THE BIBLICAL WORLD

VOLUME XX OCTOBER, 1902 NUMBER 4

THE BIBLE AND THE COMMON SCHOOLS.

THE fact that the Bible is generally excluded from the public schools of the United States, where formerly it was used as a book of devotion and instruction, is not to be attributed to a growing disregard for religion, or for the most profoundly religious literature of the world—the Hebrew Scriptures. This situation has been created by the friends of the Bible rather than by its enemies; for if the friends of the Bible could have agreed among themselves as to how the Bible should be taught in the schools, their influence would have secured the continuance of such instruction. But it came to pass that the Bible was used in the schools, not only for general religious and ethical instruction, but also for the inculcation of sectarian and theological ideas. Protestant teachers taught the Bible in a way which antagonized the Roman Catholics; and teachers of the several Protestant denominations interpreted the Bible to the children from their own point of view. But the public money which is raised by general taxation for the support of the common schools comes from men of widely differing ecclesiastical creeds and connections, and cannot therefore be used for the dissemination of sectarian tenets. So by a gradual process the state laws have come to forbid biblical instruction, or even a devotional use of the Bible, in the common schools.

EXCLUSION OF THE BIBLE FROM THE SCHOOLS

The losses which have resulted are serious indeed. Religion and morality are primary features in a true education. The development of right ideas of duty and of conduct—in other

words, character-making—is the supreme end of school instruction. This principle had been recognized, and the Bible had been used in the schools as the chief means of teaching religion and morality. When Bible instruction was no longer permitted, the primary instrument of character-building was laid aside. Instruction in religion was discontinued, and instruction in morals was reduced to a minimum. In this way two of the chief elements of education were severed from the general curriculum of education. The home and Sunday school could impart such instruction in a measure; but since only a limited number of children attend Sunday school, or live in homes where real religion and morality are found, it has resulted that the great majority of children have been growing up without essential religious and ethical education. They have lacked those elements of character-building which alone can make them complete men and women. As they have received their education without the proper religious or moral constituents, they look upon religion and morality as incidental matters which do not directly concern them.

Losses Which Result from This Exclusion

It is also a genuine loss, though by no means to be compared with that just described, that the exclusion of the Bible from the public schools has brought in a widespread ignorance concerning the facts of biblical history and the phraseology of the English versions. It is no doubt true that the young people of the present generation are less able to identify, or even to recognize, quotations from and allusions to the Bible in English literature. It is equally true that they do not themselves quote or allude to the Bible as was customary fifty years ago. The exclusion of the Bible from the public schools, while it is not the only cause—and probably not the primary cause—is, at least, one cause of the present mode.

It is from this latter point of view that some important utterances (see below, pp. 303–5) have recently been made calling for the restoration of the Bible to the schools *as literature;* that is, it is asked that the Bible be used, not for instruction in religion and morality, but as a means of literary culture. Now, it is certainly desirable that the

The Bible to be Taught as Literature

young people of America should be able to recognize biblical quotations and allusions in the masterpieces of English literature; and it is still more desirable that they should appreciate and imbibe the surpassing literary qualities of the biblical writings. Without these attainments their culture would no doubt be deficient.

Still, culture is not the chief end of man, nor the primary function of the Bible. The biblical books are indeed masterpieces of literature, even in an English translation; but they have a much more important service to render to the world. The Bible is first of all for religious and moral instruction; historically this was its origin, and practically this is its great mission. It is a monument of the far-distant past; but it is not simply a relic, for it has a real life in the present. Rightly interpreted, it is a guide-book to our own religion and morality, and is the best medium for instruction in these most important elements of our lives.

THE BIBLE A BOOK OF RELIGION AND MORALS

If, then, the Bible should be restored to the schools for the purpose of culture, to broaden the literary intelligence and susceptibility of the children, it would be able to render a minor service which is needed; but would be forbidden to render that higher service to which it was destined. Happily, the study of the Bible as literature would of necessity involve an infiltration of its religious ideas and moral principles into the minds of the pupils, and so the primary purpose of the Bible would be in part accomplished by indirection. But is it not desirable that the Bible should pass for what it is—a book of religion and morals? If it is to be restored to the common schools, should it not be restored as a book of religion and morals? Only so can the essential defect in present education be removed. The children could do much better without the culture and literary intelligence than without the religious and moral instruction which they at present lack.

Then why not both? To be sure, let us have both literary culture and religio-ethical instruction through the Bible. But let us not become confused by supposing that we have the latter

when we have the former, or obscure the issue by talking about the one thing when we mean the other. And certainly our first and best endeavor should be that the Bible may perform its primary mission of morals and religion. Is this primary mission being adequately performed through the Sunday school and home? It has been so assumed, but each passing year shows more clearly that this is not the case. Further, there is a growing judgment of Christian people that adequate instruction in religion and morality cannot be given in the Sunday school and home alone. The home no longer feels the necessary responsibility, and the Sunday school has neither the time nor the instrumentalities for adequate instruction. And, in addition, the divorcement of religious from secular education destroys the vital relation between the two.

Should the Bible be Restored to the Schools?

Therefore, it seems certain that the ideal of education, as well as the only adequate method of education, is to establish religious and moral instruction in the common schools. This will call for the restoration of the Bible to the schools as the best medium of such instruction. And we shall then find ourselves once more in accord with the status of instruction in England and Germany. But can we now use the Bible for this purpose when not long ago it was found impracticable, and was discontinued? Can we now teach religion and morals by means of the Bible without at the same time teaching sectarian ideas? The Bible is not sectarian; Roman Catholics and all Protestant denominations equally claim it. The formal creeds and the systems of government and worship which have grown up in the centuries of Christian history are post-biblical; they are a superstructure, built upon the fundamentals of Christianity as recorded in the Bible. Can we get beneath ecclesiastical formulations, regulations, and liturgies to a fundamental religious belief and moral practice upon which all Christians can agree, and which they can unite to promote? Or must the Christian sects still strive with each other to the detriment of their cause? Must the Bible continue to be excluded from the common schools

because differing theological interpretations, modes of church organization, and manner of religious worship still divide the hosts of the Lord, and the several camps are still jealous of one another?

We believe that sectarianism is fast disappearing, that an era of unity in essentials is near at hand. Then Christianity will receive a better recognition, and rapid growth will follow. We believe also that the Bible can now be taught much more correctly and effectively than a generation ago; that many of the former difficulties with using it as a handbook of religion and morals have been removed. But if the Bible were again to be taught in the schools *as it was formerly taught*, the same objections would arise. In order to restore the Bible to the schools it must be taught in the right way — the way which accords with the best modern knowledge of the Bible, the best modern science of religious and ethical teaching, and the best Christian spirit which recognizes true Christianity wherever it exists, and is able to distinguish between essentials and non-essentials. When we can secure for our public schools a corps of teachers trained to teach the Bible in this right way, there should be no delay in restoring the Bible to the schools.

THE ANCIENT "CIRCUIT OF ARGOB."

By PROFESSOR GEORGE L. ROBINSON, PH.D.,
McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

STARTING on May 28, 1900, from Damascus, in company with Rev. Archibald Forder, of Jerusalem, and one servant named Nussar, we struck out in the direction of the Ḥauran and Jebel ed-Druze, in order to visit the ancient "circuit of Argob," which the Scriptures inform us once belonged to Og, king of Bashan.

We had only scantily provided ourselves with the necessities of life for a trip of eight or ten days, as the case might be, for we determined that the best way in which to see these dangerous parts of the Turkish dominions was to throw ourselves upon the hospitality of the natives, display as little equipment as possible, and so avoid exciting their cupidity. Accordingly we procured a few loaves of native bread and a limited amount of tinned goods, but a full supply, on the other hand, of native costume and saddlebag trappings, to escape being detected and turned back by the Turkish soldiers who have been recently stationed at various garrisons in those parts.

Our itinerary was briefly as follows: Leaving Damascus, five and a half hours brought us to Deir 'Ali, where we put up at the house of the chief of the village, Sheikh Maḥmud. The next day took us through Braḳ, situated on the northern boundary of the lava beds of el-Lejah. We passed through this village in plain sight of the Turkish soldiers, who, however, failed to recognize us as foreigners, for we were now clad in *abba*, *kufiyeh*, and *aḳal*, like the Druses who inhabit those parts. We stopped in the middle of the day at a place called Suwâret el-Kebireh for refreshment and rest, inquired for the village *meḍâfeh*, or guest-room, and were shown to a certain house, in front of which we dismounted, and, after giving over our animals to the

sheikh's servants to be fed and watered, we ascended the crude stone steps to enter the court leading into the house. But here we ran into the lion's mouth. There before us, as we entered the large reception-room of the sheikh, was Judât Bey, of Damascus, the representative of the sultan, who was stationed at Ahireh, a town in the center of the lava region, and who, with

CASTLE AT SALKHAD, BUILT IN THE CRATER OF AN EXTINCT VOLCANO.

his escort of soldiers, had come over to settle some matter of dispute between certain citizens of the village. Immediately we were put through the Turkish catechism, being asked whence we came, and whither we were going; what was our purpose, and whether we were aware of the dangers before us. To all of which questions we answered with a meekness quite unlike anything to which we had before been accustomed. The result was that we were allowed to go on our way undisturbed, which was so much of a surprise to us that we hardly recovered from it during the entire trip. The second night was spent at Umm-el-Ḥaretên; the third at Marduḳ, having visited Shaḳḳa and

Shoḥba *en route;* the fourth at Salkhad, stopping on the way at Suleim and Kanawât, besides obtaining glimpses of Sueda and Hebrân. That was a very fatiguing day's ride, being over hard roads through the stony portion of Jebel Ḥauran. At Salkhad we put up again at the *medâfeh*, or guest-room of the village sheikh, and spent much time the next day examining the

GENERAL VIEW OF EDREI, WHERE ISRAEL AND OG FOUGHT THEIR DECISIVE BATTLE.

Roman castle, which has been built in the crater of an extinct volcano. The view from it is extensive. The Turkish representative of Salkhad, whom my companion in travel knew personally and upon whom he looked as a friend, was unfortunately away from home, so that we did not see him. We had now reached the extreme point in our itinerary, and so set our faces toward Damascus.

Leaving Salkhad, we turned westward, following the ancient stone-paved highway, and visiting Bosra, which richly abounds in Roman ruins. The first night out from Salkhad was spent at

Ghasm. The second day we continued our journey, following the same old Roman road, till we came to Der'ât, or Edrei, where it is supposed the Israelites fought their decisive battle with Og, king of Bashan. We examined with enthusiasm many points of interest, and toward evening proceeded on our way through the rich harvest fields of Bashan to Muzerib, the terminus station of the Hauran railroad, which leads to Damascus. A most uncomfortable night was spent in the wretched hovel of the sheikh of that squalid little town of Muzerib. Our host seemed embarrassed by our presence, and when supper was served, which consisted merely of wheat boiled in the kernel, he apologized for having nothing else, not even bread, to set before us; and we decided that he was a very impecunious man, indeed, to be mayor of a village. The next day, leaving Muzerib and turning northward, we passed on our left Tell el-'Ash'ari, an oblong hillock about sixty feet above the surrounding plain, scattered over with the ruins of different ages. The name, as is obvious, suggests Ashtaroth of the Old Testament, but we decided (and I am pleased to see that Professor George Adam Smith reaches the same conclusion; *cf.* the *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement*, October, 1901, p. 359) that the place can hardly be identified with the capital of Og. On the contrary, a similar hillock about eight

WATCHTOWER AT EDREI, CHARACTERISTIC OF THE LAND OF BASHAN.

miles north of this, which we visited, Tell 'Ashtara, about which flow copious streams of water, is, in our opinion, more probably to be identified with Ashtaroth, the royal capital of Deut. 1:4. Going on a half-hour farther, we came to Sheikh S'ad, where again we ran into Turkish soldiers, and this time failed to escape, being compelled to accept of an escort to

A VIEW FROM SALKHAD CASTLE, LOOKING EAST TOWARD BAGHDAD.

conduct us back to Damascus. Inasmuch as we were already faced in that direction, the soldier whom the pasha sent with us in no way changed our plans or restricted our liberties. Nawa was visited *en route*, and also Zora', the latter being situated on the extreme southwest corner of the lava region of el-Lejah. Here we spent a night, and were graciously feasted by the Turkish officers, whose hospitality we quite thoroughly enjoyed; for here we found still another Turkish garrison.

The route chosen the next day was along the edge of the basaltic table-land of el-Lejah; sometimes we crossed broad promontories of basaltic black rock, while at others we followed

the seldom traveled path along the edge of the adjacent fertile plain. On the way we paused at Kirâta and Khabeb, the latter being an industrious Christian village, whose inhabitants are engaged in the important industry of cutting out large millstones from the lava which everywhere surrounds the town. Our last night out was spent in a private house at el-Mismiyeh, not far from Brak̩, at which there is stationed another very strong garrison of Turkish soldiers. From here we journeyed directly north one day and arrived safely at Damascus. We were gone something over nine days, during which time we practically encompassed the whole "circuit of Argob," the region of Og, king of Bashan. In what follows we shall attempt to identify the "circuit of Argob" and describe its features of special interest.

A SARCOPHAGUS AT EDREI, NOW USED AS A WATERING TROUGH.

