

THE BIBLICAL WORLD.

CONTINUING

The Old and New Testament Student

JANUARY, 1893

DOES any one doubt the existence of problems on every side? Is any one so blind as not to see that in the various realms of action and of thought that which is problematic prevails most widely? In a close analysis one may fairly question whether there is anything which is not more or less problematic. Is it not true that to live and be living is only less a problem than to be dying or dead? In life, therefore, and in death the unsolved presents itself. That which is dark grows at times more light to some, but, after all, it is rather a question of the degree of darkness that has been removed, than of the degree of light which has been attained.

To one who may entertain views savoring of a pessimistic character, the existence of these problems of every kind, affecting every line of thought and every principle of action, becomes a terrible reality which staggers faith and makes life itself a period of misery. To him who is more hopefully inclined, and who is able to see the light that exists, even from the midst of darkness, or to him whose inner eye has gained a glimpse of light beyond and above the darkness, there is, to be sure, none of this black despair; and yet, in so far as such a one thinks, his thought is a struggle. Indeed, all thought is struggle, for in thinking man wrestles with the influences, good and bad, by

which he is surrounded, and, alas, in too many cases the thinker, or he who honestly tries to think, is throttled by the grasp of superstition or stifled in the atmosphere of ignorance.

WHENCE come these problems that so beset us? Are they the vain imagination of men's minds, or do they find their existence in the very nature of things? Too frequently they are regarded as the invention of those who state and try to solve them; upon the mind which is sensitive enough to appreciate and formulate them we lay the responsibility of their existence. But while it is true that each man is responsible for what he thinks, it is God alone who has suggested the problems which excite thought. The world of revelation, broad and bright and great as it is, is filled with uncertainties. Many things which from the human point of view might have been settled have been left open. Indefiniteness characterizes many a subject concerning which we might have expected definiteness. In the world of nature this condition of things is even more clearly seen and more widely acknowledged. The same thing holds true in all lines of human activity—for example, in letters and politics. Here, as elsewhere, our lives, if we live, our thoughts, if we think, must be devoted to the consideration of problems.

To many minds these problems are the more serious in proportion as they are more closely connected with one's conception of God, and their serious character is still more clearly appreciated as we contemplate them, and discover that in God himself and in his plans they have their origin. It is he who, in one form or another, presents them; and the man who does not give them his attention, so far as his ability permits, who does not look into them with the opportunities at his command, and try to solve them, is guilty of the greatest sin which he can commit, either against himself or against God.

IS NOT the purpose of this condition of things clear? These problems have been given us in order that by the contemplation of them we may rise from the level of the brute to the great height occupied by the heavenly intelligences and by God him-

self. Dealing with them is a means of advancement. It is this work, which, beyond all other work, uplifts humanity. This was the crowning work of the great Teacher, who furnished in his life and in his words, the basal principles for the solution of all questions. The problems of his time were the problems of all times, and in him we find at once the explanation and the purpose, the key for the solution of these difficulties and the inspiration to undertake the work of solution.

It is true that these problems, and here we may limit ourselves to the problems of religious life and theological thought, bring real distress of mind,—perhaps even skepticism, to the minds of some. From one point of view they accomplish no end of mischief. Hearts seem to be broken, faiths shattered, by the questionings which these problems produce. Whatever we may say in explanation of all this, the fact remains that in many cases simply because of having undertaken some consideration of these things, men lose or fancy themselves to lose a something which was theirs before, and which up to this time had served, at any rate, as a substitute for the real religious spirit. But such cases are after all comparatively few and their existence only proves the truth of all that has been said.

To think is not to doubt continuously and forever, but only long enough to allow that which had been doubted to be shown to be the veriest truth and therefore to be forever accepted, or to be error and therefore to be rejected. Misuse of that which is given us to use is next to non-use of the same, the greatest sin, and one wonders which of these sins is the predominant one. When men learn properly to use that which is set before them, this misuse which prevails so widely will cease, and then with clear insight and with greater probability of success, these problems will be handled.

WHAT now shall be our attitude? Does any one suppose that so long as men live the solution of these problems will not be attempted? Just as their existence is a part of the very nature of things, the attempt to solve them is also an inseparable part

of the constitution of man's nature. The greatest work given to humanity to do and the work which will most quickly lift it is the outreaching towards that which is above; in other words, a grappling with these mysterious things in every part of man's environment. That man who searches most intently, whose mind is most difficult to satisfy, is the man in whom there is the most of the divine. He is more or less a brute who is not ready to grapple with them.

IT WAS the policy of that other journal, the predecessor of THE BIBLICAL WORLD, during the ten years of its existence, to present, and, so far as possible, to discuss the questions which stood closely related to that Book, which furnishes the foundation of our faith. Difficulties were not sought for; nor, when forced upon the attention, were they magnified. On the other hand, they were neither ignored nor underrated. An effort was made to state them, when necessary, with frankness and fairness; to meet them, when possible, with firmness and the truth. Such will be the policy of THE BIBLICAL WORLD. Its work is to build up, by any and every legitimate method, a true conception of the "Word." In order to build that which will stand, close attention must be paid to the foundations on which the building shall rest. Rubbish of any kind will, sooner or later, inevitably bring trouble.

The new journal takes up the work where the old journal laid it down. If the old friends will continue with us and give the sympathy and support so freely accorded in the past, we may confidently promise, with the new facilities at command, to render efficient aid in the work of making known in all their multi-forms the great truths which have brought and are bringing light to the world.

WHAT IS BIBLICAL THEOLOGY, AND WHAT IS ITS METHOD?

By Professor GEORGE B. STEVENS, PH. D., D.D.
Yale University.

During recent years there have been established in several American Theological Seminaries chairs of Biblical Theology as a department of study distinct from Exegesis and distinct from Systematic or Doctrinal Theology. In making this division we are following the example of Continental theologians who have long cultivated Biblical Theology as a separate branch of study. Biblical Theology is the scientific presentation, on the basis of Exegesis, of the contents of each type of Biblical teaching. It is a strictly historic science. The types of teaching with which the science deals will, in some cases, be represented by a single book; more frequently by the various writings of a single author, or the books of various authors which belong together by reason of likeness of contents or some other similarity. Different writers on Biblical Theology sometimes divide the material to be treated in different ways. Take, for example, the gospels. Ordinarily the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptic gospels and the teaching as presented in the Fourth gospel are presented separately because the first three gospels so much resemble one another in form and in matter which they present, and because the Fourth differs so characteristically from them. But some would treat the teaching of Jesus as a whole, notwithstanding this distinction, while, for the purpose of exhibiting the peculiarities of each gospel, they would naturally be treated separately. Some writers treat the Pauline type of teaching in four divisions, corresponding to the natural grouping of Paul's letters. Others treat his system as a whole, making, of course, the principal doctrinal letters (Rom. Cor. and Gal.) the basis, but drawing freely from all the others also. Most writers in treating the Johannine theology would deal separately with the Apocalypse, because—even

if written by the author of the Fourth gospel — it represents a special type of literature whose peculiarities require to be separately described.

It will be seen that the method of Biblical Theology is especially adapted to exhibit the individuality of the Biblical writers. Its immediate aim is to reproduce in the clearest manner and in systematic form the ideas of the writer who is the subject of study at the time. All other interests — such as the adjustment of the given writer's views to those of others, or the general result of Biblical teaching as a whole — are held in check for the immediate purpose of the study. Only after each type has been exhaustively studied by itself can the work of comparison be thoroughly done; only then can the general result be fully and fairly presented.

Biblical Theology is inseparable from Exegesis. It is simply the systematized result of Exegesis. In Exegesis we take the books one by one and study them critically from beginning to end, tracing the writer's thoughts in the order of their development in that particular book. Biblical Theology avails itself of the results of Exegesis, and asks, What does the Biblical writer in question teach concerning God, concerning sin, and the like? The exhibition of the given writer's teaching as a whole upon such themes as these constitutes the Biblical Theology of that author. Exegesis stops short of its goal if it does not end in Biblical Theology. Exegetical study which is not carried to its true culmination in Biblical Theology is likely to leave the mind of the student embarrassed by the details which are inseparable from its method, without conducting him to any clear and definite doctrinal results. A topical presentation of the results of Exegesis is of the greatest importance in enabling the student to appreciate the practical value of close, critical study. Thus the reason becomes evident why in the German universities the Professors who lecture on Biblical Theology lecture also on Exegesis. The two departments, although regarded as distinct, are kept in the closest relation.

It is sometimes asked: Is not Doctrinal Theology Biblical? Does it not, at least, aim to be? And if it is, what need is there for a

distinct department of Biblical Theology? If we grant that Systematic Theology *is* Biblical (a point which I have no occasion here to discuss), there is still a useful place for Biblical Theology in theological education, on account of its peculiar aim and method. The doctrinal theologian must treat the various themes of theology in a philosophical method and spirit. His aim is to justify them to reason, to defend them against objections, and to incorporate them into a system—a rational construction of doctrines. He seeks to present under modern scientific forms of thought and for practical teaching purposes, the content of Biblical doctrine. There is necessarily a large apologetic element in Systematic Theology, and, as it has commonly been pursued—and, I believe, properly—a large metaphysical and speculative element. Biblical Theology, on the other hand, distinctly disclaims any philosophical or speculative method. The Biblical theologian places himself, for the time, in the age and circumstances of the writer with whom he is dealing. He asks simply what this writer says and means, not how that can be justified to reason, defended against objection, harmonized with the teachings of other writers or translated into the equivalents of modern thought and made part of a general scheme of doctrine. He abjures all such questions. He tries to see with the writer's eyes and to think his thoughts after him. He seeks to apprehend the form and matter of the writer's thought according to the manner of its time; to place himself at the writer's standpoint and to read him in the light of his age and circumstances.

It will be a great gain for American theology to apprehend and apply the distinction of method which has just been noticed. We have had in the brief history of our country a vigorous and creditable development of Systematic Theology. Exegesis and Biblical Theology have been less diligently and thoroughly cultivated, or have been cultivated too much under the stress of strong dogmatic bias. Our theological systems have been fortified by the citation of "proof-texts," which have been too often employed without a careful and just estimate of their significance in their original connection, and without appreciation of the Biblical writer's standpoint, purpose or mode of thought. Bib-

lical Theology, if successfully cultivated, will operate as a check upon the extravagance of the proof-text method. It will do much to save Systematic Theology from erroneous emphasis and an unhistoric application of texts. But it would furnish its sister science with great positive aids. It would present to the doctrinal theologian the Biblical material, organized and systematized. This material it would then be his task to work over into a rational system, and to present it, in the method and spirit of modern science, in a form as symmetrical and complete as the nature of the case permits.

There exists just now a certain distrust of theological systems. The temper of the age offers a great opportunity to Biblical Theology. The critical spirit holds sway. Men are eager for the results of criticism, thoroughly wrought out. The demand of the time—so far as theology is concerned—is for a thorough and impartial investigation of Biblical teaching in its genetic development and its various forms. And this work is what Systematic Theology needs in the interest of her own best work and progress. Biblical Theology, if developed in a critical and scientific spirit, and at the same time with a reverent appreciation of Biblical truth, will be one of the greatest aids to Doctrinal Theology and will inevitably have the effect to arouse interest in it. I cannot believe that interest in Doctrinal Theology will long remain second to that which is felt in any other branch of sacred learning. It is grounded in the impulse to think—to construe religious truth in systematic form and to justify it to reason. No scientific age will long abandon the pursuit of Systematic Theology. If Biblical Theology will do its work thoroughly and do it now—just when it is wanted, just when it is needed—it will give a new impetus to the study of Christian doctrine and thus, both directly and indirectly, perform a lasting service in the promotion of Christian truth.

SAUL'S EXPERIENCE ON THE WAY TO DAMASCUS.

*THE NATURE OF THE CHANGE IT PRODUCED IN HIM AND ITS
EFFECT ON HIS DOCTRINE.*

BY Professor ERNEST D. BURTON,
The University of Chicago.

The purpose of this paper is not to discuss the external features of Saul's experience in his approach to Damascus. It does not concern itself with the question whether there was a veritable appearance to him of the risen Jesus. Accepting what is scarcely to be denied by any one, that Saul at this time passed through a notable crisis in his life, and ever afterward believed that he at that time received indubitable evidence that Christ had risen from the dead, it is proposed to inquire respecting the nature of the change wrought in Saul by this experience.

Rightly to understand this change, we must understand what sort of a man he was previous to this experience. Consider, then, his previous character and history.

1. He was a man of profound moral earnestness. Whatever faults of character or vices of life he had, frivolousness was not one of them. Earnestness did not begin with his conversion. Paul was always intense. This appears in all his references to his life before his conversion. Acts xxiii. 1: "I have lived before God in all good conscience until this day"; xxvi. 4: "My manner of life from my youth up, which was from the beginning among mine own nation, and at Jerusalem, know all the Jews; having knowledge of me from the first, if they be willing to testify, how that after the strictest sect of our religion, I lived a Pharisee." See also xxii. 3 ff.

2. He was an earnest seeker after righteousness. It would seem as if our Lord's blessing on those who hunger and thirst after righteousness could have been pronounced on Saul before his conversion. In Phil. iii. 6, he declares that in his Pharisaic

days he was, "touching the righteousness which is in the law blameless." Such blamelessness could only have been the result of earnest and persistent effort. To this agree also all his references to this period of his life. Compare Gal. i. 13; Acts xxiii. 1.

3. The method by which he sought to attain righteousness was a strict obedience to the law as interpreted by the Pharisees. This also is implied in Phil. iii. 6: "As touching the law a Pharisee . . . as touching the righteousness which is in the law, found blameless." Compare also Acts xxii. 3; xxvi. 5; Gal. i. 14.

Now, a careful study of Paul's use of the term law in connection with righteousness, will show that what he means by righteousness by law, or the righteousness that is in the law, is not merely a righteousness which realizes the law's ideal, but something both more and less than that, viz., a righteousness which is attained, so far as attained at all, by a self-reliant effort to obey the law. As a factor in man's moral life, law is constantly the antithesis of faith. As a conceivable method of divine conduct toward men, it is the antithesis of grace. Law stands in Paul's vocabulary for that method of life according to which a man sets before himself what he conceives to be the demands of God, and gives himself to the endeavor to attain right character, and so to earn divine approval as a thing deserved at God's hand. Righteousness thus acquired, and in so far as it is thus acquired, is by its very nature self-righteousness. And this holds true whether we conceive of righteousness simply as right character and conduct in themselves, or according to Paul's more common method of thinking, as a character or an attitude toward God which makes us acceptable to God. For law awards a man simply what he deserves. In so far as it awards him anything else, it is itself something else than law. It is indeed possible to conceive of an order of things which should combine law with faith. That is, ideally, one might from the first moment of moral responsibility cast himself on God for help, and, by divine help always meeting the requirements of righteousness, present before the law a perfect character acquired in dependence on God. But, in fact, this is a theoretical possi-

bility only, which had no place in the Pauline or in the New Testament terminology. To any one who has given serious study to human nature as it now is and has been in past days, the reason for the omission of this theoretical possibility is not far to seek. The only practical possibilities, certainly the only possibilities of which Paul ever speaks, are, on the one hand, a self-dependent obedience (or disobedience) to the divine law, coupled with an expectation of standing before that law on one's own self-acquired merits, and, on the other hand, a reliance on the divine aid and an acceptance of the divine grace, which is called faith. And as between these alternatives, Paul distinctly declares that the former was his attitude before his acceptance of Christ.

Now, it is evident that the cherishing of this conception of righteousness as something to be attained only on a basis of law and of merit would inevitably be a serious obstacle to a hearty acceptance of Jesus, or would become so the moment the real spirit and teaching of Jesus were understood. Not only had Jesus unsparingly denounced the Pharisees, not only had he taught that the only way of access to God was not by one's power or goodness, but through faith in himself, Jesus; but the very spirit of humility and lowliness of mind which he exemplified and inculcated were calculated to repel one who had not only accepted as a dogma the Pharisaic idea of self-acquired righteousness, but had become imbued with the self-sufficient spirit likely to be cultivated by the holding of this dogma.

4. Saul had, before he became a Christian, attained as nearly perfect success in his effort to become righteous as under this method was possible. On this point we have his own testimony, given when he had become a Christian and had come to look back on his former life as a mistake and a failure. Gal. i. 4: "I advanced in the Jew's religion beyond many of mine own age, being more exceedingly zealous for the traditions of my fathers' ; Phil. iii. 6: "Touching the righteousness which is in the law, found blameless."

5. His persecution of the Christians was in some sense conscientious. "I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth"

(Acts xxvi. 9, ff.). Of the same purport is his word to Timothy: "I did it ignorantly in unbelief." These statements are of great importance as indicating the state of Paul's mind and heart during his career as a persecutor. They show us a man of profound moral earnestness pursuing a course of bitter persecution of the Christians under the stress of a sincere conviction of duty.

But on the other hand, they must not be pressed beyond their true significance. They stand in immediate connection with expressions on the apostle's part of strong condemnation of the course which he then pursued, expressions which prove that, whatever his sincerity at that time, he afterwards came to see that his conduct was wrong, not simply according to some objective standard, but as involving sin on his part. He does not, indeed, undertake to locate the exact point of his responsibility; he does not enter into a minute psychological analysis of his mental and moral state; and we, at least, cannot determine whether his sin consisted wholly in previous action, mental or other, by which he had made for himself an abnormal conscience, which conscience he now could not do otherwise than obey; or whether there was still in him, in the midst of his career as a persecutor, something of that moral obliquity which, vitiating all the mental processes as they applied to moral questions, could create and maintain a conviction the falsity and injustice of which was obscured from consciousness by the same perversion that created it. He contents himself with the paradoxical, but by no means inconsistent, statement, that he acted conscientiously, but acted wrongly and sinfully.

6. Despite his success in attaining the righteousness that is in the law, despite his conscientiousness in persecuting the Christians, Saul was not wholly at ease. The words of Jesus to him on the road to Damascus: "It is hard for thee to kick against the goads," imply three things: That Saul was at this time subject to certain influences tending to turn him from the course which he had chosen; that he was resisting those influences; that such resistance involved some struggle on his part. The precise nature of these influences it is difficult to state. That

they came from without is, indeed, suggested by the figure of the goad, but that they penetrated to the sphere of thought and feeling is not less implied in the statement that he was with difficulty resisting them. What Paul wrote afterward gives us at least, the hint that his discontent with himself lay in two directions and sprang from two sources. The paradoxical nature of his statement about his career as a persecutor, already referred to, strongly suggests that, at times at least, he could not exclude the doubt whether he was altogether right in his persecutions. The godly lives of those whom he was persecuting, their heroic endurance of persecution, the triumphant death of such an one as Stephen, these perhaps formed some part of the goad against which he was kicking. That he had as yet any inclination himself to accept Christ, cannot indeed be shown; rather all the evidence is to the contrary. He was an ox pressed by the goad, urging him he knew not whither; the very intensity of his conscientious conviction that he was right would lead him to suppress the suggestion he was wrong long before it had reached the point of an insinuation that he himself must become a Christian; the conscientiousness that lay back of that conviction would forbid him peace of mind while he suppressed this half latent suggestion.

