

THE BIBLICAL WORLD

CONTINUING

The Old and New Testament Student

VOLUME II.

SEPTEMBER, 1893

NUMBER 3

THE MOST unique and the most interesting series of events in all history is that series which taken together constitutes the history of the chosen people. This history may be placed side by side with that of other nations, and the comparison will always show a superiority in at least many particulars. Covering so many centuries, presenting points of contact with so many nations, including struggles of such momentous character, bringing about results so full of significance for all the world, where is there such a history? One is at a loss to determine by what name this history should be entitled. "History of Israel" is too narrow, for so broad and significant are its lines that it might almost be called a "World's History." And, besides, a History of Israel must be as yet incomplete since Israel is still enacting history; while on the other hand, the history of which we speak, though in one sense continuing, was after all finished when, as its highest outcome, the Son of Man appeared and introduced a new order of things. The name "Bible History" signifies nothing, nor may "Biblical History" be accepted. Both are indefinite; both suggest a kind of thing which, when examined, proves to be fantastic, if not grotesque. The attempt recently made by a well known writer to show that Biblical history was a distinct kind of history with its own standards of historiography, and something to be kept apart from all other history, deserves consideration, but does not do justice to the case in hand. "History of the Old Testament" means a history of the books

constituting the Old Testament. If by "Old Testament History" we mean the history which presents itself in and through the Old Testament, and if in using the term we allow ourselves the liberty of introducing also that history from the outside which directly connects itself with Old Testament history during the progress of the same, this, perhaps, is the best of all the terms which have been suggested.

IT MAY seem a bold assertion, and yet it is true, that this history has never yet been written. We have in our possession neither a manual of this history satisfactory for use in the classroom, nor any exhaustive and scientific treatment of it. "Outlines" and "Bible Histories" and "Histories of Israel" have, to be sure, been written, but there is nowhere a treatment which, while recognizing the established results of modern scholarship, conserves sufficiently the statements of truth most commonly accepted. These outlines or histories are either too old, antedating the great discoveries of the last twenty years, and lacking entirely in the new spirit of historical research, or too new, based upon mere conjecture and neglecting to consider certain most important factors.

The question is asked every day, What book may be placed in the hands of students to furnish them a true idea of Old Testament history? and every day the question goes unanswered. It is true that Ewald has grasped as no other man the meaning and significance of Israel's history, but if Ewald were living, much that is fundamental in his treatment would undergo radical change. It is true that Stade has treated the whole subject in a most scholarly way and with all the modern discoveries within his reach, but Stade's work will live no longer than Stade himself lives; in part because he has not shown the skill or the soul of a great historian; partly because he has blinded himself to many things clearly seen by others. The Old Testament history has not yet been written. The work of writing it is a work of the future. More than two thousand years have passed since the last event of this strange and wonderful history was enacted.

Nevertheless, the most important events constituting it are still held in doubt. Its real significance is only partly comprehended; its philosophy is still unknown. Who will undertake the task of giving to the world a treatment which will do justice to the character of the events treated?

THE DIFFICULTIES in the way of properly performing such a task are many and great. The man who undertakes to write an Old Testament history must know intimately all ancient history. The beginnings, even from the most modern point of view, lie far back in what are really prehistoric times; the end will not be reached until the new dispensation has been ushered in at the coming of the Saviour. There is scarcely any ancient nation whose history is familiar to us with which Israel did not come in contact, and from which Israel did not receive something. To understand what was received and the results of the new influence thus exerted, requires in every case a knowledge of the nation exerting the influence. The fact that the whole is so far removed from us, while in some respects advantageous, is in other respects a source of serious difficulty. We are, without doubt, better able now to understand the philosophy of it all, but since the philosophy is based upon the actual facts which it seeks to explain, and since the very existence of these facts is, as many think, questionable, the historian does his work with much uncertainty. A century or two ago before the real development of the critical spirit, when men for the most part were accustomed to accept that which had been handed down to them, the task of writing history was comparatively easy. To-day the case is different. Everything must be held up for examination and for test. The foundations even, as it seems to some, have been shaken. The true historian finds himself rebuffed on every side. An independence of judgment and freedom from prejudice of every kind, an overwhelming desire for truth and the courage to announce the truth when once it is supposed to have been discovered, all these characteristics are required. The difficulties are of many kinds and many of each kind.

BEFORE the historian may fairly undertake his task, certain other important work must have been completed. The backbone of the Old Testament has been said to be the prophetic element which it contains. This prophetic element takes the form of story of past achievement and past humiliation; criticism of present conditions and present tendencies; announcement of future ideals, promising future glory and prosperity, and at the same time threatening future disgrace and destruction. This prophetic work had a beginning and growth, a culmination and decline, and at last an end. This history might almost be said to be Old Testament history itself. It includes every utterance of every prophet, all of which must be interpreted in order to secure the conception of things which was intended by Israel's greatest men. Before an Old Testament history can be written, there must first be written the history of prophecy.

THE history of a nation is largely moulded by its institutions and laws. If this is true of every nation, it was peculiarly true of Israel. First of all must be determined whether Israel's institutions and laws came objectively without reference to the various situations in which the nation was placed, and the exigencies which from time to time arose, or, as among other nations, from generation to generation, from century to century. If the latter alternative is chosen, the question again presents itself: Did the Israelitish law contain in it a definite factor which regulated events and exigencies so as to prepare the way and provide the demand for the laws which were to be promulgated; or was Israelitish law like Roman law, simply a matter of ordinary development under the general providence of an all-seeing God? Put the question in another form. Is there a history of Israelitish legislation, and, if so, of what nature is this history? To-day the question may be regarded settled. There was a history of Israelitish legislation, and *this* history, as well as that of the prophetic influence, must be written before it will be possible to write a true history of the nation Israel.

Nor is this all. Events and institutions constitute, to be sure,

the larger part of the nation's history, but a part equally important is the nation's thinking; its method of dealing with the great problems of life; this is something internal and fundamental. Israel had a philosophy; crude, perhaps, and unsatisfying, but a philosophy which must be included in its history. When did this philosophy begin? What were the main principles upon which it was founded? and, for the sake of convenience, regarding philosophy and theology as one, what were the steps in its development? How fully had these conceptions grown before the end of the Old Testament had come? The history of Israel's philosophy and theology is, after all, the greatest division in Israel's history, and the working out of this must precede a satisfactory discussion of the history at large.

WE who are interested in the Old Testament, whether as students or as scholars, have before us, therefore, three preliminary lines of work which we must do before we may understand properly or treat comprehensively this subject concerning which so much is said and so little accurately known. Something of the history, to be sure, must be known before we begin the study of any one of these preliminary subjects. Much of this history will be discovered in connection with the study of them, but the history itself in all its fullness and in all its significance, will present itself and will be understood only as we have prepared ourselves broadly and thoroughly by this preliminary work. Does any importance attach to the order in which these three preliminary subjects shall be taken? No. The study of each is the study of all three. Given at the beginning the barest familiarity with the general facts, we may take up with profit any one of the three. The priest, the prophet, the sage,—each had his work to do for Israel and for the world. Each did his work, and in the doing of it made his contribution to that unity, complex and complicated it may be, but still a unity which in all its variety makes up what we may call "Old Testament History."

IN all instruction and investigation the danger most near is that of emphasizing what is not fundamental. In a field of study like that of the Bible, where new discoveries, new views, new theories are so interesting to so wide a circle and so closely related to practical life, the danger is all the greater. How many of the thinkers, investigators, theologians, critics of the past have thought their views essential to the progress of the Church. And yet the Church quietly laid them aside and lived on without them. How much trouble and even disaster has been caused by some sincere men who insisted that what they believed was fundamental for all others. They forced upon all what in fact was temporary and incidental, not vital and permanent. Scholars, specialists everywhere are prone to this fault. Bible students have before them in the varied contents of the Book the best antidote for this disease. The Bible is ever striking out essential truths. Its writers hit at the center, and hence their thoughts will live in the hearts of men forever.

ON THE DATE OF THE CRUCIFIXION.

By the REV. ARTHUR WRIGHT, M.A.,
Fellow and Tutor of Queens' College, Cambridge, England.

III.

Did the crucifixion take place on the fourteenth day of the month Nisan or on the fifteenth?

Nisan (or Abib, as it was called in olden time) was the first month of the Jewish year and corresponded roughly to our March-April. We cannot fix it more precisely, for in the first place the months were lunar, and were therefore continually varying with respect to the year; in the next place they were settled by observation merely. If some ripe ears of barley could be found as the new moon was expected, the new year was declared to have begun; if not, a month was intercalated. In critical cases therefore a late or early spring might just make the difference. Similarly, if the moon's thin crescent was visible on the expected night, the ensuing day was proclaimed holy as the first day of the month; if not, even though the moon's absence was caused by clouds or rain, a day was intercalated, but of course only one.

By these simple expedients the calendar was kept fairly accurate without any of those elaborate calculations by which Julius Cæsar put the matter on its present basis. Modern precision however was never thought of. The year did not begin on the right day, but on the nearest new moon to the right day, or one month later; the month did not begin at the true new moon, but when the moon was first visible, which would be a day and half or two days later. The day itself did not begin at sunset, but when from one to three stars were visible. Every thing was vague and empirical.

It is impossible, therefore, for us now to recover an ancient Jewish date with any certainty. We cannot be sure to a day,

sometimes not to a month. It is however probable that already in the time of Christ contact with Greek civilization had introduced some more systematic methods of calculation.

The Jews were not seriously inconvenienced by the uncertainty of the calendar. Those who lived in the Holy Land received a fortnight's notice of the passover's approach, ten days' notice of the time for selecting the paschal lamb. Whether therefore they intended to keep the feast in Jerusalem or to eat it in their own village, there was ample time for preparation. The Jews of the dispersion came to pentecost rather than to passover.

On the fourteenth day of Nisan the paschal lamb was slain "between the evenings," (3-5 P. M.) according to Josephus, and was eaten the same night. In legal language (as the day legally began at sunset) it was eaten on the fifteenth, but in popular language it was eaten on the night of the fourteenth. To prevent misconception I shall adhere to popular language throughout the rest of this paper, and reckon the days, as we do, from midnight to midnight.

Next day, the fifteenth, was the first day of unleavened bread, one of the greatest festivals in the year, for it commemorated the deliverance from Egypt. Josephus, however, tells us that in the time of Christ the fourteenth was commonly called the first day of unleavened bread, and we find it so styled in the gospels. We must not suppose that the great festival had been shifted: that was certainly not the case: but the Rabbis in their endeavor "to set a hedge about the law" had required all leaven to be destroyed one day sooner than the law directed, and so there were practically eight days of unleavened bread now. The numbering therefore was altered, the festivals being on the second and the eighth instead of the first and the seventh.

The question is, Did Christ assemble his disciples to eat the passover on the evening of the fourteenth or was he at that time already resting in the grave, the last conflict being over? Strange to say this question has been long debated. Various makeshift answers have been given. But with the increasing sense of honesty which marks our age, some of the best scholars have dared to say "I do not know."

Let us first read S. Mark's testimony. "Now after two days was the passover and the feast of unleavened bread And on the first day of unleavened bread when (the Jews) used to sacrifice the passover, the disciples say unto him, where wilt thou that we go and prepare that thou mayest eat the passover?" , Say ye to the Master of the house the Teacher saith, Where is my lodging where I must eat the passover with my disciples? And they prepared the passover."

SS. Matthew and Luke fully confirm this. The latter adds that Jesus said, "I have earnestly desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer."

If we had the synoptists alone, no one would doubt that Jesus ate the passover the night before the crucifixion and that he was therefore crucified on the fifteenth.

But now let us look at S. John.

"*Before*" (not "at") "the feast of the passover Jesus" partook of the last supper (13: 1). During the meal Judas went out and, the cause of his departure being secret, some supposed, since Judas held the bag, that Jesus said unto him, "Buy what we need for the feast" (13: 29). They were not therefore already concluding the feast, but were looking forward to it. "Judas went out, and it was night." Yet the shops were not shut, as they would have been on the night of the fourteenth, for legally next day's festival would have begun on which no work was allowed. Next morning S. John tells us that the chief priests "themselves entered not into the prætorium, that they might not be defiled but might eat the passover" (18: 28). They had not, therefore, eaten the passover the night before, but looked forward to doing so that night. "And it was the preparation of the passover" when they crucified Him (19: 14). "The Jews therefore, since it was Preparation, that the bodies might not remain on the cross upon the sabbath" . . . applied to Pilate that they might be taken down (19: 31). We have seen that Preparation almost certainly means Friday, in which case these verses do not affect the question. They count neither way. Still we have a singularly long list of dates, some of which seem to demand the fourteenth, all permit of it. If we read S.

John's gospel alone, no one would doubt that our Lord was crucified on the fourteenth, and therefore did not partake of the Passover.

Let us first glance at some of the solutions which have been offered of this difficult problem at various times.

1. Eusebius suggested and S. Chrysostom developed the idea, which has been very generally held, that the chief priests had been, so busily employed in compassing Christ's arrest and conducting his trial, that they had found no time to eat the passover on the proper night, but had put off the duty of doing so till the fifteenth.

But Christ's arrest appears to have taken place after midnight. The passover was eaten when the sun had set. The chief priests were rigid legalists and would have abundance of time for celebrating the most solemn of their ordinances. Moreover, this supposition leaves two out of S. John's three statements unexplained.

2. The majority, therefore, of modern interpreters have inclined rather to the view that Christ himself anticipated the passover, eating it one day sooner than usual because he knew that his hour was come and because he "earnestly desired to eat it with them before he suffered."

But S. Mark distinctly writes that it was the disciples who suggested to him that the time for eating the passover had come, and that they did so "on the first day of unleavened bread when (the Jews) sacrificed the passover." Nothing can be clearer than this. The usual day, the usual hour, was come. They fancied that he had overlooked it, and they call attention to the necessity of making preparations for the universal religious duty.

Moreover, although the law directed every master of a house to kill the paschal lamb himself, no restriction about place being given, the later centralization required that the lamb must be slain in the temple. The Jews of the dispersion could not eat the passover except when they went up—perhaps once in their lives—to the Holy City. Now the priesthood have refused to sacrifice the lamb a day before the usual time. And the advocates of

this view are obliged to maintain that no lamb was obtained. They point out that in the narrative of the last supper neither lamb nor bitter herbs are mentioned. There seems to have been nothing on the table but bread, wine, and one bowl containing fish or salad or other condiment. It was (as S. John describes it) an ordinary supper. This difficulty we shall consider presently. Meanwhile S. Mark's words "Prepare that thou mayest eat the passover" and "They made ready the passover" must surely mean the paschal lamb.

3. Rabbinic students have suggested an entirely new explanation which in recent times has gained a wide acceptance. They contend that by "eating the passover" S. John meant something quite different from what S. Mark meant by the same expression. S. Mark plainly intended the paschal lamb, but S. John refers to a festal meal which is not mentioned in the Pentateuch but was prescribed by the tradition of the elders. Commonly called the *Chāḡḡāh*, it could be eaten on any of the seven days of the feast, but was usually taken on the second—the old "first"—day. It was considered of equal or even greater importance than the paschal lamb, and the term, "eating the passover" included it or sometimes alluded to it alone. In S. John, they argue, the expression "eat the passover" must refer to the *Chāḡḡāh*, for if the chief priests had defiled themselves by entering the Prætorium, such lesser defilement, caused by the presence of Roman eagles and other idolatrous signs, possibly also of leavened bread, would always be removed by washing the body at sunset. There was nothing after such purification to prevent them from eating the passover.

The feeling against idolatry and idolaters was particularly strong in that age, when the Jews were daily brought into contact with it. I can hardly believe that such pollution was so lightly got rid of. Moreover, the scribes would wish to attend the sacrifice as well as the supper. If the *Chāḡḡāh* could be eaten on any of the seven days, why should not the chief priests have postponed it till the third or fourth day, since their presence in Pilate's court was so imperatively demanded. But, indeed, I am rather suspicious about these later Jewish ceremonies. The destruction of

Jerusalem, which altered the whole procedure of sacrifice, created a revolution in the observance of the Law. The Talmud, from which our knowledge of the *Chägigāh* is derived, was not written until five centuries after the city was destroyed, and is no sure guide to Jewish customs in the time of Christ. No ancient authors imagined that "eating the passover" in S. John meant something quite different from "eating the passover" in S. Mark.

And there is another difficulty. S. John tells us that all our Lord's adherents were excommunicated (9 : 22 ; 12 : 42). And if so, it would be impossible for them to get a lamb sacrificed except by intrigue to which they would not stoop.

Professor Hort, a few months before his death, had a correspondence with Professor Sanday on this subject. Only a few extracts from Dr. Hort's letters have been published, but Dr. Sanday, who has advocated the *Chägigāh*, acknowledged himself convinced. He admitted that there is a real discrepancy between the synoptists and S. John, and that none of the explanations which had been offered could be considered satisfactory.¹

Meanwhile my own examination of the synoptic problem had forced upon me another solution on entirely new lines.

When you look at the synoptic gospels from an historical point of view the first thing that strikes you is the extraordinary fact that they do not bring Christ to Jerusalem until he entered it to be crucified. Now the more you consider this, the more remarkable it becomes.

It cannot represent the whole truth. Even if we rejected the fourth gospel altogether, we should feel certain, both from antecedent probability and from certain casual expressions in the synoptists (as "O Jerusalem . . . how often would I have gathered thy children together . . . ") that Christ was no stranger in the Holy City. A Judean ministry is quite as necessary as a Galilean.

Whence then came the omission? Did S. Peter entirely pass over the work done in Judæa? I do not think so. The very fact that S. Mark devotes six chapters out of sixteen to

¹ *The Expositor*. Vol. V., p. 183.

events which took place in the precincts of Jerusalem, makes me suspicious. Important though the passover was, it seems to be narrated at undue length. The proportions of the history are destroyed.

And when we look closer, there are many things in those six chapters which have no particular affinity to the passover, but would decidedly gain in significance, if they were put a year or two before it. They show how public feeling was educated; but that very education could scarcely be completed in a fortnight. Events in real life move much more slowly.

And there is one incident—the cleansing of the temple—which S. John has placed at the beginning, and not at the close, of our Saviour's ministry. It is very much to be noticed that S. John describes the cleansing of the temple as happening at a passover; but not at the final passover which is the only one known to S. Mark, but at an earlier passover which Christ passed in Jerusalem, some say three years, some two, those who consider John 6 : 4 to be spurious, one year before the crucifixion.

It has been usual to suppose that there were two cleansings of the temple, one at the earlier passover, one at the last. Such a repetition is, to say the least, highly improbable. That Christ should cleanse the temple once, is intelligible; that he should do so when he first came forward as the Messiah, to test the obedience of the Jews and appeal to their religious feelings, I can understand. But to what end would a repetition serve? And if repeated, why should not S. Mark or S. John have told us so?

