

THE BIBLICAL WORLD

CONTINUING

The Old and New Testament Student

VOLUME I.

APRIL, 1893

NUMBER 4

IN our study of the spiritual element in the Bible we touch the central source and secret of its amazing power. The historical background is important to such a degree that its study, in the light of recent exploration and discovery, has in many instances almost revolutionized our conception of the author and his book. The Gospels are no longer suspended in the air. The study of the land where the Saviour wrought and taught, of the people with whom he mingled, of their customs, habits, and peculiarities, as perpetuated among their descendants to-day, has given the world a "fifth gospel" outside of the Bible. The prophets have stepped out from an obscure part as living men endowed with intense and lofty personality. They are revealed not only as inspired reformers whose clarion voices summon their people to repentance and faith, but as unselfish patriots, as judicious and clear-sighted statesmen, whose divine mission and native sagacity thrust them as central and conspicuous figures into the complicated and turbulent politics of their day. Moreover the spirit of a living criticism has breathed upon the dry bones of their prophecies, and, lo, the disjointed and scattered fragments have come together, bone to his bone, form and beauty have clothed them, and again they glow and pulsate with their pristine life. Even in the case of the Apocalypse, that most mysterious and perplexing among the canonical books, whose writer seems at first sight to be wholly out of touch with his own age, and to be projecting his visions into an illimitable future, one thing is clear; whatever significance his message has for us, or for nations yet unborn, his oracles took shape and color from the

momentous conflicts and perils of his own age, and were addressed first of all (and perhaps altogether in the seer's own thought) to the men with whom he stood face to face, and this fact gives at least a firm starting point for their interpretation. The service thus rendered by historical criticism in revivifying these obscure writings has been inestimable. But when the utmost shall have been accomplished in this direction, criticism will only have constructed a firmer historical background for the spiritual element in the foreground.

LITERARY criticism has a function in Bible study as great, if not greater, than historical criticism. Problems of authorship, date and purpose must be considered. Each book must be interpreted as far as possible from the point of view of its writer. Distinctive types of style, such as history, legislation, poetry, doctrine are to be noted, the exact sense of words and phrases to be ascertained, and grammatical peculiarities to be explained. This, however, is only a preparation for a higher appreciation of a book as literature. We are charmed by the idyllic simplicity and freshness of the early Hebrew traditions, by the kingly dignity and power of the Davidic psalms, and by the practical philosophy and good sense of the wisdom literature. Paul grasps us by the might of his intellect, and we are swept along on the resistless current of his reasonings. We endeavor to sound the lucid depths of the Johannean writings, and the plummet at once floats in an abyss. From a purely literary point of view, what writer of ancient times more richly rewards a close and sympathetic study than Isaiah? He is *facile princeps* among the prophets, but his greatness here is fully paralleled by his greatness in the world of literature. However long one may be tempted to linger in admiration over the beauty of his style, the transparency and simplicity of his thought, the strength and purity of his emotion, the uniform majesty of his language, the grandeur of his poetic imagery, the amazing sweep of his prophetic vision, and the variety and energy of his eloquence, these are only the decorations of the outer court through which one passes into the inner sanctuary of the spirit. When Isaiah writes he is not bent

on making an immortal contribution to the world's literature. He is as unconscious of the exquisite felicities of his style and the majestic strength of his diction, as the water bubbling up from a mountain spring is unconscious of its sparkling purity. As it flows forth because it cannot do otherwise, so the prophet is driven by an inward impulse to communicate his message—the divine word that surges in his soul with a power as irresistible as that of the tides. The rhetorical garment in which the message clothes itself occasions him the smallest possible solicitude. The message itself, the word of Jehovah, the eternal spiritual truth is everything. What is thus true of Isaiah is true in corresponding measure of every other inspired writer. In these days when men are so often dazzled by the brilliant results of historical criticism, and when sacred literature is studied so largely simply as literature, the temptation to rest here becomes very strong, as though these things were ends in themselves rather than means to a higher end. He who misses the spiritual element in the Bible misses its heart and essence. To him its living personalities become only interesting figures in a great historical movement; its lofty poetic strains only as "a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument." Historical and literary criticism are of inestimable worth when tributary to a fuller and more sympathetic apprehension of the spiritual contents of the Bible. Otherwise they are as the chaff to the wheat.

SINGULARLY enough, historical and literary criticism which should have been conspicuous helps for strengthening of faith in the Bible, have become among the most potent means for disturbing it. In the hands of those who are inimical to revealed truth, and desirous of eliminating from the Bible every supernatural element for the purpose of destroying its claims to a divine origin, these critical instruments have been employed with alarming efficacy in disintegrating certain prevailing orthodox conceptions of the Scriptures. The success has not been so signal as a hostile criticism has been forward in proclaiming. Illogical and confused ideas have been forced to the wall, indeed. *A priori dicta*

as to the divine method employed in producing an inspired literature, like similar dicta in respect to the creation of the world, have been abandoned as untenable in view of the incontrovertible facts hurled at them by the critics. Again and again the church has been forced to modify her traditional formulas, until to-day there seems scarcely any solid ground left to stand on. Many are trembling for the ark of God, as though it were on the point of falling wholly into the hands of the Philistines. That this result will not follow is quite certain. The more thoroughly the old *theories* are shaken, the more clearly does the *fact* of inspiration impress itself on every candid investigator. Even a poem like the Song of Solomon, which only the most perverse and despotic traditionalism can twist into an allegory representing Christ and the Church, instead of a simple oriental love-song, exhibits to the fair-minded reader a theme and an occasion abundantly worthy of being illuminated by inspiration. Theories, interpretations, creeds and formulas, so venerable and decrepit as almost to be themselves regarded as inspired, are fast crumbling into dust. They are only human scaffoldings that the storm will sweep away. By and by men will rejoice when they see the temple of truth stand out against the horizon in fairer outlines. They lament now only because they mistake the scaffoldings for the temple itself. So it will come to pass that these agencies of historical and literary criticism, now regarded with sore misgivings, will turn out after all to be God's harbingers of a brighter dawn, of a larger and truer conception of the nature and purpose of His revelation. The revelation itself will be more clearly apprehended, because the literature which embodies it is better understood. Through doubts, fears, and crises, God leads His people into a larger faith.

THIS revelation, which is identical with the spiritual element in the Bible, converges in the person of Jesus Christ, and again radiates into the world of error and sin. He is the true Light which shineth in the darkness, and "which lighteth every man coming into the world." No study of the Bible is worth the name unless it promotes a better knowledge of him, and leads

the heart and will into loving submission to him. Time and again a hostile criticism has audaciously announced that it has resolved the Light of the World into the light of common day. But the light only shines with greater and steadier radiance as the centuries roll away. The historic Christ remains the central figure in the world's history. However men may hate him or oppose him, they are coming more and more to recognize in him the possible solution of their desperate problems. Men who are groping their way out of the darkness, whose lives have been embittered by the inequalities of life, who have conceived of the Church as leagued with their oppressors, and of her ministers as hirelings of the rich, are looking behind ministers and churches to the Master himself, and announcing that they discover in him the great friend of humanity, whose teachings when rescued from the accretions of a speculative theology and given a chance to operate in society, will introduce the long-looked-for day of social deliverance and human rights.

Christianity itself seems to be in a transition stage toward a more spiritual and living apprehension of the teachings of its Founder. There was a time when orthodox religion consisted chiefly in external conformity to a ritualistic worship. Then came a period of intellectual development, when doctrine was predominantly emphasized, and when salvation was primarily conditioned by dogmatic orthodoxy. This was the period of endless multiplication of sects and creeds. There is a third and final stage, that in which the chief emphasis is laid on a personal participation in the life of the Son of God. These stages may be characterized by the words, doing, believing, being. They do not supersede each other. Each higher takes up into itself the lower. The life and freedom of the spirit result in right living and correct thinking: We see, then, how the ultimate goal of all Bible study is the spiritual element in the book; how this spiritual element converges in Jesus Christ; and how the essence of Christianity, which consists in a personal participation in the divine life revealed and communicated by Christ, culminates in a worship wherein "the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth."

THE SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY OF THE ROYAL PROPHET ISAIAH.

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

Social science came into existence as soon as problems arose in society, and thoughtful men began to suggest plans for their solution. The name alone is the contribution of modern thought. As the history of the Hebrew state unfolded, it revealed evils which, at certain periods, were most threatening. Fortunately, within that commonwealth, there were great national teachers, untrammelled by fear of authority or public opinion, who studied deeply these questions, and then essayed to answer them. The questions present a remarkable analogy to those which are agitating society to-day. The position and the conclusions of those inspired thinkers, the prophets, in addition to the new interest which they possess, simply from a historical standpoint, are of vital importance in the development of a practical social philosophy for the needs of the present. Even if it be denied that they enjoyed an especial degree of spiritual enlightenment, yet there are obvious reasons why they were peculiarly fitted to be our teachers. As one studies their work it becomes patent that they were instructors of the nation and not of individuals. On the social organization, as a whole, their attention was ever fixed. Society was not as complicated as at present and therefore they could study it with greater ease and certainty. More significant still, is the fact that they were elevated, by virtue of their calling, above party strife and prejudices, and were actuated solely by the earnest desire for the attainment of absolute truth—the will of Jehovah.

In an earlier article¹ the socialistic ideas of the prophet Amos were considered. Later study along the same lines has made

¹OLD AND NEW TEST. STUDENT, June, 1892.

it evident that the sermons of the royal prophet Isaiah contain no small measure of the same socialistic element.

Of the social development of Judah during the years immediately following the disruption, little is known, probably because there was little to be known. The tendencies manifested in Solomon's policy, which threatened to revolutionize the internal state of the kingdom, and to turn it into an oriental despotism, were checked abruptly and effectually by the supreme act of separation. This left Judah a little principality of a few thousand square miles, crippled in resources, and forced for a few decades to wage a doubtful war of defence against its far stronger northern rival. Even when its political independence was assured, it had little to hope for beyond mere existence as a petty state, overshadowed by Northern Israel, and protected from foreign conquest by its insignificance and seclusion. A loose overlordship maintained with great difficulty over the wild Edomites, brought to the Judeans little wealth or influence from without. Within, only the products absolutely necessary for a simple existence could be expected from their narrow valleys and bare limestone hills, capable at best of supporting only a sparse population. Once when under Amaziah they did aspire to conquest a crushing defeat left them the "fallen hut," referred to by Amos. In the light of these facts we can, with practical certainty, picture their social life as being of the simplest. They were a nation of husbandmen and shepherds with a royal shepherd at their head. While, as we know, the religious life of the nation was not all that it might be, yet the conditions were conducive to a liberal measure of justice and social equality. This view of the past is reflected in the retrospective glances of later prophets. With Amos and Micah the ideal future is this past restored.

But with the reign of Uzziah came a marked change. While Jeroboam II was pushing his conquests and paving the way for the era of prosperity in Northern Israel, in only a lesser degree, Judah was advancing to wealth and power. Already Amaziah had captured Sela which commanded the trade with South Arabia. Uzziah extended the boundaries and became master of

the port of Elath on the Red Sea, which was the key to the trade with India. The old foes, the Philistines, were subdued, and the Ammonites and Arab tribes awed. Not only without, but within was Judah's might established. The glowing picture in Chronicles is substantiated by the allusions in contemporary and later prophets (Cf. i. 1; Hos. viii. 14; Isa. ii. 7; Mic. i. 13; v. 10;). Fortresses and strong cities were established, and a standing army was organized and equipped. Conquest and commerce brought in unwonted wealth. As in Northern Israel, these proved but heralds of a rapid and sweeping transformation in the social organization. Suddenly acquired riches are dangerous for nations as well as individuals. Doubly so for an oriental community still in the agricultural stage. A taste of wealth and power engenders a thirst for more. In the flush of the new experience and in the excitement of acquiring, the people forgot to distinguish between fair means and false. The profits of commerce and conquest accrued chiefly to those who already had vested interests or influence, while the poor only grew poorer, actually, and by contrast. His hereditary holdings were swallowed up (Mic. ii. 2, 9; Isa. v. 8) by the large estates of the wealthy proprietors, and thus the ranks of the proletariat were swelled. For more than half a century these forces were at work. The question was, should they go on unchecked until, as in Northern Israel, the social structure was rotten to the very core, ready to crumble at the least shock from without? Doubtless this awful example lent force to the words of the two prophets, so different in character but one in purpose, who, about the year 735 B. C., came forward as heralds of divine truth, to grapple with the national problem. One was the countryman Micah, the other Isaiah, reared at the capital, familiar with all the great questions of state, acquainted with and probably himself a member of the ruling classes. Through their eyes it is thus possible to view the same problem from two standpoints entirely different.

Isaiah was the great statesman and theologian of Judah. The major portion of his prophecies treat of political and religious questions, but at two periods in his life, when the social problems, perhaps, more imperatively demanded attention, he

became preëminently a social teacher. The sermons of the first period are contained in chaps. ii-v. The pictures of wealth and prosperity and commerce bespeak the latter days of Jotham's rule, while, on the other hand, it is difficult to find in iii. 2, anything except a reference to the effeminate rule of the youthful Ahaz. Without citing other indications, we can with assurance group these prophecies about the year 735, when the death of Jotham brought Ahaz from the harem to the throne.

Already the mutterings of the Syro-Ephraimitish invasion were audible. Assyria was also moving on the distant horizon. Just as to-day when a dread pestilence threatens, an unusual activity is awakened and sanitary evils formerly overlooked are corrected, so the prophets were incited by impending danger to endeavor to purge the state of its social evils. Crises gave birth to almost all the oral prophecies which we possess. Preëminently is this true of the great sermons of Isaiah. At the present occasion he first (chap. ii.) comes before the people with a general charge. It is nothing that they are eager to hear. Like his teacher, Amos, he first gains their attention. This is accomplished by directing their gaze upon a glowing picture of the future. Even while they are entranced with the glimpse of those coming days, when their beloved Jerusalem shall be the center of the world-rule, and love and justice shall be the regulating principles binding together humanity, he brings out, by a most striking contrast, all the heinousness of the present internal condition of the state. "What folly it is to talk of other nations coming to Jerusalem to learn, when you are slavishly aping their customs and suing for alliances; of simplicity, while you are heaping up gold and silver in your treasuries; of peace, while you are multiplying chariots; of the rule of Jehovah, while you are paying homage to the thousands of idols that fill the land?" Thus with the keen sword of contrast he hews away with one blow all their false confidence, and lays bare the infamy of the body politic.

Later perhaps, when his thinking had deepened and crystallized, he appears with another general charge, which is recorded in chapter v. Again with consummate skill he wins his audience, so adverse to hearing their own doom pronounced. He

asks permission to sing a song, a song of a vineyard. Simply, beautifully, he recounts how a fair site was selected, the ground prepared and no pains spared to make this vineyard of which he sings perfect in every detail. But alas, its fruit! It bears only wild grapes. "Is it not just, O Judeans, to utterly destroy this vineyard?" While their heads are still nodding in assent, like a flash comes the application. "Israel is this vineyard, carefully planted by Jehovah. Judah is His favorite vine. What is its fruit? Justice and right doing? No, only oppression and the cry of the wronged." Evidently the social organization is sadly awry. But Isaiah does not rest with general denunciations. He is searching for the cause of the social disorders, and having found it, he does not hesitate to place the responsibility just where it belongs, noble though he was. "Alas, for the nation (iii. 12-13). No wonder that it bears evil fruit. Its rulers, what are they? Little better than petulant children or weak women. O, my people, they which lead you cause you to err; and if you try to walk in the right way, they destroy the very ground from under you. Verily, upon the elders and princes shall the divine judgment fall, because they are the ones who merit it (vss. 14, 15). For it is ye that have eaten up the vineyard; the spoil of the poor is in your houses; what mean ye that ye crush my people, and grind the face of the poor?" Strong terms the prophet puts into the mouth of an indignant God, but undoubtedly well merited; for in the next chapter he proceeds to specify those social evils which he deems most deadly: "Woe unto those that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no room, and ye be made to dwell alone in the midst of the land" (v. 8). Here is the first record in the world's history of a blow struck squarely at land-monopoly. So vivid is the picture that one can almost see the rich nobles gradually driving out their weaker neighbors from their little ancestral possessions, and thus adding acre after acre to their own lands, until they dwell solitarily in the midst of their vast estates. The significant fact is that the prophet does not here denounce the means employed, but the result. To the prophet's mind land-monopoly in itself was a heinous crime. In little

Judah where the supply of productive land was limited, the evil appeared in clearer outline. The principle, which this one typical example so clearly establishes, was a broad and vital one. Excessive wealth is an injustice. The interpretation of the term "excessive" must necessarily vary in different lands and times. In poverty-stricken Judah it was applied to what we would call petty estates. But the principle remains, even though the evil of its infringement may not, in a larger state and under more complicated relations, be so obvious. One of the fundamental assumptions, common to all socialistic schools alike, thus finds clear expression in the teachings of this old Hebrew prophet. As Isaiah thinks of those thus made outcast and homeless, while the princely proprietors roll in luxury, his blood boils. "Woe to you. As surely as there is a just God in heaven, these palaces shall be without inhabitants and these fields unproductive. An angry God will take justice into His own hands."

Again the woe is pronounced upon another social evil (vss. 11, 12). This time it falls upon those who make drinking and feasting the chief end of their life. The effect upon themselves of all this revelry and music is to banish from their minds all thought of a God active in the world. But this unfortunately is not all. The whole people suffer. Captivity, famine and want are the inevitable consequences (v. 13). With his keen discernment, Isaiah has grasped a great economic principle. He does not overlook the terrible immediate evils of intemperance, but being a social teacher he does not stop here, but also studies its effect upon society as a whole. He finds that it imposes a burden upon the state which will ultimately prove its ruin. Energy thus wasted is a loss which falls upon society as a whole—a simple truth in economics too often overlooked by sage statesmen.

The second woe against those "mighty to drink wine, and men of strength to mingle strong drink," (vss. 22, 23) shows that it was the rulers, the judges whom Isaiah had in mind, for he adds, "they are the ones who justify the wicked for a reward." Unjust monopoly, intemperance and official corruption are the virtues of these classes who stand as examples for the nation.

Like stubble or dry grass before a blazing fire shall they be utterly consumed, blossoms, roots and all, because they have thus rejected and spurned those everlasting laws, in accordance with which Jehovah rules the universe (v. 24).

But the prophet does not stop with a study of externals. He investigates motives and finds within the hearts of the nation's leaders elements which account for the unnatural crop of "wild grapes." The first element is a defiant, skeptical spirit, which leads them to devote all their energies to evil doing, and then impiously call upon Jehovah to punish if He can. It is a feeling of blind security as unfounded as it is blasphemous (v. 19). The second is a total disregard for the truth. Those leaders who should stand for verity make white black and black white with supreme indifference (v. 20).

The third is a calm self-sufficiency, which is an end unto itself. "They are wise in their own eyes and prudent in their own sight" (v. 21).