But whatever doubt there may be concerning Paul's precise state of mind with reference to his conduct as a persecutor, there can be no doubt that in his life as a Pharisee he was, at times at least, and probably with increasing frequency and intensity, greatly dissatisfied with his general moral condition. The passages in his epistles in which he speaks with such emphasis and feeling of the unhappy condition of men under the law must certainly reflect his personal experience, even if they were not based wholly upon that experience. If he had fancied that he had attained full acceptance with God; if his state under the law had been one of easy self-satisfaction, if he had found the law incapable of producing discontent with oneself (as Mattheson maintains), Paul could never honestly have written those burning passages respecting the effect of the law, which are familiar to every reader of his letters to the Galatians and the

Romans (Rom. iii. 20; vii. 5-25; Gal. ii. 9; iii. 22, 23). His own experience would have given the lie to every word.

It was then a conscientious and upright man, ill at ease with himself, who rode from Jerusalem to Damascus to persecute the Christians; haunted perhaps by vague doubts which he could not wholly suppress respecting the rightfulness of this very mission, certainly dissatisfied at times with all his success as a Pharisee, painfully aware that his highest success was after all a failure.

7. Up to the time that he met Jesus in the road leading to Damascus, Saul had not believed in a Messiah who was to suffer and rise again. It has indeed been disputed whether the Jews did or did not believe in a suffering Messiah. That the Jews of a later time spoke of the "woes of the Messiah," is beyond question; but the evidence outside of the New Testament seems to fall short of proving that a suffering Messiah was looked for by the Jews of Jesus' day. And if we turn to the New Testament itself, this seems to establish beyond question that the doctrine of a suffering Messiah was not the commonly accepted doctrine. Certainly the idea of a Messiah rejected by the nation was foreign to their thought. Peter (Matt. xvi. 16, 22), having just declared that Jesus is the Christ, cannot understand that he is to be rejected and put to death by his nation. The people say to Jesus (Jno. xii. 34): "We have heard out of the law that the Christ abideth forever, and how sayest thou the Son of Man must be lifted up?" "The Christ" and "being lifted up" are inconsistent predicates to them. The faith of the disciples that Jesus is the Christ was completely discomfited by his death. Till Jesus opens their hearts to understand the things prophesied concerning him, it apparently never occurs to them that his suffering and death are only another evidence of his Messiahship. Paul's speech at Antioch in Pisidia (Acts xiii. 27) seems to be almost a direct assertion that the Jews of Jesus' day did not look for a suffering Messiah; in his speech at Thessalonica (Acts xvii. 3) he sets forth the doctrine of a Messiah suffering and raised from the dead not as a familiar but an unfamiliar doctrine; and to the Corinthians (1 Cor. i. 23) he speaks of Christ crucified as to the Jews a stumblingblock. These passages seem deci-

sive as to the general state of opinion; and this in turn makes it evident that the very fact of the death of Jesus (especially his death at the hands of the Jewish leaders, who thus emphatically rejected him) would be to Saul, the Pharisee, a great obstacle to the acceptance of him as the Messiah. Moreover, this obstacle was in his case unrelieved by any personal acquaintance with Jesus, such as in the case of Nicodemus or Joseph of Arimathea, acted to overcome their dogmatic objections to him. From the point of view of the Pharisaic dogmatics it was impossible to accept Jesus as the Messiah. The argument against him was short and easy. The Messiah does not die, still less does he die rejected by his own nation; Jesus did die thus rejected; therefore Jesus is not the Messiah.

With this was necessarily connected the denial of the resurrection of Jesus. Such denial was based not on any hostility to the doctrine of the resurrection in itself considered, nor on any unwillingness to admit the resurrection of the Messiah, except as this would have involved the admission of his death; but on the unwillingness to admit that the impostor Jesus could have received such divine attestation of his pretended Messiahship. It was a postulate alike of Jewish and of Christian thinking that the resurrection of Jesus was evidence of the validity of his claims, divine attestation that he was what he claimed to be. This appears on the Jewish side in the endeavor of the Jews to suppress the evidence of his resurrection by bribing the guards to say that his disciples stole him away; it appears in the fact that those who were convinced that Jesus was raised from the dead accepted him as Messiah and Savior, and in the opposition which the unbelieving Jews constantly manifested to the proclamation of the resurrection. It appears on the Christian side in the constant urging of the resurrection of Jesus as a reason for accepting Jesus (Acts ii. 24 ff.; iv. 33). This is, indeed, usually accompanied by the insistence that the Old Testament had predicted the resurrection of the Messiah, because the argument thus became doubly forcible; but it is also employed without such reference to the Old Testament Scriptures (Acts iii. 15). Paul especially lays constant emphasis on the resurrection,

using it with Jews in connection with prophecy (Acts xiii. 33 ff), and with Gentiles without such connection (Acts xviii. 31), and in his letter to the Romàn Christians referring to the divine sonship of Jesus as established by the fact of the resurrection (Rom. i. 4). The matter then stood thus: Denying the doctrine of a suffering Messiah led, since Jesus had died, to the denial of his Messiahship. Denial of his Messiahship necessarily involved the denial of his resurrection, since his resurrection would have been a divine attestation of this Messianic claim.

8. There is no direct evidence that Paul felt any hostility to the personal character of Jesus. His profound moral earnestness, his eager quest after righteousness, and the readiness with which he accepted Christ when once the dogmatic obstacles to faith were broken down, lead us to believe that he would have been strongly attracted by the character of Jesus. He had not burned out his soul with sensualism, nor had he frozen it it up with formalism. Righteousness, in the sense of character acceptable to God, was still for him the great thought of life. He had, indeed, sought it in a wrong way; his zeal had not been according to knowledge; but his very consciousness of failure despite the degree of success which he had attained is evidence that righteousness had not become a mere empty form, had not been degraded into a mean and unworthy travesty of the real thing. That there was an antagonism between the character of Jesus and the ideals of Saul created by the lowliness of Jesus and the spirit of self-sufficiency which had doubtless been cultivated in Saul by the Pharisaic dogmas, has already been suggested and must not be overlooked. But even in this respect the consciousness of failure already referred to is evidence that this antagonism was not in his case at its highest. It is just here that we are led to believe there existed the greatest difference between Saul and his fellow Pharisees. Many of these seem to have been repelled—at least not to have been at all attracted—by the character of Jesus. There is much reason to think that if Saul had known Jesus he would have become a follower of him while he was still among men.

We may see, then, that there were four obstacles to Paul's

acceptance of Jesus, not simply as the Messiah, but as his Lord and Savior; two dogmatic or intellectual, two moral.

(a) He did not believe in a rejected and suffering Messiah, and Jesus had unquestionably been rejected and had suffered.

(b) He believed in righteousness by law, and Jesus had continually taught that the only way of approach to God and acceptance with God was through faith in himself, Jesus.

(c) In accordance with this last named belief, he was seeking for righteousness in his own strength, was depending on himself rather than on God, was destitute of that poverty of spirit which is the first and indispensable qualification for Christian discipleship.

(d) He was resisting the evidence and the influences tending to show that his present course was wrong.

On the other hand, it must be said that he had certain moral advantages which were calculated to prepare him to accept Jesus.

(a) His moral earnestness.

(b) His eager desire to be righteous before God, and his freedom from vice and empty formalism.

(c) His dissatisfaction with his old life; the fact that, despite his blamelessness before the law he was yet not at peace with himself.

Now to such a man what would be the effect of such an experience as that which he had on the way to Damascus? His references to the matter afterward make it evident that he believed that he then saw Jesus Christ, that it was in his own view of it no mere subjective experience but an actual epiphany of the Lord Jesus himself.

First of all, it at once and instantly overthrew his first intellectual obstacle to the acceptance of Jesus. It has been pointed out above that his denial of the doctrine of a suffering Messiah led through the step of the rejection of the Messiahship of Jesus to the denial of the resurrection of Jesus. So, in reverse order, to see the risen and glorified Jesus is to be compelled to accept the fact of his resurrection. To accept the fact of his resurrection is to acknowledge his Messiahship. No dogmatic objection to the Messiahship of Jesus on the ground that he, contrary to the true idea of the Messiah, had died, could stand before the

convincing evidence flashed into his soul, that the Jesus who claimed to be the Messiah, who had unquestionably died, whom he had rejected as an imposter, was now occupying the place of divine power. It does not, indeed, at once interpret to him the Old Testament prophecies, does not enable him to see how the doctrine of a suffering Messiah is to be got from those Scriptures in which he had hitherto been unable to find it, but it does at once compel recognition of Jesus' claim to Messiahship. Interpretation of Scripture can come later. Now his objections are simply battered down *vi et armis*, by the superior might of the argument of the visible appearance of Jesus of Nazareth.

Secondly, and not less important, it at once demolished his confidence in the righteousness that is attainable in law. We have seen that there is reason to believe that he was already ill at ease in this matter. But now in one blow the whole structure of self-acquired righteousness is overthrown. He is, himself, the consummate flower of Pharisaism, the highest product of righteousness attainable under the system of law, and yet it is revealed in this revelation of Jesus Christ that he has been fighting against God himself. In the very moment when he was most zealously seeking after righteousness, in the very moment of this highest success along the line of legalism he is nevertheless in rebellion against God,—a rebellion which, though in a sense unconscious, is not merely formal, but open and actual.

It should not be overlooked that the very perfection of Saul's obedience to the law before his conversion was an important element in this new conviction. If his life had been gross and coarse, or empty and hollow, the demonstration of the futility of righteousness under the law would have been far less complete, or might have even failed altogether.

That Paul at once perceived how much was involved in this overthrow of his former view is by no means probable. In intellectual matters we may perceive that the foundation of our thinking has been shattered without at once perceiving how much of the superstructure must go down with the ruin of the foundation. Still less is the rearing of a new superstructure involved in the overthrow of the foundations of an old one. But the real

significance of the changé which was involved in this fatal blow at the very foundations of all legalistic schemes for attaining righteousness, the importance of the far-reaching consequences which were to issue from it and which only needed a suitable occasion to develop them, it is scarcely possible to overestimate. In fact, almost all Paul's subsequent theology is but the unfolding of the logical consequences of the discovery which, as in a flash of lightning, he made when he was smitten down as he approached Damascus. The prominence of the doctrine of the resurrection in his teachings is of course at once explained by reference to this experience. It would also of course soon drive him to inquire afresh whether the Old Testament did indeed teach a suffering and rising Messiah, and the results of this study appear in his arguments both in his speeches in Acts and in his letters. But it is especially in his doctrine of justification by faith, and of the inability of the law even to sanctify him who is already justified, that we see the clearest results of this experience. The stages by which he reached his full doctrine, his firm conviction that the law cannot justify, his determined opposition to the circumcision of the Gentiles, his rejection of law even as agency in the building of character,—when and how each of these became clear to him, it is impossible for us certainly to determine. But they were all really implied in this Damascus experience. This particular phase of the subject deserves possibly a fuller treatment than it has ever received, certainly a larger exposition than the present brief reference to it.

It remains to ask what effect the epiphany of Jesus had upon the moral obstacles which stood in the way of Saul's acceptance of him as the Messiah and his Savior.

It is evident that the first of these, the seeking of righteousness by his own strength, dependence on law as against faith, could remain after the demonstration of the futility of the method only by obstinate resistance to evident duty. The same is true of the second obstacle, viz.: resistance to the influences tending to show that his present course was wrong. He had been resisting evidence; here is overwhelming evidence. He had been deceived by the darkness of his own soul, but here is light.

His words "What shall I do, Lord?" seem to show that in fact both obstacles were swept away at once and instantly. "The heavenly vision" is immediately effective and a marvellous change is wrought in the soul of Saul. This change is manifestly one of profound moral significance. The spirit of self-dependence bars God out of the soul, and throws the soul back upon its own inadequate resources. Self-dependence means disappointment, failure, despair to every earnest soul, and no one has more vividly and faithfully portrayed to us the pain and anguish of an earnest soul depending on itself than the apostle Paul himself. Faith opens the door to God and brings light and hope where before were failure and anguish, and the apostle more than any other New Testament writer has set forth the victory of faith. These two pictures could only have been drawn by one who had himself passed from the one experience to the other.

But was the change which took place in Saul at this time such a change as we now call conversion? Is it correct in modern terminology to designate the Damascus event as Saul's conversion? This of course depends upon one's definition of conversion. Probably, however, we may assume that the term signifies that profound moral change by which a soul holding an essentially wrong attitude toward God and righteousness comes to take an attitude which is, fundamentally at least, right. Coming to a closer definition, probably most persons who use the term conversion at all would maintain that he should be said to be converted who takes righteousness, (employing this term in a broad and inclusive sense,) as his supreme aim, and faith in Christ as the means of attaining such righteousness. Doubtless there might be much difference of opinion if we should still further define the terms righteousness and faith in Christ. We may rest however, for our present purpose in the definition as now given, and inquire whether Saul's "conversion" included these two elements. That it involved the second there can be no doubt. His own description of his conversion given in Phil. iii. 4-9 clearly describes it as an abandonment of the principle of righteousness and the acceptance of faith instead thereof; and

with this accords all that he has written in his various letters both concerning the nature of the change through which he himself passed, and concerning the nature of the gospel way of salvation in general.

But was not the first element,—the choice of righteousness as his supreme object of endeavor already present; and if so is the absence of the second a fatal defect? Can one of them exist without the other, and if so which is really essential to a fundamentally right attitude of soul? Does the coupling of the spirit of self-dependence, the endeavor to attain righteousness through the law, to the eager desire to be righteous, merely hinder the realization of that desire, or does it fatally vitiate it, or even demonstrate that it is already false and merely specious? Or on the other hand does the existence of the sincere desire to be righteous show that faith is already germinally present, latent in the desire to be righteous, and waiting only further enlightenment to bring it forth into full exercise?

Let it be granted at the outset that, as the New Testament teaches, faith is the only right, in the end the only successful, method of attaining righteousness. Granting this, it seems necessary to make double answer to our questions. On the one hand if righteousness is really the supreme desire of the soul, in this desire there is latent the true method of attaining it, viz., faith. In this desire, if only it be the supreme choice of the soul, there is contained the promise and potency of faith, since in this supreme devotion to righteousness is involved the willingness, even the desire, to adopt that means which will lead to its attainment. But on the other hand the absence of faith, certainly the repudiation of faith, may be,—must we not say usually is?—the index of the fact that the desire for righteousness is not supreme, that the soul desires righteousness indeed, but desires it subject to the condition that it shall be wrought out in self-dependence. This is to make not righteousness, but self, supreme. Which of these supposed cases correctly represents the attitude of Saul in the days of his Pharisaism? If the former, if before this time righteousness had become in very truth the supreme object of his choice, if he had striven for

righteousness in law only because under the stress of a false and misleading education he believed that this was the divinely appointed way, then his was at bottom only an intellectual error, and that which wrought the change in him, important for himself and the world as it was, was only an access of light, not a moral transformation of soul. If on the other hand the experience of Saul corresponded to the second supposed case, if eager as was his desire to be righteous, he had nevertheless up to this time desired it subject to the condition that it be attained in dependence on himself, then his rejection of faith had been also a rejection of righteousness and a choice of self. In that case also his acceptance of Jesus by faith was at the same time the supreme choice of righteousness. In the one act he elected the only right object of endeavor and the only successful way of its attainment. Perhaps it is impossible to decide positively in which of these two ways we rightly conceive of Saul's experience. Yet the balance of evidence seems to be in favor of the second view. All that the apostle says about the sinfulness of his Pharisaic life, describing himself as a blasphemer, and a persecutor, insolently proud, chief of sinners, implies that he did not look upon that period of his life as one of innocent ignorance and latent faith. The very expression which most mitigates the severity of his self-condemnation—I did it ignorantly in unbelief—seems introduced only to explain how one so hostile to God could at all have been rescued (1 Tim. i 13-16), and merely shows that he was not one who with full perception of the nature of his acts resisted God. No reference which the apostle makes to the change itself seems appropriately to apply to a transformation which, however important, was at bottom only intellectual. The evidence from his general conception of the fundamental importance of faith is indirect but very important. Certainly he always speaks as if the difference between righteousness by law and righteousness by faith was for those to whom he wrote absolutely fundamental. There are not lacking passages in which he recognizes that on the broad plane of a universal divine government, taking in heathen as well as those to whom God's special revelation had come, the great crucial

question could not be expressed in terms of faith, i. e., as the word would necessarily be understood, conscious and explicit faith. Yet with respect to those to whom he writes, those to whom God has been revealed in the law and in the Gospel, the possibility of righteousness or of right attitude to God without faith in Christ is never so much as thought of. This could scarcely have been if he had looked back to a time in his own life, when though in essentially right attitude toward God and righteousness he had been openly rejecting and opposing Christ. We are almost driven to say that if Saul had before his Damascus experience made such choice of righteousness as that his attitude toward God was already fundamentally right, and his conversion a change of opinion rather than of heart, he himself never discovered that fact. While therefore the evidence falls short of entire decisiveness, it seems to tend strongly to the conclusion that Saul's conversion was such in the deepest sense of that term—a choice of righteousness and a surrender to God through faith in Christ; an act fundamentally changing his attitude toward God and fundamentally affecting his character.

RECENT MOVEMENTS IN THE HISTORICAL STUDY OF RELIGIONS IN AMERICA.

By Professor MORRIS JASTROW, Jr., PH. D.
The University of Pennsylvania.

Religion as a subject for speculation is as old as human thought. Religion as an object of investigation is one of the most recent of sciences. In an interesting article on "The Rôle of the History of Religions in Modern Religious Education,"¹ Jean Reville declares that "the history of religions was born with this century." Certainly we may not step beyond this limit. Apart from other considerations, the unfavorable attitude of people previous to this century toward other religions than the one in which they happened to be born, or their hostile attitude toward religion in general, precluded that impartial and broad investigation of facts which alone makes a study historical. People seem to have had either too much or too little of religion to be able to comprehend its varied manifestations. But even after the historical frame of mind had been acquired, the study of religions continued for a time to be so closely bound up with philosophical systems—as exemplified in Hegel—that its purely historical aspects were kept in the background; and it is questionable, therefore, whether we may pass much beyond the middle of this century for the beginnings of what may properly be called the historical study of religions. Since then, however, the study has been pursued with considerable activity, thanks chiefly to the impulse received from two quarters, from the researches into the history and literatures of the ancient Orient that have so profoundly affected our view of ancient thought and from the investigation of widely distributed institutions and customs that stand in close connection with the phenomena of religion.

The advance in the historical study of religions appears not alone in the actual contributions to the subject that have been

¹ See *The New World*, Vol. I, pp. 503-519.

made, of which the remarkable series, *The Sacred Books of the East*, may be taken as an index, but also in the provisions that have been and are continuing to be made for the subject itself. Holland took the lead in 1876 when, upon the introduction of a new educational law, a chair for the Comparative History of Religion was established in each of the four Dutch universities. France followed in 1880 with the creation of a chair for the History of Religions at the Collège de France, and in 1886 the government accorded the study a more adequate recognition by the formation of a "Section des Sciences Religieuses" at the École des Hautes Études, equipped with a faculty of no less than twelve members. Besides this, Paris has its special journal for the History of Religions and its museum of religious history—the famous Musée Guimet. In England such lecture foundations as the Hibbert, the Gifford and the Burnett testify to the growing interest in the subject. At the University of Brussels the subject likewise is represented by a special chair, and in some form the discipline has been introduced at the University of Rome, of Zürich, of Louvain, Copenhagen, and in some of the German universities.² Dependent as we in a measure still are for our intellectual impulses upon the example of Europe, it is due to the displayed activity on the other side of the ocean, that the historical study of religions is beginning to receive more serious attention in this country. Of our learned institutions, Harvard University was the first, so far as the writer is aware, to introduce the subject as part of its curriculum. For quite a number of years lectures on the Comparative History of Religions have been regularly delivered by Prof. Charles Everett, and more recently the general aspects of the subject have been supplemented by courses of a special character dealing with a single religion or a subdivision of it. For the present year, six such courses are announced, as follows: Prof. C. H. Toy, who lectures on the Hebrew religion with comparison of other Semitic religions;

² For a full account of recent movements in the historical study of Religions in Europe, see Maurice Vernes' *L'Histoire des Religions*, (Paris, 1887,) pp. 161-277. M. Vernes' book also contains some excellent chapters on the method of the study and the spirit in which it should be conducted.

also on Islam and the Koran; Prof. C. R. Lanman, on the Sacred Books of Buddhism; Prof. F. D. Allen, on Greek Religion and Worship; Prof. Kittredge, on Icelandic Sagas and the Edda and on Germanic Mythology; and to these we may add as a seventh, Prof. Emerton's course on the first eight Christian centuries, being an exposition of the conflict of Christianity with Paganism. Prof. Lyon, too, deals largely with the Babylonian and Assyrian religions in some of his courses.

