge the concept of divine inspiration. Such, however, is not the case. A late date of editing does not automatically deny the authenticity of the traditions contained in the Pentateuch, especially when, as we have noted, earlier written documents have been used in its composition. Indeed, by linking together the books of Genesis to Kings, the final editor of this material produced a unique perspective on God's dealing with humanity. This ancient metanarrative not only recounts events that have taken place, but significantly offers an authoritative explanation of them.<sup>168</sup>

In 2003, at the InterVarsity reception on the release of the newly published *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*, Longman gave a favorable review to Alexander's article with respect to the exilic redaction of the Pentateuch within the compositional "metanarrative" framing of Genesis through Kings.<sup>169</sup> Without denying his original view of "essential Mosaic authorship," Longman prefaced his comments on Alexander's views by affirming with him, "I think there is substantial post-Mosaic redactional activity extending beyond the traditional post—and a-Mosaic."<sup>170</sup> This statement is further unpacked in his book, *How to Read Genesis*, where Longman reaffirms both foundational Mosaic authorship and substantial (inspired) post-Mosaic redactional activity:

1. Moses had a foundational connection with the production of the book of Genesis and the Pentateuch as a whole.
2. Moses used sources, presumably oral and written, that were handed down to him from an earlier time.
3. Evidence of significant post-Mosaic redactional activity exists in the book of Genesis and the Pentateuch.
4. It is not possible or useful to definitively and completely divide the pre-Mosaic, Mosaic and post-Mosaic from each other.<sup>171</sup>

In his review proper of Alexander, Longman comments,

Alexander also argues that there is a basic narrative plot that extends from Genesis to Kings and that points to a final redaction of the material in approximately 560 [B.C.], in the middle of the exile. So in conclusion, Alexander argues that the Pentateuch as we know it came into literary existence at the time of the exile, but that there is clear evidence in the case of Deuteronomy 5-26, but also more potentially, that there is ancient material in the final composition. While he concludes that "Moses probably did not compose the Pentateuch as we presently know it" he also in my opinion rightly asserts that "the Pentateuch's claims concerning Moses' literary activity should not be rejected but rather respected." In the end he agrees with [Meir] Sternberg that the book's authority is not rooted in Moses or human authorship but rather in divine inspiration. In short, these important articles [Alexander's and D.W. Baker's article on "Source Criticism," pp. 798-805 in the same volume] present a balanced, exegetically reasoned approach to the problem of the composition of the Pentateuch. They refuse to make strong assertions when the textual evidence does not allow for them, but they also refuse to completely abandon the idea of Mosaic involvement in the production of the Pentateuch.<sup>172</sup>

Moreover, in his book on Genesis, Longman reiterates his endorsement of Alexander's exilic date for the redactional composition of Genesis through Kings using original Mosaic sources: "it seems best to affirm Moses' central role in the production of Genesis, while ultimately affirming its composite nature. In a recent article on the authorship of the Pentateuch Desmond Alexander, a prolific and insightful thinker on the subject, suggests that some passages provide evidence that the latest editorial work comes from the time of the exile or soon after."<sup>173</sup>

Longman, like Alexander, mediates between the traditional view of Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and the historical-critical view which dates each source document (e.g., *JEDP*, the sources of the "documentary hypothesis") beyond the time of Moses. In comparison with his Old Princeton-Westminster predecessors, it is evident that Longman has gone much further upstream in his acknowledgment that there is significant and late post-Mosaic redactional activity in the Pentateuch while also maintaining that the Pentateuch was essentially authored by Moses. Thus, we see in Longman the borrowing of both traditional and critical traditions. On the one hand, Longman borrows the concept of "essential Mosaic authorship" from his predecessors, Wilson and Young, and yet, on the other hand, Longman acknowledges that the research of modern historical criticism regarding the existence of significant and late *post*- and *a-Mosaica* is also valid. The two seemingly incongruous positions are harmonized by making use of an expanded version of Wilson and Young's concept of "later inspired redactors" that would even include substantial amounts of exilic and/or post-exilic redactions. Longman believes, therefore, that there were "obvious later [canonical] additions" appended to the material

originally authored by Moses and that the two may have been redacted together by a later “inspired” editor (s).<sup>174</sup>

#### 4.6.2 Isaiah

In his chapter on Isaiah, Raymond Dillard provided an insightful historical overview of the various positions and interpretations related to the authorship and compositional history of the book of Isaiah.<sup>175</sup> According to Dillard, conservative evangelical scholars have classically defended the authorial unity of Isaiah, the eighth-century prophet of Jerusalem, while denying the notion of an extended compositional history for the book.<sup>176</sup> By contrast, historical-critical scholars claimed that there were conspicuous textual differences between Isaiah 1-39 and chapters 40-66 due to dissimilarities in vocabulary, style, perspectives, and backgrounds. Soon discrepancies between chapters 40-55 and chapters of 56-66 were also suspected. Consequently, critical scholars deemed that these three separate sections were the literary products of three different authors from three distinct periods: 1) chapters 1-39: Isaiah, the son of Amoz, the eighth-century prophet of Jerusalem, 2) chapters 40-55: Deutero-Isaiah of the Babylonian exile, and 3) chapters 56-66: Trito-Isaiah of the post-exilic, restoration community of Jerusalem.<sup>177</sup> Dillard, however, noted:

The distinctions continued to multiply. For chapters 40-66 alone, various scholars began to identify a second, third, forth, fifth, and sixth Isaiah. The dissection of the book also continued unabated in Isaiah 1-39. . . . Any element of Isaiah 1-39 that critical scholars felt did not clearly show relevance to events in the eighth century was excised. In its most extreme form, critical dissection of the book left between 20 and 40 percent of Isaiah 1-39 as genuinely from the hand of Isaiah.<sup>178</sup>

The earlier assumption among scholars of an “accidental” combination of two independent works has been largely abandoned in recent scholarship due to the acknowledgement of common themes and vocabulary in the two parts of the book. According to Dillard, the most common explanation of such literary unity was explained “by assigning the composition of Isaiah 40-66 to the prophet’s disciples or a ‘school’ of his followers (8:16-18; 50:4) that preserved his memory and applied his perspective in later generations. These otherwise unknown individuals saw in later events situations to which they could apply Isaiah’s earlier preaching.”<sup>179</sup> Dillard observed that the arguments of P.R. Ackroyd (1978),<sup>180</sup> B.S. Childs (1979),<sup>181</sup> R. Rendtorff (1984, 1990),<sup>182</sup> R. Melugin (1990),<sup>183</sup> C.R. Seitz (1988),<sup>184</sup> and others had already been “anticipated by earlier Jewish and Christian scholars who had argued for the authorial unity of Isaiah.”<sup>185</sup> However, the main difference between the pre-critical views of the earlier Jewish and Christian interpreters and the views of modern biblical scholarship is that the latter group views the unity of Isaiah as “a redactional unity.” Dillard noted, “Instead of viewing Isaiah 40-66 as an independent work accidentally appended to the work of the eighth-century prophet, some scholars now argue that Isaiah 40-66 never existed apart from the

first half of the book and that it was composed (through what could yet be a complex redactional process) in light of the earlier material.”<sup>186</sup> Furthermore, the earlier arguments made by conservatives for the authorial unity of Isaiah “based on common themes and vocabulary have now in large part been taken over and pressed into service as arguments for a redactional unity in the book.”<sup>187</sup>

#### 4.6.2.1 Dillard’s Position on Isaianic Authorship

Dillard’s own position regarding the authorship of Isaiah is moderate. Within the context of critiquing the conservative view, on the one hand, and the historical-critical view, on the other hand, it appears that Dillard desired to find a *via media* between both extremes.<sup>188</sup> Dillard seriously entertained the notion that an anonymous, divinely-inspired disciple/prophet of Isaiah wrote the second half of the book, i.e., chapters 40-66, during the Babylonian exile and appended it to the original prophecies, i.e., chapters 1-39, of the eighth-century prophet of Jerusalem, Isaiah, son of Amoz.<sup>189</sup> Cognizant of the fact that his line of reasoning cut against the grain of the earlier views of his predecessors (e.g., cf. the views of J.A. Alexander, O.T. Allis, and E.J. Young), Dillard attempted to justify his position by noting an analogous situation in the anonymous, post-Mosaic redaction of chapter 34 to the book of Deuteronomy. According to Dillard, the two cases of redactional activity were parallel because in both instances an unknown author/redactor appended inspired text to the foundational writings of a recognized prophet. In other words, Dillard pointed to the fact that since most evangelicals regarded the last chapter of Deuteronomy describing Moses’ death as not having been written by Moses himself, evangelicals should also be theoretically open to the possibility that the second half of the book of Isaiah, i.e., chapters 40-66, may have also been written by an unknown, inspired author who lived during the Babylonian exile. Dillard asserted,

Whatever one concludes about the historical relationship between Moses and Deuteronomy, it is clear that Moses did not write the account of his own death (Deut. 34:1-8); the person who wrote this final section of the book lived at a time when a number of prophets had come and gone, but none like Moses (Deut. 34:10-12). This is to say that the setting presumed by this chapter (a time after the death of Moses) precludes Moses’ having written it. Although the New Testament cites Deuteronomy and attributes it to Moses (24:1-3 in Mark 10:4; 2:4 in 1 Cor. 9:9), no one would seriously argue that this includes Deuteronomy 34. Recognizing that the setting of Deuteronomy 34 requires an author living later than Moses, the author traditionally assigned to the book, is not materially different from recognizing that the background of Isaiah 40-66 presumes an author living during the Exile. Isaiah is not mentioned in the second half of the book. However, the reality of prophetic inspiration is not thereby eliminated: an author living later in the Exile foresaw through divine inspiration what God was about to do through Cyrus, just as Isaiah foresaw what God would soon do with Tiglath-pileser III (Isa. 7). This later author saw in Isaiah’s prophecies of exile and a remnant events that were transpiring in his own day, and he wrote to develop and apply Isaiah’s preaching to his fellow exiles. Although the anonymity of this great prophet is a problem, it is no more unusual than the anonymity of the historical books or the book of Hebrews.<sup>190</sup>

Dillard's statement that "the reality of prophetic inspiration" was not eliminated because "an author living in the Exile foresaw what God would soon do through Cyrus, just as Isaiah foresaw what God would soon do with Tiglath-pileser"<sup>191</sup> confirms that he believed that the later unknown prophet was as equally inspired to write a lengthy portion of prophetic text, i.e., chapters 40-66, as the original Isaiah. Recently, moderate evangelicals in Britain, including Hugh G.M. Williamson and Christopher R. North, have also accepted the Deutero-Isaiah theory while affirming the presence of supernatural, predictive prophecy. Williamson comments,

In adopting this principle of multiple authorship as the starting point for the present investigation, one or two points deserve emphasis, even though this is not the place, nor is there today any real need, for a full exposition of the reasons that have led to the acceptance of this conclusion. First, in view of repeated accusations it should be emphasized that this opinion is not necessarily motivated by a wish to circumvent the possibility of predictive prophecy. Indeed, there remains plenty of 'prediction', both general and specific, within Deutero-Isaiah itself.<sup>192</sup>

Similarly, North asserted,

OT prophecy is largely prediction. Isa. xl-lv (lxvi) is prediction. But is it prediction two centuries in advance? There is no denying that prophets sometimes ventured on 'long-range' prophecy, but when they did it was briefly and in general terms, as in Isa. ii. 1-4, xi. 6-9. The predictions of a prophet were always related to the circumstances of his own time and it is difficult to see the relevance for Isaiah's time of a corpus of sixteen chapters containing descriptions of events and persons two centuries later.<sup>193</sup>

In this regard, due to the divergence of views among evangelicals, Dillard declared that the question of Isaianic authorship should not be regarded as a theological *shibboleth* (*Judges 12:6*) or litmus test for orthodoxy.<sup>194</sup> Moreover, he held that whether one believed that the book was written by Isaiah, the eighth-century prophet, or by others, who applied his teachings to a later time, ultimately, did not matter, because "Isaiah 40-66 clearly was addressed in large measure to the needs of the exilic community."<sup>195</sup>

In Dillard's lecture notes on the Prophets, he compared the various divine "call narratives"<sup>196</sup> and included a hypothetical section labeled "II Isaiah":<sup>197</sup>

<u>Outline:</u>	<u>Moses</u> Exodus	<u>Gideon</u> Judges	<u>Jeremiah</u>	<u>Isaiah</u>	<u>Ezekiel</u>	<u>II Isaiah</u>
Divine Confrontation	3:1-4a	6:11b-12a	1:4	6:1-2	1:1-28	-----
Introductory Word	3:4b-9	6:12b-13	1:5a	6:3-7	1:28-2:2	40:1-2
Commission	3:10	6:14	1:5b	6:8-10	2:3-5	40:3-6a
Objection	3:11	6:15	1:6	6:11a	2:6, 8??	40:6-7
Reassurance	3:12a	6:16	1:7-8	6:11b-13	2:6-7	40:8-11
Sign	3:12	6:17-21	1:9-10	-----	2:8-3:11	-----

In his form-critical investigation of II Isaiah's putative "call narrative" in 40:1-11, Dillard noted,

We only stop to look at what has been called a call narrative in Isa 40:1-11 because it is so important to higher critical arguments regarding the authorship of the book. Setting aside the matter of vaticinium ex eventu as a principle philosophical reason for the notion of an exilic 2 Isa, the presence of a second call narrative in Isa 40 constitutes perhaps the strongest argument for the diversity of authorship of the book.<sup>198</sup>

In his analysis proper, Dillard apparently wrestled with the exegetical arguments "for" and "against" the notion of a "call narrative" in "II Isaiah."

Let's look at the outline first, and then make a few comments:

- a. It is important to note the absence of anything looking like "encounter"—no theophany, no historical setting of daily events into which the divine appearance comes as an interruption.
- b. If 40:1-2 is an introductory word, the reason for the commission is given—it will be to comfort the people. Vs. 3 is pl. imptv [i.e., imperative] and vs. 6 is singular imptv—perhaps set in the divine council.
- c. Commission: It is the qol [Eng. "voice"] of Yahweh that summons Isa (6:8) and Ezek (1:28). Perhaps, ala Habel, the reason for the omission of the theophany is the imminent expectation of the appearance of the glory of Yahweh (40:5) (Note absence of shalah [Eng. "send"] and halak [Eng. "go"]).
- d. Objection to instruction to cry out is to ask "What shall I cry"—it reflects back on the "all flesh" of the commission—human flesh cannot stand the day of the appearing of God.
- e. Reassurance: Reassurance reaffirms the commission and elaborates on it. The imptv forms have changed again—to a fem singular (perhaps of Jerusalem or an ancient term for herald—Ps 68:11). "Do not fear" (40:9) is found in the reassurance to Ezekiel.
- f. No specific sign is given—but note it was also not given with the call narrative of Isa 6.

Dillard tentatively concluded that one could not be positively identified: "The precise speakers and the roles of the speakers are not clear—the changes in

imperatives, the absence of a clear indication of the divine council, etc. leave the identification of the passage as a call narrative in doubt. . . . The absence of the theophany—even though immediately expected also means that the most we could possibly speak of would be ‘fragments’ of a call narrative.”<sup>199</sup> The following notations are exemplary of Dillard’s interpretive wrestlings:

But let’s grant that this is a call narrative for a moment:

- a. I would still feel that the issue is begged by the designation “call narrative”—is this an experience which takes place only once in a prophet’s life at his “call” and which is then unrepeated so that if there were two it would mean multiple authors? Here I would mention again Micaiah in 1 Kgs 22—already widely recognized as a prophet of Yahweh, and yet his vision in the presence of Ahab is in “call narrative” form. Perhaps the issue would be less prejudiced if this were called “encounter and commission” narrative without the implication of an inceptive call.
- b. Even if we grant that there are two “calls” here, it might be worth noting that there is a marked difference in emphasis in the two calls between judgment and doom (Isa 6) and comfort (Isa 40)—presumably the separation of the single call experience into these two narratives could be a rhetorical device—though again we are only speculating.”<sup>200</sup>

Thus, it is clear from his lectures notes that Dillard did not find the presence of a legitimate “call narrative” in Isaiah 40:1-11. However, when it came time to publish his views in the *Introduction*, Dillard decided in favor of “Il Isaiah.” One of the apparent reasons for such a controversial move was, in his mind, the possibility of a prophet having a “school” or “disciples.” Dillard taught that the concept had sufficient evidence from both Old and New Testaments to justify its usage. In his lecture notes, Dillard maintained,

If you turn to the beginning of the gospel of Mark, the account opens with ‘*arche tou euaggelious ‘iesou christou*’—this opening formula could be compared with the opening of the prophetic book, e.g., ‘*hazon yeshayahu*’ ‘*dibre yirmeyahu*’ ‘*dibre amos*’ etc. Yet in the case of the gospel of Mark, we recognize immediately that this is not a statement of authorship—the account that follows is composed of both first person and third person materials, and represents the work of Mark, a follower of Jesus. Similarly the other gospels were not written by Jesus but contain reminiscences and accounts influenced by early Christian tradition and varying audiences in accord with the memory of his disciples. The accounts about Jesus were remembered differently and arranged differently and put to varying purposes by the different disciples. Jesus, the great prophet, was remembered by his disciples, under the inspiration of God to be sure. The prophets of the Old Testament also appear to have had disciples. The relationship between the man and the book, so familiar to NT studies as an issue in the search for the historical Jesus, is likewise an issue in the prophetic literature. Not only is it possible that the prophets did write, it is also possible that some never wrote themselves. The evidence for these ‘circles’ of disciples is clear in a few passages: the case of Baruch would be obvious in his relation to Jeremiah. But consider also Isa. 8: 16-17+18—some

similarly use Isa 50:4, though it is more difficult in that case. Again, . . . we walk our familiar tension again of negating both extremes: the extreme that the prophets were solitary individuals functioning always as their own scribes, and also that the prophets were only remembered in oral transmission over a long period so that what is recorded does not really reflect their messages and the events of their own times. Some prophets may have written and had disciples—some may not have had followers ('schools').<sup>201</sup>

From his own words, therefore, it is clear that Dillard held that the prophet Isaiah had "disciples" in accordance with Isa. 8:16-18 (and possibly 50:4) much like the prophet Jeremiah, who had a known disciple named Baruch (cf. Jeremiah 36).

In recent times, there has been a growing acceptance among evangelical scholars toward a similar position regarding the multi-authorship view of Isaiah.<sup>202</sup> Along with Dillard, these scholars also claim that Isaiah had disciples who authored the second half of the book. Longman, in the second edition of the *Introduction* (2006), parenthetically adds to Dillard's section on Isaiah: "[John] Goldingay provides an excellent example of an evangelical commentary that argues for multi-authorship."<sup>203</sup> In his commentary on Isaiah, Goldingay maintains that there are four human voices in the book.<sup>204</sup> These voices include the Ambassador, the Disciple, the Poet, and the Preacher. The Disciple(s) was responsible for redacting the other voices together. These voices correspond to the three critical sources including First Isaiah, Second (or Deutero-) Isaiah, and Third (or Trito-) Isaiah. Goldingay avers,

The Ambassador, the Poet, and the Preacher have been known for a century as First, Second, and Third Isaiah. Their voices appear within chapters 1-39, 40-55, and 56-66, arranged and orchestrated by the Disciple(s). Indeed, we can think of the Poet as in part a disciple of the Ambassador: that is, Second Isaiah sometime preached on texts from First Isaiah and perhaps produced the first edition of the material that now appears in chapters 1-55. And/or we can think of the Preacher as in effect a disciple of the Poet (and the Ambassador): that is, Third Isaiah sometimes preached on texts from Second and First Isaiah and perhaps produced a new edition of their words. Further, as there will have been more than one Disciple who contributed to the book, so there may have been more than one Poet: that is, more than one person may have contributed to chapters 40-55. More certainly, there was probably more than one Preacher: that is, chapters 56-66 may contain more than one prophet's words.<sup>205</sup>

It is evident, therefore, that Longman believes that evangelical scholarship and critical theories surrounding the multiple authorship view of Isaiah are compatible.<sup>206</sup>

In his writings, Dillard conspicuously did not address the arguments against the notion of Isaianic "disciples." Most noticeably, Dillard never responded to the contrarian views of his predecessors within the Old Princeton-Westminster trajectory. He sidestepped the works of Joseph A. Alexander, Oswald T. Allis, and, especially, Edward J. Young, who vigorously argued for the single authorship view. Young, in particular, was very familiar with the notion that

Isaiah's disciples had allegedly redacted and produced the canonical final form of the book. Young criticized the inherent subjectivity of the view claiming that it was merely based upon conjecture and speculation. He asserted,

[I]f the editors collected so many utterances which really were spoken by various persons, and issued them under the name of Isaiah, they did a very dishonest thing. For the heading (1:1) which these editors prefixed to the book is, as we have seen, very specific, and gives the impression that the entire book is the vision which Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning specific subjects and at a specific time.<sup>207</sup>

More recently, H.G.M. Williamson has also effectively challenged the view. Williamson declares,

[I]t has to be pointed out that there is really no evidence for the existence of such a school after the time of Isaiah nor any explanation of where or how it could have maintained itself in comparative isolation during a period of time of more than two centuries. Furthermore, [R.E.] Clements [in "The Unity of the Book of Isaiah," *Interpretation* 36 (1982): 117-129 (119)] observes that the argument is circular, the existence of the group being allegedly attested from the book itself [i.e., Isaiah 8:16], and he asks in what meaningful sense one may speak of a "disciple" could have the liberty to introduce so much new material. It remains to be seen, therefore, whether the observations on which this theory is based cannot be more reasonably explained without recourse to the dubious hypothesis of a school of disciples of the prophet.<sup>208</sup>

Peter R. Ackroyd, who was not necessarily sympathetic to the findings of conservative evangelical biblical scholars, noted that the notion of Isaianic "disciples" really had no basis in fact, but was merely an assumed deduction from the canonical form of the book. Rather, Ackroyd proposed that later editors preserved, reapplied, and/or reinterpreted the original message of Isaiah. He contested, "There is also here the point of attachment for the often elaborated view that there was a 'school of Isaiah,' responsible ultimately for the handing on of his prophetic message, for its elaboration, and in the fullest view of this, providing a context for the activity of his successors in Deutero—and Trito-Isaiah. But such a school is in reality a deduction from the present form of the book."<sup>209</sup> Similarly, Ronald E. Clements wrote that "It would be wrong to attempt to interpret these brief comments and additions as though they constituted new and independent prophecies, whether we ascribe them to the original prophet, or, as must surely be the case, to later editors. Rather they are to be seen as fuller amplifications and interpretations of the prophecies to which they have been appended."<sup>210</sup> On the issue of the composition of the second half of Isaiah and Isaiah's "disciples," Clements stated: "To posit the existence of such a community of disciples of the prophet simply extends the meaning of 'disciples' to a degree that can no longer be regarded as reasonable or probable."<sup>211</sup>

John N. Oswalt, a conservative evangelical scholar, also opposed the Isaianic "disciple(s)" concept, stating that the thematic unity found in Isaiah is

the primary reason most scholars posit a “school” of Isaiah in order to account for it. However, he wonders how Isaiah was the only prophet with such a school in the first place:

If in fact the present composition is the work of at least three major authors and a large number of editors or redactors, it becomes very hard to explain how the book came to exist in its present form at all. The degree of unity which is to be found in the book (e.g., the use “the Holy One of Israel” 13 times in chs. 1-39 and 16 times in chs. 40-66 and only 7 times elsewhere in the Bible) becomes a problem. Thus it becomes necessary to posit a “school” of students of “I Isaiah” who steeped themselves in the style and thought of the “master.” It would be out of such a group that “II Isaiah” sprang during the Exile and from which, later still, came the writings which now constitute chs. 56-66. Aside from the fact that there is no other evidence for the existence of this “school,” it is hard to imagine how it ever would have come into existence for Isaiah (and not the other prophets) in the first place.<sup>212</sup>

Moreover, on the passage often used to justify the presence of Isaiah’s disciples, Oswalt notes, “[Isaiah] 8:16, ‘Bind up the testimony, seal the teaching among my disciples,’ is frequently referred to as the impetus for the founding of a school. But this is hardly reason enough. In fact, the context makes it plain that the reference is to Isaiah’s predictions concerning the outcome of the Syro-Ephraimite War.”<sup>213</sup> He continues, “this [passage, i.e., Isaiah 8:16] is far from demonstrating that what he [Isaiah] gave them was the equivalent of a dozen chapters [and] that they and fifteen generations of their descendants developed into the present sixty-six chapters. . . . The idea is not credible.”<sup>214</sup>

Amidst such a longstanding divergence of views with respect to the multiple authorship of Isaiah,<sup>215</sup> it is interesting to ponder why Dillard had not provided a more extensive treatment on the subject as he had done with his articles on 2 Chronicles. He included no factual evidence for his controversial view on “II Isaiah” and did not seek to justify his mere assertion of the widely-accepted critical theory. One may reasonably conjecture that within the parameters of an *Introduction* that he did not have the necessary platform to elaborate on such ideas or that he was simply unable to make a definitive case for its plausibility. Be that as it may, due to the significance of what Dillard was proposing within evangelical scholarship in general and the trajectory of the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition in particular, one wonders why Dillard refrained from either: a) refuting the positions of his forebears directly,<sup>216</sup> and b) proffering a constructive, fuller treatment of his multi-authorship view on the compositional history of Isaiah. In any case, it is evident that Dillard’s acceptance of the multiple authorship view of Isaiah stands as a substantive modification to the Old Princeton-Westminster trajectory.<sup>217</sup>

#### 4.6.3 Daniel

In his chapter on the book of Daniel, Longman states that “Daniel, a sixth-century figure, was the subject and author of the book that bears his name. This view does not rule out the possibility that some later unnamed disciples framed

his speeches or even added some or all of the third-person stories. However, it does exclude the idea that the predictive prophecies were given ‘after the fact.’”<sup>218</sup> Longman finds that the book’s description of Daniel as a statesman and prophet who flourished during the sixth century B.C. is historically accurate and that, “The fact that Daniel speaks in the first person in the second half of the book (e.g., Dan. 7:2, 4, 6, 28; 8:1, 15; 9:2; 10:2) provides the internal evidence for Daniel’s authorship. It is further supported by the angelic command to Daniel to ‘seal the words of the scroll’ in Daniel 12:4.”<sup>219</sup> However, Longman is careful to note that while “the internal evidence leads us to believe that Daniel was the source of the vision reports of Daniel 7-12,” these vision reports are “often framed by third-person introductions (e.g., Dan. 7:1).”<sup>220</sup> Hence, Longman concludes that “this leaves open the possibility that the final editing was done by someone other than Daniel.”<sup>221</sup>

In his commentary on Daniel, Longman forthrightly states “the setting of material like what we have in Daniel 1-6 does no more than give us the earliest date for the composition of the book. Nowhere do these chapters claim that Daniel or anyone else wrote them. There is no claim for a sixth-century date of the book. They are accounts about the sixth century, not necessarily compositions of the sixth century.”<sup>222</sup> Longman notes that there is an inherent problem to affixing an accurate date for Daniel because the first six chapters “are surrounded by issues of historical accuracy, while the second six chapters, which are prophecy, are uncannily accurate and precise through the second century B.C., at least up to a definite point.”<sup>223</sup> The difficulty occurs as a result of the apparent accuracy of the latter six chapters especially with regard to the Greek period while presenting scanty references to the historical personages and events for the Babylonian and Persian periods. Longman writes,

To many, these facts appear to result from a second-century date of composition. . . . The conundrum is that faithful interpreters find themselves on two sides of the debate. On the one hand, there are those who believe it is necessary to stick to a sixth-century date, and if they believe that the Bible is the Word of God, they must then struggle with the theological issue of a book that, at least on the surface, attempts to deceive its audience into thinking it is prophesying future events when in reality it is casting the past into a future tense.<sup>224</sup>

Although Longman understands the attempt by some evangelical commentators to employ the well-established use of pseudonymity in the ancient Near East,<sup>225</sup> Longman states that the approach is inappropriate when applied to Daniel. Longman elucidates,

The only way that Daniel’s intention as demonstrated in the text can be achieved is by duping the audience. In other words, in prophecy given after the fact (*vacitinium ex eventu*) the idea was to convince the audience that the prophet was a true prophet to whom God had revealed the future. After showing that by predicting events that had already passed, then there was an

attempt at a real prophecy. This is more than a literary device, and one must question whether such a textual strategy would find a place in God's Word.<sup>226</sup>

In the final analysis, although Longman generally concurs with a sixth-century B.C. date for Daniel, he does not necessarily argue for the early date of the book because he recognizes that there are compelling arguments for both an early and late date for Daniel.<sup>227</sup> As a scholar connected with the history of the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition, Longman is keenly aware of the apologetic works of Wilson and Young on the early date of Daniel. Longman, however, refuses to argue for the traditional view to the exclusion of the second-century B.C. position. The reason for Longman's apparent lack of conviction on this issue is due to his stance that the dating of Daniel is no longer a "litmus test" of orthodoxy. Longman states,

We must resist the temptation to turn this issue [on the dating of the book of Daniel] into a simple litmus test. Some argue that anyone who holds to a sixth-century date is a hopeless "fundie" who refuses to look at the evidence. Others will brand those who opt for a second-century date as "liberals" or "compromisers." I know that there will be reviewers of my work and approach who will view me as softminded or soft-hearted on this issue, but I argue that it is an unhelpful simplification to categorize on the basis of someone's conclusion on this matter. At the very least, we need to look at the motives and arguments behind the conclusions as well as the treatment of the text in the light of the commentator's conclusions of the date of the book. . . . while the present commentary still finds a sixth-century date defensible, it refuses to discount all those who interpret from a second-century date.<sup>228</sup>

In short, Longman sides with J. Baldwin who wrote, "The fact that the standpoint of the writer (sixth or second century B.C.) cannot be ascertained for certain does not greatly affect the interpretation."<sup>229</sup> Longman concludes that the dating of the book—although important—should not be overemphasized. Instead, he maintains that the primary focus of attention should be centered upon the proper interpretation of the book and especially its theological content.

