

THE BIBLICAL WORLD

CONTINUING

The Old and New Testament Student

VOLUME VI.

AUGUST, 1895

NUMBER 2

TWO NOTABLE utterances of distinguished representatives of Systematic Theology have recently appeared in public print. In an address before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, President Patton of Princeton College affirms that the great question of today is not what the Bible teaches, but what the Bible is. This latter question, he declares, cannot be answered by appeal to proof texts drawn from the Bible to prove its own inspiration. The right of the Bible to rule the hearts and consciences of men is the pressing question, and its discussion involves considerations of history, philosophy, and literary criticism. President Patton believes that the John Calvin of the new theological era will believe in the same doctrine that Calvin of Geneva believed in. "But when he gathers up the results of all this modern discussion he will present them not only as doctrines that have a logical relation in a system but as divine ideas that have a chronological sequence in the unfolding of a plan. The historical method will leave its mark upon theology." We do not care to discuss with Dr. Patton whether John Calvin of Geneva, without an historical method, anticipated by a few hundred years precisely the results, from a doctrinal point of view, which historical science by its laborious method is after a time to reach. But we are interested to notice his clear recognition and assertion of the legitimacy and necessity of the historical method in theology, and, as a part of this, of that which is technically

known as "higher criticism." If President Patton has been correctly reported, he makes explicitly or impliedly four assertions. 1. The great task of the hour in theology is the attainment of a "doctrine of Scripture," a true statement of the nature of the Bible and the ground of its authority. 2. This doctrine cannot be reached by simply formulating the Scriptural doctrine of the nature of Scripture. Dr. Patton does not intimate that the Scriptural doctrine is not the true one, but only that the Scripture cannot be treated as an ultimate authority in answering the question, What is the authority of Scripture? 3. The right of the Scripture to rule the hearts and consciences of men, *i. e.*, the authority of the Scripture in ethics and religion is to be established, in part at least, on grounds of history, philosophy, and criticism. 4. The method of the systematic theology of the future will be not only logical, but historical. We believe that these things are true, and we are grateful to President Patton for his forcible statement of them. But if they are true, this means nothing less than that biblical criticism, in the large sense of the term, is for Christian scholarship the pressing duty of this hour, and that for the systematic theologian of the future a prime condition of success will be a command of the historical method.

PRESIDENT HOVEY of Newton Theological Institution in a sermon to the graduating class on the Problems of the Bible and Philosophy, gives this advice concerning the treatment of critical theories which impeach the credibility of the Pentateuch and Joshua: "Have no fear of honest inquiry, for truth is likely to prevail at last. The danger of stagnation and repression are greater in the long run than those of bold investigation; timidity is at least as foolish as audacity, especially in the search for truth. Take all the time you need for testing every novel theory concerning the Pentateuch. For the critical pendulum has oscillated perpetually during the last fifty years, and you will have no reason for haste in fixing the point where it will finally rest. The elements of this critical problem are very complex and scattered

PRESIDENT
HOVEY on
HIGHER
CRITICISM

through a large part of the Old Testament. Probably no man has mastered them all. Be patient, therefore, and trustful." It is plain that President Hovey recognizes the legitimacy of historical criticism. But the yet more notable implication of these words is that the problems of historical criticism—certain at least of those which have been most discussed and concerning which most alarm has been felt by the timid—are not after all the fundamental problems of religion. Were they such, the preacher of the gospel would be compelled to settle them at the very outset of his ministry.

THESE two utterances of President Patton and President Hovey seem at first sight to be almost contradictory. President

*THE SEEMING
CONTRADICTION-
NESS OF THEIR
STATEMENTS*

Patton declares that the question of the nature of the Bible is the pressing question of the hour, and that this cannot be settled without historical criticism. President Hovey tells us that the questions of historical criticism are not likely to be settled at once, and implies that some at least of them are so far from being the fundamental questions of religion that the Christian preacher may afford to be very patient in waiting for their solution while he goes about his distinctive work as a preacher. But this apparent contradiction between the two utterances is no real contradiction. To say that a question is the pressing question of the hour is not to say that it is the fundamental question of religion; is not to say that in it Christianity is on trial for its life.

The inclination of the theologian, indeed of every earnest-minded thinker, is to feel that every great problem is fundamental. But it is a result well worth achieving to learn that this is not so; that there are some questions, large and important in themselves, questions which may easily be for a given generation the great questions, on which nevertheless the destiny neither of religion in general nor of Christianity in particular hangs. To this class belong the great problems of the higher criticism. Important they are; it is difficult to overestimate the possible effect of their

solution on Christian thought and Christian life. Fundamental they are not. If it was not possible to discern this when the questions were first raised in modern times, the progress that has already been made render it possible now. Historical criticism does not threaten the foundations of religion or of Christianity. Not only so; but, while much is still in litigation, the beneficial effects of the higher criticism are, as President Hovey admirably points out in further paragraphs of his sermon, already apparent. President Patton is right. The problem of what the Bible is, itself to be solved by the historical study of the Bible, is the great problem of Christian theology today. Christian scholarship has no higher duty in this hour than the prosecution of the work of higher criticism. President Hovey is right. These problems are not fundamental in the sense that on them hangs the destiny of Christianity. We can afford to be patient and trustful while Christian scholarship discovers their solution.

IN rather decided contrast with the words of these two masters of theological science are the words of many men less skilled in Christian doctrine, though more prominent in evangelistic effort. To them—if the recently published words of a certain distinguished evangelist are correct—any attempt to separate the Bible into parts of different value is dangerous and to be avoided. The argument is simple; if you give up a part of the Scripture, what is to hinder another from giving up another part, until no Scripture is left. This argument is enforced with the story of the good deacon who cut out such passages from his Bible as his minister said were untrue until nothing of the book was left, and then presented the bewildered pastor with the covers. Another method of enforcing the position is to appeal to the number of converts made by men holding to the extremest conservative views in regard to inspiration, and to the paucity of conversions made by those who hold to "higher criticism." Both arguments are supposed to establish the danger of the higher criticism as a means of studying the Scriptures.

*AN OPPOSITE
OPINION*

Now nobody can deny that there is a danger in a rash rejection of any portion of the Scripture as untrustworthy. That

**THE VALUE OF
THE MAIN
ARGUMENT**

there has been too much of such rash rejection is also very likely. But to maintain that there can be no standard of judgment is not only unscholarly, but contrary to the history of the church. The merest tyro in the history of the canon knows that even in the case of the New Testament different sections of the church have never hesitated to reject certain books on purely critical grounds. But further, the acceptance or the rejection of a single word of Scripture or any other piece of literature is not a matter of personal like or dislike. No one is quicker than the "higher critic" to detect the untrustworthiness of any such subjective test. The whole question is one of standards by which to judge. If a hard-working and successful evangelist believes every word of the Bible was written at the dictation of God and by the persons whose names are attached to the various books, he doubtless has criteria that satisfy him. Without doubt such an inclusive conviction is of great homiletic advantage, especially when there exists an equally strong conviction that his interpretation is as infallible as the Word itself. But, after all, such a conviction is simply the outcome of certain processes of judgment. And it is a fair question as to whether, in the long run, the acceptance by Christians generally of a belief in the Bible on the mere basis of such authority will be as helpful to Christian growth as the acceptance of the Bible on the basis of a more discriminating judgment. Nor is it quite fair to imply that "higher critics" are endeavoring to reject portions of the Scriptures. As mere critics they are seeking neither to reject nor to accept anything. They are simply striving to arrive at the truth. An intelligent study of their work—not that of the *destructive* critics, so-called—will convince any man who is anxious for the preservation of the faith once delivered to the saints that there has been no stronger weapon of Christian apologetics than "higher criticism." Indiscriminate opposition to critical methods as such is largely the result of ignorance as to what such methods really are. To say that if one verse of the Scripture

is declared unauthentic all must be rejected is as sensible as to say that all money must be rejected because of the detection of a counterfeit. The more rational view would seem to be that of thankfulness that it is possible so to distinguish between the genuine and the interpolated as to give a firm basis for theological teaching. Such a possibility, thanks to the "higher critic," is every day growing more complete.

THE illustration of the mutilated Bible cannot be regarded with the same equanimity as the position it enforces. It certainly is taking. But it is intrinsically untrue. Who was the minister? Did he ever exist outside a book of sermonic illustrations? And it is as improbable as untrue. Did the scissors-wielding deacon have a Bible with pages printed on only one side? Or did he cut out the texts on both sides at once?

THE UNFAIR-
NESS OF THE
ILLUSTRATION

To resort to such an illustration as an argument is unworthy of any candid man—and especially of a teacher of religion. Are there no ethical limitations in the use of telling but untrue analogies? Is it allowable to use such *ad captandum* arguments in the settlement of what men whose opinion is worth everything regard as important questions? It is a relic of an unchristian theological past to make prejudice the jury before which to try an honest attempt at the discovery of truth.

AND then it is astonishing to make the number of his conversions a gauge of the correctness of a man's attitude towards the "higher criticism." Was Peter with his two thousand conversions any nearer the truth than his Master? The question as to the authenticity of Jonah is not to be settled by counting new converts. Even if the argument be that the "higher criticism" cuts the nerve of evangelical activity, the statement is as yet one of very doubtful fact. To say nothing of the short time in which criticism has attracted the attention of the church, it is not true that the men who hold to its results are without spiritual influence. They

AS TO CON-
VERSIONS

may be less effective in revival meetings, but many of them are centers of strong and edifying religious influence. Their criticism is an outcome not of their contempt but of their love for the Christian Scriptures.

THE proper attitude of all Christian people towards the results of "higher criticism" is one of impartial investigation. No one really objects to the critical method itself. The point at issue is as to its results. There is little need of alarm. Truth will not perish, and the truth, after all, is the goal of honest scholarship. The words of Presidents Patton and Hovey are of vast worth for all those who are perplexed as to the merits of today's discussions and should lead to confidence in the final outcome. In the meantime let us stop confounding important questions with those that are essential, and above all, a man's attitude towards questions of mere scholarship with his moral and religious character.

THE PROPER
ATTITUDE

THE USE OF HEBREW IN NEW TESTAMENT STUDY.

By PROFESSOR JOHN POUCHER, D.D.,
De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind.

The position stated—Reasons: 1. Idiomatic expression conveys habit of thought. 2. Hebraism dominant in the time of Christ. 3. The Jews superior teachers in religion. 4. Familiarity with Hebrew aids in the interpretation of New Testament rhetoric. 5. Explains the view of prophecy then accepted. 6. Throws light on the Apocalypse. 7. Accounts for the language of Christian theology. 8. Cumulative advantage in the knowledge of Hebrew words and phrases. 9. Quotations ought to be read in the original. Conclusion: Study the sources of truth.

Nor the least advantage gained in the study of Hebrew is the special fitting with which it furnishes an exegete to teach the Christian gospel. While in the ordinary subdivision of work in theological seminaries it may be convenient to differentiate on the basis of the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures, no one must suppose that the subjects are to be studied without regard to relation. Linguistic research must be subordinated to a perception of the inspired unity in the two records, yet a knowledge of the language in which the first part was written may be important in determining the force and beauty of the unity in both parts. The study of Hebrew is necessary to a thorough and competent investigation of the New Testament.

1. Knowledge of the language of a people is highly important in becoming acquainted with them in their modes of thought and action. Words and sounds are common and trustworthy manifestations of character, condition and conception. On this fact, to some degree at least, has been based a still persistent defense of the study of both Greek and Latin in the colleges. A strong argument is thus furnished for better education in English and the literature embodied in it, and the true reason for the study of modern German and French rests somewhat on the same principle. Culture in the sacred and classical languages may well be pursued for its æsthetic value. In addition, the

knowledge of the masterpieces of production in letters, painting, sculpture, practical mechanism, or any other form of descriptive expression fills the contemplative mind with the highest and most satisfactory ideals of being and achievement. The authors of the New Testament books were all, with one possible exception, Jews. If they did not use the ancient Hebrew tongue, they were yet thoroughly imbued with the Old Testament spirit. Though they spoke in another dialect and wrote in an acquired vernacular, their idioms of thought were inherited from Abraham, Isaiah, and the psalmists, and in spite of themselves their speech revealed their origin and their cast of mind.

2. Christianity took its rise not in a period of religious depression and inactivity, as is often asserted, but at the culmination of an enthusiastic, though bigoted, Jewish faith and spirit. Ecclesiasticism was consequently prosperous, and Herod's temple was a fit and forcible expression of gorgeous splendor in elaborate ritual and regal pomp in spiritual things. The influence of the Septuagint was at its highest and the schools of the great teachers of the law had never so flourished. Even shepherds were in a frame of mind to hear the songs of angels in the night. Simeon, Zachariah, Anna, and Mary were waiting for the consolation, pondering the prophecies, eagerly greeting the signs of a better advent. Pharisaism was the embodiment of loyalty to the Hebrew idea. It at first opposed the Christ because he disappointed them in their temporal hopes, but in the spirit that originated the sect there were evidences of sympathy with the Light and the Truth, as appears in the logical outcome of the vehement agitation in Paul's mental and mortal nature. This man insisted that he was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and yet he is recognized as the master-theologian of the new and mighty doctrine. How can one fully comprehend Paul, unless he is familiar with Paul's point of view and the nature of the substance which reflects the light revealed in him?

3. The Jews have been preëminently superior as religious thinkers and discoverers. Even if Moses, David, or Isaiah did not write all that is ascribed to them, if the book of Job was the product of a late age, or if the Old Testament consists largely

of compilations from various unknown sources, it still remains that the seed of Abraham were unequaled in their genius for thinking and writing on matters that pertain to man's spiritual relations. Their Scriptures betoken a peculiar mental process that is far better understood when the genius of their language is comprehended. Surely the forms of utterance adopted are not to be neglected when the conceptions to be transmitted are fraught with such signal force, unparalleled fervor, and unquestionable merit.

4. A study of Hebrew will furnish excellent drill in that style of composition which is best suited to religious contemplation. Picture, metaphor, trope, artistic combination of word and phrase, copious vocabulary in moral nomenclature, spontaneity in didactic vision, the poetic instinct, freedom to change the point of view from objective to subjective, or *vice versa*, readiness to connect facts and allow the observer to draw appropriate inferences, are marked features, easily perceived in the detail of words and sentences, as well as in the very being of their authors. The ability to interpret these correctly is essential to the best understanding of the revelation which has Jesus Christ and his office as its subject. Such power is acquired only by patiently dwelling on the form and idiom of the medium through which the idea has been transmitted. There may be some dull minds that can never fully appreciate the poetic conceptions of Bible story, but if they would steadily and perseveringly apply themselves to the study of Hebrew grammar so as to be able to discriminate in the niceties of syntactic and rhetorical expression, their powers of literary interpretation would be greatly improved. Much of the cold, rigid, and obnoxious theology of past ages grows out of those views of the divine Word that do not truthfully reflect the exact condition of the author's mind. The abuse is more serious in its consequences when applied to the New Testament, which has been dissected as a corpse by the doctors. Organs and their functions have been dissevered from other vital parts, and peculiar or exceptional conditions have been treated as universal and absolute. As an illustration, many of Paul's statements have been viewed not in the light in which a Jew of his

age would be apt to take them, but rather in the sense in which a modern critic out of sympathy with Semitic taste and sentiment would use them. The truth as it is in Jesus may be entirely hidden.

5. Familiarity with the original form of prophecy will enable a reader of the evangelists and apostles to comprehend their views in regard to its meaning and fulfilment. If the Jewish opinion of the Scripture then prevailing could be kept in mind, some at least of the difficulty would be removed. Bible story, very appropriately, had come to be regarded as the embodiment of moral teaching. The historic conditions and prophetic aspirations involved wholesome principles that were capable of new and recurring applications. Old Testament literature held itself in solution amid all the thoughts and desires of the Jew, so that no incident could happen without having its counterpart in the most remarkable and comprehensive religious and political cultus ever known. The apostles, and Paul no less than the others, believed in a divine destiny for the chosen people. Messianism was wholly Jewish in its origin. The idea was not thus unfitted to control the universal mind, for narrow as the Jew was in his political affiliations, he was possessed of the thought and faith that find a response in every age and clime.

6. One part of the New Testament—the Book of Revelation—is modeled on the form of Old Testament apocalypse. This much-abused portion of Scripture is intensely Hebraistic in conception and presentation. Many of the words are Hebrew, and the allusions can only be explained by reference to previous Old Testament notions and conditions. The use of "Amen" is clearer and more appropriate when taken in its original sense. Observe also such words as "Abaddon," "Alleluia" and the translated "El Shaddai" in the term "God Omnipotent." The writer thinks in the manner of Ezekiel or the author of the Book of Daniel, or Hosea, in his view of Gog and Magog, of the four beasts and of Babylon the mother of harlots. His dream of the New Jerusalem is an expression of pious and lofty patriotism worthy of a real Jew enlightened by the broader view of a regenerated Christian. He uses the term "Satan" as it had long been understood.

He delights in references to the mystic numbers and constructs his sentences in accordance with the poetic model so often adopted and approved. He ingeniously protects himself from liability to civil prosecution by cabalistic terms well understood by the initiated, but an insoluble and apparently harmless mystery to those against whom his message was directed. The nature of the volume is such that an entirely satisfactory explanation of all its enigmatic forms can hardly be hoped for, but it would not have been subjected to such grossly inaccurate and outrageous applications as have been the fancy of succeeding commentators if they could have imbued themselves with the Semitic spirit and could have thoroughly understood the form and aim of Hebrew expression.

7. The masterpieces of Christian theology, as found in the epistles to the Galatians and Romans, are conceived in the atmosphere of Hebrew thinking and composition. Paul has given to the story of Eden a meaning and importance which a mind unused to Semitic formulas and canons could have never comprehended. It is probable that the moral bearing of this account would at least have been sadly obscured had not a Greek-educated Jew been inspired to fix in philosophical terms suited to modern reasoning the delicate sentiment and moral ideas expressed in such poetic and artistic fashion by the author in Genesis. It was this son of Benjamin who could find an allegory in the story of Abraham, and Hagar, and Isaac, to prove that in the world's drama the vital principles of faith and adoption are essentially and universally embodied. His arguments were addressed to those acquainted and in sympathy with the Jewish system and the law on which it had been established. The cogency of his reasoning was apprehended by those in whose minds the literary form of his thought was indigenous. It is liable to misconstruction by those who cannot interpret the idiomatic theology and creed expression of the chosen people.

8. There are in the New Testament many words and phrases whose meaning is clearer and stronger when viewed by the Hebrew scholar. The advantage of Semitic learning is cumulative on this point, and the enumeration of a few instances would

not sufficiently impress anyone who does not appreciate linguistic research. Still it may be well to note an instance or two, so that the suggestion may not seem to be fanciful. The frequent use of "and," "so," "then," "therefore," in the gospel of John, is of Hebraistic origin, and when so regarded is more easily explained. Notice also here and elsewhere the terms, "verily," "and it came to pass," "opened his mouth," "answered and said." There is some advantage in a knowledge of the meaning of proper names and the sense in which names are employed. The simplicity of construction, considered in relation to the possibilities of involved structure in the Greek, which the gospel writers used as their medium of communication, is greatly appreciated by one accustomed to the style and thinking of the Old Testament. In phrase and vocabulary the New Testament is so much like the older document that its translation into Hebrew even from the English version is not a difficult undertaking.