At the University of Pennsylvania considerable activity has been displayed during the past few years in the same field, though up to the current year this activity was confined to the University Lecture Association. Since 1888, when a course of six lectures on Mohammedanism was given by the writer, the subject has been regularly included in the range covered by this association. In 1890 a very successful course of eleven lectures on "Ancient Religions" was arranged, the subjects being apportioned to competent specialists from various institutions. The course comprised expositions of the Religion of the Greeks, Romans, Babylonians, of Mexico, Persia, India, the Semites and Islam; and those participating were Prof. Shorey, of Bryn Mawr, Prof. Hyvernat of the Catholic University, D. C., Dr. D. G. Brinton, Prof. Jackson of Columbia College, Prof. Lanman, Prof. Jastrow and Mr. Talcott Williams, of Philadelphia. In 1891 three separate courses of lectures bearing on the study of religions were given, one on the Religion of Israel, by Rev. Prof. John P. Peters, another by Mrs. Cornelius Stevenson, on the Religion of Egypt, and a third by Prof. Jastrow, on Aspects of Ancient Worship, (*a*) sacrifice, (*b*) fire, (*c*) dances and processions.

In the present year the subject has been introduced into the university proper, five courses being announced in connection with the courses in Philosophy, Psychology and Ethics, as follows: The History of the Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, by Prof. Hilprecht; the Religion of Israel and the Religion of Islam, by Prof. Jastrow; the Religions of India and Persia, by Prof. Easton; and the Elements and Evolution of Primitive Religions, by Prof. D. G. Brinton.

In 1890, an important step was taken by another of our leading universities. As cognate to a training in Philosophy and Psychology, the study of religions was included in the Susan Linn Sage School of Philosophy, established in that year. The Rev. Charles Melen Tyler was called to the chair, which was made to cover Christian Ethics in addition to the History and Philosophy of Religion. This action of Cornell in thus according to the subject a full recognition in the curriculum is to be taken as an indication that what prejudices may once have existed against the historical study of religions are fast disappearing; and it is gratifying to note that the new University of Chicago, in whose success all friends of higher education are so deeply interested, has followed the example of Cornell and given the historical study of religions its due place among university studies.

A strong impulse to the study was furnished by the School of Applied Ethics, organized in 1891, with the specific object of "promoting the historical and scientific study of those branches of knowledge which relate to human conduct, such as Economics, Jurisprudence, Politics, Pedagogics, Religion, Social Science and Ethics proper." In accordance with this broad scope, the school was divided into three departments, Economics, History of Religion, and Ethics. While at Cornell University it was the recognition of the close bearings upon human thought that led to the creation of a special chair for the history of religions, in the case of the School for Applied Ethics it was the relation of religion to human life that formed the ground for the introduction of the subject. But whatever the underlying idea prompting the study may be—and in addition to these two, there are others equally potent—the method to be pursued remains the same. During the two summer sessions of the school in question held at Plymouth, Mass., in July 1891 and 1892, the historical point of view has been the guiding one, both in the selection of the subjects for the lectures and in the treatment of the subjects chosen. The school which owes its inception to Prof. Felix Adler, and,—it may be noted in passing—is entirely independent of any other organization, was fortunate

enough to secure as the head of the Department of Religions Prof. C. H. Toy. During the first year the chief course was given by him, the history, aims and method of the science of History of Religions being the subject appropriately chosen as an introduction to the study. This general course of eighteen lectures was supplemented by a number of shorter ones, dealing with specific religions, such as Buddhism, which was assigned to Prof. Maurice Bloomfield, of the Johns Hopkins University; the Babylonian-Assyrian religion, which was discussed by Prof. Jastrow; the old Norse religion, by Prof. G. L. Kittredge, of Harvard University; Islam, by Prof. G. F. Moore, of Andover Theological Seminary; and the Religion of the Laity in the Middle Ages, by W. W. Newell. In the second year, the entire time was devoted to the Hebrew religion, the subject being divided into six courses of five lectures each, as follows: The Prophets, by Prof. Moore; the Religion of Ancient Persia and its relation to Judaism, by Prof. Jackson, of Columbia College; the Ritual Law, by Prof. Jastrow; the Psalter, by Prof. Peters; the Wisdom Books, by Prof. Toy; and the Talmud, by Rev. Prof. E. G. Hirsch, of the University of Chicago. It is both pleasant and encouraging to record the perfect success of this Department for the History of Religions, and also of the school as a whole. As a unique experiment in education, this success may fairly be expected to be far-reaching in its consequences, and, indeed, the school has already, thanks to its own merits and the excellent policy pursued by its management, secured a firm hold on the class of students to which it more particularly appeals—teachers, clergymen, economists and public workers.

An important and indeed indispensable adjunct to the study of religions is the museum, which in its ideal form should present a tableau of the course taken by religious rites in their development. Credit is due to the U. S. National Museum for having taken the initiatory steps in this direction. In his report for 1889, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution called attention to the importance of collections of objects of worship and since that time, an excellent beginning has been made

within the departments of American and Oriental antiquities. Messrs. Tewkes, Adler and Rockhill have been instrumental in advancing the section of comparative religion in the National Museum, and with the admirable facilities possessed by a government institution for obtaining objects from all parts of the world, the scope of this section ought at an early day to be made coequal with the universe. At the University of Pennsylvania also, the place of the museum as the laboratory for the study of religions, was emphasized by a special loan exhibition of objects used in religious worship, which was opened last spring. The catalogue, which is of the entire exhibition, is due to the energetic and well directed efforts of Mr. Stewart Culin, the director of the University Museums, is an admirable piece of work, distinguished for its method, clearness, and accuracy. The exhibition embracing Egypt, India, China, Japan, America, and Mohammedanism is noteworthy as the first of the kind in this country.

As a further indication of the growing prominence which is being accorded to the study of religions in this country, two other movements, both inaugurated last year, remain to be mentioned. During the winter of 1891-2, a History of Religions Club was formed at Cambridge, the members consisting largely of Harvard professors and members of learned institutions in Boston. Meetings are held monthly at which papers are read, followed by a general discussion. It is perhaps too early in the day to do more than refer to the existence of this club, but its success so far warrants the hope that it will form the nucleus for larger organization devoted to the promotion of the important science, the interest in which has been strong enough to band together a notable company of scholars.

With a view of bringing the results of investigations in the various branches of the History of Religions to the notice of the general public, a plan was perfected last winter by a number of persons interested in the subject, looking to the establishment of an annual lectureship in the History of Religions, somewhat on the model of the Hibbert lectures of England. A meeting

called in Philadelphia for December 30th, was attended by representatives of various cities and institutions, and, after a full discussion of the subject, a committee was appointed to arrange for the permanent organization of a committee charged with procuring a competent lecturer annually to deliver a course of lectures on some subject germane to the History of Religions, the course to be given in at least six cities. The committee consisted of Dr. E. T. Bartlett of the Divinity School, Philadelphia, President W. R. Harper, Prof. J. G. Schurman of Cornell University, Prof. Toy, Profs. Gottheil and Hooper, representing the Brooklyn Institute, Prof. Paul Haupt of the Johns Hopkins University, Profs. Peters and Jastrow of the University of Pennsylvania. Besides these, there may be mentioned among those who gave their adherence to the project: Rev. Dr. G. D. Boardman, Provost William Pepper, Dr. D. G. Brinton, Rev. Dr. E. G. Hirsch, Prof. C. A. Briggs, Dr. W. Hayes Ward, Prof. Lanman, Prof. Francis Brown, Prof. D. G. Lyon, Rev. Dr. Gustav Gottheil of New York, etc. At a second meeting held in New York early in February, the permanent committee was formed under the title of "The American Committee for Lectures in the History and the Comparative Study of Religions." Prof. Toy was elected chairman of the committee and Prof. Jastrow, secretary. The plan adopted looks to the coöperation of existing institutions in various cities, under whose auspices the lectures may be delivered. Among such institutions which have indicated a willingness thus to coöperate are, the University of Pennsylvania Lecture Association, the Brooklyn Institute, Cornell University, the Peabody Institute of Baltimore and the Lowell Institute of Boston. The committee hopes to arrange for the opening course in the fall and winter of 1893-4. The project, it may be added, includes also the publication of the lectures delivered. The hearty reception which the movement received from all sides is an indication of its timely character and if the committee succeed in securing the eminent authorities with whom they are now negotiating, there is every reason to look forward to the successful carrying out of this important project.

Such is in brief an account of what has been done for promoting the historical study of religions in our country during the past few years.² Taking the past as an augur of the future, we may confidently look forward to seeing at an early day fully equipped departments for the historical study of religions established at our leading universities; for it is after all only in a department formed as in the case of the French school, through the coöperation of as large a number of specialists as possible, that the subject can be adequately taught. The general and comparative aspects must of course not be neglected, but it is only in connection with the careful and prolonged study of some particular religion that the general aspects acquire their value for the student, and the guidance through this special study, implying as it does a knowledge of the sources, can only be expected to be within the province of the specialist. Harvard and the University of Pennsylvania seem to be moving in this direction, and there is certainly no reason why at those institutions which have already established chairs for the general History of Religions, such a full department as is here indicated should not exist. Of the importance which a department of this kind would have for the historical and theological student in particular, apart from the position of the study as a cognate to Philosophy and Ethics, it is surely unnecessary to speak, and if the progress that the science of Religion has made during the past two or three decades brings out one fact clearer than any other, it is that any fears as to the possible detrimental influences of the study of religions upon religion as it exists to-day, are idle and without any reasonable foundation. The cause of religion has nothing to fear from any investigations when carried on in an earnest and sincere spirit, and least of all from investigations which reveal the steadily upward tendency of religious thought, com-

² It may perhaps not be out of place to add as another sign of the growing interest in the subject that Messrs. Ginn & Co. of Boston, are now making arrangements for the publication of a series of Handbooks on the History of Religions, which are intended to serve as text-books in the study. The series will be edited by Prof. Jastrow, with the coöperation of scholars in this country and Europe.

mensurate always with the general advance of mankind. The historical study of religions serves as a powerful illustration, nay, may truly be said to furnish *the* most powerful illustration for the permanency of religion as a factor in human life, both of the individual and of the species.

AN IMPORTANT DISCOVERY OF MSS.

By LESTER BRADNER, JR., PH. D.
University of Berlin.

So long as Archæology keeps digging at the heaps of ancient ruins in Palestine or Assyria, or searching the tombs of Egypt, and so long as there are libraries of musty manuscripts yet unexplored and uncatalogued, the students of Biblical history and criticism may yet hope for new light from the past itself upon many perplexing problems. Was not Tischendorf rewarded in his search at Mt. Sinai by the valuable discovery of a new text of the New Testament? And in 1873 the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" with its important testimony to the constitution and teachings of the early church, was brought to light. And now another rich find is to give its witness in aid of historical and critical study.

The known extent of the early Christian writings has always far exceeded the amount that has been actually transmitted to us. What we know of them must be gathered chiefly from the few fragments quoted in patristic works, and by careful inferences from their contents and settings. With such scant sources at hand, all investigators of New Testament books and of the development of Christianity in the first centuries greet with eager interest the addition which has just been made to our early Christian literature. This is, in fact, none other than the discovery of extensive portions of the so-called 'Revelation of Peter,' and the 'Gospel of Peter.' These writings, together with large fragments of the apocalyptic book of Enoch, are contained in a Greek manuscript, belonging probably to the twelfth century, recently found by French scholars in a tomb in Upper Egypt. They have just been published by the French Archæological Commission in Egypt, and will also shortly appear,

with comments by Prof. Harnack, of the University of Berlin, in the records of the Berlin Academy of Sciences.

The two works ascribed to Peter belong to a class of apocryphal literature which gained extensive dimensions during the second century. Acts of Peter and Paul and other apostles, their preaching, their revelations, and, above all, a mass of gospels were written, partly to satisfy the eager and legend-loving curiosity of the expanding church, partly to embody some particular shade of dogmatic teaching. The latter was especially the case among the Gnostics. Of these Apocryphal gospels, bearing often apostolic names, such as James, Matthew, Thomas, etc., more or less considerable portions of seven have been handed down to us, (*cf.* Tischendorf's edition), and beyond this some thirty or more are known by quoted fragments or by name alone. Of real Christian apocalyptic literature on the other hand, we have comparatively little, notwithstanding its fruitfulness on Jewish soil. Eusebius in his Church History mentions four works ascribed to Peter: his Acts, Gospel, Preaching and Revelation, while Jerome adds still another: the Judgment of Peter. And considering the apostle's importance in the early church, it is not surprising that the tendency to attribute apostolic authorship to later writings should have brought so many under his name.

Our first knowledge of the Gospel according to Peter, comes from Serapion, who was Bishop of Antioch, about the close of the second century. He found it in use, as Eusebius tells us, by the church in Cilicia, and at first, not having examined it closely, he made no objection against it, but later, discovering that it contained traces of the Docetic heresy, he wrote a refutation of it and probably forbade its use. Origen also mentions it. Both Eusebius and Jerome speak of it as a heretical work. In fact, the discovered gospel, the greater part of which is the description of Our Lord's Passion (as is the case in many Gnostic gospels) justifies these accusations by its traces of Docetism. The interesting feature of the Revelation of Peter is its close race with the Revelation of John for a place in the Canon of the New Testament. The Canon of the Muratorian Fragment (200

A. D.) accepts it along with John, noting, however, some dissenting opinions (*"Apocalypses etiam Johannis et Petri tantum recipimus, quam quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt"*). Clement of Alexandria reckons it among the so-called Antilegomena, or disputed Scriptures, whereas other catalogues consider it genuine, inspired, and canonical. Eusebius recognizes that its use was not universal, and hence throws it into a subordinate class, while Sozomen calls it spurious, but says it was publicly read once a year in the Palestinian churches. From this doubtful position it was finally excluded by the admission of John alone to the universal canon. Its length is said to have been 270 *stichoi*, or lines, but its contents up to the present time have scarcely been known. Its investigation may now help to decide the question how far the apocalypse, as a literary product, belongs to the Christian Church. Undoubtedly the apocalyptic spirit ruled completely the life of the early Christian communities, but whether the apocalypse itself was ever an independent product of Christianity is still a question of criticism.

Both the Gospel and the Revelation of Peter are, therefore, most probably the work of the second century, and it seems likely that their close examination will bring to light many interesting points for the history both of the Canon and the Church. Even the name given them is a striking illustration of the characteristic inclination of that age toward the emphasis on apostolicity. For the third part of the manuscript, the Book of Enoch, the interest lies chiefly on the textual side, as the contents of the book are already known through an Ethiopic version.

BERLIN, November, 1892.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE.

The Work of the Past Year. Although the present organization dates from October, 1889, the work of the Institute has been carried on under different forms of organization, but with the same Principal, and with the same, though ever broadening, purposes and field of work, since December, 1880, when the first course of study in Hebrew by correspondence was announced. The last Institute year closed September 30, and from the Principal's Annual Report the most of the following facts are gleaned.

The Correspondence Department. While the Institute has enlarged its sphere of usefulness in several directions, individual correspondence instruction still remains one of the leading features of its work. The single course in Hebrew, however, has grown until, for the past year, *twelve courses* have been in actual operation, four being in Hebrew with a membership, at the end of the year, of 448, one in Arabic with three students, two in New Testament Greek with 158 members, and five in the English Bible with a membership of 450. Total number of individual correspondence students, 1,059. In addition to these there have been 92 Correspondence Clubs in the English Bible, with a membership of 1,167, and 57 Non-Correspondence Clubs with 665 members, making the whole number of students connected with the Institute in this department, 2,891. The number of new students enrolled during the year is 375 for individual instruction and 557 in clubs. Courses have been completed and certificates awarded to 42 students in Hebrew, 13 in New Testament Greek, and 19 in English Bible. Nearly 5,000 examination-papers have been corrected and returned, and about 3,000 letters have been written or dictated by instructors to the members of the School. These, together with the 8,000 or more

letters written by the Secretary and others in the general work of the Institute, give some idea of the large amount of details involved in a work of such proportions. A feature of special interest this year has been the effort made to extend the knowledge of the advantages offered by the Institute in the way of correspondence study among missionaries in foreign countries. From the secretaries of nearly all the foreign missionary societies of the United States, Canada, and Great Britain, the names and addresses of the missionaries laboring under their auspices were obtained, and circulars of information were sent out to about 2,400 in all parts of the world. Although much of this work was done too late in the year for the results to appear in this report, yet many inquiries for further information were received and twenty new members were enrolled from foreign countries in the last two or three months of the year. As more than fifty students outside of the United States and Canada were already on the roll before these additions were made, the representation in foreign lands is becoming quite large. The following countries are now represented in the membership: England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, Norway, Italy, Turkey, Syria, India, Assam, Burma, China, Corea, Japan, Australia, West and South Africa, Brazil, Bermuda, West Indies, Mexico, and Newfoundland. It may be added that missionary students, notwithstanding the disadvantages resulting from their great distance from the headquarters of the School, are, as a rule, very successful, their general average, both in the amount and quality of the work done by them, being considerably above that of students in the home land.

The Examination Department. January 10, 1892, as in the previous year, an examination was held in many different places in the United States and Canada, and in China and Japan, to test the biblical knowledge of those who entered for the examination. The subjects this year were the Life of Christ, based on the four gospels, and the Gospel of John. In the majority of cases, the examination papers were forwarded to the headquarters of the Institute, where they were read and approved or rejected. Certificates were awarded to between four and five hundred persons

whose work was approved. The applications already received for the examination to be held next January, on the Founding of the Christian Church, show that the record of last year will be largely exceeded. Fifty thousand circulars of this branch of the Institute's work have been distributed through individual correspondence and at denominational gatherings, at various conventions and summer schools, and through the officers of the Christian Endeavor Society and the King's Daughters. The examination plan of work is specially adapted to popular use, and has been not only cordially approved by the officers of the two organizations just named, but their constituency have been repeatedly recommended, through their official organs, *The Golden Rule* and *The Silver Cross*, to avail themselves of the help of the Institute in their Bible study. Steps have been taken toward active affiliation with other organizations which include the study of the Scriptures among their objects.

