

THE

Old and New Testament Student

VOL. XIV.

MARCH, 1892.

No. 3.

A SERIES of editorial remarks in THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT STUDENT for December, 1891, has occasioned extensive and unfavorable criticism. They have been interpreted as a deliberate attempt to get rid of the Messianic element in Old Testament prophecy, and to reduce the prophecy itself to a purely human utterance concerning things that lay wholly within the times-horizon of the prophet. That these remarks, with such an interpretation put upon them, should have been regarded as "very mischievous" in their tendency, as "exorbitant claims made in the name of science," as "both untrue and absurd" is natural. The only occasion for surprise is that any sensible person should have indulged himself in such interpretations, seeing that the editorials in question contained no word or implication that could fairly warrant them. True, they did not pretend to a complete treatment of Messianic prophecy. Too many things, perhaps, were assumed. The writer was "very bold" in attributing to all his readers a limited acquaintance with modern hermeneutics; the commotion so innocently stirred up indicates that there are still many among the editors of the religious press who "have not so much as heard whether there be any" historical interpretation of prophecy. Some one of these belated brethren having detected, as he imagined, a strong odor of heresy raised the alarm, and forthwith a score of others took it up, many of whom, judging from their irrelevant and preposterous criticisms, had not personally investigated the matter under discussion. In reply to those who have been kind enough to read at least a part of the editorials we would say;

- 1) That their strictures fail to trouble the point at issue,

viz., *the inherent obscurity of Messianic prophecy* before its fulfilment. This obscurity cannot be appreciated by us so long as we persist in attributing to the prophets and their hearers the same understanding of prophecy as we ourselves possess. For religious and practical purposes we are constantly interpreting prophecy in the light of its fulfilment, assuming that the whole body of Messianic prophecy is an organism every detail of which points to Jesus of Nazareth; that it is the Old Testament preparation for his advent, and that we are therefore warranted in perceiving this in the Jewish Scriptures, which, as Jesus says, "are they that bear witness of me." This is entirely legitimate. It is what the church has been doing in every age since Jesus "beginning from Moses and from all the prophets interpreted to them [the two disciples] in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." It is what the church will continue to do with delight and profit till the end of time. The Holy Spirit distinctly revealed to the prophets that the superlative spiritual benefits of their mission did not accrue immediately "unto themselves, but unto us" to whom the gospel is preached (1 Peter 1:12). That is to say, they perceived that the words which they were moved by the Holy Ghost to speak, in addition to their immediate and local application, were pregnant with a divine meaning which the prophets themselves did not fully grasp, and which could not be grasped, except as a dim shadow, until that meaning became incarnate in the Son of God. Among Christian interpreters there is no controversy on this point.

What then is the difficulty? It lies right here. Following the historical tendency of our age, biblical scholars have begun to study the Scriptures historically and inductively. They ask not only, What do these Messianic prophecies mean to us, and what would the Holy Spirit have us understand by them? but how much did they mean to the prophet and those whom he addressed? Aside from any local enforcement and impending realization, did they have as large and accurate conceptions of a personal Messiah before his advent as we have subsequent to it? Obviously as much less as the conception of a laborer digging the foundation in less

than that of him who surveys the completed cathedral. The sole purpose of historical interpretation is to ascertain as far as possible, first, what local application the prophet's words may have had; and secondly, how much of Messianic import they conveyed to himself and his contemporaries. In ascertaining this it is obviously illegitimate to read into the prophecy "what can be recognized only in the time of fulfilment." The primary, historical interpretation must include, not the latent meanings, nor God's full meaning, but only what *was more or less clearly present to the prophet's consciousness*. We say "more or less clearly," since it must include not only special disclosures as to local events, but also the prophet's presentiments of a transcendently greater realization in the distant future. In some cases the former wholly obscured the latter, as the moon eclipses the sun. How inadequate this original Messianic conception really was even in its fullest form may be surmised from the difficult experiment by those who stood in the presence of Christ in recognizing him as the fulfilment. This original obscurity of the Messianic oracles characterizes all predictive prophecy. The Bible contains many yet unfulfilled oracles touching the completion of the Kingdom of God. They testify unmistakably that we are advancing toward a goal of perfection, but who now can give the faintest conception of what that glorious realization will be? Nor could the prophets materialize the shadowy outlines of the Messiah.

Now when the scientific interpreter, simply as an inductive student of history, undertakes to put himself in the prophet's place, and to define as far as he can his original and quite incomplete meaning of prophecy, he is met by the senseless cry that he is robbing it of its "strength and fulness," or "evacuating it of its supernatural contents."

2) That the alleged heresies combated by the critics are their own sheer assumptions, for which the editorials referred to furnish no ground whatever.

It is assumed that the editorials *deny* that the prophets had any idea of a larger and more remote fulfilment than that

which lay within their own times-horizon; that they disclosed anything that could not be discerned by ordinary penetration and sagacity; that they addressed other ages than their own; that Messianic prophecies contain any predictions of a Messiah; that God had anything to do with Old Testament prophecy!

It is assumed that the editorials *affirm* that there can be no historical interpretation until all references to a future Messiah have been ruled out; that Christ and the evangelists "read into" the ancient prophecies all that they pretended to find of Messianic prediction, but which was not really there; that for us to-day to give any Messianic interpretation to prophecy is "clearly illegitimate."

One or another of these assumptions lies at the foundation of all the criticisms that have appeared, but in the utterances criticised there is not a shadow of excuse for a single one of them. The objectors err in not discriminating between the primary and the present meanings of prophecy; in supposing that what is said in respect to the rigidly scientific interpretation of the former holds also in respect to the religious and practical interpretation of the latter. In combating the above assumptions and errors they have entirely lost sight of the main point—the inherent obscurity of prophecy. There is no desire to remove an iota of its supernatural elements.

3) That the editorials expressly guarded against such misconstructions as have been put upon them. The second half of page 323 emphasizes the divine side of prophecy as far as it was deemed necessary to emphasize a fact conceded by all Christians. It says: "That this reference to some object above the prophet's horizon did not exhaust the content of the prophecy must in most cases have been clear to the prophet himself. Out of a narrow historical present it expands into an ideal painted in far stronger colors than would be warranted had the fulfilment been limited to the immediate historical circumstances." It speaks of Christ as "their ultimate goal." Why have these statements been deliberately ignored by every one who has objected to the preceding paragraphs?

We do not charge our friends with intentional lack of candor. We cannot help thinking, however, that they are so wedded to the exclusively spiritual interpretation of prophecy, which legitimately takes account of the fulness of divine meaning, revealed to us but hidden from the prophets, that when one ventures, for exact historical purposes, to ask just what it meant to the prophet, they leap to the conclusion that prophecy is being depleted of its supernatural richness and power. This is just the reverse of the facts.

ONE cannot too strongly impress upon the biblical student the importance of right spiritual and intellectual *attitudes* toward the Object of his research. Preliminary to all study of the Bible, fundamental to it in all its course, is this primary attitude, the essential feeling, thought, regard, which the student cherishes toward it. These determine largely his path, his progress, his ultimate success in grasping the real heart of the Scriptures. Recently, in these pages, the suggestion has been made, in more than one form and connection, that the final cause of Bible study is its bearing upon the *life*. Readers may have become somewhat impatient with the repeated assertions respecting the total failure of all that study which did not issue in conduct. They may have misunderstood or declined to accept the convictions expressed, that in Bible study neither was Rationalism anything nor Orthodoxy, neither Higher Criticism nor no-Criticism, in comparison with a Bible-made *character*. Nevertheless this is profoundly true. The man whose attitude toward the Word is something less than this will never become a successful student of it. He may be able to explain its language and interpret its dark sayings but he has missed its life. How carefully, then, should one see to it that his spiritual attitude toward the Scriptures is one of utter submission to its teachings as "words of life"

A MORE difficult problem and one which has received many answers is that respecting the *intellectual* attitude which the student of the Bible should maintain. In one sense it is an-

swered in the preceding discussion. Intellect is a part of the spiritual equipment of man, and, as such, accepts, as its highest function in this sphere, the application of its results in the formation and exaltation of character. But in another and quite different sense, namely in the sphere of its investigations and inquiries into the meaning, application and elucidation of biblical truths, the question of intellectual attitude may have quite a different answer, is certainly open to discussion. An answer to this latter question is given by one earnest, learned and devout scholar as follows: "I know, only too well, that the most excellent methods and principles will never make a Bible student of any who does not *absolutely prostrate his intellect* before the Book." Is this rhetoric? The writer evidently meant it for sober, reasonable speech. What does it mean? Without doubt it embodies a great truth. The intellect of man is a finite instrument and its reasoning power is limited on all sides in its search after truth. In the Scripture, however, is some truth conveyed to the mind which it is the privilege of reason to receive, accept and commend to the spirit for obedience. There is no need nor demand that such truth be criticised, sifted, subjected to the tests of logic and science. There the attitude of the intellect may be said to be one of "absolute prostration," though the words are rather extravagant. But in general such an attitude may be questioned. Was the Bible intended for any such purpose? Did it originate in any such way? Has the man who proceeded on any such principle found success in the study of the Bible? Has not superstition, has not bigotry, always been bound up with this intellectual creed? The Scriptures came out of the minds of men whose intellects were often in critical attitudes toward their God, who questioned, doubted, discussed and were persuaded. The Bible, from this point of view, is a record of intellectual life, activity, energy, such as is seen in no other literature. In the imitation of this mental attitude, therefore, not in "absolute intellectual prostration," it would seem that the student of the Bible has better reason to be justified. The more really he can live over again in his mental life the activities that they disclose, the more fully, it would seem, he

can realize their attitudes,—by just so much he nears the intellectual goal of true Bible study. Conviction such as the biblical writers possessed, he must arrive at as nearly as possible in the way by which they attained it. If this was through “absolute intellectual prostration,” let him strive after it; if not, he may seek the “more excellent way.”

THERE was a time when assaults upon the Scriptures were made by men whose personal character was such that references to it were sufficient answers to the assaults. That time is past. It is unfortunate that the Bible should ever be attacked and that attacks are made by men of sincere and upright purposes. Defences must be prepared. They cannot consist of reflections upon the motives and characters of the assailants. They must meet these men on the common ground of the Scripture material which an attack presupposes to be brought into disrepute, while even the defence is compelled to grant that the Bible is called in question and needs the support of argument. Thus from both sides the dignity and authority of the Book is weakened. This is sad enough in any age and ours is witnessing this calamity in its extreme form. Men of noble life and utterly sincere and honest motives stand with the opposition and lend all the weight of argument and life to the thankless and, in its temporary effects at least, undoubtedly harmful task of rousing unbelief in the trustworthiness of the Bible.

It is not worth the while to ask, Who is responsible for this? It is no man's privilege to act as judge in this matter, however frequently and loudly men have claimed this privilege. There have been those who laid this responsibility entirely upon the attacking parties and have enlarged in a very impressive way upon the harvest which the sowers of such tares are sometime to reap. Others have found reason to tax the church itself with being the primary cause for such attacks, in that her claims for the Scriptures and erroneous views of their character and teachings have compelled these honest men to dissent and deny. Many would grant truth to both sides here. But of that matter, we repeat, none of us

need feel compelled to judge and we should be thankful to leave the question alone. Each one of those who numbers himself among the enemy must settle it before his own conscience and his God.

STILL the enemy is here and striking at the fortress from every side. There can be no doubt of this. Biblical "facts"—men have ceased to employ the phrase but must needs speak of biblical "questions." Everything is in solution. Every date and doctrine is encircled with interrogation points. The particular sphere of conflict, if one can distinguish in the midst of the general confusion, is the historical element of the Scriptures. Is the Bible history credible at all? If so, to what extent? Is it all trustworthy? These are the points where the battle rages most fiercely. That the Bible as history is not at all credible or even trustworthy is a view which in our day has been totally and triumphantly refuted. It has been done in a way which none expected, by the pick and spade, by facts dug up from Mesopotamian and Egyptian dust and sand heaps. The Old Testament, by some regarded as the realm of fantasy and fable, is in its historical element generally trustworthy. Such a statement passes everywhere among scholars without denial. No one who accepts facts can deny it. Every month makes it stronger. Every year of discovery and decipherment puts it beyond the possibility of denial. That this biblical history is in all its parts credible and in accordance with fact is not so generally accepted. The oriental discoveries are thought to offer, along with their supports and confirmations, some disagreeable divergences. They raise some hard questions, while they answer satisfactorily so many others. Scholars are not in a position yet to determine the final results. The immense variety of material and the immense labor demanded of specialists in estimating its value unite in delaying conclusions. It is too soon to call upon the enemy to surrender unconditionally or to abandon what we may for the moment fear to be a shattered fortress. Untenable positions are being abandoned everywhere and they cannot be left to soon.

Caution, common sense and patience are required of every defender and are worth more than the most deafening clamor at a point which clearly must soon be yielded to the foe. We hear too much of this kind of bluster,—usually just before the white flag is run up!

Even should it sometime become necessary for us to grant an element of inaccuracy and untrustworthiness in the biblical historical narratives and to fall back on the, even now, secure position that, in the main, they possess eminently historical truthfulness, this may not prove to be so disastrous. At present men are beginning to see that behind the history was the moral and spiritual purpose which inspired the narrator. The Old Testament is prophetic where it is most historic. This it is which is enduring—the moral and spiritual element. This makes the unity, the triumphant unity. This is the inexplicable element, the supreme and abiding miracle. No searchings of sand heaps or analyses by microscopic critics can ever reach this indestructible essence. The Bible's life,—enemies can pick at the skin, they can never pierce the heart. The Bible's light,—men can peer at it through many colored glasses, they cannot put it out. The absolutely secure, the fundamentally immovable, reproducing itself in every age, adapting itself to every sphere, the moral and spiritual element of the Scriptures leads the student and leaves him in the presence of God, its only sufficient explanation and its eternal source.

THE ORDER OF THE EPISTLES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIANITY.

By Rev. HENRY G. WESTON, D. D.,

President of Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Penn.

We know, from the express statements of the Evangelist, that the larger number of the words and works of Christ were not recorded; the Holy Spirit preserving for the permanent use of the church all that were necessary to the full and harmonious presentation of our Lord's earthly ministry. From various, but unmistakable, indications, we gather that there were other Gospels than those which have come down to us; the four in our hands setting forth the aspects and stages of redemption. The Acts of the Apostles relates but a very small part of the doings of the Apostles; it gives in succinct form the actors and the steps by which the church attained its final position. That we have not all the Epistles written to the churches in the Apostolic age is rendered certain by repeated intimations in the Epistles themselves, by the character of the Apostles and their writings, by the relation of the Apostles to the churches, and above all, by the nature of Christianity, which is life imparted, sustained, and directed by the Holy Spirit, and consequently is necessarily a growth, and not a structure finished at the beginning.

The extant Epistles form an organic whole, and, taken together, give a complete and final statement of Christianity. Each Epistle sustains a vital relation to the whole; each has its own place in the development, a place determined by the spiritual position of the writer, by the spiritual condition of those to whom it was addressed, and by the period in which it was written.*

The Epistle of James is the first in the order of nature and of time. The Church is in its earliest age. Christians are

*The necessary limits of this paper forbid any elucidation of these principles in vindication of that order of the Epistles which commends itself to me. If any one wishes to examine for himself, he will find good material in the Epistles themselves, in the more recent Introductions, and in such books as Matheson's *Spiritual Development of St. Paul*.

devout and pious Jews, plus a belief in Jesus of Nazareth as the promised Messiah. They are the true Jews, heirs to all the blessings of the covenant; they observe punctiliously the laws of Moses, they circumcise their children, they attend upon the temple worship at the stated hours, they observe the feasts and fasts, and are scrupulous as to the distinction between clean and unclean foods; they offer sacrifices and make vows, and are distinguished from other Jews by being baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, by partaking of the communion, and assembling stately for the worship of Christ. The position of the Jewish Christians is given by the elders of the church at Jerusalem in their address to Paul: "Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are that believe; and they are all zealous of the Law." As yet, there is no antagonism between the gospel and the law. Christianity is Judaism "fulfilled and transfigured." The Gospel is the perfect law, the royal law, the law of liberty. Christ is the royal law-giver, the Lord of the Glory—the Shekinah. The world is at enmity with God, is doomed to destruction. Christ is the deliverer and judge. The sins reprehended in the Epistle naturally fall into three lines; Those arising from their Jewish proclivities, from a defective faith, and from violations of the law of love. The Jewish leaven shows itself in the vices pointed out in the Sermon on the Mount: their faith is wavering and inert; they violate the law of love in their disregard of the rights of the poor,* in their envying, their evil-speaking, their jealousies, their strifes and party spirit. The anathemas in the fifth chapter

* It is a ludicrous anachronism which makes the synagogue, James 1:2, a modern Christian meeting-house with a corps of ushers. "Respect of persons" in the New Testament refers to judicial decisions. When Peter asserts that "God is no respecter of persons," to suppose he intends to say that God treats all men alike—Jacob and Esau, Jew and Gentile—is to fly in the face of Scripture and Providence. "Stand there," "my footstool." "evil-thinking judges," show that the reference is to the civil jurisdiction of the synagogue. The charge against these judges is a much more serious one than that of giving rich men good seats at church.