#### **4.7 Dillard and Longman's Contributions**

Raymond B. Dillard and Tremper Longman III were the key players for two decades of Old Testament scholarship at Westminster Theological Seminary immediately following the lengthy career of Edward J. Young.<sup>230</sup> Dillard and Longman carried on Young's legacy in several significant ways: 1) they professed a personal commitment to "a high view of Scripture" as "the inspired Word of God," 2) they followed Young's use of genre identification for the purposes of ascertaining the authorship and dates of Old Testament books such as Ecclesiastes,<sup>231</sup> and 3) they, like Young, were skilled Semitic linguists and Old Testament scholars who interacted with scholars within the academic guild and the church.<sup>232</sup>

While it is appropriate to recognize Young's influence on Dillard and Longman, the Old Testament scholar at Westminster who inspired them most

was Meredith G. Kline. Longman declares, “While Kline was Young’s longest-serving colleague in a small department, they had a number of differences of opinion when it came to interpretation and eventually Kline felt it propitious to teach at another institution, though his influence at Westminster has arguably had a longer effect than that of Young.”<sup>233</sup> Essentially, Kline’s influence upon Dillard and Young can be seen in their prolific use of: 1) the comparative method, 2) form-criticism, and 3) biblical theology in the tradition of Geerhardus Vos.<sup>234</sup>

In spite of the influence of these mentors, Dillard and Longman made unique forays into Old Testament studies. Their uniqueness was due in part to their belonging to a different time. Dillard and Longman were students and scholars during the 1970s and 80s, a period of paradigmatic changes which opened up new vistas in Old Testament scholarship that allowed evangelicals to make profound contributions to the academic guild based upon the newer synchronic approaches that sought to explicate the meaning of the biblical text as a coherent unity (e.g., rhetorical criticism, new literary criticism, and narrative criticism). As a result, evangelicals could easily sidestep the more traditional historical-critical questions related to the authorship and dating of biblical texts due to the emphasis upon the literary interpretation of the text’s final form. According to D.G. Hart, “evangelicals have become now more comfortable in the university, the evangelical consensus on Scripture that made the movement a distinct and definable community unraveled. . . . To make their way in the academy, evangelical biblical scholars increasingly approach the text from its human side and bracket out, for the sake of academic etiquette, the divine character and canonical nature of Scripture.”<sup>235</sup> The outcome of this approach has led to: 1) a congenial attitude of tolerance between evangelicals and their mainline Protestant counterparts, and 2) the homogenization of scholarly views among evangelicals and non-evangelicals within the academy.

Another ostensible reason for Dillard and Longman’s uniqueness was due to their posture toward the academy rather than the church.<sup>236</sup> Unlike their predecessors, Dillard and Longman were not ordained into the ministry and did not regularly preach in the pulpits of their respective local churches.<sup>237</sup> The other faculty members at Westminster Seminary were ordained as ministers, including those in the Old Testament faculty such as R.D. Wilson,<sup>238</sup> O.T. Allis,<sup>239</sup> A.A. MacRae,<sup>240</sup> E.J. Young,<sup>241</sup> M.G. Kline,<sup>242</sup> and O. P. Robertson.<sup>243</sup> According to D.G. Hart, the shift from ordained professors at Westminster Seminary who served and regularly wrote for the evangelical, Protestant church to non-ordained professors who were more focused on the academy—mirrored what had already taken place in the academy at large.<sup>244</sup> Hart documents this notable shift within the academy in America which was largely mainstream Protestant from 1900 to 1965 and then, as a result of cultural and sociological factors, became radically secularized after 1970.<sup>245</sup> Thus, even though the earlier Westminster faculty (including Wilson, MacRae, Young, and Kline) may have sparred with their liberal counterparts within the academy (and some of them taught at major American universities), they were, nonetheless, “liberal

Protestants" who also commonly wrote for their respective mainline churches. The situation after 1965, however, dramatically changed the Protestant face of the academy. Hart insightfully notes,

In the most recent period, after 1965, religion faculty and administrators discovered that the older spiritual and cultural reasons for teaching and studying religion were inadequate in a climate where America's religious and political ideals were, to put it mildly, contested. . . . Once the close fit between Protestantism and liberal democracy became debatable, religious studies had to find another rationale, one more academic and less dependent on the mainline Protestant churches or the political and economic order that they supported. Religion professors were no longer able to count on the cache of western civilization, affinities to the humanities, or the prestige of the Protestant establishment. Yet the search for an academic justification for religious studies has yet to produce one that gives the field coherence, carves out religion as a distinct method of inquiry that is different from the way other academic disciplines teach and study religion, or even defines the concept of religion in a way that is useful for scholarly purposes. The only academic convention that has gained the consent of most religion faculty is the one that regards religious studies as the opposite of Protestant divinity.<sup>246</sup>

This radical stance against anything Protestant after 1970 explains the dramatic shift within the academy toward a more secular mindset and outlook. This new intolerant posture towards Protestantism also made it difficult for evangelical scholars to make it in the academy without having first distanced themselves from the church.<sup>247</sup> David F. Wells helpfully comments on this recent phenomenon within evangelical seminaries,

Increasingly, evangelical seminary professors are being trained in the universities, and there is little question that they have brought into the seminaries much of the culture of professionalization. As in the university, so in the seminary, the specialists of various kinds who make their offerings in the programs typically face outward rather than inward. Their primary associations are with those in the same field, first in the seminary and then outside it. The professional [academic] associations provide the linking agencies for their ongoing conversations far more commonly than the enterprise on campus in which they are involved. . . . The small world of each specialist's group spins off into its own orbit, often refusing to contribute to a commonly owned and disciplined understanding of what the education is all about, and most commonly these [academic] groups gain their independence by assaulting theology. It is, after all, theology that has traditionally defined the core around which the other subjects have spun.<sup>248</sup>

If Dillard and Longman had been ordained ministers within the church, it is likely that their work would have conformed to the confessional strictures that supported their ordination vows. After all, the objective of seminary education at Westminster was for the training of clergy with the approbation and oversight of Reformed presbyteries that would subsequently examine each prospective ordinand determining whether or not they had been properly prepared

beforehand. This solemn responsibility would have likely figured into their scholarship and instruction related to the critical views.

Mirroring the shift away from Protestant liberalism by the academy, a separation from the traditionally-held views of their Old Princeton-Westminster forbears can be seen in the scholarship of Dillard and Longman. Their views diverged from the trajectory established by their Old Princeton-Westminster predecessors in some significant ways: 1) Dillard's position against "forced harmonizations" between the historical differences found in Samuel-Kings and Chronicles due to the literary and theological purposes of the Chronicler, 2) Longman's view that the number of *post*—and *a-Mosaica* within the Pentateuch are significantly greater than what evangelicals including his Old Princeton-Westminster predecessors had previously indicated, 3) Dillard's unsettled acceptance of the historical-critical conclusion that Isaiah's disciple, i.e., "II Isaiah," had written Isaiah 40-66 during the Babylonian exile, and 4) Longman's novel proposal that a later inspired disciple(s) may have "framed" the inspired prophecies of Daniel and gave the book its present canonical shape.

In addition to the changes made within Old Testament studies, there were two significant theological modifications that Dillard and Longman introduced that further facilitated their divergence from the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition: 1) Dillard and Longman's focal point of divine inspiration was no longer on a single author associated with the prophetic office or endowment, but on the entire historical process of inscriptionation, composition, and subsequent redactional activity, and 2) Dillard and Longman's expansion of Wilson and Young's understanding of "later inspired redactors" which now could handle the additional weight of anonymous authors. In the writings of Dillard and Longman, it is evident that these two views are interrelated in that the endowment of divine inspiration is not merely bestowed upon an attested biblical prophet *per se*, but also upon a later redactor(s) and/or disciple(s) who was ultimately responsible for the final canonical form.

In his lecture notes for the course, "Introduction to the Old Testament," Dillard forthrightly disputed R. Laird Harris' traditional view that the criterion for canonicity in the Old Testament was prophetic and apostolic authorship.<sup>249</sup> Dillard noted the following:

[L]et's look a little closer to home to the view of canon espoused by R. Laird Harris of Covenant Seminary. In pp. 154-179 of his book, *Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible*, Harris argues that the criterion for canonicity in the OT was prophetic authorship.

- 1) The OT present prophets as the media of revelation—Dt. 13 and 18 and Num 12. Moses was himself clearly a prophet—God instructed him to tell the people that he would raise up another prophet like Moses, including Moses in the same group. We should expect then, that all of the writings of the OT were of prophetic authorship.
- 2) So also the phrase "law and prophets." The Hebrew canon is now divided in 3 parts—Harris argues that this was not always the case, and that "law and prophets" does not refer to 2/3 of the OT, but to all of it. He is able to cite also the use at Qumran. The phrase is found 12 times in the NT; David and Daniel are both called prophets (Matt. 24:15; Acts 2:30). So too

Qumran documents speak of what God commanded through Moses and all his servants the prophets (Harris p. 171). Josephus and other ancient authorities (Talmud) attach the end of canonization to the last prophets.

Yet Harris' argument is open to several questions and objections.

- 1) How are we to know of prophetic authorship for Esther, Job, Chronicles [handwritten: Eccles, S of S]? While such authorship may be possible, it is not available to us to use as a criterion.
- 2) How many men were prophets? Was Solomon a prophet? If we make the definition of a prophet very broad, enough that any recipient of divine revelation was a prophet, Solomon could be so called. But there is no evidence that Sol. was thought of as a prophet in any sense of the more ordinary use of that term. We can make anyone a prophet if we continue to widen the circles of the definition. If all who received revelation are called prophets, then of course, prophetic authorship is a characteristic of all the books. Yet the more restricted use of the term prophet would normally exclude such as Solomon—nor does it seem wise to view Esther, [handwritten: S(ong) of S(ongs)], Job, and Chronicles [handwritten: single strikethrough] as from prophet authors.

But let us suppose that we could speak of prophetic authorship of all of the OT.

- 3) Can this be a criterion for canonicity? Here I think Harris has gone awry. We are not called on to judge whether or not a piece of literature is of prophetic authorship or not. Not only are we unable to know in many cases whether it is true, even the notion of using the fact as a criterion once again involved us in the destruction of canon by taking a canon outside. Then one must also ask the relationship of prophetic office to inspiration and to canonization—did inspiration extend to other prophetic writings or to all that they said? Was it all canon? What is the difference between inspiration and canonicity?
- 4) There is also here a formal parallel to the NT criterion of canonicity which is so frequently adduced—that of apostolicity. While prophetic and apostolic authorship both characterize the Bible, neither covers all cases, nor can either be the criterion for acceptance into the canon—not by us or by ancients. While both are special offices with unique endowment by God for revelation to his church, the church is never called upon to judge: the fact that the canon is largely composed of the words of prophets and apostles does not allow us to think that the essential element of canon is that it expresses the words of prophets and apostles, but rather it is found in the fact that it embodies the word of God's revelation [handwritten: and is intended by God to serve as the only rule for the faith and practice of his people].

So we have come full circle—no external tests are applicable to canon without the destruction of the very idea of canon. We must give canon as a given, self-authenticating, and calling all men into account, but being judged by no one.<sup>250</sup>

Dillard's clear rejection of prophetic and apostolic authorship as the governing criterion for canonicity is revealing. First of all, Dillard objected to Harris' widening of the term "prophet." Dillard wanted to retain a strict

definition for the office of the prophet because, in his mind, to extend the term to all inspired writers could make anyone a prophet. Secondly, books such as Chronicles, Job, Esther, Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes, do not readily present themselves as prophetic in origin, not to mention, how we would know if these books were, in fact, written by those who held the prophetic office. And thirdly, Dillard, though recognizing that prophetic and apostolic authorship characterizes the Bible in general, claimed that Harris' view did not sufficiently account for all the anonymous books and that it would be wrong for the church to distinguish whether or not a prophet or an apostle had written them. In other words, Dillard took the exceptional cases which related to the anonymous books and made it the rule, even to the point of assuming that these anonymous inspired authors were not necessarily prophets in the technical sense. To Dillard, the essential element of the canon was that "it embodies the word of God's revelation." To all intents and purposes, Dillard's objections forthrightly dislodged the authority of the Bible from the prophetic and apostolic offices to the notion of an inspired canonical text which, in essence, has no external criteria, but is only "given, self-authenticating, calling all men to account, but judged by no one."

Harris in his book, *Inspiration and Canonicity*, was careful to note, however, that there is no contrived distinction between the office of a prophet and the gift of a prophet. He asserted, "Ezekiel was both priest and prophet; David was both prophet and king; Moses wrote the five books of the Law and also a Psalm which is found in the Writings, etc."<sup>251</sup> Harris also claimed that all of the Old Testament books were specifically designated in the New Testament and specifically by Christ himself as having come from "the prophets." This was significant in Harris' mind because it answered the assumption that the anonymous books of the Old Testament were not actually prophetic in authorship.

This last assumption can be challenged in two ways. The first is that the regular New Testament phrase used to refer to the whole Old Testament outside the Pentateuch is simply "the prophets." This terminology is used a dozen times in the New Testament. Half of these expressions came from the lips of Christ Himself. Ezra, Samuel, Job, Isaiah, and Daniel are all grouped together by Christ in the category "prophets." Of course, Daniel and David are specifically called prophets in the New Testament without a suggestion of any distinction between "gift" and "office" (Matt. 24:15; Acts 2:30). But more than this, all the books, without distinction, are said to be "the prophets." Compare Matthew 26:56 and other passages where the expression "the scriptures of the prophets" refers to the Old Testament. This is not only the usage of the New Testament, but also of the Qumran Scrolls. The Manual of Discipline speaks of what God "commanded through Moses and through all his servants the prophets" (*The Dead Sea Scrolls: Manual of Discipline*, I, 3; W.H. Brownlee, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, Supplementary Studies, Nos. 10-12 (1951), p. 6). And again, in interpreting Isaiah 40:3 (which is quoted with the formula "it is written"), it says: "That means studying the Torah which He commanded through Moses, so as to do

according to all that was revealed time after time and according to that which the prophets revealed through His Holy Spirit" (*Dead Sea Scrolls: Manual of Discipline*, VIII, 15; *ibid.*, p. 32).<sup>252</sup>

Although Harris' historical survey of Old Princeton and early Westminster Old Testament scholars indicates that there were disagreements among them as to whether someone like Daniel was a "prophet" in the sense of possessing the office or only the charismatic gift, what is obvious is that all of Dillard's predecessors agreed that the persons who wrote Scripture were individuals who possessed the "gift of prophecy" and were considered to have written canonical Scripture. Harris' position necessitated a single-author view in which the person was a spokesperson under divine inspiration and that the product of what he wrote was immediately recognized as authoritative and canonical. Dillard, however, did not want to acknowledge that the "gift of prophecy" necessitated that the person be a "prophet" since books like *Chronicles*, *Song of Songs*, *Esther*, and *Ecclesiastes* could not be substantiated in such a manner.<sup>253</sup>

Dillard's view was a departure from his Old Princetonian-Westminster predecessors. This fact must have been self evident to Dillard because Harris cogently rehearsed the earlier views of Archibald Alexander, B.B. Warfield, and Charles Hodge in which they either claimed apostolic authorship or authority (e.g., Warfield's terminology was "apostolic imposition" which stemmed from apostolic authority)<sup>254</sup> as a principle for biblical canonicity.<sup>255</sup> Moreover, William Henry Green forthrightly taught that the prophetic office was imbued with the very authority of God and, as a result, what the prophet spoke or wrote should be considered canonical.

Each individual book of an acknowledged prophet of Jehovah, or anyone accredited as inspired by him to make known his will, was accepted as the word of God immediately upon its appearance. It had its own independent authority, derived from the source from which it came, irrespective of its being united in a collection with the other books of the same character. And thus the canon gradually grew, as such books were produced from time to time, until the last written, when consequently the canon was complete.<sup>256</sup>

Dillard's predecessor, Robert Dick Wilson, also took for granted that God had inspired and commissioned the prophets to write canonical Scripture. Wilson believed that the source of the Old Testament's authority was the Holy Spirit's direct inspiration of the prophets who wrote the very oracles of God. Wilson averred, "The evidence in our possession has convinced me that at 'sundry times and in divers manners God spake unto our fathers through the prophets,' that the Old Testament in Hebrew 'being immediately inspired by God' has 'by his singular care and providence been kept pure in all ages.'"<sup>257</sup> Wilson placed such an emphasis upon the prophets in their role as inspired men who inscriptured the "Word of God" that he inseparably tied the role of the prophets to the canonization of the entire Old Testament text. He declared,

[T]he conservative [including Wilson's] position is, in general, that the Canon of the books of the Old Testament was completed in the fifth century B.C., before the succession of the prophets ceased. . . . That the prophets Hosea, Joel, Amos, Jonah, Micah, and Isaiah were all written about or before 700 B.C.; Obadiah, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah before 600 B.C.; Jeremiah, Lamentations, and Ezekiel, between 650 and 550 B.C.; Daniel, Haggai, and Zechariah between 550 and 500 B.C.; and Malachi in the fifth century B.C.<sup>258</sup>

Edward J. Young also taught that the prophets were responsible for the Word of God as recorded in the Old Testament. He wrote, "Not only was the Law of Moses regarded as God's Word, but the words and writings of the prophets were also so considered. . . . If, therefore, we are to accept the testimony of the Bible itself, we see that the words of the prophets were regarded in Israel as authoritative, decisive, and inspired. Consequently, it may easily be understood how these words in their written form would be preserved in the Church and regarded as the Word of Jehovah."<sup>259</sup> Young went on to describe how the Former Prophets (i.e., Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings) were included in the canon. He claimed that, "The authors of these books, whoever they may have been, were men who occupied the office of prophet. In ancient Israel this was a special and unique office."<sup>260</sup> In the Writings, however, Young made a distinction between prophets who had possessed the office (i.e., those who were called by God to be a mediator between God and man) and those who possessed the gift of prophecy such as David and Daniel.<sup>261</sup> The point here remains that Young believed that a "prophet" had written inspired canonical Scripture.

Meredith G. Kline, a figure held in high regard by Dillard and Longman, likewise espoused the view that the office of the prophet was an indication of the authority of the prophet's words as coming from "the very mouth of God" and inherently constituted canonical status. Kline taught that,

[The] hallmark of the true prophet was that he stood before the Lord of Glory in the midst of this deliberative council of angels, while the false prophet was one who had not done so and consequently lacked divine legitimization and essential qualification. . . . Such was the call that came to an Isaiah or Ezekiel. Introduced into the council, privileged to hear there the disclosure of the Lord's purposes, the prophets were ready to be sent to men on earth as authoritative spokesmen, as the very mouth of God."<sup>262</sup>

Kline added,

Those who fulfilled the prophetic office were Yahweh's messengers, not only in the general sense that they were inspired agents of revelation (though they, along with others, were of course that), but in the particular sense that they performed a distinctive diplomatic function. The label "prophet" was employed in a more general sense, and the entire Old Testament revelation might be viewed as a revelation through God's prophets (cf. Heb. 1:1). It is, however, methodologically unsound to appeal to this broader, charismatic usage to obscure the difference between the revelatory gift and the administrative office

and so to deny the existence of the prophetic office. . . . The prophets were the representative of Yahweh in the administration of his covenant over Israel to declare his claims and enforce his will through effective proclamation.<sup>263</sup>

Such prophetic and inspired proclamation was, according to Kline, bound up in the covenantal treaty form which conspicuously revealed its inherent canonical status. Kline wrote,

[The] canonical document was the customary instrument of international covenant administration in the world in which the Bible was produced. In this treaty form as it had developed in the history of diplomacy in the ancient Near East a formal canonical structure was, therefore, available, needing only to be taken up and inspired by the breath of God to become altogether what the church has confessed as canon. And that is what happened when Yahweh adopted the legal literary form of the suzerainty covenants for the administration of his kingdom in Israel.<sup>264</sup>

Thus, Harris saw his views of canonicity as unoriginal following within the footsteps of the Old Princeton-Westminster trajectory. He comments,

The view here presented that the original division of the Old Testament canon did not consist of three definite sections, but was somewhat fluid, and that certain books were sometimes in the second division and sometimes in the third, is not original with the author. It apparently was held in former days, but the view of a threefold development gained credence among critical scholars in the last century. Then, among conservatives, the prestige of the name of William Henry Green carried the day for the theory of a tripartite canon. Robert Dick Wilson, approaching the evidence afresh, taught the view here espoused for a fluid threefold classification of the books. It was passed on to the author by his teacher, Wilson's pupil, Dr. Allan A. MacRae. It is a pleasure to acknowledge this debt.<sup>265</sup>

It is more than apparent, therefore, that when Dillard rejected Harris' view of inspiration and canonicity as tied to the prophetic and apostolic offices that he simultaneously undermined the position of his predecessors. This theological modification, however, gave Dillard the justification to allow divine inspiration not to simply reside in an office or endowment of prophecy, but upon the entire historical process (e.g., the prophet along with any subsequent redactor[s]) that would eventually culminate in the canonical form of a particular biblical book.

With respect to Dillard and Longman's expansion of the concept of "inspired redactors," a notable example is found in Dillard's understanding of "II Isaiah." On the one hand, Dillard recognized that the Old Testament, as an inspired text, had a long and complex pre-history. On the other hand, he desired to interpret the text within its canonical context as the "Word of God." Thus, in Dillard's mind, his version of "II Isaiah," as the anonymous, inspired author who followed the original "Isaiah of Jerusalem" and lived during the Babylonian exile, was not identical to the "II Isaiah" of modern-critical scholarship. Dillard believed that the inspiration was not solely based upon the prophetic office (and,

therefore, “single-authorship”) but on the entire process of the book’s canonical formation (i.e., “providence”).<sup>266</sup> Thus, according to Dillard, his use of “II Isaiah” did not impinge upon his understanding of a “high view of Scripture” since “the essential element of canon is . . . found in the fact that it embodies the word of God’s revelation.”<sup>267</sup> In other words, his expansive concept of “later inspired redactors” along with his placing divine inspiration upon the entire historical process of canonization, ultimately, accommodated his use historical-critical methodologies with their conclusions.<sup>268</sup>

In the main, however, Dillard’s use of Wilson and Young’s concept of “later inspired editors” to validate a multi-authorship view of Isaiah was substantively dissimilar from its original intent and meaning. One former colleague of Dillard and Longman’s at Westminster Seminary, O. Palmer Robertson, contends that Dillard had inaccurately compared two disparate literary genres in order to support his view of “II Isaiah.” Robertson states,

While arguments have been made repeatedly for the distribution of materials in the book of Isaiah among the preexilic, exilic, and post-exilic eras, the case made by Dillard and Longman is not particularly strong, especially given their premise regarding the divinely revealed character of the book. Paralleling the question regarding the authorship of Isaiah to the recording of Moses’ death in Deuteronomy ignores the difference in genre between the two writings. The record of Moses’ death comes as a historical prologue dealing with matters of succession in a covenant-renewal document [i.e., the book of Joshua]. As such, this material can be expected to conform to the scriptural conventions related to historical writings. For this elemental reason, it may be assumed that the Pentateuch did not intend to represent Moses as the person who recorded the circumstances of his own death and the ensuing funeral procedures, for historical writings do not as a standard rule describe events in advance of their occurrence. But Isaiah 40-66 appears as an entirely different literary genre. This material possesses all the characteristics of prophetic writings that anticipate events and circumstances of the future. In this case, it is quite natural to expect authorship to reside with someone who lives prior to the age being anticipated. For this reason, Isaiah ben Amoz would not be automatically eliminated from consideration as the author of this material as is Moses with respect to the historical record of his own decease.<sup>269</sup>

Moreover, Wilson and Young had originally viewed these alleged inspired additions and revisions as quantitatively minimal in extent. For example, these editorial changes may have included: the modernization of the text’s language, the updating of names/places as in Genesis 14:14, glosses that better explained the context of a passage, and additional historical information such as the record of Moses’ death in Deuteronomy 34. Iain M. Duguid cogently explains Wilson and Young’s position on inspired redaction of the Pentateuch in the following manner:

There is no room in their conception for substantial (inspired) additions “in the spirit of Moses” which cover subjects that Moses never addressed. Nor could the Pentateuch itself be dated much later than Moses, since for Young the repeated

ascriptions in the Book of Joshua to “the book of the Law of Moses” are part of his case for Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch (*Introduction to the Old Testament*), p.44). The parallel with the gospels is apt. No one doubts that the Gospel writers, under the inspiration of the Spirit, framed their report of the words of Jesus to suit their own narrative goals. Nonetheless, conservatives would assert that the Gospels were composed from the evidence of eye witnesses, close in time to the events themselves. Moreover, in shaping their material the gospel writers never invented new sayings, which they then attributed to Jesus, nor did they so selectively quoted Jesus as to misrepresent what he actually said. The Gospels are therefore an accurate historical record of what Jesus really said. Likewise, for Young and Wilson, the Pentateuch is an accurate historical record of what Moses really said. In principle, then, we are all agreed on the two points asserted by Young and Wilson, that the Pentateuch as it stands is essentially the work of Moses and that there are inspired revisions and editorial additions. *For Young and Wilson, those details were demonstrably small and of minor significance.*<sup>270</sup>

In substantial agreement, Michael Grisanti writes, “Although *limited in scope*, important changes took place from the time of a biblical book’s initial composition to the time when it reached its final canonical form. Those changes were ‘maintenance changes,’ done to make a given text more intelligible to a later generation of readers.”<sup>271</sup>

The central issue then relates to Dillard’s understanding of the identity and function of the “inspired, anonymous author.” Was he “the great unknown prophet” as commonly designated as “Deutero-Isaiah”? Or was he an inspired editor(s) who had faithfully collected Isaiah’s prophecies and then framed them into its present canonical form? Richard L. Schultz observes, “A contemporary editor or group of editors could legitimately frame and order Isaiah’s oracles, adding brief explanatory comments whenever they considered them to be necessary. But is there any inherent reason why ‘an unknown prophet of the exile’ who chose not to identify himself should share in Isaiah of Jerusalem’s divinely bestowed authority?”<sup>272</sup>

Although Dillard firmly rejected the anti-supernatural presuppositions of the “rational critics,”<sup>273</sup> his presumption of the Babylonian background in chapters 40-66, however, is a clear example of his historical-critical reading of the book over and against the single-authorship view of his predecessors. Moreover, it is ironic that Dillard attempted to utilize an expanded form of Wilson and Young’s concept of “later inspired redactors” (e.g., Deuteronomy 34) in order to substantiate his acceptance of the critical position on “II Isaiah,” because Wilson and Young had originally utilized the theory in order to protect the traditional view of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, i.e., that Moses was its one and primary author in spite of later inspired modifications and additions which they deemed were only minimal in extent. It readily appears, therefore, that Dillard’s intent in expanding Wilson and Young’s concept of divine inspiration was to validate his view of “II Isaiah” to the evangelical community at large. Hence, despite the obvious differences in genre between Deuteronomy 34 and Isaiah 40-66,<sup>274</sup> Dillard’s revised concept transformed Wilson and Young’s “inspired redactor(s)” into an outright prophet and author

who did much more than minimal revisions. We must conclude, therefore, that Dillard's view of an inspired "anonymous author/prophet" who freely composed twenty-seven chapters (including the four "Servant Songs") represents an innovation within the Old Princeton-Westminster trajectory.