Other Lines of Work. Schools for the study of the Bible and the Biblical languages were held in connection with the summer schools at Chautauqua, N. Y., and Bay View, Mich. Circulars on Bible study were distributed at fifty Chautauqua assemblies throughout the country, and at many of them special conferences upon the work of the Institute were held. New Local Boards were organized in Washington, Baltimore, and Springfield, and the preliminary work has been done towards organization in other cities. Addresses on Biblical subjects were delivered by the Principal and Vice-Principal before Sunday-school associations, Christian Endeavor and Young Men's Christian Association conventions and at several universities. Very successful Bible Institutes were held in Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Chicago.

Work for the Coming Year. The various lines of effort in which the Institute has proved itself useful in the past will, of course, be continued. In the Correspondence Department at least two additional courses will be offered: one in New Testament Greek, and a second English Bible course on "The Founding of the Christian Church," based on the Acts, Epistles, and the Revelation. Proposed advances in the Examination Department have already

been mentioned. More and better work in the way of Bible Institutes and of Biblical lectures on the University Extension plan has been arranged for. A special circular on this subject announces thirteen lecturers and thirty-four courses of six lectures each. While the themes discussed are all in Biblical lines, a great variety of topics is offered from which to choose. Nearly all the lecturers have been connected with the work of the Institute in some way in the past, or have had experience in similar work through other organizations, so that this advance step is taken with much confidence in its success. C. E. C.

HISTORICAL STUDIES IN THE SCRIPTURE MATERIAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL LESSONS.

By ASSOCIATE PROF. GEORGE S. GOODSPEED, PH.D.
The University of Chicago.

I. THE RETURN OF THE EXILES. EZRA i, 1-iv, 24.

The fifty years and more of Babylonian exile had wrought many changes in the thought and feeling of the people of Israel. They were years of subjugation under heathen conquerors, who, while belonging to the old Semitic stock, were yet of the warlike line of the Kaldi rather than the more peaceful and older Babylonian race, among whom Abraham had dwelt. A new generation had sprung up, born in captivity, trained in the traditions of the fathers, yet never having known by personal experience the glories of the native home. The ancestral worship of Jehovah could no longer be carried on under the old forms, for there was no temple on Mount Zion, to which the pious might resort, and whither, at all times, he might lift his eyes. It would not have been strange if they had lost much of their national and religious spirit. The process of "deportation" was designed to accomplish this very thing. It affected Israel, doubtless, quite in the way that it affected other nationalities, only not in the same degree. While other peoples gradually became merged into the complex of civilizations and lost their individuality, Israel was enabled, through the vitality of her religious life, to hold together and maintain with substantial integrity, though with important modifications, the essence of her national character. She went out into the darkness of captivity, holding to the thread of divine promise, and, trusting herself to it, came forth at last into the light of realization, weakened, worn, transformed, but with the germ of the old faith and the old ideals living and powerful.

In the preservation of the religious and national life through this threatening period, prophets had a large share. Beside them were the priests and the "sages." Each of these had a special work to do. The "sage" struggled with the problem of the present, and his theodicy remains for us in the Book of Job. The priest sought more practical ends in providing for the religious life of the time its suitable forms, means of expression and ideals of living. The prophet explained the meaning of the present from a study of the past, emphasized the ethical demand which resulted from such a study, and developed the hope of a future in which sorrow would be turned into joy and punishment into blessing. Often these lines of thinking run together. The "sage" turns prophet. The prophet uses priestly forms, in which to express his hopes. The purest form of prophetic teaching appears in Isaiah 40-66, whose wide sweep seems

to pass at times quite beyond the old national and racial lines into a theoretic universalism, in which all nations are to be worshippers of Jehovah. Prophet and priest alike found the highest religious ideal and hope of the nation in an expected return to its native seat, to Jerusalem, where alone, as it seems, Jehovah could be worshipped in the truest way. Each conceived this ideal and hope in a somewhat different fashion, but both united in the prayer that it might be speedily realized.

This hope of restoration seemed to be one of the wildest dreams ever cherished by a people in captivity, and especially under the sway of an empire apparently so strong as that of the Chaldæans. But as time passed, the prophecy was seen to justify itself from two directions. The Chaldæan monarchy contained in its very essence a fatal weakness in that it was the organization under the dominance of Chaldæan rulers of two different peoples, the Babylonians and the Chaldæans. The genius of Nebuchadnezzar set itself to unify the two peoples through religion and politics, but the task was only half done at his death, while under his less able successors the original duality emphasized itself. until, in the person of Nabonidus, a "Babylonian" became king. Naturally his work was dictated by a spirit more or less in opposition to Nebuchadnezzar, and was seen especially in his endeavor to rehabilitate the old Babylonian seats of religious worship, and to depress the importance of Nabu and Marduk, chief gods of Babylon; the result was to alienate the priesthood of Babylon, and introduce another element of discord into the realm. The opportunity was ripe for the fall of the New-Babylonian empire, and it needed only an avigorous attack from without to show its weakness and accomplish its overthrow.

This attack was made by Cyrus, the Medo-Persian king. The facts relating to the origin of the kingdom of Persia—more properly, Anshan—and its relations to Media are not clear. Most probably Media was the first of the Aryan kingdoms on the east and north of the Mesopotamian plain to rise into prominence under Cyaxares, and Cyrus, king of Anshan, was one among other rulers of its vassal kingdoms. On the death of Cyaxares (B. C. 584) a Scythian invasion swept over the kingdom, and Astyages, its leader, became the successor of Cyaxares and lord of the vassal kingdom of Anshan. Against him as a usurper Cyrus rose in revolt for the deliverance of his country from the foreigner, succeeded in defeating him, owing to the passing over of the Median army to his side, in a critical engagement, and became ruler of the entire Medo-Persian kingdom in 550 B. C. With an army flushed with victory and filled with a national spirit, he extended his conquests westward and southward, came into contact with the kingdom of Lydia in the west and overthrew it (B. C. 546), and turned toward Babylonia for a decisive struggle, whose prize was the sovereignty of Western Asia.

Unfortunately no contemporary records are preserved which make clear the causes leading to the conflict between Cyrus and Nabonidus, or the details of the campaigns which preceded the final struggle. But what has been

found in the inscriptions is sufficient to substantiate all that has been said respecting the inner discord and weakness of the Chaldaean empire. The last years of Nabonidus were troubled with revolts in Kaldi-land, the region about the Persian Gulf, and in the North of Babylonia. The advance of Cyrus did not meet with serious resistance. Nabonidus was defeated and fled. Babylon opened her gates to the soldiers of Cyrus, and the New-Babylonian empire came to an end in 538 B. C. Speculation has been rife with respect to the relation of the people of Israel to these events culminating in the fall of the empire. Isaiah 40—66 mentions Cyrus by name as the chosen servant of Jehovah, to punish Israel's enemies and restore her possessions. Were the Jewish people in the empire actively in sympathy with the movements of Cyrus, and did their support contribute to the victorious advance of the Persian army? There is no definite answer to these questions to be given, but it seems probable that with such feelings and expectations as are expressed in the prophetic writings just mentioned, they must have done what they could to help on the result. Their presence in Babylon and the other cities of Chaldaea could not but have been another weakening element in the social and political organization.

But how is their situation to be improved under the new conqueror? Is it not passing from one tyrant to another? Were they not likely to suffer more from a people of alien blood like the Persians than from their own Semitic brethren? They thought otherwise, and while they did not know definitely how the improvement was to come, the result shows that their expectations were well founded. The change in the situation of Israel came from the new political and religious attitude and policy of the new rulers. It was part of a larger movement which affected the whole empire. According to the religious ideas of antiquity, every region had its god whom the dwellers worshipped and whose presence and protection they lost when they left that region. Coming into a new locality, they came under the protection of a new god and owed him homage. Hence, every "deported" people lost, with its country, its gods also, and must acquire new objects of worship in the land whither it had come. Conquering nations left the gods of the conquered to them so long as they remained in their native seats. With Cyrus and the Persians such a policy was not possible in its entirety. They had stepped into possessions not their own, for Anshan was a petty, vassal kingdom which was swallowed up in the vast domains over which Cyrus ruled. Hence Cyrus, though a conqueror, must exchange his gods for others—a thing which was not to be thought of—or he must carry through a policy of religious toleration which permitted him to hold the religion of his ancestors while he ruled from a land whose gods were different and yet claimed homage from the dwellers in their territory. This required of him a formal acknowledgment of the authority of the local deities while it did not prevent him from retaining the faith of his fathers. It also constrained him to carry through the same measures in every conquered land, and to grant to dwellers in that land the

religious freedom which he reserved for himself. Precisely this policy is seen in his dealings with Babylonia. There he appears as a faithful servant of Marduk of Babylon, while he also returns to their native seats the images of the gods which Nabonidus had brought to Babylon. This attitude has been thought to show that Cyrus was a Polytheist and not a Zoroastrian, but the conclusion does not at all follow and is opposed by other facts. The position of Israel was at once altered for the better, and they enjoyed from this time forward, under the Persian Empire, a measure of religious toleration which the Chaldæan kings had not dreamed of granting them. A new religious idea was brought into the world by the Persians, forced upon them in the very beginnings of their national life and accepted by Cyrus as the ruling principle of his religious policy.

The other measure which concerned the people of Israel was that which renounced the method of "deportation" characteristic of the Assyrian and Chaldæan empires. A passage in the Cyrus Cylinder states that certain peoples of quite a broad region, apparently belonging to the original Medo-Persian settlements, were by his order returned with their gods to their native seats and the temples rebuilt. The like measure in the case of the people of Israel and the wisdom of this policy adds to the probability that it was carried out more extensively, indeed, that it was part of the general political policy of the new ruler. It removed discordant elements of population from regions where union with the natives was almost impossible. It bound to the empire the restored people (whose nationality had been already broken and the habit of subjection formed) through the gratitude which such an act would arouse. It made in each district whither they returned a faithful bulwark of the Persian power. Such, indeed, were its results in the case of the Jews. From a state of intense independence and a fanatical spirit of nationalism in their original kingdom, and a condition of constant disaffection and uneasiness under the Chaldæan yoke, they passed into quiet, peaceable, loyal supporters of the Persian empire.

There was something closer in the relation of Cyrus to the Jews than merely the results of a uniform civil and religious policy would indicate. Three facts must be taken into account in estimating this relation: (1) The cordial feeling toward Cyrus entertained in Isaiah, 40-66; (2) the personal religious faith of the conqueror; (3) the terms in which the proclamation (Ezra i. 1-4) and decree (Ezra vi. 3-5) of restoration are expressed. The two first support each other, for, whatever may be said to the contrary, it is hardly to be expected that the prophet would hail in such terms of high religious import a man who in religion was different in no essential respects from the Chaldæo-Babylonian rulers. That the prophet knew the Zoroastrian—or pre-Zoroastrian—faith of Cyrus, and had already observed his religious policy seems reasonable. It meant everything to the Jews politically and religiously. All the probabilities are in favor of the view that Cyrus was a Persian in faith as he was in blood. The contents of the cylinder inscription

instead of opposing, argue in favor of it, for the exaltation of Marduk, god of Babylon, therein contained the declaration that "Marduk, the great lord, the restorer (?) of his people beheld with joy his (*i. e.* Cyrus') beneficent deeds, his righteous hand, his noble heart; he commanded him to march to his own city, Babylon; . . . like a friend and helper he moved at his side," convey the impression that one God is honored, though in Babylon his name may be Marduk. The above quotation may profitably be compared with Isa. xlv. 1-3, where similar language is used of Jehovah. This inscription shows also a remarkable likeness to that proclamation by which the people of Jehovah are permitted to return home. While it may readily be admitted that the words of the permit have been altered in sympathy with Jewish religious views, yet, on any reasonable hypothesis of its original form, it substantiates the conclusion that there were some particular grounds, among which was especially that of religious sympathy, that drew Cyrus and Israel together. From the political point of view the suggestion has some weight also that Cyrus was desirous of having a loyal body of people in the vicinity of Egypt, Phœnicia, and the Mediterranean, on whom he could rely in case he advanced against Egypt, and decided to establish Israel at Jerusalem with this purpose. Thus came to pass the statement of Ezra i. 1, that "in the first year of Cyrus, king of Persia, the LORD stirred up the spirit of Cyrus, king of Persia, that he made a proclamation throughout all the kingdom" whereby the "house of the LORD in Jerusalem" was to be rebuilt and the people of Israel called to go up to their city.

The Jews had preserved their old tribal and family organization throughout the exile. The permission to return came to them, accordingly, not as individuals, but as a people, and was acted upon by their elders. The plans and their carrying out have the character of a *national* movement. It was the nation which had gone into exile. It was the nation that prepared to return to Jerusalem and build the house of the LORD. Twelve leaders are mentioned in Neh. vii. 7 in the document which is the same as that in Ezra ii, and seems to stand there in a better preserved form. Zerubbabel, the descendant of the royal house, and Jeshua, the heir of the high-priestly family, are at the head of the twelve. But who shall go with them? The entire body of Israel? That was manifestly impossible if the journey must be made immediately. Many were engaged in occupations which they could not leave at once; many had property in the land which could not be readily disposed of and which they could not carry with them. For various reasons, self-evident to one who gives a moment's thought to the situation, a very large proportion of the nation could not accept the king's kindness, even though they earnestly desired to do so. What was to be done? Two courses were open. Either the enterprise could be postponed until the majority of the nation was able to join in the homeward march, or a detachment of those who were able to arrange their affairs at once could be sent forward under official leadership, with the expectation that others would follow as rapidly as possi-

ble. Manifestly it would not be wise to delay, for it would seem like despising the king's favor, on the one hand, and, on the other, would run the risk of cooling the national enthusiasm for the return and throwing despite upon the promise of God. The latter was the plan determined upon, and under the twelve official leaders, the company began to assemble.

Of all the people the priests and religious attendants were naturally most desirous and most able to go at a moment's notice, and we find them a large proportion of the entire company. Of the rest it was evident that those who had little property were most available. As in so many other cases, so also here, it was the poor who could take advantage of God's favor, while the rich must needs remain behind. The latter, however, could help on the movement by supplying their poorer brethren with money and means for the long journey. That they themselves did not wish to go, is nowhere even hinted at. Their enthusiasm was equal to that of their brethren. Nothing in the narrative is opposed, and much favors the inference that they themselves expected in due time to follow. As in the first crusade the many who were able to go on a sudden went, while those who remained prepared to come after them. It will be later seen why they failed to come. It is enough now to emphasize the fact that, however much they might now desire, they were quite unable to get away. Thus the entire number who joined in the first return, who might be called the first detachment the advance column, amounted to about 50,000.

Cyrus, in recognition of the national character of the movement, handed over the sacred vessels, just as he returned the images of the gods to their Akkadian worshippers, to be carried back to their place in the Temple, to be built again on Mt. Zion. The people who remained made their offerings for the sacred building which they themselves hoped before long to see. There is good reason to wonder that, not so few, but so many could be found thus suddenly to undertake the journey. We may reasonably admire the enthusiasm and devotion which inspired them to give up all occupations, cut loose from friends, in some cases with no little self-sacrifice, and march out, truly heroic leaders of their people, the Crusaders before the Crusades, bound for the Holy City. They did not know the difficulties that lay before them, neglect and isolation from their brethren, envy and hostility from surrounding peoples. Nor did they realize, at the same time, that they were to be the representatives of a people, "which in spite of its seeming insignificance at the time, nevertheless bore with it a more momentous future than that of any of the nations subjugated and crushed by the Chaldæans."¹ Like many another movement of faith and religious enthusiasm, this one through much hardship accomplished results of eternal significance.

Of the route and details of the journey to Jerusalem no information is

¹ Ewald, *History of Israel*, vol. v, p. 50. The sentence refers to Cyrus as the instrument of Israel's restoration.

given. Nor is the condition of things which was found in the land or the position and order of the settlement very clear. It appears that the ancient enemies of Israel had spread over the country to the east and south in some degree, while in the north descendants of the mixed races which had been brought from the far east or had remained in the land, were settled. No doubt the proclamation and decree of Cyrus involved details concerning the removal of the population which had taken possession of the places where the home-comers were to live. It required but a short time after they had arrived on the ground for them to separate to their towns and begin the new life in the old homes. Their civil organization was marked out for them beforehand in the presence of their twelve elders and in the return to the old popular assembly which had formed the oldest basis of Israel's social and political life. Zerubbabel seems to have held some kind of an appointment from the Persian court, though there is also ground for believing that the returning company was attended by a Persian escort and under the charge of a Persian officer who remained in control of the new "province." In any case the descendant of David would occupy a unique position and exercise an important civil and ecclesiastical, if not political, authority. Beside him was Jeshua the priest who, in connection with Zerubbabel and the elders, undertook the religious organization of the community. Immediately on arriving, the gifts of the wealthy, who had remained behind as well as other contributions for the building of the temple, had been delivered over and there seemed to be no reason why the work favored by King Cyrus should not go forward with despatch. In the seventh month of that year, 537 B. C., by the action of a popular assembly, an altar was erected, offerings were made and feasts kept, their order appointed, and contracts were made for work and materials needed in the construction of the Temple. By the next year (536 B. C.), the Levites were organized for directing the building, and the corner-stone was laid amidst a tumult of joy and grief, easily explicable in the case of men who looked back on the past achievements beside which the present seemed so small and who looked forward to a fulfillment of hopes and ideals before which both past and present sank into insignificance. It was a notable day, containing in its exaltation of religious sentiment and in its glorification of the Temple tendencies profoundly significant of the future of the community. It was the first stage of their history, an auspicious beginning of what seemed destined to be of easy accomplishment.

In laying the corner-stone of their Temple, however, they laid the foundation of their troubles also. The people who dwelt round about them, especially in northern Israel, where the places of those who had been "deported" had been filled up by strangers, were worshippers of Jehovah as well as they. Their worship was, no doubt, corrupted with idolatrous forms, and possibly with heathenish notions, but, when they heard of the new-comers and their religious character and purposes, they came, apparently with sincere motives, to the new community, suggesting a union of religious forces about

the altar of Jehovah at Jerusalem. It was a critical moment in their history. It meant, on the one hand, large increase in strength, with the possible danger of religious degeneracy, or the likelihood of arousing religious hatreds which might threaten the future of the enterprise. But with their views and expectations, Zerubbabel and his advisers could take but one course. They felt secure of the favor of the court, and looked for constant reinforcements from their brethren in Babylonia. With the religious training of the exile, during which they had been forced into daily contact with the heathen, and were ever conscious of being unclean, they did not care now to renew the acquaintance with those who could not be numbered among legitimate Israelites. They answered, therefore, with short and scant courtesy, that there was no religious comity possible between them, that they themselves would carry on by themselves the work which the King had commanded them to do. The would-be religious allies withdrew in anger, and the new community must reckon with their active hostility. It manifested itself in attacks upon their settlements in Judah, as well as in intrigues at the Persian court. It is not probable that they succeeded in accomplishing anything very important against Jerusalem. Doubtless their efforts added to the difficulties under which the colonists struggled. The work on the Temple certainly ceased, and nothing was accomplished for fourteen years and more (536-521 B. C.).

The chief hindrances, however, were internal. In the first place, after the early enthusiasm for the religious services wore away, the struggle for existence began to press hard upon the new comers. The harassing attacks of the surrounding peoples became burdensome. The people had not brought much with them; they were the poor among their brethren; they must labor in the land which had suffered so much from war and devastation that agriculture must begin from the foundation. More than all that, the expected addition to their numbers from Babylonia did not appear. The rich and those who had been prevented by other things from joining in the advance movement failed to come after them. What was the reason for this delay? Not that they had become selfish or idolatrous. The Israel that remained was more pious than that which returned. But let us remember the religious policy of the Persian Empire, which just began to make its impression on the exiles. The tolerance which prevailed made it possible for them to love and worship Jehovah as well in Babylon as in Jerusalem. Their ideas were broadening under the genial influence of Cyrus' religious policy. They were loath to go. It was half a century before any considerable number could be induced to come up to the help of those whom they had followed with longing eyes as they set out on their glorious task of re-occupying the Holy City and building the Temple.