The question of justification in James has no relation to that discussed by Paul. The works of which James speak are those which prove the existence of faith; they are not works of law, nor works of goodness, humanity, or love. Take away faith, and Abraham is a murderer or a madman, his intended act one deserving the execration of mankind. The same is true of Rahab.

are in precise accordance in matter and manner with those uttered by all the old Hebrew prophets. The summoning to judgment of the oppressors of poor Christians, in a letter addressed to Christians, no more shows that these oppressors were nominally Christians, than the call to Babylon to sit in the dust, by Isaiah, proves that the daughter of Chaldea was an Israelite.

The point of view of this Epistle is that of the Sermon on the Mount. It holds the same relation to the unfolding of Christianity, in coming Epistles, that the Sermon does to the future teaching of Christ. In form, the Sermon differs from the Epistle. The Sermon, presenting the ideal fulfillment of the law, is marked by unity, symmetry and completeness. It portrays all the characteristics of the righteousness of the kingdom with the character, conduct, and destiny of the righteous man. The Epistle, dealing not with the ideal, but with the first stage of the process in the actualization, presents a picture of the new man, begotten with the word of truth, a first fruit of the creation, yet struggling with evil, the good and bad strangely intermingled, and in constant conflict.

Of the methods by which the ideal is to become the actual, our Epistle says nothing. There is no mention of the atonement, of the Holy Spirit, nor of that inner essential principle which differentiates Christianity from Judaism and from all other religions. The time for the analysis of life has not come. In Christianity, as in morals, practice must precede theory. This is in accordance with the law announced by Christ: "So is the kingdom of God, as if a man casts seed on the earth, and the seed sprouts and comes up, he knows not how; first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear." How much and in what respects the blade differs from the ear, we very well know.

Next comes the Epistle to the Hebrews. The condition of the Jewish Christians, in which they attended with one accord in the temple, having favor with all the people, has passed away, never to return. The time predicted by the Saviour has come: "They shall put you out of their synagogues." Believers in Jesus are no longer permitted to join in the divinely appointed worship of God. The temple and

its ritual are on the point of passing away forever. The persecution which, after the death of Stephen, was so stayed that the church throughout Judea and Galilee and Samaria had peace and was multiplied, has broken out again, and threatens to grow more severe and merciless than before. The sky gathers blackness on every side; where on the horizon is a gleam of hope? Three questions inevitably present themselves to these sorely tried Christians: first, Israel is certainly the covenant people; to them pertains the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; is not our ejection by them proof that we are in the wrong? Second, we trusted in one who was to give us power to become sons of God; can we be his sons, and be left to such constant and undeserved suffering? could a father in the flesh look upon children in such affliction and not come to their relief? Third; we were promised great blessing if we believed in the Messiah; where are they? The Epistle answers these three difficulties. It shows the true nature of the Levitical ritual, the true nature of sonship, and the true nature of faith. The essentially inferior character of the first covenant—a covenant temporary and preparatory—is proved by the contrast between Jesus and the angels, between Jesus and Moses, and between Jesus and the high priest. The relation between God and the people in this Epistle is solely a relation of fellowship and worship. The covenant is the covenant at Sinai; circumcision is not mentioned; sin is that which interrupts fellowship; sanctification, purification, perfection, and similar terms, refer not to any moral idea, but to qualification for worship and service. Forensic conceptions of law and righteousness do not appear.

As to their non-reception of the promised blessings, the writer claims that faith, which is the characteristic of the present time, by its very nature excludes sight. The first verse of the eleventh chapter is not intended as an exhaustive definition of faith, but as a statement of one of its essential characteristics; it must pertain to things not now in possession, things that are unseen, hoped for. The long list of ancient worthies, in this chapter, contains those only who are

signal examples of non-possession. The incidents in their lives to which attention is called are selected on this principle. Every thing in Jacob's career, for example, on which men ordinarily would profitably dwell, is omitted, and we are bidden to hear him pronounce a blessing which has not even yet been realized, and to look upon him as, in the act of leaving the world, he rests on the symbol of pilgrimage. How much there is in Joseph's life and character which has attracted the admiration and imitation of all ages, yet these things are not mentioned; we see only his unburied bones preaching for four hundred years to the children of Israel that he belonged to a race whose home was in another land. You are confounded by the fact that sufferings are heaped on the worshipers of Christ; look at the first accepted worshiper and see what his worship cost him. Sonship is treated in the same way. The relation necessitates the existence of discipline. If you are sons you must be subjected to chastisement. The scourging which you think is a proof that God does not regard and treat you as his children, is the evidence that you are members of the divine family. The whole discussion is intermingled with exhortation, founded on the character of the dispensation, against apostacy. This is God's final method of salvation: if you reject it, there is no other in reserve.

Judaism having thus set itself against the religion of Christ, making it impossible for them to dwell together, the time has come for Christianity to assume its independent and permanent place, to declare its own distinct and separate existence. This it does, for the first time, in the Epistles of Peter. It expresses itself, as it must, in the terms and imagery of that religion which prepared for it, which gave it birth, and whose place it had taken. The Jewish people had been chosen by God for his own possession, a holy nation, a kingdom of priests. They refused to fulfill the office and perform the functions assigned them, and so God rejected them, and gave the kingdom to a nation which would bring forth the fruits thereof. The Christian church in the Epistle of Peter has become the chosen generation, the royal priesthood, the holy nation, the people for a possession; in past

time its members were not a people, but now they are the people of God. This action on God's part is not an after-thought, an expedient adopted because of unforeseen events; the church is elected according to the foreknowledge of God the Father through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. Various reasons are assigned for the order here adopted, sanctification, obedience, sprinkling; but a study of the method adopted at the beginning of Jewish national life will show that this is the precise order followed. The account will be found in the twenty-fourth chapter of Exodus. Israel was separated from all other nations in the wilderness of Sinai; here the words of the Lord were read to the people and their answer was: "All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient." Then Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people;—precisely the order of the Epistle; sanctification, sprinkling, obedience. This parallel of Israel at the beginning of its national life and Christianity at the beginning of its career as the people of God, is carried throughout the Epistle, with the continual recognition of the fact that Christianity is the spiritual fulfillment of the natural type presented by Israel. The Church's sanctification is a spiritual and not an outward one, it is sprinkled not with the blood of beasts, but with the blood of Jesus Christ; its hope is a living hope; its inheritance, not that of Canaan, temporary, polluted and perishing, but one incorruptible, undefiled and fading not away; the end of their faith is not deliverance from earthly enemies, but a salvation of souls; their redemption is not by corruptible things but with the precious blood of Christ; their love to each other does not spring from earthly ties which are to pass away, but from their common birth from the seed of God which lives and abides forever; the sacrifices which they offer are spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ, and they are built a spiritual house on a living corner stone. The common character of the Israelites in the desert and the Christian community at this time is recognized throughout the Epistle. Christians are in the wilderness, strangers, sojourners, pilgrims, and their lives are to be in accordance with this relation. The

beginning of the nation of Israel finds its parallel in this commencement of the Christian life; all the duties enjoined in this Epistle are those which belong to infancy and childhood—submission, obedience, patience under censure and injustice. Christians should be blameless in their deportment and be clad with the garment of humility. Servants are to submit to their masters, wives to their husbands, citizens to their rulers, the younger to the elder, yea, all to be subject to one another. The Epistle is the Epistle of childhood. It is noticeable that there is no specific address to children.

In the second Epistle of Peter this character comes to maturity. The great and precious blessings promised have been received. Christians have become partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world. They are giving all diligence in adding virtue to virtue, that they may have an abundant entrance into the heavenly kingdom. Surrounded by those who mock at the Christian hope, they wait for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. In the meanwhile, they are growing in the grace and knowledge of Christ. To him be glory for ever and ever.

Thus far Christianity has been presented in its appointed relation to the Jewish law (James) to the Jewish worship (Hebrews), and to the Jewish theocracy (Peter). Christianity is the crown and fulfillment of them all. Henceforth it is to stand in its own completeness, distinct and separate from all other systems. God has promised, "Behold, I make all things new." In Christ there is a new life, a new covenant, a new worship, a new service, a new affection, a new relationship, a new ideal. The coming Epistles will analyze that life, will show its manifestations, its methods, its opponents, and its results.

SUGGESTIONS FOR THE PREPARATION OF AN
EXPOSITORY SERMON ON THE EIGHTH
CHAPTER OF ROMANS.

By Prof. JOHN M. ENGLISH,

Newton Theological Institution, Newton Centre, Mass.

There are sure indications of a revival of expository preaching. This is one of the best homiletic signs of the times. All too long has the topical sermon held sway in English and American pulpits. This species of discourse, while favorable to logical unity of plan and orderly progress of development, is in danger of being more philosophical than Scriptural in material and tone. Congregations are now asking their pastors, more and more, for the simple, practical unfolding of the contents of the Word of God, apart from severe logical reasoning and deep philosophical explanation. They believe that Scripture truth is intrinsically persuasive, carrying its urgent message to the deepest intuitions of the human heart.

The modern method of Bible study has much to do with this change in the trend of Christian preaching. Especially potent is the study of the books of the Bible in the unity of their contents as secured by the aim of the writer. This makes against the study of the Scriptures in the old piecemeal fashion—in isolated verses and paragraphs, and naturally leads to the consideration, in the Sunday school and in the pulpit, of an extended and connected portion of the Word of God. Some ministers now grapple with an entire book of the Bible, certainly with a whole chapter, as the basis of a single sermon.

The eighth chapter of Paul's letter to the Romans admirably yields itself to the purpose of the expository preacher. It is the object of this article to offer some general suggestions concerning the ground to be covered by the preacher in his mediate and immediate preparation of a sermon based upon it.

First of all, he needs to bring to the chapter a homiletic temper. He must insist upon it with himself that he is to make a sermon and not merely to expound. And this for at least two reasons. One is, that Paul was in a homiletic mood when he dictated the letter, which is essentially a discourse with a distinctively practical and persuasive aim. The preacher who overlooks this will be sure to miss the fervor and rush of the apostle's thoughts, and so, for preaching purposes, will miss nearly everything. The other reason is, that there is a wide difference between real preaching and mere expounding—all the difference, indeed, between preaching and no preaching at all. Expository sermons, falsely so-called, have been often deemed, and rightly, the driest sort of theological dust, largely because preaches have forced upon their audiences disconnected, detailed, and often scholastic, explanation of successive words, clauses and verses, with no attempt at wisely selecting materials and organizing them into a pointed, practical spiritual end.

Before a preacher can prepare an expository sermon on the chapter in hand, he must clearly answer this question: Just what was Paul's object in writing this letter? This arises from the closely reasoned character of it. The eighth chapter belongs, by a severe logical necessity, exactly where it is found. It forms a splendid climax of a particular section of the epistle, and this the preacher cannot appreciate until he has tested it in the light of Paul's controlling aim.

The next homiletic inquiry: With what special topic of the letter is this chapter vitally allied? In his attempt to settle this matter the preacher will find himself led back to the opening of the sixth chapter. In the first five chapters the varied aspects of justification by faith are dealt with. From the sixth chapter through the eighth the line of thought is concerned with the influence of justification by faith upon character. Or, in other words, Sanctification is the special subject. Here the preacher's homiletic eyes will open wide and his homiletic heart will thrill with delight as he discovers the prominent place that character holds in this most logical, formal, abstruse letter of Paul's writing. He will find that justification by faith is no mechanical, barren way of salva-

tion, but that it brings forth fruit unto righteousness, joy, peace, triumph.

What now,—and this is the next homiletic step,—are the chief contents of this eighth chapter? A thoughtful and sympathetic study of the chapter will fairly ravish the preacher, as he discovers the wealth and preciousness of this portion of the Scriptures. He will see that it contains the very flower of the Gospel, and from his inmost heart he will thank God that he is a preacher of Christian righteousness. He will say, as Godet tells that Spener is reported to have said, “that if Holy Scripture was a ring, and the Epistle to the Romans its precious stone, chapter eighth would be the sparkling point of the jewel.” I venture the statement that in common with the Sermon on the Mount, the parables of the Good Samaritan and the Prodigal Son, the fourteenth chapter of John, the thirteenth and fifteenth of First Corinthians, and the third chapter of Phillipians, the eighth chapter of Romans is the most read and the best loved of any portion of the New Testament.

A vital part of the mastery of the contents of the chapter is the study of its capital words and phrases. Among these are: condemnation, spirit, life, flesh, death, law, sins, heirs, suffer, glorified, expectation, creation, subjected, purpose, bondage of corruption, liberty of the glory of the children of God, groaneth and travaileth, with patience wait for it, conformed to the image of his son, the first-born among many brethren, and nearly every word from verse 31 to veres 39. In no other chapter of the Bible is found a larger, richer cluster of what may be termed the technical words of Christianity. These demand critical study of him who would preach intelligently and powerfully on this great chapter.

The final stage of the homiletic process is, the organization of the chief thoughts of the chapter. And just here it should be emphatically said that success in making an expository sermon on this chapter depends indispensably upon the preacher's rigid determination to reject material of prime homiletic value. If this is not done, his effort is doomed to inevitable and discouraging failure. Expository sermons on even brief passages of Scripture are seriously exposed to the

peril of being overloaded with subject-matter. Here more than almost, or quite, anywhere else is to be found the secret of the failure of so much expository preaching. It is at once both heavy and dry. When the sermon is an outgrowth of an entire chapter, and especially one so affluent in admirable preaching stores as the eighth of Romans, the problem of exclusion becomes immensely more difficult and imperative.

In offering suggestions as to the outline of an expository sermon on this chapter, only the most general ones can, or ought, to be brought forward. For every preacher must be left to his own homiletic individuality, if the sermon shall be his, and so be fresh, striking, powerful. Homiletic teaching becomes mechanical, fruitless, deadening when instead of presenting suggestive, living principles it prescribes a method that must be inflexibly used, a single mould into which every sermon must be run. It will be noticed, however, by every thoughtful student of this chapter that there are certain outstanding truths which must find permanent recognition in a sermon based upon it. It shall be my aim to state what, in my judgment, those truths are.

The preacher could start out with the first verse as the main thought of the sermon, and unfold that thought by offering the reasons the chapter presents why every kind of condemnation is removed from "them who are in Christ Jesus." Those reasons, it will be found, centre in and cluster about the Holy Spirit and his work in the Christian believer. Or, this truth could be elevated to foremost place in the discourse, and be phrased somewhat thus: *The Fruits of the Holy Spirit in the Christian Believer*. By this order the Christian hearers would be left to infer for themselves that they are free from condemnation, or the preacher could infer this for them in the progress of the sermon, or he could come around to it prominently in the conclusion.

Taking, then, "*The Fruits of the Holy Spirit in the Christian Believer*," as the subject, by the aid of what truths shall it be unfolded and enforced? The following will hold conspicuous place:

I. The Holy Spirit frees the Christian believer from the power of sin and of death (vs. 1-11).

First, from the power of sin, because of the holiness of the Christian believer.

Secondly, from the power of death. (1) Spiritual, because of the spiritual life of the believer produced by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. (2) Physical, because of the quickening energy of the indwelling Holy Spirit.

II. The Holy Spirit secures to the Christian believer the privilege of an adopted Son of God, and of a joint heir with Christ of glory (vs. 12-17).

Between this topic and the next there is call for a skilful transition growing out of the inevitable condition of the believer's *suffering* with Christ in order to *glorification* with him.

III. Incentives to the patient endurance of the sufferings which precede the glory that the Holy Spirit guarantees to the Christian believer (vs. 18-30).

First, the greatness of the glory.

Secondly, the intercession of the Holy Spirit.

Thirdly, the purpose of God to glorify the Christian believer.

IV. The triumphant assurance of the Christian believer's final salvation (vs. 31-39).

First, in view of God's agency in guarding his own.

Secondly, in view of Christ's agency in permitting no one or no thing to separate his own from his love.

This last topic, together with its twofold development, can most effectively be used in the form of a *conclusion* of the sermon.