I know that many persons object to admit so serious a chronological discrepancy in S. Mark, who was S. Peter's interpreter. But let us look at the facts calmly. S. Mark only brings Christ to Jerusalem at the last.

Anything which happened at Jerusalem during an earlier visit must therefore either be omitted by S. Mark, transferred into Galilee, or inserted into holy week. The structure of his gospel permits no other alternative. In short the gospel is not arranged on a chronological but on a topical plan.

If you ask how this is, my answer is that S. Peter did not give a complete course of lessons, nor did he arrange them in

order. S. Mark, as Papias tells us, did not write in order, because S. Peter's lessons had been adapted to the immediate wants of the pupils, one lesson being given at a time as the occasion demanded. S. Peter left them so, and S. Mark could not supply the defect. He was not an eye-witness, and could not recover the true sequence.

Professor Sanday fully agrees with me on this point. "The simple fact is," he writes, "that the synoptic gospels are only a series of incidents loosely strung together, with no chronology at all worthy of the name."¹

I earnestly exhort all biblical students to examine into this question of the chronology of the synoptists for themselves. If I am right, the exhausting labors and tortuous explanations of the harmonists, in their endeavor to reconcile what cannot be reconciled, have been wasted.

I wish heartily that any words of mine could save future students of the gospel from what I am convinced is a useless task. There is so much to be done in more profitable researches, that I grudge the time and energy spent on harmonies. When these evangelists narrate the same events in the same order, we are not entitled to infer that they follow the true chronology, but only that they follow S. Mark, whose order is not chronological.

Now if it be conceded that the cleansing of the temple belonged to the earlier passover, it is clear that the section in which Christ was asked, "By what authority doest thou these things?" (Mark 11:27-33) must be transferred to the earlier passover also. And if so, I should transfer several sections which are found in the next chapter, not, perhaps, to the first passover, but rather to one or other of those subsequent visits which our Lord paid to Jerusalem. These are Mark 12: 13-17, "Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar?" 18-27, the seven brethren marrying; 28-36, the great commandment of the law; 38-40, the warning against the scribes. All these sections have no real connection with holy week, but will gain in significance if we put them into an earlier period.

¹*Expositor*, Vol. v., page 16.

And I should then carry these suggestions one step further. S. Peter seems to me to have narrated how Christ, who was obedient to the law for our sakes, ate the passover in the Holy City with his disciples on his earlier visit, when he was not yet excommunicate. Then they "made ready the Passover," ate the paschal lamb and the bitter herb, drank the wine, sang the hymn with all the customary ceremonies.

One, two, or more years later, Christ again assembled his disciples for the last supper. On this occasion he gave them the sign of the man bearing the pitcher of water. On this occasion he instituted the eucharist at the close of the meal, and spoke those discourses which S. John has recorded. It was the thirteenth of the month Nisan, and, therefore, not the passover.

S. Mark has fused the two significant suppers into one, by transferring to the latter what really belong to the former. The other evangelists have followed him in this, as in all the rest of his chronological confusions.

Some one may object that S. Luke records this sentence, "I have earnestly desired to eat this *passover* with you before I suffer," thus connecting the two meals together, which I separate by a year or more. This sentence, I reply, is peculiar to S. Luke and if any one will read what I have written about S. Luke's "Editorial notes"¹ and will then examine S. Luke's Gospel to ascertain whether I have not good grounds for what I say, he will not think that verse a serious objection. The thought pressing hard on our Lord's human mind was, "This is my last meal." The western catechists have slightly modified the expression of it, or S. Luke himself has inserted the word "passover," as is his wont.

It is possible, however, that there was no such blending of narratives as I have supposed, but that the whole scene should be transferred to the earlier passover and rehearsed at the last supper. Averse though I am to vain repetitions, there is one repetition which I admit would have been full of significance. What if Christ made the personal covenant by the breaking of bread between himself and his disciples at the first passover in

¹*Composition of the Four Gospels*, pp. 116-127. (Macmillans, New York).

Jerusalem, renewed it at his second passover in Capernaum (John 6: 4) with a larger company than the twelve, and in close connection with the feeding of the five thousand, and finally repeated it a third time on the night on which he was betrayed, with perhaps the additional word that his body, which they were to eat, would soon be broken for them; his blood, which they were to drink, would soon be shed? In this way we shall both make the sacrament more intelligible as a covenant of brotherhood between himself and his people; we shall explain and justify the mysterious language of S. John 6: 51, which has always been a difficulty with interpreters; we shall justify S. Peter's statement that our Lord Jesus Christ on the same night in which he was betrayed took bread, and we shall reduce S. Mark's chronological error to a *minimum*.

Our records of Christ's life are fragmentary. If it were not for a single incidental statement in S. John,¹ we should have concluded confidently that the sacrament of holy baptism was first instituted after the resurrection. And if we now know that it had been practiced by the apostles from the commencement of Christ's ministry, what wonder if the other sacrament had been celebrated too? We might have to modify our conception of it, and regard it as a covenant of union rather than a commemorative sacrifice; in short, as a sacrifice, according to the ancient conception of the word rather than the modern, but we should, I think, only understand its real meaning the better for such a change.

The question discussed in this paper is a very serious one. Scholars are beginning to acknowledge freely that there is a contradiction between the synoptists and S. John respecting the day of the month of the crucifixion. The old explanations of the difference are failing or have already failed. The genuineness of the Fourth Gospel is at stake. Under these circumstances I have pointed out that the contradiction does not lie between SS. Peter and John, both of whom must have known the facts, but between SS. Mark and John, of whom S. Mark did not know the facts, and may have confused the records, as S. John shows him to have done on other occasions.

¹ John 4: 1-2.

I have then shown how S. Mark's error may have arisen, and how very slight it is, and how easily it may have been made. Those who at all hazards maintain the inerrancy of Holy Scripture will necessarily reject my proposals; but from others I ask a patient hearing. It is important to remember that ancient opinion followed S. John in accepting the fourteenth as the day of the crucifixion. Not only is this proven by the existence of the Quarto-decimans in the second century, but it was the belief of Apollinaris, Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Hippolytus. Not till the fourth century did the other opinion begin to prevail.

HEBREW HISTORIOGRAPHY.

By THEODORO G. SOARES,
The University of Chicago.

There is very much material, which would properly be included in a complete discussion of the subject of Hebrew Historiography, which yet may easily be eliminated from a treatment of the subject, whose chief purpose is to discover the principles, in which it is unique and different from the historiography of other peoples. Thus at once may be excluded the historical portions of the Apocrypha, for so far as they are different from the canonical books of the Old Testament, they are entirely similar to the historical writings of other peoples; and in so far as they are similar to the canonical histories, they are simply imitations, demanding no separate treatment. The same thing indeed may be said regarding the works of Philo and Josephus, and with regard to the historical portions of the New Testament, the main principles of the historiography seem to be essentially the same as those of the Old.

There still remains, however, a vast amount of material, besides the historical books of the Old Testament Scriptures in their present form, which demands consideration in a treatment of this subject. I refer to the authorities upon which the Old Testament histories are based. There are a large number of song-books, story-books, chronicles, biographies, histories, etc., to which direct reference is made in the Old Testament, but none of which, as separate works, are in existence at the present day. There is abundant evidence that there existed valuable Royal Chronicles of David and Solomon and the later kings. There is specific reference to the "The Book of the Wars of Jehovah," "The Book of Jasher," which seems to have been a collection of national songs, "The Commentary of Iddo the Seer," which

seems to have been a collection of historical stories, "The Acts of the Kings of Israel," and those great works, "The Books of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah and of the Kings of Israel," together with many other writings. These works have absolutely perished, but it is supposed that portions of very many of them still exist, as originally written (albeit somewhat divided and abridged), and are to be found in the different documents into which modern criticism has divided the Old Testament histories. And besides these, there are numerous other works to which no reference is made in the Old Testament, but whose existence is demanded by the documentary theories of the critics.

In a thoroughly scientific treatment of the subject of Hebrew Historiography, a minute discussion of these various works would be essential. But it is difficult to discuss works which are no longer extant, even if they exist in fragmentary form as different strata in the formation of other works. And furthermore, I think the great principles of that historiography, which is peculiar to the Hebrew people, are not affected by any theory of these older works. I shall, therefore, confine myself, in this paper, to a discussion of the principles, which governed the historians, who gave us the Old Testament histories in their present form; dealing of course in the proper place with the use which those historians made of these older sources and authorities.

The field to be covered then will comprise the historical portions of the Hexateuch, the Book of Judges, to which may be appended the Book of Ruth, and the Books of Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah. I omit the book of Esther as rather biographical and didactic than historical, as wanting in some of the essential characteristics of the Hebrew histories, and, moreover, because it is a book about which scholarship is very much in dispute. There are other historical portions of the Old Testament, but there are no other histories.

An interesting fact with regard to all these historical works, with the possible exception of Ezra and Nehemiah, is the entire absence of any reference to the identity of the men, to whom we are indebted for their compilation. The Pentateuch nowhere

ascribes its authorship, as a whole, to the hand of Moses; the book which is called by the name of Joshua contains no suggestion that that warrior was its author; Samuel could not by any possibility have written more than a small portion of the book which bears his name, and the other histories, even in their titles, are anonymous. We know that Nathan wrote a history of David, that Ahijah wrote a life of Solomon, that Shemaiah made a record of the acts of Rehoboam, but the great prophets and sacred writers, who gave us the histories which we call the Books of Judges, and Samuel, and Kings, and Chronicles, men whose religious influence in their day could have been in no wise inferior to that of Elijah and Isaiah, these men remain forever nameless and unknown.

Proceeding now to the characteristics of these Old Testament histories, it is to be noted, in the first place, that without exception, they are all constructed on a framework that is chronological. I do not mean of course that the histories are scientifically chronological, but that the general plan is according to the time-order of events. The histories of the patriarchs are arranged in the order, in which those worthies actually lived. The account from the exodus to the conquest of the land follows in the main the chronological sequence of the history. And in the Books of Kings and Chronicles, the chronological basis is particularly manifest, for the actual order of the kings of Israel, and of Judah, is carefully preserved.

These facts are interesting, as an indication that the Hebrew historians had that fundamental conception, without which historiography worthy of the name is impossible, that history is not a concatenation of isolated facts, brought together without regard to their mutual dependence, but that it constitutes a thread of narrative, and a chronological evolution.

On the other hand, while it is true that the histories as a whole are arranged upon a chronological basis, yet this statement must be modified by several considerations. A very common feature of the biblical histories is the existence of addenda, or appendices. For example, the Book of Judges was perhaps once complete at the 16th chapter, and the narratives of the migration of

the tribe of Dan, and of the events at Gibeah, contained in chapters 17-21, are a later addition to the book. Indeed, probably the Book of Ruth, though it appears as a separate writing, is really to be considered as an addendum to the Book of Judges.

The existence of such addenda is as common, perhaps, in our modern writings as in those of the ancient Hebrews; with this important distinction, however, that we carefully indicate the exact nature and the true historical and chronological position of such material, while they simply tacked it on to what had previously been written. And it may be observed at this point that very much of the difference between our histories and those of the Hebrews is entirely to be accounted for by the absence of the simple devices by which we indicate the difference between a main narrative and those parts which are subordinate. Matter which we should put into a foot-note was necessarily by them incorporated into the text. Distinctions which we should mark by parentheses, inverted commas, italics, smaller type, and the thousand and one little devices by which in a modern book the eye is made immediately to catch the relation of the parts, are of course entirely wanting in those ancient works. And a consideration of this fact is very important to the subject which we have in hand.

Again, in modification of the statement that these histories are chronologically arranged, it is to be noted that this is true only in the main outlines, while the details of the history are often very much out of chronological order. It is a characteristic of the Hebrew historians to finish the consideration of a subject upon which they have once embarked, and afterwards to take up the other matters, which would, on a strictly chronological arrangement, have been interspersed through the first narrative. Unfortunately, when these other matters are introduced, it is very seldom that our historian will be careful to indicate that he has departed from the chronological order. In the histories of Elijah and Elisha, in the Book of Kings, series of events are grouped together which manifestly must have been separated by many years; and it is quite impossible to decide, with any degree

of certainty, in what reign Elijah was taken up into heaven, or in what reign the city of Samaria was miraculously delivered.

Another characteristic of the Hebrew historians is to make first a rapid survey of the whole history of the particular event which it is their purpose to describe, and then, without indicating any change in the continuity of the narrative, to return, and to fill in the details of the transaction. For example, it is stated that Pekah, king of Israel, and Rezin, king of Syria, came up against Jerusalem, "but they could not prevail against it." After this, the narrative proceeds to relate certain actions of the king of Judah, which it might therefore be supposed were subsequent to the unsuccessful attempt upon the city; and it is only from a consideration of all the circumstances that we come to a different conclusion.

A characteristic of the Hebrew historians, which makes exceedingly difficult our modern reconstructions of the history, is the common practice of passing over periods of time, without the slightest reference to the fact. Two events will be narrated, apparently as having occurred almost simultaneously, while in reality there must have been a considerable lapse of time between them. Most critics suppose such a lapse of time between the choice of Saul and his first conflict with the prophet Samuel, but the narrative itself contains no such intimation. We know from the Assyrian records that twenty years elapsed between the return of Sennacherib to Nineveh and his murder by his two sons, but the Book of Kings makes the simple statement: "So Sennacherib, King of Assyria, departed and went and dwelt at Nineveh, and it came to pass, as he was worshipping in the house of Nisroch, his god, that Adrammelech and Sharezer smote him with the sword."

So far the discussion of the historiography has been from the chronological point of view. I pass now to a consideration of the manner in which the histories were prepared. Only very small portions of the works which are under consideration could have been contemporaneous with the events of which they treat. In nearly every case several centuries must have elapsed. The writers must, therefore, have depended upon earlier authorities

for a very large part of their information. As has been already shown, there was a great mass of historical material, which could be laid under tribute. The royal archives must have been full of information regarding political events; we know of many of the prophets who wrote histories of the kings under whose reign they lived; and it does not require a very bold conjecture to imagine that the Schools of the Prophets, founded by Samuel, were like the monasteries of mediæval Europe, the centers of literary activity, in which historical composition would find its proper place. Thus the historian, who designed to trace for many generations the history of his people, found himself amply provided with material for his task. What use did he make of this material? We know the methods which are employed by historians of our day. We know how authorities are examined, evidence is weighed, and, when finally a critical judgment has been reached, the history is written from the standpoint of that judgment. Biblical scholarship has decided that the Hebrew histories were *not* so written. They do not represent a final opinion of an individual writer, founded upon an examination of all the documents, the authorities, the traditions, and all that constitutes historical evidence. But rather they are a weaving together of various sections, bodily excerpted from the older narratives which our historian used. It is held that there are numerous contradictions, or at least inconsistencies, in the histories, which can only be accounted for on the supposition of different authorship. Instances are enumerated of transitions so abrupt as to indicate the close of one document and the commencement of another. Parallel accounts of the same events, with trifling divergences, are found running all through the different histories. It is supposed that there are two accounts of creation, of the flood, of the relations of Saul and Samuel, and of Saul and David, and some even carry the theory so far as to find a duplicate account in the narrative of the Sennacherib invasion. And finally, it is asserted that the whole documentary hypothesis is strongly corroborated by marked distinctions of style, and diction, and syntax, in the different documents into which the histories should be divided.

Into this subject, which constitutes the arena of polemical discussion between the Old School and the New, it would manifestly be unwise to enter in this paper. As regards the methods of the historiography, it must certainly be conceded that some method of compilation was employed. But the question still remains, as to what was the nature of the compilation. Did it consist merely in making excerpts from older histories and tacking them together, with here and there a sentence from the redactor? Or were there really *authors* of these histories, who needed something more than a pair of scissors and a paste-pot? As far as I have yet been able to see, after we have made every allowance for the presence of older documents in our canonical books, when we have admitted that the transitions from one subject to another are often strangely abrupt, when we have even, perhaps, accepted the theory that there are parallel accounts of the same event; it yet remains true that there is an order, an essential unity, a literary arrangement, and an underlying purpose in all these histories, which demands the concession that much of the material has been re-written, much of it has been carefully digested, and all of it has been admirably woven into a connected whole, until, with all their incompleteness and their minor faults, we have the finished works, remarkable for their logical, succinct and faithful presentation of the course of events in the national history of the people of God.

Passing now to a consideration of these histories as a whole, we are immediately impressed with two prominent facts. First it is manifest, that from Genesis to Nehemiah, these narratives, although independent of one another, cover the whole course of Jewish history—the creation, the call of the first patriarch, the development of the nation, the Egyptian bondage, the exodus, the conquest of Canaan, the establishment of the monarchy, the dispersion of the ten tribes, the captivity of Judah, the re-building of the temple and the city, the re-establishment of the people, awaiting the advent of the Messiah. Not minutely, not exhaustively, not even proportionately, but, as with a few bold dashes of the painter's brush, these writings present to us in outline the whole course of the national history of the chosen people.

A second noteworthy characteristic of these histories, is the great emphasis placed on certain incidents and historic characters, and a total disregard of many matters, which would be considered of the first importance by a modern historian. What detailed descriptions have we of the plagues of Egypt, of the deeds of the heroes "in the days when the Judges ruled," of the sin of David and its consequences, of the erection of the temple—all matters of comparatively slight historical importance. On the other hand, how eagerly do we look, and yet in vain, for a single item of information regarding that interesting period of Egyptian sojourn; how much information might have been given in a few words regarding the political, social and religious condition of the people in the times before the monarchy; and how easily, from an historical point of view, could we have dispensed with the detail of the private life of David and of Solomon, if we could have gained a few more hints about the organization of the kingdom, and the condition of the priestly service.

It is in these two characteristics that the unique character of the Hebrew histories consists. Evidently from this last mentioned characteristic, it is manifest that the purpose of the historiographer was not a scientifically historical purpose. The history in outline may be comprehensive and complete, but in detail it is very incomplete and disproportionate. And it is so, for the very reason that the political and social development of the Hebrew people is not the theme of the historiographer. It is upon the *sins* of individuals and of the nation that he dwells, and upon the inevitable consequences of such sin. It is upon the *faith* of individuals and of the nation that he dwells, and upon the invariable blessings that reward such faith. Even to-day we study the past that we may understand the present, and prepare for the future. And so to the prophetic historian the past history of his people was fraught with living lessons for the present, and was full of warning and exhortation for the future. A profound religious purpose governed him in his selection and arrangement of historical material. And though his record of facts had been never so accurate, he would have regarded his work a failure, if it had no influence upon the hearts and lives of the men of his own day and generation.

