THE BIBLICAL WORLD

CONTINUING

The Old and New Testament Student

VOLUME VI. NOVEMBER, 1895 NUMBER 5

THE student of religion is confronted at the outset with a serious problem. He expects to be introduced into his investigations with a reasonably definite statement of the character of his subject. In other words he seeks in the beginning a definition of religion. This would seem to be essential, fundamental. But hardly any other word can be chosen for which there is a greater variety of definitions. No writer on the theme is willing to accept that of his predecessors but must needs make a new one. Professor Max Müller would have us believe that "Religion is a mental faculty or disposition, which, independent of, nay, in spite of sense and reason enables man to apprehend the Infinite." "Religion is a sense of infinite dependence," was Schleiermacher's statement. Principal Grant is willing to regard religion as "that faith in the unseen which is recognized as an essential part of man's constitution," while Professor Flint maintains that it "is man's belief in a Being, or beings, mightier than himself, and inaccessible to his senses, but not indifferent to his sentiments and actions, with the feelings and practices which flow from such belief." In Principal Caird's view it is of "the very essence of religion that the Infinite has ceased to be merely a far-off vision of spiritual attainment and ideal of indefinite future perfection and has become a present reality." A later view of Max Müller regards religion as consisting "in the perception of the Infinite under such manifestations as are able to influence the moral nature of

DEFINITIONS OF RELIGION

man." Kellogg in his *Genesis and Growth of Religion* after noting some of these definitions along with others and finding them wanting, declares that "Religion essentially consists in man's apprehension of his relation to an invisible Power or powers, able to influence his destiny, to which he is necessarily subject, together with the feelings, desires and actions, which this apprehension calls forth." Dr. Menzies has given the latest discussion of the point in his *History of Religion*[1] where he also criticizes the view of other scholars and presents his own verdict which is that "Religion is the worship of unseen powers from a sense of need." But the next critic will surely decline to cast out of the sphere of religion everything which is not worship of *unseen* powers. These powers must be "higher," he will perhaps admit, but they need not necessarily be "unseen." And so the unending search after the adequate definition will go on.

WHY SO DIFFERENT?

THE reason for these differences of opinion on the part of scholars whose knowledge of their subject is wide and accurate is hard to understand. With some it is doubtless owing to differing philosophical presuppositions; an *a priori* theory conditions the treatment. Others have theological views that narrow or broaden their conception of the field. Again, religious theory has been emphasized and practices overlooked, or *vice versa*. Religion has always had the power of stirring the deepest feelings of men's souls. Their attitudes toward it have been not only various, but maintained with tenacity and advocated with vehemence. May we not discover one cause of the variety of definition in the fact of the relation of religion to human life, individual and social, a relation which is at once fundamental and pervasive? It conditions all spheres of man's existence. It has its intellectual side where it seems to be all, and nothing but, thought, a faculty of the mind or the product of it. Yet the feelings are equally dominated by the religious sentiment, and, if anywhere religion has manifested itself in wondrous forms, the realm of the emotions is such a

[1] *History of Religion*, by Allan Menzies, D.D., pp. 6–11.

sphere. It moves to actions, wise and foolish, selfish and self-sacrificing, heroic and devilish. In one and all of these fields religion has its home, a deep, underlying force. No wonder that men have defined it in terms of intellect, emotion, or action, according as they have regarded either element as supreme.

THE SOCIAL ASPECT OF RELIGION

But religion is also a social phenomenon and a definition must not be narrowed to the limits of the individual life. Gruppe has pointed out in the introductory pages of his *Greek Cults and Myths* the very significant fact that man has never desired to keep his religious light and truth to himself. It were possible that the one who feels himself possessed of new insight into the character of the "higher powers" and enjoying peculiar relations to them, might desire to preserve this insight for his own illumination or reserve these peculiar privileges to his own advantage. In fact, however, religion has always had a doctrine to *communicate*, something to teach to others. It is, therefore, a social force, an element of corporate humanity. Its promises have been wider than the individual. Its hopes have embraced communities. Its energies have revealed themselves in the larger realm of society. Thus its blessings and its baneful influences have been magnified an hundredfold. The way has been opened for the selfish dominance of a corrupt priesthood, as well as for the uplifting example of heroic devotion given by the missionary and the martyr. What has so deeply stirred the individual soul in all its capacities and energies, has had equal weight in the world of men, in the various fields of human history. There religion has entered as a permanent and decisive factor to such an extent that it is possible to write a universal history of mankind from the point of view of the religious element, while, on the other hand to know the history of religion in any nation, one must trace its presence in the national politics, language, art and literature. Of what other element of individual or social life can so much be affirmed?

FROM the point of view now suggested the value of the study of universal religion may legitimately be urged. It is the study of the most profoundly influential element in history.

WHY STUDY NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS?

In his recent valuable book on *The Religions of India* Professor Hopkins has summed up in detail the utility of the knowledge of that branch of the subject which he discusses. He asks and answers the question,[1] "In what . . . lies the importance of the study of Hindu religions?" We would do well to consider some of the details of his answer.

THE importance in the first place lies, he says, "in the revelation, which is made by this study, of the origin and growth of theistic ideas in one land; in the light these cast by analogy on the origin of such ideas elsewhere."

1. FOR ILLUMINATION

Man's thought about God, the highest and richest subject of man's thinking, is worthy of study wherever it appears; especially worthy in India where it grew through worship of nature in its varied aspects into higher spiritual forms, perhaps the noblest structure of human intellection ever reared by man apart from special divine revelation. Such was India's theism. So clearly do the steps of the process lie before us in the literary monuments of the Hindus that they enable us to read with greater certainty the more indefinite tracings of similar movements among other peoples.

ANOTHER element of value appears according to the author, "in the prodigious significance of the religious factor in the development of a race as exhibited in this instance; in the inspiring review of that development as it is seen through successive ages in the loftiest aspirations of a great people." The study of universal religion cannot but fill the student with faith in the essential reality of the religious life, with wonder at its tremendous power in society — moulding, transforming, destroying, recreating, — with reverence

2. FOR INSPIRATION

[1] *Cf. The Religions of India*, by E. W. Hopkins, Ph.D., pp. 564–565.

and adoration before the Creator and Sustainer and Inspirer of the spiritual nature of man. These sentiments are aroused and developed in no common measure in the review of the phenomena presented by India's religious history, when man has made religion the culmination of individual and social existence and in his pursuit of the highest good has risen so high.

---

3. For Admonition

The writer proceeds a step further to find another element of value "finally in the lesson taught by the intellectual and religious fate of them among that people that have substituted, like the Brahman ritualist, form for spirit; like the Vedantist, ideas for ideals; like the sectary, emotion for morality. But greatest, if woeful, is the lesson taught by that phase of Buddhism, which has developed into Lamaism and its kindred cults. For here one learns how few are they that can endure to be wise, how inaccessible to the masses is the height on which sits the sage, how unpalatable to the vulgar is a religion without credulity." The warnings which universal religion delivers are not the least of its benefits. If we recognize that all history, besides that of the Hebrews, has its instructions which mankind must needs heed, so does all religion, besides that which is the guardian of a special revelation, convey lessons which are to be sympathetically and earnestly pondered. Ritualism and rationalism have not preyed on Christianity alone. They have undermined the religions of India also. Superficial playing upon the religious feelings has had its reward there as it surely will manifest its results here. The attempt to make religion dwell in one part of man's nature, to satisfy the human mind and starve the heart which cries out after the living God, to please the sense or to quiet the conscience by anything else than obedience to truth and righteousness—these things are not yet dead among us, and it is well that we can know from the religious history of this far away people the spiritual degeneracy, if not death, which lies that way.

WITH these positive benefits accruing from the study of this one group of religions, there is mentioned also what we may not expect to gain from their study: Their importance is "not, we venture to think, in their face value for the religious or philosophical life of the Occident." Some western student, whose religious life may have been early brought into contact with a narrow, crude and unlovely form of Christian thought and practice, has in his later studies been admitted into the broader sphere of Hindu speculation and religious mysticism. He has been entranced and inspired by the vision, and has gone forth to proclaim the superiority of the faith born on the banks of the Indus or the Ganges. The vision was a real one, but the inference was a delusion and the proclamation is a mockery. The doctrine which was abandoned was not the Gospel of Christ. The full-orbed truth which lay so near in the Bible and the spirit of the Christ is something far above and beyond the little segment, the scattered rays, from the southern sky. Christianity will give; it has no need to borrow. As Professor Fisher has said recently,[1] it "is the complement of the other religions. It supplies what they lack. It realizes what they vaguely aspire after. It takes up and assimilates whatever is good in them. In a word Christianity is the absolute religion."

4. Not to Supersede or Improve the Gospel of Christ

ENOUGH has been presented to illustrate the proper sphere of the study of non-Christian religions. It is valuable for its demonstration of the divine presence in the heart of man and in the world, for the light it throws on the great questions of religious origins and of religious development, and for the instruction it affords respecting the outcome of tendencies in religion that are confined to no one people, tendencies from which Christianity is not free. Such studies, summed up under the comprehensive title of Comparative-Religion, are invigorating, illuminating, admonitory and inspirational. For the Christian thinker Com-

Comparative Religion no Bugbear

[1] In *The Outlook*, October 5, 1895.

parative-Religion has no terrors; rather it is full of rich fruit. To him, however, as Professor Fisher has said, "its proper fruit is not a patchwork of notions, a fabric of eclecticism, but a deeper perception of the fulfilment in Christianity of implied and often half-conscious prophecies." The only regrettable fact is that so few of our ministers and divinity students are awakened to its real importance.

THREE BIBLICAL SONNETS.[1]

Arranged by PROFESSOR RICHARD G. MOULTON,
University of Chicago.

I.

THE SLUGGARD.

Go to the ant thou sluggard;
Consider her ways, and be wise:
  Which having no chief,
  Overseer,
  Or ruler,
Provideth her meat in the summer,
And gathereth her food in the harvest.

How long wilt thou sleep, O sluggard?
When wilt thou arise out of thy sleep?
  "Yet a little sleep,
  A little slumber,
  A little folding of the hands to sleep"—
So shall thy poverty come as a robber,
And thy want as an armed man!

Proverbs 6:6–10.

[1] The limitation of the sonnet to fourteen lines (as is common in Italian and English sonnets) does not obtain in biblical poetry.—R. G. M.

II.

THE SLOTHFUL.

I went by the field of the slothful,
And by the vineyard of the man void of understanding,
  And, lo, it was all grown over with thorns,
  The face thereof was covered with nettles,
  And the stone wall thereof was broken down.
Then I beheld,
And considered well:
I saw,
And received instruction.
  "Yet a little sleep,
  A little slumber,
A little folding of the hands to sleep"—
So shall thy poverty come as a robber,
And thy want as an armed man.

Proverbs 24:30–34.

III.

THE FOOL.

Weep for the dead,
  For light hath failed him;
And weep for a fool,
  For understanding hath failed him.
Weep more sweetly for the dead,
  Because he hath found rest;
  But the life of the fool
Is worse than death.

Seven days are the days of mourning for the dead:
But for a fool and an ungodly man, all the days of his life

Ecclesiasticus 22:11.

REV. WM. SANDAY, M.A., D.D., LL.D., LADY MARGARET PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD.

By the Reverend William Horace Day.

On the tower of the Bodleian Library at Oxford is a large bas-relief of James the First giving the English Bible of 1611 to the world. Ever since the days of Wyclif the University has had an important part in translating and enlarging the knowledge of the Scriptures. Among the scholars doing this work today, Oxford has three prominent names: Professor Cheyne, author of the well-known commentaries on Isaiah and the Psalms; Professor Driver, who has recently published a work on Deuteronomy, the first in the "International Critical Commentary Series," and Professor Sanday, author of the Bampton Lectures on "Inspiration," and "Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel." The life and work of Dr. Sanday are of particular interest at present because he has just published, with the assistance of A. C. Headlam, M.A., the volume upon Romans in the international series.

Professor Sanday was born in 1843, came up to Balliol College, Oxford at eighteen, was chosen fellow of Corpus Christi College in 1863, and two years later took a "first" in his examination for B.A. He was ordained in 1869. As vicar of Great Waltham and rector of Barton-on-the-Heath in Warwickshire his work as a scholar was coupled with a heavy burden of parish duties. When called to become the Principal of Bishop Hatfield's Hall in the University of Durham in 1876 he was thoroughly fitted for the work of instructing theological students because he knew the problems of a young clergyman's life. From Durham he came to Oxford as Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis, coupled during much of the time with the exacting routine of Tutorial Fellow of Exeter College, which he continued to hold till the present year when his election as Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church Cathedral sets

him free from his tutorial duties, and leaves him entirely at liberty to devote his time to his lectures and personal study. This appointment very fittingly recognizes his scholarship, and elevates him to one of the most important university professorships in England.

A keen intellectual mind, tempered by a knowledge of men and of the round of daily life, as well as an intense spiritual purpose have combined to make Professor Sanday a leader, whether in the lecture room, with a few fellow students in a seminar, or before the larger audience reached by his books. The extent of that influence is suggested by the variety of students who attend his courses. Last year the evangelical minister sat beside the Roman Catholic priest and the American Episcopalian clergyman. The Congregational student of Mansfield College and the Unitarian from Manchester College were there, as well as the ordinary undergraduate in his little black gown with its ribands hanging from the shoulders. Last, but by no means least, there is also to be seen at his lectures the less somber garb of women, for conservative old Oxford admits women to lectures and examinations—to everything in fact except the actual wearing of the gown and taking of the degree.

Professor Sanday is an exact and enthusiastic textual critic. Under his touch the dusty details of the study of various manuscripts comes to have a living interest. He once told the writer that the piece of work which had given him most satisfaction was his share in editing the Old Latin Biblical Texts, and, much in the spirit of an ancient Roman who had pushed back the barbarians and extended the frontier of the empire, he added, "I felt it was really original work which advanced the boundaries of knowledge." But his is a zeal not only for the mere letter but for the truth that can be discovered only through the more exact shade of thought expressed in a perfected text.

Could some of the old worthies of the past raise the heavy stone slabs which cover their graves in the floor of the Cathedral and again walk Oxford streets, they would no doubt be surprised at the external improvements which have altered the appearance of the academic city, but perhaps most of all to see the way in

which this society of scholarship, existing almost entirely for the cultivation of the scholarly spirit within itself, has been waking to its duty to the people outside its walls by establishing university extension and other measures for the development of popular culture. To those of us who know how some of our most thorough American scholars have utilized their exact knowledge in lectures for popular audiences it will be no surprise to know of the active interest which a man of Dr. Sanday's technical scholarship takes in this side of student life. He has been intimately associated with Principal Fairbairn in the past in making the Mansfield Summer School of Theology so successful. This summer he was an active promoter of the Oxford Summer School of Theology for the clergymen of the Church of England.

The fascinating historical interest attached to the architectural growth of Oxford appeals strongly to Dr. Sanday. Those of us who went with him one morning to the top of the Radclif Library will not soon forget the enthusiasm with which he traced the growth of the city from the Saxon mound near the river which was there when King Alfred was in Oxford. Then the Norman Keep near it, which continued the work of defending the river, the Cathedral in its development, the quarter inhabited by Jews, the growth of college and church buildings, were one by one made to tell the story of Oxford and of all England.

After attending his course on Romans, which contains much of the material put into his latest book, one could not help feeling a new inspiration for Bible study. The student realizes that a strong mind is leading the way; so cultivated that a strained or fanciful interpretation finds no place; so honest as to say "I do not know," or, "My own investigations have not been complete enough to enable me to do more than give you the results of another." He knows, too, that he is following a man with courage enough to change his mind, and with so strong a passion for the truth as to say "I was mistaken." But more than all else, one is impressed by the occasional glimpses of the spirit within. This spirit shows itself in the unfailing kindness and consideration which is so marked in all his relations to others. It appears in the flash of enthusiasm which shines out when some of the great Pauline con-

ceptions present themselves in the progress of the exegesis. To be taught by such a teacher gives a minister a new conception of his life work. The example of a student who has labored so persistently in the face of obstacles which would make most men give up special study, puts to shame the lack of energy which permits too many of us to slight courses of systematic investigation because of the pressure of daily duty.

One comes away from a course of Dr. Sanday's, feeling that even those who are most alarmed at the methods of modern Bible study would have no fear could they but know the deep spiritual life as well as the careful scholarship which dominate the mind and heart of this Oxford New Testament scholar,

WHY CALLEST THOU ME GOOD?

By Benj. W. Bacon, D.D.,
Oswego, N. Y.

Jesus' doctrine of the righteousness of God not an improved morality— Paul, not the Jerusalem Church, was right, in preaching faith, not ethics— The history of Jesus, answer to the young ruler, exhibits the Judaizing tendencies of the Palestinian church as reactionary, not merely conservative— Jesus disclaimed the title "good" as Paul disclaimed "a righteousness of mine own, even that of the law"— He claimed the divine attributes goodness, power, knowledge (to teach with authority) in the mystic sense, as acting for God through the implanted divine Spirit— This Pauline mysticism, appearing in Mark, confirmed the teaching of the fourth gospel.

The question of the righteousness—something more than "sinlessness"—of Jesus is the oldest of Christian theology, and perhaps the furthest even now from settlement. To Paul, who certainly did not regard it as differing in kind from that required of every Christian, it meant one thing; to James something different. To the mediæval church it meant one thing, to the Reformers, if they were consistent as Paul was, it meant another. In the most recent years a distinguished American author and critic, writing on "The Gospel and its Earliest Interpretations,"[1] assures us that Jesus' doctrine of the righteousness of the kingdom of God, as distinguished from that of the scribes and Pharisees, made it simply "a righteousness of the heart" as against "a righteousness of the law" (p. 63), and that the saying (Matt. 5 : 20), was "directed against the hollow externality and legalism which then prevailed, and probably implied that the true righteousness of the kingdom consists in an inward, upright relation to the law spiritually apprehended" (p. 65). Paul's doctrine of "the righteousness which is from God upon faith," opposed to "the righteousness which is our own, even that which is by the works of the law" (Phil. 3 : 8 ff.) was, according to President Cone, a "transformation" of the teaching of Jesus.