The result of these inner difficulties and outward disappointments was to reduce the returned exiles in Judah to a condition of apathy and worldliness. They were not encouraged by the outward course of affairs. Cyrus was slain in battle in 529 B. C. His son Cambyses was a man possessing neither the

religious nor the political insight of his father. His Egyptian war, begun in B. C. 525, would lead him into the vicinity of Jerusalem, but his energies were absorbed in other activities. The condition of Jerusalem during this period is a blank. The passage in Ezra iv. 6-23 has gotten into the wrong place, and should follow Chapter 6. Ezra iv. 24 connects directly with v. 5. It was only with the accession of Darius that new hope stirred in the hearts of patriots and prophets at Jerusalem, who began to speak for Jehovah in the ears of the listless and discouraged people.

The following paper will treat of the work of Haggai and Zechariah, and the historical events connected with the times of Ezra and Nehemiah,

Exploration and Discovery.

THE LONDON ORIENTAL CONGRESS.

By CHARLES F. KENT, PH.D.
The University of Chicago.

The Ninth International Congress of Orientalists, which met at London in September, proved to be a most profitable session. A large number of delegates were present from nearly every country in Europe and also from America, India, Persia and Egypt. The Duke of York acted as Honorary President and patron of the Congress, and Prof. Max Müller presided. For special work the Congress was divided into ten sections, each with an individual organization and meetings.

Among the many interesting papers, connected with the Biblical field, was one by Prof. Hommel of Munich on "The Babylonian Origin of Egyptian Culture." In the earliest Babylonian texts, he claims to find names identical and even represented by the same signs as in many of the Egyptian pyramid texts, which indicate a distinct connection between the two ancient civilizations. He maintains that the Babylonian is the older, and instead of accepting the theory that the Egyptian was originally a Semitic language, he considers the older texts sufficient proof that it has rather an affinity with the Sumerian dialect of Babylonia.

Mr. S. A. Strong called attention to the remarkable resemblance in many cases between the Assyrian religious texts and the Hebrew literature.

Mr. T. G. Pinches of the British Museum presented a valuable paper on "The New Version of the Creation Story," which differs from all that have thus far been discovered, and is evidently a very old document. The works of creation are arranged in an order, which does not correspond with that of Genesis, but has a curious resemblance to the eighth chapter of Proverbs.

No indications of the healing of the breach between the European Orientalists appear, but rather a confirmation of the former division. Geneva in 1894 is the place and date of the next Congress, after which it will be held only once in every three years.

THE TEL-EL-AMARNA TABLETS IN THE
BRITISH MUSEUM.¹

By ASSOCIATE PROF. ROBERT F. HARPER, PH.D.
The University of Chicago.

In the winter of 1887, some Fellahin made a very important discovery at Tel-el-Amarna in Upper Egypt, on the eastern bank of the Nile, about midway between Minieh and Siout. These ruins represent the site of the temple of Amenôphis IV., *i. e.* Khu-en-Aten, the so-called "Heretic King" of the XVIIIth Egyptian dynasty—about 1500 B. C.—the son of Amenôphis III. In the early part of this century when the scientific staff attached to the army of Napoleon, on the expedition to Egypt, were surveying and searching for materials for a complete map of Egypt—afterwards edited by Jacotin—a number of Egyptian antiquities were found at Tel-el-Amarna, which, later on, found their way into the different European museums. However valuable and important these early finds were, there cannot be any comparison between them and the finds of 1887. No one knows exactly where or when these tablets were found by the Antica, for the Arabs, as is customary, took care to obliterate all traces of their digging after her great find. During the winter of 1887 and 1888 about 200 of these tablets were offered for sale by native dealers. Later on others were found. Various views have been given as to the total number of these tablets found, but the outside limit is, perhaps, 330. The British Museum secured 82 through Dr. Budge; the Gizeh Museum in Egypt about 60, and the Berlin about 160, of which a very large number are so fragmentary as to give little or no connected sense. The authorities of the Berlin Museum have published their collection, together with those at Gizeh, under the editorship of Drs. Winckler and Abel. They have been reproduced by the autograph process, and the texts are very faulty in some places and very poorly reproduced in others. Abel autographed and Winckler, according to Winckler, deciphered or copied. In the last number of Bezold's *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, Abel claims to have done his share of the copying, and his claims are supported openly by Erman and tacitly by Schrader.

The Tel-el-Amarna tablets in the British Museum are marked Bu. 88-10-13+ or, Budge the 13th of October, 1888. Students have inquired for these tablets ever since their arrival in the British Museum, but the answer given was, "they are reserved for official use." Later on it became known that Drs. Bezold and Budge were preparing an edition of this collection.

In addition to those tablets which were secured by the different museums,

¹The Tel-el-Amarna Tablets in the British Museum with autotype *fac-similes*. By Drs. Bezold and Budge. Printed by the order of the Trustees, London, 1892. Pp. xcii and 157+24 plates.

a great many passed into the hands of private individuals, Turkish, Russian, and French officials and missionaries. M. Golenischeff secured more than any other private individual.

As may be imagined, these tablets created a great sensation among Assyriologists. They have been found to consist chiefly of letters and dispatches to two Egyptian kings, whose names in these inscriptions are Nimmuriya and Naphuriya. The Nimmuriya or Mimmuriya—and even Immuriya occurs—is to be identified with Amenôphis III. We have the following from a letter of Tushratta to Amenôphis IV: "And now I say that just as I was in friendship with Mimmuriya, thy father, so also will I be more than ten times more so with Naphuriya." Naphuriya is certainly to be identified with Amenôphis IV, and is to be regarded as the Babylonian form of Nefer-Cheperu-Ra and Mimmuriya as the father of Amenôphis IV, and not the grandfather. Prof. Erman, of Berlin, in the *Sitzungsberichte der königlichen preussischen Akademie zu Berlin* (Nov. 23, 1888,) was the first authority to identify these two names with the IIIrd and IVth Amenôphis's of the XVIIIth dynasty, viz.: Neb-ma-ra and Nefer-Cheperu-Ra. Several of these letters refer to the wife of Amenôphis III, *i. e.* the mother of Amenôphis IV, viz. Queen Thi, written D. T. Te-i-e. Again, several are simply addressed to the "King of Egypt," without any further designation. These would fall, however, within the time of the two Amenôphis's. Bezold and Budge take up the identification of these names at some length and their results are thoroughly trustworthy.

These tablets are peculiar in size, shape, and style of writing. The clay of which they are made is different from that found in other Babylonian tablets, being coarse and gritty as a rule. The kind of clay of which a tablet is made often plays an important part in indicating the country from which it came. Bezold and Budge say that "in color the tablets vary from a light to a dark dust tint, and from a flesh color to dark brick red. Only a few of them have been baked. The others are all sun-dried." In form the majority are rectangular, but some are oval. Some are flat on both sides and others convex on both sides. In a great many cases the writing is careless, and only one side of the tablet is inscribed. Many different styles of writing are used, including every class and variety of form of cuneiform characters known, with the exception of the complicated characters found in some of the old Babylonian texts. Budge and Bezold describe it as follows: "The writing on the Tel-el-Amarna tablets resembles, to a certain extent, the Neo-Babylonian, *i. e.*, the simplification of the writing of the first Babylonian Empire, used commonly in Babylonia and Assyria for about seven centuries B. C. It possesses, however, characteristics different from those of any other style of cuneiform of any period now known to exist; and nearly every tablet contains forms of characters which have hitherto been thought peculiar to the Ninevite or Assyrian style of writing." Very often the characters resemble those on the so-called Cappadocian tablets which have been described by

Sayce. There are a few of these Cappadocian tablets in the University of Pennsylvania collection, purchased by Mr. Peters in Constantinople.

Again, the language of these inscriptions is peculiar. It is not good Babylonian. It is forced and often contains non-Semitic words and constructions. Bezold and Budge say: "It supplies a number of new words and forms, and exhibits peculiar grammatical constructions, the existence of which has been hitherto unsuspected, and which have a close affinity to the language of the Old Testament." In other words, Babylonian was the *lingua franca*, the diplomatic language of Western Asia and also of Egypt. Some of them are written in very poor Babylonian, however. French is the diplomatic language of to-day, and some French letters written by foreigners are in very poor and forced French. It was not until 800 B. C. that Aramaic came to the front, and drove out the Babylonian. In fact, according to the latest results—obtained by Strassmaier and unpublished—Babylonian remained a commercial language, even down to the time of Christ, and later.

But this is not all. Some of the tablets from Mitanni, which must be located in Mesopotamia, just east of Carchemish, the capital of the Hittite empire, were written in Babylonian, and others in an altogether different language. The first to notice this different language was the indefatigable Sayce, who has been from the first a pioneer in the decipherment of cuneiform and Hittite inscriptions. In the January *Academy*, 1890, p. 64, he calls attention to the "language of Mitannu." Some of these tablets are written in a non-Semitic language, but with the cuneiform characters, just as a great many people write German letters or dispatches in the Latin script. I think that this is one of the most interesting points connected with these Tel-el-Amarna tablets. In the first volume, second and third numbers (August, 1890) of the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, this so-called Mitanni language has been discussed by Jensen, Brünnow and Sayce.

In these texts we find the peculiarity of dividing words at the end of a line. These divisions are of the rarest occurrence in other Babylonian tablets. The whole subject of language will be taken up most thoroughly by Dr. Bezold in his book on "Oriental Diplomacy," which is overdue from the press of Luzac & Co., London.

He will give a list of peculiar forms—grammatical and lexicographical—peculiar expressions, idioms, etc. There will be a complete transliteration of all the texts in the British Museum, together with a glossary.

The present volume contains the text of all the tablets in the Museum, with a résumé of the contents. At present it is unwise to attempt any complete translation. Sayce, as usual, has made translations, and Sayce's translations, as usual, cannot be regarded as reliable.¹

¹ A more technical review will appear in the January number of *HERRICA*, including Dr. Bezold's *Oriental Diplomacy*.

THE LATEST FROM EGYPT.

By JAMES H. BREASTED, M.A.
University of Berlin.

Since Lepsius disclosed for us in the forties, what is known among German Egyptologists as "*das mittlere Reich*," the middle Empire, no excavations in Egypt have excited such interest as those of Mr. Petrie at Tel-el-Amarna. All the world knows of the famous cuneiform tablets embodying the correspondence between the kings of the Nile and the Mesopotamian valleys in the sixteenth century B. C., and as a consequence the flood of light which has been thrown upon the political condition of Palestine during the centuries just preceding the Israelitish occupation. But in view of some further discoveries of Mr. Petrie, it may not be out of place briefly to notice the unique origin of the city where he has been excavating.

It owed its existence to purely religious causes. Amenhotep IV has long been a puzzle to Egyptologists, but his story is now understood with tolerable accuracy, and shows that Egypt did not lack her religious controversies, as we shall see. The majority of the greater deities of the Egyptian pantheon were sun-gods; Amon Ra, Horus, Osiris all found visible embodiment in the sun, but still retained their individuality. Among the more highly cultivated of the Egyptians, the feeling very early developed, that all these divinities were but *forms* for the same great deity. Especially did the priests of the new empire understand this, and knew that the god whom the Egyptian peasant of one *nomos* honored as *Ra*, was the same divinity known as *Horus* in another *nomos*. They were but different manifestations of the same god,—an ancient Sabellianism. Indeed the priests carried this development so far, that they brought deities into the sun-cultus, who had really no connection with it; like *Amon*, god of harvest, or the water-god *Sobek*. Thus the distinctions between the different persons of the pantheon were being gradually effaced, but no hierarchy had the courage to abandon the old forms; the traditional beliefs were too firmly fixed in the hearts of the people, and not the slightest change was made in the ancient ritual and cultus.

The decisive step of worshipping this *one* deity under *one* name, was made by the king above mentioned, Amenhotep IV of the XVIII. dynasty. He chose as the striking symbol of his *one* deity, the '*eten*' or sun-disk. It preserved the ancient sun cultus, and was at the same time the symbol of the Pharaohs' universal sway; for we find on an obelisk of Queen Hatshepsut at Karnak a reference to herself as, "she whom the great circle of the gods has trained as mistress of the (*shntu-n-'eten*) circuit of the sun-disk." Not content with adopting this worship himself, the king immediately proceeded to enforce its adoption throughout his realm by the most severe measures. The names of all other gods were everywhere erased and the new cultus universally introduced. As his own name contained the name of Amon, the

king changed it to Huen'eten ("radiance of the sun-disk"), and leaving Thebes, with its too frequent reminders of the same god, he went further down the river and founded a new capital which he named "*hut-en-eten*" ("horizon of the sun-disk"), the modern Tel-el-Amarna. He enriched the place with a noble palace and magnificent temples of his new cultus, till it became a city truly worthy of a king's residence, which it continued to be till Huen'eten's death, a period of uncertain length. He was succeeded by two relatives, and a priest of the new cultus, all weaklings and unable to continue the reform. The last one was succeeded by the great King Haremheb, the last ruler of the XVIII. dynasty, who razed the capital of the reformer to the ground and utilized the stone for his own purposes. The traditional worship was restored and everywhere resumed its sway, and the idea which Huen'eten had so vigorously introduced was never again favored by any king.

An effort for the establishment of such absolute monotheism, or at least the strictest monolatry, is especially interesting, as it took place during the Israelitish sojourn in Egypt. It was a strange fortune which brought this people, even for so short a time, under the only nation of that period, which ever dreamed of monotheism, though it would be nonsense to assume that the movement had the slightest influence upon them.

This unsuccessful reform also affects the contemporaneous history of Palestine, for the internal confusion occasioned by it, so distracted Egypt's foreign policy that the Palestinian tributaries gained by the splendid victories of Thothmes III are enabled to free themselves. The power of the northern Hittites grows undisturbed till it is enabled to face the armies of Rameses II without flinching. It may therefore with probability be said that Israel on entering Palestine would still have been within the jurisdiction of Egypt, had it not been for the reformation of Huen'eten.

On the site of this old time capital, Mr. Petrie has been continuing his excavations since finding the famous letters. Tracing the razed walls of the palace, he has come upon one room nearly entire, with "a painted fresco pavement," presenting subjects treated in a style utterly foreign to previous and subsequent methods. It is unnecessary to recall to the reader the rigid conventionalism which everywhere dominates Egyptian art, and from which these new specimens are entirely free. Subjects from nature are treated with a grace and freedom which classic frescoes can hardly parallel. Especially noticeable is a bull standing among sedges with head on high and a frightened bird flying away above him. Petrie claims that nothing like this can be found "until modern times," and yet that they were done by Egyptian artists as the conventional treatment of some familiar motives shows. Whether these striking innovations like the new religion were introduced by the heretic king himself, is a question. Where the ideas came from is tolerably certain. A people living in the north and called by the Egyptians Kefti voluntarily sent presents to *Thothmes* III after his victories in Palestine;

these gifts are in a style previously unknown, and are possibly Mycenaean. More than that they lived in the north cannot be affirmed of the Kefti, but it is certain that their work came into Egypt at this time, and the new art of Huen'eten is doubtless to be assigned to this source. Mr. Petrie's assignment of it to the Greeks, of whom in this period we know *absolutely nothing*, is entirely without ground. Not the least interesting relic found, is a death mask of the king made for the use of the artists and sculptors who had his funeral equipage and sarcophagus to prepare. Such an exact reproduction as this is unique and offers an intensely fascinating study to connect these features with the known history of the man.

These developments in the art of the XVIIIth dynasty, recall the recent finds of Brugsch, at Hawara, in Fayum, which have just arrived at the Royal Museum here. In pursuance of the old custom of carving the face of the deceased in the lid of the sarcophagus, it came to be common in the later times to substitute for this, a *painted* portrait of the deceased, done upon a tablet of cypress wood or a square of heavy linen, laid over the face of the deceased. The end of the coffin lid was then hinged and could be turned down, exposing the portrait to view. Often, however, the mummy had no further cover than its wrappings. This wrapping was most elaborately done with bands of colored linen, crossed in a complex diamond pattern, bearing in the centre of each diamond a gilded button. The method seems to have been peculiar to Fayum, and during a period from the first century B. C. to about 200 A. D.

The remarkable thing about these mummies is the portraits mentioned. These are so natural in color, blending and life-like expression, that, as Brugsch remarks, had you met one of them in a modern frame, no thought of an ancient origin would have been suggested. The work was done in wax colors, mostly laid on with palette-knife, often receiving final touches with the brush. The knowledge that such work existed was shown by Petrie in '88 on the same field where Brugsch has been digging. It is undoubtedly Greek, but that the Greek portrait painters of the first century B. C. were practically the equals of modern masters, no one had dreamed. That such is the case, however, is evidenced by the words of Menzel, who, on viewing their work for the first time, exclaimed: "*Wir haben nichts hinzugelernt.*" Thus does Egypt preserve to us the relics of ancient culture and art from other shores.

Nor in the province of literary art are interesting developments wanting. It is probably not generally known among Biblical scholars, that the parallelism distinctive of Hebrew poetry is the *usual* form of the Egyptian poem. An example or two will best illustrate.

In the tomb of a court-officer, Seheteb-'eb-Ra at Abydos, the deceased is represented as having delivered to his children in praise of the king, a song, of which the following is a part. I translate literally, retaining as far as possible the order of the original:

"Worship the king in the midst of your reins,

"Honor his majesty in your hearts,
 "He is *Sa*¹ in the hearts,
 "His eyes search each body,
 "He is the sun who sees with his rays.
 "He illuminates the two² lands more than the sun-disk,
 "He makes verdant more than a great Nile.
 "He fills the two lands with strength,
 "He is the life which cools the nostrils.
 "He gives food to those who are in his train,
 "He nourishes those who follow his way.

 "He it is who causes what is,
 "He is the *chnum*³ of each body.

It will be observed that the second group is a triple parallelism (cf. Ps. cxlvi., 6-10), while the rest are on the usual plan of two members. An excellent example is also found in the temple of Osiris at Abydos, where the priests say of the king:

"How gentle is this in the hearts of the people!
 "How beautiful is this before the gods!
 "Thou makest the monuments of Osiris,
 "Thou adornest him who is before the dwellers of the west (*i. e.*, Osiris).

 "Excellent for his deeds,
 "Mighty in the naming of his name.

And the king says of himself:

"I gave the priests to know what concerned them,
 "I put right the ignorant in his ignorance.

 "I strengthen who were in terror,
 "I thrust back the evil from them.

There also occurs a rarer form of complex verse, having two lines parallel with two. The predominating variety is the so-called synonymous parallelism, more rarely the synthetic and antithetic. Did the Semites obtain this style of verse from the Egyptians or the reverse? It is an interesting question, and a thorough examination of the history of forms in Assyrian poetry would throw much light upon it.

At some future time the date and finally certain translation of the Egyptian names in Genesis xli. 45 may not be uninteresting to the readers of this journal.

¹ God of perceiving.

² Upper and lower Egypt.

³ God of creation.

THE EXPEDITION OF THE BABYLONIAN
EXPLORATION FUND.
EXCAVATIONS AT NIFFER DURING THE SEASON OF 1889.