However, this religious purpose was not the only purpose of the Hebrew historian; if it had been, the biblical histories would scarcely be entitled to the name. There was also a distinctly historical purpose, though even in this point the history-writing is unique. The Hebrew historiographer is controlled by a profound conviction that he is writing the history of a people whom God has chosen peculiarly as his own. The starting point of the history is a covenant between God and the founder of the nation; and Hebrew history, in the mind of the biblical historian, is the unfolding of the covenant relation between Jehovah God and the sons of Israel. It is no part of an historical paper to discuss the subject of inspiration, which belongs rather to the province of theology, but the suggestion may be permitted that the inspiration of these narratives lies perhaps principally in this same conviction of the Hebrew writer. He was given to understand the meaning of the history of Israel. He was inspired with the divine philosophy of the history. And so he presented to the people in panoramic view the records of their past, wherein at every step was manifest the presence of the covenant God Jehovah. The history of Israel was no history of battles, and sieges, and treaties; no history of kings, and statesmen, and diplomatists; no history of commerce, and manufacture, and art. It was a history of the faith and rebellion of the people as individuals and as a nation; it was a history of the divine reward and the divine retribution; it was a history of the providential movings of God in the selection of a man, and a family, and a nation, to be holy unto himself, and a peculiar people.

As we described the one purpose of the historian as religious, so we may describe this purpose as theocratic. And an examination of the histories from this point of view explains many of their peculiarities that were otherwise obscure. The detailed narratives of the patriarchs, of the descent into Egypt, of the wilderness journey, are a representation, not only of general religious truth, but of the development of the covenant relation between God and man, whereby gradually he prepared a people whose God he was peculiarly to be. This further explains the fact, that the whole series of histories is continuous. Where the Hexa-

teuch has stopped, the writer of Judges takes up the tale; where Judges stops the writer of Samuel takes it up; where Samuel stops the writer of Kings takes it up, and the compiler of Chronicles makes a parallel account, with the emphasis upon the development of the priestly service; where Chronicles stops Ezra takes it up; and where Ezra stops Nehemiah takes up the narrative, and with him it closes. Thus through the centuries this theocratic history was gradually evolved, beginning with the account of creation, and carrying it forward to the reestablishment of the theocracy and of the temple service, after the Babylonian captivity. For the next act in the theocratic drama we must pass over the centuries to the advent of the Christ.

I am careful to add that this view of the continuity of the histories does not depend upon the traditional view of the date and authorship of the biblical writings. It holds good, even according to the most extreme radical position. Eliminating the priestly document of the Hexateuch, we have still the compilation of the Jehovistic and the Elohist documents (which gives us all the historiography that is necessary to our purpose), in existence certainly in the eighth century. Deuteronomy is not later than the seventh century. Judges, according to Canon Driver, is in its present form from the hands of a Deuteronomic Redactor, yet probably, he says, there was a pre-Deuteronomic collection of the histories of the Judges. Samuel is assigned to about 700 B. C. Kings to about 600 B. C., and whenever Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah are to be placed, they at least follow in the order indicated, which is all that is essential to my thesis.

Moreover, this argument is not founded upon the presence of those patent connecting links between the books, which may perhaps have come from the hands of the final editor. For example, the Book of Judges opens with the phrase, "Now after the death of Joshua," manifestly connecting it with that former work, but not in itself a proof that the former work was antecedent. So the Book of Kings connects itself with Samuel by the phrase "Now when David was old and stricken in years." The argument is not founded upon these phrases, but upon the fact, that the essence of the histories forms a continuous narrative

(always from the theocratic standpoint), without a serious break, from the creation of mankind to the re-establishment of the Jewish nation under Nehemiah.

The purpose then of Hebrew historiography was religious and theocratic. From this point of view the incongruities in the history largely disappear. The Almighty counts time not by days and years. The life of Abraham was longer than the Egyptian bondage; David's forty years were longer than the forty decades of the Judges. History from the divine standpoint emphasizes that which is important in its divine relations; the puny movements of Assyrian armies and Egyptian kings are matters of trifling concern.

A word in conclusion as to the historicity of these biblical narratives. The subject demands a detailed discussion, but I must dismiss it simply with this word. It would be strange indeed if a series of histories, even inspired histories, giving an account in outline of pre-historic man, and then covering a period of nearly 2000 years of history, should not contain slight chronological, historical and geographical inaccuracies. The Hebrews seem never to have developed a systematic chronology, and, in the light of Assyriological discovery, the chronology of the Old Testament cannot be maintained throughout. Further, there are statements here and there in the histories, which, to say the least, are very difficult to reconcile with our information from other sources. It may be also that there are occasional anachronisms in these histories. Written in some cases hundreds of years after the events occurred, the record may sometimes be colored by the opinions of a later age. Especially, in the case of the reports of speeches, we should scarcely expect to be supplied in every case with the *ipsissima verba*. Yet it is not upon these negative aspects that the emphasis should be laid. Modern science and the world's philosophy have not surpassed the statement, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." The science of Egyptology stands surprised at the marvelous accuracy of the biblical historians. Tablets from the ruins of Babylon and Assyria testify to the trustworthiness of these accounts. And the final result of the most careful criticism, in the light of information from a thousand sources, is to establish the essential truth, accuracy and fidelity of the narratives of the Hebrew historiographers.

THE LIVING WORD, HEBREWS 4:12.

By THOMAS F. DAY,
San Francisco.

The "Word of God" in its profoundest sense is he who is called the Logos by preëminence. The whole doctrine of divine revelation rests ultimately upon two great truths. First, God in his essential being is One "whom no man hath seen nor can see," yet, One who desires to draw near to men in loving fellowship; but such a drawing near is forbidden by the infinitude of his being and the limitations of humanity. Second, the Logos, the second person of the Trinity, makes such fellowship possible. He interprets the unseen God to finite and perishing men. This theanthropic person, moving in the sphere of revelation, is the first of the prophets, and the source of all prophetic authority. In all theophanies his person is the central and essential fact. He is Yahweh of the Old Testament, and Jesus Christ of the New.

From this point of view the characteristic feature of divine revelation is the theophany. Apart from the Logos a theophany is impossible, and without a theophany there could be no revelation. Through him every communication from God is mediated.

Generally, therefore, in Scripture the Word of God signifies something which the Logos directly communicates to men. Attention is here confined to the biblical revelation. Whether the communication was by dream or vision, or by internal spiritual impression, or by external manifestation, it was called the Word of God. They who received it said, "Surely God is in this place." The earliest believers had only this to bind them to the unseen. By this they received their effectual calling; by this their faith was quickened and their hope sustained; by this God proved himself their personal friend and guide while they sojourned in the land of promise. Choosing the simplest means

of communication he varied the mode that none might become stereotyped. Thus he impressed himself indelibly upon their minds as the living God. The medium was transitory, but the revelation was permanent; the vision faded, but its eternal significance remained; the instrument of revelation sank out of sight before its glorious content. The outcome of all was that the men of the covenant drew near and ever nearer to Yahweh, the God of the covenant, whose self-revealing was their life and peace. This is indeed the end of all revelation, to bring men into fellowship with the fountain of life.

This intimate communion with the Living One gave to every spoken word a living potency; the message came straight from his presence, warm with the breath of his lips. It passed from the patriarchs to their children, receiving at intervals fresh accessions from the mouth of Yahweh. It was the main source of public instruction; it formed the staple of prophetic preaching. It is not improbable that there were inspired prophets who delivered the word of Yahweh to Israel and Judah whose very names, together with their proclamation, perished with their times. But a small part of the ancient oral teaching finds place in the Bible. Of the abundant ministrations of the Old Testament prophets only a splendid fragment remains. Similarly we know that what the New Testament omits of the words and deeds of Christ and his apostles, would fill many larger volumes than what it records. *Ex uno disce omnes.* No word of prophecy that bore the divine seal fell fruitless to the ground. The virtue of God's word depended not on pen or scribe. The oral message sped upon its errand, accomplishing that which he pleased, prospering in the thing whereto he sent it. The unwritten words of Jesus were as full of grace and truth as those which are recorded.

The Word of God has lost none of its vitality and invincible energy by passing into writing. The canonical Scriptures are God-breathed. In them it has pleased God to stereotype his revelation, yet so as not to interrupt the perennial flow of its vital current. Divine truth like molten gold ran into molds prepared for it. First the Hebrew tongue received it, then the Greek; the former, the intuitive language of childhood and nature; the lat-

ter, the reflective speech of manhood and supreme culture. From these it received its first linguistic flavor. These could not keep it, however, in their exclusive possession. "The Word of God is not bound." Its vitality keeps it ever in motion. Claiming every language of earth for its own, it uses each as a channel through which to pour its fertilizing streams.

The translations of the Bible exhibit marked characteristics of their own, for every new channel gives its specific color to the stream. The languages of mankind differ widely in respect to quality; some are vastly more sensitive than others to the finer phases of thought and feeling. Missionaries are sometimes compelled to invent terms for spiritual ideas. There are tribes in the South Sea Islands whose vocabularies originally had no word for God.

What shall we say then? Is the "Word of God" a misnomer when applied to the Scriptures translated into these scant vernaculars? We answer, No. Take the Bible in the most imperfect form in which it may be found; its vocabulary meager and halting; its freedom hampered; its moral beauty obscured and its power diminished; and we confidently affirm that even in such a form it is the power of God unto salvation. It is true that it does not rank with Luther's translation or that of the English revisers, but to all divine intents and purposes it is the Word of God for the tribe to whom Christian zeal has given it. By this we mean that the undying energy of truth is in it; it has power over human consciences; it gives the knowledge of sin, and proclaims the fullness of redeeming grace. It reveals the lineaments of the God-man, whose gracious call sounds divinely sweet in the rudest language spoken by man.

God's wisdom outruns us here; he pours his heavenly treasure into such vessels as the nations have at hand to receive it. Crude and incapacious as they are, they fulfill the purpose of his grace. As in the incarnation God came down to man's level in order to redeem him, so through these uncouth reproductions his word descends on the same merciful errand to the very lowest plane on which human intelligence moves.

In saying this we do not lose sight of the fact that the stand-

ard of revealed truth for all the world is found in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. By that standard all must be verified and tested. As the nations increase in intelligence, the various translations will be improved by being brought into more strict conformity with the original. But before the day of better versions comes, multitudes of souls will find God in Christ through the medium of these imperfect translations.

The cause of this perennial vigor is to be traced to the present activity of the Holy Spirit, whose work did not cease with the original promulgation of the divine word. He imparts to that word, spoken or written, his own boundless life. He breathes it daily as a fresh revelation to the souls of men. The Holy Spirit speaks to man as man. He is at home in every language. His illumination supplies the deficiencies of words. Mongrel dialects struggling to voice his truth become signs whereby he hails, convinces, and subdues the savage mind.

But the divine word becomes in the highest degree effective when it passes again out of its written form into that of articulate speech. We are in danger of not realizing the full import of the apostle's declaration that it is by "the foolishness of preaching" that the world is to be converted. What is preaching? It is not a mere repetition of the inspired word. It is something different from a homily based upon a text. Its distinctive mark is the unction of the Holy Ghost, whereby the truth of God and the personality of the preacher are fused into one; a regenerated man speaks forth the living word.

Apart from the necessity of interpretation, the truth of the Bible gets new charm and added power when uttered by the human voice. "Thoughts that breathe a divine life" spring from the lips in "words that burn" with heavenly fire. Thousands in Christian lands receive their first religious impressions through this instrumentality. Revivals everywhere attest its amazing power. Brainerd, preaching through an interpreter, who was himself at the time unconverted, wrought conviction in the hearts of hundreds of Indians. Missionary annals abound in similar examples. Popular usage calls the message from the

pulpit the word of God. This usage is plainly justified by the character and results of true preaching.

The Bible, although it contains the fundamental principles of divine truth, does not make specific application of these principles to all possible cases. Such application in its variety and wide extent is left to preaching. The pulpit, therefore, holds a unique place in the world by divine appointment ; its office is to make the living word contemporaneous with every age. Men will be set apart to the exercise of its high functions, in the future as in the past, by special anointing from above ; and it will remain for all time, until mankind is redeemed, a channel of converting grace.

SPINOZA AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

By REV. B. PICK, PH. D.,

Allegheny, Pa.

II.

Spinoza now proceeds to show that all books from Genesis to Kings present a coherent history, which aims at describing the ancient Jewish history from the origin of the people to the first destruction of the city, and from this follows, that the author of all these books was only *one and the same*. Having finished the narrative of the life of Moses, the author passes over to the history of Joshua with the words, "now after the death of Moses" (Josh. 1: 1). The same transition we find Judges 1: 1, "now after the death of Joshua;" to Judges is added by way of appendix the book of Ruth, "now it came to pass in the days when the Judges ruled." With Ruth, the author connects the first Book of Samuel, from which he passes over with the usual transition to the second book, and since the history of David is not yet finished, he joins to it the first Book of Kings, in which he continues the history of David, etc. The connection and the order of the narrative also indicate that it was only *one* historian, who had a special object in view. He commences with the first origin of the Hebrew nation, speaks of the laws of Moses given to this people, narrates the taking of the promised land, the apostasy of the people and its punishment; he then goes on to speak of the kings, pointing out that according to their obeying or disobeying the laws, they were either happy or unhappy, till finally the fall of the kingdom took place in consequence of disobeying the laws of God. Everything that did not contribute to the glorification of the Mosaic laws, the author either passed over with silence or referred the readers to other

writings. From the connection which outwardly and inwardly connects these books, and from the leading idea which rules the whole, Spinoza infers the unity of the authorship.¹

The author of all these books Spinoza supposes to be Ezra. The author who continued the history of Israel to the deliverance of Jehoiakin, cannot have lived before Ezra. During all this time the Scripture speaks only of Ezra as having "prepared his heart to seek the law of God, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments," who was "a ready scribe in the law of Moses" (Ezra 7: 6, 10), who explained the law (Neh. 8: 8). It is also probable that the book of Deuteronomy in its present form is a book of the law of God worked over by Ezra, as may be seen from such explanatory additions, as Deut. 2: 12 to vv. 3, 4; 10: 8, 9 to v. 5; from the introduction and all passages in which Moses is spoken of in the third person; also from the discrepancies in the decalogue, as the enlarged composition of the fourth commandment and the changed order in the tenth commandment. The book of Deuteronomy was probably worked over first by Ezra, because its beginning is not connected like the other books with the foregoing. Afterward he placed it in its present place in order to give a connected history from the creation to the first destruction of Jerusalem. He called his first five books after the name of Moses, because the latter's life is the main part thereof, and from the summary he took the denomination. The same was also the case with the following books as Joshua, Judges, Ruth, etc. But whether Ezra put the last file to this work and left it in such a finished state as he wished, we shall see in the following chapter.

Ezra, we are told by Spinoza in the ninth chapter, was not the final redactor. All that he did do was to collect the materials from different writers, made copies thereof, and left it without due examination and arrangement to posterity. Why Ezra did thus, Spinoza is at a loss to say. It may be that death prevented him from completing the work in all its parts. But that Ezra acted in that manner, may be seen from the few extant frag-

¹ What Bertheau, in introduction to his *Commentary on Judges*, p. xxvii, remarks fully coincides with Spinoza's result.

ments. Thus: 2 Kings 28: 17 seq. is taken from Isa. 36 seq.; 2 Kings 25 from Jer. 52; 2 Sam. 7 from 1 Chron. 19.

From the chronological data, Spinoza also infers that different sources were before the redactor. Thus, *e.g.*, the narrative of Judah and Tamar in Genesis 38. Here we read in the first verse, "and it came to pass at that time, that Judah went down from his brethren." This time must necessarily refer to the other which goes immediately before. But to this it cannot refer. The time intervening from Joseph's sale into Egypt to Jacob's arrival there amounts to about twenty-two years. Joseph's age when he was sold was seventeen, and when presented to Pharaoh, thirty. Computing the seven years of abundance and the two years of sterility, or $9+13$ we have twenty-two years. During this time Judah should have married, his wife should have had three sons, the two first should have been of an age to espouse Tamar, and should have married her successively; that after the death of the second, Judah should have diverted Tamar for some time with the hope of a marriage with his third son; that she should have deceived him, and conceived twins, of whom the elder begat two sons. All this presupposes a different chronology.

In the life of Jacob, the chronology, too, according to Spinoza, is full of contradictions. According to Gen. 47: 9, Jacob is 130 years old when presented to Pharaoh; deducting therefrom the twenty-two years of Jacob's separation from Joseph, the seventeen years of Joseph's age when he was sold, the seven years of service for Rachel, Jacob must have been eighty-four years when he took Leah for a wife. Dinah was seven years old when she was violated, and Simeon and Levi twelve to thirteen years when they massacred the Shechemites.

From this and other things, Spinoza infers that all is narrated pell-mell in the five books of the Pentateuch, that neither history nor narration is in the right place, that there is no regard to time, and all that we read there has been gathered and put confusedly together in order to be afterward sifted and arranged in proper order.

Spinoza also finds different sources in the book of Judges.

After a former narrator recorded in Joshua 24 the death of Joshua, and commenced to tell of the events after his death, (Judges 1 : 1 seq.), a new historian appears with Judges 2 : 6 seq. Spinoza also finds two records concerning David's appearance at Saul's court. According to the one, 1 Sam. 16, David was called to quiet, by music, Saul's evil spirit; according to the other, ch. 17, he was called in consequence of his victory over Goliath. The same difference, according to Spinoza, exists between ch. 26 and ch. 24, where Saul's meeting with David in the cave is narrated.

Spinoza finds a contradiction in the chronology of 1 Kings 6 : 1, where we read that Solomon completed the building of the temple in the 480th year after the exodus, a date which does not agree with the numbers given.

Moses ruled the people in the wilderness - - -	40 years
Joshua's leadership, according to Josephus and others, was	26 "
Chushan Rishathaim's oppression lasted - - -	8 "
Othniel judged - - - - -	40 "
Moabite oppression under Eglon - - - - -	18 "
Ehud and Shamgar - - - - -	80 "
Jabin's oppression - - - - -	20 "
Rest - - - - -	40 "
Midianite oppression - - - - -	7 "
Gideon - - - - -	40 "
Abimelech - - - - -	3 "
Tola - - - - -	23 "
Jair - - - - -	22 "
Oppression by Philistines and Midianites - - -	18 "
Jephthah - - - - -	6 "
Ibzan of Bethlehem - - - - -	7 "
Elon, the Zebulonite - - - - -	10 "
Abdon - - - - -	8 "
The Philistines again oppress Israel - - - -	40 "
Samson - - - - -	20 "
Eli - - - - -	40 "
The Philistines again oppress Israel - - - -	20 "
David's reign - - - - -	40 "
Solomon's reign to the building of the Temple - -	4 "
 Total - - - - -	 580 "

To this must be added the years after Joshua's death to the oppression under Chushan Rishathaim. In Judges 2: 7-10 the history of many years is certainly compressed. Besides, we must add the years of Samuel's and Saul's reign. The passage 1 Sam. 13: 1 is evidently corrupt, for the age of Saul when he commenced to reign is omitted, though it is stated that he reigned two years. But according to 1 Sam. 27: 7 David remained among the Philistines one year and four months, so that the rest of Saul's history must have transpired within eight months.¹ Finally, we must also add the years of anarchy, cf. Judg. 17 seq.