9. Direct quotations are made from the Old Testament. Much erroneous exposition, both in principle and effect, has resulted from a disregard of the conditions on which the later writers copied. Those who can interpret in their original setting the passages quoted will be better able to read the mind of him who uses them in a new connection, not only in the verses under consideration, but also in the other parts of his work where his general purpose is disclosed. There cannot be a much more fascinating pursuit for the theologian of linguistic taste and attainment than the comparative study of the Septuagint, from which so many of the New Testament quotations are made, and the text of the original composition which was not affected by Alexandrian thought and worship.

The study of Hebrew is in danger of being neglected because it is regarded only as the vehicle in which an obsolete system has been transmitted to later generations. To some it is nothing more than an interesting curiosity. Besides, the simplicity of the construction is such that to a student not far advanced in the genius of the language it seems as if little has been suggested more than may be derived from a common translation. It pays

to drink deep of the truth that flows from the original fountain, even though confined to its own limits, but there is invaluable advantage also to be gained by the fitting of the student to taste the riper product of the gospel that began to be preached in Jerusalem. The scientific theologian of these times will pursue his investigation to the original sources of inspired thought. He aims to know not only what a thing is, but how it came to be what it is, and thus will he contribute in making it what it is intended to be. The divine word is worthy of all our pains. If its last truths are more clearly comprehended by a thorough knowledge of the medium in which earlier revelations were conveyed, the opportunity thus to learn must be duly prized and eagerly accepted.

THE QUESTIONS OF HIGHER CRITICISM AND THE
SOURCES WHENCE THE ANSWERS MAY
BE SOUGHT.

By PROFESSOR F. B. DENIO.
Bangor Theological Seminary.

IN the investigations into which the writer has been led the following analysis has been gradually developed, and is presumably capable of improvement. In taking up the investigation of any book such portions of this analysis are selected as are required. The subjects in Higher Criticism are regarded as those occasioned by the nature of the contents and concerning the origin of the writings:

A. Literary Criticism :

1. Peculiarities of style, or of language.
2. Unity, the originality or revision of the writings.
3. Index of the subjects mentioned or treated.
4. Synopsis of the course of thought, or of the contents.

B. Historical Criticism, *i. e.*, the relation of the writing to history :

5. The authenticity or trustworthiness of the writing.
6. The genuineness or the authorship of the writing.
7. For whom written or spoken.
8. When written or spoken.
9. Where written or spoken.
10. On account of what cause written or spoken.
11. For what purpose written or spoken.
12. Fulfilment of the prophetic or predictive element.

Classification of the kinds of evidence which help toward the attainment of the required answers :

I. External Evidence :

- i. Evidence from tradition.
- ii. Evidence from history external to the Bible, and this is
 - (1) Direct statement,
 - (2) Indirect allusion or quotation, and
 - (3) Implication.

(a) Positive.

(b) Negative, *argumentum e silentio*.

iii. Evidence from the parts of the Bible external to the writing under consideration. This head is subdivided precisely like the preceding head.

II. Internal Evidence :

iv. The contents of the writing under consideration. This also has subdivisions precisely like ii. above.

v. Style, and here the subdivisions are from

(1) The lexicon or vocabulary,

(2) The grammar or the structure of words or of sentences, and

(3) Style proper.

vi. The place of the writing in the development of religious knowledge and institutions. This concerns

(1) The historic life of the people,

(2) Their religious institutions, and

(3) Their religious knowledge and thought.

vii. Psychological interpretation, the psychological probabilities as to the writing being produced at the time supposed, by the person supposed, under the circumstances supposed, or as to the correctness of the record and the like.

viii. Evidence from the ethical character of the record.

Of course a scheme like this may become merely mechanical in its use. Such is not its design, rather it is for the sake of making a full and thorough survey of the field, and of gaining a more precise estimate of the value of the evidence gained.

THE JEWISH APOCALYPSES.

By PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SHODDE, PH.D.,
Columbus, Ohio.

The Book of Enoch—Book of Parables—Psalms of Solomon—Assumption of Moses.

Although post-exilic and inter-Testament Judaism was characterized chiefly by the development of a radical and to a great extent one sided and formalistic Legalism, yet the nomistic principle was not the only factor and force that controlled the ideas and ideals of the people in those non-prophetic but nevertheless very historic centuries. The questions of the age were such that an exclusive consideration and study of the Law did not answer all the problems and perplexities that demanded answers. The fate of Israel, especially its condition of servitude to heathen masters, when compared with the promises of its future glory and supremacy, presented so many interrogation points, that their solution could not but engage the attention of thoughtful minds. The author of one part of the Book of Enoch laments: "We hoped to be the head and we became the tail;" and the literature of the period abounds with wails and lamentations over the deplorable lot of the people now subjected to the power of the sinners. From the days of Zerubbabel the history of the faithful is one of continuous humiliation, defeats and suppressions. The bitter realities of the present, the tyranny of the Persian, Syriac, and Roman rule, seemed to belie the picture of the golden age as depicted by the pen of the prophets for the encouragement of the people in their obedience to the Law of the Lord. It seemed as if God had forgotten his words and that his arm had become too weak to perform what he had promised. Seemingly the closest study of the Law could not unravel these enigmas; accordingly, we find side by side with the predominating literature of the Law a class of works that deal with the intricacies of the present and seek to harmonize Israel's fate and Israel's divinely

appointed destiny. This is the deeply interesting and instructive apocalyptic literature. In all these the object is, more or less apologetic, the vindication of divine wisdom and providence in its dealings with the people, and the assurance that the day of consummation, when all things shall be adjusted, is near. Those that were written before the days of Christ possess not only the historical interest for the understanding of Israel's hopes and fears, but also because they undoubtedly exerted a considerable influence in molding, the religious sentiments, thoughts, feelings and beliefs of the Jews in the New Testament era, and have a special value for the historic study of the New Testament books and their contents. The history of the New Testament Times as also New Testament Theology are largely debtors to this class of literature so long despised as mere "curiosities," but now being gradually understood in their true historic importance and value. A brief sketch of the historical background and chief contents of one or two of these unique compositions will not be a work of supererogation.

For a number of excellent reasons the Book of Enoch takes the precedent of all the works of this class. Intrinsically and historically it is the most unique and valuable of its kind. It is the only one that is quoted by a New Testament writer (Jude 14, 15); its messianic ideal is the highest produced by an uninspired pen; it was beyond doubt a powerful factor in the make-up of the religious and theological atmosphere in which the New Testament age lived and moved and had its being; it possesses a renewed interest at present from the discovery of the new Greek fragments in the Gizeh manuscript and the publication of a new English translation by R. H. Charles, of England, on the basis of an amended Ethiopic text, which is especially valued for the text critical study of this work.

In its present shape the Book of Enoch is a conglomerate of at least three different elements, written by three different authors at different times. The oldest though theologically considered not the most important portion, is embraced in chaps. 1-37 and 72-104, which also contains a few interpolations by the so-called Noachian fragmentist. Internal evidences point to the fact that

this portion was written before the death of Judas Maccabæus, *i. e.*, before 160 B. C., although quite a number of scholars claim a later period, generally that of John Hyrkanus for this portion of the book. In all probability it is a production of the chasidim or pious party of patriots, who stood up for the traditional nationality, worship and life of Judaism. The historical background, the ever memorable struggle for autonomy against heathen oppression, and the immediate needs of the hour have largely given matter and manner to the book. At no period in Israel's history was the danger of disintegration of nationality and religion greater. Especially did Antiochus Epiphanes demand practically the total annihilation of Israel as a people and as a religious community.

When surrounded by such dangers it is not surprising that the voice of pseudo-prophecy resounds. There were problems to solve; anxious inquiries to answer, downcast hearts to cheer, failing hopes to be reëstablished. Could God have deserted his people? What had become of the promised glories of the Messianic age? To answer these fundamental questions and others arising out of them, was the principal object of the author. His aim is largely to vindicate God's guidance of the people: and secondly, to give a renewed prediction of the sure fulfilment of the divine promises. Apologetic in purpose, the book emphasizes the almighty power of God, his ability to accomplish his purposes; God's omnipotence is demonstrated by an appeal to Israel's history. A symbolical account of the chosen people from the beginning to the days of the writer is given, to which, without any break whatever, is added the predictions of the near future. In this historical survey the evidences are furnished, not however purposely so stated, for an apology and defense of God's actions. The divine guidance of Israel, the chief events in the history of theocracy, and then the sure punishment of all her past foes are portrayed and left to tell their own story. In all this Israel is seen as the special object of God's providence and love and this furnishes a guarantee for the future.

And this future is really what the writer wishes to portray. Here, where logic and facts fail him, he resorts to rhetoric. He is consistent with his character as a pseudo-Enoch not to quote

UOPM

directly from the Old Testament; a fact, however, that may also, at least in part, be explained by the difference between his eschatological views and those presented by the inspired prophets. In glowing terms he predicts the deliverance of Israel from its troubles, the subjugation of its enemies, and the glories of the future. According to his views, the measure of Israel's woes is now full and the immediate future will bring succor and salvation. This is not to come by the natural development of events, but by an especial and powerful interference of Jehovah. The Lord will come to the rescue of the persecuted faithful. The hosts of heaven and the power of nature alike contribute to this great revolution. From Azazel, the chief of fallen angels, down to the meanest enemy of God's children, the sinners shall all endure terrible punishments. Then the sway of the righteous shall begin. The character of this sway is chiefly political, and, only subordinate and subservient to this, also religious. The establishment of a universal recognition of Jehovah, with Jerusalem as a central seat of worship, is a factor in this rule, apparently only because thereby Israel's glory is made all the more glorious. Nature, which suffered by man's fall, will participate in this restoration, but only as a means to the end of honoring Israel. This fundamental idea is the future greatness of Israel as a nation of the faithful brought about by the intervention of their God. After the new order of things has once been established, God, so to say, again returns to his retirement, and leaves the government in the hands of the Messiah. This latter person takes no part in the organization of the kingdom; he only appears in "the world to come," as the Messianic kingdom is technically called by Jewish theology. He is one of the people, not a messenger from on High, or of divine nature and power. He grows out of the reestablished faithful; and, characteristically, he is distinguished from his fellows only by superior strength and power. He is really only *primus inter pares*. In his heart the rule of the new kingdom is placed, and this kingdom shall be without end.

Deeper in contents and more systematic in presentation is the second part of the Book of Enoch, embracing chapters 37-71 and called by the writer himself "The Book of Parables." It

undoubtedly existed one time as a separate composition and was later incorporated into the older book. Its character, tone, tendency and object differ materially from those of the first part or groundwork. The historical substratum presupposed by its contents is different from that necessary to understand the other portions. No wars and rumors of war threaten the existence of the people. The subtler weapons of religious indifference or outspoken atheism in the circles of the aristocratic leaders threaten to leaven the whole mass of the people. The rulers of the people no longer subject themselves to the spirit of Jehovah. They are the exact opposites of what the theocratic idea of royalty in Israel would demand. Or, to be historically more definite, the political heads of the people are the representatives of the Hellenistic movement, which, in the centuries preceding the advent of Christ, endangered Israel's individuality. Herod and his family, this tribe of monsters from the alien house of Esau, were the recognized leaders of this agitation. And against this direful school of thought, their theology and their morals, the Parables of Enoch are directed. They expose the godless character of the heathenist innovations in the people's faith, and prophesy the speedy exaltation of the despised and humble few who have walked in the paths of the fathers. In no other apocalyptic work do the people of God appear so distinctly as an exclusive and united band. Again and again they are called "The congregation of the righteous." As the dangers that threaten them are almost exclusively of an intellectual or rather spiritual and moral character, the deliverance of the true Israel shall correspond to these evils. The general, more transcendental way of thinking displayed throughout the Parables is shown especially in this connection, where God does not, as is done in the groundwork, come to the relief personally, but sends his messenger, the Messiah. This idea, the deliverance of the people from the ways of false wisdom through the Messiah, is the peculiar and distinctive features of this book. Even the characteristics of the Messiah are dictated by the work he is to perform. As he is above all things to teach the truth, he is described as endowed with superior and divine wisdom. In chapter 46 we find it plainly and closely taught

that the Messiah is superhuman and pre-existent for the work he is to perform. He shall arrive in the near future. To enforce this wisdom he will be given the power of divinity. Those who have abused their high stations of influence and have led the people astray, will receive the punishment their deeds have merited. For the Messiah shall also come to judge, and only after this task has been performed will he establish his kingdom. Jerusalem again is the center and the people's glory shall be a temporal supremacy. This feature, however, is not so strongly emphasized here. The blessings are largely of an ethical character, including even the blissful state of sinlessness — *i. e.*, absolute sway of God's law. In fact, the author of the Parables reaches a height of thought, both dogmatically and ethically, that is marked by no other writer before the New Testament save by the inspired. For this reason not a few have thought that he had been under Christian influences. This, however, is manifestly not the case. He is and remains a Jew, writing with the prejudices and carnal hopes of late Pharisaism.

Entirely different in outward form but quite similar in thought to the Parables of Enoch are the so-called Psalms of Solomon. The eighteen odes bearing his name are the only productions of a lyrical character we possess from that period. Their entirely Jewish character is apparent from the mould in which they have been cast. Like the Psalms of the Old Testament, these imitations are a factory of thought rather than of force. No effort is made at a metrical system, as in the Homeric hexameter of the Sibylline books, but a successful *Parallelismus membrorum* is carried out. Here, too, the contents point out with sufficient accuracy the historical background, and this again goes far in explaining the general tendency and eschatology of the composition. The sad calamity of the people again is the theme inspiring the pen of the writer. The misfortune has this time come from the West. The contests all point to the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey in 63 B. C. as described by Josephus and Tacitus as the date of the composition of these lyrics, or rather, they were written after his death, 48 B. C.

The author frankly acknowledges that these calamities are

not altogether understood. The sins and lawlessness of the people are the cause. Pharisaically his doctrine of both reward and punishment is that of merit. Men choose between good and evil, and are rewarded accordingly. The central thought is given, 9:9, in these words:

“He who lives righteously treasures up for himself eternal life before the Lord

But he who lives unrighteously is himself the cause of his soul's destruction.”

From this historical and dogmatical basis the apocalyptic prophecies flow naturally over against the godless rule of the later Maccabean princes, and in view of the high-handed injustice of the Roman general, the pseudo-prophet remembers the promises that have been attached to the seed of the house of David. He takes up this peculiar thread and spins it out. Deliverance in such a crisis can come only from a powerful Messiah, and he shall come as a mighty potentate. So strongly is the advent of “David's Son” emphasized, that we can almost imagine we are hearing the Pharisees of the New Testament. The Messiah's mission will be of a double character. The sinners will feel the fire of his wrath and the saints the wisdom of his instructions. The unruly elements shall be removed from Zion and a new rule be established, at the head of which is the Messiah, sent for this purpose by God. The nations that disregard the laws will flee from his face or be destroyed; and the saints shall rule, being collected from the entire Dispersion. They will be the children of God; the land will be divided among the tribes; no stranger will be allowed in the sacred congregation. The heathen nations will subject themselves, fearing the Lord. The Messiah is powerful, but has nothing that transcends the human, although he is declared free from sin, and his rule shall last forever.

Of the Apocryphon called by the Greek fathers “Assumption of Moses,” which had been lost since the days of Origen and Clement of Alexandria, a few fragments have been found in recent decades. Its contents claim to be the last exhortation and instruction of Moses just before his departure to heaven,

given to his successor. Prophetically the future of the chosen people is portrayed in general outline and on theocratical principles. The history proceeds in the manner of apocryphal writings down to the Roman expedition under Varus, 4 B. C., against Jerusalem, and then the writing suddenly turns prophetically to the Messianic future. Roman supremacy will be cast aside; Satan will have an end; the Celestial One will sit in the seat of government and in holy wrath destroy the enemies of the the people. Earth and heaven will show the works of the last times; and then the happy age for the faithful will have arrived.

Other apocalyptic visions and ideals could readily be mentioned here, especially those found in the Jewish pre-Christian sections of the Sibylline books and other prominent writings of that time and kind; but the leading ideas are practically the same, although presented in a kaleidoscopic variety of shapes and forms. Since the historic method of studying the biblical books is being accepted and adopted practically by the entire protestant Christian scholarship, the value of these writings is seen and appreciated. As purely literary productions their value may be little or nothing; but as expressions of a school of thought in Israel, of the hopes and fears, false though they be, of the down-trodden people of God in the days of their humility, and as aids for the study of this world, of the thought and teachings of the New Testament era, this apocalyptic literature repays searching investigation and careful study.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE QURAN.

By DR. GUSTAV WEIL.

Translated from the second edition, with notes and references to the Quran and to other authorities, by Professor Frank K. Sanders, Ph.D. and Harry W. Dunning, B.A., of Yale University.

ISLAM—CONTINUED.

VI. *The Mutazilites.*—Even in the first century of the Hijra a violent opposition sprang up against the followers of the doctrine of predestination, who were favored by the government, and even a son of Umar, the pious Caliph, expressed himself in favor of the idea of the freedom of the will. They were naturally opposed by the Umayyads (Omeyyads) and suppressed, because their authority, resting on artifice and force, especially needed for support and justification the doctrine of the divine determinations and the predestination of all human affairs. Maabad, who stood at the head of the opposition, said in regard to his adversaries, "These people shed the blood of men and then dare to assert that all our acts are determined in advance by a divine decree." But as a matter of fact he was tortured and finally hung on account of his opinions, not because they were contrary to the Quran, but because they were dangerous to the absolute authority of the sovereign. He was executed by the terrible Hajjaj in A. H. 80, by order of the Caliph Abd Almalik. But nevertheless his doctrines spread and gave rise to the sect of the Mutazila and even influenced orthodox Islam, which indeed held fast to the doctrine of the predestination of the elect and the damned, yet—in fact without logical sequence—did not extend predestination to the individual good or bad acts of men, therefore, as with many Christian dogmatists, predestination really occurs only in consequence of foreknowledge. But the Quran, as appears from the passages quoted, rejects also this dogma and contains no place which speaks so decidedly for it as the following from the New Testament: "And as many (of

the gentiles) as were ordained to eternal life believed."¹ "And we know that to them that love God all things work together for good, even to them that are called according to his purpose. For whom he foreknew he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of his son."²

VII. *Other doctrines of Islam.*—We will not tarry longer on the remaining dogmas of Islam, partly because they do not enter so deeply into the inmost character of the faith and have less reference to life, and partly because their further development belongs to a later period and therefore to the history of Arabian philosophy rather than to our subject, Muhammad and the Quran. Such are the dogmas of the existence and attributes of God, of the eternity of the Quran and of the bliss of the righteous at the actual sight of God. All these dogmas gave rise to many conflicts and sects because some held to the letter of the Quran, others preferred a free interpretation: some blindly trusted to the so-called sayings of the prophet, others placed the law of the eternal reason above everything and strove to bring the religious systems into religious unity with the elements of Greek philosophy.

VIII. *Makrizi's opinion regarding early Islam.*—A famous Arab author, Makrizi, says in his history of religion, "When God sent his prophet Muhammad to men, this prophet gave them no different idea of God than that revealed to him by the angel Gabriel: No one asked him for a fuller explanation of this matter, as was the case in regard to other doctrines such as that of prayer, alms, fasting, pilgrimages, resurrection, hell and paradise. His contemporaries understood the meaning of the expressions relating to God in the Quran without especial instruction concerning the divine attributes, and no one thought of establishing a difference between attributes which pertained to his existence and those which pertained only to his activity. They were satisfied to recognize eternal attributes in God, such as knowledge,

¹ Acts 13:48.