Instead of having but one sermon on the entire chapter, as has now been suggested, there could well be four sermons. In that case the materials offered by the chapter could be more minutely used. I should prefer, however, a single discourse, partly for the sake of the preacher's gaining discipline in dealing with a long passage of Scripture, and partly to let a congregation *grasp*, without a break, the wealth of the truth of this splendid chapter, and *feel*, all at once, the impact of it upon their characters and lives—"the chapter," as one has well exclaimed, "beginning with *no condemnation* and ending with *no separation!*"

From this brief outline study it will be seen how comprehensive and how difficult a work it is to make an effective expository sermon on a single chapter of a book of the Bible. It will be seen also, I trust, how inviting a work it is, leading the preacher over priceless tracts of richest ore in the mine of God's revealed truth. If our present ministry will gain their cordial consent to explore this mine for themselves, and will bring forth to their audiences the treasures of truth they find there, great will be their reward in enriching their own minds and hearts with the truth as it is in Jesus, and in building up their churches in the strength and symmetry of commanding Christian character.

DID JESUS INTEND TO TEACH THAT MOSES
WROTE THE PENTATEUCH?

By Rev. W. P. MCKEE,
Olivet Baptist Church, Minneapolis.

So far as the New Testament records go, just what did Jesus say on this matter?

"And Jesus saith unto him [the man cleansed of leprosy], See thou tell no man; but go thy way, show thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them." Matt. 8:4.

At most, Jesus here only allows that Moses had to do with making certain regulations concerning leprosy. Nothing is taught as to the authorship of the Pentateuch.

"Why then did Moses command to give her a bill of divorcement, and to put her away? He [Jesus] said unto them, Moses, for your hardness of heart, suffered you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it hath not been so." Matt. 19:7, 8.

Here Jesus tacitly disapproves of an act of Moses, but he utters no positive teaching as to the authorship of the Pentateuch.

"For Moses said, honor thy father and mother." Mark 7:10.

At most Jesus admits that through Moses came this commandment. Nothing is said about the authorship of the mass of literature of which this was a part.

"But as touching the dead, that they are raised: have ye not read in the book of Moses, in the place concerning the Bush," etc. Mark 12:26.

Manifestly, the Jews believed Moses wrote the Pentateuch as a whole, with the exception of the "last eight verses, which were added by Joshua" (Toy). Jesus is confronted with the crucial matter of the Resurrection. An answer to that question is urgently, clamorously demanded. Does he turn aside from that vital matter, to discuss the point of the authorship of the record in which this incident is found? In presence of a question of first importance, he ignores the question of secondary moment. At most, here, Jesus allows the current view of the authorship of the Pentateuch to pass unnoticed. He utters no teaching upon that point.

"They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them." Luke 16:29.

Here Jesus, in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, is striving to rebuke the Pharisees for their inordinate, soul-destroying love for money. (Lk. 16: 14). The question of authorship is not before the Saviour.

"And he said unto them, These are my words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, how that all things must needs be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning me." Lk. 24: 44.

As above, Jesus' purpose in this utterance is foreign to any question of authorship.

"And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up." John 3: 14.

It may be claimed that here Jesus, by using this incident as an illustration, asserts its historicity. No more can be claimed, and even this might be disputed.

"For if ye believed Moses, ye would believe me, for he wrote of me." John 5: 46.

This would agree with the theory that Moses wrote the whole of the Pentateuch. But this statement, as it stands, need not imply that. Moses could have written of Christ without writing five books of considerable proportions. So far as this Scripture is concerned, a single passage in which Moses made reference to the Christ would be enough to fill up the necessary implication in the Master's words. The most that can positively be asserted of this passage then is, that in one place Moses wrote of Christ. And even then it is to be kept in mind that Jesus was arguing from the point of view of the Jews, and on the basis of their own beliefs. He was not at all discussing a question of authorship. He was rebuking the Jews because they did not believe in their sacred writings. Practically, he asserts here that they do not believe the Old Testament, and that unbelief in it is the reason for their unbelief in Him. Mere matters of authorship are far from his purpose.

"Did not Moses give you the law, and yet none of you doeth the law?" John 7: 19.

Plainly, at most here, the Saviour only assumes that Moses was an historical person who had to do with giving the law to Israel. The question of the original authorship of a great book is not under consideration. Similar remarks may be made on verses 22, 23, following.

We may omit Jno. 8:5 as being in a doubtful passage. Moreover it offers no facts beyond those considered already. Beyond these, I find no record of any important sayings of Jesus, touching this matter. Certainly, if Jesus says anywhere that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, he says so here. What then can be our answer to the question: Did Jesus intend to teach that Moses wrote the Pentateuch? Only this: We have no record that Jesus intended to teach, or did teach, anything whatever concerning the authorship of the Pentateuch.

The weighty words of Professor S. R. Driver, (*Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, p. xviii), upon the general question of the attitude of our Lord to the Old Testament, may be quoted here:

“That our Lord appealed to the Old Testament as the record of a revelation in the past, and as pointing forward to Himself, is undoubted; but these aspects of the Old Testament are perfectly consistent with a critical view of its structure and growth. That our Lord, in so appealing to it, designed to pronounce a verdict on the authorship and age of its different parts, and to foreclose all future inquiry into these subjects, is an assumption for which no sufficient ground can be alleged. * * * In no single instance (so far as we are aware) did He anticipate the results of scientific inquiry, or historical research. The aim of His teaching was a religious one. * * * He accepted, as the basis of His teaching, the opinions concerning the Old Testament current around Him; He assumed, in His allusions to it, the premises which his opponents recognized, and which could not have been questioned, * * * without raising issues for which the time was not yet ripe, and which, had they been raised, would have interfered seriously with the paramount purpose of his life. There is no record of the question, whether a particular portion of the Old Testament was written by Moses or David or Isaiah, having ever been submitted to Him; and had it been so submitted, we have no means of knowing what His answer would have been.”

THE IMPRECATORY PSALMS.

By Prof. W. W. DAVIES, Ph. D.

Ohio Wesleyan University,
Delaware, Ohio.

The imprecations of the Bible, mostly found in the Psalms, have been a source of much controversy, and have presented much perplexity of mind to many an earnest Christian. It may be added that the more refined the reader of these passages is, the greater will be the difficulty occasioned by the attempt at any satisfactory explanation. Not only skeptics and unbelievers, who have triumphantly pointed the finger of scorn at the sentiments pervading these Psalms, but also many of the more devout, have seriously doubted the inspiration of passages containing so much hatred, asperity and vengeance. While many others, not accustomed to thinking, have positively accepted them as inspired truth, simply because found in the Bible, failing, however, to find them profitable for instruction or devotion. And while rebelling against the bitterness of spirit therein exhibited, they yet regard them as the word of God, though having no message for them. Such blind acquiescence is not justifiable until every attempt for light has proved of no avail. An intelligent Christian should not be satisfied with total darkness, when even one single ray of light may be found.

Some of the older exegetes swept out all difficulties with one wave of the hand, by declaring that these were not imprecations, but predictions, simple declarations of what was certain to overtake the incorrigibly wicked. Such explanation can satisfy only the careless reader; for even the English versions show that many verses in these Psalms have the imperative and not the future. This fact will appear more clearly to him who can read the original, for the form of the verb in Hebrew in many of these passages is imperative rather than imperfect (future). And when not imperative, very often the apocopated imperfect. See *Psa.* 5: 10, 11; 55: 9, 10; 69: 24, 25, 28, 29; 109: 6; etc. It is, however, true that the imperfect is used in several of the passages in ques-

tion, and they cannot be made optatives without violence to the text. These must be regarded as a description of the feelings pervading the breasts of those who, in the future, would be eye witnesses of the calamities visited upon the enemies of Zion, rather than as wishes or prayers that such calamities should overtake their enemies. This is true of the harshest and most unfeeling of all these passages, in which the writer describes the spirit of the warriors engaged in the overthrow of a hostile city where, according to the barbarous excesses of a barbarous age, men, women, and even innocent babes were indiscriminately and ruthlessly slaughtered. I refer to *Psa.* 137: 8, 9.

“ O daughter of Babylon, that art to be destroyed,
Happy shall he be that rewardeth thee
As thou hast served us.
Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy little ones
Against a rock.”

Isaiah (13: 16) draws the same picture, as with prophetic eyes he gazes upon the final overthrow of Babylon:

“ Their infants also shall be dashed in pieces before their eyes ; their houses shall be spoiled ; and their wives ravished.”

So general were these cruelties and excesses, that Homer (*Il.* 22 : 62ff.) also uses almost the same language :

“ My heroes slain, my bridal bed overturned ;
My bleeding infants dashed against the floor ;
My daughters ravished and my city burned.”

These passages seem exceedingly harsh to us, much harsher than to those who first penned them. This ought to remind us of the necessity of explaining even the Scriptures in the light of the time when written, and not from the standpoint of a later and more enlightened age. Care must be taken not to wrest any passage from its proper historical connection. Prof. Edwards, speaking of these vindictive Psalms, says: “ If we were acquainted with the circumstances which called forth the imprecatory Psalms, we should doubtless find as the cause or occasion, striking cases of treachery, practised villany, and unblushing violations of law.” Had we all the data, so as to enable us to interpret these passages in their proper light, many of these dreadful imprecations would lose much of their terrific harshness. Let us also remember that they are written in the language

of poetry; and that the fiery Eastern mind indulged in exaggerated expressions which, divested of their rhetorical extravagance and Oriental coloring, contain no more malice and real venom than may be often found in the more elegant and refined speech of Englishmen.

Another fact which must be duly considered is, that most of these passages are from the pen of David. David was a king, not a private citizen, consequently these imprecations must not be regarded as the mere outpouring of a violent stream of personal indignation, private malice or irritation, but rather the feelings of a king towards the enemies of the state, the Jewish commonwealth. Israel was a theocracy, and David was divinely elected to rule over this people, to promote the national welfare, and ward off hostile invasions. Thus the enemies of David were not only the enemies of Israel, but also of God himself; for, inasmuch as the Jewish state was a theocratic institution to carry out Jehovah's plans on earth, all rebellion against David, whom Jehovah had set upon his holy hill of Zion, was rebellion against God. If this be true, these dreadful imprecations, these prayers for judgment upon, and protection against, enemies, are in entire harmony with *Psa. 2*, where the Psalmist, referring to the heathen, says:—

“Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron.

Thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.”

It is also probable that most of these curses were uttered in times of war, and, as Dr. Noyes points out, are “equivalent to prayers for personal safety,” or, still better, for national success and prosperity. If, as we may reasonably conclude, those upon whom these anathemas were pronounced, these curses invoked, were guilty of treachery and cruelties towards the chosen people of God, such treachery and cruelties as, in any age of the world, would call for speedy retribution, then this severity of language will not appear very strange. The desire to punish great crimes is intuitive. Too great a sympathy for criminals is not necessarily a virtue, but often nothing less than a sickly sentimentality, arising from weak and shallow natures, incapable of appreciating the heinousness of sin and the majesty of the law. Good men always rejoice when a desperate criminal, who for a

time has escaped arrest, is captured and brought to justice. What a feeling of satisfaction and security came over the American people when the Chicago anarchists were summarily dealt with. And yet but very few had any private malice, personal feeling, or spirit of revenge to gratify; and, certainly, none but those unfriendly to American institutions would attribute any cruelty or vindictiveness to the Judge, Jury, and officers connected with that memorable trial. So doubtless these imprecations of the Bible were uttered, not in the heat of personal indignation, but rather when the state and the church were in imminent danger.

Again, if it was right for Israel to execute God's commands and to exterminate whole families and tribes, there could be nothing wrong in invoking divine aid in the execution of such commands, in praying that their enemies should be scattered as chaff before the wind; and that their counsels might be turned into foolishness. Not only was it right, but it would have been wrong to have done otherwise, especially if the people upon whom these imprecations were invoked were leading Israel into sin, and interfering with the religious growth of the nation. In short, if it be right to punish crime, there can be no wrong in praying for the punishment of the perpetrators of crime, or even in invoking Jehovah's aid to mete out speedy retribution.

The Psalmist must have regarded men like Doeg, lost to honor and shame, as incorrigible, deserving no mercy, but worthy of the direst punishment, now, in this life. Explain it as we may, the Old Testament does not throw very much light on the life beyond; the doctrine of retribution in a future state was not unmistakably and clearly revealed to the church in David's time. Hence the naturalness of these imprecations, for if the sinner is to be punished at all it must be in this world. These passages, if viewed in this light, will not appear so vindictive. For, after all, sin is sin, and must be punished. Even the New Testament knows no other method of dealing with the impenitent sinner, with those who continue in rebellion against their Creator. The Old Testament punishes in this life; the New Testament transfers the final decision and execution of the sentence into another world, to a life beyond, where there is "no more sacrifice fo_r

sins but a certain fearful expectation of judgment and a fierceness of fire which shall devour the adversaries."

These imprecations, however, cannot be satisfactorily interpreted without grasping the idea that revelation has been gradual and progressive. This explains why the standard of morality has gradually but constantly advanced. The spirit of Elijah, who called fire from heaven to destroy his enemies, is not the spirit of Christ. There was an old dispensation with all its distinguishing features. It is impossible to understand the two Testaments without emphasizing the fact that God spoke "by divers portions and in divers manners," before speaking finally through the Son. We have, therefore no right to hold up the acts, words or feelings of David to the light of the nineteenth century, or to interpret them from the lofty standpoint of the New Testament. It may be objected that what is essentially immoral in one age or country must have been so at all times and in all ages. Theoretically this is true, but not practically; for both history and experience bear witness to the contrary. How true the words of St. Paul, "the times of ignorance therefore God overlooked." The fundamental principle of morals may be the same at all times, but the standard of morality has often changed; so that there is some truth in the strange assertion that morality, even in the same age, is often a question of geography. Slavery must have been always wrong, yet Moses legislated concerning it, and thus indirectly sanctioned its existence. And with shame we must add, so did also American legislators, a great many centuries after the time of Moses. The position of men and nations on the liquor traffic in the nineteenth century will appear almost incredible to the future generations.

The Sermon on the Mount occupies a higher plane than Mosaism. Up to the advent of our blessed Saviour, the law was a school-master to lead us to Christ, who spoke: "Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy: but I say unto you, Love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you." Thus, if we find in the Old Testament dreadful expressions of anger, and asperity of language, and fearful denunciation of enemies, we are not to be surprised. It is simply because those who

wrote them partook more of the spirit of Moses and Elijah than of him who had a tenderer heart and a clearer vision into the future life, and who, after a life of untold ignominy and suffering, prayed: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

Let us bear in mind also that because a prayer containing sentiments contrary to the spirit of Christ is recorded in the Bible, we are not for that reason to see the stamp of God's approval upon it any more than upon the words of Satan to Job or to our Lord in the wilderness. The mere fact that a prayer contrary to the spirit of the Gospel is found in the Psalms is no proof that it was pleasing to Jehovah, any more than were the wicked acts of David, Solomon, Peter or Judas, which are recorded in the Scriptures. A Psalm containing imprecations may be inspired just as much as a chapter recording the wicked deeds therein described. For, as one has wisely said: "Inspiration in its true nature secures a truthful record, it does not necessarily secure absolute sanctification" of those whose acts and feelings are recorded. Persons may be "imperfect in their conduct; imperfect in their words; imperfect in their feelings." And yet are there not many who never call in question the inspiration of those passages describing David's most heinous sins, who are utterly shocked at, and are tempted to doubt the inspiration of, what are called the imprecatory Psalms?

There is one more truth which we ought to consider: the teachings of the New Testament are the highest and purest which we can ever expect in this world. Men may, and doubtless will, understand them better in the future. They will continue to grow in beauty and moral grandeur from age to age, to the end of time. In ages to come these imprecations will appear harsher than they do to us to-day. Before the Reformation the Christian Church found little that was objectionable in them; and the Church under the Old Dispensation found in them nothing at all that was not in harmony with morality and religion. This is only a proof that the Church of God is going on, conquering and to conquer, till we attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the fulness of Christ.

THE EXPEDITION OF THE BABYLONIAN EXPLORATION FUND.

A. NEW YORK TO ALEPPO.

By ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER, Ph. D.,

Associate Professor of Semitic Languages in The University of Chicago.

In the winter of 1887 and the spring of 1888, an American Expedition was organized, under the direction of the Rev. Professor John P. Peters, for the purpose of exploring and excavating in Babylonia. The title to be found at the head of this article was officially adopted, and the Expedition placed itself under a Board of Directors and the University of Pennsylvania. The staff consisted of the following gentlemen: *Director*, John P. Peters; *Assyriologists*, Robert Francis Harper (delegate from Yale University) and Hermann V. Hilprecht (professor of Assyrian in the University of Pennsylvania); *Architect, surveyor, map-maker, etc.*, Perez Hastings Field (of Paris and New York); *Photographer and business-manager*, J. H. Haynes (of the Central Turkey College at Aintab); *Interpreter*, Daniel Noorian. Mr. John D. Prince was attached to the Expedition as the representative of Columbia College.