From all this Spinoza infers that the numbers of years cannot be fixed with safety from the historical books and that the different histories point to different chronologies. He also finds differences in the sources themselves. Thus the "Chronicles of the Kings of Israel" and the "Chronicles of the Kings of Judah" differ. According to 2 Kings 1: 17 Jehoram of Israel becomes king in the second year of Jehoram of Judah, and according to 2 Kings 8: 16, Jehoram of Judah becomes king in the fifth year of Jehoram of Israel.

Spinoza emphasizes the fact that the text as we have it now did not come down to us in a perfect state, and that mistakes have crept into it. This of course, he says, will be denied by those who assert that a special providence has watched over the text, and that the various readings contain deep mysteries. But these he regards as puerile cogitations. The similarity of the letters gave rise to mistakes, as the marginal notes prove. Besides these notes the copyists indicated many corrupt passages (by leaving a space in the midst of a sentence), the number of which, according to the Massorites, is twenty-eight. As an in-

¹ Kirkpatrick *in loco* (*Cambridge Bible*) says: "The Hebrew cannot thus [as in the A. V.] be translated. We must render *Saul was [] years old when he began to reign, and reigned [] and two years over Israel*. Either the numbers were wanting in the original document, or they have been accidentally lost. Thirty is supplied in the first place by some MSS. of the Sept., and is a plausible conjecture. The length of Saul's reign may have been twenty-two or thirty-two years. . . . The whole verse is omitted by the older copies of the Septuagint, and possibly was not in the original text."

stance of such corrupt passages he quotes Gen. 4: 8, "And Cain talked with Abel his brother . . . and it came to pass, when they were in the field," etc.; where an empty space is left, we expect to hear what Cain said to his brother.¹

Chronicles.—At the beginning of the tenth chapter Spinoza speaks of Chronicles as having been written long after Ezra and perhaps after the restoration of the temple by Judas the Macabaeian. For according to 1 Chron. 9: 3 seq., the families are mentioned which dwelt first—*i. e.*, in the time of Ezra—at Jerusalem. In v. 17 the porters are mentioned, of whom Neh. 11: 19 also mentions two. This shows that these books were written long after the restoration of the city. Who the author of these books was, Spinoza leaves undecided, though he is surprised at their reception into the canon, whereas the books of Wisdom, Tobit, and others, which are called apocryphal, were omitted.

Psalms.—The Psalms, too, were collected during the second temple and divided into five books. The 88th Psalm was, according to the testimony of Philo, composed when king Jehoiakin was still imprisoned at Babylon, and the 89th after his release.

Proverbs.—The Proverbs of Solomon were collected about the same time, or at the earliest in the time of Josiah. Spinoza bases his opinion on ch. 25: 1: "These are also proverbs of Solomon, which the men of Hezekiah, king of Judah, copied out." He goes on and says that he cannot pass over with silence the audacity of the rabbis who intended to exclude this book, together with that of Ecclesiastes, from the canon.

Prophetical Books.—Of these books Spinoza says that they contain fragments gathered together from other books, which were not always copied in the same order in which the prophets spoke or wrote.

Isaiah.—Isaiah commenced to prophesy under king Uzziah, as the copyist attests in the first verse. But he did not only prophesy at that time, but also described all the deeds of this king

¹The empty space referred to here by Spinoza is called by the Massorites *piska*; for this comp. my art., *The masoretic Piska in the Hebrew Bible*, in *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature*, 1886.

in a book (comp. 2 Chron. 26: 22), which we now miss. What we have is copied from the chronicles of the Kings of Judah and Israel. The rabbis also tell that Isaiah also prophesied under King Manasseh, by whom he was finally killed.¹

Jeremiah.—The prophecies of Jeremiah are, according to Spinoza, without any chronological order, and contain repetitions and deviations. Thus chap. 21 speaks of the cause which led to Jeremiah's imprisonment, which takes place because he foretells to Zedekiah the fall of the city; ch. 22 breaks off and speaks of the prophecies addressed to Jehoiakin, Zedekiah's predecessor; ch. 25 contains the prophecies from the fourth year of Jehoiakim; then follow prophecies from the first year of that king, and thus it goes on without order, till finally ch. 38 returns again to ch. 21: 10 (as if these fifteen chapters were a mere parenthesis).

The imprisonment is described in ch. 38 and again differently in ch. 37. The other prophecies Spinoza regards as taken from the book which Jeremiah dictated to Baruch, which, according to ch. 36: 2, contained the prophecies of Jeremiah from Josiah to the fourth year of Jehoiakin. From this book chs. 45: 2 to 51: 59 also seem to have been taken.

Ezekiel.—Ezekiel is a fragment. This is already indicated in the first verses. The conjunction points to something which has already been said and connects with something that is to be said. But not only the conjunction, but also the whole connection presupposes other writings, for the thirtieth year, with which the book commences, indicates that the prophet goes on in the narrative, but does not begin it, which the writer himself also indicates by a parenthesis, v. 3: "The word of the Lord came expressly unto Ezekiel." Spinoza also refers to Josephus *Antiq.*, 10: 9, where it is said that Ezekiel did prophecy that "Zedekiah shall not see Babylon," which we do not find in Ezekiel's book, but rather, ch. 17, that he should be taken captive to Babylon.²

¹ What befell Isaiah under Manasseh is related in the so-called *Ascensio Isaiae*; comp. my art., *Ascension of Isaiah* in McClintock & Strong's *Cyclop.*, vol. xi.

² Josephus *l. c.* 10: 7 (not 9) states not that Ezekiel did prophesy what we do not find in his book; he merely says that Zedekiah did not believe the prophecies of Jeremiah

Hosea.—Concerning this prophet Spinoza says that he is surprised that a prophet who prophesied more than eighty-four years should have left so little in writing. Carpzov says that God only suffered those prophecies to be written down which should be of use to the church of all times.

Jonah.—As a proof that we have not all the prophecies of the prophets, Spinoza also quotes Jonah, whose prophecies concern only the Ninevites, whereas he also prophesied to the Israelites, as may be seen from 2 Kings 14: 25.

Job.—Concerning the book of Job, Spinoza remarks that some say that Moses wrote it,¹ and that the whole history is only a parable.² Others have taken the history as true, and thought that this Job lived at the time of Jacob, whose daughter Dinah was Job's wife. Ibn Ezra in his commentary asserts that the book was translated from another language into Hebrew. Leaving this question undecided, Spinoza thinks that Job was a heathen of the highest strength of mind, for Ezekiel mentions him, ch. 14: 12, and believes that the change of fortune and Job's strength of mind induced many to dispute on divine providence, or at least the author to write the dialogue of this book. The contents and style do not resemble the work of one who was miserably sick and sitting in ashes, but of one sitting in his study and thinking over the matter.³ And here Spinoza goes on: "I should believe, with Ibn Ezra, that this book was translated from another language, since it seems to imitate heathenish poetry. For the father of the gods twice calls an assembly together, and Momus, here called Satan, replies with the greatest freedom to the speeches of God."

and Ezekiel, because they agreed that the city should be taken, and Zedekiah himself should be taken captive, but so that Ezekiel said that Zedekiah should not see Babylon, while Jeremiah said that the King of Babylon should carry him thither in bonds; comp. Jer. 32: 4, 5 with Ezek. 12: 13. But both oracles were fulfilled. Zedekiah was indeed taken to Babylonia, but saw it not because his eyes had been put out. Spinoza probably did not think of ch. 12: 13.

¹ Comp. Talmud *Baba bathra*, fol. 14 a, where we read: Moses wrote his book, the chapter of Balaam and Job.

² Talmud *Baba bathra* fol. 15 a: Job did neither exist nor was he created, but is a parable. This view is also held by many ancient and modern writers.

³ So, also Hobbes, *l. c.* p. 178.

Daniel.—This book contains, from the eighth chapter, the writings of Daniel himself. The first seven chapters, Spinoza thinks, were taken from the chronologies of the Chaldeans. With Daniel, Spinoza connects the book of

Ezra, and thinks that the author is the same who continues to narrate the events of the Jewish history from the first captivity. With Ezra, Spinoza connects

Esther, on account of the conjunction with which this book begins. It cannot be the same book which Mordecai wrote, for in ch. 9: 20 another author speaks of Mordecai, that he wrote letters and what they contained. And in the same chapter, vs. 31, we read that queen Esther confirmed all things belonging to the festival of lots (Purim,) as well as all which was written in the book which was then (when these events were written) known to all. Concerning this book Ibn Ezra confesses, and every one must confess, that it was lost with the others. All other events of Mordecai, the historian reckons to the chronicles of the Persian kings. It can, therefore, not be doubted that this book, too, was written by the same author who narrated the events of Daniel and Ezra, and added to it the book of

Nehemiah, because it is called the second book of Ezra.

These four books, Daniel, Ezra, Esther and Nehemiah, Spinoza asserts to have been written by one and the same author, but by whom cannot even be surmised. As sources of this history Spinoza regards the annals of the princes and priests of the second temple mentioned Neh. 12: 23; 1 Macc. 16: 23, 24, which, however are now lost. That neither Ezra nor Nehemiah is the author of these books, Spinoza infers from Neh. 12: 9, 10, where the genealogy of the high priests down to Jaddua is given; the same Jaddua met Alexander the Great on his way to Jerusalem (Josephus *Antt.* 11, 8) and as this Jaddua, according to Philo, was the sixth and last high priest under the Persian rule, Spinoza asks whether some think that Ezra or Nehemiah had become so old as to outlive fourteen kings. He, therefore, is certain that these books were written long after the restoration of the temple-service by Judas the Maccabean, and this in order to do away with the spurious books of Daniel, Ezra and Esther, composed by the Sadducees.

Spinoza comes to the conclusion, that before the time of the Maccabees, the canon of the Old Testament books did not yet exist, and that those which we have now were selected by the Pharisees of the second temple. The reason for this is Daniel 12 : 2, where the resurrection is taught which the Sadducees denied, and because the Pharisees themselves express this plainly in the Talmud. Thus we read in Talmud, *Shabbath*, fol. 30, vol. 2: Rabbi Judah said in the name of Rao: the sages wished to suppress the book of Coheleth, because his word opposed those of the law. But why did they not suppress it? Because the beginning and the end of the book are in accordance with the law. The same they intended to do with the book of Proverbs. And finally we read, fol. 13, vol. 2, of the same treatise; remember that man with respect, his name is Hanauja, the son of Hezekiah. Had it not been for him, the book of Ezekiel would have been suppressed, because its contents were contradictory to the word of the law. From this Spinoza infers that the scribes first consulted how the books ought to be, ere they were received as sacred.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE.

BIBLE STUDY IN CONNECTION WITH ORGANIZATIONS FOR CHRISTIAN WORK.

Situation.—There are in this country, in connection with the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, the Epworth League, the Baptist Young People's Union, the King's Daughters, and the Young Woman's Christian Temperance Union, two million young people. Two-thirds of these are virtually pledged to read their Bibles every day. It is safe to say that as large a proportion as this have the consciousness that they *ought to study* their Bibles. As a matter of fact, they do not study their Bibles, because they do not find the material sufficiently interesting, because their time is too fully taken up with other things, and because there is no widespread sentiment among them in this connection. All of these societies are based chiefly upon the principle of Christian work—the doing, rather than the being. Sooner or later their interest must flag and their numbers decrease, unless a constantly increasing source of power is placed in their hands. If a progressive course of Bible study could lie back of all their work, it would have a sufficiently solid basis.

These young people are ready for such a course, provided it can be one which will meet their requirements and limitations.

The Institute club courses have been tried, to some extent, by a few of the members of these organizations. The results show that the work, as it has formerly been marked out for them, is too difficult; it requires too great an expenditure of time; it presupposes a larger interest in the subject than exists; it is too expensive.

After three years of consideration and experiment, the Institute has therefore decided that one course, which is adaptable to all these organizations, shall be prepared; that this course shall be followed each year by a new course, giving in four or five years a complete outline study of the Bible, but so arranged that each course shall be complete in itself, and any year can be the first year to those coming in for the first time. From the point of view of the organizations, this course must (a) require an expenditure of not more than fifteen minutes a day; (b) the necessary cost per member must be not more than fifty cents a year; (c) it must require no stringent examinations; (d) its work must come within the nine months from October to June, in order to accommodate itself to the working year of the organizations; (e) the subject must be attractive; (f) there must be a social element, which will permit the

gathering of the members in clubs for concerted work. From the standpoint of the Institute, this course must be (a) an inductive study, however simple; (b) it must allow a progressive series of courses, covering the Bible in some logical order; (c) it must have an element answering to the examination principle.

It is therefore proposed for the first year to outline a course of study upon the Life of Christ.

The only material which shall be required for the use of students or of a club, besides the Revised Version of the Bible, shall be a small book upon Palestinian geography, the smaller Cambridge Bibles upon the Four Gospels, and a brief volume upon the Life of Christ. All students shall pay an annual fee of fifty cents to the Institute. They shall receive in return a monthly examination paper, which shall be of the nature of memoranda, rather than a genuine examination, the questions upon which students shall be *urged* to answer from *memory*, but not required to do so, and upon which they may receive criticism by the payment of a double fee. At the end of the year all persons having sent in the requisite number of papers during the year shall receive a certificate.

In addition to the examination questions, the Institute will provide each member with a direction sheet, containing general directions for Bible study, the use of the note book, etc., and all such other helps in the way of pamphlets, maps, pictures, etc., as the Institute shall be able to provide. In connection with the plan, provision will be made for a traveling collection of Palestinian pictures and curios which will throw local coloring upon the study of the Life of Christ. Persons in Jerusalem have already been communicated with in regard to making the collections. Lecture courses can also be arranged for. They may be upon some special phase of Christ's life or teaching, and may be illustrated with the stereopticon.

Exploration and Discovery.

NOTES FROM LONDON.

By ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER.

The Rassam *vs.* Budge libel case has been the chief subject of conversation in Museum and Oriental circles during the past three weeks. The following editorial from the *Daily News* of July 4 is to the point: "Mr. Rassam has obtained a verdict for fifty pounds as damages in his action against Mr. Budge of the British Museum. It is enough. Mr. Rassam was the gentleman who took out the famous letter to King Theodore of Abyssinia, and was imprisoned, and afterwards handsomely indemnified for his pains. Subsequently, he conducted excavations at Abu Habbah in the interests of the British Museum, but, greatly to the disgust of the Museum, the best things discovered did not find their way to the national collection. Other museums obtained them of the private brokers into whose hands they passed. Mr. Budge, a British Museum official, expressed himself too freely on the subject in regard to the conduct and the responsibility of Mr. Rassam. He said that we only got the rubbish, and that the foreigners got the good things, and, moreover, that they got them through the negligence of Mr. Rassam, or with his connivance. He went so far as to say that the overseers employed were relations of Mr. Rassam, and that they furthered his private breaches of trust. This was not true; they were not Mr. Rassam's relations; they only said they were; and the Eastern imagination is so luxuriant. Mr. Rassam maintained that he sent home all that he found, and that it was not his fault if precious things were afterwards found by others and sold at a good profit. It was his misfortune, beyond question, for, as the mound was excavated at the expense of his employers, all the tablets should have gone to them. Mr. Budge made what most persons would have considered an ample apology, but this was not enough for Mr. Rassam or for his counsellors. Sir Henry Layard and Mr. Renouf gave evidence on behalf of Mr. Rassam, and the trial was, in some respects, a sort of antiquarian festival." *The Athenæum* of July 8 voices the sentiments of a great majority of Orientalists. "Most people will regret that Mr. Rassam ever went into the law courts against Dr. Budge, and few will think that the latter has been otherwise than hardly

treated. Dr. Budge's zeal no doubt led him into accepting hastily statements which were untrue, because they seemed to him to account for the poor results obtained by the museum from the excavations at Abu Habbah. But it is to be remembered that when he first repeated these statements, Sir H. Layard was the only person present who was not an official of the museum; and on the second occasion, when he called on Sir H. Layard, he had been directed by his official chief to tell Sir Henry all he knew. It was evident, therefore, that he had no malice against Mr. Rassam, nor any idea except that of promoting the interests of the museum. Dr. Budge has done much good work for the museum, both by his labors in Bloomsbury and his visits to the East. Nor have his services been confined to Egyptology, as it was he who secured the papyrus containing the 'Constitution of Athens' and the other papyri which have lately increased our knowledge of Greek literature." Dr. Budge is popular with his colleagues in the museum, and, since the trial, the keepers and assistants have combined to present him with a cheque in settlement of his damages. The feeling here is that Budge acted throughout in the interests of the museum, and hence it would be unfair to allow him personally to suffer.

THE next number of Dr. Bezold's *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, due (in Europe) about August 15 or 20, will contain: (1) A complete calculation of the Saros period, by Fathers Epping and Strassmaier; (2) *ti'u-erysipelas*, by Sanitätsrath M. Bartel; (3) on *Lapislazuli*, by Professor H. V. Hilprecht; (4) Texts from Constantinople, by Father Scheil. In this connection it will be well to notice for the first time in print the proposed "Semitische Studien," by Bezold and Emil Felber, the publisher. Having been compelled to exclude many articles from their journal on account of their length, and in order to collect "such papers in convenient form, hoping thereby to advance Semitic studies, C. Bezold and E. Felber have determined to publish a series of" *Ergänzungshefte zur Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, "to appear at short and convenient intervals. Each number will contain one communication, and be complete in itself. The scope of these studies will include unpublished texts in all the Semitic languages; notes on comparative philology, palæography, and epigraphy;" and monographs upon the chronology, history, and geography, religions, art, culture, and legal systems of the inhabitants of the countries of the Semitic races." The first numbers will be (1) by K. Vollers; (2) and (3) by Dr. E. A. W. Budge, and (4) by Father Strassmaier. Each number will contain at least 80 pp. octavo.

THE "Long Vacation Lectures in Theology at Oxford" are in progress. This course of lectures is held from July 17-29, and it is so arranged that those who are unable to remain during the whole time, may attend complete courses in either week. The fee for the two weeks is one pound; for one week fifteen shillings. The following is the complete schedule:

FIRST WEEK.