The phrase "the circuit of Argob" is mentioned in but two contexts of the Old Testament. In Deut., chap. 3, we read: "And we took all his cities at that time; there was not a city which we took not from them; threescore cities, *all the region of Argob*, the kingdom of Og in Bashan. All these were cities fenced with high walls, gates, and bars; beside the unwalled towns a great many" (vss. 4, 5). "And the rest of Gilead, and all Bashan, the kingdom of Og, gave I unto the half tribe of Manasseh; *all the region of Argob*, even all Bashan. (The same is called the land of Rephaim. Jair the son of Manasseh took *all the region of Argob*, unto the border of the Geshurites and the Maacathites;

and called them, even Bashan, after his own name, Havvoth-jair, unto this day)" (vss. 13, 14.) On the other hand, in 1 Kings, chap. 4, we read: "Ben-geber, in Ramoth-gilead; to him pertained the towns of Jair, the son of Manasseh, which are in Gilead: even to him pertained the *region of Argob*, which is in Bashan, threescore great cities with walls and brazen bars" (vs. 13).

The name Argob seems to spring from a root רגב, *ragab*, which signifies "clods of earth" (*cf.* Job 21:33; 38:38); hence Argob would denote a rich and fertile tract or "glebe" like that of Bashan. Only on the hypothesis that the root is cognate with רגם, *ragam*, can it be made to signify "stony." The name is invariably used in connection with חבל, *ḥebel*, which signifies "cord" (Josh. 2:15) or "measuring line" (Mic. 2:5), and figuratively "a measured portion, or allotment" (Josh. 17:7; 19:9), being applied to a particular district or region (Zeph. 2:5, 7). The common usage of this word suggests, therefore, that the expression implies a *circuit* with definite boundaries.

The identification of Argob with el-Lejah (*i. e.*, "refuge, retreat") is uncertain; its precise situation, accordingly, remains undetermined; all that can be positively affirmed is that it was located somewhere in Bashan (Deut. 3:4). It may have included the western portion lying between Edrei, Ashtaroth, and Jebel ed-Druze (so Dillmann in his *Commentary*, and Guthe in the *Z. D. P. V.*, 1890, p. 237); or it may have designated more especially the western declivities of Jebel Ḥauran, north of Salkhad (so Driver, art. "Argob" in Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible*). The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan restrict it to the Trachonitis of the Greeks, that is, the region known to the Arabs of today as el-Lejah, a rocky region and easily defensible. In 1838 it is said that 6,000 Druses defended it successfully against Ibrahim Pasha, of Egypt, who lost 20,000 men in attempting to force it. Argob certainly *included* this rocky portion of the land of Bashan.

El-Lejah is geologically one of the most interesting portions of all Palestine. It is an immense bed of congealed lava, which seems to have issued forth from the many now extinct cones of the Ḥauran mountains, situated a few miles to the southeast,

especially from the Ghararat el-Kibliyeh, a now extinct volcano in the northwestern portion of the mountainous district. The lava issuing from the craters of these volcanoes seems to have flowed out on every side, but especially toward the northwest, covering a territory oval in shape, about twenty-two miles long from north to south, and fifteen from east to west. Before cooling,

ANCIENT BRIDGE AT EL-KANAWÂT.

its surface was apparently violently agitated by internal convulsions of nature. The wavy surface shows in which direction the current of the thick liquid was flowing while in the process of cooling. It is frequently filled with air-bubbles; the whole mass is almost as hard as flint and emits a sharp, metallic sound when struck. Out of it, notwithstanding, many of the millstones of Syria and Palestine have been chiseled, some having been transported even as far as to Egypt.

This pear-shaped district is located about thirty miles south of Damascus and forty east of the Sea of Galilee. It rises abruptly some twenty to thirty feet above the level of the surrounding

plain; its surface is generally of the same altitude, but at the same time rough and rugged and very fatiguing to traverse. It consists largely of a solid mass of congealed basalt, appropriately called "a strange petrified ocean," with numerous detached boulders of the same black material; the surface is divided in every direction by crevices and fissures, with here and there small fertile and cultivated depressions. Through many of its labyrinthine gullies the iron-shod hoofs of horses and other beasts of burden have in course of time succeeded in wearing tracks or roads leading into the interior of the region. The Romans in their day, indeed, cut a highway through its entire length from north to south, connecting Damascus and Bosra.

STONE DOORS IN THE REGION OF ARGOB.

Near the borders especially, but also scattered throughout this entire region, are still to be seen the standing remains of many strongly built cities, each with its watchtower of black basalt. Over fifty have been counted. At one sweep of the eye I remember of having called my companion's attention to seven watchtowers, belonging to as many different cities close about us. Baedeker's *Handbook for Palestine and Syria* gives the names, and locates on its map of el-Lejah the situation, of nearly threescore cities and towns. Several of these today are without inhabitants, just as the sides of Jebel ed-Druze are studded with deserted villages. Wetzstein reports, in his *Reisebericht über Ḥauran und die Trachonen* (1860), having seen in the Druse mountains hundreds of stone-built villages with

their gates and bars. Porter also, in his *Giant Cities of Bashan*, describes the almost numberless ruins of towns and cities in this same volcanic region.

The dwellings in all these parts are ordinarily built of massive blocks of basalt stone, with stone stairways on the outside leading to the roof, and with heavy double folding doors moving in great sockets cut in door-sills and requiring all one's strength, as the writer can testify, to open and close. Many of these dwellings are still in a good state of preservation—indeed so well preserved that the traveler, in approaching one of these towns, expects to find its citizens thronging the streets; but, alas! instead he finds a deserted village. At least a score in el-Lejah alone are in this extinct condition, being absolutely without an inhabitant. The effect produced upon the traveler is weird. How long they may have been depopulated it is difficult to say. While the architecture of the superstructures seems to point in most cases to the Græco-Roman style of the early Christian centuries, one can hardly doubt but that the actual foundations of these massive structures may date from a much earlier period. Who would dare affirm that these now extinct cities do not represent in some way, if not by their superstructures, at least by their foundations, the "threescore cities" of the ancient kingdom of Og, which are described in Deuteronomy as having had high walls, double gates, and bars? For the account in Deuteronomy describes in a marvelous manner the actual conditions which exist today.

But besides these habitations of stone, which we have attempted to describe, there exist also on the west of the Zumleh range and at Edrei subterranean chambers, entered by shafts invisible from above, and intended as retreats in time of war. At Edrei there is an extensive underground city, first discovered by Wetzstein in 1860, but more fully described by Schumacher in his work *Across the Jordan*, 1882 (pp. 135 ff.), consisting of a succession of chambers with "mangers" for grain and cisterns for water, and obviously intended as a place of retreat in time of siege. According to Schumacher, "it seems probable that these underground cities are the work of the

earliest inhabitants of the Ḥauran, the so-called 'giants' of Scripture" (p. 139).

Perhaps it is to these subterranean resorts that reference is made in the Law when the promise is given to the children of Israel that the Lord will send the "hornet" among them, until *they that are left and hide themselves perish from before them* (Deut. 7:20; Exod. 23:28). The hornets are said habitually to infest these underground places of refuge.

TEMPLE AT SULEIM, IN THE SOUTHEASTERN PORTION OF ARGOB.

Troglodyte habitations also are frequently seen in the Druse mountains. Caverns have been found at Umm Dubeb, 'Ajelâ, and Shibikka on the eastern slopes of Jebel ed-Druze, along valleys cut in the soft rock, and so arranged as to form separate chambers. In one case, described by Wetzstein, at Hibbikke, about eight miles northeast of Salkhad, a chamber was found cut out of the rock and covered with a solid stone vault, like a tunnel or cellar. These habitations would also naturally belong to the earliest inhabitants of the region.

In view, therefore, of the character of el-Lejah and the mountainous district lying adjacent to it on the southeast, it is impossible to conclude that a rocky, unproductive region such as el-Lejah, with its sixty cities more or less, could ever have been a separate independent division of Og's territory. It is

rather more likely to suppose that in that remote age el-Lejah was the natural fortress, so to speak, within which the inhabitants of the land of Bashan, or at least all those in the adjacent parts, built their houses for self-protection. So that, when it is stated in the book of Deuteronomy that the Israelites took "all the circuit of Argob," even the threescore cities of Og, king of Bashan, the author intends to convey the thought that not only did the Israelites conquer the open country of the plain and seize the cities thereof, but also the fortified and inaccessible cities of el-Lejah and of the volcanic mountains to the southeast, driving out all the inhabitants of these regions, notwithstanding that they were able to, and probably did, betake themselves to their underground fortresses for refuge. In other words, "the circuit of Argob" is commensurate with the entire region of el-Lejah and Jebel ed-Druze—the most secure and best-defended portions of the land of Bashan, the kingdom of Og.

THE MEDICAL LANGUAGE OF ST. LUKE.

By Rev. Professor R. J. Knowling, D.D.,
King's College, London, England.

Dr. Hobart, in his well-known book on the *Medical Language of St. Luke*, refers to an article in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, June, 1841 (p. 585), as the earliest notice on the subject with which he was acquainted; and Dr. Plummer refers to the same article, in his *Commentary on St. Luke*, as perhaps the earliest notice of this characteristic of the evangelist with which we are concerned. But it is of interest to observe that nearly a century earlier than this article in the *Gentleman's Magazine* one of the greatest of New Testament editors and commentators, J. J. Wetstein, had drawn attention to the medical accuracy of Luke in his gospel and in Acts (see under Luke 14:2; Acts 28:8). And earlier still another illustrious commentator, J. A. Bengel, had remarked the same characteristic in his comments on Luke 8:43; Acts 3:7. A succession of German writers has drawn attention to the same subject, and Dr. Zahn, in his recent *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Vol. II, p. 427), has borne generous and ungrudging testimony to the value of Dr. Hobart's book. Among recent English writers Professor Ramsay, in his *St. Paul the Traveler* (p. 205); Dr. Plummer, in his *Commentary on St. Luke* (pp. lxiii–lxvi); and Sir John Hawkins, in his *Horae Synopticae* (p. 184), have drawn special attention to the same book, and have recognized that the author's main point has been abundantly proved (see further *Expositor's Greek Testament*, Vol. II, pp. 9 f.).[1]

[1] Of the writers who support the thesis maintained in the following pages we may mention the following Roman Catholic scholars: Hug, Kaulen, Belser, Knabenbauer, and Fouard; and, in addition to the English scholars already named, there are J. Smith, of Jordanhill, Trench, Alford, Humphry, Lightfoot, and, more recently, Salmon, Page, Headlam (art. "Acts" in Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible*), Bebb (art. "Luke, Gospel of," *ibid.*), Rendall, Lumby, Farrar, Pullan, Rackham; see also Hackett, *Commentary on Acts*, p. 341. It is a matter of regret that Renan has not

An endeavor will be made in the following pages to take some leading instances in Luke's gospel and in Acts, and to subject each alleged medical term to the tests demanded by Dr. Plummer: Is it used in the LXX? Is it employed in classical Greek? We may commence our inquiry with a few passages in which we have the advantage of comparing Luke's words with those employed in parallel passages by Matthew and Mark.

The healing of Simon's wife's mother is narrated by all the synoptists: Luke 4:38, 39; Matt. 8:14; Mark 1:30. Matthew and Mark both use the same word, *πυρρέσσουσα*, "sick of a fever;" Luke says *συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ*, "holden with a great fever." It may be admitted that the verb *συνέχεσθαι* is often used with *νοσήματι* in classical Greek in a similar sense, and that it is so found in Josephus. But it may be observed that both it and the simple verb *ἔχεσθαι* are constantly used by the medical writers as in this passage; that in Acts 28:8 we not only have it joined with *πυρετός* as here, but we also have its simple form joined with *δυσεντερία*, just as in Hippocrates we have the phrase *ὑπὸ δυσεντερίης ἐχομένῳ*; and that we also have in the passage before us the familiar distinction drawn in medical writings between a great and a slight fever, upon which Zahn equally with Hobart lays stress. Moreover, here as so often elsewhere, Luke introduces his characteristic word *παραχρῆμα*. In the New Testament this word occurs eighteen times, but sixteen of these instances are in Luke's writings. The word is not only frequent in medical writers like Hippocrates and Galen, but it is used by them in a manner analogous to its use by Luke, *i. e.*, it is constantly associated with recovery from sickness or the contrary, and closely joined with medical terms. From one writing of Hippocrates Hobart cites, as Zahn reminds us, no less than sixteen instances of the employment of the word. No doubt it must be admitted that the adverb is found several times in the LXX, and that it is of frequent occurrence in the best Attic prose. But still it is significant that its employment in the New Testament is almost exclusively confined to

given us more than a general statement, but it is significant that he speaks, not only of Luke as having the title of "physician," but also of his writings as proving his medical knowledge.

Luke, and that in eleven out of sixteen passages it is associated by him with disease and death.

Luke's next chapter (chap. 5) supplies us with two cases in which we may again compare his words with those of his brother-evangelists. While Matthew and Mark describe the leper who seeks the aid of Jesus by the same simple term λεπρός, Luke (5:12) has the significant phrase πλήρης λέπρας, peculiar to him in the New Testament. The adjective is no doubt characteristic of Luke, but it is in frequent use in connection with disease, as, *e. g.*, with leprosy, both in Hippocrates and Galen. There is no parallel phrase in the LXX, although λέπρα is constantly used, and the phrase "a leper as white as snow" is applied to Miriam and to Gehazi. A few verses later we have a description of the healing of the paralytic at Capernaum. Here, as elsewhere, Matthew and Mark have the popular form παραλυτικός, "a paralytic;" Luke, alone of the New Testament writers, here and always has the technical term παραλελυμένος, "a man that was palsied" (in 5:24 Westcott and Hort read in the margin παραλυτικῷ), and so in Acts 8:7; 9:33. From no less than four medical writers, as Zahn again points out, are parallels adduced by Hobart to a use of the expression in the sense of the passage before us. The only other passage in the New Testament in which the word occurs is Heb. 12:12, where it is evidently used metaphorically in a quotation from the LXX; *cf.* also Eccles. 25:23, which is evidently a quotation (as in Hebrews) from Isa. 35:3. It must be admitted that in 1 Macc. 9:55 we have the expression καὶ παρελύθη used of Alcimus, and in 3 Macc. 9:22 τοῖς μέλεσι παραλελυμένος of Ptolemy Philopator; but the fact remains that not only in Acts, but in narratives which we can parallel, as here, with those of the other synoptists, Luke used a technical medical term, and that, too, absolutely. Moreover, in Luke's narrative we have not merely the characteristic παραχρῆμα, but also one of the four words for "bed" which he employs, a word used by him alone, κλινίδιον (5:19). Luke, in fact, uses two words for the bed of the sick, in common with Matthew and Mark; but in addition to them two other words, peculiar to his writings, κλινίδιον and κλινάριον, the former

occurring twice in this narrative (5:19, 24), and the latter in Acts 5:15.