With the corrupt nobles, the responsibility for the existing social evils, was shared by others. It may have been precipitated by some incident in his preaching, but Isaiah's attack upon the proud, vain women of the capital was the result of mature deliberation. Again in later years (xxxii. 9) he reproaches the women for their spirit of utter carelessness. Here he suddenly turns from general charges to a particular class (iii. 16-iv. 1). "Upon you, O haughty, voluptuous daughters of Jerusalem, rests a great burden of guilt. Not the passion for gratifying the appetite, which Amos denounced in the women of Samaria, but a passion for show and adornment is leading you into cruel excesses." As Isaiah with marvelous minuteness rehearses the various articles of their gorgeous costumes, he is thinking of the effect of all this upon their character, and of the injustice represented by all this finery. He thinks perhaps of the poor dependents slaving on the great estates of the nobles, or of the poor outcasts starving in the midst of such splendor. Such thoughts must have inspired the harsh threats which follow. "The day is not far distant when Jehovah will strip off all this finery. Baldness, sackcloth and branding shall succeed the present beauty.

Foreign conquest with all its horrors shall utterly change their present lot." Isaiah was right. Society could not be leavened when the leaven was worthless. "If the women are corrupt, the state is moribund."

Another passage (ix. 8-x. 4) confirms the socialistic position and teachings of Isaiah. Here, not the national sins of Judah, but of Northern Israel are the object of attack. Judah is trembling in the fear of an invasion from the North. Isaiah has uttered his remarkable prophecies, recorded in chapters vii. and viii., assuring his countrymen that Syria and Northern Israel are but tails of burning fire-brands, which will quickly burn out. Hence there is no real cause for terror. Perhaps some of his hearers came and asked him on what he based these conclusions. He recognized that this was a rare occasion to establish a great principle. The message is really for Judah, although the denunciations fall upon Israel.

"You ask why I think that Israel is on the verge of dissolution. Note the blind feeling of security. Hear their boastful words: 'The bricks are fallen, but we will build with hewn stone.' Invaders and foes on every side do not shake their false confidence in their own ability—that self-confidence that you will remember Amos denounced so bitterly. There is no trace of true reform. Their legislators go on enacting unjust laws, their judges pervert the fountain of justice. The poor and needy thus become the prey of those in power. The holiest instincts of the nation are violated, for the widows and fatherless, instead of being succored and defended at any cost are hunted down and spoiled. What is in store for such rulers? Disgrace, captivity, desolation. Saddest of all, they shall drag the whole nation down with them. Do you question now why I proclaimed its speedy fall." True, Isaiah was also aware that Assyria was rapidly advancing, but he saw in this only the effect, the instrument of judgment. The corruption of society was the true cause.

Possibly at certain periods, the social evils in Judah were not so glaring. But there are no indications of a permanent social reform. When the immediate danger of the Syro-Ephraimitish

invasion had past, the nobles appear to have continued in their practices, so suicidal to the future life of the state. One man, even though he were an Isaiah, was well nigh helpless against the strong tendencies of the times. Discouraging was the outlook. But obstacles only nerved him to action.

Another great national crisis influenced him to speak, and the people in their extremity to give heed. To the year 701 B. C., the year in which Sennacherib swept down the western plains of Palestine, capturing and sacking cities, laying desolate the towns of Judah, and sending his legions up to the walls of the Holy City itself, must be assigned the prophecy contained in chapter i. Certain scholars would place it in the year of the Syro-Ephraimitish invasion, while others feel obliged to postulate an unrecorded invasion by Sargon in 711. The latter is only a conjecture, and internal evidence does not support the former. The picture of utter desolation is satisfied alone by the events of 701. The awful résumé of the degenerate state of society indicates that during the thirty years intervening the progress has been only downwards. The old apathy so much deplored by Isaiah in earlier times is gone, and the nation is beginning to realize that all is not well. The absence of any word of condemnation against the king strengthens the belief that the reformer, Hezekiah, is on the throne. After more than a generation of valiant service, the prophet speaks with an authority and boldness which well accords with what we know of his position in the state at this later date.

Again he opens his address with a general charge, but it is no longer necessary for him to win a hearing by some attractive picture. Heaven and earth are called to witness the unnatural sight. A brute animal recognizes the source from which its bounties come, but this nation, Judah, instead of acknowledging the loving God who has heaped upon them all conceivable blessings, have rebelled against and spurned him. Graphically he presents the results of this course. Society is sick. "From the soles of the feet even unto the head, there is no soundness in it, but wounds and bruises, and festering sores, they have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with oil."

Sadder still; instead of improving, it is continually growing worse. Externally the prospect is equally deplorable. Lands desolate, cities plundered, and fair Zion itself, deserted and alone, is in a state of siege. Only a little handful of men within its walls are preserving the spark of national life from utter annihilation. Little wonder that Isaiah gains a hearing at this great crisis, for he is the only man who can save the state.

Even the rulers are aroused to the necessity of action. As their feeling of false security departs, they seek to conciliate Jehovah by redoubled sacrifices, and a more punctilious observance of religious rites. With biting sarcasm Isaiah, like Amos before him, waves all these externals aside. "They are hateful—an abomination to Jehovah. Do you think that he can grant your prayers when you spread forth your hands before him all stained with the blood of murder? Once the judges of this city rendered just decisions. But now what do I see? The early purity of the social life has been polluted. The princes are in league with highwaymen and thieves. No one would refuse a bribe. Instead, they court them. Superlative of infamy! The sacred cause of the orphan and widow is set aside, and judgment is rendered to the highest bidder." The social evils are those of earlier days grown greater. Chapter xxviii. 14-18, coming from the same period, confirms the socialistic conclusions voiced in chapter i.

Carefully and earnestly, Isaiah studies society, and he found that "the times were sadly out of joint." Inequality, suffering, moral corruption and threatening dissolution, are only a few of the evils of the social organism. The reform of Hezekiah had changed the externals of the religious cult, but it had not permeated into the heart of society. Unlike the hero of Shakespeare's great tragedy, he did not idly lament, but set before him the task of ascertaining the causes, and then of applying a remedy. What the evils were we have seen. Unfortunately they were not confined to Isaiah's time. The chief responsibility he lays at the door of the nobles, the wealthy proprietors and the vain women. Their dastardly crimes—oppression, taking of bribes, land-monopoly, drunkenness and revelry are

at the bottom of the evils. They, too, are the leaders of society. Compared with their sins those of the masses he considered not worthy of notice. When we remember that the prophets generally addressed the nation collectively, this limiting of the responsibility to distinct classes represents a great advance along socialistic lines.

Notwithstanding their blindness to danger and calm feeling of security, Isaiah repeatedly warns them that destruction will—must come upon them for their crimes. Never does he suggest that the lower classes, so sadly wronged, should arise and take justice into their own hands. For “the Lord will enter into judgment with the elders of His people and the princes thereof” (iii. 14), and “Jehovah shall avenge Himself of His adversaries” (i. 25). Isaiah throughout bases his teachings upon the universal laws of justice, the same for all classes alike.

His conclusions also rest upon an idea common and fundamental to all types of socialism. Society is a unit, and its fate is bound up with that of its component parts. Each class, therefore, has a duty to perform to the whole. If it fails in this the whole suffers. This is the tragic element in the situation. It is the tragedy of Israel's history and of human life. The innocent, as well as the culpable, must suffer for the latter's crimes. “Therefore my people have gone into captivity for lack of knowledge” (v. 13). Since those who were responsible have not been true, the whole state is going to pieces.

Isaiah, however, did not teach that the present or the future is hopeless. A catastrophe is certainly impending. Yet there is still one way to avert it. Sacrifices are of no avail. “Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment; relieve the oppressed; judge the fatherless; plead for the widow.” “If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land.” A thorough reform, bearing fruit in life and conduct, so complete that it shall do away with all the social evils is the only remedy. For this he longed and labored. But judging from present conditions is there a reasonable ground for anticipating its realization? As he studied the times and noted

the persistent indifference of the ruling classes, he came to the same conclusion as Amos before him in Northern Israel. There is no hope for amelioration through peaceful means. A convulsion must do what reform can not, because of the attitude of those in power. The worst is coming (ii. 10; iii. 11). Divine justice must be vindicated. The state must be turned upside down that the deserving classes may come on top. Destruction is swiftly coming upon the high towers and strong walls and proud ships of Tarshish. The lofty shall be brought low. Men shall be glad to escape to the caves of the rock. All the pillars of the state shall fall. Society shall be completely disintegrated, and no one shall be found to reconstruct it. Jerusalem shall become a ruin and Judah shall cease to be a nation. In v. 26-30 he clearly indicates the means. It is to come from without. With powerful imagery he pictures the advance of the foreign foes, led on by Jehovah, to execute judgment upon his own corrupt nation. In the immediate future, therefore, Isaiah thinks only of coming judgment.

Under such conditions a less inspired man would have become a pessimist. Grandly he rises above the present horror. The innocent shall not forever suffer with the guilty. There is yet a future for them. The present social disorders can be removed only by extreme methods. But "in that day" (iv. 2) when the sifting process is complete, and the oppressors of the people are no more; after the Lord shall have "purged the blood of Jerusalem from its midst by the blast of judgment and the blast of burning;" after "he has purged away this dross," then shall the glorious pictures which illumine his sermons be realized.

It is well worth the time to study Isaiah's pictures of this ideal state, this Utopia of his day-dreams, for they contain the elements of his constructive social policy. Other prophets shared these ideals. The earlier developed the temporal and social side, while the later accent more and more the purely spiritual. Isaiah considers both aspects. He has given us several portraits of this reconstructed state, in each of which some particular element is brought out in strong relief, with a few of those bold strokes which were the natural expression of

the prophet's poetical soul; but the composite is remarkably clear cut.

The political organization of this new state is to be practically the same as that of the then existing. A Davidic king is to sit upon the throne. About him princes and judges. Therefore that for which Isaiah longed was to be realized by a thorough moral and social, rather than a political, reform. Unknown to him were the extreme measures of certain modern, radical socialistic schools who would attain the ideal social state by completely remodeling the political structure. Chapter xxxii. coming from the earlier days of 701 B. C., portrays that regenerate state for which he looked. Then the principles of absolute justice shall govern the actions of king and nobles. The man of authority, instead of being an oppressor, shall be a guardian of those who are now so sadly in need of succor. This new generation shall be quick to perceive the truth. No longer will it be possible to palm off the false for genuine. Men and things shall be estimated at their true worth. Every act shall receive its due reward. The laborer shall enjoy the fruits of his toil, and not the undeserving. No longer shall the poor and needy be the prey of the designing.

Chapter xxxiii. 15, clearly states who will survive this sifting process to become the citizens of this ideal state. "He that walketh righteously, and speaketh uprightly; he that despiseth the gain of oppressions, that shaketh his hands from holding bribes, that stoppeth his ears from hearing blood." Qualifications depend, not upon birth or position, but simply upon ability and inclination to rightly perform his functions as a unit in this new commonwealth. The wheel of fortune shall thus turn, bringing up the oppressed classes, while the oppressors go down. For "he shall dwell on high places, his place of defence shall be the munitions of the rocks." The citadels shall no longer be the possession of voluptuous nobles. "His bread will be given him; his waters shall not fail." The present want shall be a thing of the past.

Repeatedly Isaiah has proclaimed that the unproductiveness of the land is the inevitable consequence of their moral and

social crimes. But now that the old evils are removed, and those who rule, do so with justice, broad fields, watered by Jehovah's showers, shall bear rich harvests (xxx. 23-26). Even on the bare, thirsty mountain-tops, springs shall send their leaping streams to irrigate the land of Judah, by nature so dry. The light of the sun and moon shall be increased many fold, so that brightness shall ever reign. The picture is highly poetical, but the idea in the prophet's mind is clear. Justice, mercy, prosperity and equality are the characteristics of the future commonwealth which looms up before his vision.

Thus we have seen that Isaiah carefully analyzed the society of his times, he held up its evils, he fixed the responsibility where it belonged, and he took a step farther, he presented before his wondering countrymen the picture of a perfect state, which, he declared, would ultimately succeed the imperfect one of the present. Modern socialism, with many detours, travels thus far along the same road, but at this point a barrier confronts it which has proved quite insuperable. How is this ideal state to grow out of the present? Almost as many schemes are suggested as there are so-called socialists. Isaiah here parts company with most of them. If socialism rests on a purely economic basis, he is no socialist. He advocated no particular theory for the political and economic reorganization of society. His bridge between the present and the future state was not a material, but a moral and spiritual structure. In the heart of humanity the transition must be realized. Its objective manifestation will be the new ideal commonwealth. Isaiah saw no hope for society while the present purposes ruled the actions of mankind. An external remedy was not enough. To be effective it must move the hearts and wills of men. The only power capable of purifying and inspiring the human soul to action resided with the Father of all truth. Therefore he proclaimed that Jehovah would perform a mighty wonder. The details of the pictures vary according to the immediate circumstances. At one time he declares that Jehovah himself will come and dwell among His people. At another, His representative, the Prince of Peace, who in his character embodies the essential

elements—justice, mercy and strength—of that ideal state, which he would inaugurate, is heralded. The fundamental principle is one. The Divine, acting in history and in the heart of man, alone can, and will, bridge over this broad chasm, and prepare the way for this perfect society that Isaiah pictured and confidently expected. No one can say that he was an idle dreamer. His predictions have been in part, and are today, still being realized, although the plans of the Divine unfold more slowly than the prophet perhaps anticipated. Within the heart of humanity those principles of justice, universal equality and fraternity which Isaiah taught are gaining wider and wider acceptance; and in the same proportion as this is realized, are they taking objective form in society. Modern socialism, therefore, in so far as it is based on fact and truth, is but a corollary of this great principle.

THE FUNDAMENTAL THOUGHT AND PURPOSE OF THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW.

Translated from the Introduction to PROF. ROBERT KÜBEL'S *Exegetisch-homiletisches Handbuch zum Evangelium des Matthäus*,

BY H. B. HUTCHINS.

[Continued from the March number.]

2. The result of the data thus collected as bearing upon the question of the fundamental thought and purpose of this gospel may be stated as follows: It presents Jesus to us as the Christ, who brings in the kingdom of heaven. The wretched are drawn to him, and especially the poor people of Israel, who are as sheep without a shepherd. But Israel, through the influence of the Pharisees, the leaders of the time, is prevented from coming to him. Hence, the throwing open of the kingdom of heaven to the wretched involves Jesus in bitterest conflict with the Pharisees, a conflict which he opens in the very beginning with the sermon on the mount, and which, indeed, in the end, costs him a felon's death on the cross. But out of this bitter labor of the Servant of God, there come not only Christ's own victorious resurrection and exaltation to the lordship of the world (xxviii. 18), as he himself will finally demonstrate in his Parousia, but also the New Testament church and the salvation of the world. Matthew shows, however, that this Jesus really is the Christ, because in his person, in his teaching and work, in his end, everything has been realized which, according to the Old Testament, is to be expected of the Christ. It is realized in his person, because, as is already indicated by his descent, birth, etc., he is the promised son of David, and he is at every turn constantly more clearly and decisively recognized and acknowledged as "Son of God." It is realized in his teaching and work, because his work is that of the Isaianic Servant of God, the shepherd who cares for the flock of God; this is the

act of the "righteous man" (xxvii. 19, 24), who fulfills all righteousness, who himself most carefully obeys the will of God, but—quite different from the Pharisees—lays an easy yoke on his disciples. His teaching, also, is that of the true "righteousness," the teaching of the kingdom of heaven, into which men enter through the forsaking of sin and the denial of self and the world, and as citizens of which they bear the cross in following Christ, receiving, however, in return, the glorious "reward in heaven." Lastly, it is realized in his end, because in it the fulfillment of the "Scriptures" comes out with perfect clearness. In his death the ransom is paid for the many. In the New Testament blood of the passover a new covenant is established; the closed sanctuary is opened; the righteous dead of the Old Testament who await redemption are waked to life. Furthermore, a fulfillment of the law and the prophets is given, in which positive and negative are conjoined. The higher view demanded by the old itself is re-established, the divine kingdom of the Son of Man. According to his idea this is an all-embracing kingdom (viii. 11), and although for his earthly task as teacher, Jesus limited himself to the territory of Israel, yet all who hunger and thirst are invited to enter. Indeed, since Israel despises this invitation, the kingdom of God passes over from Israel to the Gentiles, and the departing Lord gives command that all nations be made his disciples. And this passing over of the kingdom to the Gentiles becomes final with the judgment upon Jerusalem, and it is precisely to the significance of this critical epoch that Matthew refers with special emphasis. But with this epoch also, the transition is made to the time of the fulfillment, to the Parousia, and the setting up of the kingdom of glory. But the kingdom of the spirit brought by Christ is not universal in the sense that there is not to be a great distinction among its "called," only a few of whom, as "chosen," really belong to it as citizens and heirs. The New Testament church is a peculiar union of brethren, with strict discipline over one another, and with the word of pardon, which is a word of "binding" as well as of "loosing." Tares and wheat are commingled, but at last they will be completely separated, and hence the most important duty is

seriously to prepare oneself for this final crisis. In short, the purpose of this gospel is in the critical period of the final passing over of the kingdom of God from the Jews to the Gentiles, and in expectation of the consummation of the kingdom, to present Jesus as the Christ whom the Jews have wrongfully rejected, and who therefore justly gives them over to judgment and turns to the Gentiles with the offer of salvation—the salvation which he, as the promised Messiah and Servant of God, has wrought out by his teaching, by his labor on behalf of men, by his suffering, by his resurrection, and which he will perfect when he comes again in the glory of his kingdom—the salvation which is offered in his community to all the wretched, but which, as it is ethical in its results, must exhibit itself in the practice of the “righteousness” which belongs to it.

3. Is the definition of the purpose which has been given to be somewhat more specialized or modified? Or must we assume, besides the chief purpose described, still another secondary purpose, suggested by what the gospel perhaps intimates in reference to a special circle of readers to which it is addressed? From what has been said already, it is evident that the author is a Jewish Christian. He is not, however, a Jewish Christian in the technical sense of a narrow-minded, particularistic, and dogmatically conceived Judaism, but, partly in the sense of being related to Israel by virtue of descent, as well as by his manner of thought and expression; partly in the sense of having a preponderating interest in the question of the relation of the New Testament to the Old, and in the recognition of Jesus as the Christ, etc. If the author was an apostle, he surely belonged to the “apostles of the circumcision,” who labored chiefly, at all events, for the circumcision. But, granting that, is this gospel intended chiefly or solely for the circumcision? Are the readers also Jewish Christians? And if such is the case, must we assume that he has particularly in mind a special circle of Jewish Christians (Palestinians, perhaps) without, however, excluding the rest of the circumcision. We can answer the first question in the affirmative, if we do not mean that the author intends to write only for the Jews, with express exclusion of the Gentiles.