[1] By President O. Cone. New York: Putnams, 1893.

To this we oppose the positive conviction that the righteousness of Jesus, both as regards his own personality and that which he required of those who would be of his kingdom, was essentially different from that of the scribes and Pharisees, and essentially identical with that which Paul sets forth in his great epistles. This conviction will not be defended by appeal to the fourth gospel, in which the teaching of Jesus is admittedly recast in the moulds of a theology built upon the system of Paul, but upon the words of Jesus as reported in the oldest of our gospels, after demonstration of their primitive character in comparison with the modification they have undergone in a later gospel at the hands of a school opposed to Paul.

The light to be gained from this enquiry should fall in two directions. It should give us, first, a new and priceless insight into the vital problem of Jesus' own Messianic self-consciousness, explaining how he could at once accept such tributes to his moral perfection as would explain the characterization of Paul: "Who knew no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth," and at the same time could reject the title "Good Master," on the ground that "There is none good but One, that is God," refusing thus to be exalted even in his highest Messianic attribute of moral perfection above the level of absolute humanity, and resting his claim of divinity where the fourth gospel rests it, in what on its human side is simply voluntary merging of our personality with the divine, and on the divine side is the mysterious but undeniable fact of the divine immanence.

Secondly, we may learn more clearly than hitherto what was the really distinctive feature that made the gospel of Jesus a new revelation comparable to the creative light shining out of darkness, not only to Paul (Rom. 7:24 f.; 2 Cor. 4:6; *cf.* Tit. 3:4–7 a "faithful saying"), but to all the church, except a reactionary minority. The distinction which President Cone seeks to draw between "a righteousness of the heart," as that of Jesus and of the Sermon on the Mount, over against a righteousness of the law; an "inward, upright relation to the law spiritually apprehended," over against a "hollow externality and legalism," is unjust both to Jesus and to his predecessors. The prophets cer-

tainly were not blind to this distinction, nor can we see in it any adequate ground for that great chasm by which Jesus separated his gospel from the preaching of John the Baptist, as if the latter belonged still to the age of "the law and the prophets," though greatest of them all; while he that was least in the new kingdom was greater than he. If the new gospel simply presented a more "inward, upright relation to the law spiritually apprehended," it can scarcely be distinguished at all from the teaching of John, as given in Luke 3:7–14. Moreover, the shades of difference between the ethical standard of John, as here given—historically, as we have every reason to think—and that found, both in the best contemporary literature, as, *e. g.*, the *Psalms of Solomon*, and in the prophetic, are almost indistinguishable. Again, if we look forward from this ethical standpoint toward that of the Sermon on the Mount, comparing by the way some of the golden teachings of Hillel, some of the New Testament examples of men that "waited for the kingdom of God," scribes who declared the law of love to be "much more than all whole burnt-offering and sacrifice," and Talmudic teachings which repudiate as hypocrisy the forms of pharisaism denounced in the gospels, and declare the only true Pharisee to be he who serves God neither through fear of punishment nor hope of reward, but "from love of his Father in Heaven," we shall find it less easy than is commonly imagined to draw broad lines of demarkation between Jesus as a teacher of pure morality and some of his predecessors and contemporaries.

The more we learn of the ethical teaching of the age, the more difficult does it become to define any essential difference in requirement between the righteousness of the kingdom of God preached by Jesus, and the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees which he denounced. The task of belittling and detracting from the real beauty and greatness of other and older ethical systems and ideals for the sake of magnifying to the utmost the acknowledged superiority of the ethics of Christ is one for which we have no liking, nor is it apparent why we need feel reluctance to concede, if necessary, that in the sphere of ethics, which is simply the science of human conduct, other and

earlier teachers might have enunciated principles and rules as perfect as those of Jesus. The radical distinction which made him the conscious bearer of epoch-making glad tidings lies elsewhere.

What is unmistakably apparent from the entire gospel story is this: That Jesus was the conscious possessor of a revelation destined to mark a new era in the world's history, and that the essence of this revelation was the knowledge of the "righteousness of God," as consisting of the free gift of his spirit. As opposed to the ethical morality of the "scribes and Pharisees" that of Jesus was religious and mystical, resting ultimately upon the fundamental mystery of religion, the relation of the human to the divine personality.

If we are restricted for our conception of his doctrine to the view adopted in the Jerusalem church, and by James the Lord's brother, we must assume that this tremendous, epoch-making idea was simply such a shade of advance upon the ethical standard then in vogue as is marked, *e. g.*, in the change of the Golden Rule from the negative form of Hillel to the affirmative, and must then go on searching with ever dwindling success for something to differentiate the Christian moral standard from the best that preceded. The fact that one evangelist (Luke 10:27) places this same synopsis of the "whole duty of man" in the mouth of "a certain lawyer," while another (Mark 12:29-31) attributes it to Jesus, goes to show that the gospel writers were not greatly concerned as to who had the credit of enunciating the most perfect rule of life.

If, on the other hand, we are permitted to think that Paul's conception of his Master's teaching was in closer harmony with Jesus' real thought than that of the Judaizers, we shall understand at once how the "righteousness of God" preached by Jesus was a fundamentally different thing from the "righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees," an epoch-making revelation in the religious history of the world, even though its definition of right conduct, its ethical standard, a purely scientific question, might not differ at all from that preached by contemporary or earlier reformers. To Paul also the righteousness of God made known

in the gospel lies not in the sphere of ethics, but of religion. It is not essentially a better *system of conduct*, but the divinely-given *means of attaining* a moral ideal already given, the objection to which was not its imperfection, although it had not till now received its highest expression, but its impracticability. The gospel was the proof of the possibility "with God" of that which "with men is impossible."

According to Paul the attempt to live up to the moral standard of the law is foredoomed to failure on account of the inherent weakness of the flesh. The light of the knowledge of the glory of God which has shined in our hearts in the face of Jesus Christ, as when the light of the creative day shone out of the darkness of chaos, is the revelation of a "spirit of adoption" given by God upon the prayer of faith, which wars against the law of sin in our members, until, overcoming it at length, we find ourselves the children of God, heirs of his nature and joint-heirs with Jesus Christ. This new spirit or disposition is a "gift of righteousness," graciously bestowed by God. He who has received it finds that the impulse of the carnal nature is now overruled by the stronger impulse of the implanted divine nature of love, so that "there is, therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, since they walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit. The "law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus" makes them "free from the law of sin and of death," so that the very requirement of the law, which through the weakness of the flesh was formerly found unattainable, is now "fulfilled in them."

If the objection be raised that this doctrine of salvation by pure grace takes away from man his moral responsibility, in that it first makes his unrighteousness inevitable, and afterwards, upon his regeneration, substitutes for his own action the action of a spirit that is not his own, but implanted from above, Paul answers to the first by a doctrine (of Rabbinic origin) of federal headship in Adam, our common condemnation being a just penalty for the sin in which all participated, not merely in the loins of their fathers, but also individually, by conscious rebellion against the still present "law of the mind." But this federal

headship in the fleshly Adam is more than counterbalanced by that in the preëxistent spiritual Adam, *i. e.*, Christ. To the second he replies, that the coöperation of the divine will and the human is of necessity an inscrutable mystery, since God is absolute, and at the same time man is consciously a free agent. Therefore sanctification is a joint process, we must "work out our own salvation with fear and trembling, *because* it is God that worketh in us even to *will*, as well as to do of his good pleasure." In the benediction by which a disciple of Paul entreats this grace of the spirit upon his hearers, the God of peace is besought to "make them perfect in every good work, *working in them* that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ."

While the doctrines of federal headship in the first and second Adam are of course derived from the Rabbinic schools, rather than Christian teaching, it is obvious that the Pauline conception of the gospel makes it preëminently religious, rather than ethical. This was the vital, essentially Christian element in Paul's teaching, of more than temporary validity. The moral standard in his gospel is simplified and elevated, but it is not essentially different as a rule of conduct from that of the law and the prophets. The creative new light is the revelation of a gift of God by which the unattainable is now made easy. It is still "the righteousness of the law" which is the ideal aimed at, only now it is "fulfilled in us," who "walk not after the flesh but after the spirit." God gives his own divine nature of love, his spirit of holiness, goodness, purity, unselfishness, truth, to become an indistinguishable part of our human nature. This new nature becomes then the source, the root, the spring, from which will naturally come forth in ever-growing measure the required moral perfection. This is certainly what to Paul makes Jesus the "second Adam" in whom ruined humanity achieve the ideal of the Creator. Rightly or wrongly Paul regarded this gift of grace as *the* revelation of Jesus κατ' ἐξοχήν, and his preaching a purer, more heartfelt, more spiritual moral standard was to Paul a matter of at least very subordinate importance.

Granting now that Paul in his doctrine of justification by faith alone stood strongly opposed to the mass of the Jerusalem

church, which we must admit found in the teaching of the Master little more than this improved moral standard—admitting that if Paul was the truer of the two to the actual teaching of Jesus, he has given a more forensic *color* to the doctrine of "the righteousness of God," in adapting it to the needs of his polemic against the Judaizers, we are concerned to show that in spite of this inevitable result of the theological struggle the more historically accurate of the two representations is Paul's, which makes the teaching of Jesus primarily *religious;* rather than that of the reactionary Jerusalem church, which made it primarily *ethical.* No better evidence can be asked in support of this thesis than the incident related in all three of the synoptic gospels, of the young ruler who came running to Jesus saying: "Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" It is natural that President Cone, who repudiates the idea that Jesus could have taught anything like the religious mysticism of the fourth gospel, and regards him from the Nicodemus standpoint as merely the teacher of an improved morality, should say as to this incident, that he knows of no satisfactory explanation.

As to the origin and mutual relation of the synoptic gospels we are substantially agreed with President Cone. In the nature of the case the material of which they are composed was first transmitted through the un-Pauline medium of the Jerusalem Church. In this instance the proof is abundant that the earliest form of the story is that of Mark, upon which both Luke and "Matthew"[1] are based, the former departing but very slightly from his copy, the latter independent of Luke, and introducing certain changes which radically transform the meaning, and are highly significant of [the medium out of which this Judaized form of the primitive tradition has come down to us. In Mark we have undeniably the Petrine tradition, which, if it departed in either direction from strict accuracy, would incline rather toward James of Jerusalem than toward Paul.

Luke's version, which is admittedly taken from Mark and almost verbatim, we may leave out of account. It shows no

[1] Our gospel is an enlarged and rewritten Greek version of the little compilation of λογια by the apostle.

tendency whatever. In Matthew we find the following striking differences, which it is easy to prove are not the variations of an independent version, but at least in part, are intentional alterations due to doctrinal presuppositions, and prove the progressive reaction of the Jerusalem Church toward pharisaism and away from the "Pauline" mysticism—if the anachronism may be permitted—of Jesus.

Beginning with the preceding context, Mark 10:13–16, the story of the blessing of the babes, and noting that the order of events in both gospels is the same, we find, as a first difference, that Matthew (19:13–15) substitutes "lay his hands on them and pray," for Mark's "touch them." The reverse process is improbable. Next the statement of Mark 10:14 that Jesus "was angry" (ἠγανάκτησε, from the verb whose physical sense according to Liddell and Scott is "to be violently irritated") is omitted, as in Luke. The reverse process is here insupposable; the motive too is sufficiently apparent even without the corroborative evidence of Mark 3:5 which is similarly treated by the later evangelists. The next difference is Matthew's habitual change of "kingdom of God" to "kingdom of heaven" out of reverence to the divine name; another intentional change certainly on Matthew's side. The only other difference of note in Matthew's version of this incident is the absence of Mark 10:15, already given by him in 18:3, and the omission of "he took them in his arms and blessed them" from Mark 10:16, whereby, as in vs. 13, Jesus' attitude is made more reserved and dignified.

Passing to the story of the rich young man, we meet at the outset the most striking of all the differences. Instead of Mark's "Good Master, what shall I do that I may have eternal life?" followed by Jesus' protest: "Why callest thou me 'good?' None is 'good' save one, even God," Matthew has: "Master, what *good thing*," etc., followed by the reply: "Why *askest* thou me *concerning that which is* good?" But this is followed immediately, as in Mark, by "One there is who is good," a clause which has no pertinence in the absence of the epithet "good" *applied to Jesus*, and which thus proves that the change removing Jesus' seeming disclaimer of "goodness," so incomprehensible

to this evangelist, was on Matthew's side. That the motive here was the avoidance of a doctrinal difficulty is too apparent to require further proof. But for completeness' sake observe that the tenth "commandment" is restored in Matthew from Mark's very free rendering to the exact Old Testament form, a characteristic piece of reactionary conservatism, and that in the succeeding context Mark's "hard saying" about receiving "a hundredfold, *now in this time, houses and brethren and sisters and mothers and children and lands, with persecutions*, and in the world to come eternal life," is emptied of all difficulty, as well as of some of its deepest significance, by the omission of the words printed in italic.

When we remember the impossibility, from the extent of verbal identity, here and elsewhere, of maintaining the independence of Matthew and Mark, it becomes a matter of practical certainty in view of such a series as this, that the dependence is on the side of Matthew, and that the differences are largely due to intentional change based on dogmatic considerations.[1] The significance of those which affect the story of the young nobleman, some of which I have yet to speak of, will not be fully apparent till we have ascertained the sense of the incident as narrated by Mark in its primitive form, and compared this with the very different sense conveyed by Matthew's version.

There is a superficial appearance in this story as if Jesus had fully coincided with the young man's point of view. He belonged to that class of Pharisees described in the Talmud as "going from teacher to teacher asking some new precept to observe," but in the obvious sincerity of his desire to "fulfil all righteousness" he is much better exemplified in Saul of Tarsus, engaged heart and soul "in all good conscience" in the effort to

[1] The argument is not affected even if the now generally admitted priority of Mark be denied. Even were the version of Matt. 19 : 13–30 not derived from Mark 10 : 13–31 directly, but through some common source employed by both evangelists, it would be manifest that the variations of Matthew are all explicable as alterations from the form shown in Mark to avoid difficulties, some being inexplicable in any other way; those of Mark, on the contrary could never have been substituted for the form shown in Matthew, and are unaccountable save on the assumption of their genuineness.

be "justified by the works of the law," "as touching the law a Pharisee; as touching zeal persecuting the Church"—wherein he "verily thought he did God's service;"—"as touching the righteousness which is in the law, found blameless." The young man whom Jesus "looked upon and loved" is engaged in precisely the same effort which Paul found so agonizingly hopeless: to "fulfil *all* righteousness," "planting a hedge about the law," observing every requirement which could be suggested, even beyond its express provisions that he might thus "inherit eternal life." Passing over the paradoxical disclaimer of the epithet "good," Jesus' reply to the request for a new requirement, whose fulfilment should give assurance of eternal life, *seems* to be exactly in line with the request. "One thing thou lackest: go, sell whatsoever thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me."

Certainly the surface sense of this reply cannot be harmonized with Paul's conception of the gospel. If the apparent meaning here was actually the teaching of Jesus, the Judaizers were right. Jesus was then merely one more of the scribes who "sit in Moses' seat binding heavy burdens and grievous to be borne," prescribing to the devout Pharisee some additional and more perfect ethical requirement, whereby one might inherit eternal life. He was then the very ideal and crown of pharisaism. Paul's Gospel could scarcely be called even a "transformation" of this, it is so radically opposed to it. If this was the Christianity of Christ, Paul was converted to something the exact opposite of what he supposed. The very foundation of Paul's Christianity was the utter collapse of this whole pharisaic system of merit with God, in an overwhelming *reductio ad absurdum*, *cf.* Rom. chap. 7; Gal. 2:15–21. And this collapse of pharisaism was for Paul the revelation of Christ. His answer to the suggestion that an observance of the commandments coupled with unlimited almsgiving might entitle to eternal life we have: "And if I give all my goods to feed the poor, and give my body to be burned, but have not charity—the divine spirit of love— it is nothing!"

Is it possible, then, to assume that the surface meaning of this "new commandment" of Jesus — unlimited almsgiving — is the real one? Not even the semi-Judaistic Matthew thinks it possible to take over the teaching in so bold a form. He must at least pay to Paul the tribute of inserting the law of love among the commandments which the young Pharisee has observed from his youth; Matt. 19:9; *cf.* Mark 10:19; James 2:8. But after this is done he has no hesitation in maintaining that all that Jesus required further for "perfection" ("if thou wouldst be perfect," Matt. 19:21; *cf.* Mark), was to "give all his goods to feed the poor." This was the distinctive feature of the Jerusalem church. Its Christianity was pharisean; its exaltation of unlimited almsgiving as the crown of all virtues stamps all its literature, and its exaggerated esteem for poverty obtained for it in its later history as a heretical sect the ephithet Ebionite; *cf.* Acts 4:32–37; Gal. 2:10; James 2:1–9, 14–17; 5:1–6. With these "amendments" Matthew takes over Mark's account of what Jesus required of the rich young man as a *bona fide* statement of what entitles a man to eternal life. A scrutiny of the original from which this quasi-Ebionite version of the story is derived will show, on the contrary, that the saying of Jesus was intended to work as complete a *reductiô ad absurdum* in the young man's mind as was later accomplished in the mind of Paul. To this end it is necessary to return to Jesus' first utterance, so grievously distorted in Matthew, concerning his own "goodness."