It cannot be said that the employment of diminutives is characteristic of Luke, as is sometimes alleged (whether rightly or wrongly) of Mark; nor can it be maintained that the two diminutives in question are borrowed from the LXX, for neither of them is found there. Both the words are classed by Dr. Kennedy as "colloquial," and they both occur in Aristophanes; but there are distinct instances, as Hobart shows, of the reference of both words to the couch of the sick. And so the fact remains that in the writings of the evangelist who is known to us as Luke the physician we have no less than four words used to denote, as the context almost invariably proves (except in Luke 8:16; 17:34, where *κλίνη* is used quite generally), the beds of the sick.

While our Lord is apparently still in Capernaum he enters on another sabbath into the synagogue, where there was a man whose right hand (*ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ἡ δεξία*) was withered, Luke 6:6. Luke alone, unlike the other evangelists, mentions the right hand, *ἡ δεξία* being added emphatically after *χεὶρ* (*cf.* Acts 3:7). Zahn notes the significance of this point, especially as it was customary with medical men to state whether the right or left member was affected.

In Luke 8:27–39 the healing of the demoniac of Gerasa is described by Luke, as also by the two other synoptists. It was once remarked to the writer by an Oxford scholar of high standing that, if medical language was characteristic of any writer in the New Testament, it was so of Mark rather than of Luke; and it is no doubt true that Mark introduces many terms for which parallels can be found in medical writers, as we can see by glancing down the references in Wetstein. It is also true that in the miracle before us, and perhaps more notably still in the healing of the demoniac boy after the Transfiguration, the details are given by Mark with a vividness and fulness which are very striking. But this constant introduction by Mark of little points of detail may be fairly accounted for by the fact that Mark, as there is good reason to believe, received his

account from Peter, an eyewitness; and the fact still remains that Luke also is able to introduce details here, as elsewhere, peculiar to himself, and details, too, which are quite characteristic of a medical man (see Zahn, *u. s.*, and Hobart, p. 17). To take one point only: neither of the other evangelists mentions that the disease had lasted a long time (*ἐκ χρόνων ἱκανῶν*), a fact which might naturally claim the attention of a physician, as intermittence was mentioned by Aretæus among the notes of mania, and a fact quite in accordance with Luke's invariable custom to give us, as Zahn again notes, the period of the duration of the malady in those who were afflicted.

The case of the Gerasene demoniac is quickly followed in Luke's gospel by the cure of the woman with an issue of blood. Here again it might be fairly urged that Mark, in the parallel 5:25 (not Matthew), uses an expression which is quite medical, the identical expression, in fact, used by Luke 8:43, *οὖσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος*, "having an issue of blood." But note what follows: while Mark tells us that the fountain of her blood was dried up (*ἐξηράνθη*, 5:29), Luke, using again the medical phrase *ῥύσις αἵματος*, tells us that the issue of her blood staunched (*ἔστη*, 8:44). He thus not only employs *ἱστάναι* in a sense in which it is found in no other New Testament passage, but he also introduces a distinct medical term, used especially, as by Hippocrates and Galen, of such bodily discharges as are mentioned here, in place of what Zahn calls the poetical expression of Mark.

There is perhaps no miracle in the account of which we are more sensible of the graphic and circumstantial details of Mark than in the healing of the demoniac boy as our Lord descended from the Transfiguration glory. But we must not forget that Luke introduces some striking words in his narrative which are not found in the other gospels. For example, Luke describes the spirit as tearing the boy that he foameth (*μετὰ ἀφροῦ*, 9:39). Here we have a word used only by Luke in the New Testament and not found in the LXX, but employed in classical Greek sometimes as here, and often also by medical writers, as by Hippocrates and Aretæus, in describing the symptoms of epilepsy.

Again, Luke alone introduces the word ἐξαίφνης, "he *suddenly* crieth out," a word which Zahn no less than Hobart regards as a term which Luke would naturally introduce from its constant employment in medical language in connection with spasms and paroxysms. It is true that the word occurs several times in the LXX, and that Mark uses it on one occasion (13:36), but Luke has it four times in his writings, and it occurs in only these five passages in the New Testament. Other terms in the narrative are also noted by Zahn as medical, *e. g.*, ἐμβλέπειν, "to look upon," used by Luke in the account of this miracle and in 1:48. The verb is found once, it is true, in James 2:3, but in a different sense. It was used also in the LXX (Tobit, Judith) of regarding with pity. But it was also constantly employed by Galen (see J. Weiss, *in loc.*) of examining the appearance and condition of a patient, and it might therefore be fitly chosen by Luke in this connection.

There is another miracle of healing which is common, not only to Luke and the other synoptists, but to John as well. In Gethsemane, on the night of the Passion, Peter strikes with his sword a servant of the high-priest and cuts off his right ear. All four evangelists record the effect of the sword-cut, but Luke alone tells us how Jesus touched the ear and healed it. Dr. E. A. Abbott, in his elaborate account of the miracles of St. Thomas of Canterbury (1898), informs us in his last chapter that, even if the saint's miracles of healing or restoring members of the body could be accepted, yet the similar miracle attributed by Luke to Jesus in the narrative before us must be rejected. And his first reason for this rejection is that the three other evangelists omit the record of the healing. But it is surely significant that this mention should thus come from the medical evangelist only; in Zahn's judgment we cannot attribute this fact to chance, and J. Weiss, in his commentary, notes that "only Luke the physician has the healing" (Luke 22:50). Moreover, if the insertion had been due to a later tradition or to legend, we should have expected to find such a notice, not in Luke, but in a much later gospel, the gospel of John (see further, in reply to Abbott, Plummer, *Commentary on St. Luke*, p. 545).

In addition to the miracles already mentioned, it must not be forgotten that there are others peculiar to Luke. Among the few detailed accounts of restoration to life in the gospels, Luke alone gives us the raising of the widow's son at Nain. In this narrative, Luke 7:15, as also in Acts 9:40, but nowhere else in the New Testament, we have the verb *ἀνακαθίζειν*, "to sit up." Hippocrates, Aretæus, Galen, all use the verb in this intransitive sense, which is rare, to describe patients sitting up in bed. The verb does not occur in the LXX, but it is used by Plato in the middle voice, *ἀνακαθιζόμενος ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην* (*Phædo*, c. 3, p. 60*b*), in the same sense. Dr. Plummer refers to the medical use of the verb, although he only reckons it among the doubtful cases (*op. cit.*, p. lxv). But the fact remains that we have here a word which is frequently used by medical writers (so Grimm-Thayer, *s. v.*), used once, if not twice, by Luke alone in the New Testament in its characteristic medical sense and verbal form. Moreover, the whole phraseology of the evangelist in narrating this miracle should be fairly taken into account (on which see Hobart, *in loc.*).

In the healing of the woman with a spirit of infirmity, Luke 13:11–13, the verb *ἀνακύπτειν*, "could in no wise lift herself up," is peculiar to Luke in the New Testament, at all events in con nection with disease. Not only is it just the kind of term which a medical man would employ, but it is associated with other noticeable verbs in the immediate context. Galen uses the verb for the straightening of the vertebræ of the spine (closely joined with *ὀρθόω*, *cf. ἀνορθόω* below), and Hippocrates uses the noun *κῦφος* or *κύφωμα* for a curvature of the spine, and also the verb *λύειν* for its removal; *cf. ἀπολύειν*, "thou art loosed" (vs. 12), only here in the New Testament of disease. The same verb is used twice in the LXX, but in the sense of lifting up or throwing back the head.

One other verb claims attention: *καὶ παραχρῆμα ἀνορθώθη*, "and immediately she was made straight." The verb *ἀνορθόω* is frequently found in the LXX, but almost always in a figurative sense, and never, as frequently in medical writers, in connection with disease. See its similar use in the only other New Testa-

ment passage in which it occurs, Heb. 12:12. Dr. Plummer declines to class this word and *ἀπολύειν* as in any sense medical terms, but in commenting *in loc.* he points out that Hobart has shown that the verb is used by medical writers of straightening abnormal or dislocated parts of the body (*cf.* the use of *ὀρθός* by Luke alone, Acts 14:10). It would seem, therefore, that we have a series of terms which a medical man would be likely to use, and that added to this we find, not only the characteristic *παραχρῆμα*, but another frequent characteristic, the mention of the length of time the disease had lasted (for other instances see Hobart, Zahn). In the next chapter of his gospel Luke (14:2) speaks of a certain man who had the dropsy. The incident is peculiar to his narrative, and in his description he uses, as J. Weiss notes, the technical word of the medical writers, *ὑδρωπικός*. The term is employed also by Aristotle and Polybius, but it is not found elsewhere in biblical Greek, although the disease is referred to (Numb. 5:21 f.).[2]

But Luke's medical phraseology may be traced, not only in the miracles of his gospel, but in familiar sayings and incidents common to him and to one or other of his brother-evangelists, or in sayings peculiar to him. It must, for instance, always remain an interesting fact that our Lord's quotation of the saying, "Physician, heal thyself," to which parallels may be found in Jewish and also in medical literature, is given us by Luke alone, 4:23 (and for instances of the use of specific medical terms see Zahn, *u. s.*).

One of our Lord's sayings, made familiar to us by all three synoptists, tells us: "They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick." Matt. 9:12 and Mark 2:17 both give us the saying in identical Greek terms, while Luke 5:31 introduces the verb *ὑγιαίνειν*, "to be whole," a common word, no doubt, both in the LXX and in classical Greek, but also the distinctive medical term for being in good health, in contrast to *νοσεῖν*. The verb *ὑγιαίνειν* is used only three times in the gos-

[2] Zahn, as well as Hobart, emphasizes the fact that Luke's medical bias may be seen in the words which he abstains from using as well as in those which he employs (*cf.* HOBART, p. 61).

pels, and each time by Luke in this its primary sense (*cf.* 7:10; 15:27); elsewhere in the same sense (3 John, vs. 2), and frequently by Paul in his later epistles. Dr. Plummer, who cannot be accused of failing to test each word which can by any possibility be claimed as medical, thus comments *in loc.*: "For *οἱ ὑγιαίνοντες* Matthew and Mark have *οἱ ἰσχύοντες*. This looks like a deliberate change made by Luke for the sake of a word which would more definitely express health as opposed to sickness. Like *παραλελυμένος* for *παραλυτικός* (5:18, 24), and *ἰάσθαι* for *διασώζειν* (6:19), these changes may be the result of Luke's medical training" (*cf.* Salmon, *Introd.*, p. 29, and Zahn, *u. s.*).

The present writer has elsewhere[3] drawn attention to the remarkable *combination* of words which is found in Luke's rendering of the familiar saying, 18:25, as compared with the language of the parallel passages in Matthew and Mark, and it may be sufficient to add the following notable passage from Professor Nestle's *Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament*, Eng. tr., p. 275: "The evidence in support of the readings *τρήματος* (eye) and *βελόνης* (needle) is very strong (ℵ B D L). The choice of the terms *τρήμα* for *τρύπημα* or *τρυμαλιά* and *βελόνη* for *ῥαφίς* betrays the language of the physician." Another familiar saying, common to Matthew and Luke, in which Dr. Plummer admits a term as perhaps accounted for by medical phraseology, is given by the former evangelist (23:9), *αὐτοὶ δὲ τῷ δακτύλῳ αὐτῶν οὐ θέλουσι κινῆσαι αὐτά*, "they themselves will not move them [*i. e.*, the burdens] with their finger." Luke, in recording previously a similar saying (11:46), writes, "ye yourselves do not touch them (*προσψαύετε*) with one of your fingers (*δακτύλων*)." The verb used by Luke is not found in the LXX, although it occurs in a few cases in classical Greek; but it would probably have been familiar to Luke, as the simple verb *ψαύειν* is several times found in Hippocrates, with or without *δάκτυλος*, of a gentle touch or pressure of the body, as distinct from *πιέζειν*, of a heavier pressure, while its compounds *προσψαύειν* and *παραψαύειν* were also current medical terms (so Hobart).

Among the terms upon which Dr. Zahn lays special stress is

[3] *Expositor's Greek Testament*, Vol. II, pp. 9 ff.

Luke's use of the verb ἀτενίζειν, "to look steadfastly." The verb is found no less than fourteen times in the New Testament, of which twelve instances are in Luke, and the remaining two in Paul. References can no doubt be given to its employment by Aristotle, Polybius, and Josephus; but it was also a favorite word with medical writers to describe a peculiar, fixed look (see instances from Hippocrates, Aretæus, Galen, in Hobart, p. 76). It would, therefore, be the kind of word which a medical writer might naturally introduce to denote an earnest, fixed gaze. And thus it is noticeable that Luke introduces it (22:56) in a passage which finds a parallel in Mark 14:67. One of the maids in the high-priest's palace sees Peter warming himself, and "she looked upon him (ἐμβλέψασα αὐτῷ)," says Mark; but Luke says, "she looked steadfastly upon him (ἀτενίσασα αὐτῷ)." The two instances of LXX usage which Hatch and Redpath give (1 Esd. 6:28; 3 Macc. 2:26) do not help us, because this verb is employed in these two cases in a secondary sense; but in Aquila, Job 7:8, it is employed in its primary meaning of "beholding," "gazing with the eye."