MONDAY, July 17.	TUESDAY, July 18.	WEDNESDAY, July 19.	THURSDAY, July 20.	FRIDAY, July 21.	SATURDAY, July 22.	HOURS.
	DR. SANDAY, Characteristics of the Apostolic Age.	DR. SANDAY'S Second Lecture.	DR. SANDAY'S Third Lecture.	MR. LOCKE. Sayings of Our Lord not recorded in the Gospels.	MR. LOCKE'S Second Lecture.	{ 10 a. m.
	MR. OTTLEY. Old Testament Theology.	MR. OTTLEY'S Second Lecture.	MR. OTTLEY'S Third Lecture.	MR. OTTLEY'S Fourth Lecture.	MR. OTTLEY'S Fifth Lecture.	{ 11 a. m.
	DR. BRIGHT. Some Movements of Thought in Early Church History.	DR. BRIGHT'S Second Lecture.	DR. BRIGHT'S Third Lecture.	DR. BRIGHT'S Fourth Lecture.	DR. BRIGHT'S Fifth Lecture.	{ 12 noon.
	MR. HARRISON. Some Modern Difficulties of Belief.		MR. HARRISON'S Second Lecture.			{ 6:15 p. m.
DR. INCE. Introductory Address.		MR. INGRAM. Working Men's Clubs their possibilities and methods of manage- ment.		DR. MEE. The Clergy and Church Music.	Conference : The attitude of the Church towards Social Questions. Introduced by the BP. OF CHESTER.	{ 8:30 p. m.

SECOND WEEK.

MONDAY, July 24.	TUESDAY, July 25.	WEDNESDAY, July 26.	THURSDAY, July 27.*	FRIDAY, July 28.	SATURDAY, July 29.	HOURS.
	MR. GORE. The Epistle to the Romans.	MR. GORE'S Second Lecture.	MR. GORE'S Third Lecture.	MR. GORE'S Fourth Lecture.	MR. GORE'S Fifth Lecture.	} 10 a. m.
MR. HEADLAM. The Gospel according to Peter.	PROF. SAYCE. The bearing of recent Oriental Discovery on O. T. Criticism.	PROF. SAYCE'S Second Lecture.	DR. DRIVER. An Exegetical Study of Hosea.	DR. DRIVER'S Second Lecture.	DR. DRIVER'S Third Lecture.	} 11 a. m.
CANON BERNARD The Apologists of the Second Century.	CANON BERNARD'S Second Lecture.	CANON BERNARD'S Third Lecture.	BP. of SALISBURY. The Holy Communion in the Early Centuries.	BP. of SALISBURY'S Second Lecture.	BP. of SALISBURY'S Third Lecture.	} 12 noon.
	CANON HICKS. Ephesus and the Temple of Diana.		CANON HICKS. St. Paul and Hellenism.			} 6:15 p. m.
MR. JACKSON. The value of character in Architecture.		SIR C. WILSON. Palestine Exploration in its relation to Scripture History.		Discussion on the results of the Meeting.		} 8:30 p. m.

Synopses of Important Articles.

THE DIFFICULT WORDS OF CHRIST. III. THINGS OLD AND NEW. By
REV. JAMES STALKER, D.D., in *The Expositor* for July, 1893.

The passage considered is found in Matt. 13:52. The name which our Lord employs for Christian teachers is noteworthy; he calls them scribes — "every scribe who is instructed unto the kingdom of heaven." The "scribes," in the New Testament, and especially in Christ's own history, occupy a sinister position, and theirs is an evil name. However, their occupation was with the Word of God, and in this respect analogous to that of the teachers and preachers in the new order of things which Christ came to found. The "scribes" failed in their duty. They misused the Scriptures. Those who were instructed so as to be of use in forwarding Christianity must so use the Word as Christ himself had used it.

The equipment of the Christian teacher is called a "treasure." It is not the Bible, nor anything outside himself; it is within him. It is a storehouse or magazine in the mind, which he has filled with spiritual accumulations. Some of these are obtained from Scripture by personal study and appropriation of its teachings. Some are derived from personal religious experiences, and some consist of acquaintance with the experiences of others. Hence it appears how enormously the treasures of different Christian teachers differ from one another; both in quality and quantity. This treasure is to be emptied out again for the good of the world and our Lord indicates how this is to be done in the words — "bringeth out of his treasure things new and old." The common interpretation which takes this phrase to recommend a pleasing variety in Christian teaching is entirely beneath the height and dignity of Christ's teaching. The connection shows that Jesus had been teaching many things in parables, and that he commends its use to his disciples also. "Things new and old" is a characterization of his own method of parabolic teaching. If we understand by the old the well known and familiar, and by the new the unknown or unfamiliar, a parable may be defined to be a familiar incident setting forth an unfamiliar truth. The old and the new are not, therefore, to be brought out of the treasure apart — sometimes one and sometimes the other — but they are to be brought forth together, in such a way that what is already well-known and familiar may become the stepping-stone to ascend to what is novel and recondite.

This interpretation of "things new and old" lays the emphasis on the mode of teaching rather than on the contents, on the pictorial illustrations of truth rather than

on the truth to be illustrated. Illustration, whether by parable or otherwise, is no doubt a valuable adjunct in presenting spiritual truth; but to understand our Lord as referring wholly or even chiefly to this seems "entirely beneath the height and dignity" of his words. The truth, whether new or old, is the essential thing; the mode in which it is presented is altogether subordinate and incidental.

P. A. N.

ST. PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY. VII. THE DOCTRINE OF SIN.

By Professor A. B. BRUCE, D.D., in *The Expositor* for July, 1893.

St. Paul's negative doctrine concerning justification, viz., that it is not attainable by the method of legalism, resolves itself practically into the Pauline doctrine of sin, which embraces four particulars:

(1) The statement concerning the general prevalence of sin in the "sin section" of the Epistle to the Romans. This popular argument does not prove that salvation by works is impossible, but that it is very unlikely. Without distinction of Jew or Gentile, it is clear that, whatever might be possible for the exceptional few, the way of legal righteousness could never be the way of salvation for the million. This conclusion, however, the Apostle is not content to rest, either on the appeal to observation nor on citations from the Hebrew Psalter.

(2) The necessary supplement is to be found in the famous passage concerning Adam and Christ (Rom. 5:12-21). This vindicates the Apostle's whole doctrine of justification, both on its negative and on its positive side. The religious history of the world is here summed up under two representative men. Between these two St. Paul draws a parallel in so far as both by their action influenced their whole race. It may be said that the Apostle here supplies a supplementary proof of the impossibility of attaining unto salvation by personal righteousness—a proof which converts his first statement concerning the general prevalence of sin into an absolutely universal doctrine as to the sinfulness of man. This new proof starts from the universal prevalence of death, which is the wages of sin. All men die because all men are sinners. But if so, men must have sinned before the giving of the law. But how could that be if where there is no law there is no transgression, and if by the law comes the knowledge of sin? The answer to this question Paul finds in the great principle of solidarity, or the moral unity of mankind. The first man sinned, and that is enough. By one man sin entered into the world, and death followed in its track legitimately, righteously, because when one man sinned all sinned. Such I take to be the meaning of the famous text Romans 5:12. The rendering of the Vulgate, *in quo omnes peccaverunt*, is grammatically wrong but essentially right. The common interpretation, that death passed upon all men because all men *personally* sinned, is not true to the fact. For those who die in infancy have not so sinned.

In the famous comparison between Adam and Christ sin and righteousness are conceived of *objectively* as two great antagonistic forces fighting against each other, not so much *in* man as *over* him, the one manifesting itself in

death, the other in life. From the day that Adam sinned sin showed the reality of its power by the death which overtook successive generations of mankind. The existence of an Adam through whom the race was condemned made it necessary that there should appear a second Adam, in whose righteousness it might be righteous. The objection that it is unjust and unreasonable that one man should suffer for another man's sins must not be pressed, for modern science, by its doctrine of heredity, has made it more manifest than ever that the solidarity of mankind is a great fact and not merely a theological theory, and that the only question is as to the best way of stating it so as to conserve all moral interests.

(3) It must be shown, furthermore, that sin is a power in man as well as above him. This demonstration the apostle supplies in his statement as to the sinful proclivity of the flesh, Romans, ch. 7. It takes the form of a personal confession. "I am carnal, sold under sin, for what I do I know not; for not what I wish to do, but what I hate, this I do." Personal in form, the confession is really the confession of humanity. The ego that speaks is that of the human race. It is not St. Paul's flesh that is at fault, it is *the* flesh, the flesh which all men wear, the flesh in which dwells sin. Of the origin of this bias in the flesh toward evil he gives no account. The nearest hint to an answer is to be found in the terms in which, in 1 Cor. 15, the first man is described as in contrast to the second, only a living soul, psychical as distinct from spiritual, and of the earth, earthy. These expressions seem to point in the direction of a nature not very different from our own, and altogether suggest an idea of the primitive state of man not quite answering to the theological conception of original righteousness.

(4) The last particular in the Pauline doctrine of sin is the statement concerning the effect of the law's action on the sinful proclivity of the flesh. On this point the apostle teaches that in consequence of the evil bias of the flesh, the law, so far from being the way to righteousness, is rather simply a source of the knowledge of sin, and an irritant to sin. This topic is handled chiefly in Romans 7:7, seq. The law must have been instituted, therefore, with reference to an ulterior system which should be able to realize the legally impossible, and intended to be superseded when it had served its purpose. This purpose was to prepare for the advent of the Son of God, who, coming in the likeness of sinful flesh, and with reference to sin, should condemn sin in the flesh, and help believers in him to be indeed sons of God. The law, however, does more than bring to consciousness human depravity. In doing that it at the same time makes man aware that there is more in him than sin,—an inner man in a state of protest against the deeds of the outer man. This duality is at once my misery and my hope: my misery, for it is wretched to be drawn two ways; my hope, for I ever feel that my flesh and my sin, though mine, are not myself. This feeling all may share. On the bright hopeful side, as well as on the darker, St. Paul is the spokesman for the race.

The foregoing series of articles accentuates the value of a scientific biblical theology in the interpretation of Scripture. Had the writings of Paul been studied as a whole, and for the purpose of ascertaining what they really teach, he could not have been held responsible for so many unreasonable doctrines which an *a priori* theology and an uncompromising logic have deduced from him. Fairly and self-consistently interpreted he preaches a gospel as broad and sympathetic as that of Christ himself.

P. A. N.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF EZRA II. AND IV. 6-23. I. By the RIGHT REV. LORD ARTHUR C. HERVEY, D.D., Bishop of Bath and Wells, in *The Expositor* for June, 1893. Pages 431-443.

The difficulty in Ezra 2 arises from the fact that this chapter is a duplicate of Neh. 7. Are the two passages identical in the sense that they are borrowed one from the other? If so, which chapter is the original and which is transcribed from the other? By a comparison of the two accounts of the offerings for the temple service in Ezra 2:68-69, and Neh. 7:70-72, some interesting discoveries are made. Evidently there are several words lost and evidences of text corruption, especially in the numbers. The difference in the proper names in the two are probably due to clerical carelessness. Everything goes to prove that the original document belongs to Nehemiah. (1) He tells us in Chap. 7:5-6 on what occasion he found and used this document. By verses 6-60 the claims of all who came up "to be reckoned by genealogies" were tried. A few presented themselves who could not prove their claims to a place in Zerubbabel's register, and so were omitted from Nehemiah's roll. Some were also found who claimed to be priests who could produce no register of their genealogy, and were set aside until the high priest by the Urim and Thummim decided regarding their claims to the priesthood. All this is manifestly no part of Zerubbabel's register, but a record of what happened in pursuance of Nehemiah's project in verse 5.

(2) Neh. 7:66-69 contains what is still more conclusive. The number in verse 66 f. is not the total in Zerubbabel's list, but the total of those whom Nehemiah "gathered together to reckon by genealogies." This is indicated by the obvious probability of the case, by the discrepancy of the numbers, and by the place in the narrative where the enumeration comes in at an interval of four verses after the close of the list, and by the use of the word *haq-qa-hal* congregation (verse 66). The difference between the sum total of 42,360 and the total of the items, 30,000, represents the increase in the population during the years which had elapsed since Zerubbabel's census was taken. (3) Again, Ezra 2:68, "house of the Lord," clearly implies that the "house of the Lord"—not standing in the reign of Cyrus—was now one of the buildings of the city. (4) The crowning evidence is the mention of "Tirshatha," who was certainly Nehemiah himself (*cf.* chap. 8:9). If this is Nehemiah, can it be any one else in Ezra, 2:63? If Ezra 2 treats of

Nehemiah how can it be a part of the history of the times of Zerubbabel and Cyrus?

Nehemiah then is the original text, and Ezra 2 was an insertion of a later redactor from this document.

This is not so satisfactory or conclusive a discussion as we could wish of this troublesome chronological snarl. Bishop Hervey is quite too dogmatic in his assertions of certain results. When the second part appears we may have some additional light on his method of solution.

PRICE.

ARE THERE METRES IN OLD TESTAMENT POETRY? ANCIENT STATEMENTS AND MODERN THEORIES. By PROFESSOR EDWIN CONE BISSELL, D.D., in *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for July, 1893. Pages 440-449.

Philo and Josephus were the pioneers in the view that the poetry of the Old Testament was metrical in form. The church fathers largely sympathized with them and gave currency to the same opinions. It now seems that those pioneers intentionally misrepresented the facts in order to put Hebrew poetry on a par with Greek. Early in the seventeenth century a Dutch professor at Groningen became the leading adventurer of modern explorers in this line. He found as a result of his principles that Hebrew verse is like that of Latin and Greek, only that *each verse has its own kind*. The wits of his day said of his scheme: "*Gomari lyram delirare.*" The eighteenth century records the vain delusions of such metre-finders as Jones, Greve, Bishop Hare, Weisse, Drechsler, Lautwein, and Anton. Early in this century appeared several new *patent-applied-for* schemes in explaining the venerable poetry of Israel, such as Bellerman and Saalschütz. The last half of this century also has its roster of metrical *prospectors*. Among them may be named Meier, Peters, Ley, Bickell, Briggs, and Ball. Everything of metre in Hebrew poetry thus far advocated submits the text to unwarrantable emendations, interpolations, and literary violence. Metre in Hebrew poetry is little less than an *ignis fatuus*.

PRICE.

OLD WINE IN FRESH WINE SKINS. By PROFESSOR HOWARD OSGOOD, D.D., in *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July, 1893. Pages 460-486.

The old wine of biblical criticism is presented to the consumer in such fresh wine skins as Driver's "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament" and in Cornill's "Einleitung in das Alte Testament." Both scholars represent the same school of criticism, and are among the leading critics in England and Germany respectively. For comprehensive grasp of the situation and full facing of the sea the German is the captain on the bridge. He is entirely at ease on his vessel in the sea of criticism. The Englishman, on the other hand, has scarcely become *sea-mated* on these waters. It takes him

one-third longer to make the same trip, because all the way he tries to keep in sight of land without wrecking on the rocks. He uses the Kuenen compass, but for the sake of his passengers keeps within sighting range of the shore.

These works are marvellously faithful reprints of the critical views of Hermann Samuel Reimarus, author of "The Apology or Defence of the Rational Worshippers of God," which appeared in Hamburg in 1767. With a little shading here or lightening there, not only Cornill and Driver, but all such uniformed and skilled operators have used the same critical negatives. Higher criticism is neither new nor modern. Its germ dates from the second, its evolution and development from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Voltaire and the deistic Frederick II. of Prussia were among its most vigorous promoters about the middle of the eighteenth century. Kuenen, of our own century, himself a deist, held practically the old ground. He rejected the supernatural, the miraculous, and immediate revelation. Consistently, too, he maintained his ground. But this jewel is rarely found among his professed followers outside of the continent of Europe.

But this school of criticism, the world around, is cloistered. As if behind convent walls, shut off from the news of the past, it pores over its musty manuscripts, framing rules for detecting documents, devising dates, discussing development in the literary and religious history of Israel. But outside of their thick-walled, narrow-windowed confines there is bright light. This last half of the nineteenth century has produced arc-lights for the critic. The dynamos are located on the Nile and in the Mesopotamian valley. Only those who stay behind their adamantine walls of prejudice and cover their windows with the blinds of a false logic entirely ignore these new helps. Literature and history are all ablaze with this light. Civilization was old before Moses day. Language and religion were existent in remarkably perfect forms one thousand years before Israel's sojourn in Egypt. Southwestern Asia and Egypt were occupied at least two thousand years B. C. by peoples who had reached maturity in many respects in the chief elements of civilization. These facts are unchallenged by the best archæological scholarship of this day. How, then, can critics of recognized ability in other respects silently ignore this line of research? It simply cannot be done. This new-old history will compel recognition, particularly by men who claim to be historical critics. These facts once acknowledged and accepted, the foundation theories of these introductions are swept away as with a flood. Israel was not so far beneath its neighbors in language, religion, morals, and care for their sacred records. They were Semites, and among the best and brightest of them. Why then should they be, as these introductions make them appear, thousands of years behind the other Semitic peoples? These works imagine a state of society and religion before the age of David in blank contradiction to the facts revealed by the monuments. This purely imaginary society and religion give their theory its basis. "If these results of Egyptology and Assyriology are true,

then there is far greater reason for placing the composition of the Pentateuch in the classic age than in the age of the decline and abasement of Western Asiatic and Egyptian literature." Again, the New Testament is shut out of the race by Driver's preface as incompetent. How "strange to read eight hundred pages of criticism of the Old Testament by two Christian theological professors and never meet once with a mention of Christ or of the Holy Spirit or of the witness of the New Testament!" Kuenen cast the die for this stamp when he said, "We must either cast aside as worthless our dearly-bought scientific method, or must forever cease to acknowledge the authority of the New Testament *in the domain of the exegesis of the Old*. Without hesitation we choose the latter alternative" (Prophets, p. 448.)

But another and better school of criticism has arisen. It begins where the truest science begins, in the consciousness of each individual. Experimental religion, personal union with the Master, the aid of the Holy Spirit in the understanding of the Word, promise still more lasting and eternal conquests for the Bible and the Church.

Dr. Osgood insists on a broader study of criticism. To weigh correctly its results necessitates a careful examination of its history and of the latest discourses in the East. These points are essential and must be given due regard in the settlement of critical views.

PRICE.

Notes and Opinions.

Professor Bruce as a Leader of Thought in Scotland.—The Reverend Arthur Jenkinson has a very interesting article in the July *Thinker* on the Reverend Professor A. B. Bruce, D.D., as a Leader of Thought in Scotland. After speaking of the new feeling for the historic Christ which is characteristic of the present age, he writes: "No one represents this modern return to the Christianity of Christ so adequately or consistently as he does. The whole endeavor of his life has been to get back to the Christ of the gospels. Almost everything he has written has been an illustration and vindication of this movement. Through spiritual sympathy and imaginative insight it has been his life-long effort to understand Jesus."

Of Professor Bruce's influence, he writes: "There are hundreds of young men in Great Britain who would thankfully acknowledge that when they were sorely smitten with the malady of doubt, when the ground seemed slipping from them on all sides, the writings of Professor Bruce brought them just the help they needed."