Why should Jesus begin his reply to such a vital question as that of the young Pharisee with such an apparently trivial objection as his criticism of the epithet "good" applied to himself? Why *not* call him "Good Master"? The answer can only be that, in the sense the Pharisee would give the word, Jesus did not wish to be considered "good," and that the difference in their conceptions of "goodness" was of fundamental significance. To the Pharisee a man who "as touching the righteousness which is in the law" was "found blameless," and who both by precept and example had set forth the duty of absolute self-renunciation for the kingdom of God's sake, was "good," and was thus entitled by merit to "eternal life." He comes running and kneeling

to Jesus because convinced that Jesus is in this sense "good." But to Jesus the man who had done all this is nothing of the kind. He is "an unprofitable servant, who has done that which it was his duty to do." He, Jesus, in his own view, had done nothing to merit reward, nor did he even deserve to be called "good" in the pharisean sense, *i. e.*, "possessed of accumulated merit." On the contrary, whatever goodness he has is due simply to the grace of God, the indwelling divine Spirit which impels him to thus act. There is none "good" but One, that is, God. To find the exact parallel of this remarkable disclosure of "goodness" on Jesus' part there is none other to whom we can turn than just the man who is supposed to have "transformed" the teaching of Jesus on this score. Paul had been, "as touching the righteousness of the law, found blameless," but had gladly "counted all this but refuse," that he might .... "be found in Christ, *not having a righteousness of mine own*, even that which is of the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is of God by (Greek '*upon*') *faith*. "It is thus, "if by any means," that Paul would "attain unto the resurrection from the dead."

Wherein now does this religious mysticism of Paul, more fully developed in the "Johannine" theology, differ from the teaching of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount, concerning the "righteousness of God?" This, while it far "exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees," and supersedes" all the law and the prophets," yet leaves not one jot or tittle unfulfilled. It is nevertheless of a totally different nature. It is to be "sought" by asking of the Father, who "delighteth to give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him," and men thus become "children of the Highest, because He is good even to the unthankful and the evil." The possession of this new implanted Spirit of the Father goes beneath the very roots of the selfish nature. It "makes the tree good," and thus obtains by spontaneous action the "good fruit."

If this adoption into a divine sonship by the descent and indwelling of the divine Spirit is not the essential thing in the teaching of Jesus, differentiating it immeasurably from the best of reformed moral standards, whether in that or previous times,

what is? What entitles it to be called a "gospel?" Why should the baptism of John be distinguished from it as only "with water," whereas this is "with the Holy Ghost"?

We derive, then, from our interpretation of this pregnant story of the young nobleman, first, Jesus' definition of his own "goodness." It is not, any more than that of Paul, the righteousness which is of the law, even though, according to that, he were "found blameless;" but "that which is given by God upon faith." And here we come upon the profound significance of this story from the earliest of our gospels to the doctrine of the person of Christ, an insight into his own Messianic self-consciousness which corroborates the essential teaching of Paul and of the Johannine school as to his teaching regarding his own divinity. What Paul gives as the very kernel of "the ministry of reconciliation, how that God was in Christ," what the fourth gospel reiterates again and again as the very essence of Jesus' teaching, how that the finite humanity which he shares with us is so capable of sublimation by self-merging in the Spirit of God "that they also may be in the Father as Christ was in the Father and the Father in him"—this is the implication and presupposition of Jesus' doctrine of "the righteousness of God" as here applied to himself. It is the justification of both the Pauline and the Johannine mysticism. For Jesus' disclaimer of "goodness" in his own right, is simply the parallel to his disclaimer in this same earliest gospel of all divine attributes, all Messianic qualifications, except as by complete self-surrender, he has made himself the vehicle for the divine power, wisdom and goodness. In accepting the greatness divinely "thrust upon" him, his choice of Messianic titles was that which most completely expresses the utter dependence, weakness, helplessness of humanity over against God: "the Son of Man." The entire record of his exaltation is simply that he "humbled himself" utterly before God. He would be Messiah only "to minister," not to be ministered unto." The greater the claims he makes for God *in* him as type and representative of the race, the more complete is his own self-obliteration.

It is thus also with his claims of power. Of himself he can do nothing. When the demoniac healed is bidden to go home and tell his friends, he is to tell, not what Jesus has done, but "what the Lord (*i. e.*, God; see Luke) hath done for thee." When sufferers seek aid, they are bidden to "have faith in God," whose power cannot be limited. Conversely he is not disconcerted when, as in Nazareth, "he could do no mighty work." He never claimed that *he* had power. God had it, and if it were not forthcoming, it was due to the "unbelief" of those that sought it.

So also of his Messianic teaching with authority, and divine wisdom. He teaches that which the divine voice clearly speaks to the heart and conscience of humanity, what "the light that is in thee" reveals.

So of his "goodness." "There is none good but One, that is God." He does not pretend to be "good;" he is conscious of an indwelling Spirit of the Father, which has descended to abide upon him with the assurance: "Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased." To be a "son of the Highest" by living in this Spirit of the Father is all the "goodness" he knows. But if the scribe or Pharisee ask what can be done to merit eternal life by fulfilling all righteousness, he can only point to the fruits "the righteousness of God" has borne. He himself and these followers with him have left all, house and brethren, sisters and mother (is there no personal remembrance in this?) fathers, children and lands for the gospel's sake. This they have been prompted to do simply by the Spirit of the Father in them, and feel that already they are reaping a hundredfold, while for the future they have in this same Spirit a pledge of the coveted "eternal life." If, then, one who represents the "righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees" asks: What lack I yet? from the standpoint of comparative meritoriousness, Jesus can only point to the examples present of the fruits of the Spirit and suggest: "By this much thy righteousness has fallen short of that given by God. Thou hast not yet forsaken all and entered the way of Calvary." The hope for this young man is that when he has tried in his righteousness *without* God to equal

that thus exemplified, he will find as Paul did that it is "impossible;" and thereupon, grasping the divine gift of a new spirit, will find that "*with* God all things are possible."

Secondly, this interpretation of Jesus' definition of "goodness" makes the gospel to every man in reality "glad tidings" of grace and truth instead of a mere improved science of ethics. The religious mysticism which the above interpretation implies in the teaching of Jesus is indeed wanting from the portrait drawn in Matthew's version. In the church presided over in the year 61 by James the Lord's brother, surnamed by the Jews for his legalistic piety, "the just," *i. e.*, devout, there was a very different conception of the gospel. James himself, speaking in the year 61 A.D., describes the adherents of that church as "many myriads from among the Jews, all zealous for the law." They felt far more hostility to Paul than their neighbor Jews did to them. To them Jesus doctrinally had simply put the crown upon pharisaism, establishing its teaching of "eternal life;" extending its moral standard by a completed "hedge of the law," wherein almsgiving and the law of love were the chief new features; justifying and uplifting its Messianic hopes and its eschatological expectations. This Palestinian branch of the vine ultimately became in part reabsorbed into Judaism, as from its nature we should expect; in part it degenerated into a mere heretical sect, denying (as we might also have expected) the divinity of Christ, and laying all stress upon the ethics of socialism, and the inequalities of wealth. Not abiding in the vine it was cast forth as a branch and withered. Does this Judaistic-Ebionite element of the primitive church represent then the historic teaching of Jesus? Or is it represented rather by an element whose first great leader fell a martyr to the persecuting zeal of Pharisean zealots, because he maintained that Jesus had taught of a new, universal temple superseding that "holy place," and a new righteousness which should "change the customs Moses delivered unto us?" At least the Gospel of Paul, the second great leader of this school, so far as it came to him from human lips at all, came through Stephen and the men who had *thus* understood Jesus. It was not received from certain

"super-eminent apostles" whom as persecutor he had not thought worthy of notice, though knowing they were in Jerusalem (Gal. 1:17) even while he journeyed to Damascus in pursuit of the Hellenists.

To our apprehension the incident of Mark 10:17–22 is of no small importance to show what Jesus meant by "the righteousness of God," both in himself, and in as many as with him should become "partakers of the divine nature." In the contrast which the "amendments" of Matthew present to this version we have the evidence that the Judaizers were really, as Paul maintained, reactionaries, unconsciously, or perhaps in some cases even consciously (see Gal. 6:12) disloyal to the fundamentals of Christ's gospel; not merely that they felt unable to follow Paul into a necessary "transformation" of the earlier doctrine. When the critical relation of the two versions of this story in Mark and Matthew can be reversed, and Mark's shown to be derived from Matthew's, and not *vice versa*, it may be possible to maintain that Paul was the innovator, and "they of James" the true conservatives. Until then "the gospel of Jesus the Christ the Son of God" must be understood to have been fundamentally and essentially, that which is developed into a philosophic system, and to some extent adapted to new conditions, in the theology of Paul. This reversal, it is safe to say, will not be obtained until every canon now known to the "higher criticism" for determining which of two interdependent accounts is the older, has been proved to be false or futile.

After Paul the leadership in the Hellenistic school of Christianity passed to Ephesus and the great theologians who have given us the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Johannine literature with its doctrine of the Λόγος. It was not long ere this view had established itself everywhere as the only orthodox Christianity in a supremacy that today is stronger than ever.

We need hardly add that the great current of the Johannine gospel tradition, which toward the close of the century comes to take up and carry along with it the Pauline doctrine, however small we make the actual written contributions of the apostle John thereto, is nevertheless a witness of inestimable value to

the fact that this mystical and religious interpretation of the doctrines of "the righteousness of God," divine sonship and the Messiaship was at least a vital part of the historic teaching of Jesus.

WHAT HIGHER CRITICISM IS NOT.

By the Rev. Professor Willis J. Beecher, D.D.
Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

When a Protestant uses the term "Catholic" as if it were synonymous with Roman Catholic; when a Presbyterian or a Baptist or a Methodist speaks of "the Church" as if the term denoted especially the Episcopalian Church; when religious men talk of the respective claims of science and of theology as if science were exclusive of theology; in each case, the person so using language verbally gives away his own position, in favor of his opponent. He intends no concession. He merely means to save time by using a briefer expression. But, verbally, he concedes the whole point at issue; and practically the concession has a genuine and important influence over many minds.

The same is true when one uses the terms "higher criticism," "the higher critics," as a mere descriptive phrase, or a phrase of opprobrium, in speaking of the views in regard to the Bible which he himself disapproves. In doing this he concedes, verbally, that the doctrines he opposes are the genuine product of genuinely scientific processes, and are therefore probably true. He does not intend this concession, but he actually makes it; and as the age is fully convinced of the validity of scientific processes, his concession has more effect than all the arguments he can adduce on the opposite side. Supposing the new views of the Bible to be from Satan, Satan must be remarkably well pleased at having them met, not by study and argument, but by a spiteful sounding misuse of the terms that describe them.

Higher criticism as a process is, of course, the scientific search after the truth in regard to the literary structure and peculiarities and the authorship of writings. The men who advocate what some of us regard as destructive views concerning the Old Testament necessarily consider themselves as genuine higher critics, and the results they have reached as preëminently the higher criticism of the Old Testament. Their opponents cannot afford to admit the truth of this claim. They are higher critics, but

not the only higher critics. Their studies are attempts in higher criticism, but to admit that these attempts have been so successful as to deserve to be called the higher criticism is to admit that the results they have reached are true.

This is commonplace. No one disputes it. But there are plenty of public speakers and public prints that will give these definitions with perfect clearness, and then proceed to discuss the questions involved as if the definitions were not true, as if higher criticism were simply the criticism that attacks the received views concerning the Bible. This, then, is constantly the first statement to make as to what the higher criticism is not. It is not any one particular school of higher criticism. The term is a name applied to a department of science, or, from another point of view, to a scientific process, and not exclusively to any one set of investigations or conclusions in that department. This statement is trite as trite can be, but it needs to be repeated yet a thousand times, and insisted upon till men heed it.

In what more I have to say, I shall limit the subject. There is now prevalent a certain generic form of the higher criticism of the Old Testament, a form which exists with a good deal of specific variation, but with a general similarity of processes and results. Without taking the trouble to define it more particularly, let us note, in a few incomplete specifications, what this form of higher criticism is not.

First, it is not the final higher criticism of the Old Testament. Few of its advocates would claim that it is. Most of them recognize the fact that it is inchoate, transitional, incomplete. Many of its particular processes and results are yet tentative, some of its laws being yet unestablished, and many of its criteria uncertain. Personally, I should go very far in denying its validity, at many points. It is an attack on traditionalism, but it has retained as its own basis most of the weaker elements of the traditional view. To a vicious extent it rejects testimony in favor of conjecture. It pours deserved contempt on the excessive use of processes of harmonization in the traditional treatments, but in its own treatments makes a far more excessive use of baseless harmonizing processes. It treats living tissues as if

they were dead matter, to a great extent ignoring all elements that are not purely mechanical in the speech and conduct of the writers of the Old Testament and the persons mentioned therein. I have no doubt the final higher criticism of the Old Testament will assign extreme antiquity to the little poems quoted in Genesis; or that it will regard the contents of the Hexateuch as so far belonging to the times of Moses and Joshua as to justify the ancient tradition attributing its authorship to these two men, provided that tradition be correctly understood; or that it will regard David and his contemporaries as the great psalm writers of Israel. I say these things here, not for the purpose of obtruding my opinions, but to make definite the point of view from which the things that follow in this article are said. There are plenty of scholarly men who place a much higher estimate than I do upon the work done and the results reached by the prevailing schools of higher criticism; but I think that no one will dispute the proposition that our present higher criticism is far from final.

In the second place, our prevalent type of higher criticism is not a merely shallow, transitory, impertinent, flippant playing with a great subject. Engaged in it are men of all types of intellectual and religious character. It is likely enough that some of them may have had unworthy motives. In what movement are men uniformly free from unworthy motives? But this field compares well with other fields of investigation in the amount and quality of reverent study, of painstaking industry, that have been expended in it by men of ability and insight and devotion to the truth. Many of the results reached are permanent and valuable. If the clergymen who are most uncompromisingly opposed to the prevalent type of higher criticism will take the trouble to compare the helps to Bible study they now use, and the Bible articles they themselves now write, with those which they used or wrote twenty years ago, most of them will appreciate the fact that they have learned much in twenty years, and that they have learned it largely from their opponents. The higher criticism of the future will accept the doctrine that the Hexateuch is a unit. It will accept a large part of the current

classification of the literary phenomena of the six books, though I think it will account for them by better hypotheses than those now in vogue, and will certainly reject most of the dates now proposed. Other permanent fruits have been gathered. The man who sees clearest the weaknesses and the vices of the higher criticism now in vogue ought also to be most appreciative of its excellences.

In the third place the prevalent higher criticism is not necessarily an attack upon the truthfulness of the Old Testament or upon its claim to our reverence as the Word of God. In this statement the word "necessarily" is important. In a great transition movement there are all sorts of side currents, and some of them differ in direction from the main current. Incidentally, in particular instances, there can be no doubt that faith in the Bible has been sapped. Individual critics have actually been hostile to the received doctrines, and their hostility has not unfrequently been aggravated by the treatment they have received. There have been needless antagonisms, and there have been reckless statements on both sides. And besides this the current criticism, if accepted, logically necessitates modifications of the views of inspiration that have heretofore prevailed. And there are minds so constituted that they will drop their belief in inspiration rather than modify it. Every transition of opinion and every proposed transition, while it is being considered, is attended with peril to individuals. All this is a reason for watchfulness and care. It is not surprising if it causes alarm to good men. The advocates of new views should be very considerate of those who are alarmed. Nevertheless, little children should learn to walk, even if creeping is for the time safer than walking. The fact that the search for knowledge involves danger is no reason why we should be content to remain ignorant.

As a matter of individual opinion I am sure that the final higher criticism will not accept the views which most strongly demand great changes from the received doctrines of inspiration. But even with the utmost modifications called for by the criticism now current, one might still consistently hold that the Bible is in a singular sense God's Word, the record of a unique

revelation inspired by the divine Spirit, the ultimate rule of doctrine and conduct.

One more point, a fourth, must suffice. The prevalent higher criticism is not merely the erratic movement of a few men, to be dealt with as an erratic movement, by ostracism, or satire, or hurried denunciation. A favorite way some have of attacking it is by alleging that its positions are those of Paine's *Age of Reason.* Very likely some of them are. Paine had access in Paris to the works of the great pioneers of the present higher critical movement, and presumably he used them. The alleged resemblances between the *Age of Reason* and the current critical theories are mostly unreal, but it is a fact that these pioneer critics have now obtained from the devout Christian world the hearing that was denied them a hundred years ago. Whether the fact is pleasing or not, it is a fact. The higher criticism of today is part of a long-existing historical movement. Its progress in the past can be traced. Its laws can be ascertained. It is bound to go forward to its proper terminus. It is not accidental that the coming to the front of these discussions occurs in our day. A hundred years ago was too early for it; a hundred years hence would have been too late. It comes under law. In other words it is providential. The world has just become ripe for it. It is a part of God's plan for the education of mankind.

The time has come for a better knowledge of the Bible than was formerly possible. The conflict that is going on will be a benefit to us, if it awakens us to this fact. Without the conflict we should not have become conscious of our need. The conflict provokes study and discussion. It would not provoke these half so thoroughly were there no disclosures of error or of danger. Every time of unsettlement has its peril, but by such crises a more intelligent knowledge and a firmer faith become possible. It is ours to watch, to keep our eyes open to the signs of the times, to recognize the good there is, and to resist the evil, to do this without becoming uncharitable or unjust toward those who differ with us, and without becoming panic stricken, as though God could be slain, or truth could fail.

NOTE ON THE BEARING OF DEUT. 34:1 UPON THE QUESTION OF THE AUTHORSHIP OF DEUTERONOMY.

By W. Scott Watson, Jr., A.M.

The critics lay great stress upon the mention of Dan in Dt. 34:1 as a time indication, because, as they say, "Laish first received the appellation Dan from the Danites immediately after Joshua's death (Josh. 19:47; Judg. 18:29)." I believe that Moses wrote all of Deuteronomy with the exception of the short appendix which, I think, was added by Joshua.