In sum, Dillard's movement toward the acceptance of "II Isaiah" was the result of two steps: 1) broadening Wilson and Young's idea of "later inspired editors" (as in the case of the Pentateuch) and applying it to the redactional history of Isaiah, and 2) removing the notion of a single-inspired author who was associated with the office of the prophet in order to place the emphasis of inspiration on the historical process of inscripturation, composition, and redaction. Dillard's acceptance of "II Isaiah," in this regard, represents a significant shift in the Old Princeton-Westminster trajectory toward a posture of openness to critical approaches and to their conclusions.

## NOTES

1. This two decade period is not meant to be arbitrary, but represents the period of time during which Raymond B. Dillard (who was first hired at Westminster in 1969) and Tremper Longman III (who left for Westmont College in 1989) were members of the Old Testament faculty at Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.

2. *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary Philadelphia 1965-1966*, 5.

3. *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary Philadelphia 1969-1970*, 25.

4. *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary Philadelphia 1979-1980*, 75.

5. *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary Philadelphia 1981-1982*, 60. Co-taught with Raymond Dillard and Tremper Longman.

6. On Kline's influence, Dillard declared, "It was during a course in Old Testament history and theology in my last year of seminary study (1968-69) that I first became so intrigued and enamored with the Hebrew Bible as to redirect my own interests to pursue study and teaching of the Old Testament as a vocation. The teacher in that course was Meredith G. Kline. I had a growing love for the Old Testament prior to this particular course, but it was Prof. Kline who fanned that interest into a flame. I suspect that every scholar in any field can point to a handful of individuals whose thinking has been of seminal influence in their own development. For me Meredith Kline was one of those figures, and I have continued to regard him as the father of my own interest in the Old Testament. I stand in awe of the fertility of his mind and the breadth of his insights." Raymond B. Dillard, "Intrabiblical Exegesis and the Effusion of the Spirit in Joel," in *Creator, Redeemer, Consummator: A Festschrift for Meredith G. Kline*, eds. H. Griffith and J.R. Muether (Greenville, SC: Reformed Academic Press, 2000), 87. Longman also recognized Kline's influence among evangelicals with respect to form-critical and comparative studies: "The use of the comparative method has deeply enriched our understanding of the OT as it helps us [i.e., evangelical scholars] rediscover the cultural and generic background to the text. Meredith Kline has forcefully demonstrated that OT covenant texts bear a close generic relationship with Hittite treaties and has drawn significant and helpful implications from this relationship." Tremper Longman, "Form Criticism, Recent Developments in Genre Theory, and the Evangelical," *Westminster Theological Journal* 47 (1985): 66.

7. Two other significant Old Testament professors at Westminster during this two-decade period were O(wen) P(almer) Robertson and Bruce Kenneth Waltke. Robertson was born in Jackson, Mississippi on August 31, 1937. He received his B.A. degree from Belhaven College (1952), B.D. from Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia (1962), Th.M. from Union Theological Seminary in Richmond, VA (1963), and Th.D. from Union Theological Seminary in Richmond, VA (1966). During his Th.M. program, he concentrated on Old Testament studies working under noted Old Testament scholars, such as: John Bright, James Luther Mays, and Balmer Kelly. His Th.D. concentration, however, was in the field of New Testament studies. His unpublished dissertation was entitled, "A People of the Wilderness: The Concept of the Church in the Epistle to the Hebrews" which was supervised by Mathias Rissi who had recently come to Union (Richmond) from Basel, Switzerland (Robertson, Personal Correspondence, 27 October 2004). Robertson has taught on the faculties of many evangelical, Reformed seminaries

including: Reformed Theological Seminary (1967-1971), Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia (1971-1980), Covenant Theological Seminary (1980-1985), Knox Theological Seminary (1992-1995), and the African Bible College (1992-2002). He is currently the Vice Chancellor at the African Bible College in Uganda (2002—). His representative writings include: O. Palmer Robertson, *The Books of Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990); idem, *The Christ of the Covenants*; idem, *The Christ of the Prophets* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2004); idem, *The Israel of God: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Pub., 2000); idem, *Understanding the Land of the Bible: A Biblical-Theological Guide* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 1996). During his seven years at Westminster, Robertson taught courses in: "Old Testament History," "Prophets of the Restoration," "Old Testament History and Theology," "Poetical Books," "Exploring Biblical Theology," "Prophetic Books," "Programmed Hebrew," "Elements of Hebrew," "Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah," "The Conquest of the Land," "Studies in Genesis 1-11," "Elijah and Elisha," "Studies in the Psalms" (Cf. *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary Philadelphia*, from 1969 to 1979 *passim*). A festschrift was presented to Robertson entitled, *The Hope Fulfilled: Essays in Honor of O. Palmer Robertson*, edited by R.L. Penny and published by P&R in 2008.

Bruce Waltke was born on August 30, 1930 in West New York, New Jersey. He received his A.B. degree from Houghton College (*magna cum laude*, 1952), Th.M. in Semitics and Old Testament Exegesis from Dallas Theological Seminary (*summa cum laude*, 1956), Th.D. in Greek and New Testament (1958), Ph.D. in Near Eastern Languages and Literatures from Harvard University (1965), and was a post-doctoral fellow at the Hebrew Union College (Jerusalem) in 1970. He has taught on faculty at Dallas Theological Seminary (1958-1976), Regent College in Vancouver, B.C. (1976-1985), Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia (1985-1991), Regent College in Vancouver, B.C. (1991-2001), and is currently Professor of Old Testament at Reformed Theological Seminary in Orlando (1996—). Waltke had left Dallas Theological Seminary, prior to coming to Westminster, after having taught there for sixteen years due to his conversion from dispensationalism to Reformed, covenant theology. For Waltke's view on covenant theology, see Bruce K. Waltke, "Kingdom Promises as Spiritual," in *Continuity and Discontinuity: Perspectives on the Relationship between the Old and New Testaments, Essays in Honor of S. Lewis Johnson*, ed. John Feinberg (Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1988), 263-287. During his five years at Westminster, Waltke taught courses in: "Intermediate Hebrew," "Old Testament History and Theology" (co-taught with Dillard and Longman), "Advanced Biblical Hermeneutics and Exegesis," "Archaeology and the Bible," "Numbers," "Old Testament Textual Criticism," "Comparative Semitic Grammar," "Advanced Hebrew Grammar," "Exegesis of Proverbs," "Exegesis of Micah," "Psalms" (*Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary Philadelphia 1986-1988*, 76-78, 96-97). His representative writings include: Bruce K. Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs: Chapters 1-15*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004); idem, *The Book of Proverbs: Chapters 15-31*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005); idem, *Creation and Chaos: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Biblical Cosmogony* (Portland, OR: Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, 1974); idem, *Micah: An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1988); Waltke and Cathi J. Fredricks, *Genesis: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2001); Waltke and O'Connor, *An*

*Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax.* A festschrift was presented to Waltke on the occasion of his seventieth birthday entitled, *The Way of Wisdom: Essays in Honor of Bruce K. Waltke*, edited by J.I. Packer & S.K. Soderlund and published by Zondervan in 2000.

8. "Memorials: Raymond Bryan Dillard," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 37, no. 1 (1994): 155.

9. Dillard, "Intrabiblical Exegesis and the Effusion of the Spirit in Joel," 87. See also footnote 5 above.

10. "Neo-Babylonian Texts from the John Frederick Lewis Collection of the Free Library of Philadelphia," Unpublished Dissertation, Dropsie College, 1975. The advisory committee is listed in his acknowledgements section.

11. *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary Philadelphia 1969-1970*, 5.

12. *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary Philadelphia 1971-1972*, 7.

13. *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary Philadelphia 1974-1975*, 29.

14. *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary Philadelphia 1977-1978*, 29,

15. *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary Philadelphia 1981-1982*, 17.

16. "In Memoriam: Raymond Bryan Dillard (1944-93)," *Westminster Theological Journal* 55, no. 2 (1993): iii.

17. See *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary Philadelphia*, from 1969 to 1986 [1988], passim.

18. "In Memoriam: Raymond Bryan Dillard (1944-93)," iii.

19. Ibid.

20. Dillard wrote, "I have profited also from the shared research, friendship, and encouragement of other scholars who are ploughing these same fields; the consultation on the Chronicler at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature has proved fertile ground for interaction with others whose labors have been at least in part devoted to this literature. I feel a particular debt of gratitude to Profs. Ralph Klein and Hugh Williamson for their encouragement along the way." Raymond B. Dillard, 2 *Chronicles* (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), ix-x.

21. M.P. Graham, K.G. Hoglund, S.L. McKenzie, eds., *The Chronicler as Historian* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 14.

22. Raymond B. Dillard, "The Chronicler's Solomon," *Westminster Theological Journal* 43, no. 2 (Spring 1981): 289-300; idem, "Reward and Punishment in Chronicles: The Theology of Immediate Retribution," *Westminster Theological Journal* 46, no. 1 (Spring 1984): 164-172. He also published two other articles on Chronicles outside the *WTJ*: Raymond B. Dillard, "The Chronicler's Jehoshaphat," *Trinity Journal* 7, no. 1 (Spring 1986): 17-22; idem, "The Reign of Asa (2 Chronicles 14-16): An Example of the Chronicler's Theological Method," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 23, no. 3 (September 1980): 207-218.

23. Dillard, 2 *Chronicles*. For example, see the positive reviews by David Barker, "Book Review: Raymond B. Dillard's 2 *Chronicles*, Word Biblical Commentary (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987)" in *Grace Theological Journal* 10, no. 2 (Fall 1989): 241-243; Mark A. Thronveit, "Book Review: Raymond B. Dillard's 2 *Chronicles*, Word Biblical Commentary (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987)" in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108, no. 3 (1989): 512-514. Williamson comments, "The commentary throughout is thorough and up-to-date and may be characterized as representing the best of moderate and responsible conservatism." H.G.M. Williamson, "Book Review: Raymond B. Dillard's 2 *Chronicles*,

Word Biblical Commentary (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987)" in *The Journal of Theological Studies* 40, no. 1 (April 1989): 344.

24. Raymond B. Dillard, "Joel," in *The Minor Prophets: An Exegetical and Expository Commentary*, Vol. 1, *Hosea, Joel, and Amos*, ed. T.E. McComiskey (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1992).

25. Raymond B. Dillard and Tremper Longman, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1994).

26. "In Memoriam: Raymond Bryan Dillard (1944-93)," iii.

27. Raymond B. Dillard, *Faith in the Face of Apostasy: The Gospel According to Elijah & Elisha*, The Gospel According to the Old Testament (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 1999).

28. The concept of "plundering the Egyptians," was taken from Exodus 12 where the Bible describes the Israelites being freed from the bondage of the Egyptians after God had sent the tenth and most devastating plague (i.e., the killing of the firstborn in Egypt) upon the beleaguered nation that resulted in the exodus of Israel from Egypt. Verse 36 presents the riches (including gold, silver, and articles of clothing) that Israel received from the Egyptians who gladly offered them in exchange for the quick departure of the Israelites from their land. The plunder, though acquired from a pagan nation, was still taken and, ultimately, given to the Israelites by the LORD (v. 36). There was no stigma attached to the items that were taken, but that the LORD, in his grace, gave the riches of Egypt to Israel.

In similar manner, Origen took the phrase "plundering the Egyptians" and metaphorically applied it to the selective use of non-Christian culture. The principle was originally propagated by Justin Martyr who taught that all truth regardless of its origin could be used for "true philosophy, or Christianity." Other early church fathers followed Justin and Origen's lead including Gregory Nazianzus, John Chrysostom, Ambrose of Milan, and Augustine of Hippo. Lisa D. Maugans Driver, "Early Christian Rhetoric," in *The New Westminster Dictionary of Church History*, vol. I, edited by Robert Benedetto (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008), 213.

29. Kline affectionately dedicated *The Structure of Biblical Authority* to Van Til. Kline noted the tremendous impact that Van Til had upon his thought. Kline wrote, "Cornelius Van Til stands as the prince of twentieth-century Christian apologetics. He has had by far the most profound impact on my own thinking of all my teachers. His theological insight and prophetic witness have been a conscience, if not canon, and his warmly human and gracious godliness has been an inspiration for the life which is in Christ Jesus. To turn a biblical phrase, may he not regard the small estate of this book but only the unbounded esteem and affection his servant, the author, would express in dedicating it to him." Kline, *The Structure of Biblical Authority*, 15.

30. Van Til articulated his indebtedness to Kuyper: "For the action of sinful human though is not merely fruitless; it is destructive of the truth. Sinful man is out to destroy the special principle when it comes to him with its challenge. The natural principle takes an antithetical position over and against the special principle and seeks to destroy it by means of logical manipulation . . . I have chosen the position of Abraham Kuyper." Van Til, *The Defense of the Faith*, 261-265 *passim*.

31. John C. Vander Stelt, *Philosophy and Scripture: A Study in Old Princeton and Westminster Theology* (Marlton, NJ: Mack Publishing Co., 1978), 217.

32. *Ibid.*, 220.

33. James D. Bratt, "The Dutch Schools" in *Reformed Theology in America: A History of Its Modern Development*, ed. David F. Wells (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1997), 122-123.
34. Vander Stelt, *Philosophy and Scripture*, 221.
35. Bratt, "The Dutch Schools," 123.
36. Ibid. On the wide-spread impact of Van Til's thought on the other academic disciplines and courses taught at Westminster Theological Seminary, see John R. Muether, *Cornelius Van Til: Reformed Apologist and Churchman* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2008), 223.
37. John R. Muether, "Van Til: The Chalk Still Flies," *The Bulletin of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia*, No. 4 (1987): 4.
38. On the notion of "common grace" and the "plundering [the Egyptians]" of non-Christian scholarship by Christian scholars, John Calvin wrote, "From this passage [Titus 1:12-13] we may infer that those persons are superstitious, who do not venture to borrow anything from heathen authors. All truth is from God; and consequently, if wicked men have said anything that is true and just, we ought not to reject it; for it has come from God. Besides, 'all things are of God' and, therefore, why should it not be lawful to dedicate to his glory everything that can properly be employed for such a purpose?" John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon*, trans. by Rev. W. Pringle, reprint edition (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1993), 300-301. Quote referenced by Dennis E. Johnson, "Common Grace and Theological Scholarship: Titus 1:5-16," Discourse delivered at Westminster Seminary California, Escondido, California, April 16, 1991. Mark Noll asserts, "Evangelicals have long professed to believe in Common Grace, the principle that God communicates some truth to all humankind, Christian or not, through study of the natural world and of history." Noll, *Between Faith and Criticism*, 165. For a more comprehensive treatment on common grace, see John Murray, "Common Grace," in *Collected Writings of John Murray*, 4 vols. (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1976-82), 2:93-119, cited in Frame, *Cornelius Van Til*, 215.
39. Van Til, *The Defense of the Faith*, 169.
40. Frame, *Cornelius Van Til*, 208, 212-213.
41. Muether, "Van Til: The Chalk Still Flies," 4.
42. Iain M. Duguid, e-mail correspondence, May, 15, 2008.
43. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, xviii.
44. Ibid.
45. Ibid.
46. Ibid.
47. Ibid.
48. Ibid.
49. On Dillard's views on biblical historiography and its general trustworthiness, see his "Book Review: Thomas L. Thompson, *The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives: The Quest for the Historical Abraham* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1974)" in *Westminster Theological Journal* 39, no. 2 (Spring 1977): 376-380.
50. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, xviii-xix.
51. Ibid., xix.
52. Ibid.
53. Ibid.
54. Dillard wrote, "This commentary [on 2 Chronicles] is the product of a number of years of study and reflection on these books [i.e., 1 and 2 Chronicles]." Ibid., ix.

55. Dillard outlined the theological interests for Kings and Chronicles in his course, "OT 213: Old Testament History and Theology," co-taught with Tremper Longman, Spring 1985, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.

#### Topic #1: Theological Motivation in Biblical Historiography

##### Outline:

- I. How not to approach biblical historiography: errors in reference to the relation of history and theology in these writings.
- II. Theological interests in Kings
  - A. The central question: "How did it happen?"
  - B. Emphases in the answer: the standards of Deuteronomy
    1. Centralization of worship (Deut 12:1-32)
      - a. Israel's sin: following Jeroboam I and golden calves
      - b. Judah's sin: the high places
    2. History of the monarchy (Deut 17:14-20)
    3. Efficacy of the prophetic word (Deut 18:14-22) (e.g., compare 1 K 11:29 & 12:15; 1 K 13 & II K 23:16-18; 1 K 14:6 & 15:29; II K 1:6 & 1:17)
    4. Fulfillment of the curses (Deut 27:15-28:68)
    5. Additional individual examples
- III. Theological interests in Chronicles
  - A. The central question: "Is God still interested in us?"
  - B. Emphases in the answer
    1. The relation of Chronicles to Kings
    2. The genealogies (1 Chr 1-9): continuity with the past, legitimacy in the present
    3. David & Solomon: I Chr 10-II Chr 9
      - a. The Chronicler's omissions
      - b. The Chronicler's contributions
        - i. The new Moses & Joshua
        - ii. The new Bezalel & Oholiab
    4. The divided kingdoms (II Chr 10-36); the theology of immediate retribution
    5. Emphasis on the cult
    6. The conclusion (II Chr 36:21)

56. Ibid., xix. Dillard did not deal in length with questions regarding authorship, date, text, sources, theological themes, and outline since they were treated in the companion volume, Roddy Braun, *1 Chronicles*, Word Biblical Commentary (Waco: Word, 1986), xvii-xlv. Dillard expressed general agreement with Braun and Williamson in regard to authorship, date, text, sources, etc. On the question of the common authorship of Chronicles with Ezra-Nehemiah, Braun explained, "the common authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah, accepted since the time of Zunz as scholarly orthodox and buttressed by the support of men of the stature of W.F. Albright (*Journal of Biblical Literature* 40 [1921] 141-24), has been seriously questioned, initially by Sara Japhet (*Vetus Testamentum* 18 [1968] 330-71). Japhet noted five phenomena held as evidence of a common authorship (the presence of the first verses of Ezra at the end of Chronicles, the fact that 1 Esdras begins with 2 Chr 35-36 and continues through Ezra, common vocabulary, style and syntax, and uniformity of theological conceptions) and concluded on the basis of vocabulary and syntax and style that the two works could not have been

by the same author. Others have arrived at the same conclusion, due both to the work of Japhet and their own research (cf. D.N. Freedman, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 23 [1961] 436-42; H.G.M. Williamson, *Israel in the Books of Chronicles*; J. Newsome *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94 [1975] 210-17; and the author [Braun]) . . . the differences in such significant theological themes as retribution and the author's appraisal of such a prominent figure as Solomon make it seem most unlikely that Ezra-Nehemiah in its present form could have come from the same hand as *Chronicles* (cf. Braun, *Vetus Testamentum Supplements* 30 [1979] 52-64)." Braun, *1 Chronicles*, xx.

57. Barker, "Book Review: Raymond B. Dillard's *2 Chronicles*," 242. On the use of these two major themes in *Chronicles*, see Dillard, "The Chronicler's Solomon," 291-292.

58. According to Dillard, as a part of his dominant compositional technique the Chronicler has framed the entire corpus of *Chronicles* using a theological theme known as "retribution theology." Accordingly, this theological perspective "represents the Chronicler's conviction that sin always brings judgment and guilt always brings disaster (usually war or illness), whereas obedience and righteousness yield the fruit of peace and prosperity." In accord with verses such as 1 *Chronicles* 28:8b-9, 2 *Chronicles* 7:14, 12:5, and 5:2 ["The LORD is with you when you are with him. If you seek him, he will be found by you, but if you forsake him, he will forsake you."], Dillard noted that the reigns of individual kings were judged primarily upon how they conformed to these divine standards. This type of theological analysis could be applied to each of the kings in *Chronicles* with respect to "immediate retribution" and the reasons for such divine judgments (cf. the reigns of Saul, Rehoboam, Joash, and especially Asa) as opposed to the conspicuous absence of cause-and-effect elements within the Samuel-Kings accounts. See Dillard, "The Reign of Asa," 207-213. Dillard also noted, "Beyond the specific announcement of retribution theology as his approach, the Chronicler is untiring in his efforts to demonstrate the validity of this principle as it operated in the history of Israel. Since 2 Chr 7:14 announced a program for Israel's future, the Chronicler concentrates on the period after the schism. Of the twenty-six chapters devoted to this period, about half of the material is unique to the Chronicler, without parallel in Kings; the vast majority of this nonsynoptic material is directly in the service of retribution theology as the Chronicler seeks to provide the theological rationale for the events he narrates." Dillard, "Reward and Punishment in *Chronicles*," 167.

59. Dillard contended, "Solomon's prayer presumably had liturgical use through much of the first temple period and was probably recited regularly in the liturgy of the post-exilic temple. The Chronicler was seeking to demonstrate the validity of those petitions and God's response through history, and by implication for his own generation as well. Though the temple had once been destroyed, God's choice of Jerusalem was still valid; though no descendant of David sat on a throne, the Davidic line had not failed (7:18). One would yet come whose origins are of old, from ancient times, to be ruler over Israel (Mic 5:2)." Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, 59. Passage cited by Barker, "Book Review: Raymond B. Dillard's *2 Chronicles*," 242.

60. The word *tendenz* is a German word meaning "trend" or "tendency." See under "Tendenz," in *Collins German Dictionary*, ed. Peter Terrell (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1994), 490. According to R. Soulen, "*Tendenz* Criticism (Ger.: *Tendenzkritik*) refers to the analysis of the intention of an author or, more precisely, to the particular bias with which the author treats his subject matter." Richard N. Soulen, *Handbook of Biblical Criticism*, second edition (Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1981), 191.

61. The Chronicler's *Vorlage* consisted primarily of the books of Samuel-Kings and other available sources that are now unavailable. Braun explicated, "It is commonly agreed that the Chronicler used as his primary source the books of Samuel-Kings although they may well have been in a form somewhat divergent from that found in our Hebrew Bibles or major LXX manuscripts. While a few textual differences may be due to varying text types, and while in some cases no satisfactory explanation has been found (cf. 1 Chr 21 and 2 Sam 24), the great majority of variations is easily seen to have their origin in the Chronicler himself, either as part of his theological *Tendenz* or otherwise." Braun, *1 Chronicles*, xxiii.

62. On Dillard's understanding of passages unique to the Chronicler, Barker notes, "[According to Dillard] the Chronicler probably had a number of texts available (cf. Talmon's discussions of OT textual history), and so more often than not, it would have been a matter of choice of text rather than free composition for the sake of polemic. Dillard also expresses a well received caution about drawing too much from departures from available *Vorlagen*." Barker, "Book Review: Raymond B. Dillard's *2 Chronicles*," 243. Cf. the comments found in H.G.M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, New Century Bible Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982), 17-23.

63. N. Perrin explained, "Redaction criticism is an attempt to represent in English the German word *Redaktionsgeschichte*, which Willi Marxsen [in his *Der Evangelist Markus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956, 1959), 11] proposed as the designation for a discipline within the field of New Testament studies, a discipline that has come very much to the fore within the past two decades. It is concerned with studying the theological motivation of an author as this is revealed in the collection, arrangement, editing, and modification of traditional material, and in the composition of new material or the creation of new forms within the traditions of early Christianity. Although the discipline is called redaction criticism, it could equally be called 'composition criticism' because it is concerned with the composition of new material and the arrangements of redacted or freshly created material into new units and patterns, as well as with the redaction of existing materials." Norman Perrin, *What is Redaction Criticism?* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1969), 1-2.

64. Note Silva's comments in regard to evangelicals and redaction criticism: "Dr. Stonehouse anticipated redaction criticism—a discipline strongly attacked by evangelicals—how does one explain the acceptance of his work by conservatives who have not in any significant way altered their view of the gospels?" Moisés Silva, "Ned B. Stonehouse and Redaction Criticism: Part II: The Historicity of the Synoptic Tradition," *Westminster Theological Journal* 40, no. 2 (Spring 1978): 281. For a historical overview of the debate among evangelical scholars over the use of redaction criticism, see Grant R. Osborne, "Round Four: The Redaction Debate Continues," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 28, no. 4 (December 1985): 399-410. Note also the recent advocacy of a responsible use of redaction criticism by two prominent evangelical biblical scholars: D.A. Carson, "Redaction Criticism: On the Legitimacy and Illegitimacy of a Literary Tool," in *Scripture and Truth*, eds. D.A. Carson and J.D. Woodbridge (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1992), 119-142; Craig L. Blomberg, "The Legitimacy and Limits of Harmonization," in *Hermeneutics, Authority, and Canon*, eds. D.A. Carson and J.D. Woodbridge (Grand Rapids, MI: Academie Books, 1986), 143-144.