² Romans 8:28-30. It should be noticed the frequent phrase, "whom God guides" often means simply "who takes God as a guide." Cf. Sura 17:99 and 18:16. So in many places the phrase "God guides whom he will" means "God guides that one who wishes (to be guided)." Suras 2:209; 35:8, 9; 39:5; 32:13; 6:125.

power, life, will, hearing, sight, word,¹ fame, splendor, magnanimity, benevolence, strength, might. They did not express themselves any more clearly concerning these. They also took in a literal sense everything which God ascribes to himself in the Quran, such as face, hands, and so forth, without in the least degree thinking of a similarity of God to his creatures. They believed in the unity of God regardless of everything to the contrary, without, on the other hand, destroying God's existence by denying the attributes. They held fast to the authority of the Quran and believed in God and the mission of Muhammad without recognizing the methods of the scholastic theology or the investigations of philosophy."

IX. *Good works rather than faith the supreme requisite among the early Muslims.*—As we do not desire to go beyond the companions of the prophet, we will not follow further the history of the dogmas of Islam, and merely remark in closing that however much stress Muhammad laid in the Quran upon belief in *one* God, in the prophets, and in the immortality of the soul, and exhorted to prayer, fasting, and war for the faith, none the less in a host of places obedience to other revealed doctrines and a virtuous, pure life, according to the teaching of the Quran, is required from true believers and is noted as a means of obtaining the good-will of God and a share of the happiness of Paradise. It wrongs the founder of Islam to assert that he did not value the practice of virtue and resistance to passion and required only faith. How often do phrases like this occur in the Quran: "Those who believe and do good come to Paradise." But as this mistake is frequently made some passages may be adduced to prove the contrary: "Say! I am only a mortal like yourself. I am inspired that your God is only one God. Then let him who hopes to meet his Lord act righteous acts and join none in the service of his Lord."² "He who acts aright and he who is a believer there is no denial of his efforts; verily we write them down for him."³ "As for him who is outrageous and prefers the

¹ *I. e.*, his thought as he revealed it through prophets.

² Sura 18: 10.

³ Sura 21: 94. Compare also Sura 22: 14, 23, 49, and 5: 12.

life of this world, verily hell is the resort. But for him who feared the station of his Lord and prohibited his soul from lust, verily Paradise is the resort."¹ In Sura 74 the inhabitants of hell answer questions as to why they were condemned to such punishment. "We were not of those who prayed! we did not feed the poor, but we did plunge with those who plunge and we called the Judgment Day a lie."² Sura 70 reckons as inhabitants of Paradise "those who pray, divide their property with the poor, believe in the day of Judgment, are not dissolute nor faithless, do not break their word nor pervert true witness."³ In the third Sura usurers are threatened with the flames of hell.⁴ So if in other places Paradise is promised to those who believe in God and fight for his kingdom, yet it is by no means said that the rest is set aside by God-revealed teachings, but, on the other hand, a complete mastery over human passions and an exact obedience to God's will, as set forth in the Quran, is prescribed to the true believer, who must be prepared at any moment to sacrifice his life for his God. The Muslim dogmatists, who are even less to be confused with Muhammad than the church fathers with Christ, indeed maintain that believers, despite their evil deeds, are not thrust out of Paradise forever, but they still admit that they must first be punished for their crimes. It is maintained by Christian sects that unbelief alone deserves the name of sin and is reckoned against a man in the future; on the other hand he has no reward promised for good deeds. Christendom, the church independent of the state, might reject false doctrines, and progressive theology might seek to soften the harshness, to explain difficulties, and to separate the real from the unreal, and the additions of man from the truly divine. But in Islam the doctrines most favorable to the rulers always had the ascendancy, and of course the many crimes of the later Umayyads and first Abbasides, under whom the dogmatism of Islam was established, placed faith over good deeds, although in the Quran they go hand in hand.

X. *The personality of Muhammad the element of weakness in Islam.*—We are indeed far from wishing by these observations to put the founder of Islam on a level with the founder of Chris-

¹ Sura 79:36-41.

² Vss. 44-47.

³ Vss. 22-33.

⁴ Vss. 125, 126.

tianity, but in our opinion the difference lies in the personalities rather than in the dogmas. If the Mutazilites had been able to develop as freely as protestants, it is possible that a system of theology would have sprung from the Quran which at any rate would have satisfied the requirements of human reason, as well as Christian rationalism founded on the Gospels. In the personality of Muhammad, which first came really to the light during his stay at Medina, not in the different conception of the doctrines of the fall and the atonement or in the denial of the Trinity, that is of the Trinity as taught in the seventh century, is to be sought the decline and the eventual destruction of Islam. Christ was consistent throughout his life and sealed it by his death; but Muhammad shrank from threatening danger and sought by all kinds of artifices and finally by force to gain control for himself and for his religion. Moreover, later he was not content to spread general doctrines and moral precepts in the name of God, but his positive laws and ordinances were to be considered as coming from heaven, although he himself was frequently compelled by circumstances to change them and had too little control over himself to submit to them. Muhammad himself not only cannot be a mediator between God and man, but is not even a pattern of virtue; and so his revelations have come to nought and are incapable of inspiring the soul with true religious feeling. If the Quran, as compared with the Gospels, is full of anachronisms it is not because it combats various dogmas whose significance at that time was entirely unknown, but because, like the Pentateuch, it contains laws which are not useful and applicable to all countries and peoples nor to all times. Muhammad was originally a reformer and as such he deserves full recognition and admiration. An Arab who saw the dark side of the Judaism and Christianity of that period and sought at the peril of his life to crush polytheism and to impress upon his people the doctrine of the immortality of the soul deserves not only a place among the great men of history, but even the name of prophet. But as soon as he ceased to be a persecuted man, as soon as he tried to establish truth by means of assassination and open war, and in the name of God proclaimed new interna-

tional, ceremonial, civil, police and criminal laws, he put upon himself and his word the stamp of human weakness and transitoriness.

XI. *Legal material of the Quran.*—The ceremonial laws of Islam are indeed not so numerous as is commonly supposed in Europe, but there is one which at least frees Muhammad from the reproach of favoring the physical comfort of the Arabs in his precepts, viz., the fast of Ramadhan.¹ When we think of the glaring desert of Arabia and of the command for a whole month, from sunrise to sunset, not only to abstain from food but not even to drink a drop of water, it will be impossible to consider the observance of the Muslim regulations as easy or to affirm that it requires no struggle between soul and body. The prayer five times a day with the accompanying purification is less burdensome, for it is short and every man performs it for himself. The pilgrimage to Mecca, however, once in a lifetime, and only to be avoided by those whose circumstances do not permit of such a journey, requires of those who live far from this holy city a great sacrifice of money, time, and trouble.

The most important laws concerning food consist of the prohibition of wine, of blood, of animals dying a natural death or sacrificed in honor of an idol, of beasts of prey and of pork. The police who have charge of the markets have to look out for the observance of these regulations and also to prevent forbidden games of chance.

The laws of Islam which have to do with public law and administration determine the taxes, the division of booty, the treatment of prisoners, and the relations of believers to idolaters, Jews and Christians. According to the more severe laws of Muhammad's last years, they are to war against the idolaters until every trace of idolatry ceases, and against Jews and Christians until they submit and pay tribute. Only the tithe is to be exacted from believers and according to the Quran it is to be used for the poor, for travelers, for the tax-collector, for the freeing of slaves, for the assistance of those who have to pay an expiatory offering, for maintenance of the army, and to win

¹ Since the Arabs observe a lunar year, the month of Ramadhan comes in turn at all seasons of the year.

desirable people to the faith. It has already been mentioned that although Muhammad could not as a man have taught and acted otherwise under the prevailing conditions, still by these martial laws he weakened his prophetic position and thereby placed himself far below Christ who sought to gain, by inward character, not by force, the dominion of the world for his faith. But even Christianity itself, in direct opposition to the gospel, from the time it mounted the throne of the Cæsars until now has plainly shown how great the temptation is, after attaining to power, to use it for warring upon and suppressing those of other faiths.

But at any rate it is impossible to deny that, while intolerance is an outgrowth of Christianity which either church or state can root out and has rooted out in almost all European countries, it is forbidden in the Quran; at least there can be no talk of equality between Muslims and non-Muslims as long as this holds the position of a supreme and unquestioned law-book.

The law of punishment in the Quran is exceptionally mild. The death penalty is only for those guilty of unnatural crimes, of apostasy from Islam and of murder; and if the relatives of the murdered man prefer blood-money to revenge, even a murderer saves his life. Adulterers, too, at least in the Quran in its present form, are not punished with death, and in any case only when four male witnesses were present at the deed. For bodily injuries either the Old Testament law of retaliation was followed or the offender had to pay a fixed sum to the injured.

The most severe criminal law, which is justifiable only by the necessity of checking the inborn propensity of the Arab to thievery and robbery, is the cutting off of the hand for each appropriation of the property of another.

The civil laws of the Quran deal especially with inheritance and marriage. They are chiefly directed towards securing the rights of the woman and limiting the power of the man. Polygamy is not prohibited, but conditions are attached which the true believer can rarely fulfill. Fidelity in marriage is made a duty for the man. Another portion of the civil law takes up the lot of slaves, which Muhammad also sought to lighten. The way was prepared for the complete extinction of slavery,

and they were often freed, especially in the case of believers. Emancipation of all the slaves was hardly possible in view of the continual wars in which the conquered were permitted to live only as slaves. The poverty of the Quran in laws of traffic is explained partly by the simple conditions of the time and still more by the fact that Muhammad probably retained many existing customs without bringing out any revelation about them. This lack was soon felt; but they appealed first to oral traditions of Muhammad, then to the examples of the earlier Caliphs and their decisions, made with the help of learned men, and lastly, since in the completely changed conditions of life these became insufficient, they sought to decide from analogy, so that at times the most difficult questions about any matter, from a phrase in the Quran to a steamship voyage, could be settled in the name of heaven by a Muslim jurist just as by a rabbi of the old school.

XII. *The sociology of the Quran.*—The sociology of the Quran can be considered the most complete part of this remarkable book. To be sure, like the other subjects of the book, it is not found in any one chapter, but the most beautiful moral principles and precepts, like a golden thread, go through the whole web of superstition and deceit. Prejudice, vengeance, self-conceit, pride, falsehood, double-dealing, slander, invective, mockery, covetousness, profligacy, extravagance, jealousy, ostentation, distrust and suspicion are enumerated as godless vices; benevolence, humanity, modesty, forbearance, patience and perseverance, contentedness, uprightness, honesty, chastity, love of peace and truth, and, before everything, faith and devotion are recommended as the virtues most pleasing to God.

XIII. *The outlook for Islam.*—If, after this condensed discussion of Islam, one asks what future it has before it¹ and what progress it must make in order to push itself to the heights of European civilization, it seems probable that it must go the same way as reformed Judaism, both in sundering tradition from revelation and in making a distinction in the sacred word between

¹ Dozy thinks that Islam has a future development at least as brilliant as that of Catholic Christianity. He calls attention to the fact that they have gone through similar stages of development, and affirms that Islam is making great progress in southeastern Asia and the Indian Archipelago.

eternal truth and laws and precepts which are called out only by temporary external circumstances, and are suited only to a certain period and people. A future gradual union with Christianity is only possible if it is portrayed in such a way that Muhammad's polemic against it finds no point of attack. But if Christian missionaries proceed, as hitherto, to require of Muslims a belief in dogmas which they cannot grasp and which they, like the founder of their religion, are compelled to reject as heathenism, then all their efforts will still be fruitless. We must seek to enlighten the Muslim by the elementary study of the history of the world and of religion as well as of the sciences, instead of by means of the catechism and the Bible, which, without a commentary, are a closed book to non-Christians, its exterior repelling rather than attracting. If the money yearly expended by the different missionary societies for the conversion of the Muslims was used to found good schools, then able teachers sent to the Orient would do more to undermine the foundations of Islam than the missionaries with their free distribution of translations of catechisms and Gospels. Moreover, that after conversion to Christianity orientals would still be far from European culture is proved by the Christians living among them, who in many respects stand below the Muslims, although from the point of view of the missionaries of the various creeds the latter have the greater need. The work of the Turkish government in regard to education both in Stamboul and Cairo bears the mark of egotism and is always more or less connected with military affairs. The foundation of European institutions, good primary and grammar schools, is entirely lacking. Therefore there has been no inward change possible hitherto, but only a glossing over of old corruption; and therefore most orientals who have been sent to European universities for a scientific education have returned without having attained their aim.

But the fact that education at the present time is of a low grade is to be attributed not to Islam, but to bad government; for the high position which scientific studies held among Muslims in the Middle Ages proves that they are not incompatible with that faith. A sensible code of law, which alone can justify the Muslim Orient in taking a place beside European Christian

countries, is incompatible with Islam unless it is reformed as suggested above. Since many people have maintained that Muslims use their subjects of other faiths no worse than many Christian rulers treat theirs, we will cite a few laws which prove the contrary. The payment of a head-tax and the wearing of a distinct costume were early enforced. Worse yet are the following Muslim laws: Of unbelieving prisoners of war, the women and children are enslaved; as for adult males, the Imâm is to decide whether they shall be killed, enslaved, exchanged, allowed to be ransomed, or, if it seems expedient, set free. A murderer is executed only if he has killed a Muslim, not for the slaying of an unbeliever. The blood-money for a non-Muslim is fixed at one-third of that for a believer. This was the reason of the long opposition of the Porte to the execution of the murderers of the consuls at Salonica. One indispensable qualification for a judge is that he should be a Muslim. An unbeliever is ineligible as a witness. Many other laws are not at all suited to our times; as, for example, those relating to the tribute, which have long been observed by the Ottoman government only so long as they filled their own coffers. Also the limitation of trade to articles permitted to Muslims. Speculation in food products is forbidden. The government can compel the speculators to sell their stock at market price. No interest can be demanded for loans. But Europe has troubled herself little about such laws, which, however, for the most part are still in force: whence it has had to insist upon the actual suspension of all privileges founded on religious belief; for only thus, even with better rulers than Turkey has had since the death of Sultan Mahmud, is a peaceful and harmonious intercourse between Christians and Muslims possible, and a single European power has undertaken to interfere with every protection in favor of the faithful. Whether the Sultan has the power to defy the Ulamas in this way is a question which does not belong here. But it is certain that an equalization of the different creeds, which is of more importance than nationalities, must put an end to the privileges of the Turkish race, if the Ottoman kingdom is to make genuine inward progress.

THE USE OF MYTHIC ELEMENTS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. I.

By C. M. CADY, A.M.,

Late Professor of English Literature in Doshisha University, Kyoto, Japan.

It has been one of my duties for the past few years to introduce classes of Japanese students to the mythological tales and personages of Greece and Rome as preparatory to the study and appreciation of English literature. In the course of this instruction I have had occasion to call attention to parallel stories in the Bible in which similar truths or great facts of human nature and experience are taught or illustrated. As a result my attention and thought have been directed anew to the question of the existence and use of mythic elements in the Old Testament.

Perhaps the main reason why most Christians shrink from the idea of there being myths in the Bible is the loose conception, often taken, of a myth as a euphemism for falsehood or lie; and, as the great aim of the Bible seems to be the declaring of truth, the possibility of its containing lies is very disturbing. We need therefore to define our term. For our present purpose we may summarize the scientific definitions found in such standard works as Murray's *Manual of Mythology*, Keightley's *Classical Mythology*, and *The Century Dictionary*, as follows:

A myth is a more or less fictitious or imaginary story or narrative respecting, *First*, deities or objects of worship; *Second*, prehistoric events connected with the life of a nation or of the human race; *Third*, prehistoric heroes, real or imaginary; *Fourth*, the phenomena of nature.

I am well aware that some mythologists would reduce all myths to the fourth class, and seek to explain the origin of every myth as an attempt of man in his poetical and philosophical moods to account for, or, rather, to clothe in language and thus make understandable to his imagination and fancy, some ongoing of the world outside of man. But we need not stop to discuss

this classification, for the fourfold division given answers to the general conception; and that is the conception we need in considering the subject before us.

In regard to myths of the first class—stories of deities or objects of worship—we can say at once that, though the Jewish people sprang from a race worshiping various deities, and though they came in contact with the systems of mythology of Egypt, Phœnicia, Babylon, Chaldæa and other ancient peoples, including Greece and Rome; and while they at times believed in and worshiped the various gods of some of these nations, yet we have in the Old Testament no stories about any of them.

Again, whatever theory may be true as to the different names of deity in the Old Testament, the complete absence of stories about their origin or the relations between the Being intended by them and the gods of the surrounding peoples reduces the mythic elements to the minimum of possibilities. About the only chance for a reference to a myth would be in regard to God's relations to beings other than human and less than divine. It is precisely in this connection that we find what may be such a reference in the allusions to a conflict between God and some proud, arrogant giant being or beings, which are found in the following passages:

- ¹ God will not withdraw his anger;
The helpers of Rahab (the Proud One) do stoop under him.
- ² He maketh peace in his high places;
Is there any number of his armies?
- ³ He stilleth the sea with his power,
And by his understanding he smiteth through Rahab.
- ⁴ Canst thou bind the chain of the Pleiades,
Or loose the bands of Orion (the foolhardy Giant)?
- ⁵ O arm of the Lord! art thou not it
That cut Rahab to pieces, and pierced the Dragon?

It should be said, however, that A. B. Davidson and others interpret this "Rahab" as referring to the sea, ultimately, and so make it a nature myth of another kind while agreeing that in

¹ Job 9:13. ² *Ibid.* 25:2-3. ³ *Ibid.* 26:12. ⁴ *Ibid.* 38:31. ⁵ Isa. 51:9.

Bildad's speech (Job 25: 2-3), the reference is to a war, similar to the Titanic war of Greek mythology, where Jehovah overcame with the help of his heavenly armies. It has been suggested also that the Nephilim, mentioned in Gen. 6: 4, refer to this same race of Titans who made war upon God. Aside from this reference we are not likely to find any use of a myth of the first class in the Old Testament.

Another class of myths found among all nations—if we except the Jews—is about prehistoric events connected with the origin and early life either of the human race or of individual nations.

In Genesis, up to the tenth verse of the eleventh chapter, we find what purports to be accounts of creation, including that of the first man and woman; how evil came into the world; the first murder and the building of the first city; the destruction of the habitable world by a flood, and the subsequent re-peopling it; the origin of different languages and the consequent dispersion of the races.

I suppose that few, if any, doubt that tradition had *some* share in preparing these accounts for the use of the first writers; and that in most of these narratives, if not in all, there is *some* play of the human imagination manifested in certain pictorial efforts to make these scenes and truths appreciable and vivid. If this be so, then, even under divine inspiration and divine guidance, the natural processes of thought, including the imagination, of the writers would make use of at least non-historical elements. One illustration of this, which would be admitted by every thoughtful person, is the declaration: "And the Lord *came down to see* the city and the tower which the children of men builded."

It would be too long a task to go into the details of each of these narratives; nor, if we did, could we determine just where fact and fiction begins, supposing the latter to exist. In point of fact no two minds, certainly no two classes of mind, would draw the lines precisely alike. So far as I can see, we must take the stories as they stand, and with all the light we can obtain from every source—including the parallel accounts of the same, or similar events found among other peoples—determine each one for himself the general impression left on his mind. For

my part, the impression has been, from my earliest recollection, that of a *story*, setting forth great facts, but still a story, the details of which are clearly imaginary. The talking of a serpent to a woman, the conception that knowledge of good and evil could be obtained by eating a certain kind of fruit, or life be gained from another tree, and the like, seem purely and evidently fictitious forms, sort of interesting, even necessary garments,—garments of flesh, if you will,—clothing truths that otherwise would fail to be recognized. Some, I know, think the account of the fall is an allegory; but it does not seem to have the self-conscious marks of that class of writings. To me Lenormant's¹ admission seems more in harmony with the probabilities; namely, "that the inspired compiler of Genesis used, in relating the fall of the first human pair, a narrative which had assumed an entirely mythical character among the surrounding peoples, and that the form of the serpent attributed to the tempter may, in its origin, have been an essentially naturalistic symbol."