The example of Paul on the one side, and of Peter and John on the other, shows that the division of the field of labor (Gal. ii. 6-10) was not in general intended to be so sharply made. And if this gospel lays especial stress on the proof that Jesus is the Christ, that was a subject quite as interesting to the Gentile Christians as to the Jewish Christians. And, even in those New Testament writings which have Gentile Christians as their chief or only readers, the greatest importance is attached to the question of the relation of the New Testament to the Old. Moreover, if the author, as has been shown, writes in the time of the passing over of the kingdom of God from the Jews to the Gentiles, and represents this event as taking place through the righteousness of God and in virtue of the express words of Jesus, then along with this idea he has in view *eo ipso* a Christianity in which the circumcision more and more ceases to be a special sphere shut off from the rest. In such a Christianity the congregations from among the Jews, in so far as they do not wilfully exclude themselves by becoming more and more sectarian, must gradually coalesce with the congregations from among the Gentiles. Therefore, Matthew can by no means have intended to write for the Jewish Christians in the sense of excluding the Gentile Christians. He writes for the entire Christian world. But since he is himself a Jew, it is self-evident that he has in mind the circle to which he himself belongs, as the circle which will be the nearest and the immediate readers of the gospel. We cannot, it is true, from any single direct indication in the gospel itself, learn to whom the author has especially directed his writing. The case is entirely different, not only with Luke, but also, to a certain extent, with John (xx. 31). But the view that he writes, in the first instance, for Jewish Christians, is sustained by indirect proofs contained in the entire method of the gospel as hitherto presented. The genealogy traced from Abraham, the conflict with the Pharisees, etc., were more important for Jewish Christians than for Gentile Christians. In the thought of the author himself, however, this is important for the Jewish Christian readers, not in the sense of any gratification of national pride, but in the entirely reverse sense of the

contest with Judaism, understanding his word in what, for brevity, may be called the anti-Pauline sense. The presentation of this conflict is not, to be sure, his special purpose in the composition of this gospel; but the emphasis on the positive side of the fulfilment of the law and the prophets through Christ (v. 17 ff.) as well as the reference to its negative side, particularly again in the matter of the passing over of the kingdom of God from the Jews to the Gentiles, becomes intelligible, if we recognize that, together with his chief purpose, he intends also to combat narrowly Jewish conceptions within Christianity itself. The particular opponent whom Matthew attacks is, to be sure, Pharisaic Judaism itself as it placed itself in opposition to Christianity from without. But in so far as Pharisaism in the form of Judaism made itself felt on Christian soil, this also is attacked by such opposition. By this we do not mean that such polemic is the peculiar purpose of this gospel. It bears none of the marks of a polemic tendency-writing ('*tendenzschrift*'), or, indeed, of a '*tendenzschrift*' of any kind. But the manner and the method of the author's treatment of the work of Jesus, the manner of his selection from and his formation of the discourses of Jesus Christ, etc., show that he is a man whose writing without any effort or intention on his part is necessarily though incidentally influenced by this conflict.

But the immediate circle of readers addressed by this gospel—and this brings us to the second question—might be conceived of still more definitely, and in this way there be discovered another aim, secondary, indeed, but not unimportant in its bearing on the character of the gospel and the date of its composition. Are the Jewish Christians, of whom as readers the author is in the first instance thinking, to be looked for especially in Palestine? So the church fathers for the most part assume. The fact that the author "does not explain Old Testament and Palestinian allusions"—cf. *e. g.* Matt. xv. 2 with Mark vii. 3f, the failure to explain the term, "holy city," iv. 5, xxvii. 53, etc.—does not necessitate our answering this question in the affirmative, for this was not necessary for Jewish Christians, and besides, there is an opposing consideration in the interpretation of Hebrew names and words (i. 23; xxvii. 33-46) which proves

—as does also, perhaps, the peculiar relation of this gospel to the LXX.—that the Hellenists are by no means to be thought of as excluded from consideration. For the contrary position we can adduce Matt. xxiv. 15-20. To be sure, Mark xv. 14-18 agrees with this almost word for word, and, according to our conviction, we have here a truly reported speech of Jesus. Hence, the purpose contained in the passage must be regarded as the purpose of Jesus himself, and the reason why this discourse is reported so accurately (cf. on the contrary, Luke xxi. 20ff.) must be regarded as common to both the evangelists. Indeed both, by the phrase "Let him that readeth understand," call especial attention to the matter. However, the report of Matthew does differ, as has already been said, from that of Mark by its use of the expression "in the holy place," and especially, "on the Sabbath" (20); in addition Mark lacks (14) "spoken of by Daniel the prophet." Matthew therefore keeps more specially in view the subject under discussion. Now, in this passage the point is, that the inhabitants of Judæa—the expression is entirely general, therefore it means not merely the Palestinian Christians—when they see the abomination of desolation shall flee forthwith. And the injunction, "Let him that readeth understand," to which we supply as the object of "readeth," not the words of Daniel, but the words of Jesus, has—not exclusively, but yet in a measure—the sense: "Take heed to what you have read; if it comes soon, then follow this summons, etc." If this view is correct, the author is thinking especially of the Palestinians, for only for them, viz., "those in Judæa," had the emphasizing of this injunction any meaning. Therefore, we shall be obliged to answer our question in the affirmative, in that we distinguish three circles of readers of whom the author is thinking. The widest circle is composed of Christians in general; the more limited circle is that of the Jewish Christians; the narrowest is that of the Jewish Christians in Palestine (in a certain sense also, the Jews). It is self-evident that these concentric circles are not mutually exclusive, but at special points the narrower and the narrowest circles become prominent as the ones who are immediately addressed. And if we consider what has just been

said, together with the remarks before made in regard to the special purpose as determined by the conditions of the time, we discover this also, as a special secondary purpose, viz: To give to the Jews instruction and warning for the time of judgment closely impending over Jerusalem and Judæa.

THE TABERNACLE.

PROFESSOR JAMES STRONG, S.T.D.,
Drew Theological Seminary.

A peculiar interest belongs to this comparatively small structure on account of several circumstances which render it unique in character. It was the earliest of which we have any positive record, as having been erected for the worship of the true God, and, therefore, was not modelled after the specimens of which remains exist to the present day; especially in Egypt, supposing these to have been extant at that time; but was constructed in accordance with explicit and minute directions by Jehovah himself, accompanied with a pattern exhibited to Moses on Mount Sinai. It also differed from all other temples in being movable, and was actually transported in detached portions for a period of forty years of migration. Moreover, as might have been expected from these singular facts, it was of the most ingenious and yet practical style, both in plan and workmanship. The biblical description of it, the only original source of information, except such hints as oriental analogies and the requirements of the case suggest, although occupying two long chapters, is remarkably concise, and yet sufficiently definite to enable the careful expositor to reconstruct it complete. True, great diversity of opinion has existed among archæologists on this head, and almost all have despaired of any rational solution of the many problems which present themselves in the account and its interpretation; but the present writer at least believes that all these have at last been satisfactorily adjusted both with the statements of the text, and with the known habits of the times, the region of country, and the demands of use and consistency. The purpose of this short article is not to trouble the reader with the details of this elucidation, but merely to notice, in a historical manner, certain salient features which can be readily understood and

appreciated by all who have given attention to the subject. Incidentally it may be remarked that the study, more or less profound, of the theme, even down to the present day, is evinced by the fact that no less than twenty monographs upon it, some of them highly elaborate, have been published, during the last three centuries, exclusively devoted to this structure as a whole, and innumerable others to its immediate accompaniments. We may also premise that the success which now appears to have crowned these efforts is a specimen of the improved results of modern methods of investigation, as well as an omen of the probability that similar, if not all, difficulties in the sacred volume will at length be cleared up. Biblical archæology has certainly entered upon a new career of triumph.

The first cardinal fact which we here mention, as adapting the central erection to the nomadic necessities of the people for whom it was designed, is the distinction, generally overlooked, of the *mishkan*, or "dwelling-house" base, and the *ôhel*, or "tent" superstructure. The former, being the wooden walls on the sides, gave solidity and capacity to the building, while the latter, being the canvas roof, afforded a light but effectual protection from sun and rain. The method and means of combining these two, no less than of constructing each of them, have been very inadequately treated by most critics and writers on the subject. Fergusson, an architect himself, was the first to perceive that the roof, of course, must have had a peak, as every tent-maker knows and practices; but his mode of joining and applying the curtains of which this covering consisted is an obvious failure, both as to dimensions and utility; for he is compelled to extend them as wings far beyond the bounds of the walls, and at last makes a sad gap in the roof directly over the precious vail! Besides, nobody suggested any way of fastening the roof to the walls, until Paine discovered that the "taches," absurdly understood as designating *S-hooks* for attaching the two sets of goats-hair curtains together (instead of a substantial and close stitching together, like that of the breadths themselves), were *knobs* in the walls for buttoning down the edge-loops securely over the eaves, thus preventing all

drip inside. In like manner he showed that the coats of badger-skin and of ram-skin were a perpendicular outside sheathing of the walls, and not a clumsy and useless blanket on the roof, intended to stop the aforesaid leak!

As to the disposition of the "boards" (rather *planks*) of the walls themselves, the great puzzle was how to construct each "corner-board" out of a single cubit-and-a-half-wide plank (like all the others), so as to make up ten cubits for the rear out of these two and the six other planks. No plan except the one devised by the present writer accomplished this feat; and it may be added, none but his succeeds in getting all the requisite sockets duly under the planks without confusion and interference. Especially has nobody before him expounded the proof-text on this point as to the bars and rings (Exod. xxvi. 24) in any consistent or intelligible manner. The "corner-boards" are the key to the whole situation.

Paine likewise was the first to suggest the use of the sixth or surplus breadth of one of the roof-curtains, although he plainly contradicts the text (Exod. xxvi. 12) by wrapping it across the rear gable only. It was he also who first gave any good reason for sewing the eleven breadths into two large sheets, namely, because they were spread double, like the "fly" over a modern tent for better shedding the water; but here again his curtains misfit in length, because he makes the rear twelve instead of ten cubits broad by his mistake in the corner-boards.

But even a greater trouble with interpreters has been how to dispose of the inside or colored curtains; for until Paine none of them could make these fit, in whatever way they might be stretched. Here once more Paine's ingenuity was of service, by suggesting that they were sewed together end-wise, and that they ran double along the walls, instead of being hung (by some unknown attachments) overhead, where they would soon lose their beautiful colors by the wet. As each compound length would thus be exactly twice as long as the circuit of the three walls, Paine shrewdly suggested that they must have been *fulled in*, as folds in curtains usually are; but how this could be done without disfiguring the cherubs embroidered on them he

did not expound. He, too, for the first time, has exhibited a rational mode of distributing the three colors (blue, purple and crimson), by having them woven in cross-stripes of wool on a white linen foundation of warp or longitudinal threads, adopting (as he honorably acknowledges) a private hint to that effect from the present writer; but he gives no explanation of the proportionate width of these stripes, nor any reason why they are invariably named in this precise order, nor what relation they hold to the cherubs upon them.

Advancing now into the interior of these sacred apartments, we are met with numerous questions as to the form, construction, adjustment and significance of the various articles or pieces of furniture, both decorative and useful, which they present or contain. Most conspicuous of these are the cherubic figures already brought to notice as ranged around the walls like a cordon of sentinels or guard about the abode of the divine Majesty. On a careful estimate their total will prove to be an exact multiple of seven, the sacred number, both in the holy and the most holy place, and consequently likewise in the two combined. Moreover, by a coincidence too remarkable to be accidental, we shall find the cherubs as well as the colored stripes on which they are represented, as well as those with which they are interspersed, all occurring in exact harmony with the boards of the walls on which they hang, and precisely opposite each other on the two side walls, notwithstanding the necessary reversal of the direction of these last in the continuous series; and this is happily brought about by the same "corner-boards," which from a stumbling-block have been converted into a stepping-stone to the most satisfactory results. Again, the length required for the woolen loops, on which the curtains are suspended, is thus ascertained; and it will be discovered to be mathematically exact in order to fulfil that striking but at first seemingly unnecessary injunction, several times repeated, "See that thou hang the vail under the taches;" for it thus turns out that the four-cubit-wide curtains, added to the single cubit of a perpendicular to the triangle which the loops constitute in order to stretch the blue stripe for forming a smooth ground for the gold-threaded cher-

ubs, make up the five cubits demanded for the height of the veil, like that of all the other doorway screens. Furthermore, the number of pillars required for the successive entrances, and the space of the passages between them, gradually diminishing from the outermost to the innermost, as propriety and usage approve, as well as their purpose of due and equable support, without interfering with the sockets of the wall-planks or concealing the cherub-figures, vindicates not only the whole arrangement, but also the presence or absence of the rods or "fillets" by which they are kept apart and at the same time together, and the number and position of the hooks (not otherwise specified), in precise accord with the statements of the sacred text. Such a series of agreements is a cumulative and conclusive argument that the minutest details and extreme concinnity have at last been authoritatively expounded.

The cherubim themselves have been a standing riddle among archaeologists, as to their form and still more as to their significance. The fact that on their first mention in Scripture, where they appear as guardians at the gate of Eden forfeited, they are called (in the original) "*the cherubim*," shows that they were already well-known in the time of Moses, and accordingly we find figures of this sort freely delineated on the Egyptian monuments. From the visions of Isaiah (where they re-appear under the title of *seraphim*), and more copiously in those of Ezekiel, we gather that they were substantially human in shape, but with the fore-legs and feet of an ox; that they had, besides human hands, two pairs of wings, one for clothing, and the other for flight (in Isaiah an extra pair for veiling the face); and were four-faced, as a man (the proper front), a lion (on the right), an ox (on the left), and an eagle (behind), all of course upon a single head. Those on the curtains were doubtless with both sets of wings closed, and with arms folded, as the panels were too narrow to contain them otherwise, while those on the sacred veil were probably flying, and those on the ark were certainly with extended wings. There is no authority for supposing that any of those in the tabernacle were kneeling, although this posture is sometimes depicted on the Egyptian monuments; and

the *living creatures* (A. V. most unfortunately "beasts") of the Apocalypse occasionally assume that attitude. As to their symbolization we may assume that they were not intended to represent any actual being (especially not the glorified state of Christ or the saints — a grotesque and even shocking thought to us), for then they would have been idolatrous; but were, as we conceive, merely imaginative embodiments of the four leading attributes of Deity in the physical world according to the unscientific, but really profound and correct, notions of the Hebrews; namely, *intelligence, power, constancy and rapidity*. Accordingly they are (especially in Ezekiel) the bearers of Jehovah's throne; and they correspond essentially to what we term cardinal "laws of nature," *i. e.*, forces acting for a definite purpose uniformly and instantaneously. In this light the location of the two upon the lid of the sacred ark is preëminently fitting as the custodians of the *divine* law, nature thus corroborating revelation.

In this connection we may not inappropriately pause a moment to correct a common error, which confounds these symbolical forms with angels; whereas the latter are actual beings, who temporarily in Scripture assumed a human body, but were invariably *destitute of wings*, notwithstanding the idealism of poets and the delineation of painters and sculptors. The common pictorial representation of the cherubim as beautiful young "cherubs" is equally devoid of foundation. They were essentially *animal* forms, as their analogues on the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments abundantly show, no less than all the scriptural portraitures.

Inasmuch as the official garb of the sacerdotal order is part of the prescription in the cultus of the tabernacle, this paper would be incomplete without some allusion to it. It was in fact but an improved fashion of the ordinary dress of orientals, consisting essentially of the tunic or shirt, with the invariable girdle for the waist, and the skull-cap for the head, but omitting the sandals on account of the sanctity of the edifice, and adding drawers for the sake of decency. The high-priest had an extra robe or surtout fringed with bells and tassels, an ornamental ephod or cape, sustaining the breastplate as a pouch for

the mysterious Urim and Thummim, a turban about the head, bearing the gold plate with its inscription significant of consecration to Jehovah's service.

The furniture or apparatus for the two sacred apartments, as well as for the exterior court, is likewise minutely described in the Scripture account; but for its elucidation, which would require great detail, we content ourself with referring the reader to our book so often alluded to above.

On one other point, however, of a general character we may be indulged with a little amplification, namely, the gradually increasing sanctity of the successive inclosures. The great mass of the Israelites were wholly excluded from the sacred precincts, and privileged characters among laymen were alone allowed to enter even the outer (and only) court with any considerable degree of freedom; while (male) worshipers could only do so for purposes of special sacrifice. The Levites were admitted to this at all times as assistants of the sacerdotal order, but under no circumstances could they enter farther, except to carry away the frame-work and fixtures of the tabernacle itself, together with the sacred utensils, after these had been properly dismantled and covered by the priests. The ordinary priests again went into the holy place, as a regular thing, but twice a day, namely, at the hour of the morning and evening sacrifice (*i. e.*, the one offered on the brazen altar outside), in order to extinguish and trim or else to light the lamps in the candelabrum, to change the shew-bread (once a week), and to burn incense on the golden altar. The high priest on the day of annual atonement only went (according to the rabbins, several times) into the most holy place, but in plain linen clothing (to denote humility), for the purpose of sprinkling the blood around (not upon) the mercy-seat of the ark. In all this graduated seclusion we perceive a strong contrast with the synagogue of later times, which was the precursor of Christian churches, where full liberty of access prevails for all classes and persons, because no special Shekinah of the divine presence is ever visibly there vouchsafed, and no Levitical services are held therein. The one great and final Sacrifice has been offered once for all, in the

person of the supreme High Priest himself; each truly regenerate individual is a priest for himself or herself; the prayers of the saints are the daily incense; and every pious heart is the divine abode. The original model of the tabernacle is reserved for the disclosure of the heavenly world.¹

¹For a copious elucidation of everything relating to the subject the reader is referred to the writer's full work entitled "The Tabernacle of Israel in the Desert," published by Harris, Jones & Co., Providence, R. I.; 1888, square 8vo; with a portfolio of colored plates.

THEOLOGICAL INSTRUCTION IN SWITZERLAND.

By REV. P. W. SNYDER,
Middletown, Conn.

III.

BERN.

Everyone goes to Bern. No one stays in Bern. This seems to be the rule for the American public in Switzerland, and for the ordinary traveler it is easily understood. The quaint old town has too many charms to be passed by, but it lies too near the great centers of attraction in the Bernese Oberland, too near Thun and Interlaken, Grindelwald and Lauterbrunnen; and so, after a hurried glance at the clock-tower and the cathedral, the museum, and one or two modern buildings, the bears, and the wonderful view from the cathedral terrace or the Klosterhof, the tourist hastens on to see the mountains face to face or turns his steps toward Geneva.

It by no means follows that such haste is to be recommended to the student.

It is true that the theological faculty of Bern is smaller than that of Basel or Zürich, and that the lectures are given in the dreariest building I have ever known dignified by the name university,—a building whose "classic" shades make it painfully easy to sympathize with Faust when he exclaimed:

"Weh! Steck ich in dem Kerker noch?
Verfuchtes, dumpfes Mauerloch!"

especially when one remembers that the whole glory of the Bernese Oberland lies just outside those wretched class-rooms and is ever visible from the windows.