By ASSOCIATE PROF. ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER, PH.D.
The University of Chicago.

In the *Proceedings of the American Oriental Society* at Washington, D. C. (April 21-23, 1892), the Rev. John P. Peters, Director of the Expedition of the Babylonian Exploration Fund (under the auspices of the University of Pennsylvania) gives a brief account of some of the doings of the party while *en route* and in camp at Niffer. In the *Old and New Testament Student* for 1892, I have traced in outline the proceedings of the expedition from New York to Aleppo, Aleppo to Baghdad, and from Baghdad to Niffer, the site chosen for excavation.

The staff for 1888-'89 consisted of the following members: Director, John P. Peters; Assyriologists, Robert Francis Harper and H. V. Hilprecht; Architect and Engineer, Perez Hastings Field; Photographer and Business Manager, J. H. Haynes; Interpreter, D. Z. Noorian.

It is my purpose, in this concluding article, briefly to note a few of the most important transactions at Niffer.

The sites for excavation, chosen by Mr. Peters, rather than by the members of the expedition, were Anbar, identified by the Wolfe expedition with Sippara; Birs Nimrud (Borsippa) and Niffer or Nufar—Nippuru. According to Mr. Peters, Anbar was refused by the Baghdad authorities, and Birs Nimrud and Niffer were granted. The conditions of excavation were those prescribed by the Turkish law. No concessions, or special permissions, were granted, except, perhaps, in the matter of the topographical map of the site to be excavated, which is generally required beforehand. Mr. Field was permitted to prepare this map after his arrival at Niffer.

Our party arrived at Niffer at six on the evening of Jan. 31st, 1889, under the escort of Makota, acting head Sheikh of the Affek Arabs, and some Turkish soldiers. Here we found the rest of the expedition, who had come from Hilleh, with the baggage, by a shorter route and had arrived on the 30th. Our tents were pitched and after a frugal dinner—if one can make use of the term—we retired for the night. After an early breakfast (Feb. 1st), Hilprecht and I began to get our tent in order. We had a U. S. Army tent, 9x14 feet, provided with a fly. I unpacked boxes and bags and brought out the rugs purchased in Baghdad. On the ground were placed two large reed mats obtained from the Arabs; on these the rugs were spread out. After we had finished, the tent looked very oriental and pleasant. About 9:30 the Sheikh, with a numerous following, came for his *Baksheesh*. He wished us to take a guard of fifteen men from his tribe. Field worked upon the map during the whole day. After dinner the party spent the evening in the "smoking room," as our tent had been designated.

(Feb. 2d, Sat.) Field finished his map of Niffer, and after Bedri Bey, the Turkish Commissioner, had satisfied himself that it was exact, it was handed to Mustapha, our chief servant, to be taken to Diwaniyeh. Along with it went a telegram from Bedri Bey to the Wali Pasha of Baghdad, saying that the regulations in regard to the map had been fulfilled, and a request to telegraph permission to commence excavations. The party made a survey of the mounds. We went over to the Bint-el-Amfr and decided on the so-called temple mound as one of the good places for excavations. We found several walls *in situ* at different places. Phalli are very numerous. Later on the Arabs called and our tent was used as the "reception tent."

(Feb. 3d, Sunday.) It rained during the night and, in the morning, the mud was about four inches deep all around us. The rain continued during the whole day. Our tent was selected as the "church" and Mr. Peters read the Church of England service. I feared for the safety of our tent several times. The rain poured, the wind blew and the tent shook. Here we were, sitting on a dry spot of ground, 9x14 feet, under canvas walls, surrounded on all sides by swamps and Bedawin, expecting every minute to have our tent picked up by the wind and set down again afar off in the Affek swamps. In the afternoon, I visited Bedri Bey and he showed me three fragments of a stone found under his tent. These were the first finds.

(Feb. 4th, Monday.) Our encampment is becoming a little village. It is larger and more prosperous than many of the Arab encampments which I have seen. Bedri Bey's tent was finished to-day. He had trouble with the Arabs on account of the small pay, and as a result, we had our first war dance in camp. Mustapha returned from Diwaniyeh at 8 p. m., bringing letters and dispatches.

(Feb. 5th, Tuesday.) Excavations were begun on a small scale this a. m. Mr. Peters selected a spot very close to our encampment. During the day some coffins, vases, etc., were found, but nothing of any importance. In the afternoon, Berdi's tribe came into collision with a neighboring, unfriendly tribe. Berdi and his men were with us, and the others were 200-300 feet away. The war dance began, and both parties became very excited. They were in earnest. Noorian went over to the other tribe and persuaded them to leave the mound, as we would join Berdi with our six Turkish soldiers. The mounds were more closely examined and they were found to be of great extent. Their circumference is more than a mile. All the mounds are high, and especially the Bint-el-Amfr. We are now well settled in our tents and are excavating with a small force.

From this time on until April 1st life in camp did not vary much from day to day. The force of Arabs engaged in the trenches was gradually increased to more than three hundred. Many new places for excavations were selected, and finds were made every day. In the morning after an early breakfast, I generally spent from one to two hours on my horse—whose name, by the way, was Burnaburiash—visiting the different trenches and sites of excavations.

From 9 to 12 and from 1:30 to 4 or 4:30 was spent in cleaning the finds of the previous day and in catalogue-work. Again at 4, I would mount my horse and ride around the mounds, visit some neighboring Arab encampments, run races with Arabs or with some other member of our party, etc., etc., until the call for dinner. The amusements after dinner were numerous and varied. One could either play draughts, cards or chess; hunt jackals—our success was poor, as I do not think that a single jackal was killed; visit the Arabs and watch their games—which, by the way, are always very vulgar; visit the Turkish soldiers (we had at different times six, sixteen and twenty-five in camp); join in friendly war dances with the Arabs in camp and sometimes be amused by a genuine, hostile war dance, which Mr. Noorian would speedily disperse, owing to his great influence over the Arabs. There were letters to be written, books to be read and plans to be discussed. We received our letters once a week by special soldiers sent from Diwaniyeh. These same soldiers carried back letters and dispatches for Baghdad, the general headquarters. Two or three of us adopted the Arab dress from the beginning, and used no other while in camp, except when riding.

About April 1st, Mr. Peters and Bedri Bey, accompanied by a guide, undertook a visit to Tello to see M. de Sarzec, who was carrying on excavations there at that time. M. de Sarzec had made a great many valuable finds during the season, but, for some unknown reason, he refused to show his finds to Mr. Peters. Bedri Bey was more fortunate. According to his statement, all the de Sarzec finds were placed before him for inspection. During the absence of the Director and the Turkish Commissioner, we had an uprising in our camp at Niffer. One of the Arabs in a certain trench struck another with a pick. He was ordered out of the trench by Mr. Noorian and told not to return to work. On the next day he was found at his old place in the trench and refused to leave it. He even went so far as to throw a basket of dirt at Mr. Noorian. The latter immediately rode him down and horse-whipped him. The Arab then called his friends to his aid, and came against the encampment. There was a panic, all the Arabs stopped work and joined the mob. Hilprecht and I were at work on the finds, when some of the servants came and informed us that the Arabs were coming against us.

Going out to one of the entrances, or gateways, we saw a peculiar and impressive sight. From all the trenches and all sides of the mounds, the Arabs were rushing upon us. Here and there soldiers were to be seen, who were hurrying in from their stations to our aid. Finally Mr. Noorian came up and began to harangue the mob. In a very short time, he had them under complete control, and some of the Arabs wanted to kill the man, who had been the cause of the trouble by his attack on Mr. Noorian. Half an hour later, they were all at work again. Makota, the Affek Sheikh was sent for, and he came into camp about the middle of the afternoon. The Sheikh wished to make an example of the culprit, but Mr. Noorian interposed in his behalf. He was, however, ordered out of the encampment. On Sunday

(April 1st), Berdi, the friendly sub-Sheikh, gave those of us who were in camp at that time a feast, consisting of chickens,—served whole, and to be eaten with the fingers,—*lebn*, or sour milk, or rather curds, rice, etc. He sat at the same table and ate with us, a very uncommon thing for a Sheikh to do.

On March 15th, the thermometer marked 106 degrees in my tent, and, from that time on, we suffered greatly from the heat during the day and the coolness at night. The change in temperature, the plots of the Arabs, the vermin, the stretchers used as beds, etc., were anything but agreeable. Everything, however, went on rather pleasantly until April 1st. Then the heat was greater, the swamp-water poorer, the vermin more numerous and more determined, and the Arabs more untrustworthy. We now began to plan our evacuation of the stronghold which had been our headquarters for two months, and decided to leave between the 20th and 25th of April. Our plans were suddenly changed, however, by circumstances over which we had no control.

On Saturday night (April 14th) our bread ovens were broken by some Arabs and four sheep stolen from the camp. On Sunday (15th) the boats, ordered from Hilleh to take back our finds and camp-baggage, came from the Euphrates through the swamps to the base of the mound. They were a week ahead of time and Mr. Peters ordered them back. Through the influence of some other members of the party, they agreed to remain in the swamps,—a very lucky thing for us as we soon learned. During the evening, Hilprecht, Bedri Bey and myself sat outside my tent and discussed the advisability of applying to the government for a large force of soldiers to act as an escort out of the Affek country. We retired after twelve, and, before I could sleep, shots were heard, and great excitement in the encampment. Without dressing I seized my Winchester and ran to the scene of action. The whole camp was aroused by this time and we learned that the Arabs had been attempting to steal the mules belonging to the soldiers. After five minutes, one of the soldiers returned and informed us that he had killed an Arab. We were in great straits. Our encampment, while in the territory of the Affek Arabs, was also very close to three Said camps. Was it a Said or an Affek that had been killed? From which side was the attack to come? After a short parley, it was decided to send a messenger to the governor (Kaimakam) of Diwaniyeh, the nearest government station, eight hours away through the swamps, and also to Berdi, a sub-Sheikh of the Affek, who, except on one occasion, had proved very friendly and trustworthy. We soon learned that the Arab killed belonged to the Said tribe. His body was carried into the small Said encampment at the base of our mound, the fires were built, the women were wailing and the dogs barking. Would Berdi come, or would he leave us to get out of our trouble as best we could? After more than an hour of anxious waiting, a small band of Arabs was seen to be approaching. They were halted by the soldiers on guard, and the cry

came back: "It is I, Berdi." A few minutes later, Berdi was in camp, looking every inch a king and fully realizing his responsibility. He informed us that he had come to help us, that he had sent word to the other Sheikhs of his tribe and that they would soon be in camp, and finally that he had sent a messenger to the Said Arabs with the information that he was in camp to protect the *Inglizi*, as we were called, and that, if they came against us, they would come against his whole tribe. This was very reassuring. Berdi threw a guard of his men around our camp and some of us retired for a little rest and sleep.

In the morning, chiefs representing the whole Affek tribe, with numerous followers, were in camp. From this time on we were practically in a state of siege. We did not leave camp, except under escort, and then only to take some photographs. The Suids refused to treat with us. They wanted the blood-revenge and would not accept blood-money. In the evening ten soldiers, with a great deal of ammunition, came from Diwaniyeh. On Tuesday twenty more came from Hilleh. In the evening there was an altercation between the Turkish soldiers and the Arab guard. After a council, we decided, if possible, to leave the mound on the following day. On Wednesday the tents were struck and all baggage brought to the two boats in the swamps. We could not get away, however, until the morning. After a sleepless night and a poor breakfast, we were in readiness to start. The horses were saddled, hundreds of Arabs were on the mound to see us off. Berdi, who had gone, on the evening before, to bid farewell to his wives, had come back. He was to accompany us to Baghdad, and there receive recognition due his services to us. In a quarter of an hour we would have been on our horses. I was sitting on my camp-bed talking to Berdi, when we heard the cry of fire. Looking up, we saw the whole encampment on fire. I might say here that we had at least a dozen large reed tents, joined to form a sort of barricade. These tents were used for the kitchen, dining room, storehouses, stables, etc. In ten minutes the whole encampment had been reduced to ashes and three of our horses were burned to death. During the fire the Arabs robbed us of everything they could find, including the expedition's money. The so-called friendly Arabs had at the last minute set fire to our encampment and robbed us. The Said wanted our blood and the Affek had taken our belongings.

After another short council, it was decided that Mr. Peters, Bedri Bey and myself should start for Diwaniyeh at once on horse,—using the small boats when necessary to get through the swamps,—and that the others should start for Hilleh on the boats sent for the baggage. We divided the chiefs and soldiers and separated. After a tedious ride, we came to Diwaniyeh at 11 p. m., Thursday, and were received with open arms by the governor and his officers. Friday night at 8 we left for Hilleh and arrived at 12:30 p. m. on Saturday, stopping only thirty minutes for breakfast. On Saturday p. m. the boats arrived with the other members of the party. On Sunday, the Wali

Pasha of Baghdad, with a large following of soldiers, came to Hilleh to see what he could do for us. Some of us called, and he, accompanied by several officers, returned our call at the Khan. On Tuesday we left Hilleh for Baghdad. On Wednesday evening, I resigned my position on the staff for reasons perfectly satisfactory to Mr. Peters and myself. On Thursday we arrived in Baghdad and Mr. Field presented his resignation, which was accepted. After a stay of a week in Baghdad, Mr. Peters, Hilprecht and myself left for Aleppo and the coast by way of the Euphrates. Our caravan consisted of four wagons, two of which we occupied. The other two belonged to a Turkish pasha and his harem, including his chief wife and either four or five other wives. The head wife was old, stout, and wore men's clothing. All of the others were young. On one occasion the wagon containing the harem was overturned, and the harem was spilled out on the road. Our pasha was the only Moslem, whom I met, who would talk about the female members of his family. We stopped one day at Anah, one at Dêr, and one in Aleppo. We made the journey in thirty days and were on board a French boat at Scanderun, bound for Alexandria and Marseilles, on June 1st. I am not in a position to say anything about the excavations carried on during the following year by Messrs. Peters, Haynes and Noorian. So far as I have learned they were successful.

Synopses of Important Articles.

DOES THE BIBLE CONTAIN SCIENTIFIC ERRORS? By Prof. Chas. W. Shields, in *The Century*, Nov., 1892.

Can the Bible yield us any real knowledge within the domain of the various sciences? Three elements, commonly spoken of now in connection with the Scriptures, do not impair their scientific integrity or philosophical value, and so are not to be regarded as scientific errors, namely, literary imperfections, historiographical defects, and traditional glosses, all of which may be admitted as present. But, aside from these, the Scriptures, as judged by their own claims, if accounted inerrant at all, must be so accounted as to their whole revealed content, whatever it be and wherever found, whether in the region of the natural sciences or in that of ethics and theology. It is seldom remarked that both the physical and the spiritual teaching of the Bible are alike given in a non-scientific form. Often it is said—and said truly enough—that the Bible does not teach astronomy or physics as a science. But neither does it teach theology or ethics as a science. If it be urged that we have left far behind us the contemporary astronomy of the Old Testament, how shall we defend its contemporary theology, with its manlike deity so often depicted as a monster of anger, jealousy and cruelty, its polygamous patriarchs and proslavery apostles. If we are warned against a few devout scientists who are endeavoring to harmonize their geology with the Mosaic cosmogony, is there to be no warning for this scandal of great churches and denominations at the present moment adjusting their metaphysics to the Pauline divinity? The physical and the spiritual teaching alike have a permanent and universal import, as well as local and temporary reference. It is true that the physical sciences are, in the main, bodies of empirical knowledge; but it is not true that they can find no metaphysical ground and material in the biblical revelations concerning physical facts. The physical portion of revelation, small though it seems to be, is of the greatest benefit to science, philosophy and general culture. The Bible gives, not the empirical part of any physical science, but its metaphysical complement, the divine ideas expressed in those phenomena, and the divine causes of those laws. The inspired Bible is a radiant source of divine knowledge, chiefly within the psychical, but also within the physical, sciences.

It does not appear from this discussion what contribution is made by Scripture revelation to the physical sciences, for the knowledge given of them is noumenal, not phenomenal, hence metaphysical, not physical. This then comes back to the com-

mon conception that the revelation of the Bible concerns spiritual things, those of which a knowledge is necessary for man's highest welfare. C. W. V.

THE QUESTION OF SYCHAR.* The identification of Sychar is important, because the difficulties connected with it have been made the ground for denying that the author of the Fourth Gospel was familiar with the geography of Palestine. These difficulties are three: 1. Sychar is not known to us as a city of Samaria. But the author of the Fourth Gospel is familiar with the Old Testament passages relating to the connection of Jacob with Shechem. It is highly improbable, then, that he would use another than the Old Testament name for such a place without accurate information. He may have known Sychar either as another name for Shechem, or as the name of another place near Shechem. Of the first, there is absolutely no proof. For the second, there is the evidence of the continued name of the place. This evidence is first found in the beginning of the fourth century, when Sychar is mentioned twice. The next evidence is from mediæval travelers, in 1106, 1130, 1160-70. A traveler in 1283 is quoted as authority for a town Istar, north of Jacob's well. At the present time a few ruins, a little over half a mile north of the well, are called 'Askar. Can this 'Askar be derived from Sychar through 'Ischar? Robinson says it cannot, but analogy with other place-names of Palestine would seem to indicate that it could be. Can the name be one that has been forced on it by pilgrims? Hardly, for from the fourth century on it was agreed that Shechem and Sychar were the same, yet meanwhile this name has existed as a native name. 2. Would a woman come for water from 'Askar to Jacob's well? There is a copious fountain in 'Askar and a stream, which she must have crossed, large enough to turn a mill, flowing only a few rods from the well. But from wherever the woman came, she must have passed by these or other sources of water. The real difficulty is why the well was ever dug there at all. 3. It is said that expositions which assume the accuracy of the narrative involve the error of assuming that the road to Galilee goes north from the forks at the well, instead of east, past Shechem. Now, it is true that the present road to Galilee does take this eastern route, but there is a track of easy grade sometimes taken yet, by which one may pass directly north, leaving Shechem on the west. This third point, however, is a small matter, and does not affect the narrative in John.

A very clear article. Its position, while differing from that of Robinson, agrees with the conclusions of the Palestine Exploration Society's survey. It may certainly be regarded as a very probable identification. I. F. W.

THE RÔLE OF THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS IN MODERN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.†—The history of Religions as a science dates from the present

* By Prof. George Adam Smith, in *The Expositor*, December 1892, p. 464-472.