One of our Lord's most familiar parables is that of the Sower, given us by all three synoptists. Now, without laying stress upon the descriptive part of the parable in Luke's gospel, in which both Zahn and Hobart trace medical terms, we may turn for a moment to the explanation of the parable, which is also found in all three writers. The man who receives seed among the thorns allows the cares of this world to choke the seed, "and he becometh unfruitful;" so Matt. 13:12 and Mark 4:19 in precisely similar Greek terms. But when we turn to Luke 8:14 we find quite a different expression: "and (they) bring no fruit to perfection (οὐ τελεσφοροῦσι)." Here is a word, not only peculiar to Luke in the New Testament, but not found at all in the LXX, although it occurs apparently in a metaphorical sense in 4 Macc. 13:19. It must be admitted that the verb is used precisely in the same sense as here of the growth of plants by Theophrastus, Strabo, Josephus. But its frequent medical use is supported by passages from Aretæus, Dioscorides, Galen; and, although it is no doubt employed by them of

women and animals bringing their young to maturity, it is also used, exactly as by Luke, of fruit and seed coming to perfection; *e. g.*, Dioscorides, *Mat. Med.*, V, 2, uses it so of the vine (see J. Weiss, *in loc.*).

But while these and other similar passages may fairly be adduced in support of our position, it is no doubt true that some of the alleged instances must be subjected to very careful sifting. For example, in the concluding passage of the Sermon on the Mount, as compared with the corresponding passage in the sermon given us by Luke, Dr. Zahn emphasizes the language of Matt. 7:26 f., when placed side by side with that of Luke 6:48 f. The latter introduces in this one passage four words which do not occur either in Matthew or elsewhere in the New Testament, but which are of frequent occurrence in medical writers. The word *πλήμμυρα*, "flood," occurs in the LXX, although only once, in Job 40:18(23); but it is found in Josephus, in Philo, in Plutarch, and its cognate forms occur in classical Greek. The verb *συνέπεσε* (Westcott and Hort, R. V.) is no doubt used by medical writers of the collapsing of the body or of some members of it; but it is also found, according to high authority, in Job 4:14, *τὰ ὀστᾶ συνέπεσεν*; it is used in the same connection by Plato, and also in classical Greek of the falling together, falling in, of a house. The verb *προσέῤῥηξεν*, "against which the stream *brake*," is undoubtedly employed by medical writers of the rupture or bursting of veins, and it is not found in the LXX or in classical Greek in the connection before us, but it is used once by Josephus in the active voice, and by M. Antoninus in the passive voice of waves broken against a promontory. The noun *ῥῆγμα*, "the *ruin* of that house," is not used in this sense either in the LXX or in classical Greek, although in the latter it is used of bodily fractures or ruptures, and so technically in medical writers of the laceration or rupture of the body; but it may be noted that it is found in the LXX (Amos 6:11) of rents in a building (so Plummer). It is evident, therefore, that each of the four words cited by Zahn, in agreement with Hobart, must be used with great caution. But here, as elsewhere, it may still be admitted that it is the *combination* of medi-

cal terms which is noticeable (*cf.* Luke 18:25; Acts 11:5), although, no doubt, in some cases they are employed in a secondary sense; as also the fact that *the same phraseology is not found in parallel passages in the other evangelists.*[4]

[*To be concluded in the next number.*]

A Meditation.

Phil. 3:14. "I press toward the mark."

There is a decided distinction between perfection of progress and perfection of attainment. Paul was striving after perfection of attainment. He already was making progress. He said: "Not as though I had already obtained, either were already made perfect."

Paul depended largely on his personal example and influence, as well as his words, in helping others. "Brethren, be imitators together of me and mark them who so walk even as ye have us for an example." Our mutual influence over one another can become our strongest ally. We should make all our influence and work tend to soul-development, "going on unto perfection." Money is quite essential in this age, but that consideration should be entirely secondary.

The larger the soul, the larger the capacity for enjoyment, not only here, but hereafter. We *can* be what we *will* be. Let each one believe that it is possible by the grace of God in Christ to be what God intended he should be. As we advance, advancement becomes more possible, even necessary. The more we widen our field of vision, the more we take in of God and his truth. The more we exercise our God-given faculties, the stronger and more enduring will become the fibers of our spiritual natures. Paul's motto is indeed a noble one: "I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

EMORY L. COLE.

BAD AXE, MICH.

[4] Luke's medical phraseology may be traced in the narratives and parables peculiar to him (see Hobart and Zahn, *u. s.*). Zahn draws attention to the significant fact that in Luke's account of our Lord's birth terms are frequently used which are specially characteristic of medical writing.

TRUE AND FALSE PROPHETS IN 1 KINGS, CHAP. 22

By Rev. Dean A. Walker, Ph.D.,
South West Harbor, Me.

The terms "true" and "false," as applied to the prophets of the Old Testament, serve to distinguish those whom the Bible approves from those whom it does not approve. Yet few, it may be, of those who use these terms in this general sense have considered the question wherein consists the trueness of the one class and the falseness of the other. With many the readiest answer would be that the false prophets were those whose predictions did not come to pass. Others would say that the false prophets were those who were not commissioned of God to speak for him. Still others would make the distinction to be that the true prophets tried to teach the people the truth, while the false prophets wilfully tried to deceive them.

To the people of Old Testament times this was not a question of merely academic interest, but one of vital importance; for these prophets were their contemporaries, to whom they had to look for practical guidance in political and spiritual things. They could not, as some champions of inspiration in these days profess to be able to do, accept a "thus saith the Lord" as an all-sufficient criterion of the true prophet, because they knew that every claimant to the prophetic office in those times used this same introductory formula (1 Kings 22:11; Jer. 23:30–40), and that Moabite and Assyrian monarchs were quite as prone to hear a divine calling in their own patriotic and personal inclinations as any Hebrew king or prophet.

It is not strange, therefore, that we find in the Bible more than one attempt to give the people some test by which they might know the true prophet from the false. We read in Deut. 18:21, 22: "And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which the Lord hath not spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor

come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken: the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously, thou shalt not be afraid of him." Evidently, such a criterion is, at best, only a negative one, and applies only when a prophet is willing to stake his reputation on the fulfilment of a definite prediction. Moreover, if the prediction be ambiguous or its fulfilment be put far into the future, it is of little use to a man wanting to know his immediate duty. The form implies also, though not with absolute necessity, the converse—that, if the thing come to pass, the predicter may then be regarded as a true prophet. But, obviously, an impostor could hardly fail to hit right in some of his shrewd guesses.

The Deuteronomist himself saw this and felt the need of some further limitation in the test. Accordingly, in 13:1–3, he gives this additional rule: "If there arise in the midst of thee a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and he give thee a sign or a wonder, and [read, *even though*] the sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; thou shalt not hearken unto that prophet or that dreamer of dreams." To the former test of clairvoyance there is here added an ethical one. The character and purpose of the would-be prophet must be looked at in their relation to certain ultimate principles of the divine law. If those principles were already embodied in written form, we have here something closely parallel to the appeal which the Protestant reformers made from the pope and the councils to the Scriptures; and in the positiveness of it, it is surpassed only by Paul's demand that, though he himself or an angel from heaven should preach any other gospel than that which he has already preached, let him be anathema (Gal. 1:8). To the ordinary mind, such an appeal from Paul future to Paul past would be rather confusing; and to the man of Old Testament times, if he reflected that the law was given by Moses, it might have been equally difficult to choose between a prophet long since dead and one who was now making predictions fulfilled before his very eyes.

It is plain, however, that in substituting an ethical test for

mere success in prediction and miracle-working, the Deuteronomist has come to higher ground, and a time-honored law may reasonably command greater respect than the claims of some upstart prophet. Superior powers for wonder-working were valuable in ancient times as introductory credentials. Jesus himself did not disdain to make use of them. But a right moral purpose was a *sine qua non* of the true prophet.

Nevertheless, even a right moral purpose does not of itself constitute a man a true prophet. Beyond this it is necessary that he be correct in the great underlying premises of his prophecies, and by the correctness of these must his work ultimately stand or fall.

No better text for a study of such premises and purposes can be found in the Bible than the chapter (1 Kings, chap. 22) in which the so-called false prophets encouraged Ahab to go up against Ramoth-gilead. Judged by the outcome of the campaign, they certainly were false prophets, and, by the same test, Micaiah ben-Imlah was a true prophet. But it is hardly fair to let Micaiah go down in history as a true prophet, and to condemn all the other four hundred as false solely on the ground of their attitude in the one and only incident in which they are known to us. Why may it not have been a successful hit on Micaiah's part? What reason have we to suppose that he was equally happy in all his attempts to forecast the future? All else that we know of him is what we have on Ahab's testimony (vs. 8), that Micaiah had always been, like the proverbial Irishman, "agin the government." As the party "in opposition," he must often, as Ahab implies, have met the king's plans with prophecies of evil. Yet Ahab throughout his reign had been what we would call, from a political point of view, a successful man. He had bound to himself by matrimonial alliance the king of Sidon; and by the marriage of his daughter with the son of Jehoshaphat he had ended the wars between Judah and Israel which previous dynasties had kept alive since the disruption; and, in spite of the opposition and maledictions of certain of the Jehovah prophets, he seemed in a fair way to secure a reunion of the two kingdoms under a descendant of both David and Omri (2 Kings 8:18).

He had been defeated by the Assyrians at Karkar, it is true, but, what was of far more importance to him, he had been uniformly successful against his nearer enemy, Ben-hadad of Syria, and was able to command the tribute of Moab. It would seem that Micaiah's predictions must often have been wide of the mark and those of the four hundred successful. Moreover, the mass of the people were so subservient to Ahab that he had been able to transgress the ancient laws of landed inheritance with impunity.

What, now, were the grounds on which the four hundred ventured to predict success at Ramoth-gilead? We may reasonably believe them to have been such as the following:

1. There were some whose principle in predicting was to say the agreeable thing whenever there was an even chance of its proving correct.

2. There were those whose principle was to prophesy whichever way seemed likely to pay best in physical convenience. They had no liking for a dungeon and a bread-and-water diet.

3. There were those who always made it a point to be found in the majority. In this case, perhaps for reasons we shall consider later, the majority was overwhelmingly in favor of the war.

4. Some, who otherwise would have condemned the project, seeing that a large majority were in favor of it, and moved by what is often considered a praiseworthy desire for harmony, voted "to make it unanimous" (vs. 13). The above classes of men have no claim to be called true prophets.

5. Some who at heart, perhaps, doubted the expediency of the plan, saw that Ahab was bent on going anyway, and, believing that courage is half the battle, would do what they could to give him this initial advantage. These were the opportunists. They came nearer to being true prophets. They meant well and tried to make the best of the situation.

6. There were those who favored the campaign from a sense of justice. As the result of the last war, Ben-hadad had promised to give back to Ahab the cities that his father had taken from Ahab's father (1 Kings 20:34). Ramoth-gilead was one of these. But three years had now passed (22:1), and Ben-hadad had not yet complied with this item in the treaty. It was

time to use forcible measures. Those who agreed with the king in this were the idealists. Let justice be done though the heavens fall.

7. Finally, there were the philosophical theologians, constituting the responsible nucleus of the four hundred. They were guided in their forecasts of the future by certain great principles of divine providence, as they understood it, which constituted their philosophy of life. Chief among these principles was one that figures prominently in Old Testament thought: the belief that righteousness has its reward in material and temporal prosperity, with its natural corollary that material prosperity is an evidence of divine favor. Ahab, as we have noted above, had been a successful man. According to this philosophy, therefore, he was a favorite son of fortune, and there was no reason to suppose that the divine favor was now to be withdrawn. "Nothing succeeds like success," is our modern way of putting it. Ahab could not but be successful. Go up, therefore, to Ramoth-gilead and prosper.

Such were some of the grounds on which the four hundred favored the king's purpose. And they were false prophets, not because they intentionally advised the king contrary to his best interests, nor because they falsely claimed to be inspired of God, for the narrative itself regards them as in some sense his agents in the affair; nor because the outcome was different from what they predicted. But they were false prophets because the grounds on which they made their predictions were false.

Why, on the other hand, should we call Micaiah a true prophet? Not because this one of his many predictions came true, nor because he alone prefaced his words with a "thus saith the Lord," nor because he was more sincere in his belief as to what the outcome would be. It was rather for this, that he had got hold of a more correct and fundamental principle of divine government than these others, namely that, notwithstanding all appearances to the contrary, a righteous God cannot in the long run favor a wicked man, and such a man Micaiah believed Ahab to be. On this principle he had consistently predicted evil for Ahab throughout his career. We do not know how often these

predictions may have been defeated in specific cases before now. We have shown that Ahab was in a measure justified by his past successes in discrediting Micaiah's auguries of evil. But in the long run Micaiah's principle, that a righteous God cannot favor a wicked man, stands in the same class with the dictum of Socrates, that "there can no evil befall a good man, whether he be alive or dead." These are eternal principles of divine government, and he who prophesies on these principles is a true prophet, however remote or infrequent may be the fulfilments of his specific predictions.