Peters, Prince and myself sailed on the S. S. Fulda (June 23d, 1888) for London, where I remained until Sept. 11th. While in London two large and important collections of tablets and antiquities were purchased for the University of Pennsylvania, viz., the so-called Joseph Shemtob (J. S.) and the Khabaza (Kh.). The most important tablets in these collections have been described in *HEBRAICA*, Vol. VI., No. 3, and Vol. VII., No. 1, to which reference may be made. These collections, together with another purchased later, and the finds secured at Niffer, are now open to inspection at the University of Pennsylvania. Through the kindness of Mr. Stuart Wood, a large number of casts of the most important Assyrian and Babylonian objects in the British Museum was also obtained at this time.

Professor Peters, Director of the Expedition, will, without doubt, publish a complete and detailed account of all the doings of the party. Hence, from this point, I will speak only of my own experiences as a member of the Expedition, and I will leave to Prof. Peters the task of recounting the travels and work of the Expedition as a whole. The name of Mr. Perez Hastings Field, the architect, will be the only one mentioned.

On Sept. 11th, 1888, I joined Mr. Field in Paris and we proceeded immediately to Marseilles, from which point, ten days later, we sailed on the S. S. Sindh for Alexandretta, or Iscanderûn as it is known among the Turks. Our first stop on Turkish soil was at Salonica (the ancient Thessalonica), about ten hours' run from Athens. This city has about 100,000 inhabitants, 70,000 of which are Jews. Taking a guide, we visited several of the most important mosques. In the afternoon, we went to the celebrated monastery of the dancing dervishes, about one mile distant from the city wall. The chief dervish gave us a very cordial reception, offering us the usual coffee and cigarettes. After a few minutes spent in complimentary remarks—those coming from us being made through the interpreter—the chief invited us to a special afternoon performance in the adjoining hall. The dervishes were ordered to exhibit their wild and fantastic dances, and we were highly amused and much interested for half an hour. We visited later the shrines in this hall, and on leaving made a great mistake in offering *bakshish* to some of the dervishes who, in a most dignified manner, quietly refused it. In the evening, we attended a concert given by a Hungarian band and later went aboard and retired, to awaken on the next morning in the harbor of Smyrna. This harbor has a very narrow entrance and presents the appearance of a large lake surrounded on all sides by mountains.

Smyrna is essentially a Greek city. Different authorities vary in their estimates of the number of inhabitants, some giving 200,000 and others as high as 400,000. The chief street lies on the quay and runs parallel with the Mediterranean for two or three miles. Here are found the largest hotels, the theatres, cafés, concert-gardens, and the finest of

the private residences. During our stay of two days, we saw the chief sights of the city, which is a queer combination of the European and Asiatic. The inhabitants are very cosmopolitan, and the well-to-do speak Greek, Turkish, Arabic, French, English and German. The garden cafés are always well filled with people, who are drinking coffee or mastich and smoking either cigarettes or nargilehs. From 6 to 8 in the evening, the *élite* attend the open air concerts on the quay. The life reminds one more of Brussels or Marseilles than of any other European cities. Five to ten minutes' walk brings you into the Mohammedan Quarter, and here a different phase of life presents itself. Dogs, dirt, donkeys, veiled women, etc., meet you on all sides. The bazaars did not impress me very favorably, although they were the first of any size and importance that I had as yet seen. They have lost their former grandeur and will undoubtedly soon go to the wall completely, on account of the ever increasing influence of Greek and European ideas.

At five p. m., on the 29th, we steamed away with no expectation of revisiting Smyrna for some time to come. At one a. m., eight hours out, a tremendous crash was heard. I spoke to Field, who was half dressed before I could fairly waken up, and asked him to go on deck to learn what had befallen us. He soon returned and informed me that we had run on the rocks. Of course, I lost no time in getting up after this piece of news. On deck everything was in a state of confusion. There were only eight or ten European (Frank) passengers, the rest being Turks and Arabs. The latter surrounded us and asked for news, the women crying and the men praying to Allah. As we had little Turkish, our answers were chiefly given by the aid of signs. We knew as little about matters as these ignorant Turks, since it was impossible to get information from any of the officers. The most amusing man on board was a young Jesuit priest, who had lived seven years in England without learning very much of the language. He was very much excited—as much as the Turks—and came to us and said: “It is awful; can we not get upon the earth?” Later on it was learned that we were on the rocks, only a short distance from land, off the

Isle of Samos. The sea was smooth, otherwise there would have been no hope for us, for on the following day we found it almost impossible to land—even in the light—because of the steepness of the rocky shore. The pumps—both steam and hand—were kept working all the time, the Turks being impressed, or rather scared into service. On Sunday morning an Austrian Lloyd steamer passed us, but refused to answer our signal for help. Later on a small English tug came up, and she was sent back to Vathy for aid. On Monday, at about one p. m., the tug returned, accompanied by a Turkish gun-boat, which the prince of the island had kindly sent to bring off the passengers to his capital, Vathy. We boarded the man-of-war, and after a tedious ride of four or five hours we came to Vathy, where we were well received. Monday night, Tuesday, Wednesday and a good part of Thursday were spent in Vathy. We telegraphed to Smyrna for a boat, but to no purpose. It was expected hourly, and the time was spent in the cafés on the quay, looking out over the harbor for the ship which was to take us off Samos. Late on Thursday afternoon, the little English tug appeared and we were ordered on board. After a most tedious ride of 20 hours, we found ourselves back in the Smyrna harbor. Here a great question confronted us, viz., what were we to do with our baggage? Would it be possible to get it through the custom-house without a special permit?—which we did not have. It was a serious question. To lose our Winchesters was to lose everything. We soon learned that a small English boat was to sail that afternoon. There were four of our party on board. Two of them decided to transfer their luggage and all the weapons direct to the English boat and thus avoid the customs. This was done and they set sail on the same day. Mr. Field and myself did not like the appearance of the English ship—it was a freight steamer, with very poor accommodations for only a very limited number of passengers—and hence we decided to stop over for the next Russian steamer, which was to sail five days later. A Mejidieh (= 80 cts.) put our baggage through the custom-house and we were very happy to be back in Smyrna once more. During our stay in Smyrna, we ran down to Ephesus—a few minutes

distant from Ayasaluk, in order to view the ruins and to see the excavations made by the English. Through the kindness of Mr. Semitopoulos of Vathy we were admitted to the Smyrna club and were shown several private collections of antiquities. On the following Tuesday we boarded a Russian steamer, and the trip (4 days) to Alexandretta was uneventful. The other members had arrived on Friday night in time to disembark. We came to anchor at 7 p. m., but it was too late to get the so-called *pratique*, and hence we were obliged to remain on board during the night. In the morning, by the aid of a *bakshish* our baggage was landed and passed and we began to make arrangements for our trip inland. In the afternoon we rode up to Beilan, where we spent Sunday. The ride from Beilan to Aintab, which was to be our headquarters for some time, is 30 hours—an hour being about 3 miles. Only one incident happened during this ride of three days. On the second day out, as we were nearing the city of Killiz, Field and myself very foolishly rode in advance of the caravan. Field was five minutes ahead of me, when I saw a Kurd, on a road parallel, riding towards him. The Kurd had not seen me. I spurred my horse and tried to reach Field before the Kurd, but could not. The latter galloped up and stopped suddenly. Field wheeled immediately and, in doing so, brought his gun into a shooting position. A minute later my gun was also levelled at the Kurd, and we made signs—not knowing any Turkish at that time—for him to take his departure, which he seemed very glad to do. He carried a large native revolver and was undoubtedly a robber.

On our arrival in Aintab, we were the guests of Mr. Fuller and Mr. Riggs of The Central Turkey College. From Aintab as headquarters we made several excursions, viz: (1) to 'Zinjirli, a Hittite mound, about 16 hours distant, which had been excavated by the Germans; (2) to Marash where the missionaries have established a theological school and a sem-

¹For full account, cf. "A Trip to Zinjirli" OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT, Vol. VIII., No. 5, 1889.

inary for young ladies; and (3) to 'Carchemish (Jerabis) on our way to Aleppo.

In the next paper, I will describe the trip from Aleppo to Baghdad, passing hurriedly over the first part, which has been taken up in three short articles on "Down the Euphrates Valley," published in Vol. X., Nos. 1 and 2, of the OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT STUDENT.

¹For full account, cf. "A Visit to Carchemish," OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT, Vol. IX., No. 5, 1889.

Founding of the Christian Church, 30-100 A. D.

IN FIFTY STUDIES.

PREPARED BY CLYDE W. VOTAW, CHICAGO, ILLS.

[Copyrighted by the STUDENT PUBLISHING CO.]

STUDY VI.

SEC. 5. RENEWED HOSTILITY OF THE JEWS TOWARD THE CHRISTIANS.

Acts 3:1-4:31.

30-31 A. D.

JERUSALEM.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—(1) Cambridge Bible on Acts, pp. 31-50. (2) Gloag's Comty. on Acts, I: 120-161. (3) Meyer's Comty. on Acts, pp. 75-98. (4) Expositor's Bible on Acts, I: 148-192. (5) Bible Dictionary, arts. High Priest, Sadducees, Sanhedrin, Temple. (6) Neander's Planting and Training of the Christian Church, I: 41-46. (7) *Vaughan's Church of the First Days*, pp. 61-101. (8) *Peloubet's Notes*, 1892, in loc. (9) *S. S. Times*, Jan. 13, 20, 27, Feb. 3, 1883.

FIRST STEP: FACTS.

I. Whether the verse synopses are or are not printed here, the student is expected always to work them out carefully for himself. Make them as concise as possible, avoiding minor details of the narrative. The paragraph divisions of the material of the Section, with their respective headings, are as follows:

- PAR. 1. *Vv.* 1-11, THE CRIPPLE HEALED AT THE TEMPLE GATE.
 PAR. 2. *Vv.* 12-26, PETER'S CONSEQUENT DISCOURSE IN THE TEMPLE.
 PAR. 3. *Vv.* 4:1-4, ARREST OF PETER AND JOHN.
 PAR. 4. *Vv.* 5-12, TRIAL BEFORE THE SANHEDRIN.
 PAR. 5. *Vv.* 13-22, UNWILLING RELEASE OF THE PRISONERS.
 PAR. 6. *Vv.* 23-31, THANKSGIVING AND PRAYER OF THE DISCIPLES.

2. Let the student paraphrase: (1) Peter's Discourse (3:12-26), (2) The Prayer of the Church (4:24-30), endeavoring in each case to reproduce exactly the thought and the spirit, in original, concise, forceful language. Neander's paraphrase (see reference above) may prove suggestive. *These two paraphrases, properly worked out, will constitute their portion of the transcription of the entire Section, to be copied into its respective note-book.*

SECOND STEP: EXPLANATIONS.

PAR. 1. *v.* 1, (a) what connection with Acts 2:43? (b) whither were Peter and John going, and why? (c) *what were the Jewish hours of prayer, cf. Psalms 55:17; Daniel 6:10; Acts 2:15; 10:9?* *v.* 2, (a) how long a cripple, cf. Acts 4:22? (b) "they laid daily"—what custom referred to, cf. Mark 10:46;

(Study VI.)

Lk. 16:20? (c) "they"—who? (d) *what was the "door . . . Beautiful?"* v. 3, (a) were the apostles recognized by the cripple? (b) *sacred duty of alms-giving*, cf. Deut. 14:28f; 15:7, 11; 26:12f. v. 4, "fastening his eyes upon him"—meaning, cf. Acts 3:12; 14:9? v. 5, *what did the man expect to receive?* v. 6, (a) compare AV and RV. (b) Peter as spokesman. (c) *had the apostles actually no money?* (d) "in the name of Jesus"—meaning? vv. 7f, (a) graphic description of the cure. (b) *is it that of the physician Luke?* vv. 9f, (a) witnesses to the miracle, cf. Acts 4:16? (b) meaning of "took knowledge"—compare AV, cf. Acts 4:13. v. 11, (a) "held Peter"—how and why, cf. Mk. 5:18? (b) "ran together unto them"—why?

PAR. 2. v. 12, (a) "saw it"—what? (b) "by our own power or godliness"—meaning? v. 13, (a) "God of Abraham"—cf. Ex. 3:6. (b) "glorified"—how? (c) "servant"—*why preferred to "son" (AV)*, cf. Isa. 42:1; Matt. 12:18; Acts 4:27, 30? (d) "delivered up"—cf. Jno. 18:30. (e) "denied"—cf. Matt. 27:25; Jno. 19:15. (f) "Pilate determined to release"—cf. Matt. 27:24; Jno. 19:4. v. 14, (a) "holy and righteous"—*find parallel O. T. term for Messiah*. (b) "asked for a murderer"—cf. Jno. 18:40. v. 15, (a) "whereof"—notice marg. rdg. (b) "Prince of Life"—cf. Jno. 1:4; 5:26; 10:28; 1 Cor. 15:20. v. 16, (a) "by faith"—notice marg. rdg. (b) *whose faith—the cripple's or the apostles'?* (c) "faith in his name"—meaning? (d) "hath his name made"—*explain the Jewish metonymy*, cf. Acts 4:12; Psa. 106:8; et al. (e) "the faith . . . through him"—meaning? v. 17, (a) why call them "brethren"? (b) "wo!"—*why not modernized by Revisers?* v. 18, (a) *find O. T. and N. T. passages which speak of the suffering of the Messiah*. (b) "thus fulfilled"—how? v. 19, (a) "turn again"—compare AV, and state the significance of the change. (b) what "sins"? (c) "seasons of refreshing"—to what is the reference? v. 20, "send the Christ"—second advent? v. 21, (a) *in what sense is Christ in heaven now?* (b) "times of restoration"—cf. Isa. 1:25ff; Matt. 17:11; Acts 1:6; Rom. 8:22f; 1 Cor. 15:19sq. v. 22, (a) compare closely Deut. 18:15-19. (b) meaning of "like unto me"? (c) *reference to an individual Messiah, or to a line of prophets?* v. 24, "these days"—what days, cf. Isa. 25:1, 6; 26:1, 19; Ezek. 37:1-14; Lk. 1:68-75. v. 25, (a) "sons"—in what sense? (b) "covenant"—*its significance?* v. 26, (a) "unto you"—whom? (b) "first"—why? (c) meaning of "raised up"—cf. Acts 3:22? (d) "blessing"—cf. Tit. 2:11-14.

PAR. 3. v. 4:1, (a) what three classes of enemies named here? (b) what particular reason for hostility had each? (c) what were the duties of the "captain of the temple," cf. 1 Chron. 9:11; et al? (d) "came upon them"—cf. Acts 23:8; Matt. 22:23; 23:6ff. v. 2, exact ground of complaint? v. 3, "put in ward"—why? v. 4, (a) "but"—connection? (b) "word"—what? (c) increase since Pentecost, cf. Acts 2:41?

PAR. 4. v. 5, (a) three classes of Sanhedrists—describe each. (b) were a portion from outside the city? v. 6, (a) "Annas . . . Caiaphas"—explain the difficulty, cf. Lk. 3:2; Jno. 11:49; 18:13. (b) *anything known about "John and Alexander"?* (c) "kindred of the high priest"—of what party? v. 7, (a) "by what power"—inherent? (b) "in what name"—derived power?

(Study VI.)

(c) cf. Matt. 21:23; Acts 3:6. v. 8, why does Peter acknowledge the rulership of the Sanhedrin? v. 9, "made whole"—notice marg. rdg. v. 10, "in him"—meaning? v. 11, (a) "stone . . . head of corner"—cf. Ps. 118:22; Isa. 28:16. (b) to whom does this originally refer? (c) application to this occasion? (d) Jesus' use of the figure: Matt. 21:42. (e) apostolic use: I Cor. 3:11; Eph. 2:20; I Pet. 2:4-8. v. 12, (a) "neither . . . any other name"—cf. Jno. 3:18; 14:6; I Cor. 3:11; Gal. 1:8f; Phil. 2:9ff; Heb. 2:3. (b) the exact meaning of this doctrine? (c) "must be saved"—put into clear language.

PAR. 5. v. 13, (a) "took knowledge"—cf. Acts 3:10. (b) does this imply more than mere physiognomic recognition? (c) "been with Jesus"—among his followers, cf. Jno. 18:15. v. 14, was the healed man present as a spectator, witness, or fellow-prisoner? v. 15, "they," "them"—who? v. 16, "cannot deny it"—cf. Acts 3:9, 11. v. 17, (a) "it spread"—what? (b) "threaten"—meaning? (c) meaning of "speak . . . in this name"? v. 18, "speak . . . teach"—what difference between them? v. 19, (a) cf. Matt. 22:21. (b) "judge ye"—what would be their judgment in this instance? v. 20, (a) "cannot but speak"—what kind of inability? (b) "things . . . saw and heard"—when and what? v. 21, (a) why did they wish to punish them? (b) "glorified"—meaning? v. 22, "miracle . . . wrought,"—compare marg. rdg. and AV.