In regard to this mention of Dan I observe:

(1) In the present state of the knowledge of Palestinian geography it at least cannot be proved that there was no town or district called Dan before the death of Joshua. Conservative critics need not be troubled by any objections based on the occurrence of this name here until there is some apparently strong proof adduced that there could have been only one place called by this name and that that place was not so known until after the death of Joshua.

(2) As this name occurs in a well-defined appendix, however late may have been the date of its origin, it does not affect the question of the Mosaic authorship of (the rest of) Deuteronomy. It affects only the date of the appendix.

(3) There is no necessity for saying that the name Dan was not given to Laish before the death of Joshua.

Judges 17–21 is not in its chronological place with regard to the rest of the history of that book; 17–18 is the story of Micah and of the Danite expedition; 19–21 is the account of the treatment which a certain Levite's concubine received and of the consequent almost total annihilation of the tribe of Benjamin. These two incidents are probably narrated in the order of occurrence. The latter is dated by 20:28, where it is said that "Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron, stood before it

[the ark] in those days." From Josh. 22 it would appear that Phinehas became high priest before the death of Joshua (indeed, perhaps "many days" before, Josh. 23 : 1), probably through the old age of his father whose death is recorded in Josh. 24 : 33. Phinehas is not mentioned in the Book of Joshua before this chapter (22), but in it he occupies a prominent place and is spoken of as "Phinehas the priest" (vs. 30; cf. "Phinehas, the son of Eleazar the priest," vss. 13, 31, 32). Previously it was always "Eleazar the priest" that was spoken of (14 : 1; 17 : 4; 19 : 51; 21 : 1). Thus these events touching Benjamin did not occur long after Joshua's death at the latest, for a high priest who lived under Joshua was still officiating. But the position of 17–18 shows that probably the facts related therein took place still earlier.

When the company of Danites were on their way to Laish, the name of which they changed to Dan on its capture, they took from Micah "the young man the Levite" (Judges 18 : 15, 19) whom he had for a priest. This "young man" was "Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of Moses" (vs. 30). His father Gershom was born to Moses when he was dwelling with Reuel in Midian (Ex. 2 : 22), apparently not long after his arrival there. Thus he may have been about thirty-five years of age at the exodus. As he did not enter Canaan but died in the wilderness in all probability, his son Jonathan must have been born before the death of Moses. As Joshua lived about thirty-two years after crossing the Jordan (Schaff-Herzog, p. 1203), this Jonathan must have been older than that when the second leader of Israel breathed his last,—yet at the time of naming Laish Dan he was only a "young man." Therefore this incident most likely occurred before Joshua's death, and thus, even if this is the Dan mentioned in Dt. 34 : 1, the foundation for the objection based thereon to the Joshuaic authorship of the appendix of Deuteronomy is gone.

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY: ITS HISTORY AND ITS MISSION.

II.

By Rev. Professor George H. Gilbert, Ph.D., D.D.,
Chicago Theological Seminary.

The principle of Gabler began to bear fruit early in this century in biblical theological studies of individual authors or groups of authors. Thus Usteri presented the teaching of Paul in 1832, Frommann that of John in 1839, and Messner that of the apostles in 1856.

These writers and the large number of others who have continued their line of investigation have brought out with hitherto unknown clearness the rich variety of Scripture; and while they have helped to destroy that idea of the unity of the Bible which prevailed before the Reformation, they have helped to demonstrate a true divine unity in which the different types are comprehended. Passing over the works of Schmid[1] and Hahn[2] we come to what must be regarded as the best fruits thus far of the principle of Gabler, namely, the New Testament theology of Bernhard Weiss, 1868, (Fourth edition, 1895) and Willibald Beyschlag, 1891, and the Old Testament theology of Hermann Schultz, 1869, G. F. Oehler, 1873, and the fourth edition of Schultz, 1892. With these writers, as with Gabler, biblical theology is a purely historical science. They distinguish sharply between biblical theology and systematized evangelical doctrine, holding that these differ both in form and in content. "Biblical theology is neither apologetic nor polemic, but objective and impartial (Schaff). "It does not demonstrate, it narrates" (Reuss). They recognize development in the religious and moral teachings of Scripture, and the importance of individual types.

[1] *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 1853.

[2] *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 1854.

These works represent the best that has thus far been accomplished in the sphere of biblical theology. They are not to be regarded as ideal and final. They have manifest defects; and furthermore it is probable that each new age, if it is alive to God, will call for a new presentation of revealed truth. But of works covering the whole of either Testament these that have been mentioned register the high-water mark of scientific biblical theology.

It will be noticed that the development of this science as far as sketched has been wholly by Germans, and also that I have considered only the important *books* that have been produced. The first point scarcely needs any qualification. With the exception of Reuss' work and the recent able book by Jules Bovon[1] the foreign literature is German. And little original work in the English language has as yet been contributed.[2] But we must not stop with the literature. It is a fact of great significance that biblical theology as a distinct scientific discipline is being taught in our theological seminaries. In 1881 a writer in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* could say that in twenty of our leading seminaries there was not a single chair of biblical theology. Now it might be difficult to find a well equipped seminary in which biblical theology is not accorded a place, and a considerable number of our best institutions have distinct chairs for this department. So Union, Andover, Hartford, Yale, McCormick and others. The establishment of these chairs is a recognition of the abiding scientific value of biblical theology, and the existence of each one of them is a fact of greater importance for the growth and usefulness of biblical theology than almost any separate contribution to the literature of the subject.

One aspect of the history of biblical theology still remains to be considered. I have spoken briefly of the origin and development of this latest theological science. It has been said that it was a true child of the principles of the Reformation. It must

[1] *Théologie du Nouveau Testament*, 1893.

[2] We have in America the two books by Stevens, *The Pauline Theology*, and *The Johannine Theology*.

not, however, be supposed that the preparation for it was completed with the enunciation of those principles. Rather must we say that the preparation which was begun by the Reformers has been deepened and widened in a remarkable manner by the biblical study of the last hundred years, and that this preparation is still going forward. All the true progress which has been made in the criticism of the text of Scripture, all the progress made in the higher or literary criticism of the Bible, all the established results gained from the study of the history contemporary with the biblical ages, all the progress made in the philological investigation of the languages of the Bible—all these results are directly or indirectly tributary to the science of biblical theology. It presupposes all these lines of study. *Their* progress involves its progress. It could not exist as a science without them. Hence all successful laborers in these departments have been furthering the interests of a scientific biblical theology, and it may well be that some of these laborers have done more to promote biblical theology than many who have worked in this special department. In this work of building foundations England and America have had their part no less than Germany. Of the American scholars whose names might be mentioned with praise, one deserves especial notice. This scholar was, so far as I can learn, the first among us to lecture on biblical theology, which he did as early at least as 1883. He was not only the pioneer in this work but he has contributed to it indirectly by numerous scientific writings on the literary origin and character of the Old Testament Scriptures. He has contributed to it also by vigorous polemic against unsound principles of interpretation and against unscriptural teachings in his own denomination. I refer, of course, to the one who is accused of having so troubled the Presbyterian Israel in the last few years, but who might truthfully reply to the ultra-conservative element therein, "I have not troubled Israel but thou and thy father's house." Professor Briggs' work, as compared with that of his accusers, must be admitted to be far more scientific and scriptural.

From this historical sketch we pass on to consider briefly the second part of our theme—the *mission* of biblical theology. The

importance of this discipline, which is for Christians logically implied in the fact that it is a scientific presentation of the teaching of God's word, is recognized by competent students and is rated very high. Thus Grau[1] says: "Biblical theology is in my judgment the most important organ of the present day for drawing real water of life from that source from which alone it can be had, both for the Church which is desirous of new spiritual power, and for dogmatics which thirsts for new sources and principles." And Dr. Schaff thinks that "biblical theology should be the guiding star in all departments of sacred learning, a focus of light in theological study."[2] "Biblical theology," says Hermann Schultz, "is as it were the heart of theological science, which by working on the original sources, gathers the life-blood into one great center in order to pour it back again into the veins, so that the theological life of the existing church may be kept strong and healthy."[3] Dr. Orr in his "Christian View of God and the World" refers to New Testament theology as a recently founded science which has already attained to a position of *commanding importance* among the theological disciplines. These testimonies need not be multiplied, but I proceed at once to ask why biblical theology is thus exalted. What is its mission? But before attempting to answer this question, let me again bring to our mind the definition of biblical theology. It is the historical presentation of the moral and religious teachings of the Bible—*historical* in contrast to dogmatic or systematic. The word *historical* implies the recognition of development, if there is development, and the differences of individual types, if there are such differences. *Historical presentation* implies that we assume as far as possible the point of view of the different biblical writers, that we observe the proportions which they give to their respective teachings, and that we state the facts as we find them.[4]

There has been and still is not a little misunderstanding in regard to what is meant by biblical theology. Thus *The Inde-*

[1] In *Zöckler's Handbuch der theol. Wissenschaften*, p. 614, note.

[2] *Theological Propædeutic*, p. 318.

[3] *Biblische theologie des Alten Testaments*, 1892.

[4] See James Drummond, *Introduction to the Study of Theology*, 1884.

pendent of January 29, 1891, defines biblical theology as follows: "By biblical theology we understand theology directly derived from the Bible, resting upon it, proved by it, and accepted because there taught." Plainly this *understanding*, judged by the history of the science, is mainly a misunderstanding. Nor is the statement of James Stalker[1] in an excellent article published in 1890 wholly right. He says that "Biblical theology undertakes to show that there is in the Bible a gradual development of revelation, preceding by slow and sure stages from the earliest to the latest books. It undertakes to exhibit this development from book to book, or at least from group to group of books." Now it is true that as a result of biblical study a gradual development of revelation has been established, but biblical theology does not undertake to show that there *is* such a development in the Bible from book to book. If it started out to demonstrate that point, or if it started out to prove from the Bible any assumption, it would cease to be a historical science. The claim of biblical theology is that it does not undertake to prove anything. This is its great merit. It simply asks after facts. If it finds development, it states it; but were it to undertake to *prove* that there is development, it would cease to be historical and become dogmatic.

What, then, is the mission of biblical theology as thus understood? First, it has a mission in relation to the *Bible*. In the words of Dr. Schaff already quoted, biblical theology brings us face to face with the divine oracles in all their original power and freshness. It is indeed able to do this, because it takes up into itself all that has been gained by the scientific study of the text and presents the teaching in its entirety,—presents it as nearly as possible as it existed in the mind of the respective authors.[2] It is then the last and highest work of the interpreter. Teaching that lies scattered in books of law and prophecy, in histories, poems and epistles, is presented in its variety and unity, stamped with the individuality of its different authors, and set in the light of the different ages in which it was promulgated.

[1] See *Magazine of Christian Literature*, May 1890.

[2] See Wendt in *Lehre Jesu, Zweiter Theil*, p. 3.

Biblical theology has done much in bringing out into strong relief on the background of a national Jewish literature, the individuality of lawgiver, prophets, kings, and apostles, and the distinctive types of doctrine which they represented. Biblical theology has helped to bring out the *development* of revelation, and to mark its various stages. It has helped to an appreciation of the human element in the Bible, which must indeed be appreciated in order to a true appreciation of the divine element. Biblical theology has helped to exalt the Bible, by showing how through all this vast and varied literature one increasing divine purpose runs—the purpose of redemption.

This mission of biblical theology in relation to the Bible is only partially fulfilled, and the need of it will probably always exist.

But again, biblical theology has a mission in relation to *systematic theology*. This is the twofold mission of Jeremiah, to pluck up and break down, to build and to plant. Biblical theology cannot be directly destructive of error in the teachings of the church; that is, it cannot be polemic, citing and refuting unscriptural views, for thus it would cease to be historical. But it can remove erroneous teaching by the quiet and more effectual way of presenting the truth. It is its mission so to do. The systematic theology of Augustine was as scriptural as the exegesis of that time could have demanded, but the exegesis was very deficient. The theology of Calvin and the other reformers was as scriptural as the exegesis of their day could have demanded, and as a whole is admitted to have been more scriptural than the theology of Augustine. But biblical criticism began with the reformers, and as we now know it was impossible that they should do more than make a beginning in it. Now the systematic theology of the early church and of the reformers has been largely conserved unto this present day, while exegetical knowledge of the Word of God is vastly more accurate and complete now than in any preceding century. It seems to be true that the current systematic theology of Protestantism is not as scriptural either in what it affirms or what it does not affirm as the exegesis of our time demands. It must then, as

one has said, be rectified and fructified by being led back to the fountain-head of revealed truth. To take a single illustration of the need of this. "Calvinism, according to one of the most honored Presbyterian teachers of our time,[1] starts from a double predestination which antedates creation, and is the divine programme as it were of history. This programme includes the successive stages of a universal fall, a partial redemption and salvation, and a partial reprobation and damnation." Thus, it is admitted, that the doctrine of divine decrees is the central and dominant fact in Calvinism. But is it central and dominant in the Word of God? On the contrary, we must say that the great majority of the writers of the Bible, if interrogated regarding this point, reply that they are wholly ignorant of such a doctrine. Even Paul repudiates it. The Bible would have to be entirely re-written in order to give the doctrine of decrees the place and prominence which Calvin claimed for it. It stands in the dim background of Scripture, when it appears at all; but here is a system of theology in which it is central.

Now it is the mission of biblical theology to furnish the weapons of truth with which errors in existing dogmatics, where there are such, may be destroyed, and to co-work, in the most friendly way, with systematic theology in the construction of a system of doctrine which shall speak when the Bible speaks, and be silent when the Bible is silent; which shall speak aloud where the Bible speaks aloud, and shall speak gently where the Bible speaks gently; which shall regard the *proportions* of revealed truth in the Bible as themselves a part of the permanent teaching of God; a system which shall be scriptural first and speculative afterward, if at all, and which shall scrupulously refrain from prefixing to its speculative deliverances a "Thus saith the Lord;" a system which, if so unfortunate as to bear the name of any man, shall yet be recognized by ordinary people as having a divine right to be called scriptural; and a system, finally, which, though in the fuller light of advancing years it may be found to be *less* than biblical shall never be discovered to be *anti*-biblical.

[1] See SCHAFF, in *Andover Review*, 1892.

Systematic theologians cannot, of course, be expected to take blindly whatever is offered to them by biblical theology, but they will be willing to take facts, or show in open field that what are claimed to be facts are not. They will take the gathered fruits of biblical theology, maintaining, however, their own independence, as the laborer in biblical theology, though working independently, looks for help to the various earlier departments of exegetical study.

Thirdly and lastly, biblical theology has a mission to *Christian life*. This is implied, indeed, in the statement that its aim is to interpret Scripture, for whatever helps to interpret Scripture adds to the moral and religious forces that are abroad; and it is implied also in its mission to systematic theology, for whatever helps systematic theology will, in the end, be helpful to common Christian life; but it is right that the bearing of biblical theology on Christian life should be a little more fully stated.

Christian life is not supported *by* a book, but it is supported very largely *through* a book, by the Spirit of God. That book is a divine literature which blossomed through ten centuries, and the separate books of that literature must be interpreted, as one has said, from their center, and no longer from a small section of their circumference.[1]

Biblical theology seeks thus to interpret the separate books and authors, and to rise from this to a synthesis of the entire Old Testament and of the entire New Testament, and then, finally, to a synthesis of the entire revelation of Scripture.

The existence of such a method of study among the religious teachers of a people is of incalculable value. The formation of this habit of looking at Scripture as a whole means ultimately largeness and simplicity of conceptions regarding the great themes of life.

But biblical theology fosters not only a knowledge of the ranges of Scripture in their entirety, but it fosters also the historical method of study, which is the distinguishing characteristic of modern exegesis as compared with the early and mediæval. The value of this to Christian life cannot be estimated. The

[1] BRIGGS, in *Whither*, 1890.

historical method of studying the Bible brings God very near; the allegorical method puts him far away. The historical method puts facts beneath our feet for us to stand upon; the allegorical method put there fancies as changeful and as insubstantial as mists at sunrise.

Biblical theology, because historical, is, in its completed form, christological, but while it recognizes that the needle of all Scripture points toward the incarnation of God in Jesus Christ, it does not confuse the reality with the shadow, and identify the end with the beginning. It does not say with Augustine, using the words as he used them, that the New Testament is concealed in the Old and the Old revealed in the New. It sees rather that Jesus is greater than the temple, more glorious than any vision that was flashed on the spirit of prophets in their most exalted states of divine communion, and that the kingdom of Jesus far transcends not only the separate foregleams of its coming, but also the total conception of all Old Testament prophecy. Hence a part of the mission of biblical theology to Christian life is to restore the historical perspective in which writers and periods should appear in their providential relation to Christ, and to cultivate the habit of estimating all Scripture by the central fact of all.

We see Moses and Elijah, yea, also Peter and James and John, on the Mount with Jesus, who is permanently transfigured, and we recognize as divine the voice which says regarding the Son, *Hear ye him.*

This great mission of biblical theology to the Bible, to systematic theology, and to Christian life will probably be fulfilled in divers ways and slowly, but we may believe that an increasing fulfilment is certainly to be accomplished, and that out of the Scripture, better understood and better loved, the Lord Jesus will be continually going forth conquering and to conquer.

Aids to Bible Readers.[1]

PAUL'S LETTER TO THE ROMANS.

By Ernest D. Burton.
The University of Chicago.

The beginnings of Christianity in Rome — The Gentile character of the Christian community — Gentile type of the Christianity — The Apostle's reasons for writing: The Roman Christians were in his territory by virtue of being Gentiles; his work in the East was finished; he could not go to Rome at once; there was danger of the Judaizers coming to Rome — Purpose of the ethical part; of the whole — Analysis.