Various ages and different social orders have had their several principles of prophecy. The same half-truth, that temporal prosperity betokens the favor of God, which drove Ahab to his death at Ramoth-gilead, was the ground of that fatal enthusiasm under Jeroboam II. for a coming great day of Jehovah, which the prophet Amos with truer foresight declared was to be a day of darkness and not of light. Napoleon's working principle was that God is on the side of the heaviest battalions, but the heaviest battalions came unexpectedly upon a deep trench in the field of Waterloo, and God was found to be on the other side. The papist believes in the infallibility of councils; the monarchist holds to the divine right of kings and that the king can do no wrong; the democrat interprets the voice of the people as the voice of God.

The prophets among us today are often divided on our great political and social questions; some seek leadership from insincere and selfish motives, but a great many on both sides are honestly trying to promote righteousness. Time only can show which of these latter are the true prophets; for, while the true prophet must preach what he believes to be the truth, uninfluenced by any considerations of what will please others or profit himself, and must accept no man's conscience as a substitute for his own, and must be ready to go on a diet of bread and water for a testimony to his sincerity—above and beyond all these, he must have laid hold of the eternal principles of divine government, and whole truths, not half-truths, must be the basis of his preaching.

JESUS THE PERFECTER OF FAITH (HEB. 12 : 2).

By PROFESSOR D. A. HAYES, PH.D., S.T.D.,
Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.

IN a recently published volume of comments upon the Johannine epistles we read: "To speak of Jesus Christ as exercising faith is to use a diction foreign to the New Testament."[1] It is to this sentiment that this paper would take most radical and absolute exception. We believe that the man Jesus, who was the incarnate God, did exercise faith. We believe that in the incarnation he entered into all the limitations of real and genuine humanity. We believe that from beginning to end his religious life was sustained by unfailing faith in the Father's promise, providence, and power. We believe he had to live the life of faith, as every other religious man must live it. We believe that these truths are not foreign to the diction of the New Testament. On the contrary, we believe that they constitute an essential element in the teaching of both the gospels and the epistles. In almost any of the books of the New Testament we might find abundant proof of this fact. In this paper we confine ourselves to the single epistle to the Hebrews.

As a basis for our study we take the titles descriptive of Jesus found in Heb. 12 : 2, Ἀφορῶντες εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτὴν Ἰησοῦν. How shall we translate these words, "Looking away unto Jesus who is the ἀρχηγός and the τελειωτής of the faith"? The word ἀρχηγός occurs only four times in our New Testament — twice in the epistle to the Hebrews and twice in the book of Acts. The primary meaning of the word is that of "leader, chief leader, captain, or prince." It represents one who stands at the head of the line as commander or most conspicuous personage. The Authorized Version and the Revised Versions, both British and American, have chosen to give this

[1] DANIEL STEELE, *Half Hours with St. John's Epistles*, p. 131.

primary meaning to the word in both of the passages in Acts. In Acts 3:15, *τὸν δὲ ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς ἀπεκτείνατε*, they translate, "But ye killed the Prince of life." And in Acts 5:31, *τοῦτον ὁ θεὸς ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτῆρα ὕψωσεν*, they translate, "This one God exalted with his right hand a Prince and a Savior." When we turn to the epistle to the Hebrews we find a strange division of opinion as to the translation of the word in the two passages there. In Heb. 2:10, *τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι*, the Authorized Version consistently held to the primary meaning of the word and translated, "For it became him to make the captain of their salvation perfect." But the Revised Versions put the primary meaning into the margin and a secondary meaning into the text, "It became him to make the author of their salvation perfect." We hold that the Authorized Version, with its primary meaning, consistent with the use of the word in the book of Acts, is clearly the better at this point. The picture of the context is that of God bringing a great company, *πολλοὺς υἱούς*, "many sons," into glory; and all of them perfected through trial. At their head stands their Captain, their Prince, the First-Born from the dead, leading the host of the redeemed into the glory which he had with the Father before the world was. The statement made concerning him is that it behooved God to make him who was their Leader, their Captain, the Prince of their salvation, perfect through suffering. Acts 3:15 called him the Prince of life. Acts 5:31 called him a Prince and Savior. Heb. 2:10 calls him the Prince of salvation. The primary meaning would seem to be clearly the better at each point.

In the passage which we now seek to interpret, Heb. 12:2, *τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς πίστεως*, the English versions agree in putting the secondary meaning of the word into the text, "Jesus the author of faith." But the Revised Versions have put the primary meaning as an alternative into the margin, "captain of faith." Thayer translates the word, "one who takes the lead in anything and thus affords an example, a predecessor in a matter." And then he interprets the word in this passage to mean: "Jesus who in the pre-eminence of his faith far surpasses the examples of

faith commemorated in chap. 11." That this primary meaning is the only proper meaning in this passage the whole context seems clearly to prove. There had been many glorious examples of faith in the Hebrew history. The author enumerates them at great length, beginning with Abel, Enoch, and Noah, and coming down to his own time; but then he hastens to say that, glorious as these examples are, they are subordinate and insignificant when compared with the supreme example of faith furnished by the man Jesus; and he exhorts his readers to look away from all inferior examples, all lesser lights, to their Leader, their Captain, the Prince of faith, the one who stands at the head of the host of the heroes of faith in all history. We believe, then, that the word ἀρχηγός ought to have its primary meaning in all of the four passages in which it occurs in the New Testament. They all represent Jesus as our Leader, our Captain, our Prince, the Prince of life, the Prince of salvation, the Prince of faith. The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews has a word which he uses for "author," or "source," or "cause." It is found in 5:9, Ἐγένετο αἴτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου, "He became the author of eternal salvation." In 2:10 Jesus is the Captain of salvation, the Leader of the many sons brought into glory, ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας. In 5:9 he is represented as the author or source or cause of salvation, and a different term is used, αἴτιος σωτηρίας. If in 12:2 the writer had intended to call Jesus the author of faith, would he not have used this, his term for that thought, αἴτιος τῆς πίστεως? He chooses the other term, ἀρχηγός, and represents Jesus as the Leader of the long line, the Prince of the host of the heroes of faith.

We are confirmed in this conclusion when we turn to the study of the other descriptive term found in this clause. Jesus is τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτήν. Jesus is the Prince of faith. He is also the τελειωτής of the faith. What does this term mean? We need not go beyond the limits of the epistle itself to feel sure of our author's usage and meaning. The word τελειωτής itself occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, the Septuagint, the Apocrypha, or the classical Greek literature. But its cognate forms are frequent elsewhere and frequent in

this epistle. The adjective *τέλειος*, the two nouns *τελειότης* and *τελείωσις*, and the verb *τελειόω* occur thirteen times in the epistle.

In 9:11 we read that Christ came *διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς*, "through the greater and more perfect tabernacle." This passage suggests the familiar truth that the whole epistle is concerned with the contrast between the Old and the New Dispensation, and that the author affirms that there was something unsatisfactory and incomplete about the former service and worship, tabernacle, temple, ritual, and covenant; and that what was lacking in that dispensation had been supplied by Christ. The Old Dispensation represented dissatisfaction, incompletion, imperfection; the New Dispensation represents satisfaction, completion, perfection. All of the remaining occurrences of these allied words in this epistle easily fall into three groups which revolve about these three ideas:

1. The imperfection of the Old Dispensation. Heb. 7:11, If there was *τελείωσις*, perfection through the Levitical priesthood, what further need was there that another priest should arise? There was no perfection there. Perfection came with the New Dispensation. Heb. 7:19, The law perfected nothing, *ἐτελείωσεν οὐδέν*. Heb. 9:9, The former gifts and sacrifices were not able to perfect, *μὴ δυνάμεναι τελειῶσαι*, the worshipers. Heb. 10:1, The law can never make perfect, *οὐδέποτε δύνανται τελειῶσαι*, them that draw nigh. Heb. 11:40, They, the heroes of faith in the Old Dispensation, should not be made perfect, *μὴ τελειωθῶσιν*, without us. These five passages all emphasize the fact of the imperfection in the old system of things.

2. A second group of four passages presents the contrasted truth, that perfection is attainable by those who have accepted the Christian faith. Heb. 12:23, Ye have come to the spirits of just men who have been perfected, *τετελειωμένων*. Heb. 10:14, By one offering he hath perfected forever, *τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές*, them that are being sanctified. Strong meat belongs to those for whom this work has been done. Heb. 5:14, Strong meat is of the perfect, *τελείων*. All are urged to press into this possibility of grace. Heb. 6:1, Let us be borne to perfection, *ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φερώμεθα*.

3. Between these two groups of passages in the epistle, representing a scheme of salvation where perfection is impossible, and another where perfection is possible, stands a group of four passages which have to do with Jesus, and all of which represent him as perfected, and therefore the superior and Leader of all the imperfect saints who chronologically had preceded him, while at the same time he is the superior and the Leader of all the perfected saints who chronologically succeed him. The first innumerable company he leads by superiority, being perfected, as they were not. The second innumerable company, that of the perfected ones, he leads by priority, being the first of the line. Heb. 2:10, It became God, bringing many sons to glory, to make the first of that glorious company the Leader of the long line, their Captain, the Prince of their salvation, perfect through sufferings, *διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι*. Heb. 5:9, Having been made perfect, *τελειωθείς*, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him. Heb. 7:28, For the law appointeth men high-priests, having infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was after the law, appointeth a Son, perfected, *τετελειωμένον*, for evermore. Last of all in this group we come to the passage which is the object of our study, Heb. 12:2. The context makes its meaning clear. There have been great heroes of faith in our history, the author says, but they were all imperfect. They belonged to a dispensation whose continuous and necessary characteristic we have shown to be its inability to bring its worshipers to perfection. Therefore look away from these imperfect examples of faith to the Perfected One. He is the Prince of faith. He is faith's Perfecter, *τῆς πίστεως τελειωτής*. Our study of the allied forms in the epistle leads to the same result. They all represent completion, perfection. All who have to do directly with Jesus represent him as the Perfected One. That, then, must be the meaning of the term, *τελειωτής*, used in this passage. Jesus has realized in himself *τὸ τελος*, the end which faith was intended to subserve in the development of human character. He has exercised faith fully, continuously, perfectly, from the beginning to the end of his life.

As Thayer puts it, he is the one "who has in his own person raised faith to its perfection and so set before us the highest example of faith."[2] Stevens says: "The author calls upon his readers to follow after the 'leader and perfecter' of their faith, who has illustrated his trust in God and his pursuit of his heavenly vocation in a life which is the perfect pattern of fidelity. Thus for our author Christ is represented, not only as the object of faith, but as the perfect example of it."[3] Westcott concludes: "The whole scope of the passage is to show that in Jesus Christ himself we have the perfect example — perfect in realization and in effect — of that faith which we are to imitate, trusting in Him. . . . . He exhibited faith in its highest form, from first to last, and placing himself, as it were, at the head of the great army of heroes of faith, he carried faith, the source of their strength, to its most complete perfection and to its loftiest triumphs."[4] Mason agrees in the general conclusion and affirms that Jesus "first showed what faith really was, and set a complete and faultless example of it, the contemplation of which may animate us to endure trials which have some resemblance to his own."[5]

We believe that this is one of the climaxing truths in the epistle to the Hebrews, largely lost sight of in the church of today, because of the faulty chapter division in our English Bibles which has separated the crowning example of faith, that of the man Jesus, from the long list of the heroes of faith which preceded it and were intended only to lead up to it; and also because of the mistranslation of the word ἀρχηγός as "author" instead of "leader or prince" in both the Authorized and Revised Versions.[6] The Revised Versions have changed that very misleading translation of the word τελειωτής as "finisher"

[2] See *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, in loc.*

[3] *The Theology of the New Testament*, p. 499.

[4] *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 395.

[5] *The Conditions of Our Lord's Life on Earth*, p. 69.

[6] It might be well to note also that the insertion of the italicized *our* in both the Authorized and Revised Versions is in a measure misleading. The Greek has the definite article. Jesus is the Prince and the Perfect Example of the faith which has been under discussion through the whole of the preceding chapter.

to "perfecter," and have thus greatly improved upon the Authorized Version at this point. Then, properly translated, the meaning of the clause we have under consideration becomes clear: looking away from all other and inferior examples of faith, unto Jesus, the Prince of faith, the Leader of the great host of the heroes of the faith, and the Consummator of faith, the Perfect Example of faith, the one who has exercised faith to the full realization of the result intended by a life of faith in the human soul. We are assured that this must be the meaning of the clause by a study of the terms themselves in their use in parallel passages in the epistle and in the New Testament, by a study of the context, and by the confirmation of the highest scholarly opinion.

We believe that this conception of the life of the man Jesus, as a life in which the exercise of faith, in the same sense in which we exercise faith, furnishes the keynote and the keystone of the character, is the conception of the epistle to the Hebrews throughout. The author of the epistle is emphatic as to the divine dignity of the Redeemer; but he is equally emphatic as to his real humanity. He says that Jesus is a brother to all believers, 2:11. He is one with them, 2:11. He shares their flesh and blood, 2:14. He is made like unto them in all things, 2:16. He is tempted in all points like as they are, 4:16. He learns obedience in gradual, human development, through the experiences of the days and the years, 5:8. He prays and supplicates with strong crying and tears in genuine human dependence upon God, 5:7. He is characterized by godly fear, like Noah or any other godly man, 5:7. He sacrifices his own will to the Father's will always; the one cry of his heart is: "I am come to do thy will, O God," 10:7. There were bright days when in the consciousness of his sonship Jesus lived in undisturbed faith and hope and love, in unquestioning dependence, obedience, and trust. Then there were dark days when he suffered under special stress and trial, in buffetings of mind and agony of soul, even unto blood, 12:4. But his faith held firm. It was tried more terribly than that of any man before him, but it was true.