With regard to myths of the third class, those about heroes, real or imaginary, one hesitates to say much; for here it is possible—as the facts in the case abundantly show—to take the widest divergency of view, and, therefore, here is the greatest liability of mistake. I suppose Samson occurs to nearly everyone as the character in the Old Testament most likely to have mythic elements attached to him. The story of Jonah is so commonly thought of as a "Parable setting forth the love of God to the Gentiles" that we can leave it out of the account. We are all familiar with the theory that Samson, like Hercules, is a *sun myth*. Possibly, but if so, he has been so thoroughly metamorphosed into a man that he has lost all trace of his origin except his name, which means *sun-like*; and how dangerously foolish it is to build or reconstruct a myth out of a name may be seen from that ingenious attempt, made a few years ago, to show that Gladstone was a sun myth (*glad-stone, e. e., bright, light-giving-stone*). The writer might also have gone on to show that Disraeli was Gladstone's father, instead of the black storm dragon that on occasion swallows up the sun, for was not the

¹ *Beginnings of History*, p. 115.

former afterward called *beacon's-field*, and Lord beacon's-field at that?

That nearly every nation of antiquity had its hero of strength is true, I suppose, and that there gather about these heroes more or less of marvelous and fictitious accounts is not only probable but inevitable. I see no insuperable objections to supposing that some such accounts adhere to the Jewish hero Samson, but beyond this there seems no good reason for going. Certainly, if Samson be a *sun myth* then the writer of his life is proved to be a most wonderful, creative literary genius; for, long before there had been gradually developed the faculty for writing fiction, in the modern sense, this writer had this faculty so fully in possession that he gave to literature a character thoroughly human from top to toe, "every inch a man," such as not even Homer could give or Shakespeare surpass.

In myths of the fourth class, myths of fabulous birds or creatures originally setting forth well-known phenomena of the physical world, we find the most unmistakable references and allusions in the Old Testament, particularly in the poetical portions, precisely where we should expect to find them supposing them to exist.

Take the reference in Job, 29:18, to that fabled bird, the Phœnix: Then I said: I shall die in my nest, and I shall multiply my days as the Phœnix; or to the mythical night-hag or demon (Heb. *Lilith*.),—traditional first wife of Adam—mentioned in Isa. 34:14, who was to haunt Edom along with satyrs and wild beasts of the desert.

It would be interesting to examine other examples, especially those bird-like, or beast-bird-like creatures the cherubim and seraphim which, according to Dr. Friederich Delitzsch, were mythic in origin. "The cherubim," he says, "were originally personifications of the clouds and the seraphim of the serpent-like flashes of lightning."¹ I shall confine myself to one more example, one which appears under a variety of names.

¹ *Wo lag das Paradies* (1881), p. 155, quoted by Cheyne in *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, Vol. II. pp. 297, 298.

Job (3:8) as he curses the day when he was born, says:

"Let them curse it that curse the day,

Who are skillful to rouse up Leviathan" (*or the Dragon*).

If we compare this with Job's saying (26:13):

"By his spirit the heavens are made bright,

His hand hath pierced the swift serpent,"

we get a clear idea of the meaning of both passages. Workers of magic, or men currently believed to have the power, are implored to overcome or cover the day with darkness by their skill in waking up some huge creature, serpent-like monster, called leviathan. On the other hand, the Lord, by his having pierced the serpent, clears, makes bright the heavens. Thus we have both sides of this ancient and world-wide mythic belief: first, that a monstrous winged serpent (the storm-dragon) had the power to darken the day by covering or swallowing the sun; second, that some divine being (in this case, the Lord) was quite able to slay this monster and, by so doing, restore the heavens to their accustomed brightness.

In Isaiah (27:1) we have another reference to this same mythical creature and the Lord's power to slay it:

In that day the Lord

With his sore and great and strong sword,

Shall punish leviathan, the swift serpent,

And leviathan, the crooked serpent,

And he shall slay the dragon

That is in the sea.

If by "*the sea*" is meant "the waters that are above the heavens," mentioned in the Psalms, the "upper ocean in its dark, cloudy reservoir," then the reference is remarkably true to the character of several nature myths; for the dragon in the sea is then the same as the swift or gliding serpent, and that again is the same as the crooked or winding serpent. We thus have the dark storm-clouds personified under different aspects; swiftly, silently covering the sky; twisting themselves in out, over and around one another; and swimming in the sea overhead, and yet the three are one.

Aids to Bible Readers.¹

THE LETTER OF JAMES.

By ERNEST D. BURTON,
The University of Chicago.

James the Lord's brother: his place in the Church: his doctrinal position—His letter addressed to Christian Jews outside of Palestine—Their condition and the purpose of the letter—Its characteristics—Analysis.

JAMES the Lord's brother, though in the life of Jesus not a believer in him, became early in the apostolic age a leading man in the Christian Church. The way in which he is spoken of both in the epistles of Paul and in the book of Acts implies that he was at the head of the church at Jerusalem, and a man of influence not only in Jerusalem, but among Christians generally. See Gal. 1:19; 2:9—he is even mentioned here before Cephas and John; compare the prominent place which the book of Acts (15:13 ff.) assigns to him in its account of this same event—Gal. 2:12; 1 Cor. 15:17; Acts 12:17; 21:18. Tradition agrees substantially with these intimations of the New Testament. He is said to have been surnamed the Just, because of his exceeding righteousness, to have been highly esteemed both by Christians and by Jews, and finally to have died a martyr's death (probably about 63 A.D.) testifying to Jesus (Josephus Ant. 20, 9, 1; Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. 2, 23). During the latter years of his life, he was practically the head of Jewish Christianity, sustaining to it a relation similar to that of Paul toward Gentile Christianity. Though he did not take the attitude of hostility to Gentile Christianity which the opponents of Paul assumed, but, on the contrary, recognized the validity of Paul's mission to the Gentiles according to Paul's understanding of it (Gal. 2:9), yet for himself and for his Jewish brethren he clung to the law. Tolerant toward the more liberal view so far as it affected the Gentiles, it is nevertheless doubtful whether he ever fully appreciated its real meaning—quite certain that he never would have reached it for himself.

¹ Under this head will be published from month to month articles intended to furnish help in the intelligent reading of the books of the Bible as books. They will aim to present not so much fresh results of critical investigation as well established and generally recognized conclusions.

This is undoubtedly the James of the New Testament Epistle of James.

The letter is addressed "to the twelve tribes which are in the dispersion," *i. e.*, to Jewish Christians outside of Palestine. For though the tone of the letter is in general such that it might almost as well have been addressed to Jews as to Christians, yet one or two passages show clearly its Christian character. See 1:1, 2:1, also those that are somewhat less clear, 2:7; 5:7, 8. These were the larger parish of James, perhaps in part Jews who had come under the influence of their brethren who accepted Jesus as the Messiah when visiting Jerusalem to attend the feast, perhaps in part commercial travelers (see 4:13) who either had once resided in Jerusalem, or had come in contact with Christians in their travels. We speak of them as Jewish Christians, yet it would probably be more correct to call them Christian Jews, or to use the expression of Acts, Jews that believed, *i. e.*, in Jesus as the Christ. For it is doubtful whether any of those to whom the letter was addressed recognized themselves as in any sense the less Jews because they had become Christians. Christianity—even this word did not yet exist for them, their faith, let us say—was to them simply a type, to them the true type, of Judaism.

The letter being written to persons scattered in many places, and indeed in some cases moving from place to place, could not in the nature of the case address itself to any particular situation existing in a given place and at a given time, but is necessarily somewhat general in character. Yet it is written to accomplish a definite result. Those to whom James writes are very far from being perfect according to the standard of the law or of the gospel. Most of them were poor (2:5, 6; the passage 5:1-6 is probably not addressed to the readers of the letter, but is a denunciatory apostrophe to the rich outside of the Christian synagogue); they were subject to trial which it was needful for them to bear with patience, and to temptations which evidently they did not always resist. Though poor, and oppressed by the rich they were yet meanly obsequious to them. Faction, jealousy, strife, self-confidence were prevalent among them. Perhaps the root of all their faults lay in their having carried over into their lives as believers the old characteristic vice of the Judaism of their day, a formal conception of religion, which makes it consist in the holding of certain opinions rather than in character and conduct. As Jews, which be it remembered they still were, they were prone to be hearers of the law rather than doers. As Christians they were inclined to make faith a

mere assent to certain propositions, rather than a relation to God transforming their lives.

The purpose of the letter is intensely practical, and its method is the method of a practical man. James does not emphasize for his readers the theological error which underlay their mistakes of life. He rebukes their sins directly and by name, insisting upon the necessity of a high and pure morality. Intimations there are indeed in his references to the new birth (1:18) and to the law of liberty (1:25; 2:12) that he knew that the only spring of right conduct is in a renewed heart, whereon God has by the word of truth written the new law, that thus becomes a law of liberty. Yet these things are but referred to in passing. The stress of the letter's emphasis is upon objective right living.

Though it shows evidently the influence of the ethical teachings of Jesus, it is very different from the discourse of Jesus. Though it touches on some of the same themes with which Paul dealt, and teaches a doctrine to which Paul would have assented, it reflects a mind of a very different cast from his. The profound insight of Jesus did not belong to his brother according to the flesh. The organizing and reasoning power of the Apostle to the Gentiles did not appear in the head of the Jewish Christian church. Nevertheless it is very wholesome advice which James writes to his Jewish brethren abroad; and after all these centuries the Church finds this letter still useful, helpful reading. Sententious, almost epigrammatic in style, abounding in simile and metaphor, the book is full of sentences that stick in the memory, and carry their lesson with them. If it is, as perhaps the majority of scholars hold, the earliest writing of the New Testament collection, this fact adds interest to the study of the book and furnishes a hint of what Christianity would have been had no Paul arisen with profounder insight into the true significance of the gospel of Christ.

There is little that can be called plan in the book. It consists of short paragraphs whose connection one with another is chiefly in the one purpose that animates the letter.

ANALYSIS.

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Salutation. | 1:1. |
| 2. Concerning trials and temptations. | 1:2-18. |
| 3. Doers of the word, not hearers only. | 1:19-27. |
| 4. Against respect of persons (obsequiousness to the rich, contempt of the poor). | 2:1-13. |

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| 5. Against faith without works, which is dead. | 2 : 14-26. |
| 6. Concerning the use of the tongue. | 3 : 1-12. |
| 7. Against faction and conceit of wisdom. | 3 : 13-18. |
| 8. Against love of pleasure and of the world, leading to strife and pride. | 4 : 1-10. |
| 9. Against evil speaking and judgment one of another. | 4 : 11, 12. |
| 10. Presumptuous planning and boasting reprov'd. | 4 : 13-17. |
| 11. The oppressive dealing of the rich denounced. | 5 : 1-6. |
| 12. Patient waiting for the coming of the Lord enjoined. | 5 : 7-11. |
| 13. Against swearing. | 5 : 12. |
| 14. Praise and prayer enjoined. | 5 : 13-18. |
| 15. Care for the erring ones enjoined. | 5 : 19, 20. |

Comparative-Religion Notes.

Recent Appointments.—The Ohio Wesleyan University has appointed the Rev. W. F. Oldham, A.M., D.D., to the position of Lecturer on Missions and Comparative Religion. Dr. Oldham was formerly the head of the Anglo-Indian College at Singapore.

Edmund Buckley, Ph.D., has been appointed Docent in Comparative Religion at the University of Chicago. Dr. Buckley was formerly connected with the teaching staff of the Doshisha College in Japan. His special field is that of the Chinese and Japanese Religions. The University of Chicago conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Philosophy after a course of special studies and the presentation of a thesis upon "Phallicism in Japan," which is noticed elsewhere in this department.

Lectures and Studies.—The Haskell Lectures on Comparative Religion, on the foundation established by Mrs. Caroline E. Haskell at the University of Chicago, were given at the University on successive Sundays from May 5th to June 9th by the Rev. Dr. John Henry Barrows of Chicago, who was appointed the first lecturer. The general theme of the lecturer was *Christianity, the World-Religion*. The subjects of the several lectures were as follows: May 5, Universal Aspects of Christianity; May 12, World-wide Effects of Christianity; May 19, The Universal Book; May 26, The Universal Man and Saviour; June 2, The Christian Revelation of God the Basis of a Universal Religion; June 9, The Historic Character and Elements of Christianity in their Relations to the Universal Faith. Great interest on the subject was aroused not only on the part of University students but also among the thoughtful people of Chicago. The course was a pronounced success and prophecies' great usefulness for the new foundation.

Professor J. Leonard Corning announces a course of Illustrated Lectures which he entitles "Art Studies in Comparative Religion." They are seven in number. After an introductory discussion the following themes are discussed and illustrated: 1) Theophany, or the Expression of the idea of God in the Art of the Ages; 2) The Trinities of Pagan and Christian Art; 3) Demonology in Pagan and Christian Art; 4) Mortality and its symbols in Pagan and Christian Art; 5) Eschatology, or Tomorrow of Death, as symbolized in the Art of the Ages; 6) Pagan Symbolism in Christian Art. Mr. Corning has collected the illustrations for these lectures with great pains, copying from original drawings, paintings and sculptures in the principal libraries, museums

and churches of the Old World. The idea is an ingenious one and the material can hardly fail to be instructive. Mr. Corning can be addressed in care of the U. S. Consulate, Munich, Bavaria.

The Study of Religions at Plymouth.—The School of Applied Ethics at its fourth session held at Plymouth, Mass., July 8–August 9, offers an attractive series of lectures in the History of Religions. Professor H. S. Nash, D.D., of the Cambridge Episcopal Theological School gives four lectures on “Tendencies of Thought in the Christian Church.” Rabbi David Philipson, D.D., of Cincinnati, discusses “The Reform Movement in Judaism,” and “Tendencies of Thought in Modern Judaism.” “Religion and Philosophy” is the theme of four lectures by Professor George T. Ladd, of Yale. His special topics are, The Nature of Religion, The Being of God, God and the World, The Nature of Man, The Destiny of Man. Another series of topics considers “Religion in Modern Literature.” Dr. H. L. Wayland and others lecture on “Church and State.” The secretary of the school is S. Burns Weston, 1305 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Piety in Mohammedanism.—It has been generally believed that Islam has fallen into a condition of apathy, decay and formalism which precludes the growth of genuine individual piety. This is a mistaken notion, as was pointed out by President Washburne in his careful comparison of Christianity and Mohammedanism presented at the Parliament of Religions. He read in connection with his paper a pathetic and devout poem of praise and worship to God composed by a Mohammedan woman. As a further illustration of the same element of devotion and piety, the following Mohammedan hymn, translated from the Hindu by Mr. F. J. Coffin of the University of Chicago, is here printed;

Perfect art Thou, O Lord, in Thy Majesty.
 No one can number the works of Thy creation.
 Whatever is virtuous is inherent in Thy nature,
 And besides Thee, there is no helper.
 The petition of the transgressor ascends to Thee.
 O! be pleased to hear my prayer
 And from the treasure-house of Thine excellence, do Thou enrich me.

It is all the more interesting to notice that this poem has been borrowed for use in Christian churches, being printed in “A Collection of Hymns for Divine Worship by Parsons and Christian;” published by the Baptist Mission Press, Calcutta.

New Histories of Religion.—The long announced book by Dr. Allan Menzies of the University of St. Andrews has just appeared. It is entitled “History of Religions; a sketch of primitive religious beliefs and practices, and of the

origin and character of the great systems." It is published by Charles Scribner's Sons in the "University Series" and is a volume of 438 pages. There is no doubt that it is the most complete work we have in English at present. A full notice of the book will appear in a later issue of the *BIBLICAL WORLD*.

Principal G. M. Grant of Queen's University, Canada, has written a little book with the title "Religions of the World in relation to Christianity," in the series of Guild Text-books, published by Black of Edinburgh, and Randolph of New York. In 137 pages of small type he discusses the four great non-Christian religions, Mohammedanism, Confucianism, Hinduism and Buddhism, giving, first, an outline of their character and, second, enumerating the elements of their strength and weakness, with a comparison with Christianity expressed or implied. Much valuable and suggestive thought has been put into the book.

Professor Chantepie de la Saussaye whose "Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte" is the standard compendium upon the subject, authorizes the announcement that a second edition of this work is to be published in 1896-7 in which the parts that have already become antiquated will be revised and rewritten in collaboration with younger scholars of more special knowledge of the several parts. The new edition will be in one volume and omit the Phenomenological Division. This latter portion Professor de la Saussaye hopes to republish later in a separate volume in fuller form. At present he is engaged on a work in Teutonic Mythology for the series of religious manuals, edited by Professor Jastrow of Philadelphia.

Phallicism in Japan.—The thesis entitled "Phallicism in Japan" referred to above constitutes a real contribution to the history of religions, in that it firmly and fully establishes the fact of phallicism in a land where its presence had hitherto been known, and that but fragmentarily, to very few. Indeed, the cult of the *phallos* and *kteis*—Greek terms respectively for the male and female generative organs—though once widely spread abroad among men, has hitherto, in common with most other features of ethnic religion, been known to only a few specialists. The symbolism here employed for the divine source of all *increase*, while to us unspeakably coarse and even indecent, was to primitive man, and remains to myriads of contemporary men, the most natural and significant religious symbol devisable. In India alone an estimated number of thirty millions of the compound phallos-kteis forms to our own racial cousins the most familiar and cherished symbol of deity. In general, the Occident does not and never can know the Orient until it consents to study Oriental religion, among the very varied viewpoints of which phallicism is one of the most instructive just because so far removed from nations and sentiments which have among us become pervasive. The pamphlet is on sale only at The University of Chicago Press.

Synopses of Important Articles.

CHRIST AND THE OLD TESTAMENT. Conference address by DR. M. KÄHLER, of the University of Halle, and published in the *Chronik der Christlichen Welt*, Leipzig, No 21.

(1) Christ has made the *Mikrah* (Canon) of the Jews a permanent factor in the history of mankind.

(2) This has resulted from the fact that this Canon was his Bible until his crucifixion (John 19: 28; Matth. 26: 46) and after his resurrection (Luke 24: 25, 26; 44, 45), and for that reason also became the Bible of his messengers in all the congregations established by them.

(3) The Old Testament collection of writings was one of the means prepared by God through which the Old Testament revelation became in reality a genuine essential in the development of the inner consciousness of Jesus Christ in the unfolding of the certainty of his Messianic calling, and in carrying out this principle as the object of his life's work. Especially did this Scripture serve him, in the midst of the Judaistic particularity of his age, to grasp in a vivid manner his earthly calling and to recognize the corresponding significance of his person.

(4) His messengers have utilized the Old Testament especially for the purpose of demonstrating his Messianic character and work. In this respect prominence is given to this, that Jesus as the Messiah, *i. e.*, as the Mediator between God and man, can be understood only on the basis of the Old Testament development. This development, however, becomes a permanent factor only in its last results, namely, in the Old Testament collection as a whole. In this way this book or its contents continues to be a presupposition for the faith in Jesus as the Messiah. Without the Old Testament Christ and his mission will surely be misinterpreted.