PAR. 6. v. 23, (a) "their own company"—who and where? (b) why make this report, cf. Acts 16:25? (c) was it probably the basis of this account in Acts? v. 24, (a) "lifted up their voice"—a Hebraism? (b) who made the prayer? (c) was it a set prayer which all repeated? (d) ascription, cf. Ps. 146:6. vv. 25f, (a) meaning of "by the Holy Ghost" in this connection? (b) compare carefully Ps. 2:1f. (c) state the original meaning, reference and significance of this passage. (d) "imagine"—notice marg. rdg. (e) "vain things"—what were they? vv. 27f, observe the situation of the Christian Church now as parallel to that of the Theocratic Church in David's time. v. 29, (a) "look . . . threatenings"—that they may not be realized? (b) "boldness"—cf. Lk. 21:15; Acts 4:13. v. 30, "stretchest . . . heal"—miraculous cures to corroborate the truth spoken? v. 31, (a) "shaken"—why? (b) compare Acts 16:26.

THIRD STEP: TOPICS.

1. **Significance of this Miracle.** (1) how soon after Pentecost? (2) was it the first apostolic miracle, cf. Acts 2:43? (3) relate the incident in detail. (4) compare with it carefully Acts 14:8-18. (5) what was the spiritual condition of the cripple before, and what after, his cure? (6) is there any mention of the cripple's faith, or is it all Peter's? (7) was the man healed for his own sake, or as a spectacular testimony to the work and teaching of the apostles? (8) consider reasons for recording this miracle at such length: (a) it was the occasion of Peter's powerful preaching to a Jewish multitude; (b) it precipitated the first persecution of the Christian Church as such; (c) it brought about Peter's testimony before the Sanhedrin; (d) it directed the attention toward the Gospel; (e) it was a divine testimony to the church; (f) it was a notable work of mercy; (g) give others, and state which reasons seem to you the most important.

(Study VI.)

2. Peter's Public Discourse. (1) describe the circumstances under which the discourse was given. (2) recall Christ's discourse here a little time before, cf. Jno. 10:22f. (3) *how had the intervening time since Pentecost been spent—had the activity of the Church been within its own limits; if so, how and why?* (4) state the line of thought and the points of truth presented by Peter in this discourse. (5) what advantage in showing the miracle to have been wrought by the God of the Hebrews? (6) *discuss the doctrine of the continuity of revelation, as set forth here.* (7) account for Peter's charge of guilt upon the people for Jesus' death. (8) *discuss Peter's use of the two O. T. passages.* (9) *what was the idea of Peter and the Church as to the time and the condition of Christ's second coming?* (10) *have we here all of Peter's discourse, or only an epitome?* (11) state the practical aim of the discourse, and how attained. (12) name the chief characteristics of the discourse.

3. Apportionment of Responsibility for the Crucifixion of Christ. (1) *is there a five-fold division of the responsibility: (a) the Jewish people, cf. Acts 2:23; 3:13f. (b) Pilate, cf. Acts 3:13. (c) the Sanhedrin, cf. Acts 4:10; 5:30. (d) an ignorance on the part of the Jews as to what they were really doing, cf. Acts 3:17; 13:27; Lk. 23:34; 1 Cor. 2:8; 1 Tim. 1:13. (e) the determinate foreknowledge of God, cf. Acts 2:23; 3:18; 4:28; Lk. 22:22.* (2) *judge, as wisely as you can, the amount to be charged to each.* (3) *what degree of guilt attached to the Jews for their ignorance: (a) previous to the crucifixion; (b) afterward, in the light of the resurrection, the Pentecostal outpouring, and the Christian Church.* (4) *just what is to be understood by Peter's statement that "Christ was delivered up by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God" (Acts 2:23)?* (5) *why did Peter put so much emphasis upon the doctrine that God's eternal plan was not thwarted by the Jewish execution of Jesus, cf. 1 Cor. 1:23.* (6) *state briefly, but exactly, what you understand to have been the reasons for and the significance of Jesus' crucifixion.*

4. The Trial and the Decision. (1) why had there been no persecution since the crucifixion until this time? (2) how had the Church been progressing meanwhile? (3) state the way in which this persecution arose. (4) who were the prime movers, cf. Acts 4:1? (5) why were the Pharisees not among them? (6) what particular motive had the Sadducees for their opposition? (6) *observe carefully, and explain, the fact that the bitterest enemies of Jesus were the Pharisees, while of the apostles they were the Sadducees.* (7) what does the full, formal meeting of the Sanhedrin indicate concerning the nature of this trial? (8) *describe the customary mode of proceeding in a trial before the Sanhedrin.* (9) state the charge entered against the apostles. (10) explain the temper and wish of the Sanhedrin. (11) what barrier was interposed, cf. Acts 4:21; Lk. 20:6, 11? (12) consider Peter's defense: (a) *make a paraphrase of it;* (b) note the points made and the teaching about Christ; (c) the evident inspiration; (d) the moral courage; (e) the effect of the defense. (13) state the decision of the Sanhedrin. (14) *were these the same men who had condemned Christ to death?* (15) give reasons for their present leniency: (a) indisposition to violence; (b) did not dare to persecute as formerly; (c) leanings of some of them toward Christianity; (d) did not think persecution necessary. (16) *compare this judgment against the Christian Church with the condemnation of Christ, as regards the degree of guilt involved on the part of the Sanhedrin.*

5. Peter and John, Leading Apostles. (1) their companionship, cf. Mk. 6:7; Lk. 22:8; Jno. 1:41; 18:16; 20:6; Acts 8:14; Gal. 2:9. (2) their complementary traits. (3) advantages of the "two by two" method, cf. Mk. 6:7. (4) *is it to be supposed that John was always silent, Peter making the speeches, or only that John's words are not recorded?* (5) characterize and explain the conduct of these men in this event. (6) meaning of "unlearned and ignorant" as applied to them, cf. Jno. 7:15. (7) what do the discourses of Peter and the writings of John indicate as to their education and training? (8) *compare the attitude of Peter and John before the Sanhedrin (Acts 4:19f) with that of Luther before the Diet of Worms, and formulate the eternal principle involved.*

6. The Prayer of the Church. (1) state the facts which made this an important crisis for the infant Church? (2) was the outcome a virtual triumph for the Church against the Sanhedrin? (3) observe the elements in this prayer: (a) ascription to God (v. 24); (b) recalling the prophecy (vv. 25f); (c) description of the situation (v. 27f); (d) appeal to God for protection, courage, assistance, testimony (vv. 29f). (4) *why was the prayer made to God instead of to Christ (v. 24)?* (5) how did the Christians feel concerning the situation of their Church? (6) *what was the manner of this prayer—was it: (a) a stated prayer or chant of the Church, already familiar, which the Christians now repeated (see Meyer in loc.); or (b) a prayer made on the occasion by one of their number, in the spirit of which all joined?* (7) how was the prayer answered?

FOURTH STEP: OBSERVATIONS.

1. The impulsive, practical Peter, and the contemplative, idealistic John, became most useful co-workers for Christ.

2. The apostles, besides being Christians, were faithful to their religious duties as Jews.

3. Miracles were worked by the apostles, but only and confessedly in the name and by the power of Jesus.

4. It would seem that even the apostles had no more money than was necessary for their plainest needs.

5. It was the God of Israel that had been manifested in and was working through Christ.

6. The belief of the first Christians was that the Gentiles, to share in the Kingdom of Heaven, would have to become members of the Jewish theocracy; also, that when the Jews as a nation would acknowledge Christ to be their Messiah, then Christ would return in glory.

7. Peter charged the Jews with the murder of Jesus, proclaimed the full truth about Him, and summoned all to repentance, assuring them of ready forgiveness.

8. The first persecutors of the Christian Church were Sadducees, who objected to the resurrection doctrine, and the priests and temple officials, who objected to the disturbances which the work of the apostles caused.

9. The membership of the Church increased from three thousand to five thousand in probably much less than a year.

10. The favor of the people for the Christians prevented the Sanhedrin from measures of violence.

(Study VI.)

11. The Christians were closely united in heart and life, and were full of confidence, courage and thanksgiving.

12. The grace, inspiration and assistance needed by the Church were constantly given by God.

FIFTH STEP: SUMMARY.

1. State in a very few words the contents of this Section, showing its unity, and including all the main points, while excluding all the minor ones.
2. Gather and classify all information the Section contains concerning :
 - (1) relation of the early Christians to the Judaic worship.
 - (2) apostolic miracle-working.
 - (3) attitude of the common people toward the Gospel and the Church.
 - (4) teaching of the apostles, respecting especially : (a) responsibility for the death of Jesus ; (b) the truth concerning Him ; (c) duty of unbelievers and persecutors ; (d) blessings which would follow a general acceptance of Christ.
 - (5) apostolic understanding and use of O. T. prophecy.
 - (6) different elements which united in the first persecution of the Christian Church, and the respective causes of their opposition.
 - (7) numerical and religious growth of the Church.
 - (8) first trial of the apostles : (a) the proceedings ; (b) position assumed by the apostles before their persecutors ; (c) official injunction against their work, and its rejection ; (d) leniency of the Sanhedrin, and causes therefor.
 - (9) internal life of the Church : (a) their unity ; (b) their character under trial ; (c) their prayers ; (d) manifestations of God's providence for them.
3. Review carefully the Summaries of Secs. 3 and 4, observing topically the relation of their material to the material of this Summary ; make all the history up to this point seem a familiar and living unit.

SIXTH STEP: TEACHINGS.

1. It is the privilege of the poor in this world to make many rich, and having nothing, yet to possess all things, cf. 2 Cor. 6:10.
2. It is the duty of Christian workers to turn the thoughts of men away from themselves to Christ.
3. Guilt not seldom attaches to our ignorance.
4. Christians are inspired and protected at critical junctures.
5. There is a higher authority than human legislation, to which all men owe supreme allegiance.
6. Christ is the Savior—no other mediator of forgiveness has ever been known or suggested.

STUDY VII.

SEC. 6. PROPERTY RELATIONS AND BENEFICENCE
IN THE JERUSALEM CHURCH.

Acts 4 : 32—5 : 11.

31-33 A. D.

JERUSALEM.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—(1) Cambridge Bible on Acts, pp. 51-58; (2) Gloag's Comty. on Acts, I: 161-178. (3) Meyer's Comty. on Acts, pp. 69ff, 99-108. (4) Schaff's History of the Christian Church, I: § 114. (5) Expositor's Bible on Acts, I: 193-228. (6) Bible Dictionary, arts. Ananias and Sapphira, Barnabas, Burial, Community of Goods. (7) Neander's Planting and Training of the Christian Church, I: 24-28; II: 64. (8) *Vaughan's Church of the First Days*, pp. 101-112. (9) *Peloubet's Notes*, 1892, *in loc.* (10) *S. S. Times*, Feb. 10, 1883.

FIRST STEP: FACTS.

PAR. 1. *v.* 32a, loving union of Christians. *v.* 32b, fraternity and beneficence. *v.* 33a, powerful witness-bearing. *v.* 33b, grace of the entire Church. *v.* 34a, all Christians provided for. *v.* 34b, unselfish contributions of the wealthy. *v.* 35, distribution to supply all need. *Vv.* 32-35, UNITY OF HEART AND COMMUNITY OF GOODS.

PAR. 2. *v.* 36, Barnabas, a Levite and Cyprian. *v.* 37, makes a notably generous donation. *Vv.* 36-37, BARNABAS' SACRIFICE.

PAR. 3. *v.* 5 : 1, two Christians purpose a gift. *v.* 2, but selfishness vitiates it. *v.* 3, Peter charges them with hypocrisy. *v.* 4, their sin without palliation. *v.* 5a, divine judgment strikes Ananias dead. *v.* 5b, fear comes upon the witnesses. *v.* 6, his burial. *v.* 7, later appearance of Sapphira. *v.* 8, her complicity and falsehood. *v.* 9, a like judgment pronounced against her. *v.* 10, her death and burial. *v.* 11, awe over the entire community. *Vv.* 5 : 1-11, SIN AND PUNISHMENT OF ANANIAS AND SAPPHIRA.

THE TRANSCRIPT. The following condensed paraphrase of this Section will give the idea of what is called for in the preparation of an original transcript (see Preliminary Suggestions, Topic 4: Record of Work; also Sec. 3, First Step, Remark.):

The Christians were one in heart, interest, and possessions. The Holy Spirit was with them in their ministry to unbelievers and to each other. A charity fund for the poorer brethren was provided by those who had more wealth. Particularly interesting was the generous contribution of Barnabas, whose home was in distant Cyprus. One sad instance marred this enthusiastic beneficence. Two members of the Church, who wished to appear as generous as the others, but were at heart wholly selfish, in hypocrisy offered a contribution. This sin struck so vitally at the integrity and purity of the infant Church that it called down divine judgment upon them. Under Peter's condemnation, first Ananias, and later his wife, were visited by sudden death. A deep feeling of awe came over the entire community at this solemn, severe meting out of divine justice for the purification of the Church from its unholy members.

(Study VII.)

SECOND STEP: EXPLANATIONS.

PAR. 1. *v.* 32, (a) one of the frequent short paragraphs descriptive of the condition of the Church, cf. Acts 2:42, 43-47; 4:23-31; 5:12-16; 12:24f; et al. (b) "of one heart," etc.—Hebraism meaning what, cf. 1 Chron. 12:38; Jer. 32:39; Rom. 15:5f; Phil. 2:2; 1 Pet. 3:8. (c) "not one"—cf. the weaker expression of AV. *v.* 33, (a) "with great power"—in what ways manifest? (b) "witness"—recall the points concerning this made in preceding Sections (Acts 1:22; 2:32; 4:20; et al). (c) "great grace"—what was its nature and how manifested, cf. 1 Cor. 15:10; Acts 5:13? (d) "upon all"—whom? *v.* 34, (a) "for"—cf. AV. and state exactly the connection intended with *v.* 33b. (b) "lacked"—in what respects? (c) "sold"—the translation does not bring out the continued past action in the verbal form. *v.* 35, (a) "laid them," etc.—to be taken literally or figuratively? if the latter, explain the meaning, cf. Psal. 8:6 (see Hackett's Comity. in loc.). (b) why was the money given to the apostles? (c) "distribution . . . need"—compare AV, stating the improvement made by RV.

PAR. 2. *v.* 36, (a) concrete instance of the community of goods. (b) why was Barnabas thus surnamed by the apostles, cf. Acts 11:23? (c) why was the interpretation of the name added? (d) ascertain the main facts about his later career, cf. Acts 11:22-25; 12:25; 13:1ff; 14:12sq; 15:35-39; Col. 4:10. (e) "Levite"—why is the fact mentioned? (f) locate and briefly describe Cyprus. (g) is it to be understood that Barnabas was a resident of that island? *v.* 37, (a) is there any information as to where Barnabas' field was, or the value of it? (b) why is his gift so prominently recorded: because he was afterward eminent, or because the gift was unusually large, or because it involved a special sacrifice?

PAR. 3. *v.* 5:1, (a) "but"—marks the sharp contrast between the two instances of charity cited, the first good, the second wicked. (b) "certain man"—how much is known about this man and his wife? (c) "Ananias"—a common name, cf. Acts 9:10; 23:2; 24:1. (d) what shows that they were members of the Christian community? (e) "a possession"—anything to indicate the nature of it, cf. Matt. 19:22? *v.* 2, (a) "kept back part"—though pretending to bring the entire amount? (b) meaning of "his wife being privy to it"? (c) "certain part"—what proportion of the whole? (d) "laid it"—hypocritically professing the same devotion as other givers? *v.* 3, (a) why is it Peter who addresses the men? (b) meaning of "Satan filled thy heart"—cf. Lk. 22:3; Jno. 8:44? (c) "to lie to"—cf. marg. rdg., better. (d) meaning of "lie to the Holy Ghost"? (e) what relation did the deception sustain to the apostles? (f) was Ananias responsible for this indwelling of Satan, cf. Jas. 4:7; 1 Pet. 5:8f? (g) "keep back"—fraudulent concealment? (h) what was the source of Peter's knowledge of the deception? *v.* 4, (a) "whiles . . . own"—meaning of the clause? (b) "after . . . power"—meaning? (c) "thou hast conceived"—Ananias himself responsible for it? (d) "conceived . . . heart"—deliberate purpose indicated? (e) "not lied unto men," etc.—cf. Psal. 51:4, and state the exact meaning of the words. *v.* 5, (a) had Peter a knowledge of what was about to happen? (b) what was Peter's relation to the death of Ananias? (c) what was the manner of that death (consider Neander's view)? (d) "gave up the ghost"—meaning; why retained by the Revisers? (e) "fear"—why? *v.* 6, (a) "young men"—were they regular

(Study VII.)