As Fairbairn has said: "He had to live his personal life (1) within the limits necessary to man, and (2) in perfect dependence upon God. Had he transgressed either of these conditions, he had ceased to be man's ideal Brother or God's ideal Son."[7] He never transgressed these conditions. Within the limits necessary to man his faith had to be constantly exercised, and his faith never failed him.

No wonder that the author of the epistle to the Hebrews exhorts his readers near the very beginning of his discussion: "Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of a heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High-Priest of our confession, even Jesus; who was faithful to him that appointed him," 3:1, 2. And no wonder that here toward the epistle's close we come upon the corresponding and climaxing exhortation of the whole discussion: "Look unto Jesus, the Prince of the faith, the Perfect Example of the faith, who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising shame, and hath sat down at the right hand of the throne of God. Consider him that hath endured such gainsaying of sinners against themselves, that ye wax not weary, fainting in your souls. Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin," 12:2–4. Jesus did all of this, and therefore he is, as Stevens says, "the supreme example of unshaken trust in God. He passed through a career of the severest moral trial and proved himself victorious over evil. He endured the greatest sufferings without the slightest loss of confidence in God."[8] "He did not know everything, else he could no more have been tempted than God could have been tempted. He grew in wisdom as he advanced in years. He learned by experience—by the things which he saw and which he suffered. He lived and wrought, as he told his disciples, by faith in God his Father, as we must all do."[9]

This is the Leader presented to us in the epistle to the Hebrews, the man Jesus, our Brother in trial, our Example in victory. He exercised faith as we exercise faith. He lived a life like ours, "full of temptations, privations, contradictions of

[7] *Expositor*, First Series, Vol. III, p. 337. [8] STEVENS, *op. cit.*, p. 519.

[9] WALKER, *The Spirit and the Incarnation*, p. 322.

unbelief, ending with death on the cross; calling into play to the uttermost the virtue of fortitude, affording ample scope for the display at all costs of fidelity to duty and obedience to God, and, in the most desperate situations, of implicit filial trust in a heavenly Father. . . . . How can any son of God . . . . doubt the value of a Leader so trained and equipped?"[10] He was the very Prince and Perfecter of the exercise of faith in a human life.

That is the conception of the epistle to the Hebrews throughout: Jesus, one with us in disability and in sympathy, one with us in the conditions of conflict, a very Prince of faith, a Leader whom we can follow with perfect confidence because he has never known defeat, a Prince whose white plume will lead the great army of the heroes of faith to a continuous and eternal victory. In the second chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews we read that Jesus is not ashamed to call us brethren, saying: "I will declare thy name unto my brethren. And again, I will put my trust in him," Heb. 2:11–13. What does that second proof passage mean? It can mean only one thing: that the author of the epistle would represent Jesus as one with his brethren in the continuous exercise of faith, in living like them the life of faith. That was the motto inscribed upon his banner, "I will put my trust in God." That was the legend upon his Excalibur, "I have had faith in God." That was the ideal of every day's endeavor with him, "I will exercise faith in Him," Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι πεποιθὼς ἐπ' αὐτῷ, Heb. 2:13.

Our Leader said: I will be made like unto my brethren in all things. Must they live a life of faith? Are their spiritual victories to be won only by faith? Then I will live by faith. I will win my victory by the exercise of unfailing faith in every extremity and in every trial. I will take for my earthly life the same conditions in which my brethren stand, the same flesh and blood of which they partake; and I will maintain without flinching the attitude and condition of creaturely dependence upon God. It shall be true of me as of my brother, the prophet or king of old, that, living or dying, "I will exercise faith in Him,

[10] BRUCE, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 103.

Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι πεποιθὼς ἐπ' αὐτῷ. "Lo, I am come (in the roll of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God," Heb. 10:7.

He was always true to that resolution. His faithfulness was severely tested. His faith was terribly tried. He was tempted, and he suffered being tempted, Heb. 2:18; 4:15; 5:7. But in his suffering he learned obedience, 5:8. Through his suffering he was made perfect, 2:10, the perfect Prince of salvation, 2:10, because he was the Prince and Perfecter of faith, 12:2. He was the Righteous One, who lived by the exercise of faith, 10:38. With good courage he always said: "The Lord is my helper; I will not fear. What shall man do unto me?" 13:6. Consider the Apostle and High-Priest of our confession, even Jesus. He was faithful to Him that appointed him, 3:2. He was faithful in life and he was faithful in death. Consider the issue of his life and imitate his faith, 13:7. He was faithful in life and faithful in death; he will be faithful for evermore. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today, yea and forever, 13:8. Look away from all inferior examples of faith and fix your eyes upon Jesus. He is the Prince and Perfect Example of the exercise of faith and of the victory won thereby. He hath sat down at the right hand of the throne of God, 12:2, 3.

If this is not the conception of the epistle to the Hebrews, we misread the epistle throughout. We believe that it is the conception of the epistle, as it is the conception of the entire New Testament. Jesus exercised faith. He was the Prince and Perfect Example of the exercise of it. We crown him *τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτήν.* We believe that, because he was these, he could become *αἴτιος σωτηρίας*, the author of salvation to all those who exercise like faith with him, who was the incarnate God, who is the exalted Christ.

THE LATE PROFESSOR A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D.
II.[16]

By Professor George Adam Smith, D.D., LL.D.,
United Free Church College, Glasgow, Scotland.

III. DAVIDSON AS A TEACHER.

I now turn to the more easy task of some recollection and appreciation of his powers as a teacher. The generation of students to which I belonged reached Dr. Davidson's class-room before the crisis of the great controversy — that test which, though he took no public part in it, revealed to Scotland that he was the man who was doing more than any other to change her theological temper. Like the older men, therefore, we also knew him before the broader — it could not be a richer or a fonder — fame, which the Robertson Smith case brought him, had gathered round his figure. What was it, if I may attempt to answer a question beyond my ability, that we found in himself?

I have said that his power as a teacher was the bed-rock on which all the rest of his great reputation was founded. Certainly — apart from the tradition of his personal spell which had penetrated our undergraduate world — that was the first thing we felt. To pass into Dr. Davidson's class-room was to feel oneself on a floor of absolute security. The instinct of this awoke in us from the first, and every week confirmed it. We were in the care not only of a very keen intellect, but of one which was thoroughly master of its subject. Moreover, we felt its patience; its patience with everything but slovenliness. Dr. Davidson had to teach us the rudiments of the language. This was half his work with us; and the fact that he, now the leading authority in his subject, set himself to our instruction in the details of grammar and syntax, enhanced our grateful confidence to the pitch of enthusiasm. He did not betray to his students any sense of

[16] Concluded from the Biblical World for September, 1902, pp. 167–77.

sacrifice in doing this; but in later years he said more than once that it was a pity that a professor should have to occupy one of the two short sessions given to the Old Testament in New College with preliminaries to his real work of teaching the criticism and theology of the larger half of the church's Scriptures.

The sense of security which these things imparted was, if possible, further confirmed by the impression of Dr. Davidson's disinterestedness. As Dr. John Watson has justly said, he was "a scholar, without any regard to popularity and worldly aims"—and, one might add, merely ecclesiastical issues—"cleared from unreality and affectation—a loyal and undivided servant of learning."

The next item in this bare list of what we got from our master was the gift of historical vision. The prophets whom we studied with him had been to us but figures speaking in vacancy. Amos at Bethel, Hosea amid the rich scenery and thronging life of northern Israel, Isaiah of Jerusalem, sounded to us—what another was, but what they in reality certainly were not—voices *crying in the wilderness*. He changed all that. He waved his wand, and their world rose about them. He waved his wand—I choose the words. It was a magical change. By no purple painting did he kindle our imagination. One morning—I at least date from that day my awakening to the reality of the prophets—he said: "The prophet always spoke first to his own time." They had "times," then! From the illimitable futures over which, as we had been taught, the prophet's word roved in search of its vague end—from the interminable doctrinal controversies about the fulfilment of prophecy—our thoughts were drawn in to a definite bit of real life. We saw a man with a message to the men about him. These sprang up alive, eager, impassioned; and the whole tragedy of *one* at strife for God with his contemporaries stood out before us. There was no recapitulation of archæology, or history, or geography. Davidson created the prophet's world out of the prophet's soul. By a word, and sometimes by a still more significant gesture, he showed us what the prophet's eyes saw and what the prophet's heart felt round about himself, as he stood alone

with God's word in him, kindling every sense that he had, of body or of mind, to a glowing purity of vision. Of course, we were driven to read all we could find on the historical conditions of the periods in question. There was very much less than there is now. We had Strachey's *Jewish History and Politics*,[17] for its time a most useful book; and, above all, we had Ewald's *History of Israel*, the English translation of the prophetic period of which had just appeared. But, even from Ewald, we always came back to our own master. To our minds he, more clearly than any other, looked out of the prophet's eyes, and saw, not a historical reconstruction of the times, but just what the prophet saw, and what was needed to make us realize the prophet's message as an immediate word from God to the men of his own day. We remember best two lectures: one on Joel, whom Davidson at that time, with most critics, assigned to the eighth century, and one on Amos.[18] He contrasted the town and the country prophet. But this contrast was only the ground on which living men spoke to living men of the living God. It is very difficult to understand how this method of interpretation (now generally adopted), of expounding first of all what a prophet meant for his own day, can be conceived by anybody (as it sometimes is conceived) to be destructive of the ultimate religious worth of prophecy, or as rendering us incapable of feeling that those ancient voices spake also to ourselves *on whom the ends of the world have come*. For, under Davidson, we felt ourselves beside those to whom the prophet spoke. We were they. *Our* consciences were stirred, *our* faith was fed, *our* day was explained to us. Davidson stimulated our personal religion and inspired us to become preachers.

All this is on the line of the statement made previously, that Davidson's interest in the Old Testament was engrossed by its great personalities. It was from inside these that he surveyed and used the history. This was not for lack of expertness in other departments of Old Testament science. As everybody

[17] The second edition had recently been published.

[18] These lectures had already been published in *The Family Treasury*. They were first delivered in 1863.

knows, his mastery of the text and of its criticism was perfect.[19] His reviews, in the *Theological Review*, of all manner of books upon Semitic origins, episodes of Jewish history, the influence on Israel of other nations, Hebrew philology, and phases of Jewish thought, show that he kept abreast of the rapid increase of Old Testament literature. What is less known is his familiarity with archæology. Yet he has strewn proof of this along almost all his career, from his article in the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review* for 1871 on the Moabite stone and the work of the Palestine Exploration Fund in Jerusalem, to his Ezekiel. A few years ago I had occasion to discuss with him the book of Nehemiah on the topography of Jerusalem, and I was astonished at his mastery of the intricate data.[20] On all such subjects — historical, archæological, geographical — he could have lectured as fully as many specialists. But he used only so much of his knowledge as was necessary to illustrate the experience or the message of the individual souls, the interpretation of whom excited his highest powers. As so many of his students have lately testified, his lectures on these were fascinating. We laid down our pens and ceased taking notes, to follow, with breathless interest, his account of the story of Jacob, or of Saul, or of Elijah and the prophets. Sometimes he made his studies of the latter more general. A great attraction to his mind was the prophetic psychology: what the visions of the prophets amounted to, and in what subjective states the possession of the Word of the Lord consisted. To such phenomena — whether normal or morbid — he returned again and again; and made excursions into the New Testament to examine the phases of "prophecy" described by Paul in the Corinthian church. It is an obscure atmosphere, and he of all men was least tempted to speak dogmatically about it. Yet one would fain hope that, among his papers, lectures on the subject may be found to complete the relevant fragments which he has already published.

Davidson's interest, however, was never exhausted by the

[19] He was one of the most influential of the Old Testament Revision Committee which issued the English Revised Version.

[20] Compare also his introduction to Nahum, in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools*.

subjective phenomena of Israel's religion. Their objective origin and goal was to him the fundamental and supreme duty of the expositor. He once said to me that "the prophets were terribly one-idea'd men"—the idea being that "Jehovah had done or was going to do something;" and he frequently asserted that the message of the whole Old Testament might be summed in one word—God. There any skepticism he had stopped short. In concluding a review of a field on which his temper was perhaps most at home—the book of Ecclesiastes—he uses the following words:[21] "God and his moral rule, however obscure its incidence may be, and the moral life of man, are sure. When our Lord said, 'God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit,' he not only stated a necessity, he gave a definition. The human spirit is an ethical subject, and has fellowship with God, in whose image it is made. And this fellowship is independent of outward circumstances. But, though in moments of lofty faith the Hebrew saints attained to this feeling, *nevertheless I am continually with thee*, they could not sustain themselves in it. But he who has this fellowship no longer feels that God is outside of him, crushing his spirit with iron fetters; he is with God at the center of the universe, and can say to himself, 'All things are yours.' He has already all things under his feet." To Davidson the value of the Old Testament lay in its many exemplifications of this fellowship. Prophecy was a revelation; he really never treated it in any other aspect; and he was loyal to his belief in ways that few know. For instance, because he considered—whether rightly we need not now inquire—that the terms of Lord Gifford's will excluded revealed religion, he refused the honor of the Gifford lectureship at St. Andrews.[22] He would not interpret the religion of Israel except as revealed. The divine pursuit in the Old Testament absorbed his heart. Past all formulas and con-

[21] *Theological Review*, Vol. III, p. 20.

[22] Lord Gifford, one of the judges of the supreme court in Scotland, left funds to endow a lectureship in natural theology at each of the four Scottish universities. The lectureship is given for two years, and is worth from £400 to £500 a year. Among others, Max Müller, Edward and John Caird, Pfleiderer, Fairbairn, Sayce, Professors Royce and James of Harvard, have been Gifford lecturers.

ventions, past dogmatic faith and experimental doubt, his aim was to reach the living God. And thither he led his students also. A more powerful guide to God few of us have known.