The letter of the apostle Paul to the Romans differs from all his earlier extant letters in that it is written to the Christians of a city which up to the time of the writing of the letter he had never visited. To whose labor or to what causes the beginnings of Christianity in Rome were due, it is impossible to say with certainty. Residents of Rome, Jews or Jewish proselytes, visiting Jerusalem and hearing the gospel preached there; travelers hearing of the new religion in the lands about the Ægean Sea, where Paul and his companions had preached it; preachers of the gospel who went to Rome for the very purpose of carrying the gospel to the capital city — all these may have had that part in bringing it about before the apostle of the Gentiles found himself free to visit the great Gentile capital there was already there a band of believers whose faith was spoken of far and wide (Rom. 1:8–13). But it is a noticeable fact that the apostle makes no reference to any previous connection, direct or indirect, between himself and the church as such. Probably neither he nor any one closely associated with him had taken any leading part in the founding of the church. Equally noticeable is the absence of any reference to any other person as the founder of the church. The view that it was planted by Peter finds no hint of support in the letter — indeed seems plainly excluded by the apostle's conduct and his principle of not building on another man's foundation, which he announces in this very letter — 15:20. The view most consistent with the internal evidence is that the church was in a peculiar sense an independent body, owing its existence to various

influences rather than to the labors of a single apostle or missionary. Indeed it seems probable that the Christians in Rome constituted several groups or communities rather than one organized body. The letter is addressed to all Christians in Rome (1:7), but the word *church* occurs only in the 16th chapter, and then refers, as concerns Rome, to a local group of Christians rather than to the whole body of Christians in the city.

Concerning the character of the community the letter affords us somewhat more definite information. The Christians in Rome were evidently in large part of Gentile blood. While addressing himself to all Christians in the city the apostle definitely speaks of them as Gentiles (1:5, 6, 13). That there were also Jews or Jewish proselytes among the Roman Christians is indeed probable. Setting aside 2:17, which is merely an apostrophe, and 7:1, which rightly translated contains no reference to the Jewish law in particular, and 4:1, in which the apostle perhaps merely speaks from his own point of view, it still remains that Paul assumes in his arguments and references an acquaintance with the Old Testament on the part of his readers not likely to have existed if the church were simply and purely Gentile (the similar element in Galatians is to be explained from the Jewish influences to which the Galatians had been subjected), and especially that the scruples about food and days spoken of in chaps. 14, 15, are much more likely to have existed among Jews than among Gentiles. Yet the paucity of this evidence and the definiteness of the expressions referring to the persons addressed as Gentiles, leaves no room for doubt that these latter constituted the prevailing element of the Christian community. It was moreover as Gentiles that they became Christians. There is nothing in the letter to indicate that they had as yet come under such a judaizing influence as that, for example, to which the Galatian churches had been subjected. All that the apostle says concerning what they had been taught is in approval (1:8; 6:17; 15:14). This is not indeed enough to show that he was entirely satisfied with them. Yet when taken with the silence of the letter concerning any serious errors prevalent among them, and with what we know of the apostle's view of the judaizing heresy as being for Gentiles an utter perversion of the gospel (Gal. 1:7; 5:2 ff.); it goes far toward proving that the Christians in Rome already held a type of Christianity not widely different from that which Paul preached; it makes it quite certain that they had not accepted circumcision and the ordinances of the Jewish law as the foundation stone of their Christianity. This existence in Rome

of a Christian community, not only predominantly made up of Gentiles, but holding a non-Jewish type of Christianity, yet not established by Paul, is itself an interesting fact and one which throws light upon the progress of Christianity in the apostolic age.

There is at first sight something rather perplexing in the evidence concerning Paul's relations to the Romans, and his reasons for wishing to visit them. On the one side it is evident that he regarded the Roman Christians as within the scope of his apostleship just because they were Gentiles (Rom. 1:5, 6, 13; 15:14–16). On the other side he declares that he has made it his aim so to preach the gospel not where Christ was already named, that he might not build upon another man's foundation, and that this has prevented his coming to Rome hitherto (15:20–22). There is an apparent inconsistency between this principle and his then present intention to go to Rome, which he has already announced and which only a few lines later he announces again. But this appearance of inconsistency is turned into a means of gaining a more exact knowledge of the apostle's principles and methods when we observe that in writing Rom. 15:20 Paul really has before his mind two closely related, yet distinguishable, principles respecting his choice of places of labor. The one pertains to the condition of the place in itself considered, the other to the relation to other Christian workers into which labor in a given place will bring him. The latter of these two principles is expressed in the words "that I might not build on another man's foundation." Its precise significance is made clearer by the comparison of 2 Cor. 10:13 ff. At Corinth other men had encroached on Paul's field of labor, seeking to pervert his followers, and thus to find occasion of glorying in things made ready to their hand by him. Of such conduct Paul declares himself not guilty. He would not encroach on another man's territory, or, as he says in Romans, he would not build on another man's foundation. Yet this principle does not exclude him from Rome. The avowal of the principle is followed immediately by the announcement of his intention to come to Rome. Moreover, he had long wished to come to Rome, and had been hindered not by anything in the history or constitution of the Christian community there, but by a temporary obstacle now removed (1:13), viz., the pressure of work further east (15:20–23). Indeed, he evidently feels it necessary to explain why he had not come before rather than why he comes at all. It is evident, therefore, both that Rome is not in the territory of another and that his principle respecting his fellow-workers, was not that he would not

take up the work another had laid down, or carry forward what he had not himself begun, but that he would not encroach on a territory that belonged to another, would not seek to proselyte a church founded on different lines from those which he approved. His principle of choice of fields, so far as it pertained to the condition of the field, is expressed in the words, "making it my aim so to preach the gospel not where Christ was already named." Obedience to this principle had kept him in the East till he had fully preached the gospel from Jerusalem round about unto Illyricum; and even now that his work in the East is finished, he can gratify his long-cherished desire to visit Rome only on his way to unevangelized Spain (15 : 24). Yet the fact that he writes to the Romans and that he plans to visit them even on the way, shows that his principle was not that he should never do any work in a field where Christ was already known, but that he should not allow such work to interfere with his own special task of *planting* Christianity in new fields. Combined into one the two principles become a determination to give the preference to unevangelized fields and never to labor in places where Christ has already been preached, either when this would be encroaching on another man's territory or when it would interfere with his own proper pioneer work. The former condition had apparently never existed in the case of Rome. We have at least no intimation in the letter or elsewhere of its existence. We are led to believe that though the field was not Paul's by right of having planted the seed there, yet it was his by virtue of its Gentile character, and belonged to no one else by any conflicting claim. The second obstacle had till now hindered him from going to Rome, but was now removed by the completion of his work in the East, and the fact that Rome could be visited on the way to Spain.

But why then does not the apostle start at once for Rome? Why did he write this letter instead of going? He had reached a turning point in his work as a Christian missionary. From Jerusalem round about even unto Illyricum he had fully preached the gospel, so that he had no longer any place in these regions (Rom. 15: 19–23). The missionary journeys in Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece, of which we read in the letters to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Corinthians, were all past, and by them he had lighted the light of the gospel in the centers of influence throughout the Greek world. His face is toward the West as never before. But one thing hinders him. He has an errand to accomplish in Jerusalem. It is a matter of great consequence. Eager as he is to reach Rome, eager as he is to preach the

gospel to regions beyond, the long journey to Jerusalem must first be made in order to carry to the poor among the saints there the offering of the Gentile Christians in Galatia, Macedonia and Achaia, and thus to bind together by bonds of love and gratitude the two great divisions of the church and to avert a schism of the body of Christ. How long time this journey would occupy it was of course impossible to foresee. Meantime he knows only too well that the same party whose influence he has reason to fear at Jerusalem, and who have for several years been moving westward along the line of the Gentile churches, is not likely to be inactive. The judaizers who have so nearly succeeded in corrupting the churches of the Galatians, and who have so bitterly opposed him at Corinth have not yet given up the fight. They do not seem to have reached Rome; certainly they had made no marked impression there. But no one could tell how soon they might take ship for Italy. The time which Paul's journey to Jerusalem would necessarily occupy would give them time to anticipate him in Rome.

The occasion of the letter, then, seems to be furnished by the coincidence of these facts; the completion of the apostle's work in the East leading him to turn his face toward the West; the necessity of postponing his journey thither long enough to make a visit to Jerusalem; and the activity of the judaizers, involving the danger that before he should reach Rome they would be there perverting the Christians of the capital from the liberal type of Christianity, which up to this time they had held, to the narrow, judaistic view of the nature of the gospel's mission. That the letter to the Romans was written to prepare the Roman Christians against a possible attack of the judaizers, is indeed nowhere explicitly stated, but the epistle is certainly admirably adapted to this end, and no more probable view of its main purpose has ever been suggested.

This does not, however, quite account for the whole letter. The practical ethical portion of the letter (12:1—15:13) bears no special marks of being directed against judaistic errors. It deals in part with broad principles of Christian morality appropriate to any church; in part with the relations of Christians to the state, a matter of special importance to Christians in Rome; in part with the conscientious scruples, felt by some but not at all appreciated by others, concerning the eating of meat and the observance of certain days. Such differences of opinion on matters of conscience might easily become the occasion of dissension and division. Yet it does not appear that such division had actually occurred. In general purpose, therefore, this

portion of the letter is akin to the earlier chapters. It seeks to build up and fortify rather than to correct or to rebuke; only the dangers which it foresees are from within rather than from without, and are moral rather than doctrinal.

Taking the whole letter together it is evident that it was written when the apostle was looking forward to visiting Rome, yet was temporarily hindred from going at once, and that its purpose was to set before the Roman Christians a clear exposition of the gospel of salvation for both Jews and Gentiles by faith apart from works of the law, and to enforce certain great principles of Christian morality, in order to protect them against the possible assault of judaizing error, and to build them up in Christian character particularly in the matters affecting their relation to the state and their internal harmony.

The course of thought is orderly and systematic, and in the main so clear as to leave but little room for difference of opinion concerning it.

ANALYSIS.

I. INTRODUCTION. 1:1–17.
1. Salutation, including description of the author's apostleship. 1:1–7.
2. Thanksgiving for the faith of the Christians in Rome, and expression of his deep interest in them. 1:8–15.
3. Theme of the Letter: The Gospel the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believes, both Jew and Greek. 1:16, 17.

II. DOCTRINAL PORTION OF THE LETTER: Defense and exposition of the theme. 1:18—11:36.
A. Sin and guilt universal, and hence justification by works of law impossible. 1:18—3:20.
1. The guilt of the Gentiles. 1:18–32.
2. The guilt of the Jews. 2:1—3:20.
B. But now a righteousness apart from works of law, available through faith, for both Jews and Gentiles, has been revealed; this righteousness described and explained. 3:21—5:21.
1. This righteousness comprehensively described. 3:21–26.
2. Bearing of this on Jewish pride and exclusiveness. 3:27–30.
3. Accordance of this teaching with law (*i. e.*, with the Old Testament conception of the nature and office of law) shown from the case of Abraham. 2:31—4:25.
4. Blessedness and excellence of this salvation. ch. 5.
a) Blessed consequences of justification: peace; joy

PROFESSOR BRUCE'S LECTURES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

By EDMUND BUCKLEY, PH.D.
The University of Chicago.

II. EVOLUTION AND AGNOSTICISM.

REMARKABLE as is the position occupied by Professor Bruce in relation to historic Christianity, it is equaled in originality, scholarship, and sympathy by his treatment of the scientific and philosophic postulates of Christianity. Readers of the summary of the former in the October number of the BIBLICAL WORLD will desire a summary of the latter. Professor Bruce's conclusions on evolution and on agnosticism are accordingly here presented, and to them just one remark should be added. That undesigned evidence, the telltale voice, bore witness throughout these lectures that if ever envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness had existed in relation to those who, though they might agree in aspiration and moral purpose with the lecturer, differed intellectually from him, such feelings had forever passed away. This sympathetic power, as rare as it is invaluable in expositor and critic, was possessed by Professor Bruce in an exceptional degree, and this it was, we judge, that from beginning to end inspired his hearers with the confidence in his judgment they evidently felt.

EVOLUTION AND THEISM.—The eighteenth century view of the world as a mechanism with a transcendent God has yielded in the nineteenth, under the influence of Lyall, Darwin, and Spencer, to a view of it as an organism with an immanent God. Some thinkers, however, still deem requisite a special action of God at certain crises. Thus Chapman in his "Pre-organic Evolution" holds that the general equilibrium of the primitive world-all needed action *ab extra* to initiate motion. But, if true, this view would prove of little use to ordinary minds.

Again, the origin of life is considered by many a hopeless enigma without the assumption of quickening from an outside source. Bastian and all since him have denied spontaneous generation. Therefore, some theists argue, when life appeared, as all grant it did at a certain time, it did so from the immediate causality of God. But others cry *non sequitur*, since the conditions may have differed, and with them the results. The presumption is always in favor of natural causes, and since life appeared at a particular time, its preconditions probably existed. Life is not more than the action of matter in peculiar combination. Such arguments of Mr. Fiske have led Professor Drummond and other theists to abandon their old position that the origin of life formed a crisis in evolution, requiring action *ab extra*, while they hold that God is in all life from beginning to close.

Many appeal to the origin of consciousness as inexplicable from the natural conditions then present. Here the scientist assumes an agnostic position, and the theist may, with Le Conte, here as before give evolution full sweep and argue to God as the ground of the whole. This Mr. Spencer can concede, and thus God's action on the world becomes conceivable or at least credible in analogy with the action on our bodies of our own spirits. The contention between evolution and theism has been only as to the *mode* of God's action, which is relatively unimportant. The evolution of man's body from lower animal life is now generally admitted on the evidence of anatomy and embryology. The human embryo passes through the stages of fish, reptile and mammal before maturing as man. The evolution of man's mind is still in dispute. Proofs for it are sought in mental phenomena of the lower animals, of savages, and of children. Thus Romanes speaks of recepts as the animal analogy of human concepts, enabling an animal to distinguish a stone from a loaf, and developing into concepts by the aid of language. But does not language presuppose the very thing — reason — it is here introduced to explain?

Evolution seeks to explain the origin of conscience also. Mr. Spencer defines conduct as acts adapted to ends, and hence applicable to all animals. Animals that bear myriads can have no family affection, which begins in mammals, and is perfected in man where prolongation of infancy owing to increase of cerebral surface extends the period of parental care. Perhaps the same *hysteron proteron* as above occurs here also.

Mr. Fiske in his "Man's Destiny in the Light of his Origin," a book I exhort everyone to read, has set aside the polemic of his "Cosmic Philosophy" against theism. It appears here that evolution puts man just where revelation and the *consensus gentium* have, at the head of creation, and indeed proves it. If we thus accept the evolution of man's entire nature, we can show that he has significance in an interpretation of the world, in the knowledge of God, and in the understanding of himself. Thus, first, in man all that precedes finds its rational end. Second, this evidence of God's *purpose* in creation grounds the inference to him as like man, whereas the argument from *causality* would admit of God being as much like one thing — say matter — as another, namely man. It is true that anthropomorphism has marred this concept, but progress takes place here also, every age needing its own prophets. In the third place, man's position in nature grounds a forecast to his destiny in ultimate perfection. Evolutionists like Mr. Fiske and Professor Le Conte accept even the immortality of man as an act of faith in the reasonableness of God's work.

As to Christ and evolution, we must stick to him at all hazards. But he is a problem we may leave the future to solve.

AGNOSTICISM. — This term was meant by its originator, Professor T Huxley, to suggest antithesis to gnosticism, the profession of full knowledge about God. Science is often agnostic because jealous of the introduction of

God into the realm of causality, and because it believes it deprives the old theistic arguments — cosmological and teleological — of their cogency, and finally because it fails to distinguish between man and brutes in point of worth and significance. As to the theistic arguments referred to, interest in them is waning, though Professor R. Flint and Dr. Martineau have restated them and believe in them. Especially notable are the teleological implications of evolution pointed out by Professor Flint. There are, (1) That atoms have the marks of manufactured articles. (2) That the hereditary production of like by like is not a matter of necessity. (3) That atoms have only a limited and definite tendency to vary, and thus exclude chance. (4) That overproduction which alone renders selection possible is not necessary. Professor Schurman works in the same direction when he shows that the survival of the fittest does not explain the arrival of the fittest. Kant, while an agnostic on speculative grounds, was a theist on ethical ones, and his position has the advantage that the more moral a man is the more cogent does its support become. Hamilton and Mansel deny all natural knowledge of God, the latter in the interests of censured articles of the Christian faith, which he thus removed from the sphere of man's natural judgment. Against Kant the theist may urge that science now tends to realism, and against Hamilton that only on the ground of the moral nature in man can the morality of God be asserted, which involves that the morality be of the same kind.

Agnosticism denies that the existence of God is a necessary assumption of the verdicts of conscience. This assumption is Dr. Martineau's favorite doctrine, compared by him to the necessary perception of the world. Newman held an opposite opinion, and the truth lies between them. The agnostic can quote Newman here, and himself traces conscience to social control, which Martineau opposes on the ground that a "must" cannot be changed into an "ought." The theist need not dogmatize here, for on any of these theories he may hold that God speaks through conscience, immediately according to Dr. Martineau, mediately according to Mr. Spencer.