† By Jean Réville, in *The New World*, Sept. 1892, pp. 503-519.

century. Its existence was made possible (1) by the collection of facts on the various religions made accessible by philology and archæology, contributed by missionaries and travelers and students of folk-lore; (2) by a disposition to study these facts seriously, a disposition increasingly encouraged by the facts themselves, in the face of theological bigotry and anti-religious free-thinking; (3) by the application to these facts of a critical scientific method, which stands apart from the partisan, the apologetic or the doctrinaire method. Thus beginning, the science has been making its way slowly in universities and cultivated circles, through periodicals and printed books, by libraries and museums. The question arises, Where and how introduce the science of religions into the curriculum of public instruction? or, How may the facts of this science influence education? It should not be taught in primary or secondary schools, both because the curriculum there is already too full, the subject too complicated and the risk of arousing religious prejudices too great. The university is the place for direct instruction on this subject, where the teacher of the lower schools may be trained by this study in a spiritual and moral temper which he may transmit to his pupils. The clergy must study it, first as theologians, second as leaders of men. Theology can only remain scientific by embracing in its sphere of accepted truth the facts of religion outside of Christianity and Judaism. Christianity and Judaism themselves cannot be understood without a knowledge of other related religions. Theology must collect all the religious facts possible, exclude none by *a priori* judgments, test all, classify, compare them. Otherwise the laws of man's religious life cannot be ascertained, and theology ceases to be scientific. But the science of religion itself needs religious men to study and teach it, in order to be fairly appreciated. Again, the minister, as a leader of men in religious life, needs to know this science, since it acquaints him with the religious life and character of humanity in its elements and its largest extent: *e. g.*, (a) it teaches him the universality of religion and its profoundly human character, the permanent needs and religious aspirations of the human soul; (b) it teaches him to disengage the essential characteristics, the general elements of all religion which are most important to cultivate in believers, as the consciousness of dependence upon a superior power, the need of pardon, the intuition of life after death; (c) it teaches him toleration, without cultivating indifference as to Christian belief and life. To recognize Christian elements in other religions is not denying Christianity or betraying the Gospel; it is affirming the universality of Christian truth, or, to speak more exactly, the fundamental identity of "this religion of humanity of which the Gospel of Christ is for us the highest expression"; (d) it emphasizes Christian universalism, in which thought is a great power on the side of the religious sentiment of modern times—at all times God has called and everywhere man has responded according to his degree of civilization and his differing aptitudes. Thus is educed the fundamental truth of religion in which all unite, the eternal and permanent religion of humanity.

The spirit of this article is earnest and religious. Its emphasis upon the need for the study of the science of religion by theologians and ministers is thoroughly sound and commendable. Its insistence upon a scientific critical method, without apologetic or philosophical presumptions, is just. The claims made for this science as a distinctively educative force in current religious life seem to us, however, somewhat overstated. One agrees willingly that such a study should not lead to indifferentism, as many fear, for breadth does not necessarily imply shallowness. But a composite religion as is here sketched out does not excite our highest interest. It is an excellent intellectual exercise to work out such a religion from the faiths of the world; it teaches toleration and possibly helps to subdue pride, but it remains an intellectual achievement after all, and the result does not fire the soul with an emotion of reverence and faith. Christianity, if it ever does pass away, will only yield—we say it reverently—to a greater than Jesus Christ, not to “the eternal and permanent religion of humanity,” which is the substratum of the world’s religions. Just here is the defect of this excellent article. It says the right word for the intellectual effects of a study of religions, says it earnestly and impressively, but forgets that the power of the religious life is not mind or heart but *personality*. G. S. G.

THE ESSENCE OF CHRISTIANITY. By Otto Pfeleiderer in *The New World*. September, 1892. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

The religious personality of Jesus is the most important source for perceiving the essence of Christianity, and the most characteristic feature of his personality was his consciousness of divine Sonship. Not in the exclusive, peculiar, unique sense set forth in the doctrine of the Trinity and the Christ, which cannot be realized by us. This may be taken as the historical presupposition of Christianity, but not as its universal essence. The latter consists rather in a kind of consciousness of God common to all men, that which led Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels to refer to God as *his* Father, in no other sense than he taught us to pray, “*Our* Father in heaven,” and in the sense in which Paul speaks of divine Sonship (Gal. iii. 26, Rom. viii. 29). This new relation to God is not one of fear like the Jewish-Gentile piety, but of childlike love, which surrenders the whole man, the undivided pure heart, to the holy will of the Father. Herein lies the essential difference of the Christian conception of God from the Gentile and the Jewish. The God of Christianity is neither on the one hand a personified power of nature or a refined human nature, nor on the other hand, merely an opposite will over against man as lord and judge. He is self-communicating holy love, which does not indeed set aside the ethical constitution of the world, but which leaves men to perceive and prove the better way (Rom. xii. 2); and not only so, but leads them by chastening, if necessary, to become partakers of his holiness (Heb. xii. 10). Herein arises a most important difference between the Law, which was foreign to man and which could merely judge and slay without giving life, and this holy love, which becomes in the heart of man himself the power of the Holy Ghost (2 Cor. iii. 6), the new and free principle of life (Rom. viii. 2), that betrays its divine origin in the begetting of Godly sentiments (Rom. xii. 2). The power of sin is overcome. In this overcoming of sin is included its forgive-

ness. This forgiving is certainly a gracious gift of divine love; yet it is holy love, which does not simply overlook sin and exempt the sinner from the punishment of his guilt—as it might seem—but it effaces guilt itself by breaking and overcoming the natural impulse to sin through the higher power of the holy impulse of the Spirit (Rom. viii. 2). This is the redeeming and reconciling revelation of the essence of God as love, which is one with holy justice.

From this idea of divine Sonship springs the Christian conception of the real dignity of all men. While the Bible fully recognizes this, it does not speak of it so much as of man's universal sinfulness, because it knows that sin is a power that has root in the inmost recesses of human nature and rules over the whole human race. In his battle against this power, the individual is never able to gain the victory unless aided by the redeeming and educating power of the divine Spirit, in the community of the kingdom of God. On the other hand, the Bible recognizes the universal ability of all men to be redeemed, which is based on the indestructible essence of the divine image in every man. This redemption, however, in the sense of the Gospels, is not a miraculous event occurring once, and brought about outside of humanity by a superhuman mediator between the Godhead and humanity; it is an inner process within the heart of man which always and forever repeats itself when the fettered and diseased powers of the soul are freed and healed, when the image of God and the child of God, that slumbers in everyone, are awakened to life, reality and power. Such a force proceeds in every community from those who are relatively sound and strong, and through them affects others. The ideal, the ethical-religious *truth*, is the freeing and elevating power (John viii. 32); the individual is such only in so far as he is a type and voice of the idea.

The special merit of Jesus Christ, compared with other ethical and religious geniuses, consists in this, that at a time when the ancient world was facing spiritual bankruptcy, he perceived this new and exalted ideal of man—divine Sonship. He represented it in his life and teaching, and finally surrendered his life for its realization in a new kingdom of God—a universal community founded on the divine ideal of man as the child of God.

To this ideal of man as potentially the child of God, corresponds also the Christian conception of the world, which finds its purpose in the spiritual-ethical kingdom of God. It becomes an orderly arrangement of means for the purposes of the spirit, and not the plaything of a divine, despotic will, or the arena of fantastic actions of omnipotence, the supernatural miracles of which would supplant real nature by an imaginary super-nature that is unnatural.

The above synopsis represents only a part of Professor Pfeiderer's profound and noteworthy discussion of fundamental principles. The article is significant as an indication of the tendency of scientific thought in its interpretation of the teachings of Scripture. Professor Pfeiderer's position is open to many criticisms. From a purely exegetical point of view, we are constrained to differ with him at the outset, since the

New Testament nowhere explicitly, and only rarely by inference, permits us to speak of a universal sonship of humanity. In his consciousness of God, Jesus never includes himself in the same category with the disciples. He does not say, "I ascend unto our Father, and our God," but, "unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God." The model prayer was dictated for the use of the disciples only. It was not a prayer in which he could unite. The article, moreover, seems to eliminate every supernatural element from God's relation to humanity and to the world. P. A. N.

Notes and Opinions.

The Memorabilia of Jesus.—This book by Peyton on the Gospel of St. John is reviewed briefly and interestingly by Marcus Dods in the November number of the *Expositor*. Dr. Dods censures certain blemishes of style and errors of taste, and has no sympathy with the author's opinion that all questions of genuineness and authenticity in New Testament study are superfluous. He gives, however, the highest praise to the book. "But after all deductions Mr. Peyton's volume is one which for originality of thought and felicity of expression, for the delight it will bring to its readers, and the stimulus it will give to faith, may be put on a level with the best work of this generation To Mr. Peyton is due the credit of setting Christianity in new relations to nature and of thereby eliciting from each a significance previously hidden But the charm of the book arises not more from its main teaching than from the skill and beauty with which the teaching is given. For Mr. Peyton is not only thoroughly equipped in science, he is a poet as well, and conveys his meaning, not in verse, but in that most flexible and least monotonous of instruments, a prose which has all the swing and terseness and flash of poetry. This blend of science and poetry give its peculiar flavor to the book. There are descriptions of nature equal to anything in Kingsley or in Tyndall, while there are expositions of the spiritual life as searching and appeals as tender and inevitable as the finest passages in Maurice. The volume throughout has that peculiar charm and glamor which only genius imparts. From first to last, one scarcely meets a commonplace thought or a thought expressed in a commonplace way, and on almost every page are sentences which will often be quoted as the first and final expression of important truth. Above all, the entire volume is pervaded by faith, courage, hopefulness, charity, the spirit of power and love and a sound mind."

Some Cases of Possession.—Demoniacal possession is the subject of a study by Dean Chadwick, in the October number of the *Expositor*. He considers three cases: 1. The Demoniac in the Synagogue. 2. The woman with a spirit of infirmity. 3. The man with a deaf and dumb spirit.

In considering the first case the writer lays stress on the fact of the intense hostility of the evil spirit to Christ, on his knowledge of him as the Holy one of God, and on Christ's severity with the Spirit and absolute authority over him. The whole relation of the two would hardly be explicable were Christ merely healing some disease. The writer argues for a Kingdom of Evil Spirits, a har-

monious league with Satan at its head. This miracle illustrates the cruel usurpation from which Christ has rescued humanity. The attitude of each is that of undisguised hostility.

In the second case the spiritual thralldom was not that of convulsion, but of impotence, of "palsy and a downward gaze." "It is a beautiful and characteristic incident. But it does not add to our knowledge of the phenomena much more than this, that Satanic influence lay behind other diseases than violent and outrageous ones, and experience coincided with theory, in affirming that there was gradation in the wickedness even of fiends, so that one could find seven others more wicked than himself."

In the third case the evil spirit is cast out and there followed not only tranquillity, but the power to speak. As in the first instance presented, the multitude had been struck by the authority that could cast out evil spirits, so here they exclaim: "It was never so seen in Israel." "In two cases, therefore, out of three, we find a distinct recognition by the public of something which differentiated Christ's treatment of possession from anything known before. Miracles were everywhere. It was impossible that he should escape the imputation of what was ascribed to every popular preacher. But in truth his miracles could not amaze the most critical and scientific age more perfectly than they amazed his own." Commenting on the fact that those possessed of evil spirits are usually afflicted with disease for the most part of a nervous type, he says: "Either the fiend causes the disease, or he takes advantage of it. The latter is in some respects the more attractive theory." The writer concludes by affirming that both experience and reason confirm the testimony of the Scriptures as to the existence of evil spirits.

Christ's Sonship to God.—One of the most interesting questions in Biblical Theology is the New Testament conception, expressed or implied, of Christ's sonship to God. We say "implied" because the conception can not be found merely in any one or more explicit statements, but can only be ascertained, as all sayings of Christ, all sayings about Christ, all events of his life, are carefully studied and compared and made to surrender each its own contributing element.

The central importance of this question not only in Biblical Theology, but also for Systematic Theology is indicated by three articles that have recently appeared: one by Pfeiderer, on "The Essence of Christianity" in the *New World* for September; one, an editorial on "The Divinity of Christ" in the *Andover Review* for October; and the last by the late Dr. Samuel H. Giesy, on "Christ's Essential Sonship" in the *Reformed Quarterly Review* for October.

Pfeiderer seeks the essence of Christianity not in the historical development of the Church, though it may be found there, but in the personality of Christ, as disclosed in the New Testament writings, and he finds this essence in the rela-

tion of sonship to God. All admit, says Pfeleiderer, that this consciousness of sonship is the characteristic feature of the personality of Jesus, but men would differ in their understanding of this consciousness. Pfeleiderer takes the first three Gospels as evidence and asserts that, as witnessed to in them, the consciousness is one that may be common to all men. Jesus called God *His* Father in no other sense than the one in which he taught us to pray "Our Father in Heaven." He admits that Jesus occupies a unique position in that he was the first perfectly to realize this ideal of sonship, but the conception of Jesus as the Christ, as it is presented in the New Testament and found in the early Church, is the result of the influence of Jewish apocalyptic and Hellenistic modes of thought. But may it not be that this Sonship of Christ being a wholly unique relation to God, one realized by no one before or since, needs for its expression words no less pregnant than those of the New Testament and the Nicene creed, and for its interpretation no less a doctrine, modified, it may be, but still essentially the same, than that formulated in the fourth century—the doctrine of the Trinity. Such is the position of the last two articles in which Christ's essential sonship as an eternal relation between himself and the Father is maintained.

The question of fact concerning Jesus' sonship is one thing; of interpretation, another. For the fact we turn to the historical and critical student of the New Testament writings; for its interpretation, in its threefold relation to God, to man and to the world, we turn to the philosopher of the Christian religion. As a fact disclosed through the New Testament writings, what was the nature of Christ's sonship?

The Revised Version.—Under this heading Bishop William Walsham How, in the October *Expositor*, suggests a plan by which the Revised Version may be made more acceptable to English readers. The Revised Version, he asserts, has by no means taken the place it should have taken and that it was expected to take. He attributes this fact to the many unnecessary changes in revision. The revision committee far exceeded the power given them, in this respect, standing in marked contrast to the Old Testament revisers. They were to revise only where "plain and clear errors were found to exist." The Convocation from which the committee derived its authority did "not contemplate any new translation of the Bible or any *alterations of the language* except where, in the judgment of the most competent scholars, *such change is necessary.*" When the new version finally appeared it was found to contain "a multitude of minute and unimportant alterations, and by degrees the value of the really important corrections became more and more obscured by the multiplicity of what I fear I must call trivial and unnecessary changes." The book "which was received with so much interest has forfeited its first popularity, and is now comparatively neglected." In the Sermon on the Mount, there are 127 changes, some of which Bishop How characterizes as irritating trivialities, such as: "lift herself up," instead of "lift up herself;" "disbe-

lieved," for "believed not;" "Disciples of Moses," for "Moses' Disciples;" "if there is," for "if there be;" "scoffed at," for "derided;" etc.

Other changes that hardly seem "necessary" are such as the following: "reproach," for "revile;" "a city set on a hill," for "a city that is set on a hill;" "it shineth," for "it giveth light;" "in no wise," for "in no case;" "last," for "uttermost;" "by the heaven," for "by heaven," etc. Notwithstanding his strictures, Bishop How speaks in the highest terms of the work of the revisers so far as it concerns the necessary alterations.

Bishop Ellicott, before the revision, made seventy-five changes in the Sermon on the Mount, the revisers made 127. Bishop How would make only twenty-four.

He commends a suggestion made by the late Dr. Liddon some years ago, that the alterations be reduced so as to be brought within the limits of the original instructions, and that these then be printed in the margin of the text in an edition prepared for reading in Church. He closes his interesting article with these words: "I think at least my readers will agree with me in holding that it would be an inestimable boon if the uncritical and unlearned hearer could listen to the words he has learned to love and revere with more intelligent understanding through the removal of 'plain and clear errors,' whether of reading or of translation, as well as of serious obscurities, without losing his sense of familiarity with the wording and idioms of our old translation, so pure in its diction, so grand in its flowing periods, so priceless in its influence upon all our literature, so faithful in its simplicity, and so dear to thousands and tens of thousands of Christian souls." T. H. R.

It is commonly supposed in this country that English and American theologians are much more conservative than German scholars, less ready to welcome a new opinion and forsake an old. In general no doubt this is true. But a recent remark of Prof. Schürer brings freshly to light, what was indeed by no means unknown before, that in certain lines of thought the Germans exceed English speaking scholars in conservatism. In a review (in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Oct. 29) of T. K. Abbott's recent volume of *Essays, chiefly on the original texts of the Old and New Testaments*, he says that the two essays on the Hebrew text of the Old Testament "give welcome proof that certain critical views which in Germany still have to struggle for existence, are in conservative England already more and more prevalent." The reason for this apparent anomaly is not far to seek. Relatively speaking English scholars have devoted larger attention to textual criticism, German scholars to historical criticism. Despite the preëminence of the work and name of Tischendorf, Germany has not led in textual criticism. It is an interesting fact that one of the most eminent—perhaps one may say the most eminent—textual critic in Germany to-day is an American, born and educated in this country. The result of the relatively larger attention to matters of textual criticism by English-speaking scholars is that in England and America,

questions of the text of the Bible are viewed with complacency and new views are considered, with critical interest indeed, but without alarm. Indeed though there was a time when the investigations of textual critics were viewed with apprehension it is now clearly recognized that their work has issued not only in producing a purer text, but—scarcely less important—in establishing upon a much firmer basis of evidence that great portion of the text which is left unchanged by the work of textual criticism. It is in part the recognition of this fact that has secured for textual criticism an undisputed place among the Biblical Sciences. There are some signs that what has happened in reference to Textual Criticism is about to happen also in reference to Historical Criticism. Possibly if to German indefatigable toil in investigation, and inexhaustible fertility of imagination there could be added in the work of historical criticism somewhat more of the English and American coolness and sobriety of judgment, this science might the sooner assume the position of real and recognised helpfulness already secured by its allied science of textual criticism.

E. D. B.

Work and Workers.

THE second part of the new *Hebrew Lexicon*, edited by Professor Brown, is announced for publication soon.

CASSELL & Co. have published a new work by B. T. A. Evetts, entitled, *New Lights on the Bible and the Holy Land*.

AT the Baptist State Conference of New York, Professor Wheeler, of Cornell, gave an address on The Study of the Bible.

AUGUST MÜLLER, professor in the University of Königsberg, is another man recently deceased connected with Biblical scholarship through its Semitic side.

AMONG the interests represented on the grounds of the World's Fair next summer, will be that of the Sunday Schools. It is proposed to erect a building, which shall be devoted to the use of Sunday School interests. Subscriptions are now being received for this purpose, and the erection of the building is considered secured.

M. RÉNAN'S *History of the People of Israel*, which was not completed at the time of his death, will be continued under the superintendence of his widow. A large number of notes have also been left to her care. The supposition may be that we shall have one or more posthumous volumes edited from these notes.

FOLLOWING in the wake of the issue during the last year of Genesis as divided by the critics who accept the documentary hypothesis, comes the announcement of a new book along this line. It is the first volume of the *Hexateuchal Documents*, containing the Jahvist and Elohist portions, arranged by W. E. Addis. The second volume, which is promised within a year, will contain the Priestly and Deuteronomic portions. The publisher is David Nutt, of London.

Dr. FREDERIC GODET, of Neufchatel, whose work as a commentator is known wherever the Bible is studied, has just passed his eightieth birthday. This was made the occasion of a memorial, which took the form of an address from students and friends, accompanied by a service of silver. Not only is he known as a scholar, but, by his pupils and the friends of his church, as a man whose fatherly interests have endeared him to those who have been in any way connected with him.

THAT the same question is meeting a very different answer at the hands of other Jewish leaders is seen in two books recently published, *The Pronoas to Holy Writ*, by Rabbi Wise, the President of the Hebrew College in Cincinnati, and *The Jewish Religion*, by Dr. Friedlander, of the Jewish College in London. They assert that a belief in the integrity of the Hebrew Scriptures is an essential part of the Jewish creed, and do not hesitate to characterize the position of those who, like Mr. Montefiore, hold to the opposite view, as savoring of antagonism to Judaism.

THE death of Joseph Ernest Rénan has taken away one who has stood for a long time prominent in two ways. Perhaps no one has been, to the minds of the mass of intelligent Christians in this and other countries, the representative, the negative spirit in the scholarship of Biblical subjects so much as he. But there was a positive side to his work, which gives him a place among Biblical scholars. His two most widely known works are his *Life of Jesus* and his *History of the People of Israel*, but his relation to scholarship was determined by his *General History of the Semitic Languages*.