Church officials, or only spectators? (b) why was it they who performed this duty? (c) "wrapped him round"—meaning? (d) "carried"—whither, outside the city? (e) "buried him"—why this haste? (f) how could a legal investigation by the civil authorities into the circumstances of this death be avoided? (g) describe the burial customs of the Orient? (h) who were the witnesses of this tragedy—the whole assembled Church, or only Peter and some others? v. 7, (a) "three hours"—after what? (b) how could she be ignorant of that which had happened? (c) "came in"—whither? (d) for what purpose? v. 8, (a) "Peter answered"—in what sense were his words an answer? (b) "tell me"—apostolic authority? (c) "ye"—who? (d) "for so much"—and no more? (e) did he actually point to the money left by Ananias, or only name the amount? (f) why did not Sapphira grasp the situation? (g) was Peter's question intended to appeal to her Christian conscience? (h) what did her absolute falsehood indicate as to her spiritual condition? v. 9, (a) "tempt the Spirit"—meaning? (b) "the feet of them"—literally heard without, or spoken as a figure of instant judgment? (c) "shall carry thee out"—in view of her complicity, and the punishment of Ananias, was Sapphira's fate plain to all? v. 10, was the manner of her death the same as of her husband's? v. 11, (a) "great fear"—cf. Acts 2:43. (b) what great lesson did this stern judgment teach the Christians? (c) "church"—the first time this word has been used to denote the Christian community, and why here (see Camb. Bible in loc.)? (d) "all that heard"—those who were outside the Church?

THIRD STEP: TOPICS.

1. **The Social Life of the Christians.** (1) of how many members was the Church at this time composed? (2) discover (*vv.* 32f) four characteristics of the Christian community: (a) unity of spirit; (b) witness-bearing; (c) divine grace; (d) community of goods. (3) what reasons were there for this perfect accord? (4) in what ways was it manifest? (5) how did their fraternity appear in their property relations? (6) what was the burden of the apostolic teaching? (7) what influence had the Church upon outsiders? (8) in whose charge was the distribution of their charity? (9) what other arrangements earlier and later, cf. Acts 2:44f; 6:1-4? (10) who received aid from this source? (11) what proportion of the Christians needed such assistance? (12) name some reasons for this poverty, cf. *Jno.* 9:22; *2 Thess.* 2:2; 3:10ff. (13) what was the spiritual and moral condition of the Church, as seen by contrast in the case of Ananias and Sapphira? (14) what indications that Peter was the leader of the Church? (15) were there as yet any regular officers in the Church? (16) what does the term "church" mean, as then applied to the Christian community?

2. **Property Relations in the Jerusalem Church.** (1) make a close, careful study of these verses: Acts 2:44f; 4:32, 34; 5:4. (2) what was the purpose of this beneficence? (3) what kind of "possessions" were thus turned into charity? (4) how general among the Jerusalem Christians was this disposition of property? (5) was it required of any one, or purely voluntary? (6) did those who contributed give all they had, or only such a portion as they saw fit? (7) what were the underlying causes of this communistic arrangement: (a) paternal beneficence toward needy brethren, cf. Matt. 22:39; Gal. 6:10; (b) the supposition that it was instituted and approved by

(Study VII.)

Christ in the case of himself and his apostles, cf. Lk. 8:3; et al.; and which ought therefore to be continued in his Church. (c) the anticipation of Christ's speedy return, when earthly possessions would no longer be needed. (d) *what relation, if any, did this condition sustain to the similar feature of life among the Essenes (cf. Josephus' Bell. Jud. 2:8:3)?* (8) how long did the custom obtain in the Jerusalem Church? (9) *is there any further reference to it in the Acts and Epistles?* (10) was the custom put into practice anywhere else? (11) *if not, why not?* (12) state its points of success and failure as tried in the Jerusalem Church. (13) *was the later destitution of that church due to this experiment, in any measure?* (14) state the general principle involved in the Jerusalem communism—was it: (a) the abolition of private ownership in property, or (b) a readiness to share with those in want, as a result of which all property was held by the owner subject to draft on demand for that purpose? (15) *what related basis had the monastic life and the vow of poverty in the Roman Catholic Church?* (16) what is the principle of the Christian system regarding private property, cf. Matt. 19:21; Lk. 6:20; 12:33; Jas. 2:5; et al. (study carefully the interpretation)? (17) in view of this, what is the right attitude of the Christian Church to-day toward the social problems?

3. The Sin of Ananias and Sapphira. (1) who were they? (2) just what did they do, and with what result? (3) did their sin consist in the fact that they retained some of the money realized by their sale? (4) what did Peter tell them concerning their right to the money thus obtained? (5) did their sin lie in their hypocritical pretense that the amount turned over to the Church was the whole amount received? (6) what motives had they for making such a misrepresentation? (7) how prominent a motive was their desire to have a reputation for generosity and beneficence, such as characterized their fellow-Christians, while at heart they were supremely selfish? (8) *was it before or after the sale of the property that their selfishness gained the mastery?* (9) may their sin be exactly described as "a spurious imitation of exalted virtue"?

4. Justification of the Divine Punishment. (1) in the founding of a great institution, such as was the Christian Church, is it essential to have the principles of that institution absolutely recognized and established at the outset? (2) to secure this, what degree of resistance to enemies of the institution will be justifiable? (3) could any blow be more dangerous to the Christian Church than one aimed at the purity and sincerity of the moral and religious life of its members? (4) was the sin of Ananias and Sapphira anything less than this? (5) consider whether it was: (a) premeditated; (b) grossly corrupting; (c) from within the very body of believers; (d) essentially unchristian. (6) consider what sort of a punishment in this case would: (a) extirpate selfishness and hypocrisy from the Christian community; (b) exclude all who were not genuine Christians; (c) support the divine authority of the apostles in their forming of the Church. (7) was anything short of the punishment inflicted upon Ananias and Sapphira adequate to effect this? (8) did it in fact accomplish that for which it was sent? (9) when does divine justice necessarily replace divine love?

5. Parallel Instances in Old Testament History. *At the inauguration of new eras in the development of his Kingdom, God has seen fit to inflict the severest penalties upon transgressors, in order to protect his*
(Study VII.)

Church. This judgment upon Ananias and Sapphira had its counterpart in the Old Testament history. Consider carefully five instances: (1) Gen. 4:1-15, the sentence passed upon Cain, for murder at the outset of the human race. (2) Lev. 10:1-7, the death by fire of Nadab and Abihu, for desecrating the holy worship of Israel newly instituted. (3) Num. 16:1-35, the engulfing of Korah and his confederates, for rebellion against Moses in his work of establishing the Jewish theocracy. (4) Josh. 7:1-26, the destruction of Achan and his house, for base covetousness at the very entrance into the promised land. (5) 2 Sam. 6:1-7, the sudden death of Uzzah, for desecrating the Ark at the time when the throne of David was established over Israel.

FOURTH STEP: OBSERVATIONS.

1. The Christian community lived in unity of heart and practical fraternity.
2. The contributions to the charitable fund were voluntary, limited, local and temporary.
3. The communistic arrangement was due partly to the example of Christ, and partly to their expectancy of his immediate return.
4. The apostles were the overseers of the Church's charities.
5. Divine grace rested upon the Christians to guide and instruct them, and to give them influence over outsiders.
6. The Church had been threatened from without by persecution; it was now threatened from within by corruption.
7. The integrity and purity of the Church, remarkable as they were, had to be maintained at whatever cost.
8. Peter, the leader, was supernaturally endowed with the knowledge and wisdom necessary to deal with the case of Ananias and Sapphira.
9. The extreme punishment visited upon them was just, and only adequate to secure the well-being of the Church.
10. The divinity and the personality of the Holy Spirit are made plain in Peter's words.
11. It may be questioned whether there has been any reference to regular officials in the Church.
12. The first recorded shadow has fallen across the primitive Christian community.
13. The lesson taught by the calamity was wholesome both to Christians and to outsiders.

FIFTH STEP: SUMMARY.

1. Make a statement as to: (a) what you understand to have been the exact facts concerning property relations and beneficence in the primitive Christian Church; (b) what you believe, in view of this, should be the attitude of the Church toward present social problems.
2. Gather and classify all facts afforded by this Section which relate to the following topics:
 - (1) characteristics of the moral and religious life of the Christians.
 - (2) characteristics of the social life of the Christian community.
 - (3) the internal government of the Church.
 - (4) the relation of the Church to the multitudes without.
 - (5) God's dealings with his Church.

(Study VII.)

3. Bring together all the information contributed by Sections 3, 4, 5 and 6 to these five topics, viewing and considering each topic through the entire history up to this point.

4. *Make a brief survey, in writing, of each of the five topics, which shall incorporate all the information so far obtained concerning it.*

SIXTH STEP: TEACHINGS.

1. True Christianity produces an essential unity of feeling, purpose and possession, among its adherents.

2. Extreme socialistic principles find no warrant in the community of goods of the primitive Church.

3. There is great responsibility in being members of the Church of Christ.

4. The desire to appear what we are not, to do what we do not do, to feel as we do not feel, is hypocrisy, against which Christ warned men in most solemn and awful language.

5. The integrity and purity of the Christian Church must be preserved; when this cannot be effected by divine love, divine justice must assert itself.

(Study VII.)

Biblical Work and Workers.

The annual series of Monday lectures given by Joseph Cook, in Tremont Temple, Boston, are this year upon "Strategic Scriptures, or Merits and Defects of the Higher Criticism."

Rev. E. K. Mitchell, D. D., a graduate of Marietta College, has been elected Professor of Biblical Literature and the History of Christianity, in the University of the City of New York.

The volumes of the "Expositor's Bible," that series which has proved of so high average scholarship and utility, announced for this year are, "The Epistles to the Thessalonians," by Rev. J. Denney; The Gospel of John, vol. 2, by Dr. Marcus Dods; The Psalms, vol. 1, by Rev. Dr. Alexander MacLaren; The Acts of the Apostles, vol. 2, by G. T. Stokes, D. D.; The Book of Job, by R. A. Watson, D. D.; The Epistle to the Ephesians, by G. G. Findlay, B. A.

The *Expositor* during the current year is to contain some papers on the Miracles of Our Lord, by Dean Chadwick; Professor Beet, the commentator on the Epistles of Paul, will write on the Doctrine of the Atonement in the New Testament; Studies in New Testament Theology will be contributed by Rev. Dr. James Stalker; and Rev. G. Adam Smith will work over some of his material, acquired in a recent trip to Palestine, in a series of articles on The Historical Geography of Palestine.

Dr. Winckler of the University of Berlin has recently published the first part of what he entitles "Cuneiform Textbook to the Old Testament." The purpose of it is to furnish in convenient form for reference the original material from the Assyrian and Babylonian cuneiform remains which bears upon the Old Testament. Only the transliterated text and a German translation are given though notes are promised if found to be desired by students. An English edition of this little book would be useful. It may be added also that a new History of Assyria and Babylonia by Dr. Winckler is in the press.

The trouble among the Canadian Methodists, which arose from the advanced views on the subject of Messianic prophecy and the inspiration of Scripture recently set forth by Prof. G. C. Workman of Victoria College, has resulted in his resignation. It seems that the institution, in their purpose to retain him in the faculty and at the same time prevent him from giving theological instruction, transferred him to a chair in the Arts department. This was naturally interpreted by the professor as a reflection upon his soundness of doctrine, and his withdrawal was the result.

In England an outcry has been raised against the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, because it has requested Prof. A. H. Sayce, LL. D., to prepare a little volume which shall present the results of recent researches in Palestine and Egypt in their relation to the recent Old Testament criticism. However the matter may alarm the High Church theologians, it is evident

that the important task could not have been given into better hands; and, judging from Prof. Sayce's articles along this line which are now appearing in the *Expository Times*, there is little occasion for fear that the work will not be sufficiently conservative.

It is with much interest that we note the steps being taken to promote a more general Historical Study of Religions. The plan is to institute popular courses of lectures, somewhat after the manner of the Hibbert Lectures in England, to be delivered annually in our leading cities by the best scholars of Europe and America. Dr. C. P. Tiele, Professor of the History of Religions at the University of Leyden, can be secured for 1893, and Prof. Jas. Darmster, Member of the French Academy and Professor at the College de France, for 1894. A committee of representative persons from different sections of the country have the project in hand.

Paul de Lagarde, of the University of Göttingen, one of the leading orientalis of Germany, whose death recently occurred, was the author of more than sixty books, many of them edited texts of works in oriental and classical languages, among the best known of which was his edition of the Septuagint. He has been equalled by few either in extent of learning or power of work. His views in theology and criticism were unusual combinations, and he was not well understood. But his scholarship and achievements nevertheless made him eminent. When called from his labors he was planning a new Syriac lexicon, which would undoubtedly have been a work of prime importance.

A severe criticism is passed upon the new edition of Baedeker's *Palestine* by Revs. Geo. Adam Smith and W. Ewing, in a recent number of an English biblical journal. The bad omissions of the earlier editions have not been supplied or the mistakes corrected. Mr. Smith used it in a trip through Syria last summer, and the faults pointed out are those which he discovered by actual use of the book in travel. It is not up to date in its account of discoveries. Such a place as Beersheba is omitted entirely. Mr. Ewing, a missionary in Palestine, criticises its vocabulary severely and calls attention to many slips and much careless work in editing. All who venture to use the book should examine the detailed criticisms and notes of Mr. Ewing.

An authorized English translation of Prof. H. H. Wendt's "Der Inhalt der Lehre Jesu" (The Content of the Teaching of Jesus), is soon to be published by Messrs. T. and T. Clark of Edinburgh. It will have the benefit of a revision by the author. Perhaps a more useful and valuable work has not appeared in the department of Biblical Theology. Rev. Buchanan Blake's new work, "How to Read the Prophets," has just been issued, treating the Minor Prophets with the same success which characterized his recent book on Isaiah. Rev. R. H. Charles, M. A., is to prepare a scientific edition of the Book of Enoch, to be published by the Oxford University Press. The new, carefully revised edition of Andrew's "Life of Our Lord," by Scribners, is now upon the market.

On a recent Sunday in New York City, five of the leading churches heard sermons concerning the problems of biblical criticism. In the Madison Avenue M. E. church, Prof. Miley, of Drew Theological Seminary, spoke on "The Agency of the Holy Spirit in the Authorship of the Scripture." Prof.

Marvin Vincent, of Union Seminary, discussed "The Bible and New Testament Criticism," at the Church of the Puritans in Harlem. Dr. A. J. F. Behrends, at the Church of the Covenant, presented "The Bible and the Present Drift of Religious Thought." A sermon on "The Inspiration and Inerrancy of the Bible," was delivered in St. James' Lutheran Church by the pastor, Dr. Remensnyder. And at the Marble Collegiate Church (Dr. Burrell's), Prof. Wm. H. Green, of Princeton Seminary, discussed "The Anti-Biblical Higher Criticism," a synopsis of which sermon will be found on another page. The theological controversies now prominent have evidently awakened and enlisted the laymen of the Church. It will be interesting to observe what contribution they can make to the solution of the vexed questions.

The death of Rev. Chas. A. Aiken, Ph. D., D. D., Professor of the Relations of Philosophy and Science to the Christian Religion, and of Oriental and Old Testament Literature, in Princeton Theological Seminary, took place on Thursday, Jan. 14th. Previous to his latest professorship, he had occupied the chair of Latin in Dartmouth College, and then in Princeton College, the latter office terminating when he became President of Union College in 1869. Two years after this he assumed the professorship of Christian Ethics in Princeton Theological Seminary, from which chair he was transferred in 1882 to that of Old Testament Literature. When Dr. Patton became President of Princeton College, the last change was made in Prof. Aiken's professional charge. His intellectual attainments were very high, and his linguistic knowledge was extensive and accurate. As a teacher of language he was among the first. He was a member of the Old Testament Revision Committee, the editor and translator of "Lange's Commentary on Proverbs," and a frequent writer for the theological reviews, his last article appearing in the January number of the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, discussing "Christianity and Social problems."

Book Notices.

Inspiration and the Use of the Old Testament.

The Oracles of God. Nine Lectures on the nature and Extent of Biblical Inspiration and on the special significance of the Old Testament Scriptures at the present time: with two Appendices. By W. Sanday, M. A., D. D. London and New York: Longmans. Pp. X., 147.