It is also true that the immediate situation of the city has no such charm as that of Zürich, though, on its sandstone peninsula high above the swift Aare, Bern is much more picturesque than

Basel. Nevertheless, the newer suburbs must afford delightful places for residence, while the wonderful Alpine views from the city itself and the neighboring hills, together with the fact that the very heart of the Oberland can be reached at any time in a few hours, may well commend Bern to one who wishes to carry on his studies for a summer semester and still be within easy reach and under the constant spell of the Bernese Alps.

At the same time there are attractions in departments closely allied to that of theology which ought not to be overlooked. Professor Ludwig Stein, for instance, who gave up the position of Jewish Rabbi in Berlin to devote himself to philosophy, presents the history and problems of his chosen department in an exceedingly vivid and attractive manner and draws about him many enthusiastic listeners. So the historian, Professor Philipp Woker, who also lectures on church history in the (old) Catholic faculty, is most admirable as a lecturer, despite some peculiar mannerisms, and is a great favorite with his students.

In the theological faculty itself we find a state of things somewhat different from that in either of the other universities.

Doubtless the best known name is that of Professor Rudolf Steck, who lectures on New Testament introduction and exegesis. He is a man fifty years of age, a native of Bern, and has been professor there for eleven years. He is delightfully informal socially, while as a lecturer his manner is very quiet, with occasional touches of humor. There is nothing about him in any way striking, and a stranger who met him or saw him in the class-room would have no idea that he was looking at the principal exponent of one of the most radical critical hypotheses about the New Testament which has ever been suggested. Professor Steck, and apart from him no one outside of Holland, regards the comparatively pacific tone of the Acts as representing the real state of things in the early church, and rejects every single Pauline epistle as a spurious work, forged in the interest of an increasingly bitter conflict between Jewish and Gentile Christians. From this standpoint he not only regards all these epistles as late forgeries, but also reverses their commonly accepted order, placing those last which, like Galatians,

show the most intensity of feeling. This is Baur's critical process stretched to such an extreme that, like an umbrella, it has suddenly turned inside out and reversed all its own previous conclusions. It is to the credit of German criticism that Professor Steck stands almost absolutely alone in this matter, and that the genuineness of at least the four greater Pauline epistles is practically unquestioned.

Next to Professor Steck, and with him representing the radical element in the Bern theological faculty, is Professor H. Lüdemann, who has the chair of dogmatics and history of theology. Whether one sympathizes with his views or not, it is refreshing to mark his outspoken frankness and earnestness of conviction and to listen to his clean-cut sentences in the classroom. In him there is no minimum, even, of the Ritschlian leaven, and he gives the impression of being much like Professor Schmidt of Basel in his aggressive advocacy of the "reform" in theology. He was born in Kiel in 1842, and was extraordinary professor there from 1878 till 1884, when he was called to Bern as full professor.

The other active professors, E. E. Müller, F. Barth and S. Oettli, are supposed to represent the center and right wing, perhaps in the order mentioned, although I imagine that the right wing at Bern does not reach very far beyond the center.

Among them Professor Oettli, with his vivid manner and decided Swiss accent, is looked upon as a very strong man in his department of Old Testament introduction and exegesis. He assisted in commenting on the *Hagiographa* in Strack's and Zöckler's Commentary.

Such are the leading theological instructors in the three universities of German Switzerland. Let us try briefly to sum up the results of our investigations.

First of all, there is abundant opportunity to study the methods and results of the more radical German critical and theological tendencies. No one can fail to be struck by the predominance of a decidedly liberal theology. Orthodoxy is represented, but, as a rule, not by the men who give tone to the various institutions. Only in Basel is there a thoroughly

vigorous orthodox party under the leadership of Orelli, and even there my own personal feeling is that the aggressiveness and enthusiasm are rather on the side of the liberal element. Orelli himself seems to be overmatched in influence by Duhm, while Schmidt probably produces a deeper impression upon the students than any other man in the faculty.

This fact does not exactly recommend German Switzerland for inexperienced or unstable American students who have hitherto come in contact with little but the systems and traditions of American orthodoxy. The shock would probably be too severe to be altogether wholesome.

When Professor Schmidt, in an address on the "inner unity of the protestant church" delivered at the *Reformtag* at St. Gallen last June, speaks of the doctrines of the pre-existence of Christ, the personality of God, the atonement and the life everlasting as "non-essentials," doctrines whose acceptance or rejection ought not to prevent men from working together as Christians in the same church—then the uninitiated Christian from across the ocean is inclined to catch his breath and wonder what doctrines Professor Schmidt does regard as of any special consequence: nor, *these things* being *abandoned* or *questioned*, can he find a great deal of satisfaction in the one thing which Schmidt does emphasize, faith "in a living God, the God of Jesus Christ, the Holy One, whose demand of holiness is as omnipresent as is his sin-cleansing power in all who open their hearts to the incoming of his spirit."

I do not believe that every young man, or every pastor, is ready to listen with impunity to such instruction. It may possibly be pure mountain air, but, if so, it is too rare to be breathed with impunity by one fresh from the valley. It is apt to produce hemorrhage. But for the more thoughtful, for those who already realize something of the magnitude of the questions that must be answered, it ought to be a wholesome thing, as it certainly is an intensely interesting and stimulating thing, to come face to face with the extreme results of methods of treating Scripture whose cautious application to the Old Testament is already causing so much feeling in our own country.

It is also a valuable lesson in charity, a lesson which may help us to estimate at their true worth the relatively insignificant matters over which we are exercised in our assemblies and mission boards. It *ought*, surely, to enlarge our sympathies when we become familiar with the spirit of men who have no thought of going out of the church, who glory in their protestant Christianity, and who verily believe that they are going on in the spirit of the reformation; who even address missionary gatherings, and nevertheless deny or question nearly every doctrine which we have been wont to regard as distinctive of Christianity.

Apart from their critical and dogmatic position there is no doubt that the universities of German Switzerland offer excellent facilities both for pursuing special lines of theological study and also for hearing lectures on those allied branches of philosophy, history and social science which are so closely connected with the practical work of the ministry.

If I were to rank the three universities according to their value for the theological student or pastor simply as places for study, the order would be Basel, Zürich, Bern. If, on the other hand, I were to rank the cities according to their relative attractiveness as places of residence and centers from which to make excursions in the spring and early summer, the order would be Zürich, Bern, Basel.

FRENCH SWITZERLAND.

As already indicated, the transition from German to French Switzerland is almost like passing from one country to another. Language, physiognomy, traditions, methods of thought, are all sharply contrasted; and this contrast is quite as marked in the theological schools as elsewhere, especially in the independent schools.

In the comparatively large universities of Geneva and Lausanne the external difference is less pronounced. Here there is much of the freedom of the German university life, the students being left largely to their own tastes and inclinations in the choice of lectures, etc. In the independent schools, on the con-

trary, where there is but the single faculty and a small number of students, the state of things is much more like that in our own smaller theological seminaries, and this is also the case in the academy of Neuchâtel. In these schools the relations between professors and students are far more intimate, and the courses of study pursued by the individual students are subjected to a much more rigid supervision than in the universities. The champion of the university system would probably say that the young men in the independent schools are treated as scholars rather than as students, but this method has, nevertheless, its own manifest advantages.

I shall make no attempt to describe the six theological faculties of French Switzerland with the same personal detail with which I have spoken of the three in German Switzerland, but shall content myself with general statements and calling attention to a few of the best-known instructors.

GENEVA.

The charms of Geneva for both summer and winter residence are too well known to need any description in such an article as this. Those who are at all acquainted with Switzerland know something of the beauties and wonderful location of this most attractive city. It is probable, however, that the traveling public is much more familiar with the Pont du Montblanc and the Jardin Anglais than it is even with the fine university, fronting the Promenade des Bastions, with its hundred professors and instructors and six hundred students; while comparatively few ever find their way to the unpretending Oratoire, in the obscure Rue Tabassont, where between sixty and seventy young men are receiving an evangelical theological training or the preparatory schooling.

With reference to the theological department of the *University*, with its five professors and rather more than forty students, I must repeat the statement that here a liberal spirit prevails, not so different from that of German Switzerland. It is, however, somewhat more conservative, no one holding so radical ground as do several of the professors whose names I have already men-

tioned. A most admirable and authoritative statement of the attitude of the *Église Nationale* in Geneva is given in an article entitled "Protestantism in Geneva," by Professor August Bouvier, professor of systematic theology in the university. The article was written for *The Modern Review* of January 1, 1884, but the French text is published in pamphlet form in the Librairie Fischbacher, Paris, and the Librairie Cherbuliez, Geneva. From this it will be seen that the position taken by the theologians of the university, in harmony with the party of "liberal Christianity" or "modern theology" (technical terms in French Switzerland), is a somewhat radical assertion of the rationalistic standpoint. It is evidently the position of Professor Bouvier himself and denies "inspiration, miracles, the supernatural, dogmatism and confessionalism." It retains, however, "Christian theism, the central and sovereign place which belongs to Christ in the faith and religious life of the soul, and in the history of humanity, to Christ the revealer of the divine sonship of men, the founder of the kingdom of God and of true civilization, moral and social; and finally, personal survival, which, in the opinion of almost all, will eventuate under the government of God in universal salvation." Professor Bouvier himself cannot fail to make a lasting and most delightful impression, with his tall form, silvery hair and gracious manner. He is a native of Geneva, a son-in-law of Adolf Monod, is now sixty-six years of age and has been a member of the faculty for twenty-seven years.

I notice by the catalogue that of forty-four students only fifteen are Swiss, while twenty-five are French, three are Italian and one is German.

Over against the liberalism of the university, the conservatism of the theological school established by the *Société Évangélique* is all the more marked. Founded, as already stated, as a direct reaction against German socinianism, it does not desire to draw its students exclusively from any one denomination, but "desires to be of service to all the churches which have *preserved the foundations of the faith*, and call for pastors according to the heart of God." Among the conditions of admission is one

which would cause no surprise in America, but which a person fresh from a German university feels like reading over two or three times to make sure that there is no mistake. It is that the applicant must make a written statement of the circumstances of his conversion and of the motives which have led him to choose the university.

Of the professors I can speak from personal knowledge of but a single one, Professor Baumgartner, a young man of most charming address, who has recently received his Ph.D. from Marburg, and who has the chair of Old Testament introduction and exegesis.

Such are in general the attitudes of the two theological faculties of Geneva, and one scarcely need call attention to the opportunities for study offered by two so sharply contrasted schools in a city itself so fascinating.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE.

The Chautauqua Assemblies throughout the country will, this year, represent systematic Bible study as never before. At Waseca, Minn.; Colfax, Ia.; Ling Pine, Neb.; Southern California, Pacific Grove, Pennsylvania, Chautauqua; Fryeburg, Me.; Framingham, Mass., and Lakeside, O., the matter of establishing a regular department of Sacred Literature is under serious consideration. At five of these Assemblies arrangements are actually completed for such work, and instructors and lecturers have been assigned. It is not to be inferred that none of these Assemblies have had Bible work before. The realization of the need for this work has been a steady growth for years. A class in the systematic study of some part of the Bible has been a regular part of the work of certain Assemblies for several sessions, but the schools have been independent and scattered heretofore, while now there will be a unity, arising from the connection of each with the central organization of the Institute, which recommends the instructors and the courses of study. At the Mother Chautauqua such a connection has been maintained for a number of years.

Rev. O. C. S. Wallace, of Toronto, Ont., has sent the following interesting report of the work of the Institute Bible Club in his church. It is encouraging, as it shows the practical working of the Institute plan, and how important results are secured that do not figure largely in the published reports of the Institute.

The Bible Club of the Bloor Street Baptist Church, Toronto, was organized early in 1891. The first year was spent upon *The Life of Christ*. In the January, 1892, examination eighteen certificates were awarded to our Club by the Institute. During the second year we went over the first half of the course on *The Founding of the Christian Church*, and the Institute gave certificates to twenty-two members of the Club, several of whom secured the maximum mark, 100, and all but two of whom were marked "first class." Thirteen of the twenty-two took the Advanced grade work, seven the Progressive, and two the Intermediate. The third year's work has been taken up with undiminished interest, the working members of the Club numbering between thirty and forty.

The members of the Bible Class are distinguished for the diligence with which they apply themselves to their scriptural studies, the enthusiasm with which they talk of the Bible from day to day, and their competency as Sun-

day-school teachers. Some time ago I asked from each a written answer to the question "How have you been benefited by these lessons?" In substance the answers received were: "Greatly increased interest in the Scriptures;" "Much better understanding of the Bible;" "A quickened spiritual life." A very large proportion gave the last named answer.

The work has proved a great blessing to us, and Bible study is pursued in our homes with increased zest and profit. I believe thoroughly in the Bible Club idea, and hope that the attempt to engage a larger number of the young people of the continent in such study may be successful.

Brief mention was made in the March number of *THE BIBLICAL WORLD* of the plan of Bible study proposed by the Institute for the Young People's Societies. This plan is simply the regular "Correspondence Club" plan adapted to the special needs of the class for whom it is intended. For this class the Life of Christ course, based on the four Gospels, is recommended as being best fitted, both in subject and treatment, for a beginner's course.

In the interest of Bible study in general, and especially of this plan for the young people, a special representative of the Institute will visit nine State Conventions of the Y. P. S. C. E. during the next three months. These are all in the West, from Colorado to Washington, and follow each other in rapid succession. In addition to an address on Bible study at each convention, an effort will be made to meet, personally, all who are interested, and to give them any help that may be desired toward organization in the several States.

STUDIES IN THE WISDOM BOOKS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LESSONS.

BY ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR GEORGE S. GOODSPEED, PH.D.
The University of Chicago.

I. THE BOOK OF JOB.

1. *The Wisdom literature.* The books of Job, Proverbs and Ecclesiastes belong to what is called the Wisdom Literature of the Hebrews. This literature differs from the prophetic writings in fixing its attention, not directly upon the social and religious questions of the age or historical period, but upon the more general problems which concern man as man, as a part of the world and under divine government. Prophecy sought to move the men of its particular time to action in view of some threatening crisis. "Wisdom," if ever it considered this crisis, was concerned with it only as it presented an occasion for the consideration of general principles or for the application of maxims of practical wisdom. Hence, while the prophetic books need to be interpreted in the light of their historical setting and the occasions which brought them into being, these can be immediately made available and applied to modern problems, since they are after all the old problems of man in all ages.

2. *The book of Job as wisdom and prophecy.* While the above statement is true in general, it needs to be modified when applied to the book under consideration. The book of Job is a discussion of the problem of suffering, and in that sense is a "Wisdom" book. It is not like the sermons of Isaiah, bathed in local color, nor does it address itself directly to the needs of a political or religious epoch. It portrays an episode in the life of an individual, indeed, but it presents only the spiritual element of that episode, and presents it, not for what it is in itself, but as an illustration of fundamental principles directly applicable to all human life.

Yet the book of Job, more than any of the other two wisdom books, has a definite historical situation in mind. It thus stands midway between the prophets and the "wise men." It is a prophetic-wisdom book, a book in which meditation and reflection on great principles have produced a definite religious lesson—but in which a tremendous living problem has driven the author to reflection, and in which the principles that he elucidates are intended to apply to the solution of that problem.

3. *What was the historical background?* From this point of view we take up the study of the book of Job, the study of a book in which the "Wise

Man" has turned "prophet," the philosopher has stepped down into the sphere of a nation's life and offered a solution for a particular difficulty in the crisis of a nation's history.

That nation was Israel. That crisis was the exile.

4. *The two-fold problem of the Exile.* When Israel was carried into exile there was no distinction made between the faithful worshippers of Jehovah and the false and idolatrous people. All were consigned to one common fate. But when they were settled in their new homes in the land of the conqueror, when the faithful in obedience to the will of Jehovah had submitted to the foreign yoke—a new series of sufferings began. It was the false Israel who felt the captivity less burdensome, less of a punishment. The true Israel, on the other hand, found their devotion to Jehovah the cause of their severest woes. Both from the heathen who surrounded them, their captors and lords, and from their faithless brethren who had given in their allegiance to the gods of the land, came the cruel strokes of scorn and injury. The difficulty which assailed them was therefore two-fold. Why were they, the faithful remnant, sent into exile? Why were they *kept* in exile when they had patiently submitted to the conqueror as the instrument of Jehovah's will?

5. *The search for the solution.* The problem was a serious one, involving the very foundations of religious faith and life. Questionings of all sorts presented themselves. Had God deserted them? Could Jehovah be the God of righteousness and allow this? It was an awful crisis in the history of Israel's religion—and of her nationality as well. Would they survive the experience into which they were plunged? Could they understand the anomaly—solve the difficulty and come forth triumphantly, not only from the captivity but from the bondage of their dark doubts and difficulties into a day of spiritual victory?

To help on the dawning of this day was the purpose of the Book of Job. It sets forth the critical moments in the life-history of a man which illustrate the meaning of Israel's present crisis, and it brings forth also for all time certain principles of Divine government, and certain elements of the Divine character.

6. *The divisions of the book of Job.* The book consists of the following divisions:¹

(1) Chapters i.-ii. The prologue (in prose).

(2) Chapter iii. Job's passionate outbreak in the presence of his friends (in poetry, as also the following).

(3) Chapters iv.-xxxi. The debate between Job and his friends, consisting of three circles of speeches (1) chaps. iv.-xiv., (2) xv.-xxi., (3) xxii-xxxii. "Each of these three circles comprises six speeches, one by each of the three friends in succession, with a reply from Job. In the last round Zophar, the third speaker, fails to come forward."

¹ This outline is that of Davidson in his commentary in the Cambridge Bible.

(4) Chapters xxxii.—xxxvii. The speeches of Elihu.

(5) Chapters xxxviii.—xlii. 6. The speeches of Jehovah out of the storm.

(6) Chapter xlii. 7—17. The epilogue (in prose).¹

(7) *The lesson of the prologue.* What does the book contribute to the solution of the problem that confused and overwhelmed the faithful Israel suffering in exile?

The dramatic scene in the prologue offers one element of solution. God permits his innocent and faithful servants to be severely *tested* by misfortune and suffering in order to bring forth from their example evidences of their fidelity. The exhortation of the prologue, therefore, is—"O Israel, God is putting you into the furnace of affliction to illustrate your faithfulness to him in the most unhappy and grievous sufferings. Be faithful therefore." Such faithfulness Job exhibited. Twice he stood the test and accepted the will of God without murmuring.

But just here comes a difficulty. What was to result in Job's case from his standing these two fearful tests? Manifestly, restoration and reward. This could be the only right sequel. Of this restoration and reward the epilogue speaks. But there is an intervening experience of terrible and prolonged suffering and struggle. The two—prologue and epilogue—belong together. Testing—triumphantly met—should be rewarded. Israel, faithful Israel, willingly submits to be led away into exile with the unrighteous. This prologue teaches her that this was allowed as her test. She suffers the reproach of the heathen and the renegade Hebrews. This is her test. The prologue explains this to her, and makes it possible for her to preserve her consciousness of innocence, her trust in Jehovah. Now what does she expect as a result of her standing this test? Nothing else than restoration and reward. But just this result does not come. Hence the test theory of suffering fails for the Israel who continues in suffering and misery after meeting the tests which Jehovah has permitted the Satan to bring to bear.