Again, agnosticism doubts the moral order of the world, or providence, on the ground of the confusion in human life. According to Schopenhauer, the Absolute, if conscious, could be a devil mocking man in cruel sport, and this view is now appearing in light literature. Two cautions are here necessary. (1) Don't assume that the disease is only temporary. (2) Don't flatter yourself there is only little in the world leading to such a view just because all seems well with you. Much is really wrong in the world, and so long as this remains the difficulty with God will remain too. Now, the agnostic position here is not pessimistic as is that of Schopenhauer and his school. Both Mr. Spencer and Mr. Fiske hold that the present condition is transitory to one in which evil will have vanished, and Mr. Fiske recommends for the present resignation, which the agnostics deem admissible in the case of a force, but not in that of a personal God whose justice to future generations cannot excuse injustice to past ones. To this the theist objects that it refuses to

allow God time to work, whereas all growth is slow in proportion to its value, and whereas rapid evolution may involve some inherent impossibility. Indeed, evolution lightens the burden by showing that good is coming with certainty, and thus renders faith less liable now than formerly to fluctuations. Old thinkers overcame the difficulty, and the audacity in thought of the author of Job shows that they must not be supposed under bondage to traditional views. Charges against God should be prevented by the consideration that the possibility of sin was involved in that of a moral being, and that limitation of the divine power is involved in the same, for a *gratia irresistibilis* is unthinkable. The harm of sin was not limited to the sinner lest man should become selfish. Only solidarity affords to love a career. The Old Testament was querulous just here, but the New Testament loyally accepts the law of self-sacrifice. Better to win thus than by stupendous and stupefying miracles.

Lastly, agnosticism doubts the knowability of God, as in modern German theology. Kant's doctrine of the thing-in-itself, and Schleiermacher's doctrine of religion as feeling have led to the view that God is known only as he *affects* man. Thus Ritschl, who dominates theology in Germany, applying the philosophy of Lotze to theology, confines theology to God's relation to man. Not omnipotence, omniscience and the like, but love should be the attribute of God chosen for investigation. Christ has the religious value of God because God's love is manifested in him, and victory granted through him. Even Christ's metaphysical essence is unknowable, and his divinity must be learned, if at all, in his earthly history, as opposed to theories about his pre-existence. Thus in general theology consists of "value-judgments," and such knowledge of God is as real as similar knowledge about the world. Natural theology is so much waste effort. Dr. Hermann, an extremist of this school, holds that only through Christ can man learn either that God is or that he is good. To which the obvious objection is that much genuine piety is recorded in the Old Testament, and in non-Christian scriptures. Comparative religion has well shown this, and St. Paul declared it of old. Of course, Christ has a unique value in this regard, but he that claims more exposes himself to the agnostic objection that universal experience must be trusted rather than the testimony of any one individual. Better make Christ the true interpreter of experience than oppose him to it, for, in faith, what one sees there depends much upon the mood of the seer.

When Mr. Forsyth declares that nature has no revelation for man because it has no forgiveness, he overlooks such facts as the knitting of bones after fracture and the general tendency to restoration in all living tissue.

The combination of agnosticism with ethico-theism in such writers as Carlyle and Matthew Arnold should be made use of in combating anti-theism. Mr. Arnold showed in "Literature and Dogma" how the Bible is saturated with the notion of God as righteous, and claimed that hence arose its value. It may be well in our times to preach such truths on the basis of Job and Psalms 37 and 73, rather than developed theology. But while the main

contention of Arnold is increasingly approved, it remains true that he has overlooked the greater truth of God's magnanimity in his choice of Israel and manifestation in Christ.

Thus England agrees with Germany in anti-dogmatism, restricting the number of affirmations about God, because we do not know them and need not care. This is healthy compared with a belief in the all-importance of dogma, but may easily go too far, as in Germany in reaction from Hegel who made religion a matter of thought.

Notes and Opinions.

"He Descended into Hell."—Professor Lumby writes vigorously in defense of this clause of the Apostles' Creed, in the *Thinker* for September. It has been attacked because the words in which it is stated are not found in any orthodox creed before A. D. 390, about which date we read in Rufinus (In Symb. Apost., 18) that though not found in the Roman Creed nor in those of the Oriental churches, these words were contained in that of the church of Aquileia in North Italy. It does not appear in the Nicene Creed (A. D. 325), and yet Professor Lumby brings much evidence to show that at that time it was an article of Christian faith. The writings of both Eastern and Western Fathers contain this information, quotations being made from Athanasius, Basil the Great, and Cyril of Jerusalem for the East, and for the West from Hilary of Poitiers and St. Ambrose of Milan, all in the fourth century. In the third century equally strong evidence for the belief is found in the writings of Origen, Clement, Tertullian, Irenaeus, and among the Apostolic Fathers, Ignatius especially. So that the teaching contained in this clause of the Creed is traced back to the days immediately succeeding the apostles. Nothing can account for its prevalence and persistence but the view that it was a part of the most primitive Christian teaching. It should content us to know, says Professor Lumby, that this descent of Christ into Hades is one of the truths revealed in Scripture—that by it we were delivered from the power of death and Satan. To know more we must wait for that other life, in which not only this, but many other of the things of faith will become clear, though now they lie beyond the grasp of human reason.

Jeremiah as a Prophet of Retribution.—Such is the view taken of Jeremiah by Dr. Stalker in the *Expositor* for September, and he states it thus: "Jeremiah may be said to have been the conscience of his generation. The consciences of his contemporaries were blunted and seared, and this was the reason of their ruin; but, as in an ill-doing family there may be a brother or sister in whose gentle heart all the shame and pain accumulate which the others do not feel, so the prophet was the sensitive center in which the sin of the age was fully felt. One function of the conscience is to reveal the moral ideal; and Jeremiah held up to his fellow-countrymen the image of their own life as God intended it to be. Another function of conscience is, when the ideal is infringed, to insist on the wrong which has been committed; and Jeremiah was so incessantly pointing to the particular faults by which the law of God was contravened that we can still see in his pages all the abuses of

the time. But conscience has a further function: when sin has been committed, it gives warning of punishment; and perhaps the most prominent feature in the work of Jeremiah is the denunciation of divine retribution about to fall on those who have sinned. . . . . His function as a prophet of retribution was not restricted to the mere proclamation of the general principle that sin would be punished sometime; he was, further, endowed to a remarkable degree with the gift of predicting when and in what forms the punishment was to fall.

"At present it is the fashion to depreciate the predictive element in prophecy; and some interpreters of the prophetic writings appear to take special delight in pointing to instances in which the predictions of the prophets were not fulfilled. This is a reaction from an opposite extreme. A generation ago the predictive element in prophecy received exaggerated prominence. The prophets were spoken of as if their principal function had been the foretelling of future events, and as if the value of any prophetical book had to be measured by the number of coincidences which could be counted between its predictions and subsequent history, Daniel, on this account, for example, being studied more than Isaiah. This was an exaggeration. Prediction was not the sole function of the prophets; it was not even their principal function. They were not sent to foretell the future condition of the world, but to alter its existing condition; to grapple with the people of their own generation about their duty and their sin; to declare the will of the living God for living men. To read the prophets from this point of view is to see them with new eyes; and it is hardly too much to say that our generation, reading them thus, has rediscovered the most valuable section of the Old Testament.

"Yet prediction was a function of the prophets, and a very extraordinary one. Jeremiah possessed the gift in a remarkable degree. In his very first vision the direction from which the retribution was to come on his country was indicated—'out of the north,' *i. e.*, from Mesopotamia. And this was remarkable, for it might just as well have come from Egypt on the south. . . . . As time went on the prophet's sensitiveness to the approach of coming events seemed to grow more keen, and he was able to predict many particulars. One of the most remarkable was the death of the false prophet Hananiah, which occurred within the year. Another was that the exile would last for seventy years, instead of being finished in two, as the false prophets were alleging. But the most remarkable instance was Jeremiah's steadfast certainty that the city, with its temple, and the state were for the time to perish. How was he certain of this? The wonder of it is brought home to us when we remember how, in exactly similar circumstances, with a besieging army encircling Jerusalem, Isaiah confidently assured his countrymen that the city would not perish. How did Isaiah know, in the one case, that Jerusalem would be delivered, and Jeremiah, in the other, that it would fall? No doubt the two men stood at different points of the providential development; there was a profound moral reason, in the one case, why the city should be saved

and its inhabitants receive another chance, and in the other why there should be no further postponement, because the cup of iniquity was full. But it exceeded the wit of man to measure these distinctions, and in the one case and in the other the tallying of events with the preceding predictions was clear proof of supernatural knowledge in the prophet."

Sources of the Acts History.—One of the foremost problems in New Testament criticism at the present time is the ascertainment of the sources from which the Book of Acts was drawn. A recent German work of much ability—Jüngst's *Die Quellen der Apostelgeschichte*—has treated the problem in a way which has aroused much interest and comment. The book is reviewed by Professor Dods, in the *Critical Review* for July, in connection with which he defines the present state of the problem: "Some of the foremost of recent critics despair of ascertaining with any completeness the sources of the narrative of Acts. Although persuaded that the writer has made use of written sources, they think he has so freely adapted his material to the requirements of his book, that it is now impossible thoroughly to sift source from source, or source from redaction. Weizsäcker, for example, says: 'If he used a source, it cannot be indicated in his text. The narrative is too much of a piece, and too smooth for that.' This position, at any rate so far as regards the earlier parts of the book, is held by Holtzmann, Pfleiderer and Beyschlag. On the other hand there have always been, since Schleiermacher's time, critics who not only believed in the possibility of dissecting the narrative into its original component parts, but have actually attempted the dissection. Some of these attempts have, indeed, been merely conjectures or suggestions, not based upon any close examination of the text. Thus, Schleiermacher suggested that the book was made up of scraps of local tradition—an idea which, as Jüngst points out, takes no account of the unity of style in various parts of the book, nor of the relation of the speeches to one another. Biographies of Peter, Paul and Barnabas have been supposed, and a number of other documents. When greater attention began to be paid to the language there was, except in Van Manen and Clemen, a return to simpler views. Feine was satisfied with two sources; Spitta found that two-thirds of the book, including the 'we-passages,' were from the hand of Luke, and that a Jewish Christian document, containing scarcely any speeches, and admitting much more of popular tradition, appears to have been used, not only in the early chapters, but throughout. . . . . Blass suggests that Luke may have derived his information regarding the early history of the church in Jerusalem from Mark, who lived there, and who was connected both with Peter and with Barnabas.

"The result reached by Jüngst himself is that the Acts of the Apostles have been composed essentially out of two sources, of which the one (A) embraces the 'we-passages,' and extends through the entire work, but has admitted in the second half considerable interpolations at the hand of the redactor. In the first twelve chapters the redactor (R) has used the so-

called 'Ebionite' source made use of in the gospel (B), but has dislocated its chronological order to adapt it to A. This view has certainly the merit of simplicity. The difficulty is that he does not allow the final revision to be ascribed to Luke. To this companion of Paul's he refers A inclusive of the 'we-passages,' R, the final redactor, really the composer of the book, is brought down to the period between 110 and 125 A. D. . . . . The proofs of this late date advanced by Jüngst must be pronounced entirely insufficient. . . . . It may be taken for granted that the author of the Book of Acts made use of documentary sources, and was not particularly anxious to conceal this by skilful editing. Dislocations of the narrative, repetitions in the same or very slightly altered form, and other 'infallible proofs,' put this beyond question. It is enough to refer to chaps. 5:12b–14, 2:41–47, *cf.* 5:32–35. Let any one consider how 2:41, in which it is said that three thousand souls had been added to the church, is related to vs. 43, in which it is said that they were all in one place; or let him consider the relation between the statement of 2:43, that many wonders and signs were done by the apostles, and the account given in chap. 3 of the *first* miracle, and he will conclude that this book was not written freely from information held in the mind of the writer, but that he was endeavoring to embody as much as he could of the information which lay before him in documentary sources. And if in Acts Luke followed the same method as he tells us he used in the gospel, then the probability is that he used all the sources he could lay hands on."

The Chronology of Old Testament History.—This is one of the features of Bible study most widely and persistently misunderstood. Ussher's attempt at chronology which, although obsolete, still stands on the margins of the Bibles commonly used, is generally regarded as a chronology which the text itself clearly furnishes, and as therefore of equal authority with the text. It is true that the text furnishes some figures — not *dates*, of which there are none at all — for a chronology of Old Testament times, but not with completeness, exactness or even entire trustworthiness. The order of events, and their relation to each other, is a more important matter upon which the Old Testament text throws more light, but that is not chronology. There is at present no perfect agreement among scholars as to a scheme of dates for the events of Old Testament history prior to the ninth century. The state of the problem, and some of the conjectural dates, are well set forth by a paragraph in the *Sunday School Times* for October 12: "There is no statement in the Bible to the effect that the year 4000 B. C. was 'soon after the founding of the human race.' 'Bible chronology' is a misnomer, for there is no system of chronology specifically set forth in the Bible. What is commonly understood to be Bible chronology is in the main Ussher's calculations, which have been given a place in the margin of our English Bibles. The earlier portion of these calculations is based on the references to the ages of the patriarchs in the recension or critical revision of the Hebrew text from which our English version

was translated; but these ages are given differently in the Septuagint, or ancient Greek translation of the Old Testament, in the Samaritan Pentateuch, and again in the Masoretic Hebrew text from which our English Bible is translated. These differences amount in the aggregate to fourteen or fifteen centuries, as prior to the time of Abram's leaving Haran. Hence it is agreed by all scholars that there cannot be a common agreement on this point while we have no fuller information than these conflicting records as to times and dates of events in the early Bible story. The essential thing to have in mind is, that the Bible gives no clew to the age of the world, nor indeed to specific dates prior to the call of Abraham. What light future discovery from extra-biblical sources may throw upon the chronology of the early chapters of Genesis, the future only can tell. . . . . Professor McCurdy puts the Exodus about 1200 B. C., while the older traditions assigned it to about 1500 B. C. Of late it has been usual to estimate it about 1320 B. C. . . . . But the farther back we go, the less can we hope to establish a chronology, and the more evident is it that God had no intention of revealing it."

The Walls of Jericho.—If, as may perhaps be assumed, there are many who question whether the narrative of the falling down of the walls of Jericho at the blast of the ram's-horn trumpets, taken in its literal sense, describes that event precisely as it happened, what theories may be held of the physical cause of their fall, and of the origin, from a purely human point of view, of our present narrative? Confining the inquiry to the narrative, we discover that it is assigned by the critics to the document formed by the union of J and E, both of which are supposed to date from about the eighth or ninth century B.C., or some six hundred years after the event described. How were the facts preserved during this period, and what were the sources of our author's information? He may have used older documents, or he may have taken the story direct from the mouth of popular tradition. It is conceivable that, like Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who extracted a history of Troy from the cyclic poems, our author has hardened into history what was originally only high poetry. The supposition agrees well with his procedure in Josh. 10:12–14, where the miracle of the lengthened day appears to rest upon a misunderstanding of the poet's meaning.

To render the view here presented entirely acceptable, we need some evidence that the story of Jericho was told in song. We do not know the full contents of the Book of Jashar. Besides the description of Joshua's battle with the five kings, at which the sun and moon metaphorically stopped to gaze in wonder, it contained the Song of the Bow (2 Sam. 1:18), and according to an emendation of the Septuagint text following 1 Kings 8:53, the words of Solomon at the dedication of the temple. A book which described one of Joshua's victories may well have mentioned the other. That the battle with the five kings and the fall of Jericho are alike preceded by a divine

promise of victory (6:2; 10:8), may serve to confirm the view that both accounts were derived from the same source, viz., the poems of Jashar.

Another solution may be had by following a hint from Maimonides. That learned Jewish commentator is quoted by Burder, in his notes to Whiston's *Josephus*, as saying that, "Whosoever saw the walls sunk deep in the earth would clearly discern that this was not the form of a building destroyed by man, but miraculously thrown down by God." Maimonides must have understood by the walls falling down flat, that they sank into the earth,—an interpretation possibly sanctioned by the text. *Tachath*, the word rendered "flat," is said in the margin of the authorized version to have the signification of "under;" in the margin of the Revised Version, "in its place;" thus apparently making the text mean that the walls went down *in their place*, or *under*, and justifying the interpretation of Maimonides, that they sank into the ground. If this be granted, we have a clue to the origin of the narrative. Excavations about the place led to the discovery of the ruins of ancient walls, which, appearing to have been sunk into the ground, though in reality only covered with *débris*, generated the belief that here had been the scene of a miracle. The two theories may easily be united into a single view, according to which the buried walls furnished the basis of a poetical description of their sinking, which in its turn became the source of our present narrative.

Estelline, S. D. CHARLES L. ABBOTT.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE.

GENERAL NOTES.

A new field for the Club Course has been found in connection with schools and colleges. The fact that the courses in this department run from October to June and cover a period of four years makes them especially suited to such work. In some cases they have been introduced by the faculty, and in others by the students in their Christian Association work.

Among the schools and colleges where classes are now in progress are Leland Stanford University, the University of California, Vassar College, Woman's College of the Northwestern University, the University of Chicago, the Woman's College of Nashville, Tenn., Hardy School, Duluth, Minn., and Lake Erie Seminary, Painesville, Ohio. The courses are found especially helpful in institutions where there is no regular biblical instructor, the work being so carefully planned for the student that almost any member of a college faculty or even a bright student can conduct a course satisfactorily.

An unusual feature of the club work this year is noticed in the *size* of the clubs, the average membership of those thus far enrolled being over thirty. Several clubs of forty, fifty, and even sixty members, have reported.

The South Dakota Christian Endeavor Union passed the following resolution at its recent annual convention: "Resolved, that we heartily commend increasing the interest in systematic Bible study through the organization of Bible clubs of the American Institute of Sacred Literature."

Rev. C. M. Daley, Superintendent of the Missionary Department of the Congregational Sunday School and Tract Society, was appointed chairman of a committee of three to introduce the work, and steps have already been taken which will give every society in the state the opportunity to form a Bible club.

The "Normal Class" has come to be a recognized necessity in connection with every Sunday School. Two errors in the introduction of these classes are frequently fallen into, viz., (1) the idea that the class is formed primarily for supply teachers and therefore should study the same lessons as the remainder of the school one week in advance; (2) that they should study *about* the Bible, its form, character, books, etc.