65. Ned Bernard Stonehouse was born in 1902 in Grand Rapids, Michigan. He was educated at Calvin College, Princeton Theological Seminary, and the Free University in Amsterdam. Stonehouse taught New Testament studies at Westminster Theological

Seminary from its inception in 1929 to his death in 1962. For a fuller treatment of his life and works, see Dan G. McCartney, "Ned Bernard Stonehouse," in *Bible Interpreters of the 20th Century: A Selection of Evangelical Voices*, eds. W.A. Elwell and J.D. Weaver (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1999), 154-164.

66. Silva, "Ned B. Stonehouse and Redaction Criticism: Part I: The Witness of the Synoptic Evangelists to Christ," 78.

67. Ibid., 81-82.

68. Dillard explained, "Harmonization is the effort to provide scenarios by which two apparently contradictory statements or one improbable statement can be considered historically accurate." Raymond B. Dillard, "Harmonization: A Help and a Hindrance," in *Inerrancy and Hermeneutic: A Tradition, A Challenge, A Debate*, ed. Harvie M. Conn (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988), 152. See also the article by Craig L. Blomberg, "The Legitimacy and Limits of Harmonization," 139-174.

69. Silva, "Ned B. Stonehouse and Redaction Criticism: Part I: The Witness of the Synoptic Evangelists to Christ," 82. The original quote can be found in Ned B. Stonehouse, *The Witness of Matthew and Mark to Christ* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1944), 189. The emphasis is Silva's.

70. Silva, "Ned B. Stonehouse and Redaction Criticism: Part II: The Historicity of the Synoptic Tradition," 282.

71. Dillard, "The Reign of Asa," 208. Quotation cited by Harvie M. Conn, "A Historical Prologue: Inerrancy, Hermeneutic, and Westminster," in *Inerrancy and Hermeneutic: A Tradition, A Challenge, A Debate*, ed. H.M. Conn (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988), 26.

72. Moisés Silva, "Can Two Walk Together Unless They Be Agreed? Evangelical Theology and Biblical Scholarship," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 41, no. 1 (March 1998): 14. Moisés Silva delivered this presidential address at the 49th annual meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society on November 20, 1997 in Santa Clara, CA. Silva was born in Havana, Cuba, on September 4, 1945, and immigrated to the United States in 1960. He received his doctorate from the University of Manchester where he studied under F.F. Bruce and James Barr. He taught Biblical and New Testament studies at Westmont College, Westminster Theological Seminary, and Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary.

73. Ibid., 14, n. 36. Silva, however, does not clearly state which aspects of Dillard's proposals he is defending.

74. Dillard, "Harmonization: A Help and a Hindrance," 157.

75. Ibid.

76. Thiele's work was not published by Zondervan but by the William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

77. See Edwin Thiele, *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings: A Reconstruction of the Chronology of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah*, revised edition (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1965), 57-64. In fairness to Thiele, Dillard has, for the sake of brevity, truncated Thiele's argumentation. From an historical and theological perspective regarding the unity of Asa's reign, Thiele cogently explicated the chronological dissimilarities between the Kings and Chronicles accounts: "If these scriptures concerning thirty-fifth and a thirty-sixth year have no meaning when applied to the reign of Asa, might they originally have had some other meaning? It will be remembered that Rehoboam reigned seventeen years and Abijam three, making twenty years before Asa began his reign. The fifteenth year of Asa would thus be the

thirty-fifth year since the disruption of the monarchy, and that was the year that brought the war with Zerah. This was the year of the great victory celebration at Jerusalem, attended no only by 'all Judah and Benjamin' [Southern Kingdom] but also by the 'strangers with them out of Ephraim and Manasseh, and out of Simeon, for they fell to him out of Israel in abundance [Northern Kingdom], when they saw that the Lord his God was with him' (II Chron. 15:9). This is exactly what Baasha was trying to stop when 'he built Ramah, to the intent that he might let none go out or come in to Asa king of Judah' (II Chron. 16:1). When would this building of Ramah take place—in Asa's sixteenth year, immediately after the great influx to Judah of Baasha's subjects from Israel or twenty years thereafter, ten years after Baasha had gone to his grave if the chronological pattern of Kings is sound? Such a picture fails utterly to make sense, whereas the picture secured when II Chron. 15:19 and 16:1 are reckoned not as the years of Asa but years since the establishment of the divided monarchies gives both historical and chronological harmony. It will be obvious that if the synchronism of II Chron. 16:1 is accepted as historically correct, the chronological pattern of Kings is completely shattered. This is, however, a pattern which when subjected to the most careful analysis gives every indication of being Biblically correct and historically sound. If Egyptian chronology of the ninth and tenth centuries B.C. could be established upon its own secure and absolute basis, the exact synchronism of 1 Kings 14:25, describing Shishak's attack on Jerusalem in the fifth year of Rehoboam, would provide the final answer as to the accuracy of the dates here set forth. But nothing substantial from that period in Egypt is at present available. The weight of evidence favors the dates and the arrangement we have here set forth, and it is in accord with such a pattern that we will proceed" (60-62).

78. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, 123-124.

79. Ibid., 124.

80. Ibid. Dillard later affirmed, "Edwin Thiele provided an alternate explanation for this and many similar phenomena in Old Testament chronologies. Two distinctions crucial to his approach (the distinction between accession-year reckoning and non-accession-year reckoning and between Nisan or Tishri as the first month of the year) have accounted for many problem passages and apparent discrepancies. Since the great empires around Israel varied in their calendrical and regnal reckoning, there is archaeological data making it reasonable to expect a mix of these systems in biblical chronologies. Though Thiele's system may not ultimately achieve consensus in all its particulars, anyone working in Old Testament chronologies must grapple with his approach. Its explanation power is sufficiently great that it cannot be simply dismissed as 'unconscionably harmonistic.'" Dillard, "Harmonization," 155-156.

81. Harry M. Conn served as a missionary in Korea for twelve years. He joined the faculty of Westminster in 1972. He authored edited several books and served at Westminster until he retired in 1998. He passed away in 1999. Grace Mullen (Archivist for the Montgomery Library, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia), e-mail correspondence, April 29, 2008.

82. Conn, "A Historical Prologue: Inerrancy, Hermeneutic, and Westminster," 26.

83. Ibid., 27.

84. Young, *Thy Word Is Truth*, 124. Reference noted by Dillard, "Harmonization," 163.

85. Young, *Thy Word Is Truth*, 124.

86. Dillard, "Harmonization," 163.

87. Tremper Longman III and Alan Groves, "Raymond B. Dillard (1944-1993): *In Memoriam*," in *The Chronicler as Historian*, eds. M.P. Graham, K.G. Hoglund, S.L. McKenzie (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 15.

88. Dillard, "Harmonization: A Help and a Hindrance," 163. A good example of this came from Dillard's teacher, Meredith G. Kline, who taught that Genesis 1 was non-chronological partially because the genre could be identified as "semi-poetic." See Kline, "Space and Time in the Genesis Cosmogony," 2-15.

89. Ibid.

90. Ibid., 164.

91. Ibid. Dillard wrote, "The importance of genre criticism has long been recognized for books like Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes. One's reading strategy for Song of Songs is determined by whether it is identified as an allegory, a drama, or an anthology of love poems; all three positions and numerous variations have been advocated in the history of interpretation, and all three result in substantially different understandings of the book. [E.J.] Young himself approached the authorship of Ecclesiastes through questions of genre. The writer of Ecclesiastes implies that he is Solomon by claiming to be king in Jerusalem and wiser than all before him—yet the oblique way in which this very claim is made suggests that the author is using pseudonymy, an accepted literary convention of his time, and that the book itself may be dated later in light of additional evidence." Ibid., 163-164. Dillard commented on an earlier edition of E.J. Young's *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (London: Tyndale, 1966), 347-349.

92. Ibid., 164.

93. W. Lyons notes, "He [Longman] was attracted to seminary and biblical studies because of the influence of Raymond B. Dillard at Westminster." William L. Lyons, "Between History and Theology: The Problem of Herem in Modern Evangelical Biblical Scholarship" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Florida State University, 2003), 77. Tremper Longman III, interview by William L. Lyons, November 18, 2001. In his dissertation, Lyons provides the most comprehensive biography of Longman's present academic career in print to date.

94. Tremper Longman III and Alice Linda Scheetz were married on June 23, 1973, they have three children: Tremper IV, Timothy Scheetz, and Andrew Eastwick. Ibid., 77, n. 1.

95. *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary Philadelphia 1980-1981*, 32. Longman began teaching during the second semester, i.e., spring 1981.

96. *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary Philadelphia 1981-1982*, 17.

97. *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary Philadelphia* from 1980 to 1982 [1984], passim.

98. Lyons, "Between History and Theology," 77.

99. Tremper Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography: A Generic and Comparative Study* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1991), vii.

100. Ibid., vii-viii.

101. See *Catalogue of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia*, from 1984 to 1986 [1988], passim.

102. Lyons, "Between History and Theology," 78.

103. Longman's works on literary and generic studies include: Tremper Longman III, "Evangelicals and the Comparative Method," 33-42; idem, "Fictional Akkadian Autobiography," in *The Context of Scripture: Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, eds. W.W. Hallo and K. Lawson Younger Jr. (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 476-482;

idem, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*; idem, "Form Criticism, Recent Developments in Genre Theory, and the Evangelical," 46-67; idem, *How to Read Proverbs* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002); idem, *How to Read the Psalms* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1988); idem, "Israelite Genres in Their Ancient Near Eastern Context," in *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*, eds. Marvin A. Sweeney and Ehud Ben Zvi (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004), 175-195; idem, "Lament," in *Cracking Old Testament Codes: A Guide to Interpreting the Literary Genres of the Old Testament*, eds. D. Brent Sandy and Ronald L. Giese (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1995), 323; idem, "The Literary Approach to the Study of the Old Testament: Promise and Pitfalls," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 28 (1985): 385-398; idem, "Literary Approaches and Interpretation," in *A Guide to Old Testament Theology and Exegesis: The Introductory Articles from the New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, ed. Willem VanGemeren (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1999), 100-121; idem, "Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation," in *Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation*, ed. Moisés Silva (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1987), 91-192; idem, "Literary Approaches to Old Testament Study," in *The Face of Old Testament Studies: A Survey of Contemporary Approaches*, eds. David W. Baker and Bill T. Arnold (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1999), 97-115; idem, "Reading the Bible Like a Book," *Christianity Today*, March 6, 1987, 26-27; idem, "Storytellers and Poets in the Bible: Can Literary Artifice Be True?" in *Inerrancy and Hermeneutic: A Tradition, A Challenge, A Debate*, ed. Harvie M. Conn (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988), 137-150; idem, "What I Mean by Historical-Grammatical Exegesis—Why I Am Not a Literalist," *Grace Theological Journal* 11 (1990): 137-152; Tremper Longman, Leland Ryken, and Jim Wilholt, eds., *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998); Tremper Longman and Leland Ryken, *A Complete Literary Guide to the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1993).

104. Longman, "The Literary Approach to the Study of the Old Testament: Promise and Pitfalls," 390.

105. Longman, "Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation," vii. As cited by Lyons, "Between History and Theology," 80.

106. Paul R. House, "The Rise and Current Status of Literary Criticism of the Old Testament," in *Beyond Form Criticism: Essays in Old Testament Literary Criticism*, ed. P.R. House (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 3-22.

107. Ibid., 3.

108. Ibid.

109. Ibid., 5-10.

110. Ibid., 11-13.

111. Ibid., 13-15.

112. Ibid., 15-19.

113. Longman recounted, "My initial foray into the literary approach to the study of ancient literature began in 1980. I had just chosen my doctoral dissertation topic under W. W. Hallo at Yale. Or to be more accurate, Hallo had just chosen my doctoral dissertation topic. I walked into his office with the suggestion that I write a dissertation on Akkadian poetics. He simply said, 'No, it's too speculative.' Then he reached into his desk drawer and pulled out a file, plopped it on his desk and said, 'You are working on these.' These turned out to be what I would call Fictional Akkadian Autobiographies. But after working on the translation of these fifteen texts, I realized that I was engaged in a genre study. This was now 1981. Thinking that I should learn something about genre, I

told Hallo that I wanted to write a methodological chapter on genre. He said, ‘Fine, go talk to my good friend in the comparative literature department.’ Well, it turns out that his good friend was none other than Geoffrey Hartman, a world renowned literary critic and known to be the first one through whom the work of Jacques Derrida was mediated to American academic institutions. We talked for an hour and I don’t think at that stage I understood a thing he said, but realized that it would be important for me to pursue the study of genre as a concept, a tool, and a method. As providence would have it, 1981 was a portentous year when it came to the literary method because this was the year that Robert Alter published his guild-shaking book *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. Now it is true that Alter was not the first to write on the literary approach in the modern era. Among others, one might think of Eric Auerbach’s *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*’s famous chapter comparing Hebrew with Greek narrative style (‘*Odysscus’ Scar*’) or J. Muilenburg’s SBL presidential address ‘Form Criticism and Beyond.’ In New Testament, Alter’s equivalent was Frank Kermode who wrote *The Genesis of Secrecy*. Or the pre-1980 work of L. Alonso Schokel, David Gunn, Simon Bar-Efrat, and others. But there was something about Alter’s work on narrative that sent shock waves through the guild of biblical studies. It was also 1981 when I began attending SBL. I remember the heated discussions and the excitement about something that was even called a ‘paradigm shift’ in biblical studies.” Tremper Longman III, “Bible As Literature,” Paper presented at the annual Far West Regional meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, Escondido, California, April 8, 2005.

114. Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981).

115. Longman, “Literary Approaches to Old Testament Study,” 97.

116. Ibid., 98.

117. Ibid.

118. Ibid., 98-99.

119. Ibid., 99. On Childs’ understanding of canon criticism, see Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*; idem, *Old Testament Theology in a Canonical Context* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1985).

120. E.g., see the canonical-oriented works of Paul R. House, *Old Testament Theology* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998); and John H. Sailhamer, *Introduction to Old Testament Theology: A Canonical Approach* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1995).

121. On the growing prominence of evangelical biblical scholarship throughout North America and Europe, Carl Amerding writes, “Evangelical biblical studies in the United States and Canada are well represented by a growing body of widely respected scholars, a number of whom occupy posts in universities and main-line church faculties, as well as in evangelical colleges and seminaries. In Germany and throughout Europe, evangelical scholars have for various reasons had less access to university posts, which are dominated by *Landeskirche* (state church) concerns.” Carl E. Amerding, “Faith and Method in Old Testament Study: Story Exegesis,” in *A Pathway into the Holy Scripture*, eds. P.E. Satterthwaite and D.F. Wright (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994), 39, n. 10.

122. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987). Reprinted as “Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation” in *Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation*, ed. M. Silva (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996), 91-192.

123. Ibid., 103-107.

124. Ibid., 107-123.

125. Ibid., 124-133.

126. Ibid., 123-131.

127. Ibid., 124-133.

128. Longman, “The Literary Approach to the Study of the Old Testament: Promise and Pitfalls,” 388. See also Alan F. Johnson, “The Historical-Critical Method: Egyptian Gold or Pagan Precipice?” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 26, no. 1 (March 1983): 3-15.

129. Longman, “The Literary Approach to the Study of the Old Testament: Promise and Pitfalls,” 388.

130. See especially his defense of form criticism as it relates to genre identification, in Longman, “Form Criticism, Recent Developments in Genre Theory, and the Evangelical,” 46-67.

131. Longman, “What I Mean by Historical-Grammatical Exegesis,” 147-148. Longman advocates the use of formalism with historical and theological approaches: “While the other approaches throw some light on the nature of the biblical text, the most fruitful avenue to pursue is the one with which this essay began, namely formalism. But I acknowledge that any exploration of the literary nature of the text is just one aspect of the interpretive task, and it must be complemented by other approaches, including those that focus on history and theology.” Longman, “Literary Approaches to Old Testament Study,” 115.

132. Longman, *Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation*, 140-189.

133. On Longman’s defense of the historicity of the Old Testament, see Longman, “Storytellers and Poets in the Bible,” 137-150; Iain Provan, V. Philips Long, and Tremper Longman III, *A Biblical History of Israel* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003).

134. Longman, “Literary Approaches to Old Testament Study,” 115.

135. Longman asserts, “since 9/11 there has been a subduing of certain characteristics of postmodernism, especially its frivolous elements. Vegetarian readings of Job are fun when life isn’t too serious in other words. However, this does not mean that I don’t think we can learn or gain from postmodernism. However, I believe we need to do so without becoming postmodern.” Tremper Longman III, “Bible As Literature,” Paper presented at the annual Far West Regional meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, Escondido, California, April 8, 2005. In a book review, Longman comments, “One might think I would recommend against reading this book [on postmodern approaches to biblical interpretation]. On the contrary, I highly recommend it. In the first place, it shows the brightest minds utilizing the most avant-garde approaches to the text. Second, I often find the most illumination reading treatments of the text with which I disagree. For one thing, it does shake me loose from my own preconceptions. I have learned most from reading feminist writings in this regard.” Tremper Longman, “Book Review: *The New Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible*, eds. J.C. Exum & D.J.A. Clines (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1993)” in *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 40, no. 1 (March 1997): 159.

136. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994); Tremper Longman, III and Raymond B. Dillard, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, second edition (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2006). Note that in the second edition the names of the authors have been reversed due to the fact that Longman revised the entire work.

137. Tremper Longman III, interview by author, April 15, 2005.

138. Dillard and Longman, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 9.

139. Ibid., 19.

140. Ibid.

141. Ibid.

142. Ibid.

143. See Armerding, *The Old Testament and Criticism*, 4-11.

144. Ibid., 7.

145. Ibid., 9.

146. Ibid.

147. Ibid., 10.

148. Howard Marshall argues along the same lines: "It is true that biblical study has often been carried out on the basis of presuppositions which deny the truth of biblical Christianity, and Christian scholars have sometimes been influenced by such presuppositions. However, we argued that it is possible to distinguish between the proper use of methods of linguistic and historical study and the adoption of skeptical presuppositions, and that believing Christians can use the methods of biblical criticism with a good conscience. Not only so: they must do so if they are to understand the texts fully in the light of their original contexts and composition." I. Howard Marshall, *Biblical Inspiration* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982), 117.

149. Dillard and Longman, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 38.

150. Ibid.

151. Ibid., 39.

152. Ibid.

153. Ibid.

154. Ibid.

155. Ibid.

156. Ibid., 40. Within the Old Princeton tradition, R.D. Wilson was the first to employ the notion that Moses did not have to write every word in the Pentateuch to be legitimately considered as its author. On this view, see Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 48-49, where he also spoke of "the fundamental authorship" of Moses. E.J. Young reiterated Wilson's apologetic in Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 45. Peter Enns likes to speak of the "Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch" rather than "Mosaic authorship" because, "The latter implies that Moses wrote all or nearly every word of the final product, which is a position that is difficult to maintain." Peter Enns, "William Henry Green and the Pentateuch," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 45, no. 3 (September 2002): 402.

While Wilson was the first to set forth the idea of "later inspired redactors" in a published work, Archibald Alexander, Princeton's Seminary first professor, was the first to articulate it in the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition. On Wilson's statement, see his, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 12; on Archibald Alexander's position, see Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School*, 20-21. E.J. Young also followed (and cited) Wilson's view of "later inspired redactors" in his *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 46. Although they do not explicitly cite Wilson or Young in their Introduction, Dillard and Longman follow Wilson and Young in their views on the concept of "later inspired redactions." Tremper Longman III, interview by author, April 23, 2007. Bruce Waltke also affirmed the likelihood of inspired redactional activity: "the notion of an original autograph should also take account of later inspired editorial activity. From this perspective it is important to distinguish inspired scribal activity from noninspired scribal changes introduced into the text." Bruce K. Waltke, "Historical Grammatical Problems," in *Hermeneutics, Inerrancy, and the Bible*, eds. E.

Radmacher and R. Preus (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1984), 78, as cited by Michael A. Grisanti, "Inspiration, Inerrancy, and the OT Canon: The Place of Textual Updating in an Inerrant View of Scripture," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 44, no. 4 (December 2001): 592.

157. Dillard and Longman, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 40.  
 158. Tremper Longman, *How to Read Genesis* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2005), 46-47.

159. Ibid., 47.

160. Ibid.

161. Ibid., 47. On Gordon J. Wenham's view, see his magisterial commentary, *Genesis 1-15* (WBC 1; Word, 1987). Allen P. Ross' view is found in, *Creation & Blessing: A Guide to the Study and Exposition of Genesis* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1988), 35, n. 12.

162. Bruce K. Waltke, "Historical Grammatical Problems," 90. Cf. the dissenting views of Kenneth L. Barker (pp. 133-141) and Allan A. MacRae (pp. 145-162) in the same volume. Both Barker and MacRae took issue with Waltke's borrowing of two sources, i.e., the Yahwist (J) and the Priestly Writer (P), from traditional source criticism.

163. In his course syllabus for "OT702: Old Testament History and Theology" at Westminster Theological Seminary during the Winter Semester of 1993 ("Lecture 4: Theme and Plan of the Pentateuch and of Genesis," p. 29), Waltke identified what he believed to be only a limited amount of *post-Mosaic* in the Pentateuch.

Part II : Author and Date of Pentateuch

Introduction: anonymous

- I. Pre-Mosaic Materials: see formation of canon
  - 1. Some clearly identified: Gen. 5:1; Ex. 17:14; Num. 21:14
  - 2. Known practices of composition in Ancient Near East.
  - 3. Other inferred by changed styles (Ge. 1:1-2:3; 2:4-4:26)
- II. Mosaic Materials: Gave Pentateuch its basic structure.
- III. Post-Mosaic:
  - 1. Cf. Dt. 5:22-30 with 18:14-19
  - 2. Ge. 36; Ex. 11:3; 16:36; Nu. 12:3; Dt. 34.

164. Waltke, "Historical Grammatical Problems," 93.

165. Bruce K. Waltke with Cathi J. Fredericks, *Genesis: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2001), 27-28.

166. T. Desmond Alexander, "Authorship of the Pentateuch," in *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*, eds. T.D. Alexander and D.W. Baker (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003), 61-72.

167. Ibid., 70. T.D. Alexander first published this view in *From Paradise to the Promised Land: An Introduction to the Pentateuch*, second edition (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 93. He writes, "Since the books of Genesis to Kings, as a coherent narrative, cannot have existed prior to the exilic period, the events of the exile may well have been catalytic in bringing these books together into a continuous account."

168. Ibid., 71.

169. Tremper Longman III, "A Review of *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003)," Review presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature sponsored by InterVarsity Press, Atlanta, Georgia, November 23, 2003.

170. Ibid.

171. Longman, *How to Read Genesis*, 57.
172. Longman, "A Review of the Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch," n.p. Dennis Olson, a mainline Lutheran scholar who teaches Old Testament at Princeton Seminary, has discerned a wide spectrum of critical positions among evangelical scholars within the *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch* with regard to the compositional history of the Pentateuch and its relation to Mosaic authorship. Interestingly, Olson points out that Alexander's view of the compositional history of the Pentateuch represents a more moderate view: "There is no uniform consensus among this collection of scholars on how far to take the critical study of the Pentateuch. There is some wide variety in how much certain scholars are 'into' such critical methodology and its results. Some are quite traditional, even as they are fully aware of the most recent scholarship. So, for example, the author of the article on the entry for 'Leviticus' [i.e., N. Kiuchi] discusses recent proposals about P (the Priestly source) and H (the Holiness school) by Jacob Milgrom and Israel Knöhl. But after all of that, the author concludes, 'As regards the date of Leviticus, there seems to be no weighty evidence proving that the material in the book is later than the time of Moses. It is thus the conviction of the present writer that, if not by Moses, the book could well have been written by one of his contemporaries' (p. 523). But if you then turn to the article on the 'authorship of the Pentateuch,' you read that 'the weight of evidence suggests that Moses probably did not compose the Pentateuch as we now have it' and that 'it is exceptionally difficult to demonstrate that the Pentateuch itself existed in its entirety as a literary unity prior to the sixth century B.C.' ([T.D. Alexander] p. 71)." Dennis T. Olson, "Between Faith and Criticism: *The Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch* and Evangelical Pentateuchal Scholarship Today," Review presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature sponsored by InterVarsity Press, Atlanta, Georgia, November 23, 2003.
173. Longman, *How to Read Genesis*, 56.
174. Dillard and Longman, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 40.
175. Ibid., 268-275.
176. Ibid., 268-269.
177. Ibid., 270-271.
178. Ibid., 271.
179. Ibid., 273. 179 On the concept of Isaianic "disciples" see the seminal work of Sigmund Mowinckel, *Jesajat-Disiplene. Profetien fra Jesaja til Jeremia* (Oslo, 1926); idem, *Prophecy and Tradition: The Prophetic Books in the Light of the Study of the Growth and History of the Tradition*, ANAO (Oslo: Dybwad, 1946). See also Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 330-333; J.H. Eaton, "The Origin of the Book of Isaiah," *Vetus Testamentum* 9 (1959): 138-157; D.R. Jones, "Exposition of Isaiah Chapter One Verses One to Nine," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 17 (1964): 463-437; Rolf Rendtorff, *Canon and Theology*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993), 146-147; Christopher R. Seitz, *The Book of Isaiah 40-66: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections*, The New Interpreter's Bible, vol. VI (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 2001), 320-321.
180. P.R. Ackroyd, "Isaiah 1-12: Presentation of a Prophet," *Vetus Testamentum Supplements* 29 (1978): 16-48.
181. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 324, 337.
182. R. Rendtorff, "Zur Komposition des Buches Jesaja," *Vetus Testamentum* 39 (1984): 295-320; idem, "The Book of Isaiah: A Complex Unity. Synchronic and

Diachronic Reading," *Society of Biblical Literature 1991 Seminar Papers*, ed. E. Lovering, Jr. (Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1990), 8-20.

183. R. Melugin, "The Servant, God's Call, and the Structure of Isaiah 40-48," *Society of Biblical Literature 1991 Seminar Papers*, ed. E. Lovering, Jr. (Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1990), 21-30.