It must not be supposed, however, from what has been said of the personal foci on which his mind concentrated, that he made no attempt to collect and to grade the general doctrines of the Old Testament. His students in the seventies remember two courses of lectures—on "The Doctrine of Sin," in which he made some answer to the late Principal Tulloch; and on "The Teaching of the Old Testament upon the Future Life." Besides a few scattered paragraphs in his reviews, and his introduction to Ezekiel, there are his articles on "God in the Old Testament," and "Prophecy and Prophets," contributed to Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible;* and we are waiting with expectation to know whether he left ready for the press any part of that Old Testament theology which he was preparing.

Another of our master's charms was his poetic feeling. That so good a schoolmaster, so exact a grammarian, had also the poet's mind is a surprising fact, considering the rarity of the combination. Strangers to him will understand how it added to our enthusiasm. Those who were under him from 1875 to 1877 had a peculiar opportunity for feeling it. In one of these years he organized a voluntary class in preparation for the Semitic fellowship, which Dr. John Mure opened to the Scottish graduates.[93] The subjects set were Syriac, a number of Old Testament books in Hebrew, and Renan's *General History of the Semitic Languages*. Davidson took us for Syriac grammar and translation on Friday afternoons at his house, and from 9 to 10 two other days of the week on Canticles and Ecclesiastes. Apart from his lectures on Jacob, Saul, Elijah, and the prophets, I think we had him at his best in these poetical readings. The sun surely did not shine every morning of that Edinburgh winter, and Davidson's room lay in the shadow of other buildings. Yet I am unable to think of that room, when we eight or ten gathered to read Hebrew poetry with him, except as filled with sunshine. Those were the most radiant hours of all our

[93] It was of the annual value of £100. It did much to extend Semitic studies in Scotland, and during its continuance was nearly always won by a pupil of Davidson.

student years; and to this day we cannot open certain pages of our Hebrew Bibles without that face above the desk being visible over them, and that sunshine falling athwart the verses. The uncouthness of the oriental language was for us, once for all, dissolved. We were in the heart of a great literature and a great life. To the interpretation of Canticles he brought not only the fragrance of the Syrian spring—I affirm I felt the magic as much in that Edinburgh class-room as afterward on Esdraelon itself—but the kindred airs of many other poetries, both of East and West; while he let his skepticism and his humor play full upon Ecclesiastes. "Our hearts remember how!"

I have not contributed to these pages anything of his humor.[24] The recent notices of him have given the public a number of sayings more or less authentic; but such a "spate" of them utterly misrepresents the fine reserve and rare aptness with which he used his wit. Nothing, perhaps, was more significant of his mastery of his subject than the fashion in which these easy, unpremeditated, unexpected, never-repeated odds and ends of humor flashed out on us; while nothing more firmly proved the possession he had of our minds than our acceptance, without resentment or rankling, of his caustic and pitiless criticisms. He sometimes drew blood, but the wound was for good—clean, sharp, and washed with humor. We felt even a paradoxical sense of honor when some of our suggestions drew the same scorn as we saw him pour on certain theories identified with venerable names. His contributions to the *Theological Review* show how he never hesitated to turn his rapier, on just occasion, against the greatest of contemporary scholars; but on the printed page one misses the curious blush that flushed his face so often as he let his scorn break out in a lecture. Once this was over he was as before, the same shy scholar, eager to draw his pupils' opinions, and respectful to the views of the humblest interpreter of Scripture. You thought you had caught at last the real, imperious spirit of the man, but it escaped you. In this, too, he was elusive.

To return to ourselves—work that was honest, however poor,

[24] For instances see an article by the late PROFESSOR BRUCE in the BIBLICAL WORLD for 1896.

he never blamed; but no man dared in his class to be slovenly, or florid, or pretentious, more than once. His moral, like his intellectual, discipline was very severe.

Dr. Davidson was as great a preacher as he was a teacher. He preached seldom, and only in obscure little churches. Whenever we got the clue, we students went to hear him. It is said that he had not more than twelve or fifteen sermons—"Jacob," "Saul," "Elijah," "Psalm 51" and other psalms, "The Rich Young Ruler," "*It is Finished*," some leading verses in Romans (especially the argument in the ninth chapter), and some passages in Revelation. It is twenty years since I heard him, but I remember these texts and the general bearing and emphasis of each sermon. He read; very quietly, but occasionally grew impassioned, and then his voice rose shrill on the Aberdeen accent. To hear him was a profound religious experience.[25]

His prayers, both in the pulpit and at his desk in opening his class, his students never can forget. They were expressed in very simple language, full of Bible phrases; but you felt that a great, meek, wistful soul was speaking with God, and he drew you near to God.

It is my fault if these recollections of Dr. Davidson's teaching do not make it clear why so many of his students so easily dropped the older views of prophecy and of the Bible in which they had been brought up. When the new way was opened to us by such a man, is it wonderful that our passage should be so easy; that so trenchant and so radiant a personal influence should exceed all the force of orthodox tradition; or that so religious an inspiration should render harmless to our faith the rupture with habits of mind formed by associations so many and so sacred? It was, in truth, one man against an ancient and an honored system; and the fact that his students so easily and so painlessly left the latter is the final proof of the greatness of his qualities, of the confidence he bred in us, of the strength of his intellectual discipline, of the charm and wealth of his instruction, of the soundness and infectiveness of his piety. He never attacked the older views. He had neither scorn nor impatience for them. He thought that others spoke "with unnecessary

[25] The sermon on "Jacob" is published in the *Expositor* for March, 1902.

force of past methods of handling and conceiving of Scripture as 'uncritical and irrational.'" He compared these methods with God's wise accommodation of his revelation to men, as in different ages and with different conditions they needed it and were able to receive it. "Has not," he asked, "the same wise providence that dispensed the revelation presided in some sense also over the interpretation of it? Do not the age and the method always harmonize? Would a former time have been able to 'receive' the methods of the present one?" A critic "may urge the living to gird up their loins to what he considers their new and great task, but he may silently leave the dead to bury their dead."[26]

IV. LAST YEARS.

There is little need to linger on the later years. Successive generations of students proved what their predecessors discovered. Nothing new emerged, except that they gave him the singularly infelicitous name of Rabbi. No borrowed title, this least of all, suited one who was so different from all his kind. Being just himself, his own simple name "Davidson" was, and is, the best to call him by. His fame and influence constantly increased. After the death of Robertson Smith, he was the one man who represented the Semitic scholarship of Scotland to other schools and countries. Honors fell thick upon him. He had been a member of the Old Testament Revision Committee. He was the first scholar outside the Church of England to contribute to the *Cambridge Bible for Schools*. No general work in his own department has been begun in Great Britain in recent years without his advice, and almost none carried out without his help or inspiration. Our greatest biblical scholars have almost unanimously looked up to him as one greater than themselves. I have heard (outside his own pupils) Driver, Sanday, Ryle, Gore, James Robertson, Flint, Hastie, Kennedy, Briggs, Francis Brown, and many others praise him in superlatives. Had he gone to America he would have taken you by storm; there was no man on this side whom Drummond, or Stalker, or myself, was oftener questioned about.

[26] *Theological Review*, Vol. III, p. 63. Then follow some wise remarks on the relation of preaching to criticism.

Of university honors he had (besides the degrees of doctor of divinity and doctor of laws in his earlier years, and the offer of the Gifford lectureship already mentioned) the rank of doctor of letters in Cambridge University, and that of doctor of divinity from Glasgow at its fourth centenary in 1901, when he received it, to his great satisfaction, along with Briggs, Francis Brown, Cheyne, and Driver.

Age enhanced, if possible, his lovableness, but did not diminish the features already described as so paradoxical in his character. He remained to the end as solitary and as elusive. One might spend ten years asking him to preach: he was always coming and he never came. He avoided the moderator's chair to which his church called him. On one or two occasions on which he appeared in public he spoke as if all his professional work had been vain, except for the love it had gained him from his students. For years two of what would have been his greatest works were advertised, but he died without completing them. Nor did he grow more fixed about the things he had always held in solution. In one of his reviews he seems to hint that, if a scholar does grow more certain in his opinions, he becomes less able to stimulate the mind of others.[27] He quotes with sympathy the views of more positive scholars, that the new criticism can be brought into the sphere of Christian thought and made serviceable to Christian life; that to do this is "to disarm the giant and dedicate his weapons to the house of our God; we may find, when a new pinch comes, that we can use his sword, and that 'there is none like it.'"[28] Yet he committed himself to few of the new positions and was always careful to present them to the minds of his students in equal balance with the old. These things were more or less indifferent to him. His heart was below them in fellowship with God through the revealed word; and this, won as we saw through struggle in his youth, and sustained through all the critical movement which coincided with his career as a teacher, was his chief influence and his highest example to his generation.

[27] *Theological Review*, Vol. III, p. 117. [28] *Ibid.*, pp. 62, 63.

A PROPOSAL FOR A GRADED BIBLE SCHOOL.

By Rev. W. F. McMillen,
Chicago.

A widespread conviction that something more should be done to meet the recognized need of a graded course of study in Sunday schools led to the appointment of a committee by the Illinois State Association of Congregational Churches at its annual meeting in May, 1900. A year later, 1901, the committee submitted a sixteen-page printed report, incorporating as closely as was deemed practicable the principles and methods suggested by the new pedagogy, the new psychology, and the new Bible study. In applying these principles, two points of interest were kept prominently in mind: the selection of lessons adapted to pupils of different ages, thus giving a wider range of study; and the method of presenting the lessons.

The report, which is called "The Graded Bible School," provides for six grades or departments of the school:

1. *The cradle roll.*— For children below kindergarten age, not yet old enough to attend the school.

2. *The kindergarten.*— For children under seven years of age, who do not yet go to the public schools. Kindergarten methods are used in topical instruction, Bible object-lessons, and nature studies. For this work there are excellent books of lessons and of general direction.

3. *The graded Bible school.*— In the main school twelve grades are arranged, corresponding to those in the public school, containing children from seven to eighteen years of age, inclusive. These twelve grades are grouped into three departments:

(1) Primary. First to fourth grades. Bible stories and Bible truths, preferably from the New Testament, in the first and second grades (pupils seven and eight years of age); and Bible stories from the Old Testament in the third and fourth grades (pupils nine and ten years of age). Special emphasis is laid upon committing to memory verses and passages of Scripture. Object-lessons and nature lessons are also to be used. Here also there are first-class series of lessons already available.

(2) Junior or Intermediate. Fifth to eighth grades. In the fifth and sixth grades (pupils eleven and twelve years of age) the life of Christ is to be studied connectedly. In the seventh and eighth grades (pupils thirteen and fourteen years of age) the history of the early Christian church and the life of Paul are to be studied. Christian biography and Christian missions are also introduced in these grades as supplemental work.

A New Testament is given to each pupil in this department to be used in his study. Of suitable text-books for these grades there is a lack. The Bible Study Union Lessons may be employed, and there are good books on the life of Christ and the life of Paul which can be used as text-books.

The school year of study is made to correspond with that of the public schools, beginning in the autumn and ending in the spring. The summer is given to special subjects of study, supplemental to that of the regular school year. This admits of the absences or vacation often necessary during the summer months, without breaking up the continuity of the year's instruction.

(3) Senior. Ninth to twelfth grades. This is the "decision period" of the young life, and the instruction is to be directed toward developing the individuality of the boy or girl into the religion and ethics of true Christian manhood and womanhood. The ninth and tenth grades (pupils fifteen and sixteen years of age) provide a connected study of Old Testament history and teaching. The eleventh grade (pupils seventeen years of age) provides a second study of the life of Christ and of the apostolic Christian history. The twelfth grade (pupils eighteen years of age) consists of a study of Christian beliefs and evidences, of the teachings of Jesus applied to everyday life, and of Christian duties and the church.

For these courses of study there are many good books which can be used as text-books, and not a few excellent series of lessons prepared.

4. *The adult Bible classes.*— The pupils should never be allowed to feel that the completion of the work in the graded Bible school means graduation, but only promotion to the Bible classes. In this department a large number of courses can be arranged, providing more extended and more thorough work in the history, teaching, and literature of the Bible, and also in church history, ethics, sociology, and theology.

5. *The normal course.*— The normal course is designed for those

graduates of the graded Bible school who desire to fit themselves to be teachers in the school. It consists of a review of the subjects taught in the graded Bible school, and of an adequate study of the principles and methods of religious pedagogy and Christian nurture.

6. *The home-study department.*— The aim of this department is to get parents to assist their children in studying their lessons, and to furnish instruction to those who are "shut in" so that they cannot attend the regular Bible school.

The committee which prepared the report just outlined was continued, and in May, 1902, a second report, also printed, was submitted and enthusiastically received. This was principally to show what progress had been made during the year. Brief reports of the work being done in ten schools showed a clear perception of the plan and a decided increase in interest. One of them says:

> Our method is to grade the lesson to fit the uniform life of developing children, instead of grading the school to fit a uniform Scripture lesson, diluted for the youngest, condensed for the oldest, and perhaps fitted for neither. A peculiar feature in the working out of the plan is our system of supervising teachers. This consists in having a leader for each grade. We retain the small group in the class, and the teacher moves from grade to grade with the class. The leader directs the teachers and meets the classes together about once a month for review and pre-view. We aim to have the leader a trained teacher and a specialist in the department. The pastor's classes, previously held on a weekday, have been made part of the school system. At the period when decision for Christ should be made, the pastor finds himself in weekly contact with all the youth of the best age to be influenced. This has given him a larger number of boys of high-school age in his class than he has ever succeeded in reaching before. The plan may be introduced most effectively with a few classes at a time, preferably beginning with the younger. The children will not then have been paralyzed by the notion that the Sunday school is not a school. They will be more ready to study and recite. We have tables at which the scholars sit, thus permitting the use of pen and ink, for notebooks, map work, etc. Doing work stimulates work. Our aim is to train the pupils in the Bible method of successful living, and our prayer is that each one in the school will intelligently choose the only sure guide, our Lord Jesus Christ, before he completes the course.