(5) Neither Jesus nor his disciples were through scientific research or other means prepared for, nor did they concern themselves in any way or manner about, the investigation of their Bible as the source of Israel's national religion. Rather they read this book as the revelation of the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ. They accordingly do not interpret it from the standpoint of the original author, in accordance with the historical principle, but solely in the light of God's fulfilment. The Old Testament for the Messiah-believers is the Scriptures in which God's Spirit or the Spirit as the Messiah testifies of his sufferings and his glory (1 Pet. 1: 11), which is the sum and substance of the revelation of God (Gal. 3: 8, 22), and in which the experiences of the men and the people of God are recorded, not for historical purposes, but for the ben-

efit of those who shall live in later days (Rom. 4:24; 1 Cor. 10:11). They estimate and judge of the contents of their Bible from the standpoint of the Gospel.

(6) The Old Testament collection is thus a part of the church's canon. This dignity is accredited to it (a) as a body of traditional revelations, (b) interpreted from a Christian standpoint. The "Christian" interpretation of the Old Testament is thus not "unhistorical" absolutely, but at most "unhistorical on the basis of the historical principle of interpretation" (*zeitgeschichtlich ungeschichtlich*). It is historical from a higher standpoint (*im grossen Stil*). This point of view excludes the idea that Jesus presupposed the verbal inspiration of the Old Testament as this is also excluded by the various gospel traditions in the New Testament.

(7) We confess the divinity of Christ, who, however, in his days of humility assumed the form of a servant. Until his death, in work and favor he was the "Elect Jehovah." During this period, with the exception of his sinlessness, he claimed to differ from the prophets only in his knowledge (*Erkenntnis*) arising from his peculiar relation to the Father (Matt. 11:27 and the Fourth Gospel). If the divine nature in him submitted to all the limitations of the flesh in order to be like unto us (Heb. 2), why not then, too, to the limitations of the knowledge of such facts as can be discovered only through a regular course of continual research? His infallibility in revealing the Father does not arise from his secular knowledge, but his infallible judgment concerning the affairs of the world originated in his perfect knowledge of the Father. If some of his statements concerning matters of history and of nature turn out on investigation to be incorrect, this can invalidate the truth of his word as little as the dogma concerning creation, which has become a different one since it has been found that the world is round and not flat.

(8) Of Christ's statements concerning the Old Testament we have only samples (Luke 24:27, 45 sq.). We accordingly cannot conclude as to his literal usage of the Old Testament.

(9) In matters of history and literary estimate concerning the Old Testament Christ nowhere departs from the current thought of his age. He did not criticise their views nor correct them. This is important for this reason, because he, as far as the contents are concerned, concedes to it decisive authority. Accordingly his method of viewing the Old Testament cannot come into conflict with the application of the historical principle.

(10) The New Testament references to the facts of the Old Testament pertain to the largest degree to prehistoric times, *i. e.*, to times concerning which we have no historical data outside of the Old Testament itself. Of prehistoric times we cannot judge with scientific correctness until we have contemporaneous evidences.

(11) Jesus found the revelations of the Father not in human opinions concerning God and his will, but in the acts which he considered as God's acts.

In this regard he must be an authority for us. According to his days the Jews not only *thought* to know certain things but did actually *know* them. Cf. also Matt. 22. (We do not ask the secular historian to regard Adam and Eve and the patriarchs as scientifically settled facts. We ourselves accept the earliest traditions down to Moses. But we do so because the antitype guarantees to us the type (Rom. 5:14), and the revealed name of God guarantees the patriarchs, of whom the God who reveals himself is not ashamed).

(12) The historical method of studying the Old Testament has this service to render to the Church—to make her conscious that her establishment on the great historical facts of the Scriptures is independent of submission to purely human traditions or researches, which vary at all times.

(13) The purely historical method of studying the Old Testament taken alone must either acknowledge the insolvable mystery in Christ or it will misunderstand and misinterpret this mystery (2 Cor. 3:15, 16).

(14) Not the Jesus of this earth, but the perfected and preached Christ (Luke 24:46, 47), is the fulfilment of the Old Testament covenant, certifying to its contents and complementing these. The authority of the two portions of Scripture treating of him accordingly does not originate alone in the historical traditions concerning him, but is established on his work through his representative, the Paraclete.

The address has both a representative and an individual value. The author is a protagonist of that conservative school in Germany which believes that modern criticism has done some good work and that some concessions must be made to it. The discussion treats of the burning question in Protestant Germany and shows how a defender of a pronounced evangelical type of biblical study adapts some of the newer views to his positive convictions.

G. H. S.

FLORILEGIUM PHILONIS. By C. G. MONTEFIORE. *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, April, 1895, pp. 481-545.

I am not going to tell the ordinary things about Philo's life and environment, nor shall I attempt the slightest account of his philosophical system as a whole. My object is to pick out and arrange from the great mass of the Philonic writings certain salient thoughts and sentences worthy of notice. Philo borrowed many ideas from others, Greek philosophers. His doctrine of the Logos is based upon Heracleitean and Stoic teaching; in almost every part of his religious and ethical writings he is under obligations to the Greeks. Most of what we admire in Philo today is fundamentally Greek rather than Hebrew; Greek philosophy, colored, modified, transfigured by Hebraism. If Philo is often striking, it does not follow that he is helpful. It is in grand generalities that he excels; his ethical details are few and disappointing. He is deeply imbued with the characteristic yearnings of mysticism. He is always tremendously in earnest in his great quest, *viz.*, the knowledge of God.

With him it is a religious passion; yet he seeks this knowledge by philosophic means, through metaphysics rather than through goodness; and yet he is also convinced that God always will be unknowable, or rather known only in part. In Philo's mind we find the constant yearning to know God and the abiding conviction that he is essentially unknowable. The specific statements in the *Pentateuch* are allegories, except the *ethical* statements, which stand true as they are.

What then are Philo's ideas about God? What strikes us above all is his doctrine of the divine ubiquity; he is desperately anxious to maintain, and if possible, to explain at once the transcendence and the immanence of God. Though God remains immovable in his omnipresence, yet his power may be manifested with varying intensity in different plans. The omniscient Deity is naturally conceived as supremely perfect; all sufficient to himself; whatever is most desired and excellent in humanity is only fully realized in God.

Philo's God is not only a god of thought, as with Aristotle, but also a god of goodness, as shown in his creation of and relation to the world. This goodness is essentially ethical, equivalent to God's grace. He does, however, not venture to say that God created also what seems to us evil. He next discusses the theory of divine benefits and punishments, which latter are entrusted to certain subordinate ministers and agents. But this does not explain the problem of evil. More interesting is his theory that God's grace and his punishments are proportionate to the nature which has to enjoy the one or to suffer the other. In the creation of man God looked to the capacities of the recipient. The biblical anthropomorphisms are an accommodation to human weakness and human needs. These their cause, their purpose educational. Philo associates a low intellectual conception of the divine nature with an imperfect morality and an imperfect service of God. The passions and diseases of the soul are at once intellectual and moral. To Philo, no less than to the author of the Fourth Gospel, the two are inextricably blended together. As anthropomorphic beliefs are connected with the fear of God, so the love of God with the truer, more spiritual conception of the divine nature. Yet there is no absolute gulf or difference of kind between man and man. Lack of opportunity may often account for lack of visible excellence. Opportunity is, if not divine, at least the companion of Deity. Every kind of life may be dedicated to God. This is a corollary of his favorite theory, that all our faculties and powers, as well as our surroundings and possessions are the gift of God, and in no wise our own. He has an appreciation for the honest failure in the quest of highest good. The search for God is the life-work of man; to reach the goal, there are two fundamental requirements: the first is repression of body, of pleasure, and imperfection, manifesting itself as error and wickedness; the second is a particular kind of humility.

In Philo there lurks a measure of asceticism; how much cannot be exactly determined. As God needs nothing, so the good man's needs should be few

and simple; this is to be near to God. Yet there is false as well as true asceticism; the former is niggardly and illiberal. The right use of external goods is highly commended. Licentiousness and intemperance should be put to shame by moderation and sobriety. Philo denounces the false Stoics and hypocritical ascetics. The service of man must in all cases precede the uninterrupted service of God. We must work our way through the "practical" life before we come to the life of contemplation; the contest of the one must precede the higher contest of the other. It is thus we can escape the charge of laziness and indifference.

The service of God is not identical with the service of man, but has a special sphere of its own; if noblest, it is also hardest. The perfectly virtuous are exclusive lovers of neither man nor God; they excel in both at one and the same time. In his more sober moments Philo recognizes the social nature of man. Man is a social animal by nature. He must live for and love the world and God, that of God he may be beloved.

In his statement on solitude and social intercourse Philo is rather inconsistent, because he cannot get over an abiding contempt for the multitude and their vices. Solitary wisdom of the rapt theosophist is higher than the gregarious wisdom of human action. But not always has he found solitude efficacious to thought.

In the ascetic ideal Philo is very wanting. No explanation of sorrow, no comfort in misfortune and misery in his writings. Here the Psalter, Epictetus and Seneca excel him by far. The life which depreciates the body and exalts the soul is true life.

We not only need a kind of life, but also a mental attitude; more precisely a particular kind of humility, primarily intellectual in its character, merging into and including moral humility; its opposite is self-conceit in the mental sphere and selfishness in the moral. The Stoics applied this self-conceit to the intellect only, Philo gives it a specially religious meaning. In this he differs from Epictetus and Seneca, their conceptions of God being different from his. Philo opposes the Stoic independence, that man is the son of God, because he is part of an omnipresent and undivided reason; to the Jew man is the child of God. The Stoic, true to his principles, does not acknowledge because he does not feel the need of direct aid from God to man. In this also Philo differs, he realizes the need of God's assistance; with this comes the prayer for it, and with the prayer the assurance of response. To the Stoics, man's independence, though in the last resort a gift, is yet strongly marked. Man must recognize his own divinity, and so find his salvation and his strength. To Philo the sense of man's dependence is never wanting. God gives to the individual as well as to the kind, and what he gives he can withhold. Self-conceit is the parent of forgetfulness, ingratitude, and self-love; only when you know yourself do you realize God. No religion without humility. No service of God without a sense of the nothingness of man. This humility does not involve fear, but rather confidence to supplicate God. Since everything

is the gift of God, we should use these gifts to good purpose. The ethical effects of humility are the right of our possessions and consolation over their eventual loss; the effects of self-conceit in these cases are licentiousness and grief.

The selfish man has a whole list of vices appended to his special fault; the man who "attributes all things to God" has all the virtues. Occasionally Philo alludes to repentance which indicates a possible passage from the category of evil to the category of good. Repentance can soothe conscience, that stern and unbribable judge. Conscience with Philo is primarily the "convicted." Against men's will it stings them into confession of their evil deeds; it is born with the birth of the soul, unsusceptible of wrong. Philo identifies conscience with the divine Logos. In one sense it is, as it were, the cause of sin, as well as the cause of well-doing, for without its presence in the soul no erroneous action could be deserving of blame, and sin would therefore be impossible. How is God within man? By virtue of his mind, every man's contains an impression, or fragment, or ray of the divine nature. The mind sharing the perfection in the universe, whenever it contemplates the cosmos, widens with the limits of the universe. Human reason is of divine origin; yet God only dwells in the souls of the good, shows his divine influence. This real divine influence, by the law of God's relation to his human kinsman, is granted to those who are fitted to receive it. There can be and there is, a scale of increasing divine immanence which culminates in inspiration. Again God helps man, both in moral effort and in the acquisition of knowledge, culminating in the knowledge of God himself. Teaching, training and nature must each have its proper share in the acquisition of virtue; all three must work together, although one factor may predominate. Man is given help by the divine Logoi who walk in the minds of those who are still not wholly cleansed of error and of sin, the divine thought. The Logos helps those who are akin, or inclined to virtue, and when it calls the soul to itself, freezes together its earthly and appetitive elements. In virtue, as in knowledge, God meets the sincere suppliant half way. He fertilizes virtue by sending the seed from heaven. The same office is also assigned to the Logos.

Philo is of the opinion that men have won a belief in God through what we now call the argument from design. His aim is to approach as near as he can to God as he is himself, apart from what he may be inferred to be from his works. Of course he admits that God cannot be comprehended; he is not even apprehensible by the mind, except only as to existence. As ruler and creator, God is stamped straightway as all-powerful and good; his two main names, Lord and God, typify his ruling and his goodness. A still higher aspect of God is that of the Logos, the reason of God in every phase and form of it that is discoverable or realizable by man. The apprehension of the Logos is the highest stage in the knowledge of God which is obtainable by ordinary man. Nevertheless God is above the Logos, and

there is a possible realization of him, which transcends all that even the Logos can suggest to us. Only a very chosen few can advance beyond the Logos. These are the inspired minds, such as Mosès. It is to the "perfect" alone that "the first God" can be revealed. Inspiration, if given by God, must be prepared by man. Yet this highest condition of the mind is pure passivity; the human is blotted out to receive the divine.

There are two main attitudes of the mind with which God is regarded: fear and love, corresponding to the Deity's two fundamental powers. These together with the Logos (which is the first) are the first three of the six great divine powers. In man fear and love must be combined, or there should be that perfect love which knows honor, but is ignorant of fear. Yet higher than all these qualities in man are the knowledge and adoration of God for what he is. According to these should be man's religion. The highest attitude towards God, which corresponds with the highest conception of him, might perhaps be more rightly called adoration than love. Philo is quite sound and prophetic on the relation of outward form to true religion. Not that he wishes to break from forms. On the contrary he is a strong conservative. Just as we must be careful of the body, as the house of the soul, so must we give heed to the letter of the written law. He emphasizes the true relation of ritual to religion.

The service of God can only be that of praise; for God, unlike a human master, has no needs. It is the glorious distinction man has received above all other animals. Philo's conception of faith is equally high with his conception of God's worship. Faith is not the condition or beginning of virtue, but its goal; it is not opposed to knowledge; it involves trust; faith in the Creator implies, as its correlative, unfaith in the creation, unfaith in self. If the service of God brings with it a perfect faith, it also includes a perfect freedom. The service of God is sought for itself, and its rewards are spiritual. The more glorious the subject-matter of a command, the less need for external reward.

Some characteristics of Philo's conception of the highest life are these: Hope is the seed of which faith is the fruit. It is therefore the most characteristic quality of the human soul; the good life should be hopeful. A second characteristic of the perfect nature is joy, typified and symbolized in Isaac; true and genuine joy is only found in the virtues of the soul; the wise man rejoices only in himself, not in his environment. Therein joy differs from pleasure. A third characteristic of the noble life is peace; true peace is the prerogative of God and of the worshiper of God. It is on these high generalities of the ideal life that Philo is wont to dwell, and in these he most excels. In ethics neither student nor preacher will gather much from his pages.

Montefiore's exposition of Philo's teachings and philosophy is excellent indeed, and he who wishes fully to appreciate it must read the article as a whole. It is to be hoped that another, similar exposé on Josephus may soon follow this florilegium, which I am convinced, would find as eager readers as this present contribution.

W. M.-A.

THE SCOPE AND PLAN OF THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN. By PROFESSOR MILTON S. TERRY, in *The Journal of Biblical Literature*, Parts I. and II., 1894. Pages 91-100.

The author assumes the unity of the Apocalypse, and accepts the work as the genuine production of John, the disciple of Jesus. The mixture of Jewish and Christian elements, alleged by the recent hypotheses of Vischer, Voelter, Spitta, and others, is but the abundant appropriation of Old Testament imagery made by a Jewish-Christian disciple who had listened to the teaching of the Lord "as he sat on the Mount of Olives over against the temple" (Mark 13:3). The theme of the Apocalypse is identical with that of Jesus, as reported in Mark 13 and the parallels in Matthew and Luke, when, in answer to the disciples' question, he spoke of the sign of his coming and of the end of the age. Again and again the writer assures us that his revelation is of "things which must shortly come to pass." The mystery, propounded as a riddle in 13:18 and 17:9-11, is most easily explained by dating the book in the reign of Nero, and before the commencement of the war which ended with the overthrow of Jerusalem.

There is no teaching of our Lord more clearly recorded in the synoptic gospels than that the Son of Man was to come in his kingdom and glory before some of those who heard him speak should taste of death (Matt. 16:28, Mark 9:1, Luke 9:27). And unless the language of Matt. 24 and its parallels in Mark and Luke are an unfortunate patchwork of misleading statements, Jesus most positively declared that his coming on the clouds of heaven would accompany, or immediately follow, the woes of the ruin of Jerusalem. The ruin of the Jewish metropolis and temple was destined to mark the end of the pre-Messianic age, and the inauguration of a new dispensation of the kingdom of God. In strict accordance with this doctrine of Jesus, the great theme of the Apocalypse is announced in chap. 1:7, in language appropriated from Dan. 7:13 (cf. Matt. 24:30) and Zech. 12:10: "Behold he cometh with the clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they who pierced him, and all the tribes of the land shall mourn over him." This coming is about to take place, and the time is at hand. The scope of the Apocalypse of John is, therefore, the overthrow of apostate Judah and Jerusalem, and the consequent establishment of Christianity in the world. These things are set before us in great symbolic pictures, the imagery and language of which are appropriated almost wholly from the Hebrew Scriptures.

The book may be divided into two nearly equal parts, chaps. 1-11 and 12-22. Most præterist expositors make the catastrophe of the first part refer to the fall of Jerusalem, and that of the second part to the fall of pagan Rome. But the second part of this revelation is, like the first, a prophetic picture of the fall of apostate Judah, and the establishment of the new kingdom of Christ. As Joseph's dream of the sun, moon and stars making obeisance to him was in substance but a repetition of his previous dream of the sheaves in

in the field (Gen. 37:6-9); and as Pharaoh's double dream of the seven kine and the seven ears was repeated unto the king twice in order to deepen the impression and assure him that the thing was established of God and shortly to come to pass (Gen. 41:32), so the second part of the Apocalypse of John is but another presentation of the same subject as the first part. Chaps. 5-11 reveal the Lamb of God under various symbols, glorious in power, opening the book of divine mysteries, avenging the martyred saints and exhibiting the fearful judgments about to come upon the enemies of God. Everything is viewed as from the throne of the king of heaven, who sends forth his armies, destroys the murderers of his prophets and burns up their city (cf. Matt. 22:7). The second part reveals rather a picture of the church [the woman clothed with the sun, etc.] in conflict with infernal powers and worldly principalities, surviving all persecution, triumphing by the word of her testimony, and, after the fall of Babylon the harlot, appearing as the New Jerusalem, the wife of the Lamb, glorious in beauty and imperishable as the throne of God. Chaps. 1-11 therefore contain the Revelation of the Lamb, and chaps. 12-22 the Revelation of the Bride, the wife of the Lamb.