184. C.R. Seitz, *Reading and Preaching the Book of Isaiah* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1988).

185. Dillard and Longman, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 273-274.

186. Ibid., 274.

187. Ibid.

188. Ibid., 275.

189. Ibid. Even before Dillard, Moses Stuart, an early American pioneer of conservative biblical scholarship, entertained the notion that another author named Isaiah wrote the second half of the book: "Is it not possible that another prophet, who also bore the name of Isaiah, lived and wrote at this period? I must confess that I have sometimes suspected this to be the case. Most knots which we must now cut, would easily be untied by such a solution. *The principal objection to it is, that history has not said any thing of such a man; and it is difficult to even to suppose that the name of such a writer, at so late a period, could be covered with entire darkness. Did we know that such a person lived and wrote, we might call him Deutero-Isaiah, but surely not (as recent critics do) Pseudo-Isaiah.* The mistake of redactors in later ages, (in case there were two prophets who both bore the name of Isaiah), in arranging and combining their works together, and placing them under one category, might be easily accounted for, in such a case. I should feel some inclination to admit this theory, as the most easy and ready solution of the difficulties, if it could only be rendered probable, that such a person as the Deutero-Isaiah could have lived and written such a piece of composition as Isa. xl.—lxvi., and yet not have been conspicuous in Jewish history. The lack of any notice of such a writer, is certainly one of the unaccountable things." Moses Stuart, *Critical History and Defence of the Old Testament Canon*, (London: George Routledge & Co., 1849), 101 (emphasis added). Stuart only entertained the notion that there might have been an exilic prophet with the same name, i.e., "deutero-Isaiah," because it would have resolved some of the critical problems associated with the traditional single author view. However, Stuart maintained that the lack of historical evidence regarding such a theoretical "deutero-Isaiah" militated against the view as being tenable. John Giltner conclusively notes that Stuart contemplated "the possibility of there having several authors of Isaiah, though he felt the evidence still too inconclusive to abandon his older opinion." John H. Giltner, *Moses Stuart: The Father of Biblical Science in America* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988), 100.

190. Dillard and Longman, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 275.

191. Ibid.

192. Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah*, 2.

193. North, *The Second Isaiah*, 2.

194. Dillard and Longman, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 275. In his review of the Old Testament introductions by Gleason Archer and Dillard/Longman, evangelical Old Testament scholar, J. Robert Vannoy concludes, "Both of these volumes are the product of very competent participants in the ongoing study and analysis of OT literature. Comparison of the differences in approach and conclusions reached highlights the breadth of the spectrum of thought within the evangelical community on specific issues

in the analysis of OT literature, and how much work remains to be done if any consensus is to be reached.” J. Robert Vannoy, “Book Review: Gleason L. Archer, Jr.’s *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*, third ed. (Chicago, MI: Moody Press, 1994); Raymond B. Dillard and Tremper Longman III, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan 1994),” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 40, no. 1 (March 1997): 156. Whereas Archer’s *Introduction* represents the conservative pole of the spectrum, Longman and Dillard’s *Introduction* represents the other extreme. Vannoy, however, affirms that both are solidly within the evangelical camp. Waltke, while holding to the single-authorship view of Isaiah, also affirmed that “the authorship of these chapters [chs. 40-66] should not be a test of orthodoxy.” Bruce K. Waltke with Charles Yu, *An Old Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2007), 67.

195. Dillard and Longman, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 275.

196. According to Victor Matthews and James Hoyer, “The call narrative is the distinctive event marking the occasion when a person becomes a prophet. . . . The literary pattern in these stories [i.e., call narratives of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel] includes a divine encounter of theophany (Isa 6:1-2), an introductory word or greeting (Isa 6:3-5), an objection or demur (Isa 6:4-5), a commission (Isa 6:9-10), and a sign or talisman (Isa 6:11-13). The intention of the stories is to describe how God conferred authority on the prophet, not to provide an autobiography.” Victor H. Matthews & James C. Moyer, *The Old Testament: Text and Context* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997), 113.

197. Raymond B. Dillard, “OT 311: Prophets,” Lecture Notes 1-B-1, Fall Semester 1992-1993, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.

198. Ibid.

199. Ibid.

200. Ibid.

201. Ibid., Lecture Notes III-3.

202. On the appropriations of recent evangelicals to the multi-authorship view of Isaiah see, Schultz, “How Many Isaiahs Were There and What Does It Matter?”, 150-170. One of the notable examples proffered by Schultz is from the well-known, evangelical Old Testament introduction: William S. LaSor, David A. Hubbard, & Frederic W. Bush, *Old Testament Survey: The Message, Form, and Background of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982). Schultz comments, “As a result of their [i.e., the believing community’s] editorial work, Isaiah of Jerusalem could speak directly to the specific circumstances of the exilic and postexilic communities. How do LaSor, Hubbard and Bush therefore understand the nature of the inspiration that imbues this human activity with divine authority? In their words, ‘The entire process may be attributed to the action of God’s Spirit, as the ultimate Author, both on the prophet and on his ‘disciples,’ whoever they were and whenever and however they put the work in its canonical form.’” Ibid., 155-156. For the original citation, see LaSor, Hubbard, and Bush, *Old Testament Survey*, 378. This view, though more open to the classic tripartite-division of Isaiah, is similar in its use of an inspired disciple(s) to the one proffered by Dillard. Bruce Waltke contemplates the possibility that one of Isaiah’s disciples *could have written* Second Isaiah, but in the end opts against it: “While confessing verbal inspiration and the infallibility of Scripture and rejecting the historic critic’s confession of *vaticinium ex eventu*, I agree with J. Ridderbos (*Bible Student’s Commentary: Isaiah*, Zondervan, 1985, pp. 14-20) that a disciple of Isaiah could have authored Second Isaiah. Even after Cyrus appears on Israel’s radar screen, it would be amazing, contrary to all expectations (41:21-29), that the uncircumcised conqueror of Babylon would restore the Jewish exiles

to their land and build their temple out of his own treasures (44:24-45:8). No prophet of any other nation foretold this reversal of history. I am not arguing for the notion of a Second Isaiah; Isaiah 40-55 lacks a superscription, and the New Testament *seems* to assume one Isaiah (John 12:38-39; Rom. 9:27-29)." Waltke, *An Old Testament Theology*, 67.

203. Longman and Dillard, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 311.

204. John E. Goldingay, *Isaiah*, Vol. 13, New International Biblical Commentary (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2006), 5.

205. *Ibid.*

206. For Goldingay's perspective on Genesis 1 having been written by the Priestly Writer (P) during the Babylonian Exile, his defense of the 2nd century B.C. date for the book of Daniel, his rationale for the existence of Second Isaiah, and his position that the books of Job, Jonah, Ruth, and Esther are all God-inspired parables, see John E. Goldingay, "What Are the Characteristics of Evangelical Study of the Old Testament?," *Evangelical Quarterly* 73.2 (2001): 99-117.

207. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 208. In agreement, John Oswalt remarks, "It is significant that there is almost no specific historical detail in chapters 40-66 apart from the one glaring exception, the naming of the deliverer, Cyrus. This would be consistent with the historical Isaiah having written these chapters, having a general idea what the future would hold but no specific knowledge. If those chapters were written in those actual times, then we must believe that later editors stripped the details out in order to heighten the impression that Isaiah wrote them." John N. Oswalt, *Isaiah*, The NIV Application Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2003), 18, n. 1.

208. Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah*, 8.

209. *Ibid.*, 28-29.

210. R.E. Clements, "The Prophecies of Isaiah and the Fall of Jerusalem," *Vetus Testamentum* 30 (1980): 428.

211. *Ibid.*, 436.

212. John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapter 1-39*, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986), 19.

213. *Ibid.*, 19, n. 8. In this regard, cf. also the interpretation of J. Alec Motyer in *The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 30-33.

214. Oswalt, *Isaiah*, 35.

215. For a summary of the arguments against the discipleship view of Isaianic authorship, see Schultz, *How Many Isaiah's Were There and What Does It Matter?*, 167-170.

216. On the recent refutations of Old Princetonian views related to Mosaic and Isaianic authorship made by scholars who are affiliated with Westminster and associated with Dillard and Longman specifically, see e.g., Peter Enns, "William Henry Green and the Authorship of the Pentateuch: Some Historical Considerations," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 45, no. 3 (September 2002): 385-403; John Halsey Wood, Jr., "Oswald T. Allis and the Question of Isaianic Authorship," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 48, no. 2 (June 2005): 249-261. Halsey was a former student of Enns at Westminster Theological Seminary. For a counter refutation in defense of Allis' position of Isaianic authorship against Wood, see G.K. Beale, *The Erosion of Inerrancy in Evangelicalism* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2008), 155-159.

217. G.K. Beale verifies this shift as he notes, "Up until the late 1970s, the consensus among evangelical scholars was to accept the Bible's claims about the human authorship of some of its books, whether that be Isaiah's authorship of the entire prophecy, the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, or the attribution of the psalms to David. This was the position taken by the drafters of the Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy. It is noteworthy that in almost as brief a period as thirty years, there has arisen in American evangelical scholarship a willingness to accept formerly liberal, higher critical views of the Bible's claim about authorship of particular books such as Isaiah, though some contemporary Old Testament evangelical scholars still hold to the traditional view about this book." Beale, *The Erosion of Inerrancy*, 124. In a footnote after his statement regarding some American evangelical scholars who now accept liberal critical views such as the multiple-authorship view of Isaiah, Beale cites Dillard and Longman's *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, pp. 268-74, as an example. Ibid., n. 2.

218. Longman and Dillard, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 375.

219. Ibid., 373.

220. Ibid.

221. Ibid. Kline was uncomfortable with Longman's treatment on the authorship of Daniel in the *Introduction* due to what he perceived to be an intentionally unified authorship of the book within the sixth century B.C. Kline stated, "Why has the evidence been questioned, not just by unbelievers but even among Christians? Even F.F. Bruce buys into the new [critical] view; Dillard and Longman (Westminster PA) also [are] concessive." Meredith G. Kline, "OT702: The Prophetical Books," Class Notes by Debbie Dewart, Spring 1995. Westminster Theological Seminary in California, Escondido, p. 21.

222. Tremper Longman, *Daniel*, The NIV Application Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1999), 21.

223. Ibid., 22.

224. Ibid.

225. John E. Goldingay, *Daniel*, Word Biblical Commentary 30 (Waco, TX: Word, 1989); E. Lucas, *Daniel*, Apollos (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002). The latter cited Longman's work on Akkadian fictional autobiography to support pseudonymity in Daniel, but Longman says, "wrongly." Longman and Dillard, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 373.

226. Longman, *Daniel*, 22-23.

227. Longman notes two commentaries in particular: Goldingay, *Daniel*; W.S. Towner, *Daniel* (Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1984).

228. Longman, *Daniel*, 23.

229. J. Baldwin, *Daniel*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1978). Cited by Longman, *Daniel*, 24.

230. According to Longman, "Young taught more than thirty years at Westminster Seminary, longer than any other person in the history of the Old Testament department up to the present day." Longman, "Young, E (dward) J (oseph) (1907-1968)," 1069.

231. On Longman's view of the non-Solomonic authorship of Ecclesiastes, Timothy Laniak writes, "In the introductory chapter on genre (pp. 15-22) he [Longman] briefly presents his case for the closest formal similarities between Ecclesiastes and the Cuthaeian Legend of Naram-Sin, the Sin of Sargon text, and an Adad-guppi autobiography. The macro-genre of fictional autobiography explains the overall structure of these works. The bulk of Ecclesiastes is made up of thoughts attributed to Solomon by a wise teacher,

while a second author ('frame-narrator') is responsible for the introduction (1:1-11) and the conclusion (12:8-14)." Timothy S. Laniak, "Book Review: Tremper Longman III's *The Book of Ecclesiastes*, New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998)" in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118 (1999): 726-727.

232. This is evident from the numerous Semitic language courses taught by both Dillard and Longman.

233. Longman, "Young, E (dward) J (oseph) (1907-1968)," 1069.

234. Ibid., 1071. The section, "Approaching the New Testament," is included in each chapter of Dillard and Longman's *Introduction* and represents their view of biblical theology within the Reformed tradition.

235. Darryl G. Hart, "Evangelicals, Biblical Scholarship and the Politics of the Modern American Academy," in *Evangelicals and Science in Historical Perspective*, eds. D.N. Livingstone, D.G. Hart, and M.A. Noll (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 308, cited by Schultz, "How Many Isaiahs," 153.

236. I am indebted to Dr. Darryl G. Hart and Dr. Iain M. Duguid for bringing this important perspective to my attention.

237. It is clear from the available biographic sources for Dillard and Longman (see their respective biographies above) that they were not ordained into pastoral ministry. In a recent interview, Longman was asked, "With whom do you hold your ministerial credentials?" Longman responded, "I am not ordained as a minister. I am ordained as a ruling elder." The interviewer continued, "Is it common [in] the US to become a lecturer in a seminary without being ordained as a teaching elder (minister)?" Longman stated, "It is an interesting subject because the reason I didn't become an ordained minister is because I didn't have a call to a particular church. The issue of people who ministering [*sic*] as teaching elders [i.e., pastors] in the Church by lecturing in the Seminary was a question that was discussed in the 1970s and early 1980s in the Philadelphia Presbytery where there were many ministers teaching at Westminster Seminary, and this overloaded the Presbytery with teachers who weren't engaged in day-to-day ministry." Longman also noted in this interview that he now belongs to a small, more conservative, evangelical church in Southern California with denominational ties to the PCUSA. Tony Johnson, "Wisdom for Today with Dr. Tremper Longman III," *Fellow Workers* 4, No. 3 (November 2007): 10.

238. "Robert [Dick Wilson] would have take up the work of an evangelist had not his studies caused him to perceive that there was a great need for a type of biblical scholarship that would deal with objective evidence. . . . He was ordained in 1885, and received his Ph.D. from the College of New Jersey in 1886." Kaiser, "Robert Dick Wilson," 74-75 *passim*.

239. "In 1914 he [Allis] was ordained a Presbyterian minister. In 1922 he became an assistant professor of Semitic philology." Skilton, "Oswald T. Allis," 124.

240. "Back in Los Angeles after graduation, Allan came before a presbytery made up of both liberal and conservative ministers and elders, to be licensed and ordained. Following his introduction as a prodigy, the presbytery's committee meekly asked him who wrote the four gospels (and a few other rather simple questions), and then proceeded to ordain him!" Dunzweiler, "Tribute to Allan A. MacRae," 26.

241. "Young was ordained in the newly formed Orthodox Presbyterian Church, and was active on many of its committees. He served as moderator of the denomination's general assembly in 1956." Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 190.

242. "The Orthodox Presbyterian Church ordained him [Kline] to the gospel ministry in 1948. He taught Old Testament at Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia from 1948 until 1965." Griffith and Muether, "A Tribute to Meredith G. Kline," 9.

243. O.P. Robertson was active both as a professor of Old Testament and an ordained teaching elder (minister) in the Presbyterian Church in America. In the mid-1960s, Robertson pastored his first church in Picayune, Mississippi. After serving on the faculties of various other American Reformed faculties including Westminster Theological Seminary, Covenant Theological Seminary, and Knox Theological Seminary, Robertson pastored Wallace Memorial Presbyterian Church in the Maryland suburbs of Washington D.C. from 1985 to 1997. Jane Kincannon Robertson Dodds, "A Biographical Sketch" in *The Hope Fulfilled: Essays in Honor of O. Palmer Robertson* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2008), xv-xix.

244. Darryl G. Hart, e-mail correspondence to the author, May 23, 2008.

245. See Darryl G. Hart, *The University Gets Religion: Religious Studies in American Higher Education* (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999).

246. Ibid., 244. See also George M. Marsden, *The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 429-432.

247. Hart, e-mail correspondence to the author, May 23, 2008.

248. David F. Wells, *No Place for Truth: Or Whatever Happened to Evangelical Theology?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 242.

249. Cf. R. Laird Harris, *Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1957), 154-179.

250. Raymond B. Dillard, "OT 113: Old Testament Introduction," Lecture One: I:C:3 "Part One: The Canon of the Old Testament," Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, second semester, 1988-1989.

251. Harris, *Inspiration and Canonicity*, 170.

252. Ibid., 171.

253. Dillard wrote: "If all who received revelation are called prophets, then of course, prophetic authorship is a characteristic of all the books. Yet the more restricted use of the term prophet would normally exclude such as Solomon—nor does it seem wise to view Esther, [handwritten: S(ong) of S(ongs)], Job, and ~~Chronicles~~ [handwritten: single strikethrough]as from prophet authors." Dillard, "OT 113: Old Testament Introduction," Lecture One: I:C:3 "Part One: The Canon of the Old Testament,"

254. See Benjamin B. Warfield, *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible* (Phillipsburg, NJ: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1948), 415. M. James Sawyer explicates what Warfield meant by "apostolic imposition": "The practical effect of this subtle distinction is to allow for the inclusion of books such as Mark, Luke, James, Jude and Hebrews which were not actually penned by the apostles, but were, according to tradition, written under apostolic sanction. Warfield asserted that the canon of Scripture was complete when the last book of the New Testament was penned by the apostle John. From the divine standpoint the canon of Scripture was complete. However, human acceptance of an individual book of that canon hinged upon "authenticating proof of its apostolicity." The key idea here is the concept of *apostolic law*. Scripture was authoritative because it was written by an apostle who imposed his writing upon the church in the same fashion as Torah was imposed upon Israel." M. James Sawyer,

"Evangelicals and the Canon of the New Testament," *Grace Theological Journal* 11, no. 1 (1991): 32.

255. Harris, *Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible*, 291-292.

256. William Henry Green, *General Introduction to the Old Testament: The Canon*, reprint edition (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1980; originally published, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898), 35.

257. *Ibid.*, 13.

258. *Ibid.*, 12. Kaiser notes, "Wilson championed the conservative position on many of the crucial issues of the day: the completion of the Old Testament canon before the last of the prophets (fifth century B.C.)." Kaiser, "Robert Dick Wilson, 79.

259. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 34-35.

260. *Ibid.*, 35.

261. Harman comments on Young's inability to explain the inclusion of the Prophets and the Writings into the Old Testament canon and the fact that his presentation would have benefitted from Kline's significant work on the ANE and biblical covenants (i.e., *The Structure of Biblical Authority*): "He [Young] then defended the traditional threefold division of the Old Testament canon, though admitting there is little evidence to show how the Prophets and the Writings were incorporated into the canon. Once an inspired book appeared, it was immediately recognized by God's people. At the time of its revision, Young's presentation could have been strengthened by incorporating the approach taken by his former colleague Meredith Kline, which is oriented more towards biblical theology, and which also brings in relevant material from extrabiblical treaties." Harman, "Edward Joseph Young," 197.

262. Kline, *Images of the Spirit*, 58.

263. Kline, *The Structure of Biblical Authority*, 57-58.

264. *Ibid.*, 37.

265. Harris, *Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible*, 10. Harris was a student of MacRae's at Westminster Theological Seminary. See R. Laird Harris, "Allan A. MacRae: An Appreciation" in *Interpretation & History: Essays in Honour of Allan A. MacRae*, eds. R.L. Harris, S.H. Quek, J.R. Vannoy (Singapore: Christian Life Publishers, 1986), 14.

266. On the discussion between conservative and neo-orthodox scholars on the relationship between "inspired author" to "inspired text," i.e., the difference between an inspired prophet versus an inspired canonical process, see Stephen B. Chapman, "Reclaiming Inspiration for the Bible" in *Canon and Biblical Interpretation*, eds. C.G. Bartholomew, S. Hahn, R. Parry, C. Seitz, A. Wolters (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2006), 167-206. Chapman, who writes in favor of the neo-orthodox view of Brevard S. Childs, states: "Other conservative scholars have indicated a greater openness to an expanded notion of inspiration, based in large measure upon greater attention to the phenomenon of biblical canon formation, and particularly with regard to the Old Testament. In fact, scholars such as Robert Dick Wilson, E.J. Young, Merrill F. Unger, Bruce Waltke, Ronald Youngblood, Herbert Wolf and Duane Garrett have all sought to resolve the difficulties of an exclusively author-centered hermeneutic by allowing for some degree of inspired 'updating' of the biblical books. At stake, however, is more than a matter of minor adjustments. Simply seeking to extend an author-centered model of inspiration to a few other 'recognized individuals' only compounds the problem at hand by failing to grapple with the full complexity of the Bible's literary formation." *Ibid.*, 181. Chapman, however, does not provide a fair nor nuanced critique of the evangelical

position on inspired “updating.” Inspite of Chapman’s dismissive and negative remarks against Carl F.H. Henry’s author-centered model of divine inspiration, Henry’s point still maintains validity in light of Scripture’s self-attestation with regard to its divine origin (cf. 2 Tim. 3:16-17; 2 Pet. 1:20-21). Henry astutely noted that “many evangelicals appeal to special divine providence to explain the compilation and preservation of the canon. If one asks why providential divine sovereignty could not have been equally operative through dialectical canon-formation [the position of B.S. Childs], the response is that apostolicity is a more compelling principle than dialectical process to account for the reception of the canonical books as authoritative.” As cited by Chapman, *ibid.*, 177. The original quote appears in Carl F.H. Henry, “Canonical Theology: An Evangelical Appraisal,” *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* (1990): 86.

In answer to the objection of inspiration being applied to fallible redactors during the history of the canon’s formation, Chapman interestingly defers to the work of Peter Enns (*Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament* [Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2005], 168), a former student of Dillard’s at Westminster Seminary. Chapman claims, “At this recent point a recent work by Peter Enns proves quite helpful.” Chapman continues, “Enn’s ‘incarnation analogy’ allows for a theological re-appraisal of the significance of historical thought forms and ancient literary genres. In elaborating this analogy, Enns also draws upon the theological idea of divine accommodation to suggest that God chose to reveal divine truth incarnationally (i.e., in ways its recipients could understand) by entering fully into the messiness of human culture and society.” *Ibid.*, 190. While the incarnational analogy has been admittedly a prominent concept within the tradition of the church (as Chapman duly notes), it is apparent that Enns was following Dillard, in his appropriation of it. Cf. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, xviii-xix.

267. Dillard, Lecture Notes, “Part One: The Canon of the Old Testament,” Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, second semester, 1988-1989.

268. In contrast to Dillard’s notion of canonicity, Carl F.H. Henry held that the central criterion for the canonicity of the New Testament was, in fact, apostolicity. He asserted, “The complete canon emerged from recognition that the Christian churches, guided by the principle of apostolicity, treasured the apostolic writings and continually returned to them as foundational to the church’s life and growth. That need not mean that apostolic authorship was the exclusive hallmark of documents received by the churches as authoritative. Apostolic commendation was equally serviceable, since the apostles were the divinely authorized interpreters of the crucified and risen Christ’s ministry and mission. What was decisive for the canon is authorship by the apostles and/or their attestation of apostolic colleagues who faithfully relayed the apostolic message.” Henry, “Canonical Theology: An Evangelical Appraisal,” 86-87.

While his critical comments were not directed toward Dillard *per se*, the following critique by Henry could have been applied to Dillard’s statement that “the essential element of canon is . . . found in the fact that it embodies the word of God’s revelation.” Henry noted, “Evangelicals resist any notion of canonicity that locates scriptural authority merely in the fact that in these writings the church continues to hear the Word of God. The fact that a canonical text functioned as Scripture did not objectively validate the Bible’s divine authority in the early Christian community. The achievement of a canon whose authority an interacting community acknowledges and to which it submits does not in and of itself guarantee its divine authority.” *Ibid.*, 106-107. The quote from Henry is striking because it calls Dillard’s statement into account. Although Dillard

claimed that the canon was “judged by no one” because it was “self-authenticating,” the question remains as to who then made the final decision to canonize a particular book. It is very doubtful that the covenant community would have recognized a book as canonical and divinely inspired unless it had been closely affiliated and associated with the authoritative prophetic or apostolic offices.

269. O. Palmer Robertson, *The Christ of the Prophets* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2004), 228-229.

270. Frank J. Smith (editor), “Westminster OT Profs Not Sure Who Wrote the Books of Moses,” *Presbyterian and Reformed News* 6, no. 1 (Jan.-Feb. 2000): 13 (emphasis added).

271. Grisanti, “Inspiration, Inerrancy, and the OT Canon,” 588 (emphasis added).

272. Schultz, “How Many Isaiahs,” 167. Presenting a similar argument on the composition of the book, Barry Webb writes, “Most scholars have continued to regard chapters 40-55 as a unity, but the tendency has been to see chapters 1-39 and chapters 56-66 as complex compositions of material from various periods, with only a relatively small nucleus of material (from chapters 6-8 and 28) being from Isaiah himself. In this process the notion of ‘disciples’ has become very elastic, and the connection between Isaiah himself and the book which bears his name extremely tenuous. At the opposite extreme E.J. Young has continued to attribute everything to Isaiah and nothing at all (except faithful preservation) to his disciples. The truth probably lies somewhere in between.” Barry G. Webb, *The Message of Isaiah: On Eagles’ Wings*, The Bible Speaks Today (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1996), 34.

273. So Armerding, *The Old Testament and Criticism*, 6-7.

274. Robertson, *Christ of the Prophets*, 228-229.

# **Chapter Five: CONCLUSION**

The present work has documented the significant changes that occurred in the study of the Old Testament at Westminster Theological Seminary between the years of 1929 to 1998. It focused primarily on the approach of Westminster scholars: Robert Dick Wilson, Edward Joseph Young, Meredith George Kline,<sup>1</sup> Raymond Bryan Dillard, and Tremper Longman III. The methodological procedure of the study was to present each of their views with respect to the highly controversial issues surrounding the authorship, dating, and compositional history of Genesis (and of the Pentateuch in general), Isaiah, Daniel, and, in the case of Dillard, Chronicles. This thesis maintains that while there remained considerable continuity in terms of the study of Old Testament at Westminster, paradigmatic changes took place with regard to the use of critical approaches, presuppositions, and theology.

## **5.1 Issues of Continuity**

As a Reformed theological seminary, Westminster Seminary continued the tradition of Old Princeton in placing great emphasis on biblical scholarship and excellence in teaching. Continuity in the study of the Old Testament at Westminster evidenced itself in the type and quality of its scholars. Westminster's Old Testament professors were, first of all, formidable Old Testament scholars well-trained in Semitic languages. Second, they were experts in ancient Near Eastern literature and history. Third, they seriously engaged the available critical resources at their disposal. Fourth, they were committed to excellence in their scholarship. And fifth, they wrote not only for the academy, but also for the church. In this regard, the Westminster Old Testament scholars retained their identity as Reformed scholars within the Old Princeton-Westminster tradition and showed what Old Testament scholarship looked like within the parameters set forth by their belief that the Bible was uniquely the inspired Scriptures of the church.

## **5.2 From Anti-Criticism to Criticism: Foe Becomes Friend**

In the early years at Westminster, the anti-critical stance that had been articulated most clearly by William Henry Green of Old Princeton was carried forward in the scholarship of Robert D. Wilson, Oswald T. Allis, Allan A. MacRae, and Edward J. Young. A moderate, but judicious use of historical-critical methodology is seen in the work of Meredith G. Kline, and what can be regarded as a full-blown "plundering" of the critical tools is displayed in the

works of Raymond B. Dillard and Tremper Longman III. The movement from anti-criticism to criticism was gradual but no less discernible. Meredith G. Kline's work represents the mid-point of the shift and could be described as a hybrid between the "traditional conservative" and the "evangelical critical" groups, to borrow from Carl Armerding's helpful categories.<sup>2</sup> On the one hand, Kline shows similarities to the conservative leanings of Edward J. Young in his defense of the traditional views of the Old Testament. But, on the other hand, his methodology of allowing the literary *form* and structural *content* of the text to evoke new possibilities of interpretation sets him apart from Young.<sup>3</sup> Kline's restrained use of critical tools such as the comparative method in order to defend traditional views, such as the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, opened the door for future Westminster scholarship to follow suit. Although the later generation, represented by Raymond B. Dillard and Tremper Longman III, generally acknowledged the apologetic concerns of their predecessors, they went beyond Kline's modified use of genre analysis, form criticism, and comparative studies also embracing aspects of source criticism, redaction criticism, New Literary criticism, and canonical criticism. Whereas Kline employed the form and content of the text to drive the interpretive implications for conservative apologetic purposes, Dillard and Longman were openly "unapologetic" and were plainly driven by their critical and methodological concerns.