8. *An illustrative possibility.* To illustrate the situation more definitely, let us suppose that in the early years of the exile the little story of Job, the prose tale, including prologue and epilogue—that is all—appeared from the hand of some unknown writer, explaining to Israel the meaning of her being taken away into exile and made to suffer the reproach of strangers—though innocent, though righteous. How did this explain the situation? "It is a *test*, be faithful, as was Job, and you shall be delivered and rewarded!" This the faithful Israel did. It was conscious of doing this—but the suffering continued. A test cannot last forever. Once met, it is over, once for all. Job accepted the loss of property and family, the infliction of the dreadful disease, but the acceptance of both was followed by the removal of both and restora-

¹ The story of the book is concisely and clearly told in the first chapter of Davidson's Introduction. A general knowledge of the contents of the Book of Job is requisite for an understanding of the treatment that follows.

tion to the old happiness. A prologue of testing was followed by an epilogue of restoration. Israel's experience was different; the restoration did not come.

Hence the prose story of Job fails to explain the continuance of suffering. The test theory falls to the ground.

Another writer, a poet, sees the difficulty. He recognizes the truth of the prose story but also its inadequacy, breaks it in two, inserts his contribution to the new problem between the two parts—a poem, in which the endeavor is made to teach Israel what the *continuance* of these sufferings means, while she continues pious and righteous.

9. *The higher meaning of the poem.* He goes over the whole field of discussion. In the person of Job in debate with the three friends, he reviews the various theories to account for the sufferings of the righteous, the theory that they must have sinned, the theory that suffering is chastisement for which a man should be thankful¹—what is this in the present circumstances but the theory of *testing* in another form?—the theory that suffering is for the prevention of sin, to keep a man from falling into it.

He shatters all these against Job's conviction of innocence before Jehovah, and his demand that the suffering be stopped whose continuance—it grows worse and worse—stirred him to open his mouth in the beginning, and keeps him in doubt and sometimes despair throughout the colloquies.

It seems, therefore, that the poem marks a decided advance on the prologue.² It is the endeavor to explain not suffering borne as a trial on the part of the righteous, but the *discipline of suffering*; to show how suffering is a school in which a man may remain, though righteous, though pious, there to learn new and higher lessons concerning God's ways and will, and concerning God Himself.

10. *The school of suffering and its lessons.* The school of suffering—this was what Job was passing through in the *poem* as distinct from the prose prologue.

And what did he learn there?

11. *Job's lesson of trust in himself.* (1) He learned there to grasp with a clearer consciousness and with unmovable assurance the fact of his own *righteousness*—to hold fast to it—to maintain it—never to doubt *himself*. It need not be said how clearly this appears in his passionate outcries against the insinuating statements and open accusations of his friends. They would explain his sufferings by his sin. He would have no such explanation

¹ Cf. v. 17-26.

² It is not claimed that there was a prose story of Job which was afterwards worked over into the combination of prose and poetry which we find at present. The attempt is made merely to present it as a possibility in order to bring out more clearly what seems to be the only satisfactory standpoint for the interpretation, viz., the advance in thought from the prologue to the poem and its correspondence to the exile problems.

—better no explanation at all, than a denial of the inmost central facts of his own consciousness.

12. *His old idea of God shattered.* (2) He learned to give up his old idea of God. A thoughtful consideration of chap. i. 20, 21; ii. 10 of the prologue will reveal the idea of God with which Job entered upon these experiences. The attitude of Job toward God is a stoical one. His conception is of a master, a more or less arbitrary ruler, who renders evil or good alike, and man should take it as from the hand of a master. Master and slave is the relation which predominates. Indeed is not the whole representation of a testing God in the prologue after that order?

Entering into the debate with such notions of God, and confronted by such a figure as his friends held up before him, a God who punishes only the sinner but does good to the righteous, Job growing even more conscious of his own righteousness, cries out against their God and his. The truth is, that all through the poem it is not Job but God who is being tested, to see whether He, as conceived by the debaters, can be equal to that situation. Job brings Jehovah to the bar of his own experience, the Jehovah of his friends' belief and of his own, proves how in his own case injustice has been done to the innocent—and not in his own case only, but in the case of multitudes all over the world. Chapter xxiv. gives us his conclusions as to the absence of the divine rectitude in the world at large.

He has gained the victory over his friends and—over himself. "He has shown that God's rule over the world is not just in the sense in which his friends insisted that it was just, and in the sense in which his own moral feeling demanded that it should be just. God is not righteous in the sense that He punishes wickedness with outward calamity and rewards the righteous with outward good." He is not righteous to allow suffering to dominate in Job's life and increase and grow worse—while he himself grows more conscious of his own innocence. The God of Job's ideal is shattered.

13. *A new God disclosed.* (3) Job has learned to know another Jehovah. He has learned him in the growing grasp of his own personal righteousness. Observe how all through his passionate outcries he appeals from God to God; he shatters the idol with one sentence only to feel after, grope after, the Ideal with the next word.¹ We have before us the process of growing into a firmer grasp on Jehovah's righteousness as the corollary of the consciousness of personal righteousness.

14. *A God greater than the individual apprehension.* (4) Yet one thing more Job has to learn, and this the Almighty alone can teach him. What has led Job to destroy his old conception of Jehovah and to grasp after the new and higher conception? His own personal sufferings endured with a consciousness of innocence. He has measured all the world, and God too, by himself. He has burst into passionate complaints, even blasphemies, has con-

¹ Cf. xiv. 13-15; xvi. 18-21; xix. 23-27; xxiii. 1-10.

demned from his own standpoint the moral government of the world and pronounced all wrong, while at the same time he sees, through his own moral consciousness, the background of the higher and greater moral consciousness of a truly righteous God. Everything however has revolved about himself and is judged by himself. He needs another lesson. Jehovah speaks to him out of the storm. What does He say? Only this, "Learn that while I am reflected in your thought and heart, I am greater than the circle of your thought and life. I am the creator" (recall those magnificent pictures), "I am the God of righteousness ruling the whole earth. Do you care in view of this to undertake the moral government of the earth, you who judge me from your own standpoint and think I revolve about you!" This was what Job needed to enlarge and elevate his thought of God—an insight unto God's relation to the universe. This is the meaning of those speeches of the Almighty and this is their result, as Job's last words reveal (xlii. 1-6).

15. *The application to Israel in exile.* What was all this but the most benignant and fruitful truth for Israel, innocent and suffering more and more as the days of exile passed? "You are in the school of suffering, undergoing the discipline of learning the truth. Your old notions of Jehovah are inadequate. Throw them away and learn to trust your own heart and Him as righteous to the end and in the highest sense. But learn, too, that though He is your God, and is teaching you now and revealing Himself to you, as He did to Job, in this experience—it is to teach you that He is greater than your highest conception. 'His ways are not your ways, his thoughts not your thoughts,' as a great prophet of our time has said, and the Psalmist who sings, 'His ways are in the great waters and his footsteps not known.' He is the God of the whole earth, the righteous ruler of the world." This was what Israel did learn in the exile. She gave up her particularism, her belief that Jehovah had no interest in others beside herself. She came to know as the result of the exile experience something of the breadth and majesty, the wondrous sweep and power of the divine character. This was the lesson of the poem of Job. The epilogue adds the sequel. Having passed through the experience, having learned the lessons of the school of suffering, Job is graduated with honor and the reward is his. Such would be Israel's lot. With this promise the writer leaves his people to the future.

16. *The permanent teaching of the book.* But he as a "wise man" has left for us more general principles. He has taught us how suffering may be a test of our fidelity, and, more than that, how God leaves us to the discipline of suffering that we may come to know our own selves better, and to know God as higher and greater than our thought, to acknowledge, with his perfect righteousness, the impossibility of including His ways within the circle of our comprehension. We are thus assured of His righteousness, and we may safely trust ourselves to His government, believing that all His ways are just, though we may not be able to trace the sweep of the greater circle in which our experiences are single points.

THE DECIPHERMENT OF THE ASSYRIO-BABYLONIAN INSCRIPTIONS.

BY ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER, PH.D.
The University of Chicago.

I.

In the beginning of the XVIIth century accounts of the inscriptions in Persepolis were brought by travelers to Europe. The first of these accounts is that of the celebrated traveler, Pietro de Valle, in a letter from Schiraz, dated October 21, 1621. In 1674 Chardin copied the first complete inscription, the so-called Window inscription, the shortest of the trilingual Achæmenian inscriptions. A copy of this may be found in his travels published in 1711. This inscription was copied in 1694 by Kämpfer. He also copied the Babylonian text of the so-called Persepolis inscription H—in all twenty-five lines. In his work, published in 1712, Kämpfer discusses the nature of the newly discovered writing, and inquires whether it is alphabetic, syllabic or ideographic, deciding in favor of the ideographic. Kämpfer was also the first to make use of the term *cuneiform, i. e.,* wedge-shaped. In 1701, the Dutchman, de Bruin, began his travels. He devoted the year 1704 to the ruins of Persepolis. In 1714 he published two new trilingual inscriptions, besides one Old-Persian and one Babylonian. Notwithstanding the publication of these new finds, nothing further was done toward their decipherment until the beginning of the XIXth century.

In 1762 the celebrated vase of Xerxes was found by Count Caylus, and the quadrilingual inscription on it containing the words, "Xerxes, the Great King," was published in the same year. The important rôle played by these vase inscriptions will be noticed later.

In 1765 Carsten Niebuhr copied in Persepolis several Achæmenian inscriptions. He also distinguished forty-two different signs, which he correctly called letters. From 1798 Tychsen and Münter carried on the work begun by Niebuhr, and published their scanty results in 1802. In the same year, on September 4, Georg Friedrich Grotefend placed his discoveries before the Society of Sciences in Göttingen. Grotefend was the first to decipher a complete inscription. His discoveries did not, at once, receive the notice which they merited, and it was not until the Parisian Arabist, Silvestre de Sacy, published his accounts of them that they attracted attention.

The following short account of Grotefend's method of work is, for the most part, from Friedrich Delitzsch's appendices in the German edition of

George Smith's *Chaldean Genesis*. As towards the end of the XVIIth century new and more reliable copies of inscriptions arrived in Europe, their study was taken up again, and in 1802 Grotefend, of Hanover, published the first translation of a cuneiform text, viz.: Of a Persian Achæmenian inscription. His genius succeeded, by combinations as bold as they were ingenious, in paving the way for further discoveries. The old authors told him that the palaces of Persepolis, out of whose ruins the inscriptions came, had been built by Achæmenian kings. The Pehleve inscriptions, scattered over these same ruins, and deciphered by de Sacy, led to the expectation that something somewhat analogous would be found in the cuneiform. Grotefend had already learned the direction in which these inscriptions were to be read, viz.: From right to left. He chose for his work two small ones—the first of which had been engraved on a door-post of a building on the second palace-terrace of Persepolis, and the second on the wall of a building on the third terrace. Münter had already, by chance, noted in the inscriptions a word which was often repeated and he had decided that this word must have the meaning of "king." This same word was also found in the two inscriptions of Grotefend, which were almost alike. The only difference was that, in the first inscription a group of signs, which we may call A, preceded the word for "king," and in the second a group, which we may call B; and further that in the second, A and the word for "king" following it were repeated, while in the first a group of signs (C) without the title of king corresponded to A. Accordingly the two inscriptions had some such form as this :

- I. A king———— C————
 II. B king———— A king————

From this Grotefend drew the conclusion that these groups of signs contained proper names, standing in a genealogical relation to each other. A must be the father of B, C the father of A, and, while A as well as B were kings, C, because the title was ever wanting after his name, was not born a king. According to this, A seemed to be the founder of a dynasty. The kings were Achæmenian, and hence only two things were possible. A contained either the name of Cyrus or that of Darius. The first possibility was discarded at once, because the father as well as the son of Cyrus was named Cambyses, and hence the groups of signs, B and C, must have been the same. Again, group A was too long for Cyrus. Accordingly, Darius was all that was left for A, and Grotefend, taking into consideration the forms of these names known to the Greeks, Hebrews and Persians, read:

- A: D-a-r-h-w-u-sch=Darius.
 B: Kh-sch-h-a-r-sch-a=Xerxes.
 C: V-i-sch-t-a-s-p=Hystaspes.

and translated the inscriptions:

"Xerxes, the mighty king, king of kings, son of Darius, the king. . ."
 "Darius, the mighty king, king of kings . . . son of Hystaspes."

Later investigations showed that he had read these signs correctly. There was only one mistake—the *h* should have been read *j*. The correctness of his method of decipherment was confirmed, beyond all doubt, by the vase mentioned above. On this there is a quadrilingual inscription. The first is written in Egyptian hieroglyphs, and was deciphered by Champollion as the name of Xerxes. The other three are in cuneiform characters, the first of which, the Old-Persian, corresponded exactly to the group on the Persepolis inscription, which Grotefend read Xerxes. All later investigations are based on the discovery of Grotefend. Thirty years later (1836), Burnouf and Lassen took up the work. Lassen did great service to the young science by his ingenious discovery in one of the Darius inscriptions of a list of peoples which added much new material for the recognition of new values of the single letters, and rendered it possible, for the first time, not only to read the Persian cuneiform inscriptions, but also to explain them from a philological standpoint. The theory of Grotefend that the language of these inscriptions and that of the Avesta were exactly similar was proved to be wrong. From this time on, new discoveries in both the grammar and the lexicon were made, from time to time, by such men as Beer, Holtzman, Westergaard and others, but the material at hand was altogether too limited to permit any great advances.

It was the good fortune of Henry Rawlinson to discover this greatly needed material. In 1835, while a resident in the East, Rawlinson began his study of the cuneiform inscriptions. At first his work was quite independent of Grotefend's. From an examination of the inscriptions of Elvend, near Hamadan, without any assistance from Grotefend's work, he found the name of Hystaspes, Darius and Cyrus. In the spring of 1836, while in Teheran, he first became acquainted with the works of his predecessors—that of Grotefend in the third edition of Heeren's *Ideen*, and of St. Martin in Klaproth's *Aperçu de l'origine des diverses écritures* (Paris, 1832). He found, however, that he was already, as the result of his own study, further advanced than Grotefend. In 1837 he copied, for the first time, a large part of the Persian text of the Behistun inscription, viz.: The whole of Column I, the first paragraph of Column II, and 1-10 of Column III, besides four small inscriptions. On January 1, 1838, he sent his first translations, with notes, to London, and they were first brought to notice on May 12, 1838, by Sir Gore Ouseley, in a meeting of the Asiatic Society. Rawlinson's first report was not published at that time. Gildemeister, of Bonn, has printed the most important part in the XXVIth volume of *ZDMG*. In 1839, he was called into active service in the war with the Afghans, and it was 1843 before he could again return to his copying. In 1844 he finished the first inscription, *i. e.*, the Old-Persian, and in 1847 he copied the Babylonian text. During the following year he worked out the basis of all later decipherment. In 1849 he returned to England with the manuscript containing the Babylonian text of this trilingual inscription, and in 1850 he presented to the Royal Asiatic Society a translation of the

Assyrian inscription found on the famous Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser. In 1851 the printing of his *Memoir on the Babylonian and Assyrian Inscriptions* was finished. This contains the cuneiform text, the transliteration and translation of the Babylonian version of the Behistun inscription (112 long lines, the middle part of most of which has been rendered unreadable on account of the long continued trickling of water over them), together with a commentary and an analysis of the first thirty-seven lines. "The list of signs added to the above contains 246 numbers, with the addition of phonetic values (and also ideographic), most of which have turned out to be correct." In 1852 Rawlinson was sent by the English government as Consul General to Bagdad. He was given power by the authorities of the British Museum to conduct excavations wherever he found favorable sites. In 1855 he returned to England and has since remained there, with the exception of a short diplomatic trip to Persia in 1858.

"The year 1857 is memorable in the annals of Assyriology. In that year the Royal Asiatic Society of London proposed a test of the genuine character of the translations offered by scholars of the Assyrian inscriptions. It was as follows: Eight hundred lines of cuneiform writing, recently found by Layard on clay cylinders, at Kalah Sherkat, not far from the site of Nineveh, were to be independently translated by any scholars who would come forward and accept the proposal; the results of their work were to be sent, sealed, to the secretary of the society, and the packets were to be opened on the same day before a commission, which should report on the points of resemblance or unlikeness to be found in the translations. This proposal was made public in March, and on May 25 four packets were opened, containing the work of Sir H. Rawlinson, Mr. Fox Talbot, Dr. Hincks, and Dr. Oppert. The general similarity of the results in the four essays formed a strong confirmation of the genuineness of the translations, and the correctness of the method of decipherment, which even such a sceptic as M. Renan freely admitted."

Henry Rawlinson is, in every sense of the word, the "Father of Assyriology." He was the first to make the discovery of an inscription of any length and importance, and he was the first to translate an Assyrian inscription. His discoveries, although somewhat dependent on those of Grotedefend, were on the other hand practically independent.

[To be Continued.]

Synopses of Important Articles.

THE DIFFICULT WORDS OF CHRIST; I. THE CHILDREN AT PLAY, MATT. XI. 16-19. By Rev. JAS. STALKER, D. D., in *The Expositor*, Jan. 1893.

The passage is a criticism passed by Christ upon the generation to which he belonged, in respect to their treatment of John the Baptist and himself. Characteristically he has embodied his rebuke in a figure of speech, and has drawn from child life. A game is described in which children imitated first a marriage, one piping and the others dancing about him; then a funeral, one wailing, the others following mourning. Construing Christ's figure, who are represented by the children who complain to their companions? There are two views: (1) that they are Jesus and John the Baptist; (2) that they are the Jews in general. The latter view comes from a too literal adjustment of the parallels; the phrase "it is like" is simply a link by which the thing to be illustrated is loosely connected with the illustration, which is then developed as a picture with perfect freedom. Further, were not John and Jesus the innovators, who proposed the new departures, but could not get their contemporaries to join? Is it historical to say that fickleness and an excessive disposition to change were the characteristics of the age of Jesus? An additional argument against the second view, sentimental indeed but not therefore without weight, is that it takes all the sunshine out of the picture of child life which the illustration presents, and would Jesus have been likely to do that? By the first view nothing is lost, because all that is really brought out by the second is included; and there is everything to gain.