Dr. Sanday has felt called upon to say some things in respect to current questions in biblical study and has said them with clearness and caution. Those who are concerned to have truer views on these subjects prevail cannot but be grateful to him that he has given the weight of his name in favor of broader, while not less evangelical, views. In regard to the relation of the divine and human, he says: "In all that relates to the Revelation of God and of His Will, the writers [of the Bible] assert for themselves a definite inspiration; they claim to speak with an authority higher than their own. But in regard to the narration of events, and to processes of literary composition, there is nothing so exceptional about them as to exempt them from the conditions to which other works would be exposed at the same place and time." One of the chapters entitled "Loss and Gain," sums up the whole matter thus: the loss involved in these new views consists in the fact that they make the intellectual side of the connexion between Christian belief and Christian practice a matter of greater difficulty. Now we must ask about any passage of Scripture as to the context, the author, the time, the stage in the history of Revelation at which he wrote. The gains are (1) in truth, (2) in security; (3) in reality, (4) in the recognition and grasp of biblical principles in their historical application in the Bible.

Dr. Sanday is hopeful for the future and his book is a tonic to the depressed or the gloomy. He has no tone of arrogance or dogmatism. He is cautious about his opinions. In discussing the relation of our Lord to the Old Testament, while rejecting the theory of accommodation, he says regarding the whole problem of the relation of the divine and human in Jesus Christ, "Man is a curious being; and he has many legitimate objects for his curiosity. I doubt if this is one. The data are too precarious; they involve too great a leap of the mind into the unknown." Such a spirit and method, as this book reveals, lead us to hope much that is good, not only from the cause which Dr. Sanday so modestly advocates, but also from himself in his further investigation into the Scriptures.

A Theistic Argument.

Belief in God: its Origin, Nature and Basis. Being the Winkley Lectures of the Andover Theological Seminary for the year 1890. By Jacob Gould Schurman, Sage Professor of Philosophy in Cornell University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. 266. Price \$1.25.

Professor Schurman is an original and independent or rather cosmopolitan thinker who when one school begins to claim him on the ground of what he has written, proceeds to propound views which rank him with an opposing

party. These lectures illustrate this peculiarity. The first lecture aims to show the irrationality of the agnostic attitude. The second urges from the point of view of a sound science the logical character of belief in God and presents the author's theory which he entitles anthropocosmic theism, i. e., "the doctrine of a Supreme Being, who is ground both of nature and of man, but whose essence is not natural but spiritual." This is all very satisfactory until the evolutionary standpoint of the author, his denial of the validity of the argument from human consciousness and the dangerous leaning toward a pantheistic conception of Deity, force the enthusiastic theologian to call a halt before he follows this vigorous and bold thinker out of the window. Amid much acute reasoning and careful analysis for which the thinking world cannot be too grateful, there is in this book a good deal of hasty generalization upon points where the author cannot claim to be a specialist. This is especially true in Prof. Schurman's treatment of the history of religion and of the questions of biblical history and criticism. That discussions of such subjects belong to a book on Belief in God is evident to any modern student of the problem. It is to the writer's credit as a modern scholar that he has, even in this brief series of lectures, introduced them. They are stimulating and valuable parts of the book. But they are treated too narrowly from the philosophical standpoint and forced to contribute to the splendid march of his organized thought arguments and illustrations which are not entirely trustworthy. No one can fail to read this book without admiration of the wide learning and keen mind of the author and without real help and stimulation in the study of this the most lofty of themes. It is certain that Professor Schurman has here made a real and most important contribution to the subject. To realize that will be as genuine a satisfaction to the writer of this book as to bear witness to it is the highest praise that can be bestowed upon it by the reader.

Biblical Notes.

Habakkuk 2: 2, "That he may run that readeth it." An interesting discussion concerning the meaning of these words is going on in the *Expository Times*. Two interpretations are offered: (1) let the message of warning be made so plain that even he who runs may read it, and escape for safety. This rendering was put forth editorially in the December number, and at once invited criticism. The generally accepted interpretation, and that defended by a number of contributors in the January issue of the magazine, is: (2) let the message be so plainly inscribed that it may be read with the greatest facility, the "running" referring rather to the eye than to the feet, a figurative expression such as we use when we speak of running the eye over a page.

The Meaning of "Usury." An inquiry concerning the exact significance of this word, as it is used in the English Bible, elicits the reply from the *Sunday School Times* that its Biblical meaning is simply that of "interest," a plain word which should have been substituted for it by the Revisers of the Old Testament, as was done by the Revisers of the New. The modern sense of usury—that is, interest in excess of what is just, or of what the law allows—was not known at the time when our English version was made. Given the circumstances under which Moses forbade the taking of interest, and the Christian law of love would forbid it no less than the Hebrew. There are special cases, which may occur to every one, in which the lending—where we cannot quite afford to give, or the gift would be less acceptable than the loan—should be on Mosaic principle, and for the same reasons. But in ordinary cases, there is no more reason for refusing a reasonable compensation for the use of money, than for the use of machines, ships and houses.

Paul's First Missionary Journey. Professor Ramsay, the eminent archaeologist and biblical scholar, who has done such good work in excavating and travelling over Asia Minor, writes in the January *Expositor* under the above title. He takes Conybeare and Howson's *Life of the Apostle* as well as Farrar's, and studies their topographical and archaeological statements in the light of his independent studies and personal investigations. He holds that the narrative in Acts 13 and 14 is not the work of an eye-witness and is for the most part vague. He would like to see whether the "Jupiter before the city" at Lystra could be unearthed, and thinks that a couple of day's work will disclose it if there. His first point respects the time of the journey. He denies the argument on which the two biographical works just cited found their view that Paul reached Perga about May. The population did not migrate to the hills as is there stated. He carefully discusses the route of the apostle, and notes the ancient epigraphic testimonies to the "perils of robbers and rivers" to which Conybeare and Howson refer here. The article is remarkably fresh and interesting to the student of the Acts. Happily it is the first of a series.

A New Explanation of Josh. 10: 12, 13. Rev. J. S. Black, in his commentary on Joshua in the "Smaller Cambridge Bible," gives an interesting

explanation, which he credits to Prof. W. Robertson Smith, of the miracle of the sun standing still at Joshua's command. The account is a poetical one quoted from the Book of Joshua, and in order to understand it we must figure to ourselves the speaker at two successive periods of the summer day—first, on the plateau to the north of the hill of Gibeon, with Gibeon lying under the sun to the southeast or south, at the moment when the resistance of the enemy has at last broken down; and again, hours later, when the sun has set, and the moon is sinking westward over the valley of Aijalon, threatening by its disappearance to put an end to the victorious pursuit. The appeal to the moon is, of course, for light, i. e., after sunset. The moon appears over Aijalon—that is, somewhat south of west as seen by one approaching from Beth-horon. There was therefore evening moonlight. Joshua prayed first that the sunlight, and then that the moonlight following it, might suffice for the complete defeat of the enemy. The miraculous, therefore, disappears entirely from the incident.

The Twentieth Century View of the Old Testament. What will it be? A recent discussion gives several reasons why the Old Testament a hundred years later will be read and studied more diligently, will be better understood, and will be more generally influential upon the lives of men: (1) because it is divinely inspired, whatever of sanctity God's authority can give a book is given to this. (2) Its devotional uses will have lost none of their interest or meaning, (3) the prophecies contained in the Old Testament are full of significance; fulfilled predictions obviously serve as evidences of the New and prepare us for it; the unfulfilled warn us to look forward to a coming time. (4) Many duties therein enjoined are just as binding as they ever were. (5) Its revelations of truth are unchanged in their accuracy, interest and importance. It tells some things not otherwise known, it teaches some things with inimitable force, it affords a correct understanding of many things in the New Testament. (6) The Book is in no danger from the higher criticism, which minutely examines its authorship, antiquity and history. Let the inquiry proceed. None of the proved results of criticism have diminished in the slightest degree the just claim of the Bible to the confidence and reverence of mankind.

The Change of Saul's Name to Paul. In a new book by Prof. Max Krenkel upon the History and Epistles of the Apostle Paul, he speaks thus upon this subject: Paul must have received a Hebrew name at his circumcision, but it could not have been "Saul," because of the infamy which attached to that name in Old Testament history, in view of which no pious Jew would have so named his son. The name "Saul" sprang rather from the horror with which the *Christian* community regarded the persecutor of the Christian Church, the title of the arch persecutor being suggested by the history of Saul's persecutions of David, who was the type of the Christ, the Messianic David, now being persecuted by this Hebrew, in the person of his church. The name "Paul" was given to commemorate the victory of the apostle over Sergius Paulus (Acts 13), just as conquerors sometimes took the name of the nations which they subdued as a title of honor to themselves. Prof. Krenkel would not claim originality for his view as to the source of the name "Paul," but we think his explanation of "Saul" has not before been presented. It is more ingenious than attractive. Yet it must be confessed that prevailing explanations of the origin and meaning of the two names of the Apostle are not entirely satisfactory.

John and the Synoptics. The series of articles now appearing in the *Expositor*, in which Prof. Sanday is setting forth the "Present Position of the Johannean Question," are worthy of careful attention. The third of the series treats of the relation of the first three to the Fourth Gospel. The author summarizes the objections to the Fourth Gospel on the ground of its relation to the Synoptics under six heads: "(1) That the scene of our Lord's ministry is laid for the most part in Judea rather than in Galilee; (2) that its duration is extended over some two and a half years instead of one; (3) that in particular a different day, Nisan 14th instead of 15th, is assigned to the Crucifixion; (4) a further discrepancy involving the question of the evangelist's reckoning of the hours of the day; (5) that the historical narrative is wanting in development and progression, especially on the important point of our Lord's declaration of His Messiahship; (6) that this goes along with a general heightening of His claims." Of these he says "The first three are practically given up. The fourth is really indifferent. The fifth and sixth are most serious and important." He carefully examines these, however, and cannot find in them the force that their advocates claim. He argues convincingly against the view that the idea of Christ's præexistence as presented in the fourth Gospel is proof of its non-apostolic origin. He finds the same idea in Peter's and Paul's Epistles. St. Paul in A. D. 57 implies the existence of this doctrine and refers to it as something which he takes for granted. Where did he get it, if not from those who received it somehow from the lips of Christ? If so, this objection against the Gospel is only a proof that its author was an apostle. Dr. Sanday is at his best in this careful and yet stirring paper.

Synopsis of Important Articles.

The Book of Lamentations.* This is probably the poetical book of the Old Testament least generally known, yet it is the one about which our information is the most complete. Its theme is the catastrophe of the destruction of Jerusalem in B. C. 588. It was evidently written at the time by an eye-witness who felt the horror of the tragedy most deeply. Jeremiah was the most prominent personality of Jerusalem at the time, most probably the author of the book. But modern scholars deny this. The question has no religious importance. But the rare and peculiar genius of Jeremiah, the fact that he wrote this kind of poetry, e. g., a lament over Josiah's death, resemblances of style between these Lamentations and his prophecies, the autobiographic details of the third chapter, seem to furnish conclusive proof of Jeremiah's authorship of the book. The differences in style from that of Jeremiah are to be explained by the difference in form between lamentations and prophecies. The poetical form is peculiar; a collection of five separate pieces; elegies; four of them acrostics, a not uncommon form of Hebrew poetry. The picture painted in these poems is one of colossal sorrow. But the purpose is deeper than to give vent to the national grief. The poems are prophetic in that they call attention to the cause of this calamity. It was divine chastisement for sin. The middle chapter is most remarkable. Here the speaker relates how he has passed through a personal experience similar to that of the nation. He can comfort the people with that comfort which he has found. He bids them hope and turn again to God. Hence the book handles the problem of sin and suffering and points the way to God. We are reminded of the greater Man of sorrows both in His experience and in His contribution to the problem, viz., the perfect solution of the mystery of sin and suffering, at which the prophet so nobly wrought.

The independent and broad consideration of the literary problems of this most interesting book is in Dr. Stalker's best vein and his study of the teaching of this prophetic lament is striking. But neither of these two chief elements of the paper seems fully enough presented to satisfy a careful reader. Still if they lead one to look more deeply into the numerous and most fascinating problems of the Book of Lamentations, the discussion will be of much service.

Gideon.† Consider some preliminary words on the Hebrew conquest of Canaan. These Hebrew Bedouins are suddenly moved by a strange spirit, they unite, approach a fertile, cultivated country, Canaan, and ultimately, after hard fighting, conquer it. As for the moral character of this transaction observe (1) war, though it has its roots in iniquity, has been used by God for the furtherance of righteousness and peace; (2) we are in danger of over-valuing mere physical life. That the material life counts for very little in God's sight is the manifest teaching of history. The moral discipline is first and all-important. Men make too much of physical comfort to-day and hence

* By Dr. James Stalker, in *The Expositor*, Jan. 1892, pp. 65-75.

† By the late Professor Elmslie, in *The Expositor*, Jan. 1892, pp. 50-65.

recoil unduly when God has been seen to work benefit for our race as a whole by wars, in which cruel despotisms, inferior or sanguinary races have succumbed before superior moral or mental worth. The Hebrews were not perfect; they were far from being up to our standard. But with all their cruelty and greed, there was something very much loftier in them—the sense of having the true God with them and of taking possession of a kingdom for Him. Remember that it is a law of God's working that when sin of a certain type and degree has come in, retribution follows in the shape of annihilation at the hands of a superior race. It was better for the world that the Hebrew nation, which has done the grandest moral and religious work for the world, should root out the awfully degraded Canaanites. But they did not do so and the fact that some were left proved an invaluable moral discipline to the Hebrews. The Hebrews could never have gotten possession of the country by stratagem, by alliance. The national recollection of this time proves that they fought great battles and must have been possessed by some great enthusiasm, the belief in God. Notice that God dealt with the Hebrews after the conquest precisely on the same principle that he dealt with the Canaanites—punished them when they degenerated. It is on this background that we may picture the career of Gideon. The time was one that afforded an opportunity for a hero. The narrative brings out the traits of Gideon's character; (1) He was a doubter at first, but it was the doubt of a man who could not tolerate the degradation of God's people. For that reason he was chosen. The doubters may be the men nearest God, and some of the finest religious perceptions of our age may be outside the church. (2) Gideon began the reformation at home. (3) He sought quality not quantity, man not men. His whole career is a lesson of how good work can be done in the face of difficulties. His career was glorious, because he was faithful to the highest light he had access to.

The introductory part of this paper, while most interesting and well reasoned, rather cramps the treatment of the subject with which the paper proposes to deal. A separate discussion at greater length would have been very welcome. What Prof. Elmslie says about the moral difficulties connected with the conquest of Canaan is good, though there is nothing particularly new said, and we cannot think that the heart of the matter has been touched. As a whole, the treatment of Gideon does not equal his analysis of Samson's character and life. Of course Gideon does not offer the same opportunity.

The Higher Criticism—is it Biblical or Anti-Biblical?* Must the old view of the Bible be given up, and there be substituted for it a new view by which its authority and trustworthiness will be seriously impaired? We do not object to the application of the most searching tests to the books of Scripture, and the most thorough scrutiny as to their real origin; but, to take a single instance, we think it capable of demonstration that Moses did write the Pentateuch, and that any other view contravenes the explicit testimony of our Lord. The discussion about the absolute inerrancy of the original autographs of Scripture does not touch the real gravity of the case. The historical truth and the divine authority of the Bible stand or fall together. If Moses is the author of the Pentateuch, its historic truth is placed beyond controversy. But what confidence can be put in the history if, as the friendly critic Dr. Driver says, the records are from four hundred to a thousand years subsequent to the events which they relate, and are based upon the popular traditions of the time when they were prepared? The arguments used by the higher critics to

* A sermon by Prof. Wm. H. Green, D. D., LL. D., in *N. Y. Independent*, Jan. 28, 1892.

prove the composite character of the Pentateuch come to naught. Their assumption of the existence of duplicate and discrepant statements as a pervading feature of the Pentateuch are but assumptions, nothing more. The way in which the several alleged redactors have handled the material is most unfortunate for the historical value of their work, as there is no way of ascertaining how far they may have warped the accounts from their proper original intent by their well-meant but mistaken efforts at correcting or harmonizing them. Then does not the history of the Mosaic age rest upon a quicksand? Can anything of consequence be certainly known regarding it? It is not enough for the holders of these critical views to tell us that they believe in the truth of the Pentateuch, that they believe it to be inspired of God, and that they believe it to be infallible in all matters of faith and duty. Of course we do not question these statements of their personal faith, but this does not prove their critical theories to be harmless, and we have shown that their hypotheses undermine the historical truth, the divine inspiration, and the authority of the Pentateuch. The general acceptance of their view must lead ultimately to the denial of its inspiration even in that qualified sense in which these critics profess to accept it now, as well as to the denial of its veracity as history, as surely as the tree will bear fruit after its own kind.