Concomitantly, the use of such critical tools as form criticism and redaction criticism opened up new vistas of research and interest in questions about the compositional history of various biblical books. The theological notion of "later inspired redactors" which had originally played a central role within the Old Princeton School in the maintenance of the "essential Mosaic authorship" of the Pentateuch was expanded allowing Westminster scholars to enter into discussions about the prehistory of biblical books that were previously distained.

Development in the idea of inspired editing and redaction can be seen over time. In 1926, Wilson affirmed, "That the Pentateuch as it stands is historical and from the time of Moses; and that Moses was its real author though it may have been revised and edited by later redactors, the additions being just as much inspired and as true as the rest."<sup>4</sup> In 1949, Young in agreement added, "There may indeed be certain few minor additions, such as the account of Moses' death, which were inserted into the Pentateuch under divine inspiration by a later editor, but this by no means runs counter to the common tradition that Moses is the author of these books."<sup>5</sup> This early concession by Wilson and Young to "later inspired redactors" with regard to the books of the Pentateuch was taken up, expanded, and revised by Dillard and Longman to include other books of the Old Testament. Their concept now included: 1) the framing of third-person narratives,<sup>6</sup> 2) the authoring of significant portions of biblical text,<sup>7</sup> 3) the editing together of large blocks of narrative material which comprised the historical books,<sup>8</sup> and 4) the insertion of particular theological perspectives and concerns within the biblical material.<sup>9</sup> Dillard and Longman applied their broadened definition of Wilson and Young's concept not only to the Pentateuch but also to the historical books (having embraced a version of the critical

“Deuteronomistic History” theory), Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea, and Daniel.<sup>10</sup> The expanded revision of this idea of “later inspired redactors” allowed Dillard and Longman to use the critical insights regarding the compositional history of these Old Testament books—insights which had been previously dismissed and rejected by Old Testament scholars at Westminster.

With respect to the book of Isaiah, Dillard employed the concept of inspired redactors in order to validate his use of “II Isaiah” as the inspired author of Isaiah 40-66.<sup>11</sup> Dillard asserted, “Recognizing that the setting of Deuteronomy 34 requires an author living later than Moses, the author traditionally assigned to the book, is not materially different from recognizing that the background of Isaiah 40-66 presumes an author living during the Exile.”<sup>12</sup> Dillard’s attempt to baptize “II Isaiah” under Wilson and Young’s concept was based upon two mitigating factors: 1) that the historical-critical reading of “II Isaiah” was substantially correct, and 2) that the Bible was “the inspired Word of God.” In relation to the former, Dillard typified what has been a long standing practice within the Reformed tradition as it relates to the theological principle of “common grace” that “insights may be gleaned from all fields of scholarship, “including historical-critical studies.<sup>13</sup> Using any and all the tools of historical criticism is what Longman calls “plunder[ing] the Egyptians.”<sup>14</sup> In regard to his belief in the Bible as “the inspired Word of God,” Dillard rejected the critical view that the “unknown prophet” known as “Deutero-Isaiah” was simply a *non-inspired* disciple of the eighth-century Isaiah of Jerusalem, who had merely reinterpreted and reapplied his teachings to the exiles in Babylon. Rather, Dillard affirmed the divine inspiration of the “anonymous, great prophet” in order to support his conviction that Isaiah 40-66 was just as divinely inspired as the earlier writings of Isaiah, the son of Amoz.<sup>15</sup> Thus, Dillard linked historical criticism with his theological conviction regarding the nature of the biblical text as inspired.

However, Dillard’s use of Wilson and Young’s concept of “later inspired redactors” in order to justify his view of “II Isaiah” was a clear departure from Wilson and Young’s original notion. Young, following Wilson, considered that the inspired additions such as “the account of Moses’ death” were only a “few minor additions . . . which were inserted into the Pentateuch under divine inspiration by a later editor.”<sup>16</sup> Dillard’s revision of the concept, however, was much broader and comprehensive, as seen in his inclusion of a full-blown, prophetic author who anonymously wrote the inspired and sizeable text of Isaiah 40-66: “This later author saw in [First] Isaiah’s prophecies of exile and a remnant events that were transpiring in his own day, and he wrote to develop and apply [First] Isaiah’s preaching to this fellow exiles. Although the anonymity of this great prophet is a problem, it is no more unusual than the anonymity of the historical books or the book of Hebrews.”<sup>17</sup> Thus, it is evident that Dillard expanded Wilson and Young’s concept in two salient aspects: 1) qualitatively, in regard to the function and identity of the “later inspired redactor” which now included an anonymous, developed prophetic figure, as well as 2) quantitatively, in terms of the large amount of inspired text that was

written. Ultimately, Dillard's understanding of a "later inspired redactor" deviated from his predecessors' position because of Wilson and Young's minimalist definition of the theory. As a result, they never thought to apply the theory to the book of Isaiah. As in the case of the Pentateuch, Wilson and Young permitted the updating of place names, the modernization of the text, and minor editions such as Deuteronomy 34, but they clearly insisted that the message of the Pentateuch essentially came from Moses himself, the paradigm prophet of the prophetic office (cf. Deuteronomy 18:15-19).<sup>18</sup> In Young's case, he tenaciously held that the textual evidence from the book of Isaiah only permitted the work of *one* prophet with a distinct calling and vision from God.<sup>19</sup> It is obvious from Dillard's lecture notes that he also attempted to find a distinctive "call narrative" for "II Isaiah" in order to justify his multi-authorship view. But, in the final analysis, he was unsuccessful.<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless, Dillard opted to put his uncertain views in print despite the lack of biblical evidence.<sup>21</sup>

In sum, Dillard's approach signaled a significant shift in his acceptance of the critical consensus that an anonymous sixth-century B.C. author wrote Isaiah 40-66, using his and Longman's highly-expanded notion of "later inspired redactors." Why was this possible in the later generation of scholars at Westminster? There are two ostensible reasons: 1) it is certain that Dillard no longer considered the single-authorship view of Isaiah—as espoused by J.A. Alexander, O.T. Allis, and E.J. Young—as a litmus test for orthodoxy; and 2) Dillard sought to place the emphasis of the Old Testament's inspiration not on the preponderant association with the prophetic office, but on the entire historical process which resulted in the completion of the inspired canonical book.

With respect to the book of Daniel, Longman was in substantial agreement with the traditional views of Wilson and Young regarding an early sixth-century B.C. dating of the book. Yet with respect to the question of authorship, he held that the prophecies contained in the book originated with the sixth-century B.C. prophet, but may have been later edited by Daniel's inspired disciple(s). Although Wilson and Young did not apply their insights of "later inspired redactors" to the book of Daniel, their basic approach does not preclude the possibility of such later inspired redactions within the book. Hence, Longman's suggestion that the third-person narratives that frame the book of Daniel were inserted by a later inspired disciple(s) is a theoretical possibility and, therefore, falls within the parameters set forth in Wilson and Young's concept.<sup>22</sup>

### 5.3 A Reappraisal of Philosophy and Tradition

Simultaneous with the movement toward the acceptance of historical criticism was a reevaluation of the Old Princeton view of "higher criticism" which had involved the intimate association of anti-supernatural presuppositions with the critical tools themselves. While it is true that all of the Old Princetonian-Westminster Old Testament scholars theoretically accepted the validity of the so-called "higher criticism," they typically associated the enterprise with anti-supernatural presuppositions and "radical unbelief." As a

result, the battle lines of the “fundamentalist-modernist controversy” were often drawn over areas related to authorship and the dating of biblical books. However, as the currents within biblical scholarship changed, so did the battle lines within evangelical scholarship. Kline’s initial foray into form criticism cut against the grain of conservative biblical scholarship and challenged the prevalent traditional mindset of his day. This separation of critical methods from the philosophical presuppositions behind them signaled the second shift in Old Testament studies at Westminster. Even the highly-regarded Cornelius Van Til, who generally distrusted historical criticism because “the spirit of criticism is negative,”<sup>23</sup> never objected to Kline’s constructive use of believing or “conservative criticism”<sup>24</sup> due to its apparent apologetic benefits. Kline’s significant form-critical and comparative study between ancient Near Eastern suzerainty treaties and the book of Deuteronomy in order to argue for Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch gradually dispelled these suspicions.<sup>25</sup> The outdated and dominant notion that historical-critical methods were inescapably associated with unbelief, infidelity, and rationalism had been sufficiently proven wrong. As a result of Kline’s “plundering the Egyptians,” the tools could now be taken up by those who stood firmly within the orthodox Reformed tradition. Conservative or believing criticism was now practiced at Westminster Seminary. Criticism had been judiciously disassociated from its philosophical underpinnings. Particularly, in the 1970s and 80s the critical methods were no longer considered “off limits” due to the recognition that they could be profitably as well as apologetically employed without the adherence to anti-supernatural presuppositions.<sup>26</sup>

In addition to the separation of the philosophical underpinnings of criticism and critical tools, the later Westminster scholars were no longer influenced by the traditional interpretation of their forbears, but rather, by the evidence found in the biblical texts as proffered by critical scholarship. The self-attestation of the biblical text along with the traditions of early Jewish, Christian, and ancient secular histories had informed the “traditional conservative” view of authorship and dating of Old Testament books. In the case of Old Princeton and early Westminster, the combination of the two—the biblical text and tradition—played a vital role in what was perceived as conservative, orthodox belief. In Robert Dick Wilson’s estimation, Mosaic authorship could be substantiated by an appeal to tradition and (primarily) Scripture. In regard to the former, Wilson declared, “The Jews and the Samaritans, the Pharisees and the Sadducees, the Rabbis, Aristeas, Josephus, Philo, Christ and the Apostles, all accepted the combined works as of real Mosaic authorship.”<sup>27</sup> In relation to the latter, Wilson pointed out specific biblical texts that attested to the Mosaic authorship of various parts of the Pentateuch and especially of its legal codes.<sup>28</sup> In the same vein, Edward J. Young wrote regarding the authority of tradition: “Traditionally, by both Jews and Christians, Moses has been regarded as the author of these books. We believe that tradition is in this point correct, and that the essential Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch may be maintained.”<sup>29</sup> In Young’s

*Introduction*, he also gave an extensive presentation of the relevant Pentateuchal passages regarding the text's self-attestation to Mosaic authorship.<sup>30</sup>

In Dillard and Longman's *Introduction*, however, there is a perceptible shift in thinking. While they acknowledge and present similar ascriptions to Mosaic authorship from Jewish and Christian traditions as well as to "a number of references to his [Moses'] writing activity,"<sup>31</sup> Dillard and Longman, nevertheless, carefully note that the belief in Mosaic authorship has always been qualified. Accordingly, passages such as: 1) the narrative of Moses' death in Deuteronomy 34; 2) the anachronistic mention of the "Chaldeans" in Genesis 11:31 which was "a tribe that dominated southern Mesopotamia in the first millennium [B.C.]" after the time of Abraham and Moses; 3) the mention of the city of Dan in Genesis 14:14 which was an ancient city known only much later; and 4) the alleged self-ascription of Moses to himself as the most humble man who ever lived in Numbers 12:3—all appear to point to post-Mosaic and a-Mosaic redactional activity.<sup>32</sup> In the main, therefore, Dillard and Longman's understanding of the Pentateuch's composition differs from their Old Princeton-Westminster predecessors in two important respects: a) in their belief of "the widespread use of sources,"<sup>33</sup> and b) in their belief in "significant post-Mosaic activity."<sup>34</sup> Hence, with Dillard and Longman no longer are the two—Scripture and tradition—allied so closely together and used as the primary basis for the conservative position on the authorship and dating of the Old Testament. They begin their scholarship or argument in a different place with a new set of "traditions." These new traditions include the "received truths" of historical criticism which strongly influenced their views of the Old Testament. They are no longer in a defensive, apologetic stance as were their forbears who were oriented towards the church, but because of their orientation toward the academy, they considered themselves freed from the constraints of their inherited traditional views and began to look at the biblical evidence in new ways by employing modern critical tools in order to open up the text for investigation.<sup>35</sup> In analyzing the writings of Dillard and Longman, it is evident that the authority of tradition and Scripture had been, in their minds, trumped by the empirical evidence of the text itself and perhaps by the weight of years of Old Testament critical scholarship.

#### 5.4 Shifting Theology

The third shift within the Westminster school was in the area of theology. Although all of the Westminster Old Testament scholars readily affirmed a "high view of Scripture" as "the Word of God," subtle and implicit modifications in their understanding of the nature of inspiration and the authority of Scripture are apparent. The concession made on the part of Wilson and Young to "later inspired redactors" with respect to their own belief in minimally inspired additions and revisions made by subsequent editors was transformed and expanded by Dillard and Longman in order to justify what they perceived to be significant editorial activity within the corpus of the Old Testament books. Part of this shift included a change in the authority of

tradition, the replacement of the emphasis on the inspired prophetic office toward the inspiration of the entire compositional history, and the major broadening of the notion of “later inspired redactions” from minimal additions to substantive and numerically substantial ones.

In regard to their approach to the study of the Old Testament as sacred Scripture, each of these aforementioned scholars was unique. Wilson approached the Old Testament as a divinely-inspired book of historical facts and wanted to defend the traditional views of authorship and dating based upon an “evidential method” of investigation using historical, linguistic, and archaeological data. Young approached the Old Testament as the “inspired, inerrant Word of God” and desired to allow the Bible to speak for itself on its own terms. His interpretive method of choice was the “grammatical-historical approach,” which he often used with an expository, sermonic format. Moreover, Dillard and Longman, like their predecessors, approached the Old Testament as the “inspired Word of God.” However, more than any of their predecessors, they employed literary and genre-based critical approaches that elucidated the biblical text from a synchronic perspective that often bracketed out historical and chronological *prima facie* readings. This was first evident in their former teacher’s work, Meredith G. Kline, whose own use of genre analysis to justify a figurative reading of the days of Genesis 1 (cf. his “framework view”), as well as his application of form-criticism to the study on the book of Deuteronomy, appeared to pave the way for Dillard and Longman.<sup>36</sup> Dillard’s emphasis on redaction and genre criticism allowed him to see the historical discrepancies between Chronicles (a “theological treatise”) and Samuel-Kings (“historical books”) through a theological lens—which permitted him to allow such historical tensions to stand without alleged forced harmonization. Longman, as we have seen, adopts a multi-perspectival approach to biblical interpretation. Although he is partial to the literary approaches such as formalism (i.e., New Literary Criticism), Longman incorporates form-criticism, source-criticism, the comparative method, genre identification, and the grammatical-historical method into his hermeneutical circle.

Dillard and Longman’s shift was the result of four significant factors. Firstly, they devaluated the authority of tradition as a major support for their view authorship and dating of the Old Testament. Secondly, they accepted and integrated historical-critical views into their works. Thirdly, they expanded Wilson and Young’s concept of “later inspired redactors” in order to accommodate their critical views of substantial redactional material. And fourthly, they affirmed that divine inspiration superintended the entire historical process of canonization including later editorial activity, rather than a divinely-inspired author associated with the prophetic office.

Thus, it is clearly evident that from the beginning of Dillard’s career in 1969 to Longman’s subsequent departure in 1989, the battle lines among conservatives like Dillard and Longman had significantly changed. In this shift, the Westminster scholars were not alone. The newer literary-based approaches, including redaction criticism, rhetorical criticism, the formalist approach of the

New Literary Criticism, and the canonical criticism of Brevard Childs, allowed evangelical scholars to bracket out historical issues related to authorship and the dating of biblical texts.<sup>37</sup> These “evangelical-friendly” approaches gave evangelical scholars, like those at Westminster, unprecedented access into the academy of biblical studies which in turn provided a forum of academic freedom without the rancor and partisanship characteristic of previous generations.

This fact accords well with Mark Noll’s periodization of the past hundred years of evangelical biblical scholarship into five partially-overlapping phases: 1) full participation in professional biblical scholarship by those whom we would be considered as evangelical scholars (c. 1880-1900), 2) withdrawal from the academy in the face of liberal biblical criticism (1900-1935), 3) a realization of the value of involvement in the academy (1935-1950), 4) a concerted effort to re-enter the academy (1940-1975), and 5) success as evangelical biblical scholars in the academy (1960-present).<sup>38</sup> As evangelical critics within the academy, Dillard and Longman were participants in a new era of academic freedom; they had ample opportunity to explore answers to perennially difficult questions regarding matters of authorship and dating of the Old Testament books. In their works, Dillard and Longman expressed the sentiment that the time of the “Battle for the Bible”<sup>39</sup> had passed and that the battle lines were no longer drawn over issues of authorship and dating. Their brand of scholarship had different sets of presuppositions, different attitudes toward tradition, a different theology concerning Scripture, and a different set of interpretive tools which included critical approaches. Although they desired to hold a “high view of Scripture,” they had a new sense of freedom to reevaluate traditional positions and arguments that had been long revered as litmus tests of orthodoxy. Accordingly, all of the available historical-critical tools, including those that were once deemed unfit such as source criticism and tradition-historical criticism, were now considered acceptable. In other words, evangelical scholars felt free to accept critical positions in matters of authorship and dating because these issues were no longer to be regarded as “theological shibboleth[s] (Judg. 12:6) or test[s] of orthodoxy.”<sup>40</sup> In the analyses of Dillard and Longman, what identified Reformed evangelical scholarship was no longer methodology and a particular stance on authorship, dating, and compositional history, but on their distinctive perspective of theology.

Theologically, Dillard and Longman differed from their Old Princeton-Westminster predecessors in their views of divine inspiration; they no longer centered it strictly on the prophetic individual, but on the entire canonical process. Their expanded understanding of Wilson and Young’s concept of “later inspired redactors” was thus accommodated by their understanding of Scripture. Accordingly, the Bible was the product of divine inspiration that was bestowed not upon a single individual *per se*, but upon divinely-inspired, anonymous individuals who were collectively responsible for the canonical final form of the text.

In one sense, Dillard and Longman’s view of inspiration brought the Old Princeton-Westminster trajectory full circle. While it is true that Wilson and

Young were the first to publish on the concept of “later inspired redactors,” Princeton Theological Seminary’s first professor, Archibald Alexander, had originally proposed the idea as early as 1817. Alexander specifically noted that later inspired men had edited the Old Testament texts “before the lamp of inspiration was entirely distinguished.”<sup>41</sup> Marion Taylor elucidates,

Alexander cites four examples of authentically “inspired” later additions and corrections: (1) the account of the death of Moses in the last chapter of the Book of Deuteronomy; (2) additional notes which seem to be added to “almost all the sacred books intended that to render plain what would otherwise have been obscure”; (3) the modernizing of obscure ancient names; and (4) books written after the death of Ezra before the age of *Simon the Just*.<sup>42</sup>

It is interesting to note that the first mention of the notion of “later inspired redactors” within the history of Princeton Seminary was not seen as a concession to historical-criticism because critical methodology did not have a significant impact upon American biblical studies until after 1880.<sup>43</sup> In other words, Alexander, like Wilson and Young, was open to considering theories that accounted for what he encountered in the Bible. The idea of “light editing” was not a threat to Alexander or his view of Scripture. He welcomed ideas that aided his understanding of the Old Testament text. But Alexander did not associate later editing with questions about the historicity and reliability of the biblical texts, questions that are now clearly on the table for modern, critical interpreters.<sup>44</sup> Hence, what appears to be Alexander’s primary reason for initially positing the concept was to accommodate his perception of the evidence of minimal, later, inspired editing. In this regard, the openness and sincerity displayed by Alexander was also true for Wilson, Young, Dillard, and Longman. While they all recognized a measure of editorial activity in the books of the Old Testament, they also affirmed that these additions and editorial revisions were done under the influence of divine inspiration. This foundational theological affirmation was the result of their commitment to a “high view of Scripture” as the “inspired Word of God.”

The main difference, however, that separates Dillard and Longman from Alexander, Wilson, and Young is how they defined the concept of “later inspired redactors.” Dillard’s view on “II Isaiah” and Longman’s view on substantial a-Mosaic and post-Mosaic editorial activity in the Pentateuch, are key examples of these notable differences. It is evident from the works of their predecessors that Dillard and Longman’s innovative expansion of this Old Princetonian idea missed the meaning and purpose for which Alexander, Wilson, and Young had originally intended. The earlier generations within the Old Princeton-Westminster trajectory had employed the concept in the service of defending the traditional views of the Old Testament especially in relation to its authorship and dating.

### **5.5 Westminster and Beyond**

As this study has shown, a paradigmatic shift took place over the course of seventy years of Old Testament scholarship at Westminster Seminary with regard to the use of the method and conclusions of historical criticism. This movement occurred in three stages: 1) a continuation of the traditional, Old Princeton anti-critical stance (i.e., Robert D. Wilson, Oswald T. Allis, Allan A. MacRae, and Edward J. Young), 2) a moderate and judicious accommodation of some of the critical approaches (i.e., Meredith G. Kline), and 3) an inclusive appropriation of historical criticism in the recognition that the canonical text of the Old Testament had a complex pre-history (i.e., Raymond B. Dillard and Tremper Longman III). Hand in hand with this methodological shift was a modification in their theological understanding of the process of inscriptionation and their doctrine of inspiration. Although the Westminster Old Testament scholars differed with respect to the inspiration of an individual (tied to the prophetic office) or to the entire canonical process (including later redactors or authors), they revealed a strong line of continuity in their shared commitment to the Bible as the inspired Scriptures of the church.

The narrative of Westminster, therefore, reveals that by the end of twentieth century, Old Testament studies at Westminster had been altered. By a gradual yet deliberate process, its scholars ultimately embraced the very form of the methodology that the seminary had been founded to reject. Their objectives, however, were never intentionally iconoclastic. They, like their predecessors, simultaneously approached the study of the Old Testament with a “high view of Scripture” and the best that modern biblical scholarship could offer. Yet, in stark contrast to the earlier generation of Westminster scholars, the later generation, represented by Dillard and Longman, were no longer willing to defend the school’s previous theological traditions including some long standing beliefs about the Pentateuch, Isaiah, and Daniel. Dillard and Longman alternatively set their focus on the new “received truths” of the academy. As biblical scholars, they believed the task of interpreting the Old Testament was to allow the text with all its disparate forms and contents to drive their understanding and construal of it. Consequently, their modified brand of Reformed biblical scholarship had found a new voice within the academy and much of their contributions became part of the mainstream. In short, they were no longer opponents, but players in the guild.

The question remains, however, whether Dillard and Longman went too far in their “plundering of the Egyptians.” The final outcome of the study of the Old Testament at Westminster remains to be seen. It will be interesting to observe what the next generation of Old Testament scholars at Westminster will do to balance their commitments to a rich theological heritage and the practice of responsible biblical scholarship.<sup>45</sup>

The present work has documented the changes that took place at one particular evangelical seminary with its own distinctive theological viewpoint and legacy. Although similar changes have taken place in other schools,<sup>46</sup> Westminster’s particular historical narrative is reflective of the kind of changes

afoot within modern evangelical biblical scholarship. Westminster's history is an important test case and it aptly represents a microcosm of the larger evangelical scholarly community. This study, therefore, gives an occasion to pause and reflect upon implications that arise from such a significant history. From one perspective, the present work provides the wider academic community an inside look revealing how evangelicals became a part of the academic dialogue rather than as outsiders on the defensive. This sort of understanding is important in light of our "postmodern" context, which, in theory, seeks to understand differing perspectives from every point on the theological spectrum. Moreover, the resurgence of evangelicals within the academic guild, which is often secular, has brought a fresh perspective of faith, reminding fellow colleagues that faith is part of the equation in responsible biblical scholarship. From another perspective, this study also encourages evangelical scholars to give careful consideration upon where the direction of Old Testament scholarship has come and to where its trajectory is currently heading. While it is true that contemporary evangelicals are able to employ a variety of critical tools in their scholarship,<sup>47</sup> it is also imperative that evangelicals be reminded to combine these modern methodologies judiciously with an acknowledged reverence to the Old Testament text as the divinely inspired and inerrant Word of God.<sup>48</sup> If we do not, will there be anything truly distinctive about *evangelical* biblical scholarship in the future?

## NOTES

1. The work, contributions, and influence of Meredith G. Kline at Westminster are delineated in detail within chapters three and four of this study.
2. See Armerding, *The Old Testament and Criticism*, 4-19.
3. This insight was given to the present writer by Dr. Arthur Van Seters, a former student of Edward J. Young and Meredith G. Kline.
4. Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 12.
5. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 33.
6. As in the case of the book of Daniel, see e.g., Dillard and Longman, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 332.
7. As in the case of the Pentateuch and Isaiah, *ibid.*, 39, 47-48, 275.
8. As in the case of the “Deuteronomistic History,” *ibid.*, 112.
9. As in the case of Hosea, *ibid.*, 355. As cited in Vannoy, “Book Review: *An Introduction to the Old Testament*,” 155-156.
10. *Ibid.*
11. Dillard and Longman, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 275.
12. *Ibid.*
13. Longman, “The Literary Approach to the Study of the Old Testament: Promise and Pitfalls,” 388.
14. *Ibid.*
15. Dillard and Longman, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 275.
16. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 33 (emphasis added).
17. Dillard and Longman, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 275.
18. See Young, *My Servants the Prophets*, 28.
19. See, e.g., Young’s *Who Wrote Isaiah?* Young dedicated seven out of eleven chapters (chs. 5-11) in the book to write against the critical notion of a “Deutero-Isaiah.”
20. Dillard, Lecture Notes, “OT 311: Prophets,” Westminster Theological Seminary, fall semester, 1992-1993.
21. Dillard and Longman, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 275.
22. Young wrote, “According to Baba Bathra 15a, ‘the men of the Great Synagogue wrote . . . Daniel.’ By this statement, however, the Jews did not mean to deny that Daniel himself was the author of the book. In fact, it is the testimony of both Jewish and Christian tradition that Daniel, living at the royal court in Babylon, composed his book during the sixth century BC.” Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 360. Although Longman’s identification of Daniel’s disciples is not necessarily equated with “the men of the Great Synagogue,” his view generally adheres to the traditional early dating and authorship of the book of Daniel. Longman’s understanding of redaction within Daniel is limited to the third-person narrative introductions which he holds to be of inspired editorial activity. Other evangelical scholars, such as Gleason Archer, view the entire book as coming from Daniel’s hand in the sixth century BC: “Despite the numerous objections which have been advanced by scholars who regard this as a prophecy within after the event, there is no good reason for denying the sixth-century Daniel the composition of the entire work.” Gleason L. Archer, Jr., *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*, revised and expanded edition (Chicago, IL: Moody, 1994), 423.