The discussion is rather an exegetical than a practical one, as the general meaning and point of the parable are the same under any explanation. It is a little surprising that Dr. Stalker (with Godet) has gone back to the old interpretation of the passage, as against many recent commentators (Lange, Meyer, Weiss, Holtzmann, Bruce, Schaff, *et al.*) His principal reason for doing so is to avoid certain alleged violence done the history by the more recent view, which he cites in order to refute. But the difficulty is a conjectural and not a real one. Excessive pressure is brought to bear upon the figure to make it yield historic detail. The error of literalism which Dr. Stalker decries in his first argument characterizes his second. The figure of the parable introduces us to children at play in the streets with their customary youthful games of mimicry. Some wish to have a mock marriage, but their fellows refuse to join in their gayety; then they propose a mock funeral, but still they will not respond. In fact, they are childish, insincere and unreasonable. And just so, says Jesus, are the men of this generation. Nothing which is genuinely religious will suit them, because they do not wish to be suited. If Jesus and John have to be identified either with the children who propose the games or with those who refuse to play, the manner

of introducing the comparison (see especially Luke vii. 31-35) and the natural parallelism of figure and explanation demand the latter; *i. e.*, the Jews called upon John to be less somber and severe, but he would not; they called upon Christ to be less cheerful and social, but neither would he respond. But it is neither necessary nor desirable to understand that Jesus identified himself and John with either group of children. To do so involves a manifest lack of dignity. Christ is administering a rebuke to the Jews of his time for rejecting their truest religious leaders. He employs this illustration to disclose the underlying cause and spirit of their opposition, which were their childishness, insincerity and unreasonableness. Any attempt to draw out detailed similarities between figure and explanation is unwise because involving difficulty and violence. Besides, such a proceeding is out of harmony with the best principles of exegesis as applied to parabolic interpretation.

ST. PAUL AND INSPIRATION. By Prof. GEORGE T. PURVES, D.D., in *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, January, 1893.

The influence of Paul's teachings is so great that it may truly be said that our apprehension of Christianity depends upon our apprehension of Paul.

I. In considering the testimony which Paul gave to his consciousness of apostolic office we have, first, a summary of his teachings respecting "his gospel;" this was not elaborated by his own mind, but received through direct revelation of Jesus Christ. Furthermore, his mind was the subject of special illumination by the Holy Spirit, so that he was enabled to apprehend this objective revelation, and to regard himself as a vehicle for the utterance of God's thought; "God doth beseech you by us," "Christ speaketh in me," etc. Therefore he claims absolute authority over the faith and conduct of Christians, and, identifying "his gospel" with "the word of the Lord," he warns against any one who teaches otherwise, even though he were an angel from heaven. He attached the same authority to his letters as to his oral teaching, and to the verbal form in which his truth was expressed no less than to the truth itself; cf. 2 Thess. 2.15; 1 Cor. 2.13. Though his rhetoric, argument and style were brought to his mind by the Holy Spirit, yet there was never a more living writer than Paul, whose marked self-consciousness, intense personality, and limitations as well, stamp themselves on all his writings.

II. Setting aside at once the objections brought by naturalism, these claims are justified (a) by the fact that they were freely admitted by the other apostles, and (b) by the fact that "his gospel" is a legitimate unfolding of ideas already announced in the teachings of Jesus; it stands in such relation to that of the other apostolic writers as to be an integral and necessary part of the apostolic teaching as a whole, and a legitimate unfolding of the teachings of the Old Testament.

III. In view of the above facts, what was Paul's doctrine about the Scripture? Did he attach the same conception of authority and inspiration to it that he attached to his own teachings, whether oral or written? (a) His

descriptions of the Old Testament indicate that he regarded it as God's gift to the church of all time, that it was "inspired by God," and "*written* for our admonition." (b) Paul's actual use of Scripture shows that he regarded "his gospel" as the very substance of the law and the prophets. He treats the Biblical narrative—so far at least as its leading features are concerned—as true, and as fundamental to his view of God's government of the world and of the method of man's salvation. He supports his argument by appeal to the precise words used by the sacred writers; but since he does not derive his doctrine from the Scriptures, but from direct revelation of Jesus Christ, he is not confined to exact quotation. His exegetical method was determined by his practical purpose, so that he could either show his reverence for the letter of Scripture, or his disregard for it, as occasion required.

In the light of this study we may grasp the meaning of the word *theopneustos*—"breathed into by God"—applied by him to the Scriptures. He evidently meant that, as writings, they were so composed under God's particular direction that both in substance and in form they were the special utterance of His mind and will. The Divine Spirit dwelt in them, and breathed through them.

The authority which Paul claims for his own writings, and which he attributes to the Old Testament, he accords to the writings of other apostles and inspired men which were accepted by the church as a part of Scripture.

IV. A Christian scholar must, therefore, approach the study of the Bible with peculiar reverence, not in the same mental attitude in which he approaches other literature, not blindly nor unintelligently, but with quickened intellectual and moral power, so that he may understand it as a living thing, an organism. Paul nowhere describes the *method* by which the Divine Spirit operates in himself, or in the prophets, to produce the Scriptures. He testifies to the fact and its consequences.

The account which the Bible gives of itself provides the strongest incentive to textual criticism, the reproduction as nearly as possible of the original; it will stimulate to the most exact and painstaking exegesis; it should lead to an apprehension of the Bible as a whole. The student should not be surprised to find that elements historical, verbal, or doctrinal, which enter into the structure of the Bible, had a previous existence of their own (for example in the synoptic gospels); but only as incorporated in the Scriptures can such materials be affirmed to be inspired.

The above admirable inductive study, covering twenty-four pages, makes it clear that Paul claimed for himself, and for the other Biblical writers, a divine authority in a very high and altogether peculiar sense. But while asserting the *fact*, it is equally clear that neither he nor they give the data for constructing an adequate *theory* of inspiration. Dr. Purves' investigation proves that a careful statement of the Bible's testimony respecting its own inspiration nowise conflicts with the sober results of a most rigid higher criticism of either the Old Testament or the New. P. A. N.

PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY; I. THE SOURCES. By REV. PROF. A. B. BRUCE, D.D., in *The Expositor*, January, 1893.

To make ourselves acquainted with the Pauline type of Christianity or *Paulinism*, a careful study of the four letters to the Galatian, Corinthian and Roman churches is all that is necessary. This limitation is justified by the fact that these epistles are everywhere recognized as genuine. Moreover, these epistles have the advantage of being controversial, for in a great crisis the thoughts of men are clear, defining themselves with the utmost sharpness and energy against those of their opponents. The issue is clear and vital, viz., the nature and destination of Christianity. In the group known as the *prison* epistles the special characteristic is the prominence given to Christology. The other groups, containing the epistles to the Thessalonians and the pastoral letters, yield no distinctive contribution to Paulinism. Since the first of these four groups is separated from the last by some sixteen years, the question may be asked with propriety, Was there any growth in Paul's mind in relation to Christianity, or must we conceive of his system of Christian thought as the same at all stages of his history, poured out at the first gush so to speak, and settling thereafter into an unchangeable, rigid form? There is no *a priori* objection to the hypothesis of development. But what is the fact in respect to Paul? The epistles to the Thessalonians, with the discourses in Acts, have been supposed to be the sources of a *Primitive Paulinism*. That these epistles represent a kind of rudimentary gospel is beyond doubt. But it by no means follows that that rudimentary gospel represents all that Paul then knew. That this was not the case is clearly seen from the fact that the Thessalonian epistles were written at least a year or two after the council at Jerusalem, where Paul appeared as the champion of gentile liberties. The encounter with Peter at Antioch had also taken place, and Paul's utterance at that time, Gal. ii, 14-21, is not a supposed primitive Paulinism, but the fully formulated Paulinism of the controversial letters. There is, then, every reason to believe that his characteristic ideas had taken form before he wrote the Thessalonian epistles. The phenomena encountered in those epistles are perhaps best explained by supposing that they show us the form in which Paul judged it fitting to present the gospel to nascent Christian communities when he had in view merely their immediate religious needs and capacities. Viewed from this point these epistles are a kind of Christian Primer, in which the frequent occurrence of such phrases as "ye remember," "ye know," indicates that the writer wishes to impress upon his readers the importance of former instruction. The elements of Christian truth contained in this Primer may be summarized as follows. (1) The word commonly used by Paul to denote the message of salvation is the Gospel, more definitely the *Gospel of God*. (2) The substance of this message is escape from "the wrath to come." Salvation is regarded chiefly from the *eschatological* point of view. (3) The great object of Christian trust appears,

not so much as Jesus the crucified, but rather as Jesus exalted into heaven, and about to come thence again for the destruction of sinners and the salvation of believers. Once only is Christ's death referred to as a means of salvation, I Thess. v. 10, and that in the most general terms. It indicates, at least, that Paul was not accustomed in his mission-addresses to enter with much fullness or exactness of statement into the doctrine of redemption by Christ's death. This also corresponds with the reports of his mission-addresses in the book of Acts. The points chiefly insisted on are Christ's death for sin and his resurrection, the former being rather implied than expressed, cf. Acts xiii. 38-39. (4) In the passage just referred to the word "justified" occurs, but it is not found in the Thessalonian epistles. The same idea in *essence* is presented in the words "faith" and "grace." (5) Jesus is called *the Son of God* and *the Lord*. (6) Mention is also made of the Holy Spirit, and in the specifically Pauline sense of the *Sanctifier*. While salvation is regarded from the eschatological point of view, present sanctification is strongly insisted on as a preparation for the future salvation. The writer's interest in real Christian goodness is intense and unmistakable; and it inspires us with confidence that whatever Paulinism may mean, it will never be found to imply indifference to ethical ideals and their embodiment in right conduct.

This article is the first of a series in which Professor Bruce discusses Paul's Conception of Christianity. The first article, on *The Sources*, will be followed by an attempt to form as definite conception as possible of the nature and import of Paul's religious experience, and this by a rapid survey of the four great epistles to the Galatian, Corinthian and Roman churches. The series promises to be one of exceptional interest and value.

Notes and Opinions.

How slowly old errors die is curiously illustrated in the article of the Century Dictionary on the word Bible. Explaining its derivation (through the Latin *biblia*), from the Greek *biblos*, also written *byblos*, it gives as one definition of the latter, "The Egyptian papyrus, of the inner bark of which paper was made." All of which is quite true except the last clause; and this is quite incorrect, inasmuch as the papyrus is an endogenous plant, and has no bark either inner or outer. Did the Century dictionary writer possibly rely on Liddell and Scott, who define *biblos* as "the inner bark of the papyrus," and then "a book, of which the leaves were made of this bark"? If so, he might have learned to distrust the authority of L. and S. in this particular matter if he had turned to *byblos*, which he would have found defined as the fibrous coats of the papyrus. . . . "especially the *outer* coat of papyrus used for writing on." Under *papyrus*, although it is defined as a rush, it is stated that writing paper was made of it "by peeling off its outer coat and gluing the slips together transversely." This venerable error (self-contradicting, but not self-correcting), the late Dr. Ezra Abbot was at pains to correct in a most interesting article in the Library Journal of Nov., 1878, in which he shows the general prevalence of the error even among scholars, and sets the matter right in his usual thoroughgoing fashion. The Century Dictionary also itself states the matter correctly under the head of papyrus. "The papyrus was prepared by cutting the central pith of the reed into longitudinal strips which were laid side by side, with another layer of strips crossing them at right angles. The two layers, thus prepared, were soaked in water, then pressed together to make them adhere, and dried."

E. D. B.

The Preface to the First Epistle of John.—In the *Expositor* for February, Professor Findlay expounds the first four verses of the first Epistle of John. This is a homiletical epistle, the address of an absent pastor to his flock, or to disciples widely scattered. It is a specimen of apostolic preaching to believers, a masterpiece in the art of edification. The address is based on the gospel history. The preface is indeed a summary of the Gospel according to John (cf. 1 John i. 1-18; xx. 30, 31). Its subject is *the eternal life manifested*. St. John had witnessed the supreme manifestation of God. The secret of the universe had been revealed to him in this which *was from the beginning*. The source of spiritual life to men is that which was in the first instance the source of natural life to all creatures. Here lies the foundation of John's

theology. It assumes the unity of the seen and the [un]seen. It interdicts and excludes all gnostical, dualistic and docetic conceptions of the world. This life that came from the Father and was manifested to the eyes of the witnesses of Jesus, was the one life and love that runs through all things, the source and root of being.

The apostle emphatically asserts the actuality of the manifestation of this life. Twice in three verses he reiterates, "we have seen it," twice "we have heard," and twice he repeats, "the life was manifested." The apostles were well aware of the importance of historical truth. Their faith was calm, rational, sagacious. Criticism and an alien philosophy were not idle in those days. The Gnostics of the later apostolic age were already, in their peculiar method and dialect, treating the incarnation, the miracles, the resurrection and the ascension, as a myth, a beautiful poetic dream, a pictorial representation of religious truth. In this epistle John confronts the Gnostic error with his impressive and authoritative declaration. From the eternal life revealed in Christ and thus attested, there is derived a *new divine fellowship for man*. "Our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son, Jesus Christ." Three words resume the teaching of the first paragraph of this epistle: *life, manifestation, fellowship*.

T. H. R.

The Kingdom of God.—Erich Haupt, D.D., Professor of Theology at Halle, contributes a short but very full and valuable article on this subject for the March *Expository Times*. In the Synoptic Gospels (he writes) the Kingdom of God is the main theme of the preaching of Jesus. Nowhere, however, does Jesus give an express explanation of this term, but leaves his hearers to gather his meaning from the totality of his words and from the various occasions on which he uses them. The foundation of the idea is contained in the Old Testament and is developed in later Judaism. Jesus attaches himself to this preceding development, but in such a way as to give to the term an entirely new meaning. The term itself is not found in the Old Testament, but is first used in the Apocalyptic writings of Judaism about the time of Jesus. The Kingdom of God is the condition in which God's sovereign will, both as regards Israel and the Gentiles, is to be fully recognized and carried out. This will was a *saving* as well as a *sovereign* will. So the term came to designate the salvation, the sum of the blessings which God's sovereignty was to bring. God's sovereignty and the salvation of Israel, especially of the pious in Israel, became so synonymous that the first term became interchangeable with the latter.

To Jesus, as to the Jews, the Kingdom of God consists in this, that God *give salvation*. The Kingdom of God is not a place. It is not an organization of individuals. It is that which God gives to man in salvation. Sometimes instead of the term "Kingdom of God," we find the phrase "Eternal Life" (cf Mat. xviii. 8, 9), and in John the latter has taken the place of the former. With this exception Paul agrees for whom the Kingdom of God is righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. Christ uses the term "King-

dom of Heaven" as well as the term "Kingdom of God." By the word heaven he seeks to describe not the *place* but the *kind* of this kingdom, its nature and its character. "My kingdom is not of this world," is an explanatory paraphrase for the expression "Kingdom of Heaven." It is the condition in which, within this earthly world, the world of eternity has attained reality. Christ brought this kingdom into this world for in him the eternal life was actually existent. *It is here, for he is here.* "Summing up, we may say that to Christ the term Kingdom of God is the comprehensive expression for the New Testament blessing of salvation in its fullest sense."

The Higher Criticism.—Several noteworthy articles have recently appeared on Biblical Criticism. Orello Cone of Buchtel College has an exceedingly thoughtful study in the *New World* for September on New Testament Criticism and Religious Belief. The writer shows the relation between the two. Religious belief affects criticism and is affected by it. Criticism will give to religious belief its true basis. There is no conflict between faith and reason, rather between theology and science, between preconceived doctrinal opinions and opening new truth. A true reconciliation is certain, for man's nature is religious, and truth exists. Criticism of the New Testament prepares the way for a true belief. Such is the spirit of this article. The writer admits that there must be preconceived conceptions of the Bible on the part of any one who approaches it, but asserts that this must not affect the integrity of the critical process. The position that the New Testament writings are in their entirety, in form as well as in content, of supernatural origin, forestalls all criticism. There can be no true criticism with iron-clad prepossessions, whether they be of the dogmatic, ultra-conservative, theologic character, or whether they be of the equally dogmatic, rationalistic, philosophic nature. The writer discusses the task of criticism, its problems of the text and the writings themselves, and considers at length the theory under which criticism must do its work, viz.: that the New Testament writings, though if containing a divine revelation, yet as literature, are of human origin. Criticism of the New Testament writings proceeds on the assumption that they constitute a literature. The writer does not make the distinctions of "lower" and "higher" criticism.

In the *Reformed Quarterly Review* for October, Rev. A. A. Pfanstiehl writes on Modern Biblical Criticism. Acknowledging the necessity and value of criticism, whatever the school of theology to which one belongs, he yet deprecates certain dangers and tendencies of criticism. It deals with the Bible as literature and not as revelation, and so the truth considered and handled as literature, treated critically, scrutinized as text and writing, loses the freshness and life-giving power inherent in it. We hardly agree with the writer when he accuses the higher criticism of upsetting Biblical Theology and of destroying the inspiration of the Scriptures. This may be true of a certain type of investigation that goes under the name of higher criticism,

but higher criticism itself, truly conceived, is the handmaid of Biblical Theology, and is absolutely the only process by which we can arrive at a true theory of inspiration.

This brings us to the article by Dr. Osgood, of Rochester Theological Seminary, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for October, 1892, on the History and Definition of Higher Criticism. This is an interesting and forceful article, in which the writer denies the propriety of the two divisions of literary criticism. He claims that criticism is one process, that the so-called lower and higher criticism overlap, that the problems of each are necessarily related, that no problems of the lower can be solved without the aid of the higher, and that moreover the appellation of one as lower and the other as higher is unjust and untrue. The consideration of the text requires just as much penetration and learning as the consideration of the authenticity and genuineness. He asserts that the distinction is not common among literary critics, and is one not made by Schleiermacher, Kuenen, Weiss and many other of the leading scholars of this and preceding generations. The writer gives a characterization of the life and work of Eichhorn who was the first to claim general recognition for this distinction. In denying the validity of this distinction he asserts that Eichhorn gave no definition of higher criticism, and no rules or principles on which to base its results. Though there may be much force in what the writer says, yet there do exist these two phases of criticism represented by such men as Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf and Ezra Abbott on the one hand, and by Weiss and Wellhausen on the other. Each has its problems and its aims distinct from that of the other. Each presents a sort of work very different from the other, and one that requires a different type of mind. The one investigates the problems of the text, the other that of the authenticity, genuineness, date, etc., of the writing itself. Though the lower may require as great penetration and learning, yet the higher has the broader outlook and the wider range, touching the history and philosophy of the age.