Professor Bruce was born in 1831 in the rural parish of Aberdalgie, near Perth. His father was an elder in the parish church. "All through his childhood he must have heard the din of the 'Ten Years Conflict' which preceded the Disruption." The issue was between what was considered the latitudinarianism of the old church and the rigid orthodoxy handed down from the covenanters. Those who upheld the strict faith of the covenanters revolted and formed the Free Church. "Those were anxious and stirring times. Some of the most bitter controversies and troubles of that period sprang up in Perthshire. Keen discussions took place during the long winter nights concerning religion and the difficulties of the church, and when, in 1843, the great Disruption took place, Professor Bruce's father threw in his lot with the Free Church. And when, two years later, Alexander Bruce, still a mere boy, went up to Edinburgh and began his long course of study, first at the University, and afterwards in the new Divinity Hall of the Free Church, the evangelical fervor was at its height. Chalmers was still living, and Candlish, Cunningham, and Guthrie were the leading ministers of the city." But neither the creed nor the life of the church took hold on the young student. Thomas Carlyle was then doing his great work, and Bruce was one of the many who admired and revered him. In 1855 Dr. Bruce received license, and in 1859 was ordained. The intervening years were years of spiritual darkness and unrest. But during these years he found the Jesus of the Gospels.

With this experience he went to Cardross in 1859, his first parish. There by the shores of the Clyde he lived a quiet student life. His ministry was stimulating and helpful. The fruit of his ten years at Cardross is seen in his book, *The Training of the Twelve*. In the introduction, he states that it embodies thoughts that had occupied him from the beginning of his ministry. "It is very much more than a solid contribution to the study of the life and teaching of Christ. It is full of spiritual insight and inspiration; preëminently a book for ministers. In it we see its gifted author endeavoring to realize his own ideal of preachers of the gospel, 'men to whom a return to the evangelic fountains has been a necessity of their own spiritual life, possessing the power of historical imagination to place themselves side by side with Jesus as if they belonged to the circle of his personal companions and disciples, so gaining a clear vivid vision of his spirit, character and life, and becoming thoroughly imbued with his enthusiasms, his sympathies, and his antipathies, and with this experience behind them, the fruit of much thought and careful study, coming forth and saying to their fellow men in effect: 'That which was from the beginning which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, declare we unto you.'"

The Training of the Twelve was published in 1871, after the author had removed to Broughty-Ferry. In 1874 he was appointed Cunningham Lecturer, and selected for his subject, "The Humiliation of Christ." The lectures were published the following year. The Free Church had the wisdom to recognize his great gifts and appointed him to the chair of Apologetics and New Testament Exegesis in the College at Glasgow.

Dr. Bruce has written on fundamental philosophical problems and has shown himself thoroughly abreast of modern speculation and research, but his best work, that to which he gives himself with enthusiasm and delight concerns the Person and Teaching of Christ. The scope and nature of his work are shown by the following list of published works: *The Training of the Twelve*, 1871. *The Humiliation of Christ*, 1875. *The Chief End of Revelation*, 1881. *The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, 1882. *The Galilean Gospel*, 1883. *The Miraculous Element in the Gospels*, 1886. *The Life of Wm. Denny*, 1888. *The Kingdom of God*, 1889. *Apologetics, or Christianity Defensively Stated*, 1892. T. H. R.

Professor Bruce and the Higher Criticism.—From the same article in the *Thinker* we quote the following passages from Dr. Bruce regarding Revelation and the Bible. In his *Apologetics* (p. 298) his most recent work, published only a year ago, he writes: "To say that God gave a special revelation to Israel is not the same thing as to say that he gave to Israel a collection of sacred books. Revelation and the Bible are not synonymous. There was a revelation long before there was a Bible. God revealed himself in history as the God of the whole earth. . . . He revealed himself as a gracious electing God to the *consciousness* of Israel through spiritual insight into

the true significance of her history communicated to the prophets." The importance of this distinction between Revelation and the Bible in its bearing on the questions of the higher criticism is thus brought out in his work published twelve years ago, *The Chief End of Revelation* (p. 54): "If once we get it into our mind that Revelation is one thing, Scripture another though closely related thing, being in truth its record, interpretation, and reflection, it will help to make us independent of questions concerning the dates of books. When the various parts of the Bible were written is an obscure and difficult question on which much learned debate has taken place, and is still going on; and we must be content to let the debate run its course, for it will not be stopped either by our wishes or by ecclesiastical authority. And one thing which will help us to be patient is a clear perception, that the order in which revelation was given is to be distinguished from the order in which the books which contain the record thereof were written." On the delicate question of the relation of some of the conclusions of the higher criticism to inspiration, Professor Bruce makes the following remarks (*Apologetics*, p. 309): "If the critics are right, Hebrew editors could do without hesitation what we should think hardly compatible with literary honesty, mix up things old and new, ancient laws with recent additions, etc. . . . But what then? This may be crude morality, but it is not immorality. We must beware of laying down hard and fast abstract rules as to the conditions under which inspiration is possible."

T. H. R.

The Galilean Gospel.—Professor Bruce was asked by Mr. Jenkinson when he wrote *The Galilean Gospel*. He could not remember the year; but he knew it was written in the month of August. "It was a beautiful August," he said, "the world was full of joy and sunshine, and of the wealth and ripeness of summer. I was happy. The religion of Jesus seemed to me like the bright golden days, and I tried to write a book which would help men to feel that the Galilean Gospel was like God's summer, beautiful, life-giving, soul-satisfying." The above words with the following passage from the book referred to, (*The Galilean Gospel*, p. 6.) show well the spirit of Professor Bruce's work. "We desire to bring you back to the Galilean lake, to the haunts of Jesus, and to the *spirit* of Jesus, to the brightness and sunny summer richness and joy, and geniality, and freedom of the authentic gospel preached by him in the dawn of the era of grace. Some have not come to that happy place; many linger by the Dead Sea, and are disciples of John, to their great loss. For it is good to be with Jesus in Galilee. An evangelic faith, and still more, if possible, an evangelic temper, in sympathy with the Galilean proclamation, is a grand desideratum. It is what is needed to redeem the evangel from the suspicion of exhaustion or impotence, and to rescue the very term 'evangelic' from the reproach under which it lies, in the thoughts of many."

T. H. R.

The Epistle to the Hebrews.—No epistle in the New Testament is more striking than this. It is a book to be read as a whole from first chapter to last. In no other New Testament book is there so pure a diction. None other has a more elevated style, a loftier tone. It may perhaps be said that none is so varied in its contents, so picturesque, so absorbing in the progress of its thought.

It is not strange that Luther, and that others since his day have attributed it to Apollos, the eloquent Alexandrian, and we can easily see why it took such a hold on Dr. John Owen as to cause him to say in so extreme a fashion, "the world may as well want the sun as the church this epistle." It is written with a preacher's power. It is deeply spiritual. It is lofty, yet simple; ideal, yet practical. In no book is there a keener insight into character, a more natural and flowing and cumulative argument, a more skillful blending of stern rebuke and of urgent entreaty and encouragement.

The sweep of thought is wide. The epistle is full of striking passages. Where else do we find so great a number of varied, clean cut presentations? These are the most marked: the lofty presentation of Jesus as the Son of God; his brotherhood with man; the apostasy of the Israelites in the wilderness, and their failure to enter into the rest; the picture of Melchizedek, priest of God, "without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life." Where else do we find passages with so grand and yet simple a movement as that one in which the heroes of faith and their achievements are presented, and that other in which the contrast is made between Mt. Sinai and Mt. Zion? The main central portion of the book, too, that in which is presented the better priesthood, the better covenant, and the better ministry of sacrifice, through which only is perfection, is rich and varied, and of great power and beauty.

But it is the purpose and spirit of the writer that makes the epistle the vital and intensely human book it is. It is this that binds all the parts together into one. It is this spirit and purpose that gives the book its peculiar fascination, that is the ground of its striking contrasts and wide range and sweep of thought, and is the secret of its deep spiritual power.

It is written to a body of Hebrew Christians. Their conception of Christ is not a high one. They are at a low ebb of faith and life. There is danger of an apostasy from the faith. The life of a church is at stake. The issue is a vital one. Warning and appeal run through the book. Sharp rebuke and solemn warning are mingled with urgent entreaty and generous encouragement. The writer has a buoyant faith that the church will be true to its allegiance. Hope, courage, faith, steadfastness,—these are the tone of the book. The appeal is based on the strong, forceful argument that Jesus is the Son of God, the High Priest, who has found eternal redemption, who is able to save to the uttermost. The epistle is buoyant, even triumphant in spirit, and it is this spirit that the writer will infuse into the church.

One of the passages of warning is treated very interestingly and forcefully

by Professor William Milligan, D.D., in the May and June numbers of the *Expositor*. We give below the passage with his interpretation.

Hebrews 6 : 4-6.—“*For as touching those who were once enlightened and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and tasted the good Word of God and the powers of the age to come, and then fell away, it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame.*”

This passage, Professor Milligan maintains, does not refer, as is ordinarily held, to a complete apostasy from the faith. He claims that the true interpretation gives a milder teaching, and writes: “Like the words of our Lord himself, when he says of the sin against the Holy Ghost, that it cannot be forgiven, either in this world or the world to come, the words of the epistle have struck terror into many a heart, and have led not a few followers of Christ into despair rather than into renewed or increased exertion in the Christian life.” The difficulty, however, with the interpretation suggested by Professor Milligan, is that it robs the passage of very much of its force, and seems merely to give a statement which in the nature of things is self-evident. Taken by itself in the ordinary sense, it is certainly a most solemn warning, and undoubtedly has had the effect mentioned. But it must be taken in its relation to the rest of the epistle with its prevailing tone of hope, courage, faith.

Professor Milligan's interpretation is, in brief, this: The passage describes a state into which the Hebrews had fallen. The word *παριίπτει*, expressed in the aorist participle denotes a definite act in past time, not a complete apostasy, but a falling away, having in it probably the element of wilful transgression, cf. Heb. 10:26. The participles translated, “Seeing they crucify,” and “put him to an open shame” are present, denoting continuous action. There is no falling away here spoken of such that it may not be repented of. Christ prayed for the forgiveness of those who crucified him. All things are possible with God. The evident meaning of the passage is, it is impossible to renew them to repentance, the while (as in the margin) they crucify, etc. They cannot be brought to repentance because they keep crucifying the Son of God. So long as they do this repentance is impossible.

The article by Professor Milligan is very interesting and forceful. He would apply the passage to those who stop in the first principles of the Christian life, having no adequate conception of the lofty character of Christ, and by their inconsistent living, unconsciously perhaps, though no less really, crucify the Son of God,—this Son of God, who is the life of God in the soul.

The objection to this interpretation is, that it would not effect the purpose that the writer has in mind. He wishes to remind them that there is such a thing as an apostasy with its terrible consequences. His warnings are few and short, but very sharp and effective. In 10:26, 27, he speaks of the “fearful expectation of judgment and a fierceness of fire” for those who sin

wilfully after having received the knowledge of the truth. In the third and fourth chapter he holds up before them as a warning the Israelites who failed to enter into the promised land through unbelief. "Let us therefore give diligence to enter into that rest, that no man fall after the same example of disobedience." (4:11.) And following this passage in question (6:4-6) he makes clear and vivid his meaning by the illustration of the land. "For the land which hath drunk the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them for whose sake it is also tilled, receiveth blessing from God; but if it beareth thorns and thistles, it is rejected and nigh unto a curse; whose end is to be burned" (6:7, 8). Moreover, at the very beginning of his argument, after his lofty introduction of Jesus as the Son of God, he exclaims: "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" and following this passage of stern warning, which we are now considering, (6:4-8) he writes: "But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak" (6:9). In 10:39, likewise, at the end of his argument and exhortation, before the long passage on the heroes of faith and the appeal based thereon, he concludes: "*But we are not of them that shrink back unto perdition, but of them that have faith unto the saving of the soul.*"

Thus at the beginning and at the very end of his argument, and in both the long passages of exhortation, (5:11-6:12 and 10:19-39,) there come the words of warning with the very plain declaration of the terrible results of apostasy. Both of these long passages of personal exhortation are remarkable for their entreaty, their encouragement, the strong faith which the writer has in those to whom he writes, and his generous appreciation of their past love and good will and sufferings, as well as for the words of stern rebuke and solemn warning. His purpose is to quicken them; to arouse them to a sense of their danger, lest there shall be any among them who shall be in that state which he describes. And this is best done by the vivid presentation of a state of soul which is past salvation. Such a state he could hardly represent in other words than those he uses, a state in which wilfully and continuously the Son of God is crucified and is put to an open shame. Only rarely does he touch on this dark side, and then only briefly, with words of faith and encouragement immediately following, as here: "But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation."

T. H. R.

Work and Workers.

THE August issue of *Biblia* is especially interesting.

RABBI HENRY BERKOWITZ, of the Rodef Sholom Congregation in Philadelphia, is to read a paper at the parliament of religions on "The Voice of the Mother of Religions."

REV. DR. HERRICK JOHNSON in a conversation quoted in the *Chautauqua Assembly Herald* of July 29, states this interesting fact concerning theological institutions in Chicago. "There are seven theological seminaries in Chicago, more than in any other city in America, and Canon Farrar, when in Chicago, told me that he knew of no city in Europe that could approach it in this particular." There are nine Presbyterian seminaries in the country, said Dr. Johnson, not including two German, McCormick leads in point of numbers, having 213 students. Probably no theological school has graduated a larger class than that of McCormick this year, viz.: seventy-three students.

IT IS difficult to follow the work of the Palestine and the Egyptian Exploration Fund unless we have a clear idea of the work these Societies have done in the past and of the present purpose and plans and methods. In the August number we gave a valuable condensed statement of the work of the Palestine Exploration Fund made by one of the officers of the Fund. We present below a corresponding statement of the work of the Egypt Exploration Fund. Both are found in *Biblia*.

The Egyptian Exploration Fund was founded in 1883, under the Presidency of the late Sir Erasmus Wilson, for the purpose of promoting historical investigation in Egypt by means of systematically conducted explorations; particular attention being given to sites which may be expected to throw light upon obscure questions of history and topography, such as those connected with the mysterious "Hyksos" period, the district of the Hebrew sojourn, the route of the exodus, and the early sources of Greek art. The work is conducted on the principle of careful examination of all details, and the preservation of objects discovered. These objects are of supreme value and interest, inasmuch as they illustrate the international influences of Egyptian, Greek, Assyrian, and Syrian styles; afford reliable data for the history of comparative art; reveal ancient technical processes; and yield invaluable examples of art in metal, stone and pottery. The metrological results are also of the highest importance, some thousands of the weights having already been found.

Since the establishment of the Fund in 1883, explorers have been sent out every season; two and sometimes three, conducting excavations in different parts of the Delta. Each year has been fruitful in discoveries. Much has been done towards the restoration of the ancient topography of Lower Egypt. The sites of famous cities have been identified; the biblical Pithom-Succoth, the city of Goshen, the Greek Naukratis, and Daphnæ (identical with the biblical *Tahpanhes*), have been discovered; statues and inscriptions, papyri, and beautiful objects in bronze and other metals, as well as in porcelain and glass, have been found; new and unexpected light (not less momentous, or likely to produce less effect on contemporary criticism, than the discoveries of Dr. Schliemann in Greece and Asia) has been cast upon the ancient history of the Hebrews; the early stages of the route of the exodus have been defined, and its direction determined; three most important chapters in the history of Greek art and Greek epigraphy have been recovered from the ruins or Naukratis, Daphnæ, and Bubastis; and, lastly, a series of archæological surveys of the Delta have been made, most of the larger mounds having been measured and planned.

Excavations have been carried on principally at the following sites:

1883.—*Tel-el-Maskhutah*, in the Wady Tumilat, discovered to be Pithom-Succoth, one of the "store-cities" built by the forced labor of the Hebrew colonists in the time of the oppression. This discovery and its results are described by the explorer, Dr. Naville, in his Memoir entitled "The Store-City of Pithom," in which the route of the exodus is laid down.

1884.—*San* (the Tanis of the Septuagint and the Greek historians, the Zoan of the Bible). This excavation and its results are described by Mr. W. M. Flinders Petrie, in the Memoir entitled "Tanis, Part I."

1885.—*Tell Nebireh*, in the Western Delta, discovered to be Naukratis. This excavation and its results are described by Mr. W. M. F. Petrie, in the Memoir entitled "Naukratis, Part I.," by Mr. Ernest A. Gardner, Director of the English School at Athens, in "Naukratis, Part II."

Also, *Saft-el-Henneh*, discovered to be the town of Goshen, capital of the ancient district of that name. This excavation and its results are described by Dr. Naville, in the Memoir entitled "Goshen, and the Shrine of Saft-el-Henneh."

1886.—*Tell Defenneh*, the biblical "Tahpanhes" and the "Daphnæ" of the classical historians; also *Tell Nebeskeh*, site of the ancient city of "Am," a dependency of Tanis. These excavations and their results are described by Mr. W. M. Flinders Petrie, and his coadjutor, Mr. F. Llewellyn Griffith, in a Memoir entitled "Daphnæ," included in "Tanis, Part II."

1887.—*Tell-el-Yakudiyeh*, an ancient Jewish settlement, now shown to be the city of Onias described by Josephus. Memoir entitled "Onias," by Dr. Naville.

1889-90.—*Tell Basta*, the Pi-Beseth of the Bible and Bubastis of the Greeks. Dr. Naville located the precise site of this once magnificent red

granite temple, and disinterred its grand ruins, abounding in superb monolithic shafts, massive architraves, sculptured blocks, broken colossi, bas-relief groups, etc., inscribed with valuable hieroglyphic texts. The inscriptions touching the Pyramid era, Hyksos kings, and the warlike XVIIIth Dynasty (that of Thothmes) are of absorbing interest to the historian, while the inscriptions relating to the period of Joseph are of thrilling interest to every student of the Bible. "Bubastis, Part I," by Dr. Naville. "Part II," to appear in the spring of 1892.

1890-91.—*Ahnas-el-Medineh*, the Hanes of the Bible and Heracleopolis of the Greeks. Its mounds were excavated by Dr. Naville. Memoir to appear.

1891-3.—*Tell Mokdam* and *Deir el-Bahari* (Thebes). The latter is a most important place for explorative labors.