It is interesting to compare this statement by Prof. Green of his views concerning the composition of the Pentateuch, with that of Prof. E. C. Bissell in his recent *Christian Union* article, a synopsis of which appeared in the February STUDENT. Prof. Green makes no concessions of any sort to the higher criticism, while Prof. Bissell finds a certain amount of truth in their hypotheses. Gradations exist within the conservative school of critics as well as within the progressive school. Do not these many variations of view signify that we are only working toward, and have not yet reached, the complete truth about the origin of the first five Old Testament books, taking them as a particular instance of the whole problem as to the origin of the Scriptures? Is it not therefore advisable to proceed with caution and good humor, being especially careful to avoid any misrepresentation or incrimination of those who see the matter differently from ourselves,—this at least until there can be brought about a larger agreement among the members themselves of the two respective schools. It isn't so much the individual opinion of any one scholar, as it is the collective opinion of a large number of scholars, that men recognize as authoritative in these problems. To secure such agreement should be the objective of all this discussion at present, and it may be questioned whether it is wise to appeal to the masses in support of one's position when the solution depends so largely upon knowledge which only a scholar can acquire.

The Virgin-Birth—Its Expectation and Publication.* The question before us is, when did the idea and knowledge of the virgin-birth of the Messiah enter the public mind? (1) Was this virgin-birth a feature of the Messianic expectation prior to the advent of Christ? There was certainly no official method for clearly discerning this mark in the eagerly awaited Messiah. Mary's reply to the angel's announcement (Lk. 1:34) is diametrically opposed to any such idea on her part. Joseph would scarcely have meditated divorce (Matt. 1:19) if he had been aware of such an expectation. There is nothing in the history of the period to indicate that there was any such phase of the Messianic expectation. It was psychologically impossible beforehand to read in or into Isaiah's "Immanuel prophecy" (7:14) any such event as took place in Mary. The fulfilments of prophecies indicated in the first two chapters of Matthew are of the Rabbinical type, and are at least questionable. (2) Was

* By Prof. W. F. Steele, Ph. D., in *Methodist Review*, Jan.-Feb. 1892.

there after the advent and during the life of Jesus a belief that his virgin-birth would be a credential of the Messiah? In case of one claiming to be the Messiah, the inquiry as to the manner of his birth would then be one of the first questions asked. Yet there is no record that either His Jewish enemies or Jesus himself ever introduced the subject of the manner of his birth. That Joseph was his actual father was everywhere and always assumed (Lk. 2:48; 4:22; Matt. 13:55; Jno. 1:45; 6:42; et al). Matthew, writing two generations after the birth of Jesus, makes Joseph's adoptive relation clear (Matt. 1:16), but he does so in the light of facts made known after Jesus' death. Our records give freely the mocking charges made against Christ by his foes (Lk. 7:34; 15:2; Jno. 8:48), but there is never a breath of Jewish scandal about his birth. The only satisfactory view is, that the virgin-birth was not anticipated, nor during Jesus' life once thought of as a credential of Messiahship. (3) When, then, did Jesus' virgin-birth become known? Joseph did not tell of it. Mary apparently trusted to divine providence to bring forth that truth when and where proper. Even up to the moment of death on the cross, when the facts of Jesus' life and his claims for himself were all known, the virgin-birth was unknown to any, save his mother. But in the light of the resurrection and exaltation of her Son, and the bursting forth of the Christian Church, what more natural than that the long-closed heart should open, and that the long-sealed lips should attest to the other Marys, to Peter, to John and Luke, the long-pondered, the now believable (Jno. 3:4, 13; 16:12), the now explained and explanatory fact, of his virgin-birth?

The writer's treatment of his theme is careful and commendable, though at times lacking in due delicacy. The conclusion at which he arrives is that of most scholars in the Church, and seems the only one which corresponds with the facts as we have them. The vital discussion relating to the early chapters of Matthew and Luke does not concern the subject of Prof. Steele's paper, but questions what he assumes—the historicity of the accounts of the virgin-birth of Jesus. This is a less easy and a more important problem.

The Inerrancy of Scripture.* In this contention as to the absolute inerrancy of Scripture, seeing as I think truth on both sides, I am desirous of saying a calm and mediating word, which is this: *Revelation, but not Inspiration, necessarily implies inerrancy.* What God expressly reveals must be true; but many have come beneath the inspiration of his Spirit without being rendered infallible thereby. It seems to me that the stress of the argument for the authority of Scripture is changing. It is the revealed rather than the inspired character of the Bible which nowadays renders the Bible authoritative. That the record exists is due to Inspiration, but that the record is the supreme arbiter in matters of faith and practice, is due to Revelation. He who believes most strongly that the errancy of Scripture is relatively unimportant, and he who can hold firmly to the inerrancy of revelation, will be calm and confident during the present controversy. Has the Bible a message for man as man that is found nowhere else, does it contain a series of unique revelations from God to man? The truest anthropology and the truest soteriology are the Biblical. Then the question of absolute inerrancy becomes merely theoretical and esoteric. So long as the Bible convinces the practical man, to say nothing of the diligent student of its pages, of its unique Divine origin, its unique prophecy, its unique apostolic teaching, its unique Gospel, what matters it whether the

* By Prin. Alfred Cave, D. D., in *Homiletic Review*, Feb. 1892.

Scriptures are wholly inerrant or not? That there is not absolute inerrancy in the Bible is a matter of fact. No ingenuity can reconcile 2 Kings 8:26 and 2 Chron. 22:2, or 1 Sam. 12:11 and Heb. 11:32. The problems associated with the quotation of the Old Testament in the New cannot be solved on any such theory. The varying reports of our Lord's words, as given in the several Gospels, are instructive in this connection. But these discrepancies are largely due to errors in transcription. Serious inconsistencies between one part of Scripture and another, or between the statements of Scripture and the certain conclusions of profane knowledge, are *not* proved. And certain supposed errors in the Bible are very apt to show themselves truth upon further research.

Confusion results from the use of the expression "inerrant," as applied to the Scriptures, without any further definition. One always wants to ask, *in what respects* inerrant? A says, in respect of word, figures, geography, the minutest literary, scientific and circumstantial details, as well as of the more important things. B says, inerrant in respect of its essential teachings, so that they contain a revelation from God to man which becomes his ultimate standard of belief and conduct. A and B will both affirm inerrancy of the Scriptures; whereupon A denies B the right to use the term, and B proceeds to question A's familiarity with the phenomena of the Biblical history. If Principal Cave is correct—and his discussion seems to reach the root of the matter,—both were fighting for an inconsequential post, while the real battle has moved to another part of the field. The vital problem grants a certain degree and kind of errancy, and then asks: can an inerrant revelation, absolutely infallible, be transmitted by a vehicle which is fallible and errant, so proved in at least some respects?

The Teaching of Jesus as related to that of the Apostles.* Though we have secondary sources of information, the Old Testament and the record of its own enlarging life, the Church chiefly depends for its knowledge of Christianity upon the two prime sources, the teaching of Jesus and the teaching of his apostles. Which of these deserves precedence over the other as regards authority and value? Their mutual relation forces this question upon one, for they are not contemporaneous, nor are they coördinate, and the themes with which they deal are not mutually exclusive; furthermore, the teaching is, in each case, greatly influenced as regards both form and substance by the historical conditions under which it was given, though in both cases it gives an answer to the fundamental question what right religion is. To which teaching belongs the higher, the supreme place? (1) Some think the question unnecessary and use both sources indiscriminately in building up a theological structure. (2) Some give precedence to the apostolic teaching, holding that only in connection with the founding and development of the Church could Christianity be given in its entirety as a system. (3) But the first class are not in step with biblical study, and the second are contradicted by the apostles themselves, who give to Christ and his teaching the supreme place. To attribute absolute truth to Jesus' religious ideas is to believe that they take precedence of those of all other men, his apostles included. The special illumination given to some of his disciples did not raise them to equality with him as teachers of divine truth. Yet this does not call in question the true inspiration of his apostles, nor does it imply that the apostolic teaching needs to be corrected in any of its important features by comparison with the teaching of Jesus.

This is a fundamental question in Biblical Theology, as related to the New Testament. The position taken here, by which the teaching of Jesus is made the prime source of knowledge concerning Christianity, is the one which is most historical and reasonable. It is held by the leading scholars in this comparatively new department of biblical study. From a careful working out of this relation subsisting between the teaching of the Master and his disciples some new light will surely be thrown upon Christian truth.

* Editorial in *Andover Review*, Jan. 1892.

Current Old Testament Literature.

American and Foreign Publications.

121. *The Law in the Prophets*. By Prof. Stanley Leathes. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode. 3s. 6d.
122. *How to Read the Prophets*. By Rev. Buchanan Blake, B. D. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1892. 4s.
123. *Jerusalem—the Holy City—its History and Hope*. By Mrs. Oliphant. New York: Macmillan and Co. \$3.00.
124. *Pictured Palestine*. By Jas. Neil, M. A. London: Nisbet and Co. 7s. 6d.
125. *Die Biblischen Vorstellungen vom Teufel und ihr religiöser Werth*. By Georg Längin. Leipzig: Otto Wigand.
126. *Buried Cities and Bible Countries*. By Geo. St. Clair. New York: T. Whitaker. 2.00.
127. *Have the Monuments and Papyri anything to say of the Hebrews and the Exodus?* By Rev. C. M. Cobern, Ph. D., in *Homiletic Review*, Jan. 1892.
128. *The Book of Numbers*. Editorial in *The Thinker*, Jan. 1892.
129. *Canon Driver on the Books of the Law*. Editorial in *The Thinker*, Jan. 1892.
130. *Leathes' The Law in the Prophets*. Reviewed by Prof. A. R. S. Kennedy, in *The Thinker*, Jan. 1892.
131. *New Explanation of the Sun and Moon standing still*. Editorial in *Expository Times*, Jan. 1892.
132. *The First Psalm*. By Rev. C. D. Ginsburg, LL. D., in *The Thinker*, Jan. 1892.
133. *Cheyne's Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter*. Reviewed by Prof. Whitehouse, M. A., in *Critical Review*, Jan. 1892.
134. *Psalm 16: 1-4*. By T. K. Cheyne, D. D., in *Expository Times*, Jan. 1892.
135. *David's Religion and David's Morality*. By Prin. G. C. M. Douglas, D. D., in *Expository Times*, Jan. 1892.
136. *Interpretation of the Song of Solomon*. By C. Brunston, in *Revue de Théologie*, Nov. 1891.
137. *Exposition of Isaiah 1*. By Rev. Lloyd Robinson, in *Expository Times*, Jan. 1892.
138. *Exposition of Isaiah 1: 4*. By Rev. T. B. McCorkindale, in *Expository Times*, Jan. 1892.
139. *Isaiah—One or Many?* Editorial in *The Thinker*, Jan. 1892.
140. *Löhr's Klagelieder des Jeremias*. Reviewed by Prof. A. B. Davidson, in *Critical Review*, Jan. 1892.
141. *The Book of Lamentations*. By Rev. Jas. Stalker, D. D., in *The Expositor*, Jan. 1892.
142. *Habakkuk 2: 2*. "That he may run that readeth it." Symposium in *Expository Times*, Jan. 1892.
143. *The Old Testament in the Light of the Literature of Assyria and Babylonia*. By Theo. G. Pinches, in *Expository Times*, Jan. 1892.
144. *Driver's Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. Reviewed by Prof. Ryle, M. A., in *Critical Review*, Jan. 1892; also by Prof. A. R. S. Kennedy, in *Expository Times*, Jan. 1892.
145. *Cornill's Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. Reviewed by Prof. A. B. Davidson, in *Critical Review*, Jan. 1892.
146. *An Interpolation in some Historical Books of the Bible*. Editorial in *The Thinker*, Jan. 1892.
147. "We shall yet dig up the Bible." Editorial in *Expository Times*, Jan. 1892.
148. *A Problem in the History of the Septuagint*. By Rev. Geo. Farmer, in *Expository Times*, Jan. 1892.
149. *The Higher Criticism—is it Biblical or Anti-Biblical?* By Prof. W. H. Green, D. D., LL. D., in N. Y. Independent, Jan. 28, 1892.
150. *What is the Bible?* By Prof. T. G. Apple, D. D., LL. D., in *Ref. Q'tly. Review*, Jan. 1892.
151. *The Inspiration of the Bible*. By Rev. W. Rupp, D. D., in *Ref. Q'tly. Review*, Jan. 1892.
152. *The Methodology of the Higher Criticism Demonstrably Unscientific*. By Prof. Watts, D. D., LL. D., in *Homiletic Review*, Jan. 1892.

Articles and Reviews.

Current New Testament Literature.

American and Foreign Publications.

153. *Marcion's Gospel—a Translation.* By Rev. J. H. Hill, M. A. Guernsey, Eng.: T. M. Bichard.
154. *Through the Eternal Spirit: A Bible Study on the Holy Ghost.* By J. E. Cumming, D. D. Stirling, Eng.: Drummond's Tract Depot. 7s. 6d.
155. *The Ascension of Our Lord.* By Prof. Milligan (Baird Lecture). London and New York: Macmillan and Co., 1892. 7s. 6d.
- Articles and Reviews.**
156. *The Epiphany.* By Prof. T. K. Cheyne, D. D., in *The Thinker*, Jan. 1892.
157. *The Teaching of Jesus as Related to that of the Apostles.* Editorial in *Andover Review*, Jan. 1892.
158. *The Origin and Development of the Messianic Consciousness of Jesus.* (In *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1891, Viertes Heft.) Reviewed by Rev. F. J. Rae, M. A., in *Critical Review*, Jan. 1892.
159. *The Greatness of John the Baptist.* By Rev. David Brown, D. D., in *The Thinker*, Jan. 1892.
160. "Deliver us from Evil." Editorial in *The Thinker*, Jan. 1892.
161. *Thieves and Robbers.* By Prof. H. R. Reynolds, D. D., in *The Thinker*, Jan. 1892.
162. *Onoma and the Baptismal Formula* By Dr. A. J. Brandt, in *The Thinker*, Jan. 1892.
163. *The Present Position of the Johannean Question, III.* By Prof. W. Sanday, D. D., in *The Expositor*, Jan. 1892.
164. *The Johannean Question.* Editorial in *The Thinker*, Jan. 1892.
165. *The Four Gospels.* By E. C. Murray, in *Presbyt. Q'tly.*, Jan. 1893.
166. *The Miracles of Christ.* By Rev. G. A. Chadwick, D. D., in *The Expositor*, Jan. 1892.
167. *Simon Bar-Jona: The Stone and the Rock.* By Mrs. T. C. Porter, in *Ref. Q'tly. Review*, Jan. 1892.
168. *Paul's Rabbinic Education.* By Rev. Samuel Weyler, in *Andover Review*, Jan. 1892.
169. *Pauline Tact.* By Rev. O. P. Eaches, in *Homiletic Review*, Jan. 1892.
170. *St. Paul's First Journey in Asia Minor.* By Prof. W. M. Ramsay, in *The Expositor*, Jan. 1892.
171. *Krenkel's Beiträge zur Aufhellung der Geschichte und der Briefe des Apostels Paulus.* Reviewed by Prof. Milligan, D. D., in *Critical Review*, Jan. 1892.
172. *Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament; Briefe an die Thessalonischer u. Korinther, Johannesches Evangelium, Briefe u. Offenbarung des Johannes.* Reviewed by Prof. Marcus Dods, D. D. *Briefe an d. Kolosser, Epheser, Philemon, die Pastoral briefe, die Briefe an d. Galater, Römer, Philipper.* Reviewed by Prof. G. G. Findlay, B. A., in *Critical Review*, Jan. 1892.
173. *Exposition of Hebrews 2:9.* By Rev. A. H. Wratzlaw, in *Expository Times*, Jan. 1892.
174. *Epistle to the Hebrews in the Syrian Church.* By Rev. G. H. Gwilliam, in *Expository Times*, Jan. 1892.
175. *The Female Diaconate of the New Testament.* By Rev. H. E. Jacobs, D. D., in *Lutheran Church Review*, Jan. 1892.
176. *Gore's Incarnation of the Son of God.* Reviewed by Canon G. Rawlinson, M. A., in *The Thinker*, Jan. 1892.
177. *Duff's The Early Church.* Reviewed by Rev. C. A. Scott, in *Critical Review*, Jan. 1892.
178. *The Bible and Present Tendencies of Religious Thought.* By Rev. A. J. H. Behrends, D. D., in *N. Y. Evangelist*, Jan. 28, 1892.
179. *The Teaching of Our Lord as to the Authority of the Old Testament. I. Introduction.* By Rev. C. J. Ellicott, D. D., in *Expository Times*, Jan. 1892.
180. *Inspiration and Criticism.* By Prof. J. Iverach, D. D., in *The Thinker*, Jan. 1892.
181. *The Inerrancy of Scripture.* By Rev. Alfred Cave, D. D., in *Homiletic Review*, Feb. 1892.
182. *Inspiration and Heresy.* By P. Cameron, in *The Arena*, Feb. 1892.
183. *The "Failure" of the Revised Version.* Editorial in *Expository Times*, Jan. 1892.
184. *Paganism and Christianity.* By Prof. Jas. Orr, D. D., in *Expository Times*, Jan. 1892.