A BOOK on Buddhism, by the Bishop of Colombo, is on the list of announcements by Longmans. Bishop Copleston was raised to his office while very young, and was known in Ceylon as "the Boy Bishop" in the early years of his episcopate. He is a man of extensive scholarship, and has devoted much attention to the religions with which Christianity comes in contact in his bishopric. In that classic land of Buddhism he has had advantages that are unparalleled for a study of this system in its living aspects. A book from such a source should be one of great value.

Dr. C. F. KENT, of the University of Chicago, has been delivering a series of addresses before the various ministers' clubs of the city on "University Extension," especially emphasising the subject of thorough, scientific Bible study. Great interest has been manifested, and University Extension promises soon to become a most valuable medium for bringing to the general public a truer appreciation and clearer knowledge of the content and thought of the Old and New Testament books. To meet this need, the University of Chicago, in its last Extension Calender, offers thirty-four courses on this and kindred subjects.

OTHER new books soon to appear, are a continuation of the translation of Hausrath's *New Testament Times*, from the press of Williams & Norgate; a new edition of Robertson's *Early History of Israel*, with a new preface, from Blackwood's; *Old Testament Criticism: Sermons* by Canon Driver, a volume which is supplementary to his Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament; Erman's *Life in Ancient Egypt*, published by Macmillan. The same house also publishes Kirkpatrick's *Warburtonian Lectures on the Minor Prophets*. Two more volumes of Canon Liddon's writings are to be soon

published by Longmans: *Lectures and Essays*, and *The Epistle to the Romans*.

ONE of the most hopeful omens of the many movements in these days whose purpose is to draw Christians, and especially young Christians, into active work, is the attention which is being given to systematic Bible study as a means of Christian growth. The *Golden Rule* is publishing a series of Bible studies. The *Silver Cross*, the organ of the King's Daughters, is publishing a series of condensed studies on the early Christian Church, and the *Baptist Young People*, the organ of the Baptist Young People's Union, has begun a series of studies in the life of Christ, by Rev. O. C. S. Wallace, of Toronto. The *Young Men's Era* has for some time published studies in the Bible as one of its regular departments. All this is aside from regular and systematic Sunday School publications.

THERE is no Christian body in Jerusalem which is so strong as the Greek Church. Of late years Russian influence has been pushing its way here with vigor, and producing marked results. To the traveler, the most obvious proof of this is in the new and fine Russian buildings which form prominent landmarks in the Holy City. It is gratifying to know that the Russians are using their influence for scholarly purposes as well. The Russian Palestine Society has recently published a series, to be composed of three volumes, entitled *Analecta Hierosolymitana*. This consists of unpublished texts from the libraries of Jerusalem. Most are of a patristic nature, but many are of mediæval origin and interest. All are Greek. The same society has also published, in four volumes, a detailed catalogue of the manuscripts in the Patriarchal Library in Jerusalem.

AMONG the new books announced are the *Hibbard Lectures for 1892*, by Claude G. Montefiore, M. A. These lectures will be of especial interest to all students of the Bible as interpreted in the light of the movements of the day. Mr. Montefiore is a Jew, and has treated in these lectures the development of the Jewish religion. What makes this treatment of especial interest is the fact that he accepts without reserve the results of critical research on the Old Testament. What result is this to have on the religious position of a Jew? To a Christian, the division of the Hexateuch is by many held to be a matter of secondary importance. But to a Jew, must it not be in every way a vital matter? What becomes of the details of the Jewish ritual? What becomes of the Jewish creeds? In a word, what becomes of Judaism itself? It is these questions which make this forthcoming book of interest to all whose sympathy is capable of extending beyond the boundaries of the problems of their own creed.

Book Reviews.

THE REVISERS' GREEK TEXT: A Critical Examination of Certain Readings, Textual and Marginal, in the Original Greek of the New Testament, adopted by the late Anglo-American Revisers. By Rev. S. W. Whitney, A. M. Boston: Silver, Burdett & Co. 2 vols. Vol. I, pp. 361, Vol. II, pp. 350.

The problem which this book discusses is one well worthy of careful investigation. It is by no means to be accepted without argument that the Greek text, adopted by the New Testament Revisers of 1881, is at every point correct. To re-examine the evidence on which they based their conclusions, including also new evidence which has come to light in the little more than a decade since they did their work, and intelligently to criticise their conclusions is to render a valuable service to students of the New Testament. This is the task to which Mr. Whitney has set himself. His book gives proof of large knowledge of the sources of evidence and of a good degree of insight. After an introduction in which he clearly indicates what the general character and tendency of the body of the work is to be, he proceeds to discuss in detail the Revisers' text or their marginal reading in nearly six hundred passages of the New Testament, usually comparing with it the text of the Common Version. The tendency of the author's arguments is pretty constantly toward the conclusion that the revisers have in a multitude of cases erred, chiefly through giving an undue weight of authority to a certain few very ancient manuscripts, and that they have as a consequence adopted an erroneous reading of the Greek text. This conclusion repeatedly reached in particular cases, is made to support the doctrine that textual questions ought to be settled, not by appeal to the supposedly superior authority of any manuscript or manuscripts, but rather in the main by the application of the principles of internal evidence to each individual case. As between internal evidence based on the probability that the Scripture author would write this or that, and that based on probability respecting the conduct of a scribe in transcribing, Mr. Whitney lays special stress upon the former. There runs through his discussion a thread of depreciation of such manuscripts as the Sinaitic, the Vatican, the Alexandrian, the Codex Ephræmi Syri Rescriptus and the Regius Parisiensis. The student of the textual criticism of the New Testament will easily see that he sympathizes with the opinions of Dr. Scrivener and Dean Burgon rather than with those of Dr. Hort. The author does scant justice to the method of internal evidence

of groups. As respects the genealogical method more strictly so-called, it is only by an occasional passing phrase that the reader learns that the author has even so much as heard of it. His reticence may be due to the desire to avoid technical terms, but the book seems to show also that the author has never really appreciated the force of the argument on behalf of the method which he ignores. Mr. Whitney has given us a valuable and even acute discussion of the "internal evidence of readings" in a large number of New Testament passages; and for this the book is to be cordially welcomed. A discriminating reader will be constrained in a number of instances to agree with Mr. Whitney as against the revisers; and even assent though, perhaps, not with the heartiness that the author would desire, to his contention that the agreement of two or three of the most ancient manuscripts is not entitled to the weight commonly given to it by Westcott and Hort. But we cannot ourselves either expect or desire that the book should persuade any scholar to abandon the genealogical method and rely wholly or mainly on internal evidence of readings. Neither could we advise the student of the Revised Version, who has not investigated the subject of textual criticism to accept Mr. Whitney's conclusions unquestioningly. Probably he would do better to rely on the Revised Version alone, than to commit himself wholly to Mr. Whitney, who would certainly in many instances lead him quite astray.

By the insertion of both the Greek text and the English translation, the book is adapted to be used both by the Greek scholar and the English student. The style is clear, and despite the somewhat technical character of the discussion, the reader is carried along by interests in the subject. The publishers have done their work admirably.

E. D. B.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By John H. Kerr, A. M., Pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church of Rock Island, Ill. With an Introductory Note by Professor Benjamin B. Warfield, D. D. Fleming H. Revell Co., Chicago and New York. pp. 333. \$1.50.

The appearance of such a book as this, coming from the source it does, is a gratifying fact. It shows that average Christian congregations can be interested in discussions that are commonly supposed to belong exclusively to theological seminaries, or to ministerial circles. It shows furthermore that pastors are found who do not begrudge the time and labor for preparation which such discussions imperatively demand. The author is a busy pastor, and the volume has grown out of a series of sermons originally addressed to his own people. Accordingly, the treatment is popular rather than technical. While he has consulted the leading recent works in this department, he has not permitted himself to be seduced from conservative, not to say traditional, views by the undue influence of great names. The main facts are clearly stated, and with ample fullness to meet the requirements of those for whom the book was written. The reader will find the analyses of the various New Testament books helpful, though one could wish that they had been prepared

with more regard to proportion. The analyses of the synoptic Gospels, for instance, including respectively 28, 16 and 24 chapters, are dismissed in about a third of a page for each, while those of the epistles to the Colossians, Philippians, and I Timothy, including respectively only 4, 4, and 6 chapters, cover from one and a half to two pages each. In the latter cases they are reasonably full and satisfactory; in the former, they fail to exhibit more than a few salient points in the narratives.

Throughout his work the author falls into the common error of confounding "canonicity" with "genuineness." The former refers exclusively to the relation which any particular book or epistle sustains to the sacred canon. The fact that a book is admitted into the canon establishes at once its canonicity, but leaves the question of its genuineness to be determined by independent investigation. The Epistle of Barnabas may be genuine, though not canonical; the Second Epistle of Peter is canonical, though it may not be genuine.

As a whole, the book is thoroughly well adapted to promote that more intelligent study of the Bible, which is one of the encouraging signs of our times.

P. A. N.

GOSPEL FROM TWO TESTAMENTS. Sermons on the International Sunday-School Lessons for 1893. Edited by Rev. E. Benjamin Andrews, D.D., LL. D., President of Brown University. Providence: Press of E. A. Johnson & Co., 1892. Pp. x and 448. Price \$1.25.

This is a book that every Sunday School teacher should read. It follows a different plan from that of most "Helps." Its aim is to give in a clear, connected way the setting of each passage and the various teachings, religious or other, that may legitimately be drawn from the text. The attempt is not made to deduce all Christian doctrine from any single passage, but each lesson is treated in a common-sense way, which is very commendable. The teacher that has studied the ordinary helps will often find himself lost in the details of exegesis and illustration. But in this book he will find the lesson well summed up, its teachings and their general bearings and applications plainly indicated, so that he will be able to meet his class with the consciousness of power that comes from the mastery of a subject in its greater relations as well as in its details. About fifty men, pastors or professors, have had a part in the preparation of this volume. The work is therefore varied, but it is all good. A reverent, healthy, scholarly tone pervades the book. There are many sermons here that are models of expository preaching. One is surprised that a style of sermonizing which, it was thought, was out of fashion, should be so well represented as is in this volume.

O. J. T.

Bibliography.

Books—Old Testament.

1. *The Early Narratives of Genesis.* By H. E. Ryle, B. D. New York: Macmillan, 1892. \$1.00.
2. *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament. Herausgegeben von Prof. W. Nowack. 2 Abtheilung, 2 Band. Die Poetischen Bücher. 2 Band, Die Psalmen, übersetzt und erklärt von Prof. Frdr. Baethgen.* Göttingen: Vanderhoeck, 1892. M 8.20.
3. *The Books of Chronicles, in Relation to the Pentateuch and the Higher Criticism.* By Bishop Hervey. London: S. P. C. K., 1892. 2s.
4. *The People's Bible. Vol. 17. Hosea-Malachi.* By Jos. Parker, D. D. London: Hazell, 1892. 8s.
5. *Les Prophètes d'Israel.* By Meignan. Paris, 1892. 7.50 fr.
6. *Old Testament Difficulties: Being a Collection of Papers written for Workingmen.* By A. F. W. Ingram. London: S. P. C. K., 1892. 6d.
7. *Der Friede, die Lehre, das Ideal, und das Leben Israels.* By Dr. Adclf Kurrein. Franfort-a-M. Kauffman, 1892. M 1.
8. *Les Erreurs Scientifiques de la Bible.* By E. Ferrière. Paris: Alcan, 1892. 3.50 fr.
9. *Sermons on the International Sunday School Lessons for 1893.* By the Monday Club. 18th series. Boston: Cong. S. S. Pub. Soc'y, 1892. \$1.25.
10. *Bible Studies from the Old and New Testaments, covering the International Sunday School Lessons for 1893.* By Geo. F. Pentecost. New York: Barnes, 1892.

11. *Hints and Helps on the Sunday School Lessons for 1893.* By Rev. D. James, D. D., and Rev. J. D. Burrell. New York: Amer. Tract Soc'y, 1892. \$1.25.

Articles and Reviews—Old Testament.

12. *Professor Huxley versus Genesis I.* By C. B. Warring, Ph. D., in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oct. 1892.
13. *The Noachian Deluge and its Analogues.* By Rev. F. H. Woods, in *Expository Times*, Nov. 1892.
14. *The Notion of Divine Covenants in the Bible.* By Prof. J. S. Candlish, D. D., in *Expository Times*, Nov. 1892.
15. *Esdraelon.* By Prof. G. A. Smith, in *The Expositor*, Nov. 1892.
16. *Balaam's Prophecies—Their Form and Import.* By Prof. W. W. Martin, in *Methodist Review*, Sept.-Oct. 1892.
17. *Date of the Samaritan Pentateuch.* By Rev. H. D. Astley, in *The Thinker*, Oct. 1892.
18. *The Samaritan Acceptance of the Pentateuch.* By Rev. H. Hayman, D. D., in *The Thinker*, Sept. 1892.
19. *The Authorship and Composition of the Hexateuch.* By C. Van Den Biesen, in *Dublin Review*, Oct. 1892.
20. *Antiquity of the Book of Joshua.* By Henry Hayman, D. D., in *The Thinker*, Oct. 1892.
21. *Chronicles, No. II.* By Rev. A. C. Jennings, M. A., in *The Thinker*, Sept. 1892.
22. *Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter.* By Prof. W. W. Davies, D. D., in *the Methodist Review*, Nov.-Dec. 1892.

23. *The Chronological Order of the Earlier Visions of Isaiah*. By Rev. F. Tilney Bassett, M. A., in *The Thinker*, Sept. 1892.
24. *Latest Theories about the Book of Isaiah*. By Rev. J. M. Burwash, in *The Thinker*, Sept. 1892.
25. *Davidson's Ezekiel*. By Prof. S. R. Driver, in *The Expositor*, Nov. 1892.
26. *Jonah in Nineveh*. By H. C. Trumbull, D. D., in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oct. 1892.
27. *Hebrew Prophets and Prophecy*. By R. V. Foster, in *Cumb. Presbyt. Review*, Oct. 1892.
28. *Prescience of Future Contingencies Impossible*. By Prof. L. D. McCabe, D. D., in *Methodist Review*, Sept.-Oct. 1892.
29. *Minute Prediction and Modern Doubt*. By A. W. Archibald, D. D., in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oct. 1892.
30. *Zoroaster and Israel*. By Rev. J. H. Moulton, in *The Thinker*, Oct. 1892.
31. *Prof. Sayce and the Higher Criticism*. By Prof. S. R. Driver, D. D., in *Expository Times*, Nov. 1892.
32. *The Hibbert Lectures for 1892*. Editorial in *Expository Times*, Nov. 1892.
33. *Ernest Renan*. Biographical and critical articles concerning him in *Contemp. Review*, *Fortnightly Review*, *Nineteenth Cent. Review*, *Expository Times*, Nov. 1892.
- Books—New Testament.**
34. *The Memorabilia of Jesus, commonly called the Gospel of John*. By W. W. Peyton. London: Black, 1892. 10s. 6d.
35. *The Teaching of Jesus*. Vol. II. By Dr. H. H. Wendt. Translated by Rev. Jno. Wilson. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1892.
36. *Neutestamentliche Theologie oder geschichtliche Darstellung der Lehren Jesu und des Urchristenthums nach den Neutestamentlichen Quellen*. By Prof. Willibert Beyschlag. 2 Band. Halle a S.: Strien, 1892. M 10.
37. *Histoire de Jésu-Christ, d'après les évangiles et la tradition, expliquée à l'aide des monuments, de la description des lieux et de commentaires des écrivains ecclésiastiques*. By Abbé J. J. Bourassé. Tours: Mame, 1892.
38. *Saint Peter and the First Years of Christianity*. By Abbé Constant Fouard. Translated by G. F. X. Griffith. Introduction by Cardinal Gibbons. New York: Longmans, 1892. \$2.00.
39. *Das Evangelium Johannis ausgelegt*. By Dr. Rudolph Kögel. 1 Hälfte. Bremen: Müller. 1892. M 7.50.
40. *An Exposition of St. Paul to the Romans*. By R. M. Benson. London: Masters, 1892. 6s.
41. *Der Brief an die Galatäer, übersetzt und erklärt*. — München: Seyberth, 1892. 60 pf.
42. *The Teachers' Synoptical Syllabus. With reference tables, maps, plans, diagrams, etc., for blackboard purposes, with an introduction by W. M. Sinclair*. By C. Neil. London: Nisbet, 1892. 12s.
43. *Christian Scriptures. Vol. III*. By Bartlett and Peters. \$2.00.
44. *Revelation and the Bible*. By Robt. F. Horton, M. A. New York: Macmillan, 1892. \$2.00.
- Articles and Reviews.—New Testament.**
45. *Peyton's Memorabilia of Jesus*. By Prof. Marcus Dods, in *The Expositor*, Nov., 1892; also by Rev. G. E. Nouf, in *Expository Times*, Nov. 1892.
46. *The Gospels and Modern Criticism*. By Rev. J. J. Halcombe, in *Expository Times*, Nov. 1892.
47. *Peter's Wife's Mother*. By G. A. Chadwick, D. D., in *The Expositor*, Nov. 1892.
48. *The Prophet Caiaphas*. Editorial in *Expository Times*, Nov. 1892.

49. *St. Paul's First Journey in Asia Minor.* By Prof. W. M. Ramsay, in *The Expositor*, Nov. 1892.
50. *The Poet Jesus.* By Rev. C. S. Nutter, D. D., in *Methodist Review*, Sept.-Oct. 1892.
51. *The Testimony of Josephus to Jesus.* By G. A. Müller, in *The Thinker*, Sept. 1892.
52. *The Word Hour in the New Testament.* By W. T. Smith, in *The Thinker*, Sept. 1892.
53. *Some Aspects of the Temptation.* By Rev. J. F. Vallings, in *The Thinker*, Oct. 1892.
54. *The Divinity of Christ vs. The Divine Human Personality.* Editorial in *Andover Review*, Oct. 1892.
55. *John and His Gospel.* By J. G. Patton, in *Cumb. Presbyt. Review*, Oct. 1892.
56. *New Testament Criticism and Religious Belief.* By Prof. Orello Cone, D. D., in *The New World*, Sept. 1892.
57. *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament.* By Rev. J. M. Ludlow, in *The Thinker*, Sept. 1892.
58. *Does the Bible Contain Scientific Errors?* By Prof. Chas. W. Shields, in *The Century*, Nov. 1892.
59. *Christian Eschatology.* By Prof. J. R. Cooke, D. D., in *Methodist Review*, Nov.-Dec. 1892.
60. *The Bible as a Classic.* Prof. Moulton, in *Review of the Churches*, Sept. 1892.
61. *Historical Preparation for Christianity.* By Rev. Sam. Weir, in *Methodist Review*, Nov.-Dec. 1892.
62. *Facts and Fancies of the Higher Criticism.* By Joseph Cook, D. D., in *Our Day*, 1892.
63. *The History and Definition of Higher Criticism.* By Howard Osgood, D. D., in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oct. 1892.
64. *The Doctrine of the Atonement in the New Testament. IX. Rationale of the Atonement.* By Prof. J. A. Beet, D. D., in *The Expositor*, Nov. 1892.
65. *Is the Revised Version a Failure?* By Prin. David Brown, D. D., in *Expository Times*, Nov. 1892.