This theory of the Apocalypse differs from current expositions in several important particulars: (1) it recognizes, with the most explicit teaching of Jesus, that the fall of Jerusalem and its temple was the signal event which marked the end of the pre-Messianic age. The ministry of Christ in the flesh, and that of his apostles who founded the Christian church, fell within the latter days of the old dispensation. It was necessary for them to preach the gospel of the kingdom "in the whole world for a testimony unto all the nations" (Matt. 24-14) before the old cultus gave place to the new. The explanation of Matt. 24:14 as a prophecy of the evangelization of the world during the period of the kingdom of Christ, has been the source of error and confusion. (2) It holds that there are not two great cities which perish, but only one, which in this book is charged with the blood of saints and martyrs. "The great city" of 11:8 is specifically designated as the city where the Lord of the two witnesses was crucified. The two witnesses are best understood as representing the apostles and prophets, who preached the gospel as a witness unto the nations before the end. This great city, guilty of the blood of the witnesses (cf. Luke 13:33), is no other than the great Babylon, the mother of harlots, drunken with the blood of saints and martyrs, as described in chaps. 17 and 18. (3) The error of making this Babylon a symbol of Rome is manifest; it contravenes the analogy of biblical symbolism to portray a pagan city under the figure of a harlot; Rome was never in covenant relations with God so that a prophet could say of her as Isaiah (1:21) said of Jerusalem, "How is the faithful city become a harlot!" (cf. also Ezek. 16, 22, 23). Again, if the beast is the Roman Empire, as most expositors maintain, the harlot should be some other city than the metropolis of the empire, for how can it be truly said that any kings represented by the ten horns of that beast hated Rome and burned her utterly with fire (17:16)? For the kings or potentates

of the Roman Empire to destroy the city of the Tiber, as represented in these symbols, is both incongruous in thought and untrue in fact. Further, the notion that the "seven mountains on which the woman sitteth" (17:9) are the seven hills of Rome, the *septem colles* of the Latin writers, is a misleading fancy. So specific a designation would, in this connection, be scarcely in keeping with the demand made for "the mind that hath wisdom." The mountains are no more to be understood literally than the waters of vs. 1 and the scarlet-colored beast of vs. 3; for, according to the vision, the woman sits on many waters, on the beast, and on seven mountains. The four heads of Daniel's symbolic beast (Dan. 7:6) were not indicative of four hills on which a metropolis was builded. And lastly, the description of vs. 18, "the great city which has a kingdom over the kings of the land," may apply to Jerusalem as well as to Rome, for in 11:18 Jerusalem is the "great city," and in New Testament usage "kings of the land" is a phrase applied to such rulers as Herod and Pontius Pilate (Acts 4:26, 27). (4) It maintains that the angel of the abyss, named Abaddon and Apollyon in 9:11, is the same "as the beast that comes up out of the abyss" in 11:7 and kills the two witnesses. He is also the "great red dragon" of 12:3, "that old serpent, called the Devil and Satan," who "gave his power and his throne and great authority" to the beast that was seen to come up out of the sea. The great red dragon as well as the Roman world-power is, accordingly, to be recognized in the "scarlet-colored beast" on which the harlot was seen sitting (17:3); and in the enigmatical statement of 17:11, "the beast that was and is not" is evidently the same infernal spirit who is referred to in the eighth verse as "about to come up out of the abyss, and to go into perdition." The thought of the writer seems for the moment to be more upon the infernal "beast that cometh up out of the abyss" (cf. 11:7) than upon the empire which he appropriates for the persecution of the seed of the woman. Hence it is said that he "is himself also an eighth and is of the seven." Each successive emperor is conceived as an incarnation of the great red dragon. (5) It does away with the so-called "Nero-myth." (6) The one great catastrophe of both parts is the downfall of the great city which was for a thousand years the metropolis of the Jewish people. In the visions of John this great Babylon, drunken with the blood of saints, is seen to fall and give place to the coming and kingdom of him who is called Faithful and True, the Word of God, the King of kings, and Lord of lords. He is seen to triumph over all his foes, even over Death and Hades, and the consummation of his millennial reign is the descent of the New Jerusalem to the new earth, and the making of all things new.

New interpretations of the Apocalypse are always in order, and Professor Terry presents his exposition of the book after thorough study of Jewish apocalyptic literature and at a ripe period of scholarship. His exposition deserves the full abstract which is here given. That the theory is right in the general view of the book which it

takes may be asserted with some confidence. The præterist interpretation of the Apocalypse is (with Düsterdieck, Ewald, Farrar, Lücke, Maurice, Reuss, Stuart, Weiss, Weizsäcker, and others) to be preferred. The Revelation pertained to and realized its meaning in the Apostle's own age, in the destruction of Jerusalem and the condition of the Roman Empire of the first century; the prediction that Christ would then return, and the consummation of all things be brought about, was then unfulfilled because it rested upon the misconception which prevailed throughout the primitive church that the return of Christ would be in their own generation, and would immediately follow the overthrow of Jerusalem. So that the Revelation throws no light upon the future of Christianity other than that it will sometime triumph, and a new era of bliss will follow. This is only what we already knew from Christ. Even on the spiritual theory of the book, that it is a true predictive history of the church, giving a conspectus of the great epochs and the governing principles of the church in its development from the beginning to the end (the view of Godet, Lee, Randall, Simcox, Vaughan, Warfield, and others), Professor Milligan, its ablest English exponent, abandons any peculiar predictive element in the book, saying: "It [the Revelation] gives no knowledge of the future that is not given first by our Lord, and then by others of his inspired apostles." Professor Terry may or may not be right in his interpretation of the details of the book—that remains to be seen after the discussion which the above paper will awaken has issued in some consensus of opinion among scholars for or against the new view—but the important fact has received new emphasis that the Apocalypse of John does not give us any information about the future which the gospels do not give.

C. W. V.

Notes and Opinions.

The Life of Jesus Prior to His Public Ministry.—Professor Godet's article upon this subject in the *Thinker* for May deserves attention. The fact of the divine preëxistence, he says, which was so clearly revealed by the testimony of Jesus himself and by the teaching of his apostles, is for us as undesirable as that of his real humanity. But Jesus did not himself become conscious of this sublime fact until the testimony of God was given at his baptism: "Thou art my well-beloved son." In that hour was his true relation with the Father fully revealed to him. His development may rightly, therefore, be studied, up to that period of his life, from a purely human point of view. A truly human childhood and youth had been impossibilities if the deep mystery which formed the background of his earthly existence had been unveiled to him sooner. It could not then have been said of him that "He was made like unto his brethren, yet without sin." From the soul of Jesus, by reason of his exceptional origin, the principle of sin was altogether absent. Save on this one point, we are authorized by the Scriptures in considering the boy Jesus as cast in the same mold as all the other children of men. He came into the world with a body like to our own, but to which the soul never yielded obedience. The words of Jesus to his parents when he visited Jerusalem at the age of twelve cannot be assumed to contain the deep meaning of the later "My Father," expressing the consciousness of his eternal relationship with God. But he appears at that time to have felt that this filial bond of which he has become conscious exists, in so intense a degree, for his heart alone. This consciousness of a difference between himself and the rest of mankind arose from his observation that those around him did not live in the same close intimacy with God as he himself did. The element of sin was present in their lives and not in his. A mission already dawns before him—a mission which shall consist in an entire conservation of himself to the cause of God, in the midst of a world separated from him. The short sojourn in the holy city had made of the child a thorough Israelite. The eighteen years which were about to follow in the monotonous and essentially human life at Nazareth would make of him a thorough man.

The Angels of the Seven Churches.—The question whether these "angels" of the Revelation are to be understood as bishops is answered in the negative by Professor H. M. Gwatkin in the *Expository Times* for June. The reasons which he gives are (1) if the book generally is figurative, the "angels" are not likely to be literal. (2) they are identified with their churches in a way no bishop can be; (3) if the Apocalypse belongs to the ueronian persecution,

the revolution in church government in the few years since Paul wrote could hardly be accounted for without a divine command, and if this had been given, we should see history taking a very different course.

The Lord's Supper.—A thorough discussion of the origin and significance of the Lord's Supper by Professor Kattenbusch of Giessen appears in a condensed form in the *Thinker* for June. First, as to the permanence of the rite. The theologians who do not admit that Paul's testimony in 1 Cor. 11: 24, "Do this in remembrance of me," proves Christ's use of the words, also hold that it is a matter of indifference whether Christ instituted the ordinance and intended it to be perpetual, or not, as the church has been rightly guided in its observance. The spirit who was to teach the disciples many things inwardly moved them to establish a commemorative act. Are not the words, "Do this in remembrance of me," really doubtful? Only Paul relates them. Matthew (26: 26 ff.) and Mark (14: 22 ff.) have nothing of the kind. Luke (22: 19) supplies the same words, at least in regard to the bread. But it is conceded by the most judicious inquirers that here a later interpolation is possible; in any case there is reason to suppose that Luke leans only on Paul, and is not an independent witness. Are we not justified in leaving it an open question whether the Lord ordained the repeating of the act or not? I so far concede the right of this view, that I do not accuse those who hold it of indifference or presumption. Only I do not think that they are right. Paul is without doubt the oldest witness on the subject. He was not himself present at the Supper, and the reminiscence of it handed on to him might have been influenced by the already established observance of the Supper as a memorial rite. But Paul could easily have ascertained the facts about it, and there is every reason to believe that his account is thoroughly trustworthy. But, how, then, do we explain the silence of the gospels? I believe that we should dispense with an explanation, and fall back on the position that the consideration of possibilities is unprofitable. The gospels are in no sense complete histories; they often only intimate, and clearly assume that the churches for which they were composed needed only a voucher for their recollections. This is evident in Mark, and especially in the account of the Supper. He is here so brief that he seems to be merely noting the chief facts. What difficulty is there in supposing that he, and Matthew after him, and Luke, observing the custom of breaking of bread, and seeing nowhere any doubt that the Lord himself really ordained the custom, merely set down what was necessary to explain the Lord's action?

Secondly, as to the Lord's outward and inward situation at the institution of the Supper. We must concede that no certainty is possible respecting the day. According to the first three gospels, the Lord kept the Passover with his disciples, and instituted the Supper then. The Gospel of John supposes that Jesus did not keep the Passover, but was crucified early on the day when the Jews celebrated it. It seems to me unmistakable that here is a simple

contradiction. I know no satisfactory explanation. For myself, I cannot help thinking that John is right. The inward situation, with reference to the general state of feeling in which the Lord met death, presents more difficulty. Jülicher thinks that Christ could not have intended a perpetual commemoration because he expected soon to return. This is a difficult question; but he certainly said that he knew not the day or the hour (Mark 13:32), and we hear other words intimating that much must take place between his life and the end of the world. I could never convince myself that the Lord said that the completion of God's kingdom was to be expected at once. He did not say this, while he did not say the opposite. He left the possibility open that, according to human judgment, the end might be far off or might come soon. Thus, on the one side, he exhorted to watchfulness and constant readiness; and on the other, to patient waiting. The event has shown that the end was not near. We must not say that the Lord foresaw this, nor yet that he erred. Both phrases show little understanding of the way in which the Lord thought and spoke. He spoke of the things of the last days as a prophet, not as a thinker or inquirer. He did not calculate; he did not forget that everything has its time; but this is the least thing to him. In view of his entire life, it would be unquestionably wrong to say that he thought of a development of his Church through thousands of years. He was not so "historical" in spirit; before his spiritual vision clearly lay the kingdom of his Father, which will and must come, whose dawn began to shine when he himself came into the world, for whose completion everything is prepared.

Thirdly, the Supper as a standing memorial of the Lord's dying. The Lord might be sure that his disciples would not forget him; but a general remembrance is not enough—they were to remember his *death*. They might, in the lapse of time, come to remember only the glory of Christ—to look upward and forward with the eye of faith and hope. But by the Lord's will they were also to look backward, not to regard his earthly life and his death as something merely past. Here lies the mystery of the Supper. I regard it as the surest of facts that by his action Jesus intended to set his death before his disciples' eyes in its necessity and abiding significance. We cannot be absolutely sure what words the Lord uttered when he broke the bread and gave the cup; but it is intelligible that not so much the several words, as rather the action and the manner, abode in the memory of the disciples. In essentials the accounts are one. This should suffice us.

"Born of Water and the Spirit," James 3:5. — Professor Briggs, in his *Messiah of the Gospels*, interprets this passage as follows: The kingdom of God is, in its initiation, an invisible kingdom, which only comes gradually into manifestation. In the visible kingdom, as it appears in this world, there are tares mingled with the wheat, bad fish mixed in the same net with the good; and the separation cannot take place until the judgment divides the kingdom of grace from the kingdom of glory. Into the invisible kingdom can enter only

those who become poor and childlike, in the figurative language of the synoptic Gospels, or become "born from above," in the figurative language of the Fourth Gospel. The special difficulty in the verse is the meaning of the "born of water." It is disputed whether this refers to the water of baptism, or whether water is anything more than the Old Testament symbol of the pouring out of the divine Spirit. The oldest and most natural interpretation is to refer the water to the water of baptism. John the Baptist had made this institution the means of preparation for the kingdom of God. Jesus himself and his apostles had all been baptized with water, Jesus in the apostolic commission gives baptism and faith as requirements for salvation. The regeneration of this passage is a double one, by water and by Spirit. Both are necessary in order to enter the kingdom of God. Water alone does not regenerate or admit to the kingdom. Such a baptism may admit to the visible kingdom as an external organization, but no more. Bad fish may pass through the waters of baptism as well as good fish. No identification of the water and Spirit baptisms is here taught. The birth from heaven by the Spirit is essential — no one can enter the kingdom without it, but it is insufficient, for water baptism is also required. If the two baptisms may be separated in time and place, then the two baptisms are required at these different times and places. Jesus does not tell us here whether they may be separated or not. The peril of the theological speculations which may here arise should not deter us from following Jesus in his teaching that regeneration by baptism is necessary, as well as regeneration by the divine Spirit. Regeneration by water admits to the external organization of the visible kingdom. Regeneration by the Spirit admits to the spiritual kingdom itself. Regeneration by water ought not to be omitted, however unimportant it may be in comparison with regeneration by the Spirit. For baptism by water is necessary for their entrance into the kingdom of God in this world. This sacrament is the one appointed by Jesus for that purpose. It is in his mind here. There is no other lawful mode of entrance into the organization of the kingdom as it exists in this world. But it is not a just inference from these words of Jesus that all are excluded from the grace of God who do not have this birth from water. They are excluded from the Messianic kingdom of grace as set up in this world. But the salvation of men in its elementary form is carried on by the grace of God outside the kingdom of the church.

Work and Workers.

AN effort is being made in Germany to establish a uniform system for the transcription or transliteration of Oriental words into modern tongues. The German Oriental Society, with the coöperation of similar bodies elsewhere has recently published a scheme for such a system, and the society at its next meeting in Leipzig in October, will decide whether the system recommended by its committee shall be adopted. If so, it will probably go into international use.

A NOTE in the *Independent* for June 6 gives a summary of the conclusions reached by Professor Seeberg, of Erlangen, in his recently published investigation of the Apology of Aristides. He regards the Syriac text of the Apology, which was discovered by Professor J. R. Harris in the Mt. Sinai cloister, as the best text. He shows the Apology makes extensive use of the New Testament and other early Christian literary sources. There is to him a clear influence of the Pastoral Epistles and the Gospel of John. Of the extra-canonical literature of the earliest period it is only possible that the First Epistle of Clement was used, while it is very probable that the Shepherd of Hermas was known to the writer. The evidence for the use of the Didache is still stronger. The dependence of the author on the Kerygma Petri appears throughout, as also upon the Apology preserved in Syriac under the name of Melitos. Professor Seeberg concludes that the Apology of Aristides was presented to Antoninus Pius, and was written about 140 A. D.

A TRUSTWORTHY and useful article upon "The Jews in Jerusalem and Palestine," written by Dr. Selah Merrill, former United States Consul at Jerusalem, appeared in the *Sunday School Times* for June 8. So many estimates of the population in question have been published, varying greatly and sometimes naming impossible numbers, that it is well to have the matter set right. Dr. Merrill has made the most complete, careful and impartial estimate possible. The English and French consuls at Jerusalem made independent estimates about the same time, and the results of all these investigations were approximately the same. For Jerusalem they were respectively 25,000, 25,322, and 27,000 Jews. The total population of Jerusalem is given by Baedeker (1894) as 40,000, and by any reasonable method of computation it cannot exceed 47,000, made up of 8000 Christians, 12,000 Mohammedans, and 27,000 Jews. Outside of Jerusalem Jews are found only in Acre, Haifa, Hebron, Jaffa, Nablous, Ramleh, Safed and Tiberias—in all 15,131, and in the colonies 2,800, which, with the middle estimate of the Jewish residents of Jerusalem, would make 43,253 Jews in Palestine. A few years ago extrava-

gant, sensational reports were circulated, telling of the enormous numbers of Jewish immigrants arriving in Palestine. In July, 1891, the Turkish government issued an order forbidding the immigration of Jews into Palestine, and since that date very few have arrived, and the number in Jerusalem has not increased. Dr. Merrill does not think that the welfare of the Jews can be advanced by the current exaggerations of their numbers in Palestine, put into circulation at the start in order to induce Jews to emigrate thither.

FOLLOWING the letter of Professor Flinders Petrie to the London *Academy* of April 20, in which he announced the discovery in Egypt of relics of a before unknown race, the *Record* contained this comment: "Professor Flinders Petrie must now be acknowledged as the undoubted leader of the younger school of English Egyptologists, and it must also be owned that he has gained this position for himself by dint of hard and continuous work, and by a judicious exercise of his powers of organization. Mr. Petrie writes books, trains disciples, excavates, superintends the excavations made by others, and organizes exhibitions and meetings in furtherance of the science to which he has devoted himself. His works already nearly fill a column in the catalogue of the British Museum. He is at present engaged in writing a *History of Egypt*, which will tell us all that is known of the land and its people from the earliest times. We know the interest he took in the unearthing of that wonderful ancient library which is now known by the name of the Tell-el-Amarna tablets, and his recent little book entitled *Egyptian Tales, Translated from the Papyri*, has also been read with a considerable amount of interest by many. But all his past exploits have suddenly been eclipsed by the announcement just made by him that an entirely new race has been discovered in Egypt by the joint researches of himself and of Mr. Quibell, who works under the auspices of the "Egyptian Research Account." There is absolutely no doubt about the main facts of the discovery. The newly unearthed remains and implements differ entirely from all that is known of the Egyptians themselves. "Their pottery," to use Mr. Petrie's own words, "their statuettes, their beads, their mode of burial, are all unlike any other in Egypt; and not a single usual Egyptian scarab, or hieroglyph, or carving, or amulet, or bead, or vase, has been found in the whole of the remains in question." It is at present supposed that these newly-found archæological treasures belong to about the year 3000 B.C., but no one is as yet able to tell who these people were. Is it a Semitic race we are suddenly called upon to deal with, or were they of an Aryan stock? Did they enter Egypt from some other part of Africa, or did they come across the sea? We shall, no doubt, ere long have a handsome volume in our hands, adorned with numerous illustrations, which will at any rate try to answer these as well as various other questions that might be asked.

THE discovery of a new patristic fragment is announced by Professor Haussleiter, of Greifswald, in the *Theologisches Literaturblatt* for April 26.

And an article upon the discovery from the pen of Professor J. Rendel Harris appeared in the *Expositor* for June, from which we now gather the main facts of interest. The discovery was made by Professor Haussleiter in his work upon the new edition of Victorinus for the Vienna Corpus of Latin Fathers, and consists of the closing portion of the commentary of Victorinus in the original form, apparently with no corrections, from the hand of Jerome, and with abundant Chiliastic references and arguments. The manuscript which furnishes the new material is understood to be in the Vatican Library (Codex Ottoborianus latinus 3288 A). It is well known that in the first centuries of the Christian Church there was a steady succession of teachers, amongst whom will be found some of the most renowned and venerated names, who held the doctrine of the millennial reign of Christ with his saints on earth. But almost all the Chiliastic library of the early church has disappeared. Of the elders who followed St. John we know nothing; their great book of *Gnosis* is not extant. Papias is only known by an extract or two; Nepos of Arsinoe, who wrote the *Confutation of the Allegorists in Defence of Chiliasm*, has disappeared also; and the commentary of Victorinus of Pettau, in the close of the third century, is only current in the reform dress which Jerome gave it, of which presentation Chiliasm is no feature, though we know from Jerome's own confession that Victorinus was a Chiliast, and therefore could not have commented on the Apocalypse without disclosing his true opinions. So that is a matter of great satisfaction that even a portion of the commentary of Victorinus in its original Chiliastic form has come to the light. The text is very corrupt and belongs to the fifteenth century. Professor Haussleiter calls attention to the fact that in this revered fragment we are face to face with earlier material borrowed from either Papias or the book of the Elders. The prospect of a closer acquaintance with the proof-texts and arguments of Chiliasm gives hopes that more light will be thrown upon the history and the party lines of the earlier church. Another point of information given by the fragment is to the effect that Victorinus had a different interpretation of the four living creatures in the cherubic chariot from that which was current in Western MSS. and Fathers; the four creatures prefigure the four evangelists, but the order is Matthew, John, Mark, Luke, an order which may turn out to have been the primitive order. And the identification of the four evangelists with the four faces of the Cherubim has the appearance of coming from an older and earlier stratum than the writings of Irenæus, in which case the quadriform character of the gospels must have been recognized before his time. Professor Harris adds that the importance of these things will not be overlooked by scholars.