Pedagogically, the Normal Class should be composed of persons who are willing to take, with a view to teaching, a systematic course of Bible study, running over three or four years, embracing at least an outline study of the contents of the entire Bible. The members of this class should be called upon as seldom as possible for teaching until they have completed their course. They will then be better able to teach any part of the Bible than nine-tenths of those who are now forced into service as supplies, or even as regular teachers. Four such classes have been formed during the past month in Chicago churches, and the four years' course of the Institute has been adopted.

A notable class of this kind has been in existence in New Haven, Conn., for several years. It is under the general leadership of Mr. J. B. Underwood. This year in addition to three divisions carrying on lines of work in the English Bible, a section will devote itself to the study of Hebrew, using the instruction sheets of the Institute.

A course of lectures under the joint auspices of the University Extension Department of the University of Chicago and the Institute, is now in progress. The general subject is the History of Prophecy. The following are the more specific subjects: 1. Events, Stories, Sermons, Predictions: The Contents of Prophecy; Definitions; Literature. 2. Prophetic Situations, viz., Amos, Isaiah, Zephaniah; The Principles of Prophecy. 3. Periods in the History of Prophecy; Classification of Prophetic Material according to those Periods. 4. Prophecy before Israel's Occupation of Canaan. 5. Prophecy during the Time of the United Kingdom. 6. Prophecy of the Northern Kingdom. 7. Prophecy of Isaiah and his Contemporaries. 8. Prophecy of Jeremiah and his Contemporaries. 9. Prophecy of the Babylonian Captivity. 10. Prophecy of the Restoration. 11. The Last Days of Prophecy. 12. The Prophetic Work as a Whole. The lectures are given on Sunday afternoon at the University of Chicago, and on Monday at noonday in Steinway Hall in the city. Some fifteen hundred people in all attended the first lecture given Sunday and Monday October 13 and 14.

The inquiry often comes to the Institute headquarters, "How is the work supported?" The following list of friends who contributed to the work of the year 1894–5 will indicate the source of a portion of the income: William E. Dodge, New York City; J. G. Batterson, Hartford, Conn.; Cyrus H. McCormick, Chicago; Rev. John H. Barrows, Chicago; Professor Albion W. Small, Chicago; President E. Benjamin Andrews, Providence, R. I.; Rev. Arthur Brooks, New York City; Rev. David Greer, New York City; Francis Lynd Stetson, New York City; Reuben Knox, Plainfield, N. J.; Jas. L. Houghteling, Chicago; Rev. F. W. Gunsaulus, Chicago; Rev. A. K. Parker, Chicago; Rev. Thos. C. Hall, Chicago; Jesse A. Baldwin, Chicago; Willard A. Smith, Chicago; Mrs. S. F. Adkins, Indianapolis, Ind.; Fletcher Ingalls,

M.D., Chicago; Professor and Mrs. Geo. Palmer, Cambridge, Mass.; Rev. F. T. Gates, New York City; Professor Ernest D. Burton, Chicago; Rev. D. Stuart Dodge, New York City; President William R. Harper, Chicago.

The need of the organization is becoming more apparent with every hour, and the subscriptions to the work should be doubled in number and amount if all is to be accomplished which the times demand. If this brief mention, therefore, meets the eye of any who might be interested in becoming patrons of so great a work, a note of such names to the principal may prove very helpful.

THE BIBLE STUDENT'S READING GUILD.

Topics for Discussion at Chapter Meetings:

1. The Jewish Sanhedrin.
2. The Law, and its relation to the daily life of the Jew.
3. The services of the Temple and the Synagogue.
4. Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes,—Distinctive beliefs and customs.
5. Current Messianic ideals in the time of Jesus.
6. The influence of the Synagogue in the spread of Christianity.
7. The doctrines of Socrates and Plato compared with Christianity.
8. A comparison of Stoicism and Christianity.
9. A comparison of the practical results of the Heathen and the Christian religions of the first century in the moral life of individuals and communities.
10. Readings from Seneca.
11. The history of the Jews from the point of view of their religion.
12. The Day of Pentecost,—the events, Peter's Sermon, the immediate results.
13. The manner of life of the Christians in this early and somewhat prosperous period.
14. The early persecutions,—their source, their effect upon the spread of the new belief.
15. The first steps toward making the Church an organized body.
16. Stephen,—the man, the preacher, the martyr.
17. The attitude of the Christian Community in relation to ceremonial observances, the Jewish Law, the Temple, the Synagogue, admission to the community, gifts, etc.
18. Peter as an apologist and speaker,—his influence, his theology.

Work and Workers.

A NEW work by Dr. Stalker is published by the American Tract Society, bearing the title, *The Two St. Johns of the New Testament.*

TWO useful articles have recently been contributed to the *Sunday School Times* by Professor W. M. Ramsay, treating of *The Book of Acts in the Light of Recent Discovery.*

AN ably prepared and attractively illustrated article upon *Religious Journalism and Journalists* appeared in the October number of the *Review of Reviews.* The author is George P. Morris.

THE Open Court Publishing Company of Chicago has done an unexpected but a very good thing in publishing *The Prophets of Israel—Popular Sketches from Old Testament History*, by the well-known German scholar, Professor C. H. Cornill.

THE second year's issue of the Theological Translation Library, edited by Drs. Cheyne and Bruce and published by Messrs. Williams & Norgate, London, is to contain the following three volumes: Weizsäcker's *Apostolic Age*, Vol. II, Hermann's *The Communion of the Christian with God*, and Kittel's *History of the Hebrews*, Vol. II.

A VERSION of the New Testament in broad Scotch dialect, the work of the Rev. William Wye Smith, will soon be published by Funk & Wagnalls, New York. Such a work is of no great critical or interpretative value, but is a labor of love which will bring out new beauties of the revered book to many a devout Scotch heart, especially if it be in a far country where the old accents of the native tongue are seldom heard.

THE Revision Committee who issued the Revised Version of the New Testament in 1881 and that of the Old Testament in 1885 has now completed and will shortly publish through the Oxford Press a revised translation of the Old Testament Apocryphal Books. This completes their labors, and the fruit thereof becomes daily greater as the people learn to appreciate and use this new and much improved English version of the Bible.

PEOPLE should buy and read Dr. Moxom's Lowell Lectures published by Roberts Bros., Boston, entitled *From Jerusalem to Nicaea—The Church in the First Three Centuries*, not because it is the best work upon the subject, but because it is a good one, and they know so very little about the Church outside of the first century. The history of the Christians from 100 to 325 A.D. is alive with interest and influence for every thinking member of the church.

THE Fall announcements of the London publishing house of Hodder & Stoughton are unusually interesting to biblical scholars. Some of them are *St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen*, by Professor W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D. Two works by Dr. R. W. Dale, one entitled *Christ and the Future Life*, the other, *The Epistle of James, and Other Discourses; The Visions of a Prophet—Studies in Zechariah*, by Professor Dods; *The Seven Words from the Cross*, by Dr. Robertson Nicoll; *The Books of the Twelve Prophets*, by Dr. George Adam Smith; *The God-Man*, by Dr. T. C. Edwards; *The Book of Deuteronomy*, by Professor Andrew Harper.

IN reply to an inquirer in the *Expository Times*, Thomas Nicol of Edinburgh recommends the following books as containing the latest and most reliable information on the positive results of archæological research in relation to the Old Testament: *The Bible and the Monuments—Primitive Hebrew Records*, by W. St. Chad Boscawen (Eyre & Spottiswood, 1895); *The Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, by A. H. Sayce (Soc. Prom. Chn. Knowledge, 1894); *History of Egypt*, by W. M. Flinders Petrie (Methuen, 1894); *Geschichte des alten Morgenlandes*, by F. Hommel (Williams & Norgate); *Assyrien und Babylonien*, by Kaulen (Williams & Norgate), and *The Mummy*, by E. A. W. Budge.

A NEW edition, the fourth, of Strack's *Introduction to the Old Testament* has been published in Germany. Eight thousand copies of the work in its first three editions were sold, showing that an unusual value was placed upon it by the public. The new edition is thoroughly revised and brought up to date. It is a small book—119 pages—but contains a great amount of useful material. In addition to the Introduction proper, the work contains chapters upon the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, the canon of the Old Testament, the history of the original text and the different ancient and modern versions, and a full bibliography of historical, exegetical and linguistic works upon the Old Testament.

THE announcement will be received with enthusiasm by New Testament students and scholars everywhere that we are soon to have an edition of the gospels in the original in which the parallel portions will be set side by side, ready for examination in the study of the problems of gospel criticism. This is what Mr. Rushbrooke's *Synopticon* did and did well, but it was an expensive work and besides it is out of print. Existing Greek "Harmonies" are not at all adequate. Rev. Arthur Wright, M.A., Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge, a scholar well fitted for the task, has undertaken to get out a work which will accomplish the same end as the Synopticon, in a moderate size and at a moderate price. The book is already in the press. It may be hoped that the work will meet the need of scholars in this line, a need which has become fairly clamorous.

THE Colportage Association of the Chicago Bible Institute has been organized by Mr. D. L. Moody. Its purpose is: "(1) To supply good literature at a price within the reach of all; (2) to carry the gospel, by means of the printed page, into neglected and frontier towns where church privileges are wanting; (3) to supply pastors and other Christian workers with helpful books, not too expensive, to give away to young converts and those who are awakened to the realization of their religious needs; (4) to reach non-church-goers; (5) to supply good books at a low rate for free distribution; (6) to provide a profitable means of employment for student canvassers." The books of the association will be published semi-monthly, and will contain the writings of eminent Christian men in various fields. They will be paper-covered, about 125 pages. Single numbers will be fifteen cents; the annual subscription (for twenty-four numbers) is fixed at $2.25.

AN article upon Professor Harnack, written by the Rev. D. Macfadyen, M.A., appeared in the *Expository Times* for October. It is mainly concerned with the great historian's theological position and deliverances, and an attempt to refute them. The briefer statements of a biographical and personal nature touch upon matters less well known. "Professor Adolf Harnack, of Berlin, is the son of Theodosius Harnack, professor of practical theology in the University of Dorpat. His interest in church history is a clear case of heredity. The father was the author of several pamphlets which deal with subjects since handled by his better-known son. The son must have found his way very early into the theological atmosphere, which seems now to be the one entirely natural to him. He is still under forty-five, but has already been professor of church history at Giessen and Marburg, and is now at Berlin. His chair is the one made famous by Neander, and he is generally acknowledged to be, as Dr. Schaff called him, 'the ablest of Neander's successors.' As a lecturer he is singularly successful in carrying his audience with him. When the present writer first heard him he was lecturing twice daily, but he scarcely used a note. He was lecturing on early Christian institutions and on the history of dogma,—in one lecture dealing with a mass of details and patristic quotations, and in the next dealing with the abtruse questions of the theology of the Incarnation. It was difficult to say which set of lectures was most full of interest. In one there was an orderly marshaling of facts, and in the other a clearness of exposition which made him easy to follow, even in an unfamiliar tongue. The lecturer was never monotonous in voice, and his face was a constant study as the light and shade of humor and earnestness played upon it. He had a curious habit of driving his points home with a smile and a touch of sarcasm. But the most abiding impression left by his lecturing, as by his writing, is that of great clearness and decision."

Book Reviews.

The Didache, or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles—Restored to its original state from various sources, with an introduction, translation and notes, by CHARLES H. HOOLE, M.A., student of Christ Church, Oxford, London. David Nutt, 270–271 Strand; 1894, 90 pp., 12mo, 2s. 6d.

So often and so admirably has the teaching of the apostles been edited and annotated since its discovery by Bryennius that there should scarcely be a warrant for another edition, unless it contained some new and valuable material, throwing more light on some hitherto obscure passages of the text and enlarging our knowledge of the time and circumstances in which the original tract was written. Is this the case with the present book? An introduction of some forty-three pages gives, in a condensed form, what Harnack, Harris and others have years ago given us in their editions. The sources which Hoole prints in full are all contained in these editions with additional exhaustive critical remarks, not found in Hoole's book. The genealogy which he constructs for the text, differing somewhat from that proposed by Harnack, Warfield and others is as follows: The original teaching of the apostles composed most likely before the end of the first century was embodied partly in the Shepherd of Hermas and the epistle attributed to Barnabas. A little later it was included in the apostolic constitutions, and yet later the editor of the epitome of the Holy Apostles endeavored to complete the notion of a Didache of the Apostles by giving the names of the apostles themselves, and referring each precept to its author. These four forms of the apostolic teaching, or, at any rate, the first three of them, were in the hands of the anonymous writer of the treatise known as "The Didache of the Apostles," who compiled and abridged from them the work that we now possess as the Didache, giving in a condensed form what had previously existed in a number of other works, with a view to supplying a manual of conduct, based on the actual teaching of the apostles themselves, and adding some formulæ, possibly belonging to an earlier period than his own, for the administration of the sacraments and the appointment and maintenance of ministers and church officers. This theory in a slightly different form has been advanced by others, and final judgment must be suspended until further evidence is adduced. The introduction is followed by the text of Bryennius, Hoole's restoration, translation and a few pages of notes. In the text of Bryennius Hoole marked in brackets such passages as are not found in any of the three or four works referred to in the preface; cross references to these works are conveniently given on the margin. In his restoration the editor endeavored to replace what he supposed might have been found in the

original didache by giving the names of the apostles, and bringing the work a little more into the form used at the assumed period, by supplying a commencement and conclusion in the style of the second century. Whether the restored text offered was indeed the original, can neither be denied nor affirmed. Hoole may be right, he is probably wrong. The translation into English is very smooth and forcible, containing, here and there, a new rendering of a hitherto misunderstood passage. This is the chief attraction of the book, together with its neat appearance and the moderate price. For the average reader, who has neither time nor inclination to study the editions of Harnack and Harris, or the compilation of Schaff, this little book contains everything needful to an intelligent appreciation of the importance of our text.

W. M.-A.

Deuterographs: Duplicate passages in the Old Testament, their bearing on the Text and Compilation of the Hebrew Scriptures. By ROBERT B. GIRDLESTONE, M.A., Honorary Canon of Christ Church, and formerly Principal of Wycliffe Hall, etc. Oxford: Clarendon Press; Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co., 1894. Pages xxxii + 172, also 76 pages of book catalogue.

There is universal agreement on this one thing at least in biblical study, namely, that the Books of Samuel and Kings are duplicated in many passages by Chronicles. The significance of this fact for the study of biblical history and for a textual study of these books is very great. It is possible to determine the textual relationship of these parallels, and to estimate their possible relations to a common source from which they were compiled. This book follows in the main the text of the R. V., changing the same only where a convenient arrangement of the parallel columns demands it. The presentation to the eye, of the likeness and unlikeness between Samuel and Kings on the one hand and Chronicles on the other, is very plain, and suggests at once to the reader some interesting problems. The author names the first column, representing Samuel and Kings, A, and the Chronicles column, B. Some of the variations between these texts are startling. They reveal additions, omissions and variations of several kinds. Some are simply those of spelling, others are apparently dialectical changes either verbal or grammatical. Still others are paraphrastic, or such as to disclose corruption or variations in the text of the Hebrew. This latter is quite striking in amount, even ere the literary material is substantially the same.

These points, however, are not of more interest than those of historical criticism. In a careful study of these parallel columns we are somewhat initiated into the methods of compilations adopted by Hebrew writers. Their purpose dominates their method, and the existence of the same events in other literature modifies their results. Who were these compilers and what

was their original text? Shall we lay all the fault of variations on the original writers? or shall we attribute it to late copyists? How many of them were unintentional? and how many were deliberate, if not systematic? Because two texts apparently contradict each other are we to charge the same to the sources of those texts? or to the carelessness or ignorance of the compilers? or to our ignorance of the complete background of the narrative?

Again, if the compilers of Kings and Chronicles made use of various documents usually referred to in preparing their history, how far may we infer that other books were made up on the same plan? Is it certain that some compilers did not quote their sources, but simply patched their work together without much order or consistency? These are some of the numerous questions which crowd in upon the reader of this little book. The textual notes at the bottom of the page are a good feature, but those who would use them are as a rule students who would prefer to make comparison of Hebrew texts. The volume is supplied with an index of texts for ready reference. One feature, however, of the bound volume cannot be too severely censured. It is an imposition on the book-buying public for publishers to insert more than a few pages of advertisements in the back of their books. But here the Clarendon Press has insulted the goodwill and forbearance of its patrons by inserting and binding in with 204 pages of permanently valuable material, just *seventy-six* pages of book catalogue. Every buyer of this volume must either mar his book by tearing out the catalogue, or else carry on his shelves these seventy-six pages of room-taking trash. This method carried on by several English book-houses cannot be too sharply criticised.

PRICE.

How to Read the Prophets: Being the Prophecies arranged chronologically in their historical Setting, with Explanations and Glossary. By the REV. BUCHANAN BLAKE, B.D. Part V. Isaiah (xl–lxvi) and the post-Exilian Prophets. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. 1895. Pages, 246. Price $1.50.

With this volume Mr. Blake concludes his series of "How to Read the Prophets" in chronological order. This part contains Isaiah xl.–lxvi., Daniel Haggai, Zechariah i.–viii. and Malachi. They are treated uniformly with the former volumes of the series, viz., first, the text, in the author's translation, arranged in chronological order; secondly, the historical setting of the same texts, with running explanations. New or difficult words are printed in heavy-faced type, which is a finger-point to a glossary at the end of the book, where all such puzzles are explained. In the arrangement of the text, the author gives no arguments for the positions which he takes. But as he is writing for laymen his word is supposed to be taken as final. It is quite as necessary for

intelligent laymen, in America at least, as for the large number of ministers, to know the reasons for the variations and innovations of the author. Lack of space is no sufficient excuse, as a few footnotes in fine print could mention every valid argument for the new positions taken. Isaiah xl.–lxvi. is located in the exile without reserve. Sections regarded by Smith (G. A.) and others as pre-exilic, and by Cheyne as post-exilic, are indiscriminately placed in this period. He locates in his chronological order Isaiah 54 before 53. He cannot forbear, in his narrative treatment, the temptation occasionally to moralize (*cf.* pp. 155 and 219) on the text under discussion. The Book of Daniel, 1–6, while describing events in Daniel's day did not originate, he *thinks* (does not know it), p. 159, until about 168–164 B.C. Daniel, says he, is not among the prophets in the Jewish Canon (p. 160). But what is the Jewish Canon, and how far back does it reach into the past? The Septuagint, worth infinitely more than mere tradition, names Daniel immediately in connection with Ezekiel. On p. 161 he seems to be in doubt about the date of the first captivity, though he has just read Dan. 1 : 1. We also note that the second kingdom is the Median (p. 216) though the school which Mr. Blake follows in his interpretation has no room for Darius the Mede. On p. 223 we find a piece of jugglery with figures, perfectly innocent in itself, but of no value in the interpretation of Daniel. On the whole the work will prove to be of value to readers who have made a careful study of the prophets. It must be used, however, with caution. PRICE.