The last paper to which we will call attention is one by President Harper recently published in the *Chautauqua Assembly Herald* on "The Higher Criticism." Since it meets many of the queries raised by the preceding articles we will give this more in detail. President Harper does not question the validity of the term "higher" criticism. He takes it as one established, in use now for a century, and considers its purpose, its principles, its method and spirit, and its results. Criticism, he asserts, in its technical success, is in a single word, "inquiry." The whole business of a critic is to make inquiry. The literary critic inquires as to the authorship, the authenticity, the style and the character of a particular writing. The historical critic makes inquiry as to the date and details of an historical event, and its relation to other events which occurred before and after. History and literature have always been and are inseparable. The term, "higher criticism," describes the process of inquiring which includes both the literary and the historical, the term lower criticism being applicable to inquiry that relates only to the text. "The pur-

post of the 'higher criticism' is to discover the date of the book, its authorship, the particular circumstances under which it had its origin, the various characteristics of style which it presents; the occasion of the book; the purpose which in the mind of its author it was intended to subserve. Any and every man who asks these questions concerning any book is a higher critic. Every real student of the Sacred Word is a higher critic. If he is not a higher critic he is not a student." The materials of higher criticism are (1) the book itself, its diction, its style, its historical allusions, its religious ideas and (2) outside sources. The principles of the higher criticism require that allowance be made for the literary methods in vogue in the age in which the author wrote, for the fact that he wrote first of all for the people of his own times, and that his purpose was to bring to men that which must otherwise have been unknown, the knowledge of God and of His will concerning men. That the work of the higher criticism is a reasonable work, who can doubt? It is the very work which the student does in every other line of thought. It is necessary. The questions asked by higher criticism must be answered by the friends as well as by the enemies of Biblical religion. The indifferent must be aroused. Tradition obscures the truth, and the sacredness of truth makes the work absolutely imperative.

It is necessary to distinguish carefully between the true criticism and the false, a rational criticism and a rationalistic. The difference between the two lies not so much in a difference of purpose, materials or principles, but rather in the method of work and in the spirit in which the work is conducted. There are two classes of rationalistic critics: the class that gives undue prominence to the authority of reason and denies the authority of the Scriptures and the supernatural origin of Christianity; and that other class, truly rationalistic, though not often so-called, that magnify the authority of Scripture, but in their work, though perhaps unconscious of the fact, place reason still higher. The first class argue, there being no supernatural revelation, this material had its origin thus and thus. The second class argue, there being a supernatural revelation, this material had its origin thus and thus. There is another school of critics hardly yet organized, still largely ideal, which for convenience may be called the rational school. The rational criticism will be scientific in spirit, observing all the facts and formulating conclusions to be perfected only after reflection and verification. It will be broad and open, as against narrow and dogmatic. It requires the work of the specialist, but also recognizes that the very ability to specialize carries with it inability to generalize. The spirit of the rational criticism is never bold, yet never shrinking back, always cautious, yet ever alert. The charge of narrowness and dogmatism may be made against both classes of rationalistic critics. The rational criticism must be constructive not destructive. It will be characterized by the spirit of the greatest of all reformers. "I came not to destroy but to fulfill." He did a destructive work but his spirit was the constructive. The rational criticism is reverent not blasphemous. Here and here perhaps most widely the

rational parts company with the rationalistic criticism. World-wide is the difference between the reverent and irreverent spirit. The higher criticism will recognize both the natural and the supernatural elements. The result will be: (1) the man who has believed, without knowing why, will have an intelligent basis for his faith; (2) the men who have not been able to believe, intelligent, broad-minded men, with the removal of misconception will have no room for scepticism; (3) "The large class whose attitude has always been that of cold indifference will learn that this book is what it purports to be, the Word of God, and that being such it is worthy of all the respect and attention its strongest adherents claim for it. It will become to them a thing of life, not because it has changed—it has always been alive—but because they have changed toward it. Their interest will be aroused. The beauty and sweetness, the power and majesty will now appeal to them. A something has been found which serves as a connecting link between it and them. They have been brought into touch with it. Only this; but this is everything. And the world will, at last, give to the Sacred Word in reality the place which its friends now flatter themselves it occupies, the place of supremacy. The Bible is not supreme to-day. That it will be one day not one of us will doubt; but that day is far distant unless soon a rational interpretation and a rational presentation of Biblical material prevails more widely."

T. H. R.

Work and Workers.

Two articles of interest have lately appeared in memorial of Dr. Hort, one in the *Expositor* and one in the *Expository Times*. Both are written with that tone of affection which shows the personal charm of the man, but we wish to note what they tell of the method and character of his work. Both emphasize the thoroughness of his work. It was said of the printing of the Westcott and Hort Greek Testament, "when we thought it was all finished, Dr. Hort went over it with a microscope." In study he was not satisfied till he had gone to the bottom of every difficulty. He was almost too fearful of not doing sufficient justice to every point he had to deal with. "And in this no doubt lies the explanation of the fact that, with the exception of the" New Testament "mentioned above, and of a smaller volume containing his two most characteristic and valuable Dissertations on the true reading of John i. 18, and on the Constantinopolitan Creed and other Eastern Creeds of the fourth century, he has left nothing but scattered papers in one or two journals behind him." His modesty and the range of his studies are also noted. This last affected his method as a worker in his chosen sphere. "He was always large in his view; and notwithstanding his extreme fastidiousness and minuteness in investigation he always escaped the charge of pedantry." "As a lecturer, he was not popular with undergraduates. But no professor in any subject lectured to so many Bachelors and Masters of Arts." He took great pains with his lectures, but his great attraction was his sympathetic patience with all opinions and his great readiness to help all students, even those out of his own line, with whom he was thrown into even casual contact.

OXFORD, like other places of Christian learning, has been touched by the thought of the Bible as a widening revelation to widening capacities receiving the things of God; and it is interesting to note lecture-course titles which would hardly have been understood twenty-five years ago. Perhaps the University itself shows not so much of this as one would think who remembers that Cheyne, Driver, Sanday, are all Oxford professors. The fact is that the neo-Catholic party, now dominating the Established Church, seeks and finds its inspiration through the Church; and it is in the dissenting bodies that the new enthusiasm for Scripture exists. The younger ministers talk of the revival of religious life which they expect from a coming wave of Bible reading. A few Sundays ago in London I found one of the older ministers, Dr. Clifford, a Baptist leader, trying to help on the reading in a practical way. In the earlier part of the service he gave what might be called a prelude on the

meaning of the "Song of Songs." The sketch was very interesting, but I do not know whether Dr. Clifford gives these preludes regularly.

To return to the University. Canon Cheyne is not here this term, while Dr. Sanday is convalescent after severe illness. Nevertheless he is giving some of his courses, including one on "New Testament Times." At Mansfield, Mr. Bartlett lectures on "Development of Piety and Theology in the Primitive Church." Dr. Drummond, principal of Manchester New College (Unitarian), and well-known as the English authority on Philo's theology, is giving an "Introduction to the Fourth Gospel." On the whole, however, the New Testament work of the term shows few interesting features. There is more to attract on the Old Testament side. Canon Driver's most advanced course deals with the Minor Prophets. About fifteen men are with him in this study, which is rather elaborately textual. Perhaps half of them have been drawn hither from the Merchant Taylors' School in London. That school, a little oddly, affords teaching of Hebrew. Mr. Gray, of Mansfield, an unusually attractive lecturer, is treating of Second Isaiah and the "Theology of the Psalms." Mr. Ottley, one of the "Lux Mundi" essayists, is lecturing on Old Testament Theology, and the undergraduate who wishes to study the theology of single books, has a choice of Genesis (in Hebrew), Isaiah, two books of Psalms, Ezra and Nehemiah. Manchester New College has a tendency to general inquiries, and its two Old Testament courses concern "Introduction to the Literature and Religion of Israel," and "History of the O. T. Text." The Rev. J. E. Carpenter is the lecturer. F. R. S.

THE subject of the Bampton Lectures for 1893 is "History and Permanent Contents of the Doctrine of Inspiration." In other words, Dr. Sanday will trace the history of the doctrine from 400 A.D. backward somewhat minutely, and then compare the result of his investigation with modern apprehension of the truth of Inspiration.

What does Dr. Sanday look like? What did the undergraduates, as they looked across from the galleries, and the Vice-Chancellor, the Doctors, the Heads of Colleges, the Tutors, the Fellows, the M.A.'s, and the strangers within the gates, as they looked up to the tall pulpit,—what did they see? They saw a tall thin man dressed in black gown and Geneva bands. They saw a long thin face wearing a sweet expression, enlivened by bright, merry eyes, and broadening somewhat to a fine forehead. They heard a light clear voice speaking in a manner best described as "steady by jerks." Canon Driver has the same manner, but more jerky.

Dr. Sanday did not waste much time in his preface. For good or for evil, he said, the dictum is now accepted that the Bible is to be studied like any other book. He regretted that the assumption had lain near at hand, "Then the Bible must be like any other book;" but he believed that naturalistic criticism has gone as far as it can go, and that we are now on the way back to a better temper.

After announcing his subject, Dr. Sanday remarked that until the present century the doctrine of inspiration had received no additions since 400 A.D.; and then he proceeded at once to consider the problems presented by the New Testament. He said that these problems were three: 1, Growth of the Canon; 2, Significance attributed to it; 3, Grounds for inclusion of some books and exclusion of others.

1. No council defined the limits of the Canon, but in the West Jerome's translation fixed them practically; while in the East the struggle for admission was largely over by 200 A.D. During the preceding century a process of selection and reduction was going on.

This division of the lecture dealt largely with Harnack's theory that the Canon sprang into existence between 150-180, as a weapon forged by the Catholics to use against the Gnostics. He admitted that the Gnostic conflict hastened the formation of the Canon, but showed by much cumulative evidence the length of the consolidating process.

2. The doctrine of the Fathers as to the significance of the Canon might be called "high." Every verse was of equal importance in their view, and might be used in all sorts of combinations for establishment of doctrine and destruction of heresy. Dr. Sanday traced a constant "low" doctrine, however, quoting largely from Origen at this point.

3. First ground of inclusion, apostolicity. This argument won a place, finally, for the Apocalypse, and tended to deny one to "Hebrews;" but the latter was included, as reflecting Paul. A second ground took in Mark and Luke and the Acts, because vouched for by apostles. A third ground was found in the Reception by apostolic churches; and here we come to a most important factor, namely, the influence of leading churchmen, as Athanasius and Epiphanius. Dr. Sanday said that this influence was stronger the further back the historian tests it. The last ground assigned—one that operated for exclusion—was the mystical use of numbers, which desired four gospels, corresponding to the cardinal points, etc.

I have given a hasty summary of the first lecture in a series which may not be epoch-making, but will be useful and helpful to many; for many are feeling after the clear résumé of history and the enunciation of doctrine which Dr. Sanday's lectures are going to supply.

F. R. S.

OXFORD, February 27, 1893.

PROFESSOR W. MUSS ARNOLT, of John Hopkins University, has accepted a call to the chair of Biblical Literature at Michigan University. Mr. Muss Arnolt is known as a writer on Semitic subjects. He has an article in the forthcoming number of the *Hebraica* on A Comparative Study of the Babylonian Creation Tablets.

The *Theologischer Jahresbericht* has passed under the editorial management of Professor Holtzman, of Strassburg. Doubtless it will continue to maintain the same high character as under the late Professor Lipsius.

The Holy Synod, the official body of the Russian Church, has determined to direct the revision of the Bible in Russian. A body of scholars has been appointed to conduct the translation, and the approval of the Czar has been obtained. It is expected that the publication will be ready in about two years. This seems to be a biblical movement eastward, from the English through the German to the Russian.

The following are among recent articles on the Aristides Apology, discovered lately by Professor J. Rendel Harris: A translation, with exegetical and critical annotations, by Dr. Raabe, in the Gebhardt-Harnack *Texte und Untersuchungen, Band IX*; another in the *Tuebingen Quartelschrift*; discussions of the age of the writing in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*.

The closeness with which the whole world of scholarship is bound together is illustrated by a movement, almost simultaneous, of several biblical and theological journals. It is a movement toward the admission of articles in different languages in journals intended to appeal specially to scholars. Two journals are already doing this. One is the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*. Another is the *Zeitschrift* of the German Oriental Society. In our late exchanges we note that the number of these polyglot periodicals is to be increased, nor is the increase to come only in Germany. At the last Old Catholic Congress at Lucerne it was determined to found a new Catholic theological journal. It is to be called the *Internationale Theologische Zeitschrift*, and will be edited by Professor E. Michaud, of the Catholic theological faculty of the University of Bern. It will be a quarterly, having articles in French, German or English. Another comes from the Russification of the University of Dorpat in the Baltic provinces. It is a theological journal, to be called the *Utishonyia Sapisky*, or Learned Documents, and is to be published by the Council of the University. In addition to Russian, articles will be admitted in Latin, as well as in other European languages. Nor is America to escape the influence of this universalization of scholarship. *Hebraica* will hereafter be open to articles in other languages than English. The next number is to contain, among other things, an article in German by R. Kraetzschmar, of Leipzig. All these things are evidences that scholarship as well as steam is drawing the world together.

The death of Dr. Worcester, professor of Theology at Union Seminary, has left this chair vacant for the second time within a few years. Dr. Briggs will fill the post temporarily.

A catalogue of books on Oriental languages has recently been published by Mr. James Thin, of Edinburgh. It is particularly full under "India" and "Hebrew."

An elaborate work is just published by Dr. Max Ohnefalsch-Ritter. It contains the results of his excavations during the last twelve years in Cyprus, and is entitled *Kypros, the Bible and Homer*. It consists of 500 pages of letter-press, with 219 plates. It is historical, but gives special

attention to the inscriptions, art and sanctuaries of the island. Mr. Gladstone writes an introduction for the book.

The Cambridge Press will shortly publish a collection of popular articles relating to the history and archæology of the Bible. It will be called the *Cambridge Companion to the Bible*, and will be bound up with copies of the Bible. The general editorial work will be by Professor Lumby. The following have written articles for the work: Bishop Perowne, Professors Robertson Smith, Gwalkin, Skeat, Davidson, and Rev. Mr. Houghton. The publication is expected in April. This should be a valuable addition to the popular helps on the Bible.

PROFESSOR SAYCE is spending this winter in Egypt. In letters to the *Academy*, he is noting not only his own work and the corrections of former readings of inscriptions, but the general progress of exploration, as well as the items of interest which an observing and scientific traveler would note. In a recent letter he mentions the work of the French Archæological School during this season. They have copied and numbered all the inscriptions at Sehel, as well as on the main land between Sehel and Assuan, and will soon descend the river and superintend excavations at Kom Ombas.

PROFESSOR SWETE, who has already published, anonymously, a study of the Gospel of Peter, is soon to issue a more elaborate treatise on the same subject.

On March 18 the Chicago Society of Biblical Research held its spring meeting. The following papers were presented: The Argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Professor D. C. Marquis; The Literary Structure of the Song of Solomon, Professor A. S. Carrier; The Teaching of Jesus on the Kingdom of God, Professor A. C. Zenos. Professor Carrier took the ground that the Song of Solomon is not a drama in the modern sense, but rather a dramatic poem. He divided it into three acts, a division perhaps new. Another member of the Society, Professor Terry, of the Northwestern University, is soon to publish a study of the Song of Solomon.

Another venture, which indicates the growing interest in Oriental thought, is *The Oriental Review*, a bi-monthly, to be published at Washington. It is to be a popular magazine of Oriental science and comparative religion. Its aim will be to present, in a popular way, the results of the work of specialists in all lines of the fields covered by its subjects. It will also publish translations of some of the ancient texts, having arranged at present for translations of the Buddhist Book of the Great Decease, the Precepts of Ptah-Hotep, and the Descent of Ishtax. It makes no claim to the advocacy of any particular school of thought, but appeals to that widening circle of broad scholarship which, not only on religious, but on literary and philosophical grounds, turns with increasing interest to the results of Oriental study.

Book Reviews.

Inductive Studies in the Twelve Minor Prophets. By WILBERT W. WHITE, PH.D., Professor of Hebrew in Xenia Theological Seminary. Chicago: Young Men's Era Publishing Company, 1892. Pp. 114.

These new and practical methods of Bible study are the hopeful signs of the times. This little volume is the outgrowth and embodiment of plans successfully employed by Professor White in two conferences of college students at Lake Geneva, Wis., during the summer of 1892. It lays out before the workman the stone and timbers, with full specifications for constructing the edifice. Special stress is laid where it should be, on the careful, conscientious study of the words of the prophets. Helps in the shape of commentaries should always follow and never precede personal investigation. No student can go through this volume as directed without finding in the Minor Prophets a new mine of spiritual wealth. The mechanical make-up of the book is also attractive.

PRICE.

The Central Teaching of Jesus Christ. A Study and Exposition of the Five Chapters of the Gospel according to St. John, xiii. to xvii. inclusive. By THOMAS DEHANY BERNARD, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of Wells. New York and London: Macmillan & Co., 1892.

From one point of view this is an excellent book. There is much in it that is helpful, speaking to the heart and imagination. There is much in it to cheer, comfort and exalt. But there is much in it that is based on false exegesis and uncritical suppositions. Only by arbitrary methods can such results be obtained. The author's mind is in that peculiar state in which it is unable to see any real discrepancies or difficulties. He has but to expend his ingenuity on explaining things. How these various explanations fit into each other and how reasonable they are as a whole is no concern of his. When anything seems to him inexplicable, it is referred to some deep mystery. He makes the central teaching of Jesus include too much. As a work of the Christian imagination, it would be excellent; and on this account it will be helpful to many. But its fundamental hypotheses are rejected by most scholars.

O. J. T.

Primary Witness to the Truth of the Gospel. A Series of Discourses: also a Charge on Modern Teaching on the Canon of the Old Testament. By CHARLES WORDSWORTH, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of St. Andrews. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1892. Pp. 333.

The seventeen sermons in this volume contain forcible and suggestive expositions of practical Christian truth. They are addressed by the venerable

Bishop of St. Andrews to the people of his diocese to testify to his undiminished interest in their spiritual welfare while hindered by ill-health from appearing in his pulpit. The first sermon, on the "Witness of the Old Testament," is followed by one on the "Witness of St. John the Baptist," and this by two on the "Witness of Jesus Christ." The next, on the "Witness of all the Apostles," is followed by a series of individual testimonies from the more prominent New Testament actors and writers, such as Nathanael, Thomas, Stephen, Andrew, Peter, James, John, Paul and Luke. The last considers the "Witness of the Jews at the Present Day." The writer aims to present from these individual and independent sources a mass of cumulative testimony that will place the truth of the Gospel beyond all reasonable doubt. Still the tone is not controversial, but didactic. Not only the truth itself, but its moral applications are constantly pressed upon the reader's attention.

In the "Charge" at the close of the volume, the Bishop discusses mainly the Pentateuchal analysis. It is a little unfortunate that, after stating the origin and rise of the new opinions, and giving a sketch of the modern theory, instead of considering the grounds on which the theory is based, he contents himself with stating some "*A Priori* Obstacles to the New Teaching," and with referring his readers to recent literature on the subject. Of course the Bishop means to exhibit judicial fairness; but an upright judge will not take occasion to prejudice the jury against the defendant before the case is heard. In theological controversies this habit is common. Let us have truth, let us get at the facts, even if we must experience the painful necessity of reconstructing *a priori* conclusions and pet theories on a basis commensurate with the new facts. This primary love of truth, entirely compatible with a strong leaning toward conservatism, is especially desirable in one who "attempts to assist and guide his clergy in the formation of their opinions" on controverted critical questions.