1890-3.—*The Archaeological Survey of Egypt*, for which a special fund is provided; under the charge of Messrs. Percy Newberry, Buchman, J. E. Newberry and Carter. This work is of incomparable importance in many ways, and, in view of the wholesale and irreparable destruction of sculptures by Arabs, tourists and dealers in "Antiques," needs to be pushed vigorously forward. The famous tombs of *Beni Hasan* were thoroughly explored in '90-'92, and in '92-'93 the historic antiquities from Beni Hasan southward will be surveyed, traced, photographed, copied, etc. The tombs at El Bersheh having been exhaustively surveyed, the survey officials proceeded to Tel el-Amarna, the scene of the discovery of the famous tablets. Dr. Winslow outlined the purpose of the survey in *Biblia* for November, 1890; and in January, 1892, he described some of the "results" at Beni Hasan. A "Special Extra Report," illustrated, edited by Miss Edwards, published in December, 1891, treated of the work there accomplished. The first memoir of the survey is a quarto with thirty-one beautiful plates and illustrations (four in colors), treating of the sculptures and pictures of Beni Hasan, in which the social and business life of men, 2500 B. C., is richly depicted, and the facial types afford an ethnographical study, very valuable and altogether unique. A volume on El Bersheh, or at least one on Tel el-Amarna will be published. Special circulars relating to the survey may be had from Dr. Winslow.

The foregoing outlines the most important labors of the Fund. An annual quarto volume, with elaborate illustrations and photographs, is published. All donors or subscribers of not less than \$5 receive this volume of the season and annual report; previous volumes are \$5 each. The Survey volume of the season is sent to all subscribers or donors of not less than \$5 to the Survey. Said Dr. W. Hayes Ward, editor, in *The Independent*, "The annual volumes published are abundant remuneration to the subscribers of five dollars." Three hundred men of the highest rank in education, theology, letters, business and public life—among them eighty-nine university or college presidents—have subscribed to the American branch of the Fund. For circulars and all information address the Honorary Secretary and Treasurer, for the United States, Rev. W. C. Winslow, 525 Beacon Street, Boston.

ONE of the most prominent of the Scotch biblical and theological teachers is Professor Bruce of Glasgow. We give elsewhere (under Notes and Opinions) passages from a very interesting sketch of Dr. Bruce in the July *Thinker*. Dr. Bruce's most recent contribution is "Paul's Conception of Christianity," now appearing in the issues of the *Expositor*. These articles will be published in book form, thus increasing the already long list of works that he has written. His last published work, *Apologetics or Christianity Defensively Stated* (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1892), is divided into three parts. The first treats of the Christian facts, and Christian and other Theories of the Universe. The second is devoted to the Historical Preparation for Christianity, and embraces the questions connected with Hebrew History and Literature in their relation to Christ. The third deals with the Christian Origins, and covers the main controversies bearing on historical Christianity. A writer in the *Critical Review* for January reviewing the book, speaks of Dr. Bruce as follows: "Dr. Bruce is too well-known to our readers to need here and now any introduction. He has already attained distinction as a clear, fearless, and yet cautious thinker. His previously published books have done not a little in directing and giving tone to learned thought and inquiry on some of the most crucial and perplexing questions of our time. He has contributed his fair proportion of solid thinking towards that reconstruction of our theology for which, in its manifold departments, we are all striving and waiting." Concerning the book in question, he writes: "The present volume will well sustain the author's reputation. From beginning to end it bears on it the impress of a man who has a firm grip of the matter he handles; who clearly understands the positions he assails, and who, while . . . considerate of the difficulties of faith, is strong in his adhesion to what evidently has passed through the testing processes of his own intellect and heart." . . . "What the author seeks is a fair hearing for Christianity. On this account we must welcome the work of Dr. Bruce as one of the most valuable of our time. To all who thirst to know the best that can be said on matters vital to their own lives, this volume will prove exceedingly helpful. It is clear, robust, and vigorous in style; well arranged in chapters, with useful tables of contents, and index; and in the working out of the various lines of thought, pervaded by a strong common sense and large-hearted charity. Those who wish to pursue their studies more in detail on the various points of discussion, will find very serviceable to this end the references to the literature pertaining thereto placed at the head of each chapter."

Comparative-Religion Notes.

IN Professor Max Müller's fourth volume of Gifford Lectures just issued, entitled *Theosophy or Psychological Religion*, is a discussion of Zoroastrianism or the religion of ancient Persia. While adding nothing of importance to our knowledge of it, Professor Müller presents some views respecting the relation of Judaism to the Persian faith which are very striking and important. He holds that there are coincidences which are so close that the only explanation of them is borrowing. This borrowing has been on both sides. Zoroastrianism is distinguished from the closely related Hindu religious systems by its monotheism. This monotheistic bent so different from the "monotheism" of the Vedas, is due to the influence of the Israelites who had been deported to Media by the Assyrian kings and there came into contact with the adherents of Zoroastrianism. It was Israel that taught Persia the faith of the one God. On the other hand Judaism took from the Persian religion the beliefs in the resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul, and the doctrine of future rewards and punishments. They are not in the older portions of the Old Testament. They appeared among the Jews after the Jewish commonwealth had come under Persian domination. In the Persian religion they are a part of the earliest faith. Even the biblical "I am that I am" as a divine name is discovered by Professor Müller in the Avesta, and from critical grounds, he argues that here the Old Testament must have borrowed from Persia. These conclusions seem to be accepted on not altogether established grounds, and the student must suspend his judgment until further researches are made into the ancient Persian sacred literature, one of the most difficult of all the subjects with which students are grappling to-day. It is gratifying to know that such competent and brilliant scholars have given themselves to this field as Mills, Darmesteter, and Geldner, and not the least among them the American scholar, Jackson of Columbia College, New York.

It is not to be wondered at that there have been many expressions of distrust and disfavor respecting the Parliament of Religions, to be held in connection with the Columbian Exposition. The wonder is, some may think, that it has been received with so much applause. Strict old-school theologians, timid religionists, and many orthodox partisans were bound to oppose it. Conscientious scruples against bringing the unique religion of Christ into friendly relations with the "false" religions have compelled the withdrawal of sympathy and assistance in some quarters. Even ridicule

and abuse have been poured upon the idea from some religious newspapers. Yet it has not lacked defenders, not a few of whom have come from the ranks of missionaries. The Rev. T. J. Scott of Calcutta, expresses himself vigorously on the subject after the following fashion: "Now all the ridicule that is heaped on this enterprise, seems to assume that there is nothing in the great ethnic religions, and that systems of religious thought that have held millions of the race from antiquity, are worthy only of a passing sneer. Think how comparatively small a part of the race during the ages have had the Bible. Think of the millions that have come and gone in the ancient historic nations, and in the nations that have come down to our time, as India, China, and Japan. The population that has had the Bible is but a drop in the ocean compared with these. Have these had but very small measure of God's grace and love while his wrath only has ever lowered over them, abandoned only to darkness and despair? Have they had no dispensation of mercy and hope? To claim this is what has provoked the statement that if such is the Bible and the God of the Bible, the less of them propagated abroad the better. As one puts it, 'Why try to prove the love of God to nations whom on your own showing, God has left from the creation until now in darkness.' Has God had no care over these nations? Has he never spoken to them? Is there a providence over all the world, and if so, is there nothing to learn from these nations? What of the Gentile saints mentioned in the Bible, as Melchizedek and Job, and Jethro, father-in-law to Moses, and Cornelius, and others not so mentioned? Too many religious teachers manifest a narrow and ungenerous spirit in this matter. I have not so learned Christ. God's attitude toward the Gentile nations will yet be interpreted in a better light. What may seem to the *Indian Witness* and to some correspondents prudence and wisdom, is hardly the spirit of Jesus, nor of Paul his great apostle to the Gentiles, nor will it be the spirit of the twentieth century. No one need be ashamed to meet the representatives of the ethnic faiths at Chicago, and seek 'to deepen the spirit of human brotherhood among the religious men of diverse faiths.' Nor will any one be "ashamed of the gospel of Christ."

FROM an address recently delivered by the United States ex-minister to Russia, Hon. Charles Emory Smith, on the Greek Church, the following passages give a clear idea of the usages and present status of that great branch of Christendom:

"The Greek Church is that part of the great Christian body which recognizes only the authority of the first seven Ecumenical Councils. Originally it was united with the Roman Church. Differences began to spring up as early as the fifth century, but the schism was not fully completed till the eleventh century. The Greek Church is practically a federation of churches without any center of authority. There is no Pope in the Greek Church, but there are Patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, the chief

prelate being known as the Metropolitan. The Russian Greek Church embraces nearly seventy-five million adherents, more than the entire population of the United States. The Emperor of Russia is the head of the church, but he has no more to do with its doctrines than the King of Italy or the Emperor of Austria has with the doctrines of the Roman Church. The emperor is described as the defender of the faith. As far as the appointive power goes, he is the complete head of the hierarchy, and the Holy Synod is made up of his appointees. The Greek Church agrees with the Roman Church in various dogmas. They have the same veneration for the Virgin and mass. They recognize the sacraments and pay attention to fasting. But there are marked distinctions. The Greek Church denies the primacy and spiritual supremacy of the Popes. It recognizes no human infallibility except on the part of the Ecumenical Council. It maintains that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, not from the Son; rejects the doctrine of purgatory, though it recognizes the intercession of the saints. The church has what is termed a white clergy and a black clergy. The latter are monks. They are celibates. But the white clergy are required to marry. The white clergy preponderate. It is from the black clergy that the high prelates are chosen. The white clergy are not allowed to exercise any choice as to their wives. The selection is made by a bishop, who chooses the widow or daughter of another priest. All the priest's sons must become priests, and the only possible method of escape is by entering the army. The Greek Church does not have images, but rather representations of the Saviour, the Madonna, and the saints upon surfaces. These representations are called ikons, and those in the edifices are beautiful and very valuable, being studded often with precious stones. In every house and every shop is an ikon, and when one enters the door he must take off his hat in respect for the ikon. As to the character of the worship, one never hears a sermon. I never heard but one Russian hierarch deliver a discourse, and that was on an anniversary. The services consist of mass and music. Sometimes the music is very monotonous, but then it will become most entertaining and ravishing, the grandest melodies and the sweetest voices that I ever heard. Women do not take part. All the singing is by men and boys. The boys who have the sweetest voices are selected for the priesthood, and their voices are trained during their whole life. There is no instrumental music."

Book Reviews.

Kritisch-exegetische Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Von H. D. W. MEYER: Das Johannes-Evangelium, 8te. Auflage, neu bearbeitet von Prof. Dr. Bernhard Weiss. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1892., pp. 3+635.

The third revision of Meyer's commentary on John by Dr. Bernhard Weiss, which has just been published, is the most valuable addition to the exegesis of the Fourth Gospel in recent years. As is usually the case in German commentaries of this class, the original author is in a large degree secondary to his editor. Meyer is constantly referred to as if he were an outside authority, and his views are often pronounced untenable. Two striking illustrations are furnished by the first few pages of the exposition. On the much-debated question of the origin of John's conception of the Logos the two expositors differ very widely. Meyer maintains that the evangelist was acquainted with, and in some measure influenced by, Alexandrine speculation. Dr. Weiss cannot find the faintest trace of such influence. The diffusion of Alexandrine speculation in Asia Minor, he thinks, cannot be historically proved, and the evangelist's use of the word in his Prologue can be satisfactorily explained from his recollections of the teaching of Jesus and from the Old Testament. In v. 18 of the same chapter Dr. Weiss still adheres to the reading "only begotten God," which Meyer rejected as a dogmatic gloss appended in imitation of the first words of the Prologue. A conspicuous, and, on the whole, advantageous deviation from Meyer's method is the insertion of the textual criticism in the body of the exposition, or in foot-notes, instead of at the beginning of each chapter. There has also been considerable condensation of the matter in many places, to the reader's relief. It goes without saying, that the exegesis is invariably characterized by fine scholarship, and often by rare exegetical insight. We miss, indeed, the indefinable delicacy of spiritual intuition so often exhibited by Meyer, as we are occasionally reminded by quotations, but the editor gives so much valuable matter of his own that the loss is nearly if not quite compensated by the gain. One great question, however—the miracles of the Fourth Gospel—is treated in a very disappointing way. The reader finds it almost impossible to discover the commentator's real opinion. The cautiously-expressed suggestion that the feeding of the multitude may have been effected by the power of Jesus over the minds of those around him which induced them to give up whatever stores of food they possessed, is almost as improbable as the strange expedients to which the early rationalists

used to resort in their efforts to eliminate the miraculous from the life of Christ. The resurrection of Lazarus seems to be admitted, but the admission is coupled with the curious notion that Lazarus (as well as those whose restoration to life is recorded in the synoptic gospels) was preserved from conscious entrance into that state of being into which the human spirit usually passes when separated from the body. On the other hand, it is satisfactory to note the peremptory rejection of the theories propounded by Paulus, Strauss, and Renan respectively. Even more interesting than the exposition is the introduction, which treats of the authorship, date, purpose and nature of the Fourth Gospel. Those who are already familiar with the works of Dr. Weiss will eagerly turn to this part of the volume to ascertain the present attitude of one of the ripest living scholars to "the Johannan Question." A summary of the whole argument would occupy too much space, so that a few selected points must suffice. Speaking generally, Dr. Weiss stands where he did. Both the external evidence, which is marshalled with wonderful skill and force, and the internal evidence, endorse, to his mature judgment, the testimony of tradition that the apostle John wrote this gospel in Asia in the last quarter of the first century. The kernel of the gospel, he still believes, consists of true history and faithfully reported teaching; but the form has been in a considerable degree colored and moulded by the writer's strong individuality. No direct purpose is admitted except that plainly indicated in the gospel itself. The view which has found so much favor with modern critics, that the gospel cannot have been written by the writer of the Apocalypse, is discountenanced by Dr. Weiss. The fundamental difference between the two writings, he argues, renders close comparison inappropriate: they were separated by an interval of twenty years, during which Jerusalem was destroyed and the apostle John removed from Palestine to Asia, and, notwithstanding their radical dissimilarity, they exhibit many correspondences of thought, imagery, and expression. All this is not sufficient to prove identity of authorship, but it ought to prevent the assumption that this identity is impossible. As the work seems to have almost passed through the press at Christmas, Dr. Weiss was unable to use the newly discovered Gospel of Peter, so that we are left in ignorance of the accomplished exegete's estimate of the bearing of the document on the controversy. He claims to have consulted recent authorities as far as possible, but there is a regrettable paucity of references to works written in English; and it is rather surprising that even the famous article of Dr. Schürer seems to be ignored.

W. TAYLOR SMITH.

The Expositor's Bible: The First Book of Kings. By the Ven. Archdeacon F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1893. Pages xii. and 503. Price \$1.50.

The biblical and Christian world owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Farrar for his many valuable contributions to the better understanding of sacred literature. His mastery of the English tongue in its most fascinating forms, his prodigious

learning in many fields, and his firm grasp of the truth of whatever he handles give great popularity to every product of his restless pen. In the book here noticed he applies his methods and skill to an historical book of the Old Testament. It gives a great field for the play of a keen imagination, as well as for prudence in picking out the chief lessons to be impressed upon the reader. The author puts the whole narrative through his loom, weaves together into exquisite patterns the warp and woof at his disposal. Striking expressions, telling hits, illustrations from all history, bits of pat poetry, and an elegant rhetorical finish fill the book with genuine interest.

The work is divided into four books, (I) Introduction, (II) David and Solomon, (III) the Divided Kingdom, (IV) Ahab and Elijah. The introduction discusses (1) the higher criticism, (2) the Book of Kings, (3) the historian of Kings, (4) God in history, (5) history with a purpose, (6) lessons of the history. The body of the Book of I. Kings is treated in forty-one chapters, and the whole is concluded with an appendix on chronology, in which the last and best system (division of kingdom, 937 B. C.) is adopted.

In the introduction the writer defines, though not always clearly, his position on critical questions. The discussion shows that he follows, though cautiously, such authorities as Robertson Smith, Stade and Kittel. He is quite ready to speak of "historic tradition" (p. 302), "details added later" (p. 297); and sometimes to question the historical verity of the narrative. He, of course, is not an independent investigator on these lines, and, as we should expect, must, in large part, popularize positions already taken by recognized leaders. While carefully following the latest works in these studies, he has not neglected to add an abundance of useful and striking examples out of his fund of knowledge of ancient and modern history. His method of pursuing the subject by topics rather than by texts furnishes ample play for adding to this rich source of teaching and truth. The abundance of footnotes tells of the wide preparation of the author, and are also an extremely valuable apparatus for the real student. The book has no index—a blemish, indeed, on an otherwise praise-worthy and helpful work.

PRICE.

Wit and Humor of the Bible: A Literary Study. By MARION D. SHUTTER, D.D. Boston: The Arena Publishing Co. 1893. Pages 219. Price \$1.50.

"What a title!" Why not? The Bible represents the whole circle of human nature. Its serene and solemn, gay and joyous moods are pictured. It would be passing strange if the Bible contained no traces of genuine wit. This is a bright book. It brings out numerous cases of biting repartee, sarcastic retort, and caustic irony. In some cases the humor is apparent only in the curt, epigrammatic expression. In others there are real startling flashes of wit. This is a new and legitimate side to the human nature of the Bible, and Mr. Shutter has brought it out with good effect.

PRICE.

The Expositor's Bible. Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. By WALTER F. ADENEY, M.A. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. Chicago: A. C. McClurg. 1893. Pages viii and 404. Price, \$1.50.

A breezy book stirs up the mind and is as interesting and fascinating as cycling. But commentaries rarely start the enthusiasm of the truth-seeker. Occasionally, however, one is found which contains a veritable storage battery, charging and driving ahead with alarming momentum every mind which touches it. Such works are almost diamond-rare in this series. The expository style is not the most compact for chained argument. It breaks connection too often to draw a heavy load. Professor Adeney's volume has some excellent features. With forcible, plain, straightforward, and sometimes eloquent thought and language, he carries along his reader. No one is in doubt about his position. Fully abreast of the best information, he is fresh and helpful. The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah are genuinely historical, though put together some time after the events therein recorded. Esther is probably a product of some Jewish writer in the Persian Empire, built upon some slight foundation in fact. The character sketches are well made and add materially to the worth of the book. No notice, however, is amplified regarding the recent finds at Susa by the French Dieulafoy. This is too important a fact to be overlooked. This volume is quite above the average in the series.

PRICE.

The Expositor's Bible. The Book of Joshua. By W. G. BLAIKIE, D.D., LL.D. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1893. Pages viii and 416. Price, \$1.50.

This series of sermonic or expository commentaries has already grown to thirty-six volumes, evenly divided between the Old and New Testaments. Of the eighteen on the Old, Dr. Blaikie has already contributed to the first six-volume set two books on Samuel. As a biblical scholar his position is well understood, contrasting strikingly with the views of several other contributors to these Old Testament volumes. In the introduction to his exposition proper, he lays before the reader his reasons for finding a supernatural cause behind the remarkable events in the lives of individuals and of Israel in their early history. The higher critics come in for their share of notice, and are practically forced to retire. Modern criticism has little influence in the treatment of the Book of Joshua. He hews to the old lines. The miraculous is as abundant as ever. But there is a charm in the spirit of the writer. The moral and spiritual is made to glisten on almost every page. A gem of a sermon is each section, and a lesson of interest to the popular reader. It would be ungracious to mention minor faults in this short notice; but one thing should be said, the author sometimes wearies his reader by a disproportionate expansion of some choice thought. The uniform type and binding of the series pleases the book-lover.