ANNOUNCEMENT is made as to the authorship of the various volumes of the *International Critical Commentary*, edited by Professors Driver, Plummer, and Briggs, as follows: *Genesis*, by the Rev. T. K. Cheyne, D.D., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture, Oxford. *Exodus*, by the

Rev. A. R. S. Kennedy, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, University of Edinburgh. *Leviticus*, the Rev. H. A. White, M.A., Fellow of New College, Oxford. *Numbers*, G. Buchanan Gray, B.A., Lecturer in Hebrew, Mansfield College, Oxford. *Deuteronomy*, the Rev. S. R. Driver, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford. *Joshua*, the Rev. George A. Smith, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Free Church College, Glasgow. *Judges*, the Rev. George Moore, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass. *Samuel*, the Rev. H. P. Smith, D.D., late Professor of Hebrew, Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, Ohio. *Kings*, the Rev. Francis Brown, D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Cognate Languages, Union Theological Seminary, New York City. *Isaiah*, the Rev. A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Hebrew, Free Church College, Edinburgh. *Jeremiah*, the Rev. A. F. Kirkpatrick, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. *Minor Prophets*, W. R. Harper, Ph.D., President of The University of Chicago, Illinois. *Psalms*, the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., Edward Robinson Professor of Biblical Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York. *Proverbs*, the Rev. C. H. Toy, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. *Daniel*, the Rev. John P. Peters, Ph.D., late Professor of Hebrew, P. E. Divinity School, Philadelphia, now Rector of St. Michael's Church, New York City. *Esra and Nehemiah*, the Rev. L. W. Batten, Ph.D., Professor of Hebrew, P. E. Divinity School, Philadelphia. *Chronicles*, the Rev. Edward L. Curtis, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. *Mark*, the Rev. E. P. Gould, D.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis, P. E. Divinity School, Philadelphia. *Luke*, the Rev. Alfred Plummer, D.D., Master of University College, Durham. *Acts*, the Rev. Frederick H. Chase, D.D., Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge. *Romans*, the Rev. William Sanday, D.D., Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis, Oxford; and the Rev. A. C. Headlam, M.A., Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford. *Corinthians*, the Rev. Arch. Robertson, D.D., Principal of Bishop Hatfield's Hall, Durham. *Galatians*, the Rev. Ernest D. Burton, A.B., Professor of New Testament Literature, University of Chicago. *Ephesians*, the Rev. T. K. Abbott, B.D., D.Lit., formerly Professor of Biblical Greek, Trinity College, Dublin. *Philippians*, the Rev. Marvin R. Vincent, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature, Union Theological Seminary, New York City. *The Pastoral Epistles*, the Rev. Walter Lock, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, and Tutor of Keble College, Oxford. *Hebrews*, the Rev. T. C. Edwards, D.D., Principal of University College, Wales. *Revelation*, the Rev. Robert H. Charles, M.A., Trinity College, Dublin, and Exeter College, Oxford.

Engagements for the making of the remaining volumes not here specified will be announced soon.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE.

GENERAL NOTES.

Early reports from the Summer Bible Schools are very encouraging. At the Chautauqua Assembly at Ottawa, Kans., the enthusiasm was great. The lectures were attended by audiences varying from two hundred to four hundred in number regularly, and the popular addresses were made to much larger numbers.

At Winfield, Kans., a like interest prevailed.

At Chautauqua, N. Y., the work is entirely class work and therefore the number is somewhat smaller, but it is possible to make the work much more thorough and profitable than in the case of lectures. About two hundred people are studying the English Bible at that place, and a dozen or more are doing thorough work in the New Testament Greek and the Hebrew. It is still too early to receive reports from other schools.

The Institute was represented at the Christian Endeavor Convention in Boston by the Field Secretary, Rev. S. H. Willett, and by a full display of the literature pertaining to the popular courses.

With July first a new series of Institute Studies on the subject of the International Sunday School lessons was commenced in the *Sunday School Times*. As it is more difficult for Sunday School teachers to find helpful material on the Old Testament than on the New Testament this series will be especially welcome.

All persons interested in any of the great Christian organizations of the day in whose work Bible study is a factor, are requested to place themselves in correspondence with the Institute in order that the literature concerning the work for the coming year may be sent them. The address of the office is Hyde Park, Chicago, Ill. The popular reading and study courses commence October 1, but clubs and chapters should be organized in August and September. The correspondence courses in Hebrew, New Testament Greek and the English Bible may be commenced at any time. Lecture courses and local Institutes for the Autumn and Winter are now being arranged.

With the September number of the *BIBLICAL WORLD* the suggestions to members of the Bible Students Reading Guild will be resumed.

Book Reviews.

Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien. Erstes Heft: Textkritische und Quellenkritische Grundlegungen, 1893. Zweites Heft: Paralleltexte zu Matthaeus und Marcus. Gesammelt und untersucht von ALFRED RESCH, 1894.

As these parts are to be followed by others dealing with the Gospels of Luke and John and the Acts of the Apostles and closing with a statement of the total result arrived at in the course of these investigations; and as this work is to be succeeded by another on "Canonical Parallels," it would be obviously unfair to attempt a critical examination at present. The actual value of this wonderfully learned and laborious effort to contribute to the solution of the synoptic problem can only be rightly estimated when the whole can be passed in review. Meanwhile some account of the methods pursued by Dr. Resch and a brief statement of a few of his conclusions thus far are quite legitimate, and will no doubt be welcome to many who cannot consult the original, and to others who find it impossible to give the time and thought requisite for the intelligent study of these fascinating but unusually exacting volumes. The work was foreshadowed in 1889 by the remarkable book best known as *Agrapha* but also entitled *Extracanonical Gospel Fragments*, which was intended to be the forerunner of this far more extended inquiry. (See BIBLICAL WORLD, April, 1894.) It is maintained that the synoptic Gospels have underlying them an earlier document giving great prominence to our Lord's teaching which is most conveniently designated the *Ur-Evangelium*. It was written in a Semitic language, according to Dr. Resch in Hebrew, according to Professor Marshall in Aramaic. This detail however is admitted to be of minor importance although nevertheless considerable stress is laid on it at times in the course of the argument. Translations into Greek of this *Ur-Evangelium* (or of parts of it) were early made. Traces have been found, in our author's judgment, of three. One was used (if not composed) by the Jewish Christian who wrote our Gospel according to Matthew. Another, more Hellenic in its cast was used by Luke and Paul, the former knowing also and sometimes citing the earlier version. A third, still further removed from the Semitic original, is called the Alexandrian, being represented in the writings of Clement of Alexandria, in the Rainer papyrus, and other Alexandrian authorities. The Codex Bezae which is regarded as the one precanonical manuscript among the great uncials (that is, the one which presents a text prior to the last revision of the canon made in the fourth century) is believed, especially in the Gospel of Luke, to exhibit a

recension influenced by the first of these three versions of the *Ur-Evangelium*. Now in this codex, in the early translations of the Gospels, in the Diatessaron, in the New Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, in ancient liturgies and in patristic literature, there is a huge mass of variations from the canonical text. Many of these of course are worthless, but, when all due allowance has been made for careless quoting from memory and intentional perversion, there remains a mass of material which in the opinion of Dr. Resch who has collected and sifted the evidence with far greater care than any previous inquirer, points at the direct or indirect use of an extracanonical document that can hardly be anything but the *Ur-Evangelium*. Multitudes of these variations, it is argued, can be accounted for on the assumption of a Hebrew original which could be rendered into Greek in several ways. With the help of these our author endeavors to trace the *Ur-Evangelium* in the first and second Gospels. In 226 sections of varying length, as many passages, some comprising a verse or several verses, others only part of a verse or a single clause, are studied in this way. In some instances the parallels are very few. If only one has been discovered it is registered if of moment. In others they are many and diverse. The famous text, for instance, "Thou art Peter," etc. (Matt. 16:18), is illustrated by twenty-two references, most of which are cited in full; the words, "Think not I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy but to fulfil" (Matt. 5:17), by 25. Among the ancient authorities most freely used are the Clementine Homilies and the Apostolic Constitutions. The Rainer papyrus, the text of which it is thought may have been taken from the Gospel according to the Egyptians is utilized as far as it goes; and also the lately discovered Pseudo-Petrine fragment, the Docetic origin of which is clearly demonstrated. The passages referred to the *Ur-Evangelium* are often translated into Hebrew to show how the variations arose. In not a few cases the parallels are believed to indicate omission or dislocation in the canonical text of matter taken from the *Ur-Evangelium*. In the Lord's words to Peter mentioned above (Matt. 16:18), Dr. Resch finds an alteration subsequent to the formation of the first Gospel canon which he puts at or about 140 A. D. He shows by many references that there is no distinct trace of the passage as it stands in our oldest uncials in the whole Christian literature of the second century. The value of these 226 notes (several of which however rise to the dignity of dissertations) of course varies greatly. Dr. Resch himself admits the possible rejection of half his variants as mere synonyms; but is convinced that even then enough material remains for other inquirers to work up into fresh solutions of the problem. As to the extent of the *Ur-Evangelium* he goes further than Dr. Weiss, with many of whose views he heartily coincides, believing that his contributions to the discussion of the synoptic problem have not yet been duly appreciated by theologians. Instead of ending abruptly (as Dr. Weiss maintains) with the anointing at Bethany, the document included the passion, the resurrection and the great commission. One of the most striking and interesting portions of the book is the examination of the last five

verses of the first Gospel (Matt. 28: 16-20). This grand paragraph (with the exception perhaps of a clause or two) is all but proved to be a fragment, possibly a condensed fragment, of the *Ur-Evangelium*. Especially important and impressive is the demonstration of the antiquity of the trinitarian baptismal formula, and of its use in all circles orthodox or heretical in the early church. Never before, it may be safely asserted, has the subject been treated so fully and so ably. These twenty-nine pages containing as many as 104 quotations from ancient Christian literature are quite as worthy of separate publication as the much slighter, though very valuable note on the last twelve verses of Mark. (See summary in the BIBLICAL WORLD for December, 1894.) On the origin of the first two Gospels our author's views are as follows: The Gospel of Mark, the priority of which is considered to have been proved, was a collection of texts taken from the *Ur-Evangelium*, explained by sayings from the same source removed from their original context and completed by Petrine reminiscences. By his manipulation of his materials Mark produced a new setting of the Gospel story. The evidence of John the presbyter preserved by Papias is confirmed, thinks Resch again following Weiss by modern research. There are four points of correspondence between critical results and the presbyter's statements: (1) The influence of Peter's reminiscences; (2) selection of materials; (3) The effort at detailed description; (4) deviation from the original order. The Gospel according to Matthew, which is carefully distinguished from the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew mentioned by some of the fathers, is supposed to contain elements from at least five sources. The two principal authorities were the Gospel of Mark, which has been used almost in its entirety, and the *Ur-Evangelium*. Resch follows Weiss in the conclusion that, with the exception of a few small pieces, the whole content of Mark has passed into Matthew, the arrangement in both cases being the same. The direct influence of the *Ur-Evangelium* is seen principally in the didactic portion of the first Gospel, although the influence of Mark can be recognized even here. Very great importance is attached to the doublets, or cases in which a saying of our Lord's is given twice by the first evangelist, once as it stood in the *Ur-Evangelium* itself, another time from Mark's context and usually with his setting. "These doublets are the surest signs of the correctness of the two-source theory, the A, B, C of synoptic criticism." Besides these primary authorities there are several others which may be called secondary. The first and second chapters point back to the Semitic document independent of the *Ur-Evangelium*. Its title probably survives in the opening words of the Gospel which seem to refer not to the whole book but only to its first two chapters: "The book of the generations of Jesus Christ the Son of David the son of Abraham." Another secondary source (or pair of sources) is described as Petrine and connected with Jerusalem. This includes the story of Peter's walking on the water (Matt. 14: 28-31), the anecdote about the payment of the tribute money (Matt. 17: 24-27), the verses referring to the suicide of Judas, and some other portions of the narrative about the passion and the resurrection.

The hand of the compiler or redactor of the Gospel is seen in the twelve quotations from the Old Testament, each of which begins with "that it might be fulfilled which was said by the Lord through the prophet saying," or some similar form. In one short passage (Matt. 19:10-12) Essene coloring can be recognized. Whatever may be thought of the theories advocated in this book the unfinished character of which must be constantly remembered, it is a wonderful storehouse of materials, many of which are curious and not a few precious; and the accumulation and orderly arrangement of them constitute a noble piece of work for which all scholars ought to be deeply grateful. Had Dr. Resch done no more he would have rendered a signal service to students of the Gospels. But he has done much more. He has thrown out many fruitful suggestions, some of which are of great interest to the exegete as well as the textual critic. Note for instance the curious study on the meaning of the word "Galilee" in Matt. 28:6, the remarks on the parable of the wise and foolish virgins, and the instructive examination of the Manichean version of the parable of the wheat and tares preserved by Epiphanius. The second of the two parts under review is a valuable adjunct to the commentaries as well as an important addition to the works attempting to solve the riddle of the synoptic Gospels. A little more charity towards the one other student who is grappling with it in substantially the same manner, Professor Marshall, of Manchester, would have been welcome to those who believe that the Englishman is an accomplished and diligent scholar as well as Dr. Resch. It is not quite fair to refer to Mr. Allen's articles in the *Expositor* as showing that Professor Marshall made an incorrect application of Aramaic without any allusion to the reply. If Dr. Resch has not seen that reply, or wrote before it appeared, he ought to have withheld his criticism. Mutual appreciation and tolerance are eminently desirable in a field of research where thorough workers from the nature of the case are very few.

W. T. S.

Studien zur Topographie des nördlichen Ost-Jordanlandes. Von DR. FRANTS BUHL. P. 20.

The most interesting part of these notes on the country bounded on the west by the Jordan and the Lake of Gennesaret, on the north by Hermon and the Plain of Damascus, on the east by the wilderness and on the south by Gilead, is the discussion of the site of Ashteroth Karnaim. Professor Buhl favors the site recommended by Leake, el Muzerib, a place a few miles to the south of the Yarmuk, which has long been the seat of a large and important fair. Here is a lake now called El-bagge with an island in the middle covered with ruins, some of which are ancient. The lake is regarded as sacred; and it lies on the route of the pilgrims to Mecca, which may be the old caravan road from Damascus to the southern part of East-Jordan district. The name has completely disappeared, but that is not surprising in this part of the

country where most of the local names bear the imprint of Arabic origin. This lake city may represent the Karnaim of the First Book of Maccabees (5:43, etc.), the Ashteroth-karnaim of Genesis (14:5) the city of the Rephaim, and the Karnaim of Amos (6:13) as emended by Grätz and Wellhausen: "Ye rejoice on account of Lodebar; ye say 'have we not taken Karnaim?'"

W. T. S.

St. Paul's Vocabulary—St. Paul as a Former of Words. By the REV. MYRON WINSLOW ADAMS, M.A., Hartford, Conn. Hartford Seminary Press, 1895. Pp. 55. Price, 50 cents.

We have here an interesting and useful study of the vocabulary used by the Apostle Paul in the thirteen canonical epistles usually assigned to him. The text of Westcott and Hort forms the basis. List A contains those words used by Paul alone among the New Testament writers, amounting to 816 in all, and the references to their occurrence are given. Also, by a system of letters and references, it is indicated in this list (1) which of the words are common to the New Testament and classical Greek, numbering 562; (2) those which are exclusively Pauline in all Greek literature, numbering 11; (3) which are primarily Pauline in time, though used later, numbering 87; (4) those which are used previous to the New Testament only in biblical and ecclesiastical writers, numbering 32; (5) and those which are used in secular writers subsequent to 322 B.C., numbering 124. List B contains those words used by Paul in common with other New Testament writers, numbering 1662 in all, of which 77 are found previous to the New Testament only in biblical and ecclesiastical writings, 59 in secular writings subsequent to 322 B.C. In common alone with Hebrews Paul has 64 words, in common alone with Luke and Acts 189 words, in common alone with Hebrews, Luke and Acts 34 words. The number of words peculiar to Paul in the New Testament, as compared with the total number he uses, is larger than that of any other New Testament writer, being 33 per cent. And about one-twelfth of his vocabulary does not appear in secular literature previous to 100 A.D., while one-sixth is subsequent to 322 B.C., the time of Aristotle's death. A comparison of the words common to Paul and Luke only, 189 in all, of which only 30 are post-classical, shows that there is almost no relation of dependence of Luke upon Paul as to style. These two writers are the authors of more than half the New Testament.

Mr. Adams follows these two lists with an examination of the words classified as post-classical and ecclesiastical, indicating (1) the time and circumstances of their appearance; (2) characteristic endings found in these words of later origin; (3) some lexical affinities in the Pauline school of New Testament writers.

In the second part of the work, treating of "St. Paul as a Former of Words," a list is given of each word used by Paul alone in extant Greek

literature prior to 100 A.D., with a history of the word thereafter. There are 98 of these, from which 20 can be eliminated as probably not originating with Paul. Of the remaining 78, some appear to have been coined in an enumeration of virtues or vices or requirements of some sort; some represent thoughts doctrinally or emotionally characteristic of Paul, or have a sense distinctively Christian; a good many are compounds, of which part are formed in accordance with classic usage, part after the redundant manner of the post-classical Greek; and some are unclassifiable. Mr. Adams does not undertake to say how large a proportion of these 78 words which Paul *might* have formed, actually originated with him—to do so would be but to make a conjecture; however, he regards Paul as the originator of most (perhaps all) of them, especially of words of ethical import, holding that Paul must have done much to mold the Greek language to the needs of Christianity.

The relation of the four groups of Paul's epistles to each other, as regards vocabulary, is indicated as follows: Groups 1 (1 and 2 Thess.) and 2 (Gal. 1 and 2 Cor., Rom.) have over 70 per cent. of the total amounts of words, but only about 55 per cent. of the new words; whereas group 4 (1 and 2 Tim., Tit.), with less than 12 per cent. of the whole amount, has over 24 per cent. of the new words. In group 4 Paul's employment of new words is over two and a half times as large as in groups 1 and 2, while group 3 is a noticeable intermediary. This peculiarity of the vocabulary of the pastoral epistles Mr. Adams thinks can be explained by two facts: first, the character of the epistles is such as to call for more origination; second, as Paul advanced in experience, he gained increased facility and confidence in the formation of new words.

The work is carefully done, with much labor and precision. It constitutes an acceptable contribution to the study of the language of the New Testament.

C. W. V.

The Four Gospels. Translated from the Syriac of the Sinaitic Palimpsest.

By AGNES SMITH LEWIS, M.R.A.S. London and New York: Macmillan & Co., 1894; pp. xxviii. and 239; 8vo. cloth. \$1.90.