The misuse of the word "canon," denoting by it the genuineness of a book in the Bible, instead of the mere fact that it is included among the books of the Bible, should be noted. Also, that some of the authors on whom the bishop mainly relies for a refutation of the "new theories" are not first class.

P. A. N.

The Formation of the Gospels. By F. P. BADHAM, M. A., Exeter College, Oxford. Second edition, revised and enlarged, pp. 8+196. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1892. 5 shillings.

The first edition of this work on the Synoptic problem appeared in 1891. The new edition is more than double the size of its predecessor, and presents the author's theory in a form much easier for the reader to grasp, both because it is more fully set forth in the body of the book, and especially because an appendix presents the three Gospels analyzed by means of

typographical variations to indicate the sources from which, according to the theory, the several Synoptists drew. The theory itself in its essential features may be briefly stated, mainly in the author's own words, as follows:

1. Previous to the destruction of Jerusalem, Matthew's disciples possessed two Gospels A and B, the former written before, the latter after the flight to Pella. A and B were speedily combined, giving AB.

2. Somewhat later a Pauline Christian having A and B, and AB produces a new harmony of A and B, intended to supersede AB. This new harmony is our second Gospel.

3. Mark in Rome (*circ.* A. D. 72), knowing nothing of the forementioned documents, writes down what he remembers of the preaching of Peter.

4. About A. D. 82, Luke combines the "Preaching" and our second Gospel, occasionally showing acquaintance with the other documents above-mentioned.

5. Into AB are interpolated certain sections of the "Preaching," producing our first Gospel.

Other subsidiary elements of Mr. Badham's theory are that Mark, the author of the "Preaching," is also the author of a large part of Acts, which Luke, the author of the "we-sections," incorporated into his history of the apostolic period, as he had previously made the "Preaching" a main source for his Gospel; furthermore, that Mark is the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Thus we have three books from Mark,—the "Preaching of Peter," a narrative of the apostolic age incorporated into Acts, and Hebrews. To this may also be added I. Peter as belonging to the general group of Petrine literature, though actually written not by Mark but by Silas.

It is evident that we have here not only a theory of the Synoptic problem departing in some important particulars from those most in favor of late, but some suggestions respecting the authorship of other books novel enough at least to attract attention. From the point of view of the Synoptic problem, the most noteworthy feature of Mr. Badham's theory is that the true Mark document described by Papias as based on the preaching of Peter is neither identified with our second Gospel, nor found in it, but is discovered imbedded in the third Gospel. The author thus parts company alike with ancient tradition and the general consensus of modern opinion. The elaborateness of the theory, despite the brevity of the statement, is also noticeable. It gives us a full literary outfit, so to speak. We have three primitive documents—a first redactor who combined A and B; a second redactor who attempted to improve the work of the first and gave us our second Gospel; a third, Luke, who gave us our third Gospel, and finally an interpolator of AB who gave us our first Gospel. The theory is defended chiefly by two classes of arguments. It separates our existing documents into parts chiefly on the ground of the doublets, repetitions and inconsistencies which it finds in all three of the Synoptists. It reunites the fragments in new combinations and assigns them to their several authors, mainly on the basis of lists of words

found to be common to the separate parts. The tables of doublets, despite numerous instances of very doubtful identification, give the book a certain value independent of the theory advocated. This theory the author does not undertake to prove directly, claiming that the only test to be applied is whether the key will fit the many and complicated locks which are to be opened.

We are not prepared to say that none of the propositions advanced by Mr. Badham can be substantiated, but we strongly incline to believe that the theory will require modification in important particulars before it can be accepted simply on the ground that the key fits all the locks. Take to begin with, the proposition that the true Petrine Gospel of Mark is not in the second Gospel, but is to be recovered from Luke by analysis of that Gospel, some portions used by Luke being also found in the first Gospel. Now this proposition is open to serious objections. It involves a strangely inconsistent attitude toward tradition. If anything can be established by tradition, it would seem that we ought to regard it as thus established that Mark is in some sense the author of our second Gospel, and that the apostle Peter was a chief source of Mark's information. Now, in connection with one of the testimonies by which this conclusion is sustained, namely, the statement which Papias transmits from John the Elder, Mark's Gospel is referred to as not being *in order*. This latter could in the nature of the case be nothing more than opinion, yet Mr. Badham attaches such weight to it that he makes it almost the corner stone of his theory. Judging that our second Gospel is not disorderly, he sets aside the constant verdict of antiquity identifying our second Gospel with that which Mark wrote, in order to preserve intact this passing expression of opinion on the part of John, and, relegating our second Gospel to an unknown author, creates out of Luke a disorderly Gospel for Mark. The difficulty of this particular hypothesis is seen to be still greater when we consider it chronologically. Both these documents, the true Mark and our present Mark, were in existence as early as 80 A. D., for about this year Mr. Badham places the composition of Luke, which used as its main sources the two documents above named. They were both in existence as late as about A. D. 170, for it is part of Mr. Badham's theory that the "Preaching" was used by Tatian in the construction of his Diatessaron. Thus for ninety years they existed side by side. At the beginning, of course, the names of Mark and Peter were connected with the "Preaching;" also in the days of John the Elder, and likewise apparently in the days of Papias, say about 130 A. D. But in the latter part of the second century the name of Mark is attached unquestioningly to our second Gospel. This is indeed a strange catastrophe that transfers a name from one document to another which has nothing in common with that other, and makes this transfer in the midst, or just at the close, of ninety years of coexistence of the two documents.

If Mr. Badham had contented himself with the proposition that Luke

employed two sources, one of which was our second Gospel, and the other a document which was nearly as extensive and to which he sometimes gave the preference, it would have been less difficult to agree with him. There is indeed much in his argument respecting the relation of the two documents and Luke's treatment of them that is worthy of attention. Such for example in his instancing of the fact that Luke, assuming, as is now quite generally held, that he had our second Gospel, set aside its account of Peter's denial to insert another account. This fact suggests that we must set some limit to the Petrine influence on the second Gospel, or at least to Luke's estimate of that influence. But the affirmation that Luke *always* preferred this other document to our second Gospel is one for which no proof is advanced, and which indeed the terms of the hypothesis exclude the possibility of proving or disproving. That he always preferred it in the instances which we can observe is, to be sure, true, since Luke's Gospel is *ex hypothesi* our only source for recovering the hypothetical document. But if the hypothetical is to be regarded as real, the proof must be carried beyond the hypothetical to the real. This has not been done. While, therefore, what Mr. Badham has brought forward in this connection is important, it proves much less than he seems to suppose, and certainly fails to substantiate his theory.

When we turn to the second part of Mr. Badham's theory, which postulates two documents, A and B, which by diverse combination give rise to our first and second Gospels, we find it no more firmly established than the first part. The author regards it as a striking proof of the truth of his theory that the discrepancies between the first and second Gospels as respects order of events are accounted for by supposing that the compilers of these Gospels dovetailed identical documents at different points. But when he puts his theory to the test the combination of the two documents involves not merely a dovetailing process, but such motiveless transpositions and such identifications of very different material as put the theory to a severe strain.

In general it may be said that the whole theory is on the one side based on fanciful and subjective considerations, and on the other builds on inconclusive verbal arguments. The former characteristic appears conspicuously in the attempt to justify the assumption that Luke had before him Matthew's account of the infancy of Jesus, and in his endeavor to harmonize the chronology of John with that of his reconstructed Synoptic sources. As respects the lists of words by which he seeks to bind together the now separated fragments of the original documents, it may be justly said that one or two of them create a certain probability in favor of the propositions in defense of which they are put forth, some are wholly inconclusive, and some actually favor a conclusion exactly opposite to that which they are supposed to establish. Our space forbids the exhibition of the weakness of these lists in detail, but the proof can be had by anyone who will take pains to examine them carefully, Greek Testament in hand.

As a serious and boldly independent attempt to solve an important

problem of New Testament criticism, and as directing attention to certain facts important for its right solution, this book is welcome. But it cannot be accepted as saying the final word on this subject. Some of this work will probably stand. Much of it seems more brilliant and fanciful than substantial or demonstrative.

E. D. B.

Two Present-Day Questions: I. BIBLICAL CRITICISM. II. THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT. Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, etc. By W. Sanday, M.A., D.D., LL.D. Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York, 1892.

In the first sermon, the author pleads for the best critical scholarship. Progress is the law of all life. But new opinions should be received slowly and fully tested. The consensus of the best scholars must be awaited. Time should be given that we may grow out of the old traditions into the new truths. Much of the work of the higher critics may now be accepted, even in the extreme form in which their results are stated. The Christian conscience can reconcile itself to them without real loss in religious life. For Christianity does not stand or fall with such questions as authorship, infallibility, inspiration and the like. The author thinks the English mind is peculiarly fitted to solve many of the problems that are now before the scholarly Christian world.

In the second sermon, he discusses the question, how far should the clergy take part in the "social movement" that is now upon us. He is of the opinion that the attitude of the clergy to this movement should be one of reserve. "The Christian teacher *is* called upon to enforce duties as duties, he is *not* called upon to claim or defend or champion rights as rights."

Current Literature.

By CLYDE W. VOTAW.

The University of Chicago.

OLD TESTAMENT.

Books and Pamphlets.

- Bible Studies. Readings in the Early Books of the Old Testament, with familiar comment.* Given in 1878-9. By Rev. H. W. Beecher. New York: Fords, Howard & Hulbert, 1893. \$1.50.
- Heth and Moab: Explorations in Syria in 1881-1882.* By C. R. Conder, LL.D., D.C.L., R.E. New York: Macmillan, 1892.
- An Introduction to the Books of Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther.* By A. H. Sayce, M.A. Third Edition. New York: Revell Co., 1893. \$1.00.
- The Psalms, Vol. I. Psa. i-xxxviii.* Expositor's Bible Series. By A. MacLaren, D.D. New York: Armstrong, 1893. \$1.50.
- The Bible Remembrancer; containing analysis of the whole Bible, introductions to all the books, diagrams, maps, etc.* New York: Revell, 1892. \$1.25.
- Book by Book; Popular Studies in the Canon of Scripture.* Introductions to the Biblical books by Farrar, Spence, Elmslie, Davidson, Dods, Leathes, McClear, Robinson, Sanday, and Milligan. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1892. \$2.50.
- From the Pyramids to the Acropolis: Sacred Places seen through Biblical spectacles.* By T. DeW. Talmage, D.D. Philadelphia: Hist. Pub. Co. \$1.00.
- The City and the Land.* A course of seven lectures of the Palestine Exploration Society. London: Watt, 1892. 3s. 6d.
- New Light on the Bible and the Holy Land.* By B. T. A. Evetts. London: Cassell, 1892. 21s.
- The Holy City Jerusalem: Topography, Walls and Temple.* By S. R. Forbes. Chelmsford: Durrant, 1892. 5s.
- Recent Explorations in Bible Lands.* By T. Nicol. Edinburgh: Young, 1892. 5s.
- An Sinäi, Palestine et Syrie.* By G. de Lombay. Paris: Leroux, 1892.
- The Universal Bible Dictionary.* Based upon the latest authorities. By J. Macpherson. London: Hodder, 1892. 6s.
- Der Begriff der Heiligkeit im Alten und Neuen Testament.* By R. Schröter. Leipzig: Fock, 1892. 90pf.
- Das Buch Henoch, aus dem Aethiopischen in die ursprünglich hebräische Abfassungssprache zurückübersetzt, mit einer Einleitung und Noten versehen.* By Lazarus Goldschmidt. Berlin: Heinrich, 1892. 5M.

Articles and Reviews.

- Israel in Egypt.* By Prof. C. H. Toy, in *The New World*, Mar. 1893.
- Aazel.* Editorial in *The Thinker*, Feb. 1893.

- Hesekiah, Sargon and Sennacherib.* By Joseph Horner, in *Methodist Review*, Jan.-Feb. 1893.
- "*The Divine Wings.*" By Wm. H. Ward, D.D., in *Homiletic Review*, Feb. 1893.
- The Folk-Song of Israel in the Mouth of the Prophets.* By Prof. Karl Budde, in *The New World*, Mar. 1893.
- The Alleged Socialism of the Prophets.* By A. W. Benn, in *The New World*, Mar. 1893.
- Wellhausen on the Minor Prophets.* Editorial in *The Thinker*, Feb. 1893; also, by Rev. Jno. Taylor, in *The Expositor*, Feb. 1893.
- The Course of Revelation in the Old Testament.* By Rev. A. Westphal, abstract in *The Thinker*, Feb. 1893.
- The Mythical Element in the Old Testament.* Editorial in *The Thinker*, Feb. 1893.
- The Personal Factor in Biblical Inspiration.* By Prof. M. R. Vincent, in *The New World*, Mar. 1893.
- The Central Idea of the Scriptures.* By Prof. G. H. Schodde, in *The Treasury*, Mar. 1893.

NEW TESTAMENT.

Books and Pamphlets.

- The Gospel of Matthew in Greek.* Edited by Alexander Kerr and H. C. Tolman. Chicago: Kerr & Co., 1892. \$1.00.
- Des Leben unseres Heilandes Jesus Christus und seiner jungfräulichen Mutter Maria.* By Engelbert Hofele. Stuttgart: Suddentsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1892. 9,50M.
- Die Bergpredigt Christi, in ihrem organischen Zusammenhange erklärt.* By Prof. Hugo Weiss. Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 1892. 1.80M.
- The Gospel of St. Luke.* By A. Maclaren, D.D. London: Hodder, 1892. 3s. 6d.
- Die Kindheitsgeschichte unseres Herrn Jesu Christi, nach Matthäus und Lukas ausgelegt.* By Dr. A. Nebe. Stuttgart: Greiner, 1892. 6M.
- Von der Welt zum Himmelreich oder die johanneische Darstellung des Werkes Jesu Christi synoptisch geprüft und ergänzt.* By H. Köhler. Halle a S.: Niemeyer, 1892. M5.
- The Gospel of Jesus Christ according to St. John.* With notes and explanations. By J. H. Whitehead. London: Nisbet, 1892. 1s.
- The Question of Questions: "What think ye of Christ?"* By S. Wainwright. London: Nisbet, 1892. 7s. 6d.
- Pleadan Claims for Christ.* By Rev. H. S. Holland, New York: Longmans, 1892. \$2.00.
- The Wonderful Counsellor.* All the recorded sayings of the Lord Jesus chronologically arranged. An introduction by Francis E. Clark, D.D. By Rev. Henry B. Mead. New York: Randolph, 1892. 50c.
- Das Leben Jesu, nach den vier Evangelien dargestellt. 2. Band. Geschichte der öffentlichen Thätigkeit Jesu.* By Prof. Joseph Grimm. Regensburg: Pustet, 1892. 6M.
- The Life of Jesus Critically Examined.* By Dr. David Friedrich Strauss. Translated from the Fourth German Edition by George Eliot. With introduction by Prof. Otto Pfeiderer, D.D. New York: Macmillan, 1892.. \$4.50.
- A Chronological-Inductive Study of the Life of Jesus the Christ, in fifty-two lessons; three grades, for Sunday-schools, Bible Classes, etc.* By M. C. Hazard and J. L. Kilbon. Boston: Cong. S. S. and Pub. Soc'y, 1892. Four parts. 30c.
- Les Biographies Nouvelles de Notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ et les Commentaires Récents de l'Évangile.* By Bellamy. Vannes: Galles, 1892.

- The Acts of the Apostles. Vol. 2.* Expositor's Bible Series. By G. T. Stokes, D.D. New York: Armstrong, 1892. \$1.50.
- New Commentary on Acts of the Apostles. Vol. 2.* By J. W. McGarvey, A.M. Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Co. \$1.50.
- Die Apostelgeschichte übersetzt und erklärt.* By Jos. Felten. Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 1892. 8M.
- Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament.* By Prof. Dr. H. J. Holtzmann and others. 2 Bd., 1 Ab. 2 Auf. *Die Briefe an die Thessalonischer und an die Korinther.* By Paul Wilhelm Schmiedel. Freiburg i. B.: Nohr, 1892. 5.40M.
- Das Hohe Lied im Neuen Testament, 1. Korinth, 13.* By C. Rahm. Basel: Geering, 1892. 50pf.
- The Epistle to the Philippians.* Expositor's Bible Series. By Prin. Rainy, D.D. New York: Armstrong, 1893. \$1.50.
- Commentaire sur les Eptres de Saint Paul, aux Colossians, aux Ephesians, et à Philémon.* By Prof. Hugues Oltramare. 3 vols. Paris: Fischbacher.
- Discussions on the Apocalypse.* By Wm. Milligan, D.D. New York: Macmillan, 1893. \$1.50.
- Die religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung der Synagoge.* By Dr. D. Selver. Frankfurt a. M.: Kauffmann, 1892; 50pf.
- Articles and Reviews.**
- The Learning of the Boy Jesus.* By Rev. Julius Döderlein, abstract in The Thinker, Feb. 1893.
- Christ at the Pool of Bethesda.* By G. A. Chadwick, D.D., in The Expositor, Feb. 1893.
- The Part Played by Oral Tradition in Determining the Form and Contents of the Synoptic Gospels.* By Prof. V. H. Stanton, D.D., in The Expositor, Feb. 1893.
- Discrepancies in the Gospels.* Editorial in The Thinker, Feb. 1893.
- Types of Service, John xii. 1-8.* By Prof. J. Iverach, D.D., in The Thinker, Feb. 1893.
- The Place of the Fourth Gospel in the New Testament Literature.* By Prof. Orello Cone, in The New World, Mar. 1893.
- The Biblical Christ the Ground of Our Faith.* By Dr. Paul Ewald, abstract in The Thinker, Feb. 1893.
- Exegetical Notes on Eph. ii. 1-7.* By Rev. A. Welch, in Homiletic Review, Feb. 1893.
- Two Epistles to the Philippians.* By Prof. Daniel Völter, abstract in The Thinker, Feb. 1893.
- Paul's Religious History.* By Prof. A. B. Bruce, D.D., in The Expositor, Feb. 1893.
- The Preface to the First Epistle of John.* By Prof. G. G. Findlay, in The Expositor, Feb. 1893.
- The Essenes as Depicted by Josephus.* By Rev. C. Tideman, abstract in The Thinker, Feb. 1893.
- F. C. Baur's Teaching and Influence.* By Drs. Hilgenfeld and R. Seyerlen, abstract in The Thinker, Feb. 1893.
- The Apocalypse and Gospel of Peter.* Editorial in The Thinker, Feb. 1893.
- The Newly Discovered Fragments of Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature.* By Dr. Ed. Bratke, abstract in The Thinker, Feb. 1893.
- Recent Literature on the New Testament.* By Marcus Dods, D.D., in The Expositor, Feb. 1893.
- Historical Preparation for Christianity.* By Rev. Samuel Weir, abstract in The Thinker, Feb. 1893.
- Pagan and Christian Morality.* Editorial in The Thinker, Feb. 1893.