23. Van Til noted the apologetic duty of all orthodox biblical scholars in their defense of the Bible against what he called “negative criticism”: “It is the work of both the Old and the New Testament departments in an orthodox seminary, in addition to working out the exegesis of the Scriptures, to defend it against the attacks of negative criticism. We only remark that the spirit of criticism is negative. That is, the ordinary Bible criticism takes for granted the non-theistic position with respect to evolution, etc.” Cornelius Van Til, *An Introduction to Systematic Theology* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1974), 158.

24. Kline called the use of such historical-critical tools by evangelicals as “conservative criticism.” See his *The Structure of Biblical Authority*, 10.

25. Kline dedicated his book, *The Structure of Biblical Authority*, to Van Til using the highest praise: “Cornelius Van Til stands as the prince of twentieth-century Christian apologetics. He has had by far the most profound impact on my own thinking of all my teachers.” Kline, *The Structure of Biblical Authority*, 15. Kline was doing what Van Til had mandated, i.e., defend the Bible against the attacks of negative criticism. The irony was that Kline defended the Bible against negative criticism by judiciously using the very tools of negative criticism. By rejecting negative criticism’s antisupernaturalism along with its inherent subjectivity, Kline was able to employ critical tools such as form criticism for the defense of traditional views of the Old Testament. For example, see Kline’s article, “Is the History of the Old Testament Accurate?” in *Can I Trust the Bible?*, ed. Howard F. Vos (Chicago, IL: Moody, 1963), 135-151, where he uses the same phrase, “negative critics,” as Van Til did while at the same time using his form-critical insights taken from the Hittite suzerainty treaties to date Deuteronomy in the second century millennium B.C. in order to argue for Mosaic authorship of the book.

26. O. Palmer Robertson, a former colleague of Dillard and Longman, was an exception when it came to the use of historical-critical methodology. Rather, Robertson’s traditional stances would place him alongside his former teacher, Edward J. Young. E.g., see his arguments against Dillard and Longman’s view of “Il Isaiah,” in Robertson, *The Christ of the Prophets*, 227-240, as well as his conservative-oriented commentary in the New International Commentary on the Old Testament series, *The Books of Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah*.

27. Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 40.

28. Ibid., 27-57.

29. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 33.

30. Ibid., 42-44.

31. Dillard and Longman, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 39.

32. Ibid.

33. Ibid., 40.

34. Ibid., 39.

35. I am indebted to Dr. Iain M. Duguid for bringing this point to my attention.

36. It is certainly noteworthy that Kline employed certain historical-critical methods, as has been documented within this study, but it does not ultimately explain the later generation’s acceptance of certain critical views. Kline himself did not approve of such accommodations and his views of authorship and dating of Old Testament books were closely allied with the views of R.K. Harrison (cf. his *Introduction to the Old Testament*). With Dillard and Longman, the shift is perceptibly “unapologetic” and is clearly methodologically driven.

37. Dillard and Longman note, “The literary approach often brackets questions concerning origins and historical reference, and thus the issue of literary sources is put to the side by these researchers.” Dillard and Longman, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 46.

38. Noll, *Between Faith and Criticism*, 1-141.

39. For a narrative account over the “Battle for the Bible” (derived from the book by Harold Lindsell, *The Battle for the Bible* [Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1976]) see George M. Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987), 279-280.

40. Dillard and Longman, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, 275. Contextually, the quote is used in specific reference to the authorship of the book of Isaiah.

41. Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School*, 20.

42. Ibid., 20-21.

43. See Jerry Wayne Brown, *The Rise of Biblical Criticism in America, 1800-1870: The New England Scholars* (Middletown, CT.: Wesleyan University Press, 1969); Lefferts A. Loetscher, *The Broadening Church: A Study of Theological Issues in the Presbyterian Church since 1869* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1954); Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School*.

44. The present writer is indebted to Dr. Marion Ann Taylor for this perspective.

45. See, e.g., the work of Peter Enns, formerly Professor of Old Testament and Biblical Hermeneutics at Westminster, especially his most recent monograph, *Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament*.

46. E.g., Rebecca G.S. Idestrom, *From Biblical Theology to Biblical Criticism: Old Testament Scholarship at Uppsala University, 1866-1922* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2000).

47. Waltke cautiously contends, “In determining a text’s historical background, the evangelical must be involved in historical criticism (literary sources, oral tradition, redaction criticism, etc.)” Bruce K. Waltke, “An Evangelical Christian View of the Hebrew Scriptures,” in *Evangelicals and Jews in an Age of Pluralism*, eds. M.H. Tannenbaum, M.R. Wilson, & A.J. Rudin (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1984), 118. Waltke, however, tempered his acceptance of the use of such critical tools on the basis of the rejection of its anti-supernatural presuppositions: “But all evangelicals reject those conclusions of historical criticism drawn from its out-of-hand denial of the supernatural. Historical criticism is often associated with a naturalistic philosophy or world view that denies *a priori* the very possibility of supernatural intervention into human history.” Ibid., 119. In contrast, Waltke asserts the implications of Scripture’s divine origin in relation to historical criticism, “This conviction [concerning the Bible’s divine inspiration and inerrancy] about the source, nature, and aim of the Bible entails the following evangelical convictions regarding its interpretation. . . . Evangelicals do not adopt the stance as authoritative critics of Scripture, but they stand under it allowing it to critique, shape, and judge their thoughts. Accordingly, they reject that aspect of historical criticism which replaces the Bible’s supernaturalism with a naturalistic interpretation of history. Moreover, they do not feel free to interpret the sacred text in accordance with modern self-understanding or to impose contemporary modes of thinking on it.” Ibid., 109-110. On contemporary evangelicals and their appropriation of the historical-critical method, see Paul Edward Hughes, “Compositional History: Source, Form, and Redaction Criticism,” in *Interpreting the Old Testament: A Guide for Exegesis*, ed. Craig C. Broyles (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001), 221-244.

48. The drafters of the “Chicago Statement of Biblical Inerrancy” forthrightly and cogently declared, “The authority of Scripture is inescapably impaired if this total divine inerrancy is in any way limited or disregarded, or made relative to a view of truth contrary to the Bible’s own; and such lapses bring serious loss to both the individual and the Church.” “Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy with Exposition,” reprinted in G.K. Beale, *The Erosion of Inerrancy*, 270. The citation above appears under the heading, “A Short Statement,” #5.



# SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Primary Sources

- Allis, Oswald T. "Old Testament Emphases and Modern Thought (Part I)." *The Princeton Theological Review* 23 (1925): 432-464.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Old Testament Emphases and Modern Thought (Part II): Their Intrinsic Value." *The Princeton Theological Review* 23 (1925): 586-636.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Old Testament Emphases and Modern Thought (Part III): Old Testament Emphases vs. Higher Critical Theories—the Crossing of the Red Sea." *The Princeton Theological Review* 24 (1926): 252-307.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Five Books of Moses*. Second edition. Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Old Testament: Its Claims and Its Critics*. Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The New Presbyterian Seminary: Its Courses, Faculty, and Location [About Westminster Seminary]." *The Sunday School Times* 71, no. 35 (Aug. 31, 1929): 472.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Unity of Isaiah: A Study in Prophecy*. Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *God Spake by Moses: An Exposition of the Pentateuch*. Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Robert Dick Wilson—Defender of God's Word." *Christianity Today* 1.7 (November 1930), 4-6.
- Dillard, Raymond B. "Harmonization: A Help and a Hindrance." In *Inerrancy and Hermeneutic: A Tradition, A Challenge, A Debate*, ed. Harvie M. Conn, 151-164. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Faith in the Face of Apostasy: The Gospel According to Elijah & Elisha*. The Gospel According to the Old Testament. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Intrabiblical Exegesis and the Effusion of the Spirit in Joel." In *Creator, Redeemer, Consummator: A Festschrift for Meredith G. Kline*, eds. H. Griffith and J.R. Muether, 87-93. Greenville, SC: Reformed Academic Press, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Reign of Asa (2 Chronicles 14-16): An Example of the Chronicler's Theological Method." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 23, no. 3 (September 1980): 207-218.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Chronicler's Solomon." *Westminster Theological Journal* 43, no. 2 (Spring 1981): 289-300.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Reward and Punishment in Chronicles: The Theology of Immediate Retribution." *Westminster Theological Journal* 46, no. 1 (Spring 1984): 164-172.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Chronicler's Jehoshaphat." *Trinity Journal* 7, no. 1 (Spring 1986): 17-22.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *2 Chronicles*. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987.
- Dillard, Raymond B., and Tremper Longman III. *An Introduction to the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1994.
- Groves, J. Alan. "Allis, O(swald) T(hompson) (1880-1973)." In *Dictionary of Major Biblical Interpreters*, ed. Donald McKim, 110-114. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2007.
- Kline, Meredith G. "Because It Had Not Rained." *Westminster Theological Journal* 20 (1958): 146-157.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Treaty of the Great King: The Covenant Structure of Deuteronomy: Studies and Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *By Oath Consigned: A Reinterpretation of the Covenant Sign of Circumcision and Baptism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Genesis." In *The New Bible Commentary*, eds. D. Guthrie and J.A. Motyer, 79-114. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Structure of Biblical Authority*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Of Works and Grace." *Presbyterion* 9 (1983): 85-92.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Covenant Theology under Attack." *New Horizons* 15, no. 2 (1994): 3-5.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Kingdom Prologue: Genesis Foundations for a Covenantal Worldview*. Reprint edition. Overland Park, KS: Two Age Press, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *God, Heaven and Har Magedon: A Covenantal Tale of Cosmos and Telos*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Space and Time in the Genesis Cosmogony." *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 48, no. 1 (April 1996): 2-15.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Book Review: Bernard Ramm's *Christian View of Science and Scripture*." *Westminster Theological Journal* 18, no. 1 (Fall 1955): 49-55.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Book Review: Gleason L. Archer, Jr.'s *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*." *Westminster Theological Journal* 29, no. 1 (November 1966): 59-62.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Book Review: J. Barton Payne's *Encyclopedia of Biblical Prophecy*." *Westminster Theological Journal* 36, no. 2 (Winter 1974): 245.
- Longman, Tremper, III. "Form Criticism, Recent Developments in Genre Theory, and the Evangelical." *Westminster Theological Journal* 47 (1985): 46-67.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Literary Approach to the Study of the Old Testament: Promise and Pitfalls." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 28 (1985): 385-398.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation." In *Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation*, ed. Moisés Silva, 91-192. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *How to Read the Psalms*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Storytellers and Poets in the Bible: Can Literary Artifice Be True?" In *Inerrancy and Hermeneutic: A Tradition, A Challenge, A Debate*, ed. Harvie M. Conn, 137-150. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What I Mean by Historical-Grammatical Exegesis—Why I Am Not a Literalist." *Grace Theological Journal* 11 (1990): 137-152.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography: A Generic and Comparative Study*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1991.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lament." In *Cracking Old Testament Codes: A Guide to Interpreting the Literary Genres of the Old Testament*, eds. D. Brent Sandy and Ronald L. Giese. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Book of Ecclesiastes* The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Daniel: The NIV Application Commentary from Biblical Text to Contemporary Life*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Literary Approaches to Old Testament Study." In *The Face of Old Testament Studies: A Survey of Contemporary Approaches*, eds. David W. Baker and Bill T. Arnold, 97-115. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Evangelicals and the Comparative Method." In *Creator Redeemer Consummator: A Festschrift for Meredith G. Kline*, eds. H. Griffith and J.R. Muether, 33-42. Greenville, SC: Reformed Academic Press, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Immanuel in Our Place: Seeing Christ in Israel's Worship* The Gospel According to the Old Testament. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Song of Songs* The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Tremper Longman's Statement on the *Dictionary of the Old Testament Pentateuch*." In *Society of Biblical Literature Conference, InterVarsity Press Reception*. Atlanta: unpublished paper, November 23, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Israelite Genres in Their Ancient Near Eastern Context." In *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*, eds. Marvin A. Sweeney and Ehud Ben Zvi, 175-195. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Young, E (dward) J (oseph) (1907-1968)." In *Dictionary of Major Biblical Interpreters*, ed. Donald McKim, 1068-1072. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2007.

Longman, Tremper, III, and Leland Ryken. *A Complete Literary Guide to the Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1993.

Longman, Tremper, III, and Raymond B. Dillard. *An Introduction to the Old Testament*. Second Edition. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006.

Longman, Tremper, III, and Daniel G. Reid. *God Is a Warrior*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1995.

- MacRae, Allan A. "The Scientific Approach to the Old Testament." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 110 (1953): 18-24, 130-38, 234-41, 309-20.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel of Isaiah*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Ups and Downs of Higher Criticism." *Christianity Today* 24 (1980): 1130-1134.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Response to Historical Grammatical Problems." In *Hermeneutics, Inerrancy and the Bible*, eds. Earl D. Radmacher and Robert D. Preus, 145-165. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Prophecies of Daniel*. Singapore: Christian Life Publishers, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *JEDP: Lectures on the Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, eds. Stephen T. Hague and Robert C. Newman. Hatfield, PA: Interdisciplinary Biblical Research Institute, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Studies in Isaiah*. Hatfield, PA: Interdisciplinary Biblical Research Institute, 1995.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Principles of Interpreting Genesis 1 and 2." *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society* 2 (Fall 1959): 1-9.
- Robertson, O. Palmer. *The Christ of the Covenants*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Books of Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah* The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Christ of the Prophets*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2004.
- Waltke, Bruce K. "An Evangelical Christian View of the Hebrew Scriptures." In *Evangelicals and Jews in an Age of Pluralism*, eds. M.H. Tannenbaum, M.R. Wilson, and A.J. Rudin, 105-139. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *An Old Testament Theology: An Exegetical, Canonical, and Thematic Approach*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Historical Grammatical Problems." In *Hermeneutics, Inerrancy, and the Bible*, eds. E. Radmacher and R. Preus, 71-129. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The First Seven Days: What Is the Creation Account Trying to Tell Us?" *Christianity Today*, August 12, 1988, 42-46.
- Waltke, Bruce K., and Cathi J. Fredricks. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2001.
- Waltke, Bruce K., and Michael Patrick O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Wilson, Robert Dick. *Elements of Syriac Grammar by an Inductive Method*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1891.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Introductory Syriac Method and Manual*. New York: C. Scribner's, 1891.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Notes on Hebrew Syntax*. Allegheny, PA: n.p., 1892.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Lower Criticism of the Old Testament as a Preparation for the Higher Criticism*. Princeton, NJ: C.S. Robinson, 1901.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Royal Titles in Antiquity: An Essay in Criticism." *The Princeton Theological Review* 2, no. 2 (1904).
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Illustrations of Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar with Vocabularies*. Princeton, NJ: [Princeton Theological Seminary?], 1906.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Hebrew Grammar for Beginners*. Leipzig: W. Drugulin, 1908.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Aramaic of Daniel." In *Biblical and Theological Studies*, ed. by the Members of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary, 262-306. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Papyrus of Elephantine." *The Princeton Theological Review* 12 (1914): 411-426.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Book of Daniel and the Canon." *The Princeton Theological Review* 13 (1915): 352-408.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Silence of Ecclesiasticus Concerning Daniel." *The Princeton Theological Review* 14 (1916): 448-474.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Studies in the Book of Daniel: A Discussion of the Historical Questions*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1917.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Scientific Biblical Criticism." *The Princeton Theological Review* 17 (1919): 190-240.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Use of 'God' and 'Lord' in the Koran." *The Princeton Theological Review* 17 (1919): 644-650.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Word הָזֶה in Daniel 12:3." *The Princeton Theological Review* 27 (1919): 128-133.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Names of God in the Old Testament." *The Princeton Theological Review* 18 (1920): 460-492.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Apocalypses and the Date of Daniel." *The Princeton Theological Review* 19 (1921): 529-545.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Daniel Not Quoted." *The Princeton Theological Review* 20 (1922): 57-68.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Is the Higher Criticism Scholarly? Clearly Attested Facts Showing That the Destructive Assured Results of Modern Scholarship Are Indefensible*. Philadelphia, PA: The Sunday School Times Company, 1922.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Influence of Daniel." *The Princeton Theological Review* 21 (1923): 337-371.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Origin of the Ideas of Daniel." *The Princeton Theological Review* 21 (1923): 161-201.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Background of Daniel." *The Princeton Theological Review* 22 (1924): 1-26.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Critical Note on Exodus 6:3." *The Princeton Theological Review* 22 (1924): 108-119.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Prophecies of Daniel." *The Princeton Theological Review* 22 (1924): 377-401.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus and the Old Testament." *The Princeton Theological Review* 24 (1926): 632-661.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*. Third edition. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1926, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Evidence in Hebrew Diction for the Dates of Documents." *The Princeton Theological Review* 25 (1927): 353-388.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "On the Hebrew of Daniel." *The Princeton Theological Review* 25 (1927): 177-199.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Foreign Words in the Old Testament as an Evidence of Historicity." *The Princeton Theological Review* 26 (1928): 177-246.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Rule of Faith and Life." *The Princeton Theological Review* 26 (1928): 423-450.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament Text." *The Princeton Theological Review* 27 (1929): 36-59.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Studies in the Book of Daniel: Second Series*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1938.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Age of the Bible Told by Foreign Words It Contains." *Moody Bible Institute Monthly*, December 1922, 147-151.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Date of Genesis X." *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* 1, no. 2 (April 1890): 252-281.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Babylon and Israel: A Comparison of Their Leading Ideas Based Upon Their Vocabularies." *The Princeton Theological Review* (April 1903): 239-255.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Study and Defense of the Bible in Westminster Seminary." *Christianity Today [original series]* 1, no. 2 (June 1930): 5-6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Hebrew Word Lists for Deuteronomy." 23, n.d.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lecture Notes: Introduction to the Old Testament." Westminster Theological Seminary, Spring Semester 1930, Transcribed by Winifred Griffith Thomas

- Gillespie, Robert Dick Wilson Papers at the PCA Historical Center, St. Louis, MO.
- Young, Edward J. "Old Testament Studies in 1962." *Christianity Today*, February 1, 1963, 409-411.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Survey of Old Testament Literature." *Christianity Today*, February 9, 1962, 409-411.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Introduction: The Life and Ministry of Robert Dick Wilson." In *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, 17-21. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Biblical Criticism to the End of the Second Christian Century." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1943.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Authority of the Old Testament." In *The Infallible Word*, edited by Members of the Faculty of Westminster Theological Seminary, 53-87. Philadelphia, PA: The Presbyterian Guardian Publishing Corporation, 1946.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Old Testament Prophecy: A Course Designed for Individual Home Study." 112 leaves, 1948.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Arabic for Beginners*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *An Introduction to the Old Testament*. Revised edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Prophecy of Daniel, A Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Christian Faith and the 'Scientific Method.'" *The Evangelical Quarterly* 23 (1951): 89-95.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Isaiah Fifty-Three: A Devotional and Expository Study*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *My Servants the Prophets*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Alleged Secondary Deuteronomic Passages in the Book of Joshua." *The Evangelical Quarterly* 25 (1953): 142-157.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Daniel." In *The New Bible Commentary*. London: InterVarsity Fellowship, 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Messianic Prophecies of Daniel*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Studies in Isaiah*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Thy Word Is Truth: Some Thoughts on the Biblical Doctrine of Inspiration*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Who Wrote Isaiah?* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today*. Westwood, NJ: F. H. Revell Co., 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What Is Old Testament Biblical Theology?" *The Evangelical Quarterly* 31 (1959): 136-142.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Old Testament Hebrew for Beginners*. Philadelphia, PA: self-published, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Studies in Genesis One*. Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Old Testament Prophecy*. Toronto: The Gospel Witness, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Psalm 139: A Devotional & Expository Study*. London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Book of Isaiah: The English Text, with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*. 3 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1965, 1969, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Genesis 3: A Devotional and Expository Study*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Are the Scriptures Inerrant?" In *The Bible: The Living Word of Revelation*, ed. Merrill C. Tenney, 103-122. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1968.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Confession and Covenant." In *Scripture and Confession*, ed. John H. Skilton, 31-66. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *In the Beginning: Genesis Chapters 1 to 3 and the Authority of Scripture*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The God of Horeb." *The Evangelical Quarterly* 10, no. 1 (January 15, 1938): 10-29.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Dead Sea Scroll of Isaiah." *Christianity Today*, March 17, 1958, 16-18.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Celsus and the Old Testament." *Westminster Theological Journal* 6, no. 2 (May 1944): 166-197.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Relation of the First Verse of Genesis One to Verses Two and Three." *Westminster Theological Journal* 21, no. 2 (May 1959): 133-146.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Interpretation of Genesis 1:2." *Westminster Theological Journal* 23, no. 2 (May 1961): 151-178.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Book Review: Sigmund Mowinkel's *Prophecy and Tradition: The Prophetic Books in the Light of the Study of the Growth and History of the Tradition*." *Westminster Theological Journal* 11, no. 1 (Nov. 1948): 80-85.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The God of the Fathers." *Westminster Theological Journal* 3, no. 1 (Nov., 1940): 25-40.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Book Review: W.F. Albright's from the Stone Age to Christianity." *Westminster Theological Journal* 27, no. 1 (Nov., 1941): 60-66.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Adverbial -U in Semitic." *Westminster Theological Journal* 13, no. 2 (Nov., 1951): 151-154.

Young, Edward J., and Cyrus H. Gordon. "נָאַנְךָ (Isaiah 63:3)." *Westminster Theological Journal* 14, no. 1 (November, 1951): 54.

## Secondary Sources

- Ahlstrom, Sydney E. "The Scottish Philosophy and American Theology." *Church History* 24 (1955): 257-272.
- Alexander, Joseph Addison. *Commentary on Isaiah*. Reprint edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1992.
- Alexander, T. Desmond, and David W. Baker, eds. *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003.
- Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books, 1981.
- Andersen, Francis I. "On Reading Genesis 1-3." In *Backgrounds for the Bible*, eds. M.P. O'Connor and D.N. Freedman, 137-150. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1987.
- Anderson, A.A. "Old Testament Theology and Its Methods." In *Promise and Fulfilment: Essays Presented to Professor S.H. Hooke*, ed. F.F. Bruce, 7-19. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1963.
- Anderson, Sir Robert. *Daniel in the Critics' Den: A Reply to Professor Driver of Oxford and the Dean of Canterbury*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1902.

- Archer, Gleason L., Jr. *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*. Revised and expanded edition. Chicago, IL: Moody, 1994.
- Armerding, Carl E. *The Old Testament and Criticism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1983.
- . "Faith and Method in Old Testament Study: Story Exegesis." In *A Pathway into the Holy Scripture*, eds. P.E. Satterthwaite and D.F. Wright, 31-49. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994.
- Bacote, Vincent, Laura C. Miguélez, and Dennis L. Okholm, eds. *Evangelicals & Scripture: Tradition, Authority, and Hermeneutics*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004.
- Barr, James. *The Bible in the Modern World*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1973.
- Barth, Karl. *Church Dogmatics: The Doctrine of the Word of God*. Translated by G.T. Thomson. Vol. I, part I. Reprint edition. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1969.
- Beale, G.K. *The Erosion of Inerrancy in Evangelicalism: Responding to New Challenges to Biblical Authority*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2008.
- Berlin, Adele. *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative* Bible and Literature Series 9. Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1983.
- Bevan, Anthony Ashley. *A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1892.
- Biographical Catalogue: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1815-1932*. Princeton, NJ: Trustees of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church, 1933.
- Blocher, Henri. *In the Beginning: The Opening Chapters of Genesis*. Translated by David G. Preston. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1984.
- Braun, Roddy. *I Chronicles* Word Biblical Commentary. Waco, TX: Word, 1986.
- Bromiley, G.W. "Karl Barth's Doctrine of Inspiration." *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* 87 (1955): 66-80.
- Brown, Colin. *Miracles and the Critical Mind*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1984.
- Brown, Ira V. "The Higher Criticism Comes to America, 1880-1900." *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society* 38, no. 4 (December 1960): 193-212.
- Brueckmann, John E. "A Partial Bibliography of the Published Writings of Edward Joseph Young, 1907-1968." 14 leaves: Westminster Theological Seminary, 1969.
- Calhoun, David B. *Princeton Seminary*. 2 vols. Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1996.

- Campbell, Antony F., and Mark A. O'Brien. *Sources of the Pentateuch*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Chapman, Stephen. "Reclaiming Inspiration for the Bible." In *Canon and Biblical Interpretation*, eds. C.G. Bartholomew, S. Hahn, R. Parry, C. Seitz, and A. Wolters, 167-206. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006.
- Cheyne, T.K. *Founders of Old Testament Criticism*. London: Methuen & Co., 1893.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Wellhausen in English." *Semeia* 25 (1982): 84-85.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Struggle to Understand Isaiah as Christian Scripture*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Clements, Ronald E. *One Hundred Years of Old Testament Interpretation*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1976.
- Collins, C. John. *Genesis 1-4: A Linguistic, Literary, and Theological Commentary*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2006.
- Collins, John J. *Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1993.
- Conn, Harvie M. "A Historical Prologue: Inerrancy, Hermeneutic, and Westminster." In *Inerrancy and Hermeneutic: A Tradition, A Challenge, A Debate*, ed. H.M. Conn, 15-34. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1988.
- Crenshaw, James L. *Gerhard von Rad*. Makers of the Modern Theological Mind, ed. Bob E. Patterson. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1978.
- Davies, G. Henton. "Gerhard von Rad's *Old Testament Theology*." In *Contemporary Old Testament Theologians*, ed. Robert B. Laurin. Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1970.
- Davis, John D. "Biographical Note: Samuel Rolles Driver." *The Princeton Theological Review* 12 (1914): 482-486.
- Driver, Samuel R. *The Book of Daniel* CBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. Ninth edition. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1913.
- Dyrness, William. *Themes in Old Testament Theology*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1979.
- Eaton, J.H. "The Origin of the Book of Isaiah." *Vetus Testamentum* 9 (1959): 138-157.
- "Edward J. Young." *Banner of Truth* 54 (March 1968): 1-6.
- "Edward Joseph Young." *Presbyterian Guardian* 37, no. 2 (Feb. 1968): 18.