This volume has been preceded by two others, viz.: *How the Codex was Found*, by Margaret Dunlop Gibson, and the edition of the Syriac Text by the late Professor Robert L. Bensly, J. Rendel Harris and F. C. Burkitt; with an introduction by Agnes Smith Lewis. The present publication is a most timely one and will prove a great help and stimulus for the proper estimate of the document itself.

It was J. Rendel Harris' discovery of the Syriac Text of the Apology of Aristides, the earliest Apologist and contemporary of Quadratus, that gave the first impulse to Mrs. Lewis. Accompanied by her sister, Mrs. Margaret D. Gibson, she spent a month in the winter of 1892 in this very same convent of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai, which had years ago given us the priceless

Greek manuscript of the Old and New Testament, known as the Codex Sinaiticus. Mrs. Lewis photographed a number of ancient manuscripts, among them a palimpsest of some 358 pages, which was produced for their inspection by the late Hegoumenos and Librarian, Father Galakteon. The upper writing was a very entertaining, and at times racy, account of the lives of women saints, and its date was either a thousand and nine years after Alexander, *i. e.*, 967 A. D., or a thousand nine-ty, *i. e.*, A. D. 778, if the small hole in the vellum occupies the place of the syllable corresponding to the -"ty" in "ninety," as Rendel Harris suggests.

The writing which lay beneath this, in two columns, also in Estrangelo character but in a much smaller hand, proved to be a copy of the four gospels written not later than the fifth century, of the same type, essentially, as the Curetonian. A second expedition in February 1893 was made by the two sisters, accompanied by Bensly, Burkitt, and Harris. They devoted themselves to the task of collation, each working at the manuscript for so many hours a day, while the rest of the party, so far as not thus employed, set to work on a catalogue of the Syriac and Arabic Library of the monastery. Zahn and others consider our text very nearly akin to the fragments published by Cureton, representing a freer, more popular, but at the same time less slavish translation of the Greek than is found in the Diatessaron of Tatian. They represent two recensions of one and the same text. Both show the same peculiarities, *e. g.*, Luke 23:17 (as in D) after Luke 23:19, reading: "and Pilate was wont to release one prisoner unto them at the feast." Both contain Luke 23:36-8, etc. The deviations for the greater part are only of a grammatical, lexical, and stylistic nature.

The manuscript is numbered 30 in the Convent Library, and is a complete book so far as the later writing is concerned. Its material is a strong vellum, the outer pages only being disposed to crumble. Here we find in sober fact what happened only metaphorically in the Middle Ages—the word of God completely obscured by the legends of the saints.

It may be interesting to note that Professor Harris has detected beneath the gospel text a still older text, which would make this manuscript a double palimpsest.

Of the titles to the four gospels two only have been deciphered—those of Luke and John, with the colophons to Mark, Luke, and John. At the end of the four gospels is written in red ink: "Here endeth the gospel of the *Mepharreshē*, four books. Glory be to God and to his Christ, and to his Holy Spirit," etc.

The word *Mepharreshē* is difficult to explain. Mrs. Lewis understands the word as meaning "of the interpreters" or "translators"; although she does not consider the question as settled. Zahn and others interpret it as "separate," referring to the four separate records of the one gospel in contrast with *Mechalletē*: Gospel of the mixed, *e. g.*, the Diatessaron. Zahn discussing the relation of our Codex to the Diatessaron comes to the conclusion that the

close relationship that can be proven to have existed between the Sinaitic Codex and the Diatessaron shows that the latter was the earliest gospel of the Syriac church and that our manuscript was written at a time when the Diatessaron still exercised an immense influence. Mrs. Lewis, on the other hand, following suggestions by Nestle and Rendel Harris, believes that our manuscript is not a duplicate of the Curetonian, but the very first attempt at rendering the Gospel into Syriac, of which Tatian's Diatessaron and the Curetonian are both revisions.

The most startling variation in our text is found in Math. 1:16, "Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary the virgin, begat Jesus, who is called the Christ." Discussion has for months centered on that one verse, and many different opinions had been emitted in leading papers. But it is yet too soon to formulate a positive opinion. The manuscript should once more be examined, the text more studied, and the questions of date, character, whether orthodox or heretical, and its relations to other texts, much more minutely examined.

Mrs. Lewis discusses a number of very interesting various readings, throwing light on some obscure passages. A most remarkable feature is that our text of Mark omits the last twelve verses; that in our Codex they could never have existed. Some of the readings indicate greater antiquity for the Sinai manuscript as compared with the Curetonian. But, on the other hand, there are a few expressions which may point to a later origin, *e.g.*, the persistent use of the title "our Lord" instead of the name of Jesus, etc.

To increase the usefulness of the translation, marginal notes are given to indicate those variations from our English authorized version, which have their equivalents either in the revised version, as substantially representing the testimony of the most ancient Greek manuscripts, in Cureton's MS., or in the Codex Bezae, as the chief representative of the old Latin. At the end of the introduction is given a list of 15 emendations of the Syriac text. The translation itself covers 207 pages. Two appendices, the one of 22 and the other of 9 pages, contain a list of words and phrases in the "Textus Receptus" omitted in this version without a full equivalent, and a list of interpolations.

In conclusion, we cannot but thank Mrs. Lewis for this timely and important gift, which, together with the Syriac text, will be of great help to students of the gospel-problem.

W. M.-A.

Social Theology. By WILLIAM DEWITT HYDE, D.D., President of Bowdoin College. New York: Macmillan & Co., 1895. Pp. viii.+260. \$1.50.

Whatever may be the final outcome of recent exploitations of social phenomena, and however indefinite much sociological thinking may be, it is beyond question that the recognition of a something that is more than the sum of all the individuals of a community—society—is acting as a corrective of previous thinking and is developing a new mold into which today's

thinking is to run. Any attempt at restating old truths in conformity with this new conception of life must of necessity be pioneering. Theologies especially, if they are to include today as they have in the past, the formulations of religious experience in terms of contemporary thought, must at first appear fanciful or heretical.

The one or the other of these qualities is pretty likely to be predicated of this new attempt at modernizing evangelical theology. To any one who thinks of man as an isolated and insulated individual, the very title of the book will be unintelligible, and such words as, "to transcend one's own petty individuality and live as a conscious member of a social whole" (p. 71), will appear moonshine. Another man, who stakes his religious life upon accurate and severe definitions will shrink from such as these, "The Holy Spirit is the meeting-point between the actuality of God and the possibility of man" (p. 82). "The Father is the Absolute Ground of the phenomena of nature and the progressive movement of history. The Son is the incarnation of the divine in humanity and the champion of the ideal in its conquest of reality. The Holy Spirit is the Helper and Comforter without whose presence our aspiration to overcome the appetites of our nature would be irrational and our efforts vain" (p. 83).

Whether such definitions are to be taken as anything more than descriptions is, however, an open question. President Hyde is apparently less concerned with an absolute logical consistency than with the establishment of a new point of view. Thus (p. 85), "Unless we bring to our interpretation of the person of Christ the conception of the Father's loving will for all his children, on the one hand, and the conception of the Holy Spirit prompting us to social service, on the other hand, we cannot form a worthy conception of Christ as the Son of God. And in like manner, the Holy Spirit will never be to us anything more than a name signifying something mysterious . . . until we recognize the life of social service in ourselves as an embodiment of the eternal love of the Father, and as a reproduction in us of the life of his well beloved Son." This may not suit the maker of systematic theologies, but it has the possibilities of a new theological Organon. It adds the social to the individualistic conception of humanity and of humanity's relation with God.

So far the second main division of his work is concerned—the anthropological—President Hyde again presents old truth as if it possessed something more than a logical and verbal value. To him faith in Christ is something more than a y^2 to be added to both sides of an otherwise insoluble theological equation—it is (p. 115) "a personal relation" with God, out of which "there will develop new hopes, new aspirations, new fellowships, new activities." The suffering of Christ was borne, "not to offer a ransom to the devil, nor, what is the modern equivalent of that ancient theory, to appease an angry God," but "because it is in the nature of love to identify itself with its object" (p. 138). Here again we are resting upon a new psychology in which

personality is more extensive than individuality in that it is essentially social.

In his third division of his work, President Hyde is naturally brought to a consideration of the sociological aspects of theology—or, perhaps, better, conditions of religious life. The titles of his three chapters will disclose the movement of thought. Possession and Confession—the Church; Enjoyment and Service—the Redemption of the World; Abstraction and Aggregation—the Organization of the Kingdom. Waiving the somewhat too homiletical terminology, these titles are admirable as concentrations of thought. The chapters themselves are catholic and stimulating. Here again are old terms and thoughts subjected to a vigorous though a conservative modernizing. What could be better than this? “The spiritual life is composed of solidier stuff than cadences and candles, music and millinery; though these may serve for its decoration and embellishment. If the church is the form, the family, industry, economics, politics, education, society, constitute the solid substance on which that form must be impressed and in which it must be realized” (p. 215). Especially refreshing is the treatment of the Kingdom. It is, perhaps, not as exegetically complete as one could wish, but after one has been floundering in the slough of gush, bad exegesis, and perversion of Scripture that describes too often published studies of this glorious conception of the Master, it is a relief to come to words which if, as apparently, first uttered in public addresses, have yet been subjected to the altogether rare test of sober second thought. Indeed, if this book makes any one impression above its dominant desire to restate an accepted theology in terms of modern thought, it is that of objectivity—that is to say, of an attempt to state something that is a *thing*, not a bit of rhetoric.

President Hyde has thus given us in this unpretentious little book, a stimulating restatement of old truth; a new starting point for religious thought; an admirable example of the modern passion for reality. Such virtues tempt one to overlook the absence of certain features that would have been desirable—notably a fuller use of the New Testament, and an occasional greater care for definition. No man who is endeavoring to work his way through a traditional theology into the heart of Christian thought can afford to miss reading this work.

S. M.

Current Literature.

BOOKS.

GENERAL.

- Hommel, Fr.* Geschichte des alten Morgenlandes. Mit 6 Bildern und 1 Karte. (Sammlung Goeschen, No. 43; Stuttgart, 1895, W. Goeschen; 168 pp., 12mo.) Bound, M. 0.80.
- Jahresbericht, Theologischer, unter Mitwirkung von *Baur, Bleek*, etc., hrsg. von *H. Holtmann*. 14. Bd., Heft 1. (Braunschweig, C. A. Schwetschke & Sohn, 1895; 164 pp., 8vo.) M. 6.
- Petrie, W. M. Flinders.* A History of Egypt. Vol. 1. From the Earliest Times to the xvi. Dynasty. (New York, Ch. Scribner's Sons, 1895.) \$2.25.
- Tiele, C. P.* Geschichte der Religion im Altertum bis auf Alexander den Grossen. Deutsche Ausg. von C. Gehrlich. I. Bd., 1. Hälfte. (Gotha, F. A. Perthes, 1895; 8vo.) M. 4.

OLD TESTAMENT.

- Koch, E.* Das Sechstagerwerk der Bibel verglichen mit den Schöpfungsberichten anderer Völker und mit den Resultaten der modernen Naturforschung. (Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann; 46 pp., 8vo.) M. 0.60.

GENERAL.

- Boscawen, W. St. Chad.* Egyptian Psychology. (The Expos. Times, July, 458-9.)
- Davidson, A. B.* The False Prophets. (The Expositor, July, 1-17.)
- Ewald, Paul.* Über das Verhältnis der systematischen Theologie zur Schrift-

- Pfeil, Th.* Bemerkungen zum biblischen Fluthbericht und zu den Zahlenangaben in Genesis 5. (Jurjew, E. F. Karow, 1895; 16 pp., 8vo.) M. 0.30.

NEW TESTAMENT.

- Baumgarten, Michael.* Lucius Annaeus Seneca und das Christenthum. (Rostock, W. Werther; viii + 368 pp., 8vo.) M. 6.
- Boetticher, Carl.* Wesen des religiösen Glaubens im Neuen Testament. (Programm, Berlin, R. Gaertner; 27 pp., 4to.) M. 1.
- Clemen, Aug.* Der Gebrauch des Alten Testaments in den neutestamentlichen Schriften. (Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann; iv + 252 pp., 8vo.) M. 3.60.
- Fritsch, O.* Galater 3:20. (Programm, Berlin, Gaertner, 1895; 28 pp., 4to.) M. 1.
- Schultse, Victor.* Archæologie der altchristlichen Kunst. Mit ca. 125 Abbildungen im Texte. (C. H. Beck, München, 1895.) M. 10.50.
- Zittel, Emil.* Vom Ursprung und Inhalt der Schriften des Neuen Testaments. Ein Büchlein für Jedermann. (Karlsruhe, G. Braun; vi + 88 pp., 8vo.) M. 0.80.

ARTICLES.

- wissenschaft. (Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr., vi., 429-77.)
- Fox, John.* Phillips Brooks as a Theologian. (The Presb. and Ref. Review, vol. vi., 393-413.)
- Iverack, James.* The Foundations of Belief. i. (The Expos. Times, July, 451-54.)

- Kilpatrick, T. B.* Christian Teachers of the 19. Century. The Philosophy of Thomas Hill Green. No. 1. (The Thinker, July, 45-54.)
- Magoun, George F.* Roman Law and Contemporary Revelation. (The Thinker, July, 40-5.)
- Peake, A. S.* Thomas Kelly Cheyne. (The Expos. Times, July, 439-44.)
- Watson, John.* The Kingdom of God. (The Expositor, July, 41-53.)
- Welch, A.* Things by Means of Which Salvation is Realized. (The Thinker, July, 29-33.)

OLD TESTAMENT.

- Bissell, Edwin Cone.* The Origin and Composition of Genesis. (The Presb. and Ref. Rev., vi., 414-39.)
- Carrick, J. C.* The Old Testament in King James's Bible. No. 2. (The Thinker, July, 17-22.)
- Dawson, J. William.* The "Cursing of the Ground" and the "Revealing of the Sons of God" in Relation to Natural Facts. 2. The Fall and its Consequences. (The Expositor, July, 54-68.)
- Driver, Canon.* On *Kipper*: "Make Atonement." (The Expos. Times, July, 434-6.)
- Green, W. C.* Ecclesiastes 12:1-7. (The Expositor, July, 77-80.)
- Grosart, A. B.* Hebrew Prophecy and Modern Criticism. (The Expos. Times, July, 476-7.)
- Hardeland, Th.* Der Dekalog in Luther's kleinem Katechismus. (Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr., vi., 495-511.)
- Lampe, Joseph J.* The Authenticity and Genuineness of Daniel. (The Presb. and Ref. Rev., vi., 440-80.)
- Macmillan, Hugh.* "Holiness unto the Lord" on the Bells of the Horses, Zech. 14:20. (The Thinker, July, 22-29.)
- Montefiore, C. G.* Florilegium Philonis. (The Jew. Quart. Rev., vii., 481-545.)
- Skipwith, G. H.* Gleanings from the Book of Isaiah. (The Jew. Quart. Rev., vii., 470-80.)
- , Studies in the Book of Jeremiah. (*Ibid.*, 568-80.)
- Weymouth, R. Fr.* Hades. (The Thinker, July, 33-40.)
- Woods, F. H.* Hebrew Prophecy and Modern Criticism. x. (The Expos. Times, July, 459-64.)

NEW TESTAMENT.

- Barnes, W. E.* The Bearing of the Evidence of Clement of Alexandria on the Reception of the Acts of the Apostles in the Early Church. (The Thinker, July, 10-17.)
- French, G. E.* The Angels of the Seven Churches. (The Expos. Times, July, 480.)
- Findlay, J. J.* The First Trial of Jesus. (The Expos. Times, July, 478-9.)
- Girdlestone, R. B.* St. Paul as a Letter-writer. (The Thinker, July, 4-10.)
- Great Text Commentary: 2 Cor. 12:9. (The Expos. Times, July, 454-7.)
- Greene, William B.* The Function of Reason in Christianity. (The Presb. and Ref. Rev., vi., 481-501.)
- Kattenbusch.* The Lord's Supper. (The Thinker, July, 66-70.)
- Lumby, J. Rawson.* The Incarnation-Parable. (The Expositor, July, 18-25.)
- Ramsay, W. M.* Forms of Classification in Acts. (The Expositor, July, 26-40.)
- Rothe, Richard.* Exposition of the First Epistle of St. John; chapter 5:13-18. (The Expos. Times, July, 469-72.)
- Schauffler, A. F.* The Agony in the Garden. (The Expos. Times, July, 433-4.)
- Schmidt, D.* *Avsörgrá riva.* (Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr., vi., 478-94.)

Wellhausen, J. Der syrische Evangelienpalimpsest von Sinai. (Nachrichten der K. Gesell. d. Wissensch. zu Göttingen, 1895, 1-12.)

Whitefoord, B. Christ and Popularity:

a Study of Luke 2:52. (The Expositor, July, 69-76.)

Whiteley, W. T. Acts 2:38. (The Expositor, Times, July, 480.)

REVIEWS.

GENERAL

Gunkel, Hermann. Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit. (Rev. in Theol. Litbl., No. 22.)

Kidd, James. Morality and Religion. (James Iverach, The Thinker, July, 92-5.)

Kuyper's Encyclopaedie der Heilige Godgeleerdheid. 3 vols. (A. H. Huizinga, The Presb. and Ref. Rev., vi., 502-7.)

Phillips, Maurice. The Teaching of the Vedas. (Wm. Brenton Greene, Jr., The Presb. and Ref. Rev., vi., 524-5.)

Riehm's Handwörterbuch des biblischen Altertums. 2. Aufl., hrsg. von Baethgen. (Nowack, Theol. Litztg., No. 12.)

Theologischer Jahresbericht. Bd. 12 und 13. (A. Harnack, Theol. Litztg., No. 12.)

OLD TESTAMENT.

Charles, R. H. The Ethiopic Version of the Hebrew Book of Jubilees, etc., edited. (D. S. Margoliouth, The Jew. Quart. Rev., vii., 546-8.)

Davis, John D. Genesis and Semitic Tradition. (W. W. Moore, The Presb. and Ref. Rev., vi., 525-8.)

Smith, George Adam. The Historical Geography of the Holy Land. (S. A. Martin, The Presb. and Ref. Rev., vi., 528-30.)

NEW TESTAMENT.

Dalmer, Johannes. Die Erwählung Israels nach der Heilsverkündigung des Apostels Paulus. (Erich Schaefer, Theol. Litbl., No. 25.)

Dausch. Der neutestamentliche Schriftcanon und Clemens von Alexandria. (A. Harnack, Theol. Litztg., No. 12.)

Drummond, James. Via, Veritas, Vita; Christianity in its Most Simple and Intelligible Form. (Joseph Jacobs, The Jew. Quart. Rev., vii., 548-54.)

Friedländer, Max. Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Christentums. (Fred. C. Conybeare, The Jew. Quart. Rev., vii., 554-63.)

Führer, J. Zur Felicitas Frage. (V. Schultze, Theol. Litbl., No. 24.)

Grafe, E. Die Paulinische Lehre vom Gesetz nach den 4 Hauptbriefen. 2. Aufl. (Rüling, Theol. Litbl., No. 22.)

Mackintosh, William. The Natural History of the Christian Religion. (Benjamin B. Warfield, The Presb. and Ref. Rev., vi., 507-22.)

Meyer, H. A. W. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. x. *Bornemann,* Die Thessalonicherbriefe. (Rev. in Theol. Litbl., No. 25.)

Stephens, George B. The Johannine Theology. (J. Ritchie Smith, The Presb. and Ref. Rev., vi., 530-34.)