The Book of Psalms (Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges) with Introduction and Notes. By A. F. KIRKPATRICK, D.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; Regius Professor of Hebrew. Books II. and III. Psalms xlii.–lxxxix. Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan & Co. 1895. Pages lxxx + 223–556. Price $1.00.

The first thing that meets the reader's eye is the same Introduction that appeared in Vol. I. of this series. Quite a good production, but *one* copy of it is enough, or all that most readers can afford to give shelf-room. Will volume III. contain the same? We hope not. Then when we turn to the exposition proper we find the pagination continuous from Vol. I. What does this mean? The volumes each independent books and still dependent! These irregularities are confusing to the student. The matter of this exposition gives evidences of careful investigation by the author. By tests here and there we can form some idea of his general position. Psalms 44, 74 and 79, which are made Maccabean by those who find any such in the Psalter, are referred by the author to the early dates. He sees that they fit better the early times as we know them, than the later times which we do not know. The superiority of such popular commentaries on the Psalms, as Perowne and Maclaren (Expositors' Bible) set a difficult task before Professor Kirkpatrick. His results will be valuable to laymen who have no other critical work on

the Psalms, but for scholars and specialists in biblical study they do not supersede the valuable work of Perowne or of Delitzsch. His translations, in bold-faced types, are usually fortified by the battlements of Hebrew learning, though there is occasionally room for difference of opinion. The author's work is well "up to date." The mechanical execution of the book is uniform with the other volumes in the series. PRICE.

Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte von Lic. theol. OSKAR HOLTZMANN. J. C. B. Mohr, Freiburg i. B. und Leipzig, 1895. Pp. viii., 260 octavo. Price, Marks, 4.50.

It is seldom that so much good material is got so well into so small a compass as in this volume. It cannot indeed be affirmed that the quality has not suffered by the excessive condensation, but it is surprising that the injury has not been far greater. Professor Holtzmann has succeeded in producing a book which is small enough to be accurately described as a manual, and yet comprehensive enough to give an instructive survey of the subject. The contents are arranged under four heads: (1) a long introduction defining the theme and reviewing authorities; (2) the historical basis of the New Testament literature; (3) the forms of Jewish life in the time of the New Testament; (4) the religious notions of the Jews in the New Testament age. The work runs parallel in the main to the *magnum opus* of Professor Schürer, but our author claims to have gone further than his predecessor and master in that he gives prominence to the relation between Hellenism and early Christianity. The very interesting part of the introduction which treats of the sources for the history of the internal development of the Jewish people is on the whole capitally written. It goes too far afield however. The Book of Job (which is oddly grouped with Tobit and Judith), Proverbs, and Esther can hardly be included among the sources of New Testament history. And too much attention is given to relatively unimportant writings. Three pages, for instance, are occupied by a summary of the Pseudo-Phocylides, whilst the far more notable Wisdom of Solomon gets barely two. That nearly one-fourth of the section is devoted to Philo is not surprising as Professor Holtzmann believes that a cultivated Jew about the beginning of our era differed but little from a cultivated Christian of the second century. The bibliographical notes are characterized by German forgetfulness of works published in English. No mention is made, for example, of the edition of Enoch by Mr. Charles or of that of the Psalms of Solomon by Professor Ryle. The chapter on geography contains several unguarded statements. It is not fair to represent Luke as stating that the five thousand were fed *in* the city of Bethsaida (Luke 9: 10 ff.) The context distinctly points at the neighborhood. The remark that the Asiarchs were associated with the worship of Artemis ought to have been accompanied by a reference to the suggestion of Professor Schürer (in Riehm ed. ii. p. 123) that they were connected with the cult of the Cæsars. It is far

from certain that Paul literally fought with wild animals in the amphitheatre of Ephesus (1 Cor. 15:32), or that the Apocalyptic monster was Caligula (Rev. 13:18), yet both of these opinions are asserted as if they were facts which had never been questioned. On the other hand, the conjecture that Bethsaida Julias was named after the wife, not the daughter of Augustus, is worth considering. The chronology of the gospels is based on the synoptists and on patristic evidence. It is therefore supposed that the ministry lasted only one year, beginning in 28 and ending in 29. The chronology of Acts and the Epistles is even more at variance with received ideas. Paul was converted, not in 37 as most believe, but in the summer after the crucifixion. He may have written his first epistle, which was perhaps that to the Galatians, though our author speaks with some hesitation on this point, in 47 A. D. The Roman imprisonment terminated in 58 A. D. It needs scarcely be observed that this chronological scheme rests on very insecure foundations. The most debatable chapter in the book is the last entitled "Hellenistic Influence on Jewish Religion." In his enthusiasm for Hellenic culture Professor Holtzmann overlooks its defects, fails to do justice to some Old Testament passages, and ignores the Oriental religions with which Judaism came in contact, especially Zoroastrianism. When he contends that the teaching of the New Testament about the imitation of God, the divine care for individuals and the brute creation, body and spirit, and future retribution were strongly affected by Greek influence; when he maintains that belief in the latter came up among the Jews only in the second century B. C., and that through the silent working of Greek thought, he cannot expect judicious students to follow him. The book is well indexed and on the whole well printed, but there are some provoking errata. W. T. S.

Current Literature.

BOOKS.

GENERAL.

Harris, J. Rendel. Union with God. A series of addresses. (London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1895; 8vo, cloth.) 4 s. 6 d.

Josephi, F., opera; recognovit B. Niese Vol. vi. De bello judaico libri septem et index. Editio minor. (Berolini, apud Weidmannos, 1895; vi + 576 pp., 8vo.) M. 8.

OLD TESTAMENT.

Anderson, Robert. Daniel in the Critics' Den. A reply to Dean Farrar's "Book of Daniel." (London, Wm. Blackwood & Sons, 1895.)

Harper, Andrew. The Book of Deuteronomy; Expositor's Bible, eighth series. (London, Hodder & Stoughton; 8vo, cloth.) 7 s. 6 d.

Mez, A. Die Bibel des Josephus, untersucht für Buch v.–vii. der Archaeologie. (Basel, Jaeger & Kober, 1895; 84 pp., 8vo.) M. 2.40.

Moore, Geo. F. Judges. International Critical Commentary. (Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark.) 12 s.

Nacht, J. Tobia ben Elieser's Commentar zu Threni (Lekach Tob), zum 1. Male nach MS. München hrsg., m. e. Einleitung u. Anmerkungen versehen. (Frankfurt a. M., Kauffmann, 1895; 31 + 36 pp., 8vo.) M. 2.

Smith, W. Robertson. The Prophets of Israel and their place in History. New edition. With an introduction by T. K. Cheyne. (London, A. & C. Black, 1895.) 10 s. 6 d.

Stokoe, T. H. Old Testament History. Part i. From the Creation to the Settlement in Palestine. (London, Henry Frowde, 1895; 8vo, cloth.) 2 s. 6 d

Zahn, A. Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte. Beurteilung der Schrift von J. Wellhausen, 1894, mit 6 Beilagen. (Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1895; 154 pp., 8vo.) M. 1.80.

NEW TESTAMENT

Beet, J. Agar. The New Life in Christ. A study in personal religion. (London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1895; 8vo, cloth.) 6 s. 6 d.

Beyschlag, W. Neutestamentliche Theologie. 2 Auflage, Heft 1. (Halle, E. Strien; 1895.) M. 1.50.

Chwolson. Hat es jemals irgend einen Grund gegeben, den Rüsttag des jüdischen Passahfestes als πρώτη τῶν ἀζύμων zu bezeichnen? Erwiderung gegen Dr. L. Grünhut. (Leipzig, Voss' Sortiment, 1895; 53 pp., 8vo.) M. 0.80.

Harnack, Adolf. Sources of the Apostolic Canons; translated by L. A. Wheatley, with an introductory essay by John Owen. (London, A. C. Black, 1895; 8vo, cloth.) 7 s. 6 d.

Stalker, James. The two St. Johns of the New Testament. 6 s.

ARTICLES.

GENERAL.

Bierbrower, Austin. The seven International Wonders of the World. (The Reform. Quart. Rev., Oct., 443–66.)

Burke. Professor D. Robert Kübel. (Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr., Vol. vi., 812–37.)

Lindsay, James. The Place of the Reformation in Modern Thought. (The Thinker, Oct., 331–5.)

Macfadyen, D. Adolf Harnack. (The Expos. Times, Oct., 8–12.)

Mallock, W. H. The Religion of Humanity; a reply to Fred. Harrison. (The Nineteenth Century, Oct.)

Rabus, L. Über christliche Philosophie. (Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr., Vol. vi., 757–83.)

Ritschl, Otto. Studien zur Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert. (Zeitschr. f. Theol. und Kirche, Vol. v., 486–529.)

Troeltsch, E. Die Selbständigkeit der Religion. (Zeitschr. f. Theol. und Kirche, Vol. v., 361–436.)

Wegener, R. Theologische Spekulation vor hundert Jahren, von Ritschl erneuert. (Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr., Vol. vi., 784–805.)

OLD TESTAMENT.

Blaikie, W. Garden. Lessons from the Social Economy of the Jews. (The Knox College Monthly; abstract in The Thinker, Oct., 352–4.)

Bruston, E. De l'état actuel de la critique de l'Ancien Testament. i. (Rev. de théol. et des quest. relig., iv., 5, Sept., 1895, 474–90.)

Budde, K. Erläuterungen zum Alten Testament aus dem Leben der Türkvölker. (Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Pal. Ver., xviii., 91–100.)

Carrick, J. C. On the intimations of a future life in the Book of Job. (The Thinker, Oct., 305–19.)

Cumming, J. Elder. Is the Old Testament authentic? v. (The Expos. Times, Oct., 38–9.)

Driver, S. R. The Speeches in the Chronicles. (The Expositor, Oct., 286–308.)

Ecke. Probleme der neuesten alttestamentlichen Forschung. Schluss. (Kirchl Monatschr., Sept., 808–27.)

Kleinert, P. The idea of life in the Old Testament. (Stud. u. Krit., 1895, 693–732; abstract in The Thinker, Oct. 358–60.)

Marshall, J. T. The Theology of Malachi. (The Expos. Times, Oct., 16–19.)

Rühl, F. Chronologie der Könige in Israel und Juda. (Deutsch. Zeitschr. f. Geschichtswissensch., Vol. xii., 45–76.)

Sayce, A. H. Archaeology *vs.* Old Testament criticism. (The Contemp. Rev., Oct.)

Stalker, James. Jeremiah: The man and his message. 6. God. (The Expositor, Oct., 278–86.)

Thomson, J. E. H. Chaldeans. (The Expos. Times, Oct., 46–7.)

Woods, F. H. Hebrew Prophecy and Modern Criticism. xii. (The Expos. Times, Oct., 28–32).

NEW TESTAMENT.

Axenfeld, C. Die Furcht Gottes im Neuen Testament. ("Halte was du hast," xviii., 541–55.)

Blaikie, W. Garden. Exaggeration as a figure of speech, and its use in the Gospels. (The Thinker, Oct., 319–22.)

Blass, F. De duplice forma actorum Lucae. (Hermathena, xxxi., 121–43).

———. Über die verschiedenen Textesformen in den Schriften des Lukas. (Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr., Vol. vi., 712–25.)

Chambers, T. W. St. Paul's seeming abolition of the Law. (The Reform. Quart. Rev., Oct., 418–30.)

Cholmondeley, F. G. Harpagmos, Philippians 2:6. (The Expos. Times, Oct., 47–8.)

Christ's Prayer in Gethsemane. A symposium of opinions. (The Expos. Times, Oct., 34–8.)

Cooke, G. A. The Blessed Virgin in the Talmud. (The Expositor, Oct., 316–20).

Edwards, T. C. On the God-man. 3. The Incarnation and the Unity of Christ's Person. (The Expositor, Oct., 241–61.)

Findlay, G. G. Studies in the life and writings of St. John. i. The Spirit, and the water, and the blood. (The Thinker, Oct., 296–305.)

Great Text Commentary. The Great Texts of St. John's Gospel. John 1:1. (The Expos. Times, Oct., 21–5.)

Herz, N. A Hebrew word in Greek disguise; 1 Cor. 7:3. (The Expos. Times, Oct., 48.)

Hughes, Meredith. The Pauline doctrine of the Resurrection. (The Thinker, Oct., 329–31.)

Iverach, J. Professor Pfleiderer on the Pauline Doctrine of the Resurrection. No. 2. (The Thinker, Oct., 322–9.)

Lindsay, T. M. The Unity of the Church in Apostolic times. (The Contemp. Rev., Oct.)

Macmillan, H. Water-marks in the narratives of our Lord's Transfiguration. (The Expos. Times, Oct., 25–8.)

Nestle, Eberhard. A fragment of the original Hebrew Gospel. (The Expositor, Oct., 309–15.)

Phillips, J. Notes on the New Testament Quotations from the Septuagint. ii. Romans and Galatians. (The Thinker, Oct., 293–6.)

Ramsay, W. M. St. Paul in Athens. (The Expositor, Oct., 261–77.)

Schlatter. Gadara nicht Geser. (Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Pal. Ver., xviii., 73–82.)

Sell, Karl. Der Ursprung der urchristlichen und der modernen Mission. (Zeitschr. f. Theol. und Kirche, Vol. v., 437–85.)

Sperl, Gustav. Die heilsgeschichtliche Stellung und Bedeutung der Taufe. (Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr., Vol. vi., 726–44.)

Titzel, John M. Death and the Resurrection. (The Reform. Quart. Rev., Oct., 508–22.)

Wright, A. The Sign of Jonah. (The Expos. Times, Oct., 45–6.)

REVIEWS.

OLD TESTAMENT.

Benzinger's Hebräische Archaeologie. (Rothstein, Zeitschr. d. Deutsch. Pal. Ver., xviii., 108–12.)

Büchler, A. Die Priester und der Cultus im letzten Jahrzehnt des jerusalemischen Tempels. (E. Schürer, Theol. Litztg., No. 20.)

McCurdy's History, Prophecy, and the Monuments. i. (Jensen, Theol. Litztg., No. 20.)

Müller, D. H. Ezechiel Studien. (C. Siegfried, Theol. Litztg., No. 20.)

Staerk, W. Das Deuteronomium. (C. Siegfried, Theol. Litztg., No. 20.)

NEW TESTAMENT.

Ramsay's The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, Vol. i. (Rev. in The London Athenæum, Sept. 28, 1895, 411–12.)

Resch's Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu Lucas. (F. P. Badham, The London Academy, Sept. 14, 207.)

Schäder, E. Die Bedeutung des lebendigen Christus für die Rechtfertigung nach Paulus. (A. Deissmann, Theol. Litztg., No. 20.)

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Meyer, F. B. Christ in Isaiah: Expositions of Isaiah xl–lv. (Chicago: F. H. Revell & Co., pp. 243.) Price, $1.00

Pease, G. W. Sunday School Teachers' Normal Course: First Year. (Chicago: F. H. Revell & Co., pp. 1157.) Price, 50 cts.

Hallam, Frank. The Breath of God; a sketch historical, critical and logical of the doctrine of Inspiration. (New York: Whittaker, 1895, pp. 103.) Price, 75 cts.

Bowes, G. A. Topical Outlines of Bible Themes; an illustrative Scripture Reference Book. (Chicago: F. H. Revell & Co., pp. 410.)

Shields, C. W. The United Church in the United States. (New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1895, pp. 285.) Price, $2.50.

Smith, Mrs., A. P. Bible Diagram with Key. (Baltimore: Smith, 1895, pp. 27 with map and folder.) Price, $1.00.

Murray, Andrew. Let us Draw Nigh. Meditations on Hebrews, x., 19–25. (New York: Randolph, pp. 95.) Price, 50 cts.

Hastings and Stebbins. The Higher Critics Criticised. A Study of the Pentateuch for popular Reading, etc. (Boston: Scriptural Tract Repository, 1895, pp. lxxxiv., 236, 118.) Price, $1.50.

Cohen, H. Talmudic Sayings, selected and arranged under appropriate heads. (Cincinnati: Bloch, pp. 94.) Price, 50 cts.

Cowan, Henry. Landmarks of Church History. (New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co., pp. 154.) Price, 35 cts.

Yorkshire Writers. Richard Rolle of Hampole, an English Father of the Church and his Followers. Edited by C. Horstmann. (London: Sonnenschein, 1895, pp. 442.) Price, $2.60.

Hefele. Rt. Rev. Chas. J. Hefele. A History of the Council of the Church from the original documents, Vol. IV. (New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1895.) Price, $4.50.

Bartlet, J. Vernon. Early Church History. A sketch of the first four centuries. (Chicago: F. H. Revell & Co., pp. 160.) Price, 40 cts.

Cheetam, S. A History of the Christian Church during the first six centuries. (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1894, pp. 459.) Price, $3.00.

Wakeling, G. The Oxford Church Movement. Sketches and Recollections. (London: Sonnenschein, 1895, pp. 309.) Price, $2.25.