- Eichrodt, Walther. *Theology of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. The Old Testament Library. Translated by J.A. Baker. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1961-1967.
- Enns, Peter. "William Henry Green and the Authorship of the Pentateuch: Some Historical Considerations." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 45, no. 3 (2002): 385-403.  
 \_\_\_\_\_. *Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2005.  
 \_\_\_\_\_. "Bible in Context: The Continuing Vitality of Reformed Biblical Scholarship." *Westminster Theological Journal* 68 (2006): 203-218.
- Farrar, Frederic William. *The Book of Daniel*. The Expositor's Bible, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll. New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1900.
- Ferguson, Sinclair B. "John Murray." In *Handbook of Evangelical Theologians*, ed. W.A. Elwell, 168-181. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1993.
- Frame, John M. "Cornelius Van Til." In *Handbook of Evangelical Theologians*, ed. Walter A. Elwell, 156-167. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1993.  
 \_\_\_\_\_. *Cornelius Van Til: An Analysis of His Thought*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 1995.
- Fretheim, Terence E. "Were the Days of Creation Twenty-Four Hours Longs? Yes." In *The Genesis Debate: Persistent Questions About Creation and the Flood*, ed. Ronald F. Youngblood, 12-35. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1990.
- Futato, Mark D. "Because It Had Rained: A Study of Gen 2:5-7 with Implications for Gen 2:4-25 and Gen 1:1-2:3." *Westminster Theological Journal* 60 (Spring 1988): 1-21.
- Gaffin, Richard B. "Geerhardus Vos and the Interpretation of Paul." In *Jerusalem and Athens*, ed. E.R. Geehan, 228-243. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Co., 1971.  
 \_\_\_\_\_. *God's Word in Servant-Form: Abraham Kuyper and Herman Bavinck on the Doctrine of Scripture*. Jackson, MS: Reformed Academic Press, 2008.  
 \_\_\_\_\_. "Introduction." In *Redemptive History and Biblical Interpretation*, ed. Richard B. Gaffin, ix-xxiii. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1980.  
 \_\_\_\_\_. "Young, Edward Joseph (1907-1968)." In *Dictionary of Christianity in America*, eds. Daniel G. Reid et al, 1298-1299. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1990.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Translated by A.E. Cowley, edited and enlarged by E. Kautzsch. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910.
- Goldingay, John. *Isaiah*. Vol. 13. New International Biblical Commentary. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2006.
- Green, William Henry. *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895.  
 \_\_\_\_\_. *The Unity of the Book of Genesis*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895.  
 \_\_\_\_\_. "Primeval Chronology." *Bibliotheca Sacra* (April 1890): 285-303.

- Greidanus, Sidney. *The Modern Preacher and the Ancient Text*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Griffith, Howard, and John R. Muether, eds. *Creator, Redeemer, Consummator: A Festschrift for Meredith G. Kline*. Greenville, SC: Reformed Academic Press, 2000.
- Grisanti, Michael A. "Inspiration, Inerrancy, and the OT Canon: The Place of Textual Updating in an Inerrant View of Scripture." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 44, no. 4 (2001): 577-598.
- Hahn, Herbert F. *The Old Testament in Modern Research*. Expanded edition. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1966.
- Harman, Allan. "Edward Joseph Young." In *Bible Interpreters of the 20th Century: A Selection of Evangelical Voices*, eds. Walter A. Elwell and J.D. Weaver, 189-201. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1999. [Publisher misspelled author's last name as "Harmon"]
- Harris, R. Laird, Swee-Hwa Quek, and J. Robert Vannoy, eds. *Interpretation & History: Essays in Honour of Allan A. MacRae*. Singapore: Christian Life Publishers, 1986.
- Hart, D.G. "J. Gresham Machen." In *Handbook of Evangelical Theologians*, ed. Walter A. Elwell, 129-143. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1993.  
\_\_\_\_\_. *Defending the Faith: J. Gresham Machen and the Crisis of Conservative Protestantism in Modern America*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 1994.  
\_\_\_\_\_. *Deconstructing Evangelicalism: Conservative Protestantism in the Age of Billy Graham*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2004.  
\_\_\_\_\_. *The University Gets Religion*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.
- Hart, D.G., and John R. Muether. *Fighting the Good Fight: A Brief History of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church*. Philadelphia, PA: Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1995.
- Hasel, Gerhard. *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*. Fourth ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Hasel, Gerhard F., and Michael G. Hasel. "The Hebrew Term 'Ed in Gen 2,6 and Its Connection in Ancient Near Eastern Literature." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 112, no. 3 (Oct. 2000): 321-340.
- Hayes, John H., and Frederick Prussner. *Old Testament Theology: Its History & Development*. Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1985.
- Henry, Carl F.H. "Canonical Theology: An Evangelical Appraisal," *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* (1990):76-108.

- Hodge, Charles. *Systematic Theology*. Vol. 1. Reprint edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Horton, Michael. *God of Promise: Introducing Covenant Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2006.
- House, Paul R. "The Rise and Current Status of Literary Criticism of the Old Testament." In *Beyond Form Criticism: Essays in Old Testament Literary Criticism*, ed. P.R. House, 3-22. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- "In Memoriam: Raymond Bryan Dillard (1944-93)." *Westminster Theological Journal* 55, no. 2 (1993): ii-iii.
- Irons, Lee. "Redefining Merit: An Examination of Medieval Presuppositions in Covenant Theology." In *Creator, Redeemer, Consummator: A Festschrift for Meredith G. Kline*, eds. Howard Griffith and John R. Muether, 253-269. Greenville, SC: Reformed Academic Press, 2000.
- Irons, Lee, with Meredith G. Kline. "The Framework View." In *The Genesis Debate: Three Views on the Days of Creation*, ed. David G. Hagopian, 217-256. Mission Viejo, CA: Crux Press, 2001.
- Jackson, Jared J., and Martin Kessler, eds. *Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*. Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series, Number 1. Pittsburgh, PA: The Pickwick Press, 1974.
- Jeon, Jeong Koo. *Covenant Theology: John Murray's and Meredith G. Kline's Response to the Historical Development of Federal Theology in Reformed Thought*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc., 1999.
- Johns, Alger F. *A Short Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*. Revised edition. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1991.
- Kaiser, Walter C., Jr. "Robert Dick Wilson." In *Bible Interpreters of the Twentieth Century: A Selection of Evangelical Voices*, eds. Walter A. Elwell and J.D. Weaver, 73-81. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1999.  
\_\_\_\_\_. *The Old Testament Documents: Are They Reliable & Relevant?* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2001.
- Karlberg, Mark W. *Covenant Theology in Reformed Perspective*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2000.
- Kitchen, Kenneth A. *Ancient Orient and Old Testament*. Chicago, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1966.  
\_\_\_\_\_. "The Aramaic of Daniel." In *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel*, eds. D.J. Wiseman, T.C. Mitchell, R. Joyce, W.J. Martin and K.A. Kitchen. London: Tyndale, 1965.

- Kraftchick, Steven J. "Facing Janus: Reviewing the Biblical Theology Movement." In *Biblical Theology: Problems and Perspective, in Honor of J. Christiaan Beker*, eds. C.D. Myers S.J. Kraftchick, Jr., and B.C. Ollenburger. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1995.
- Lyons, William L. "Between History and Theology: The Problem of Herem in Modern Evangelical Biblical Scholarship." Ph.D. Dissertation, Florida State University, 2003.
- Maarten van Bemmelen, Peter. *Issues in Biblical Interpretation: Sanday and Warfield*. Vol. 13. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1987.
- Machen, J. Gresham. *The Christian View of Man*. Reprinted edition. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1984.
- Marsden, George M. "Everyone One's Own Interpreter? The Bible, Science, and Authority in Mid-Nineteenth-Century America." In *The Bible in America: Essays in Cultural History*, eds. Nathan O. Hatch and Mark A. Noll, 79-100. New York: Oxford, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Understanding J. Gresham Machen." *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* XI, no. 1 (1990): 46-60.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Massa, Mark S. *Charles Augustus Briggs and the Crisis of Historical Criticism*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1990.
- Matthews, Victor H., and Don C. Benjamin. *Old Testament Parallels: Laws and Stories from the Ancient Near East*. Second edition. New York: Paulist Press, 1997.
- McCarter Jr., P. Kyle. *Textual Criticism: Recovering the Text of the Hebrew Bible*. Guides to Biblical Scholarship, ed. Gene M. Tucker. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1986.
- McCartney, Dan G. "Ned Bernard Stonehouse." In *Bible Interpreters of the 20th Century: A Selection of Evangelical Voices*, eds. Walter A. Elwell and J.D. Weaver, 154-164. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1999.
- Meadowcraft, T.J. *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- "Memorials: Raymond Bryan Dillard." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 37, no. 1 (1994): 155-156.
- Mendenhall, George E. "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition." *Biblical Archaeologist* 17, no. 2 (1954): 50-76.
- Montgomery, James Alan. *The Book of Daniel* ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1927.

- Muihlenburg, James. "Form Criticism and Beyond." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969): 1-18.
- Muller, Richard A. "The Place and Importance of Karl Barth in the Twentieth Century: A Review Article." *Westminster Theological Journal* 50, no. 1 (Spring, 1988): 127-156.
- Murray, John. *The Covenant of Grace*. Reprint edition. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1988.  
\_\_\_\_\_. *Collected Writings of John Murray*. Vol. 2: Systematic Theology. Reprint edition. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1984.  
\_\_\_\_\_. *Collected Writings of John Murray*. Vol. 4: Studies in Theology. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1982.
- Nicholson, Ernest. *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century: The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Noll, Mark A. *Between Faith and Criticism: Evangelicals, Scholarship, and the Bible in America*. Second edition. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1991.  
\_\_\_\_\_. "B.B. Warfield." In *Handbook of Evangelical Theologians*, ed. Walter A. Elwell, 26-39. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1993.  
\_\_\_\_\_. *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind*. Grand Rapids, MI: Erdmans, 1994.  
\_\_\_\_\_. "The Princeton Theology." In *Reformed Theology in America*, ed. David F. Wells. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1997.  
\_\_\_\_\_. ed. *The Princeton Theology, 1812-1921*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1983, 2001.
- Noordzij, Arie. *Gods Woord En Der Eeuwen Getuigenis: Het Oude Teswtament in Het Licht Der Oostersche Opgravingen*. Kampen, 1924.  
\_\_\_\_\_. *The Old Testament Problem*. Translated by Miner B. Stearns. Dallas, TX: Dallas Theological Seminary, 1940-1941.
- North, Christopher R. *The Second Isaiah: Introduction, Translation and Commentary to Chapters XI-LV*. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Olbricht, Thomas H. "Isaiah at Princeton One Hundred Fifty Years Ago and Now: Joseph Addison Alexander (1809-1860) and J.J.M. Roberts (1939-)." In *David and Zion: Biblical Studies in Honor of J.J.M. Roberts*, eds. B.N. Batto and K.L. Roberts, 387-403. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004.
- Olson, Dennis T. "Between Faith and Criticism: *The Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch* and Evangelical Pentateuchal Scholarship Today." In *Society of Biblical Literature Conference, InterVarsity Press Reception*. Atlanta, GA: unpublished paper, November 23, 2003.
- Osborne, Grant R. "Round Four: The Redaction Debate Continues." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 28, no. 4 (December 1985): 399-410.
- Oswalt, John N. *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1-39* New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Erdmans, 1986.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40-66* New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Packer, J. I. *Fundamentalism and the Word of God: Some Evangelical Principles*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1958.
- Packer, J. I., and Sven Soderlund. *The Way of Wisdom: Essays in Honor of Bruce K. Waltke*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2000.
- Parker, Simon B. "Introduction." In *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, ed. Simon B. Parker. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Payne, D.F. "Book Review: E.J. Young's *the Book of Isaiah: The English Text, with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*, Vol. 1 (Chapters 1-18)." *Evangelical Quarterly* 40, no. 3 (1968): 176-177.
- Payne, J. Barton. *The Theology of the Older Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Academie Books, 1962.
- The Power of a Noble Example: Robert Dick Wilson, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D. (1856-1930)*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Theological Seminary Memorial Bulletin, December 1930.
- Prince, John D. *A Critical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1899.
- Provan, Iain, V. Philips Long, and Tremper Longman, III. *A Biblical History of Israel*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003.
- Ramm, Bernard. *The Christian View of Science and Scripture*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1954.  
\_\_\_\_\_. *Protestant Biblical Interpretation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1970.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. *Canon and Theology*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993.
- "The Rev. Robert Dick Wilson, D.D. LL.D." *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 24, no. 3: 26-27.
- Rian, Edwin H. *The Presbyterian Conflict*. Reprint edition. Philadelphia, PA: The Committee for the Historian of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 1992.
- Richardson, Kurt Anders. *Reading Karl Barth: New Directions for North American Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2004.
- Ridderbos, N.H. *Is There a Conflict between Genesis 1 and Natural Science?* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1957.
- Roberts, Wesley A. "Cornelius Van Til." In *Reformed Theology in America: A History of Its Modern Development*, ed. David F. Wells, 173-186. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1997.

- Rogerson, John. *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century: England and Germany*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1985.
- Rosenthal, Franz. *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*. Sixth, revised edition. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1995.
- Rowley, Harold H. *The Aramaic of the Old Testament: A Grammatical and Lexical Study of Its Relations with Other Early Aramaic Dialects*. London: Oxford University Press, 1929.  
 \_\_\_\_\_, *The Growth of the Old Testament*. London: Hutchinson & Co., 1950.  
 \_\_\_\_\_, *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press Board, 1959.
- Sawyer, John F.A. *The Fifth Gospel: Isaiah in the History of Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Schmitt, John J. "Book Review: E.J. Young's *the Book of Isaiah: The English Text, with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*, Vol. I (Chapters 1-18)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 35, no. 1 (1973): 127-129.
- Silva, Moisés. "Ned B. Stonehouse and Redaction Criticism: Part I: The Witness of the Synoptic Evangelists to Christ." *Westminster Theological Journal* 40, no. 1 (Fall 1977): 77-88.  
 \_\_\_\_\_, "A Half-Century of Reformed Scholarship." *Westminster Theological Journal* 50, no. 2 (Fall 1988): 247-256.  
 \_\_\_\_\_, "Can Two Walk Together Unless They Be Agreed? Evangelical Theology and Biblical Scholarship." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 41, no. 1 (March 1998): 3-16.  
 \_\_\_\_\_, "Ned B. Stonehouse and Redaction Criticism: Part II: The Historicity of the Synoptic Tradition." *Westminster Theological Journal* 40, no. 2 (Spring 1978): 281-303.  
 \_\_\_\_\_, "Old Princeton, Westminster, and Inerrancy." In *Inerrancy and Hermeneutic: A Tradition, A Challenge, A Debate*, ed. Harvie M. Conn, 67-80. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1988.
- Skilton, John H. "Oswald T. Allis." In *Bible Interpreters of the 20th Century: A Selection of Evangelical Voices*, eds. Walter A. Elwell and J.D. Weaver, 122-130. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1999.  
 \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The Law and the Prophets: Old Testament Studies Prepared in Honor of Oswald Thompson Allis*. Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1974.
- Smith, Ralph L. *Old Testament Theology: Its History, Method, and Message*. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1993.
- Stanton, Horace D. "Dr. Robert Dick Wilson's Lectures on the Historicity of the Old Testament—Part III." *The Presbyterian*, April 5, 1923.
- Stefanovic, Zdravko. *The Aramaic of Daniel in the Light of Old Aramaic*. JSOT Supplement Series 129. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.

- Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1985.
- Stewart, John W. "The Tethered Theology: Biblical Criticism, Common Sense Philosophy, and the Princeton Theologians." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1990.
- Stonehouse, Ned B. *The Witness of Matthew and Mark to Christ*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1944.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *J. Gresham Machen: A Biographical Memoir*. Third edition. Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1987.
- Stuhlmüller, Carroll. "Book Review: E.J. Young's *the Book of Isaiah: The English Text, with Introduction, Exposition and Notes*, Vol. 2 (Chapters 19-39)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 32, no. 3 (1970): 487-488.
- Taylor, J. Glen. "R.K. Harrison." In *Bible Interpreters of the 20th Century: A Selection of Evangelical Voices*, eds. Walter A. Elwell and J.D. Weaver, 312-328. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House Co., 1999.
- Taylor, Marion Ann. *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School (1812-1929)*. San Francisco, CA: Mellen Research University Press, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Samuel Rolles Driver." In *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters*, ed. Donald K. McKim. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "William Henry Green." In *Bible Interpreters of the 20th Century: A Selection of Evangelical Voices*, eds. Walter A. Elwell and J.D. Weaver, 22-36. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1999.
- Thompson, R.J. *Moses and the Law in a Century of Criticism since Graf*. Vol. XIX. Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1970.
- Tov, Emanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Van Til, Cornelius. *The New Modernism: An Appraisal of the Theology of Barth and Brunner*. Second edition. Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1947.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Defense of the Faith*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1955.
- Vanderkam, James C. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994.
- Vanhoozer, Kevin J. "Bernard Ramm." In *Handbook of Evangelical Theologians*, ed. W.A. Elwell, 290-306. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1993.
- Von Rad, Gerhard. *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*. Translated by E.W. Trueman Dicken. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

- Vos, Geerhardus. *Biblical Theology: Old and New Testaments*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Doctrine of the Covenant in Reformed Theology." In *Redemptive History and Biblical Interpretation: The Shorter Writings of Geerhardus Vos*, ed. R.B. Gaffin Jr., 234-267. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1980.
- Wallace, Peter J. "Old Testament Theology at Old Princeton." *Westminster Theological Journal* 59, no. 1 (Spring 1997): 41-69.
- Warfield, B. B. In *Evolution, Science, and Scripture: Selected Writings*, ed. Mark A. Noll & David A. Livingston. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2000.
- Warfield, B. B., and A. A. Hodge. "Inspiration." *Presbyterian Review* 6 (April 1881): 225-260.
- Weber, Timothy P. "The Two-Edged Sword: The Fundamentalist Use of the Bible." In *The Bible in America*, eds. Nathan O. Hatch and Mark A. Noll, 101-120. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*. Translated by J.S. Black and A. Menzies. Edinburgh, 1883.
- Whitcomb, John C. *Darius the Mede*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Science of Historical Geology: In the Light of the Biblical Doctrine of a Mature Creation." *Westminster Theological Journal* 36, no. 1 (Fall 1963): 65-77.
- Whitcomb, John C., and Henry M. Morris. *The Genesis Flood: The Biblical Record and Its Scientific Implications*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1961.
- Williamson, H.G.M. *The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah's Role in Composition and Redaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Wiseman, D.J. "Some Historical Problems in the Book of Daniel." In *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel*, eds. D.J. Wiseman et al. London: Tyndale, 1965.
- Wood, John Halsey, Jr. "Oswald T. Allis and the Question of Isaianic Authorship." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 48, no. 2 (June 2005): 249-61.
- Wright, Charles H.H. *Daniel and His Prophets*. London: Williams and Norgate, 1906.
- Wright, G. Ernest. *God Who Acts: Biblical Theology as Recital*. London: SCM Press LTD, 1952.
- Yamauchi, Edwin M. *Persia and the Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1990.
- Young, Davis A. "Scripture in the Hands of Geologists (Part Two)." *Westminster Theological Journal* 49, no. 2 (Fall 1987): 257-304.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Some Practical Geological Problems in the Application of the Mature Creation Doctrine." *Westminster Theological Journal* 35, no. 3 (Spring 1973): 268-280.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Another Look at Mature Creationism." *Westminster Theological Journal* 37, no. 3 (Spring 1975): 384-389.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Scripture in the Hands of Geologists (Part One)." *Westminster Theological Journal* 49, no. 1 (Spring 1987): 1-34.



# INDEX

## A

- Adamic Covenant  
Adamic administration, 129  
Alexander, Joseph Addison, 8, 10, 104, 105, 111, 113, 154, 156, 169, 201, 221, 228  
Allis, Oswald Thompson, 7, 60, 175, 186, 218, 227  
anti-supernaturalism, 2, 53, 152, 192  
Aramaic, biblical language of, 14, 15, 17, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 54, 61, 67, 68, 70, 75, 76, 77, 78, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 103, 105, 107, 109, 110, 169, 178, 181, 235

## B

- Babylonian Talmud  
Tractate Baba Bathra, 49, 138, 164, 322  
Barth, Karl, 120, 121, 122, 123, 175, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 196, 209  
Biblical Theology, 104, 127, 180, 181, 184, 188, 194, 195, 197, 199, 200, 233, 283  
Bruce, Frederick Fyvie, 119, 188, 193, 225, 291, 303

## C

- canon, 14, 30, 31, 34, 47, 48, 49, 50, 66, 67, 84, 95, 97, 276, 300, 306, 308  
common grace, 238, 251, 286, 287, 312  
Covenant of Grace, 127, 128, 130, 131, 132, 200, 202

- Covenant of Works, 127, 128, 130, 132, 133, 200, 201, 202, 203  
Craig, Samuel G., 1, 5, 178

## D

- The Deuteronomist Document, 19, 25, 28, 51, 82, 83, 97, 98, 135, 180, 190, 249, 257, 294  
Daniel, book of  
issues related to authorship and dating, 3, 4, 6, 12, 14, 15, 33, 34, 36, 39, 41, 42, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 58, 62, 63, 65, 85, 86, 93, 95, 99, 101, 105, 111, 117, 169, 170, 183, 233, 268, 269, 314, 322  
Dillard, Raymond Bryan, 2, 233, 234, 284, 285, 310  
Divine inspiration  
of Scripture, 132  
Documentary Hypothesis, 19, 20  
Driver, Samuel Rolles, 17, 68, 69, 86  
Duhm, Bernard, 155, 222

## E

- The Elohist Document, 19, 24, 25, 26, 28, 72, 80, 81, 82, 83, 93, 97, 98, 134, 135, 197, 211, 285, 295  
Evangelical Theological Society, 62, 113, 124, 188, 190, 196, 218, 242, 247, 284, 285, 290, 291, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 301, 303

**F**

- Federal Theology  
 Covenant Theology, 126, 127, 130, 133, 199, 202  
 form criticism, 62, 152, 249, 270, 317  
 framework view  
 of creation, 125, 138, 139, 140, 142, 143, 144, 147, 152, 154, 171, 199, 208, 212, 218, 219, 240, 311, 317

**G**

- Genesis 1 and 2  
 interpretation of, 22, 108, 148, 149, 151, 152, 182, 210, 217, 256  
 Greek, biblical language of, 17, 23, 27, 29, 35, 41, 42, 45, 48, 49, 50, 55, 67, 83, 93, 94, 95, 100, 108, 163, 188, 194, 268  
 Green, William Henry, 8, 10, 58, 61, 63, 66, 75, 79, 84, 85, 103, 104, 105, 111, 169, 201, 217, 275, 278, 297, 303, 306, 311

**H**

- Hebrew, biblical language of, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 31, 33, 35, 36, 41, 42, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 54, 57, 60, 61, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 75, 76, 77, 78, 83, 84, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 96, 97, 98, 107, 108, 109, 110, 114, 115, 116, 118, 141, 144, 149, 151, 152, 157, 158, 159, 163, 166, 167, 168, 170, 171, 172, 178, 180, 181, 185, 188, 193, 211, 212, 218, 220, 224, 225, 226, 229, 232, 234, 235, 243, 246, 255, 273, 276, 282, 283, 284, 289  
*Heils geschichte*, 124, 125, 126, 195, 197, 198  
 Hexateuch, 19, 24, 26, 29, 30, 32, 73, 125, 135, 195, 205  
 higher criticism, 16  
 historical criticism, 1, 2, 4, 6, 24, 63, 108, 122, 140, 152, 154, 193, 197, 233, 249, 252, 260, 312, 314, 316, 318, 320  
 historical-critical scholarship, 2, 3

**I**

- inerrancy  
 of Scripture, 62, 74, 121, 132, 169, 193, 217  
 inspired redactors, 3, 4, 30, 31, 204, 260, 272, 278, 280, 297, 298, 311, 312, 313, 314, 316, 317, 318, 319  
 Isaiah, the book of  
 authorship and dating, 4, 108, 113, 114, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 163, 169, 170, 223, 227, 260, 261, 279, 312, 313, 324

**J**

- The Jahwist Document, 5, 19, 22, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 72, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 97, 98, 112, 134, 135, 191, 192, 193, 197, 210, 225, 256, 257, 298, 299

**K**

- Kitchen, Kenneth A., 47, 93, 94, 95, 104, 219, 336  
 Kline, Meredith G., 3, 5, 108, 111, 132, 139, 233, 234, 236, 248, 270, 277, 311, 317, 320

**L**

- Longman, Tremper, III, 2, 4, 233, 235, 236, 246, 270, 282, 292, 293, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 301, 304, 305, 310, 311, 320  
 lower criticism  
 textual criticism, 16, 65

**M**

- Machen, J. Gresham, 1, 5, 7, 8, 12, 60, 64, 105, 108, 168, 176, 177, 184, 203, 231, 235, 236  
 MacRae, Allan Alexander, 7, 176  
 Murray, John, 109, 112, 113, 127, 129, 169, 180, 183, 184, 185, 199, 200, 287

**N**

Neo-Orthodoxy, 120, 124, 169, 189, 195, 196

**O**

Old Princeton Theology, 1, 7  
 Old Princeton-Westminster trajectory, 2, 3, 4, 234, 266, 268, 277, 281, 318  
 Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 109, 112, 177

**P**

The Priestly Writer, 15, 19, 22, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 73, 80, 81, 82, 83, 97, 98, 135, 189, 210, 256, 257, 285, 292, 298, 299  
 Pentateuch  
 authorship and dating, 3, 4, 6, 11, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 48, 62, 63, 68, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 79, 82, 85, 97, 98, 107, 108, 110, 111, 113, 117, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 169, 170, 177, 181, 194, 204, 205, 206, 207, 210, 218, 220, 233, 240, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 272, 275, 279, 280, 281, 297, 298, 299, 300, 303, 310, 311, 312, 313, 315, 316, 319, 320, 322  
 "plundering the egyptians"  
 concept of, 4, 235, 239, 285, 315  
 Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., 108, 109, 177, 178, 305  
 Princeton Theological Seminary, 1, 5, 10, 11, 13, 16, 19, 31, 60, 62, 64, 69, 71, 79, 102, 105, 139, 169, 170, 175, 176, 184, 207, 299, 319  
 progressive revelation, 99

**R**

Ramm, Bernard, 138, 148, 189, 190, 192, 208, 209, 216  
 Rowley, Harold H., 44, 55, 118, 171, 187, 188, 195, 224

**S**

Scottish Common Sense Realism, 17, 70, 71, 236  
 Silva, Moisés, 153, 182, 185, 187, 220, 241, 249, 290, 291, 294

**T**

textual criticism  
 lower criticism, 16, 24, 58, 65, 73, 192  
 Troeltsch, Ernst, 100, 101

**V**

Van Til, Cornelius, 120, 145, 169, 184, 188, 189, 190, 192, 214, 235, 236, 286, 287, 314, 323  
 Von Rad, Gerhard, 125, 187, 194, 195, 197, 198  
 Vos, Geerhardus, 12, 64, 79, 104, 111, 132, 169, 175, 181, 182, 184, 197, 199, 200, 201, 202, 270

**W**

Wellhausen, Julius, 19, 62, 63, 64, 68, 72, 73, 79, 97, 98, 135  
 Westminster Confession of Faith, 4, 130, 177  
 Westminster Theological Seminary, 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 60, 61, 64, 68, 107, 108, 168, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 184, 185, 188, 190, 196, 199, 232, 233, 234, 236, 246, 247, 270, 282, 284, 286, 287, 290, 291, 292, 293, 298, 302, 303, 305, 306, 307, 308, 310, 322  
 Wilson, Robert Dick, 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 13, 33, 46, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 68, 69, 70, 74, 76, 77, 80, 81, 85, 87, 95, 96, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 111, 114, 115, 116, 117, 133, 169, 175, 176, 177, 178, 184, 186, 196, 204, 220, 236, 254, 276, 278, 305, 306, 307, 310, 315  
 Wiseman, Donald J., 56, 57, 94, 102, 104, 188, 234  
 Wright, G. Ernest, 124, 194

**Y**

184, 185, 186, 187, 199, 224, 225,  
226, 227, 231, 232, 305, 307, 310

Young, Edward Joseph, 2, 107, 108,  
174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 182,