PRICE.

Manual of the Science of Religion. By P. D. CHANTEPIE DE LA SAUSSAYE. Translated from the German by BEATRICE S. COLYER-FERGUSON. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 1891. Pp. 672. Price, \$3.00.

The "Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte" of de la Saussaye, is the latest and best of the books which aim to give a compendious survey of the field of the world's religions. Its range of reading is very wide, its facts carefully selected and verified, its temper charitable, and its attitude broad-minded and sympathetic. Perhaps the most commendable feature of the book is its objective character. The writer presents both sides of any controverted question with the arguments for each, and rarely reveals his own position. While this characteristic deprives the book of an original and independent value, its usefulness as a hand-book for reference is thereby immensely increased. With the purpose he has in view, the writer has done wisely to efface his own individuality, and thus to present as in a mirror the present condition of discussion and investigation in this new and ambitious science.

To possess this work in an English translation was most desirable, though there are certain defects about this particular translation which detract from its value. Why should a new and misleading name have been given to it? "Manual of the *Science* of Religion" it is not, but "Manual of the *History* of Religion." Why should this volume bear a title leading one to regard it as a translation of the completed work of Saussaye? The preface alone informs us that it contains the first of the two volumes of the German original, and the publication of the other volume will depend on the reception of this one by English readers. One who buys this volume finds the information as to the world's religions confined to general discussions on the philosophy and phenomenon of religions and to chapters on the Chinese, Egyptian, Babylonian, and Assyrian, and the Indian religions. The second volume of the German contains the studies on the Religions of Persia, Greece, Rome, the Teutons and Islam. The hope will be cherished by all who know the German original that the second volume will soon be translated, and the book not be compelled to sail under false colors as a complete work when it is only partial.

The preface claims that the translation has been revised by Professor de la Saussaye, and the notes and corrections of the author have been incorporated into it. The translator, a daughter of Professor Max Müller, has also had the help of her distinguished father in her task. These facts lead one to expect unusual exactness in the translation and an added value over the original. The former expectation cannot be said to be realized. While the general sense of the original has usually been caught, the details of translation are curiously inaccurate. The same word is given different meanings on the same page. Carelessness and haste are often too apparent. Sometimes the author's meaning is entirely missed. It is almost incredible how so much poor work could have escaped the competent inspection—if thorough—of the two revisers of the translation. It will not be safe for any student to use the

English translation as authority in details without first referring to the original for verification. It is to be hoped that when a second edition is called for, a careful and thorough revision will be made. Apart from its inaccuracy the translation is smooth, reads easily, and makes the book as attractive as any handbook can be expected to be. The English reader will be surprised to find how much progress has been made in formulating the principles and working out the details of the Science of Religion, while the large amount of work which is being done in the collection of religious facts and the organization of them will be more than surprising. The typography is excellent. The usual absence of an index, common to most English books,—the absence, we mean, not the index,—is, as usual, deplorable.

G. S. G.

The World of the Unseen. By ARTHUR WILLINK. New York: Macmillan & Co.

This book is a curiosity in literature. It is a product of that venturesome disposition of man which prompts him to seek a solution for every mystery. The author's avowed object is to show "that it is in higher space that we look for the understanding of the unseen." Our common habit of representing the future state of men as spiritual, and of assuming that spirit is of necessity invisible, seems quite unsatisfactory to him. He thinks that John's vision of the redeemed in the spiritual world was a vision of beings like unto ourselves. We do not see our departed friends because they dwell in "the higher space," not because they have become essentially unlike us. The difference is in the space. That in which they dwell is different in its conditions from ours. John was "in the spirit" when he had this vision.

An illustration of what this higher space may be is wrought out with much care, and with some ingenuity. Lower space is divided up as to dimensions, or, as our author prefers to say, directions. Each of these is in close connection with the others, but the conditions of each are different from those of the rest. The first is enclosed in a tube of infinite length, and although of no appreciable width, yet wide enough for an atom to be held in it. This is space in one direction. This tube moved laterally would describe superficial space of two directions. Adding now thickness we have space of three directions. These all lie together, and are parts of each other. But a being dwelling in space of only one direction could not see beings in superficial space, and those dwelling in superficial space could not see any being outside of their special relations. There may be points of contact, however, where these different kinds of space intersect each other, and he who stands at that point of contact may see, in higher spaces than his own, beings invisible to his fellows in the lower space. John, "in the spirit," stood at such a point of contact. Space of the "fourth direction" was open to his view. From that space came all spiritual beings, such as angels, who have shown themselves to men in this world, and back into that space they go. It was in the same way that the Master, after his resurrection, so mysteriously appeared and dis-

appeared in the presence of his disciples. He did not change his form as he went and came. He only changed his space relations.

What this fourth direction is Mr. Willink does not attempt to explain. He says that only a few favored souls can even picture it to their mind, and he is not one of *them*. It would seem as though one of these favored ones should have written the book. As it is, the work is of a very doubtful value. It is simply an attempt to explain a mystery by a mystery, and to common minds the mystery which is to explain will seem greater than the one to be explained.

B. F. S.

Guide to the Knowledge of God. By A. GRATRY, Professor of Theology at the Sorbonne. Translated by ABBY L. ALGER. Boston: Roberts Brothers.

This work in its original form has passed through many editions. The author starts out with a saying of Bossuet, which he quotes with approval, that "wisdom consists in knowing God and knowing one's self." He declines to regard the knowledge of God's existence as a first truth because man can disbelieve in God, and there are honest atheists. But he affirms that this knowledge "can be strictly proved, and that no geometrical theorem is more certain." Such knowledge is the "beginning and end of reason," and the basis of all philosophy.

An outline statement of the inductive and deductive methods of research is given with high commendation of induction. These methods find fuller illustration in the examination of the theodicy of Plato, and that of Aristotle,—two conspicuous examples of these two methods. The method of Plato, and the results obtained thereby receive the highest praise. The true idea of God as the good, and the true moral philosophy are traced back to the Socratic school. Goodness and the divine knowledge are ever inseparable, and in this the school of Socrates excelled. Aristotle, twenty years a pupil of Plato, accepted the results which he attained but sought to prove them by a process the opposite to that of his master. Aristotle is the father of deduction. He is substantially agreed with Plato, but his philosophy has not the directness nor simplicity of the Platonic system. Cicero said that the philosophy of the Academy and that of the Portico differed only in words. So says Mr. Gratry.

The author at least shows a very intimate acquaintance with these hoary philosophers. But in his enthusiasm he certainly interprets into their writings philosophic and theistic conceptions which are familiar enough today but were quite unfamiliar in the age of Plato. It is true that they sometimes use the word *Theos* to designate the Supreme Being. But did *Theos* mean to them just what it does to us? Did they ever think of a deity as personal in our sense of that word, and as separate from the universe? It seems very doubtful if they did. Our author is, moreover, a little inconsistent when he accepts Aristotle's definition of God as "pure act," and then refuses to accept Aristotle's theory of an eternal creation, which seems to be a logical sequence of

the definition. Evidently the modern interpreter of these wise men has been too strongly influenced by what he wanted to prove by them, and has resorted to exegesis for too much.

The remainder of part first is given to expositions of the theodicy of Augustine, Anselm, Aquinas, Descartes, Pascal, Malebranche, Fénelon, Thomassin, Bossuet, and Leibnitz. Again one cannot help noticing what must be called prejudice in the selection of the authors given. But a French Roman Catholic could hardly be expected to do better than ignore all Protestant scholarship, and to despise all German philosophy and philosophers. This latter thing he does by occasional allusions to the German sophists in a way that is not a little amusing. The blemish of the book is the view it gives of the prejudices of the author's mind. But even philosophers have their prejudices, and sectarians, both Catholic and Protestant, in matters of controversy, are very much alike after all.

Part second begins with a statement of the author's aim in producing the work, which we may accept in good faith. He says that aim was to "arouse in select souls the taste for wisdom, the passion for truth, and effort for morality." A commendable aim. The discussion which follows treats of degrees of divine knowledge, and of reason and faith. It is a discussion of great value. But there is no room here to follow it out. The book will be very useful to any student of the history of theistic belief or of theology in general. I have made no effort to ascertain the correctness of the translation before me, but it is good, readable English. The introduction, by W. R. Alger, is written in a sympathetic and highly appreciative way, and the work as far as scholarship and clearness of argument go, is worthy of appreciation.

B. F. S.

Current Literature.

By CLYDE W. VOTAW,
The University of Chicago.

OLD TESTAMENT.

Books and Pamphlets.

- The Teacher's Catechising Bible: The Book of Genesis.* By C. Neil. London: Nisbet, 1893. 2s.
- The Mosaic Record of the Creation Explained: Scripture Truth Verified.* By Abraham G. Jennings. New York: Revell, 1893. 20c.
- Der Pentateuch.* Beiträge zu seinem Verständniss und seiner Entstehungsgeschichte. By Prof. Aug. Klostermann. Leipzig: Deichert, 1893. M. 8.
- Book of Job.* Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text, with notes by C. Siegfried. English Translation of the notes by R. E. Brünnow. [The Sacred Books of the Old Testament. A Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text, printed in colors, with notes by eminent biblical scholars of Europe and America, edited by Prof. Paul Haupt. Part 17]. London: Nutt, 1893. 3s. 6d.
- Les Psaumes commentés d'après la Vulgate et l'Hebreu.* By L. C. Fillion. Paris: Letouzey, 1893. 7.50 fr.
- Les Proverbes, l'Ecclésiaste, le Cantique, la Sagesse, l'Ecclésiastique.* [La Bible. Ancien et Nouveau Testaments. Texte de la Vulgate, avec traduction et commentaires. Tom. 5]. By M. F. P. Vivier. Paris: Féchoz, 1893.
- Die Zukunftsverwartung des Jesaja, untersucht.* By H. Hackmann. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1893. M. 4.40.
- Deuterosejaia.* [Sammlung hebräisch-deutscher Bibeltexte mit kritische Anmerkungen. 1 Heft]. By Prof. Aug. Klostermann. München: Beck, 1893. M. 2.40.
- Praeparation zu Jeremiah.* 2 Heft, cap. 20-38. [Freund und Marx' Praeparationem zum alten Testament]. Leipzig: Violet, 1893. 75 pf.
- Die kleinen Propheten übersetzt mit Noten.* 2 Auflage. [Skizzen und Vorarbeiten. 5 Heft]. By J. Wellhausen. Berlin: Reimer, 1893. M. 7.
- Det israelitiske Folks Historie.* By F. Buhl. Kjobenhavn: Gyldenal, 1893. 4.50 kr.
- Histoire du peuple d'Israël.* By Ernest Rénan. Tom. 4. Paris: Lévy, 1893. 7.50 fr.
- Sociales aus dem alten Testament.* By F. Düsterdieck. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1893. M. 1.20.
- Hebrew Idolatry and Superstition: its Place in Folk-Lore.* By E. Higgins. London: Stock, 1893. 3s. 6d.
- Old Testament Theology.* The religion of Revelation in its pre-Christian stage of development: translated from the fourth German edition by Rev. James A. Paterson. By Hermann Schultz. New York: Scribners, 1893. \$6.00.
- Ernste Blicke in den Wahn der modernen Kritik des Alten Testaments.* By Dr. Adolf Zahn. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1893. M. 2.

- Principles of Bible Criticism.* By Rev. J. J. Lias. London: Eyre, 1893. 3s. 6d.
- Helps to the Study of the Bible.* Edited by Canon Maclear. Oxford: University Press, 1893. 4s. 6d.
- The Cambridge Companion to the Bible.* Edited by J. R. Lumby, D.D. London: Clay & Sons, 1893. 3s. 6d.

Articles and Reviews.

- The Babylonian Story of the Fall.* By W. St. Chad Boscawen, F.R.H.S., in Expository Times, July 1893.
- The Glacial Nightmare and the Flood.* By Rev. D. Gath Whitney, in The Thinker, July 1893.
- Oetli on Deuteronomy, Joshua and Judges.* Editorial in The Thinker, July 1893.
- Kings and their Counselors.* By Prin. E. Elmer Harding, in Expository Times, July 1893.
- The Development of the Psalter.* By Prof. John P. Peters, Ph.D., in the New World, June 1893.
- The Servant of the Lord in Deutero-Isaiah.* Editorial in The Thinker, July 1893.
- Daniel: in relation to the Canon.* By J. E. H. Thompson, B.D., in The Thinker, July 1893.
- Economic Conditions of the Hebrew Monarchy. III. Commerce and Security of Life and Property.* By Prof. W. H. Bennett, in The Thinker, July 1893.
- The Problems of Old Testament Biblical Theology.* By Rev. Dr. Bernhard Stade, abstract in The Thinker, July 1893.
- Light on Scriptural Texts from Recent Discoveries, VI.* By William Hayes Ward, D.D., in Homiletic Review, July 1893.
- Jewish and Christian Interpretation of Prophecy.* By Arch. F. W. Farrar, in Review of the Churches, May 1893.
- The Higher Criticism.* By Rev. J. W. Earnshaw, in the Homiletic Review, July 1893.
- The Historical Principle in Bible Study.* By Prof. G. H. Schodde, in The Treasury, June 1893.
- Oxford Helps to the Study of the Bible.* Editorial in The Thinker, July 1893.
- The Inspiration Question.* By Dr. Kubel, abstract in The Thinker, July 1893.

NEW TESTAMENT.

Books and Pamphlets.

- Gospel according to Matthew.* The Greek Text, edited by H. R. Heatley, M.A. With notes and vocabulary. London: Percival, 1893. 2s.
- Jesus Himself.* By A. Murray. London: Marshall, 1893. 1s.
- The Gospel of John.* An exposition with critical notes. By T. F. Lockyer. London: Kelly, 1893. 2s. 6d.
- The Teaching of Jesus in His Own Words.* By J. C. Walker. London: Blackwood, 1893. 3s. 6d.
- The Final Passover.* A series of meditations upon the Passion of Our Lord Jesus Christ. Vol. 1. The Rejection. Vol. 3, part 2. The Divine Exodus. By R. M. Benson. New York: Longmans, 1893. \$1.75.
- A Key to the Epistles of St. Paul.* Being a course of lectures delivered in Bristol Cathedral. By J. P. Norris. London: S. P. C. K., 1893. 2s.
- Hebrews.* [Vol. I. The Biblical Illustrator]. By J. S. Exell. London: Nisbet, 1893. 7s. 6d.
- Der Jakobusbrief Nach Lehranschauungen und Entstehungsverhältnissen untersucht.* By Dr. Paul Feine. Eisenach: Wilckens, 1893. M. 3.
- Der Jakobusbrief und die Johannisbrief.* [Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament. 4 Theil]. By Dr. A. Schlatter. Calw: Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1892. M. 2.25.

- The Vision of St. John on Patmos.* By E. Greatorex. London: Masters, 1893. 2s.
- Die Wunder im Neuen Testamente.* By Strauss und Torney. Leipzig: Deichert, 1893. 75 pf.
- The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome.* With a preface by the Bishop of Lincoln. By F. W. Puller. New York: Longmans, 1893. \$2.25.
- The First Saints.* Character and Church Studies in the New Testament. By Rev. Jas. Rankin, D.D. London: Blackwoods, 1893. 7s. 6d.
- The Church of Christ as Set Forth in the New Testament.* Being two lectures addressed to Methodists of Leeds. By G. G. Findlay. London: Kelly, 1893. 1s.
- Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums.* 1 Band. Die zweimalige römische gefangenschaft des Paulus. 2 Band. Brief au die Thessalonischer; Unordnungen im Texte des 4 Evangeliums; die urchristliche Traditionem über Ursprung und Sinn des Abendmahls. By Frdr. Spitta. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1893. M. 8.
- Faith and Criticism.* Essays by Congregationalists. W. H. Bennett, W. F. Adeney, P. T. Forsyth, E. A. Lawrence, R. F. Horton, H. A. Thomas, F. H. Stead, E. Armitage and T. Raleigh. New York: Dutton, 1893. \$2.00.
- Lexicon of the Greek Testament.* By W. J. Hickie. New York: Macmillan, 1893. 75c.
- Articles and Reviews.**
- The Miraculous Birth of Jesus Christ.* By Aloys Berthoud, abstract in *The Thinker*, July 1893.
- The Problem of the Gospels.* By Alfred Resch, abstract in *The Thinker*, July 1893.
- Prof. Marshall's Theory of an Aramaic Gospel.* By Rev. Colin Campbell, in *Expository Times*, July 1893.
- The Gospels and Modern Criticism.* By Rev. Arthur Wright, in *Expository Times*, July 1893.
- The Kingdom of God.* Symposium by Rev. Bernard, Prof. Orr, Prin. Scott, and Prof. Stewart, in *Expository Times*, July 1893.
- Prayer.* By Pastor J. H. Morrad, abstract in *The Thinker*, July 1893.
- Some Aspects of the Incarnation.* By Rev. P. E. Pratt, in *The Thinker*, July 1893.
- A New Theory of the Atonement.* Editorial in *Expository Times*, July 1893.
- Beel's "Through Christ to God."* By Rev. David H. Lawrence, in *Expository Times*, July 1893.
- The Teaching of Our Lord as to the Authority of the Old Testament.* By Rev. C. J. Ellicott, D.D., in *Expository Times*, July 1893.
- The Unfinished Teaching of Christ.* By Rev. Frederic Relton, A.K.C., in *Expository Times*, July 1893.
- Nicodemus.* By Rev. J. W. Fryer, in *Expository Times*, July 1893.
- The Service of Women to the Gospel.* Editorial in *Expository Times*, July 1893.
- Paul's Conception of Christianity, VI.* By Prof. A. B. Bruce, D.D., in *The Expositor*, June 1893.
- Hebrews 6:4-6.* By Prof. Wm. Milligan, D.D., in *The Expositor*, June 1893.
- Notes on Galatians, 5:8.* By Rev. Clement Bird, in *The Expositor*, June 1893.
- James, the Apostle of the Christian-Israelitish Church.* By Prof. N. J. Hofmeijer, abstract in *The Thinker*, July 1893.
- Prof. Ramsay's "Church in the Roman Empire."* By Prof. W. Sanday, in *The Expositor*, June 1893.
- The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.* Editorial in *The Thinker*, July 1893.
- Leaders of Thought in Scotland, III.* *Rev. Prof. A. B. Bruce, D.D.* By Rev. Arthur Jenkinson, in *The Thinker*, July 1893.
- Frederick Godet, II.* By Prof. A. Gretillat, in *Expository Times*, July 1893.