The committee offered further suggestions concerning methods of teaching, courses of study, and available text-books.

It is to be regretted that the recent International Sunday School Convention (held at Denver last June) went no farther than to adopt

a beginners' course, which had been recommended at the Boston convention in 1896. The rejection of the proposal of lessons for advanced classes was a serious mistake; there is already large demand for such; indeed, advanced courses of study are already being used by many schools.

But, however important the lessons, the emphasis placed upon the need of training for Bible-school teachers along the lines of the best educational methods is of special importance, and strikes to the heart of the Sunday-school problem of today. The new study of the Bible has placed within the easy reach of the teachers quantities of historical, geographical, and literary material. This has given a new impetus to the historical method of study, and the need of Bible study was never greater. Facts and materials are so abundant; yet it is said that popular ignorance of the Bible is on the increase. This is, no doubt, due primarily to the neglect of Bible instruction in the home, the day school, and the college; but it is also due, in large measure, to the fact that the teaching in Sunday schools is not up to date when compared with the modern educational methods used in the day school. The loss is very great when we consider what might be gained if up-to-date principles were applied to the study of the Bible as of other subjects; all classes of minds must be reached and held to the Sunday school and to Bible study, and so to the Christian life. Such study will not hinder, but will rather render far more helpful and powerful, the work of the Holy Spirit in the minds and hearts of both young and old. The kingdom is growing, never faster or better than now. The Bible will again be taught in the public schools; and Bible-school teachers will be specially trained for their work in the Sunday school.

It is very encouraging, and one of the most hopeful signs of our time, that in so many academies and colleges the study of the Bible is urged or required as a part of the regular course. This will greatly help Sunday-school instruction. Prominent educators connected with influential schools of learning, and men in other professions, have undertaken to advance this great movement, and the outlook is most encouraging for a mighty increase in the efficiency of Sunday-school teaching. The American Institute of Sacred Literature, directed by the Council of Seventy, has greatly quickened the popular study of the Bible, widened the sphere of knowledge, and improved Sunday-school teaching. And the BIBLICAL WORLD is exercising a conspicuous leadership in the increase of intelligence about the Bible, as well

as in securing a proper place for the Bible and for religion in the education of the young.

A number of the leading theological seminaries, both east and west, are planning courses of training for Sunday-school officers and teachers. Hartford Theological Seminary now awards the degree of bachelor of religious pedagogy to those who complete the prescribed course of study in this department. It is hoped that many theological students may avail themselves of these privileges, thus preparing themselves to become teachers of teachers when they enter the actual work of the ministry. If, as Bishop Potter says, we need a teaching church, even more do we need a teaching ministry, and we shall not have the former till we have the latter. We cannot have trained teachers in large numbers till ministers are trained teachers and are willing to devote a fair share of their time and scholarship to training members of their churches to teach. Some have proved, others are proving, that this is both practicable and useful. One constantly hears ministers of both large and small churches say that the Sunday school is the most hopeful work of the church today, that it offers the greatest opportunity for the spread of truth and righteousness. Therefore everything possible should be done to make it as efficient as possible.

Notes and Opinions.

SHOULD THE BIBLE BE TAUGHT AS LITERATURE IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS?

This question has been recently brought forward in a prominent way by a statement made before the National Educational Association by President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University, New York, and by a resolution passed by that body advocating such instruction. The resolution reads:

It is apparent that familiarity with the English Bible, as a masterpiece of literature, is rapidly decreasing among the pupils of our schools. This is the direct result of a conception which regards the Bible as a theological book merely, and thereby leads to its exclusion from the schools of some states as a subject of reading and study. We hope and ask for such a change of public sentiment in this regard as will permit and encourage the English Bible, now honored by name in many schools, laws, and state constitutions, to be read and studied as a literary work of the highest and purest type side by side with the poetry and prose which it has inspired and in large part formed.

The statement made by President Butler was a portion of his longer address on "Problems of Education." He said, with regard to the restoration of the Bible to the public schools:

I want to call attention to a phenomenon which is so universal that we do do not notice it — paradoxical though that sounds — but which, if it is permitted to continue, will one day produce most startling results in our life and civilization. I refer to the fact that, owing to a series of causes operating over a considerable period of years, knowledge of the English Bible is passing out of the life of the rising generation; and with the knowledge of the Bible there is fast disappearing any acquaintance with the religious element which has shaped our civilization from the beginning. Not long ago President Thwing of Western Reserve University printed in the *Century Magazine* the results of an ingenious inquiry on this subject which he carried on among college students. His purpose was not to find out what they knew about theology or what they believed about religion. His purpose was to find out what they knew about the greatest work of English literature. Those of you who have read that paper will remember the astounding results that this inquiry revealed.

In what I now say about the English Bible I want to make myself clearly understood. I want to make this fundamental distinction clear: I am not

now talking about instruction in religion, important as many conceive that to be; I am not now talking about instruction in theology, important as some feel that to be; I am merely laying down this thesis: the neglect of the English Bible incapacitates the rising generation to read and appreciate the masterpieces of English literature, from Chaucer to Browning, and it strikes out of their consciousness one element, and for centuries the controlling element, in the production of your civilization and mine. I hold this to be true even if there were not one person living in the United States who subscribed to a single article of any Christian creed. I am speaking now about literature and life, not about religion or theology.

Teachers all over this land are trying to teach Chaucer and Spencer and Shakespeare, Tennyson and Browning. How are they to understand men who refer to the Bible, that veritable treasure-house of literature, on every page, if they cannot take children to the source from which the supply is drawn? How are they to discuss and interpret the style of Ruskin, of Carlyle, of Emerson? How are they to teach the history of the heroes of our own independence, many of whom were religious in every fiber of their being, and whose work will continue to bear the stamp put upon it at the beginning, utterly regardless of what has become of religious faith in the interval? How is one to teach the truth as history reveals it unless he teaches the whole truth? And yet, see what has happened: The quarreling of religious sects, of churches, each claiming this book for its own and denying the truth of what other persons found in it, has brought about a state of affairs in which the English Bible, a fountain of English literature, has been practically stricken from the reading of the American people. I contend that we are not only on the point of impoverishing life and literature by this neglect of the English Bible, but we have already impoverished life and literature. I am not dealing with a problem that lies in the future; I am speaking of a condition which is at hand. We are impoverishing life and literature by striking out of our life and our reading one great monument of our literary line, the source from which much of what is best in later centuries is drawn, the inspiration upon which the best English style has been built.

One of the resolutions passed by the International Sunday School Convention, held in Denver last June, speaks more briefly, but in the same direction:

WHEREAS, The Bible is not only the inspired word of God, but also the world's greatest treasury of literature, and its reading is now excluded from most of the public schools of America;

Resolved, That the Executive Committee is instructed to appoint a standing committee, whose duty it shall be to consider what means should be taken in the various states and provinces to secure the reading of the Bible without comment in the public schools of our land.

Dr. Washington Gladden, in his latest collection of addresses entitled

Social Salvation (pp. 173 f., 177 f.), also speaks of the need of Bible instruction in the public schools, even when viewed merely from a literary standpoint:

Whatever the moral and spiritual value of the Bible may be, there can be no question that it occupies a place in our literature which makes a fair knowledge of it essential to every educated man, no matter what his faith may be. The Bible is woven through all our literature; names, words, phrases borrowed from it, allusions to it, are found on almost every page; without a good knowledge of it much of what he reads will be unintelligible to the reader; familiarity with the Bible lights up with beautiful significance many a passage which would otherwise be enigmatical. There is no book in our language which has been used in this way one-hundredth part as much as has the Bible; and for the purposes of general intelligence it is therefore one hundred times as necessary that one should know the Bible as that he should any other book. This is the fact upon which educators ought to insist. I think that they are beginning to make their voices heard. We have now upon the stage a generation which has grown up without any instruction in the Bible in the public schools, and the depth and breadth of popular ignorance respecting the Bible is something astonishing.

It appears to me that something of this nature may yet be hoped for in connection with our public education, and that the subject is one which the Christian ministry ought to keep in sight. Whatever is done must be done with great prudence, and it must be evident that the interests in view are not those of dogmatism, but rather of general intelligence. We study Homer, the Bible of the old pagan Greeks, in our schools, with no objection; doubtless if anyone wanted to study the *Zendavesta*, the religious book of the old Persians, or the *Niebelungenlied*, the religious book of the Scandinavians, that would be thought innocent, if not laudable; but the proposition to study our own Bible, which, from every point of view — as literature, as history, as philosophy, as moral teaching — is infinitely more important than any or all of these, seems to fill the minds of some people with vague alarms. There seems to be no reason in this, and I hope that by and by we shall get ashamed of it, and bring the Bible back into our schools. To make it the basis of doctrinal teaching would be, of course, impossible; but we might have the occasional reverent reading of it; and we might, at least, teach the pupils to discern the beauty of its poetry and the glory of its eloquence and the uplifting power of its prophetic ideals.

Work and Workers.

THE museum and library of the Palestine Exploration Fund at Jerusalem have been removed from the rooms opposite the Tower of David to the Bishop's Buildings, near the Tombs of the Kings, where the use of a room has been provided for this purpose by the English bishop, Rev. Dr. Blyth.

THE pastor of the Westminster Church of Seattle, Wash., the Rev. Hugh W. Gilchrist, has been elected to the New Testament professorship at the San Francisco Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), to succeed Dr. J. H. Kerr, who recently became publication secretary of the American Tract Society at New York.

THE chair of Hebrew language and literature at Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill., recently made vacant by the resignation of Professor Charles Horswell, Ph.D., is to be occupied by Rev. F. P. Eislen, thirty years of age, who has been called from the pastorate of the Fifth Street Methodist Church of Philadelphia.

PROFESSOR GEORGE A. BARTON, PH.D., of the chair of biblical literature and Semitic languages at Bryn Mawr College, has been appointed director of the American School of Oriental Research for the year 1902–3, and is now upon the ground. He will have three young men pursuing study under him during the winter.

TWO LOCAL reports at Jerusalem concerning "Solomon's Quarries" were recently shown to be without foundation by Messrs. Macalister and Hornstein. The first report alleged that there was a deflection of the compass inside the cave; the second report was that an unexplored passage of great length led off from the cave at a certain point.

A GREEK inscription, now in the possession of Dr. Wright, of Nablûs, and dating from about the second century A. D., records the burial-place of a Christian woman as follows:

> The private tomb of the blessed Doxasia, daughter of Dora and Megalê, whose lives have closed. And [I adjure] the God of these bones, and the mystery of death, and the hour of judgment, that no one here tear either relic or bone out of me.

THE large relief map of Palestine, prepared some years ago by the acting secretary of the Palestine Exploration Fund, Mr. George Arm-

strong, has performed a most useful service, but is so expensive as to be beyond the reach of most Bible students. In order to give this important map a wider circulation, Mr. Armstrong has now prepared a similar map on a scale of one-half the former size. This will be framed and fully colored, and is promised at a moderate price.

THE American Standard Edition of the Revised Bible (Thomas Nelson & Sons, New York) is now published in a smaller form (bourgeois type) at $1. In leather binding and on rice paper the prices range up to $7. The fact that the American Edition has received the almost unanimous approval of all authorities for popular use makes it desirable that the work should be issued in small and cheap form, so that it may be within the reach of all. Then we should have the New Testament printed separately at a nominal price, as is now the case with the Authorized Version and the British Revised Version.

TWO IMPORTANT chairs at the Pacific Theological Seminary (Congregationalist) at Oakland, Calif., have recently been filled. Dr. T. Cowden Laughlin has been made professor of New Testament Greek and exegesis. He is thirty-three years of age and a graduate of Princeton College and Seminary, where for a time he has been instructor in biblical literature. The chair of Old Testament language and literature has been given to Professor William Frederic Bade, who is thirty-one years of age. For six years past he has occupied the chair of Hebrew literature and introduction at the Moravian College and Theological Seminary in Bethlehem, Pa.

THE action of the recent International Sunday School Convention in recommending the use of the American Standard Edition of the Revised Version, and urging that it be procurable through the American Bible Society, is greatly to be commended. The resolution adopted by the convention reads as follows:

WHEREAS, The leading American students of the Bible and publishers of Sunday-school lesson helps favor the use of the American Standard Edition of the Revised Bible; and

WHEREAS, The British and Foreign Bible Society has recently taken action to supply the English Revision of the Bible to those of its patrons who desire it; therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention memorialize the American Bible Society to take such action as will enable its patrons to secure the American Revised Bible from that society, if they so desire.

ONE of the needs of the present day is the creation of libraries of theological literature which can become available for the use of the

great mass of ministers whose salaries do not permit them to purchase the expensive array of new books in the theological field. These books, however, it is important for the minister to know, and how *he* can secure them for *his* use is the problem to be worked out. A beginning in this direction has been made by the General Theological Library of Boston, which was established in 1860, but of recent years has largely increased the number of its books and its facilities for their use. This library is located at 53 Mt. Vernon street, Boston, and contains some twenty thousand volumes. It is open to the use of members, of all clergymen, and of visiting strangers. It is furnishing, therefore, a local opportunity of great value. But its usefulness has been largely increased by a plan established last year by the directors, which provides that books may be drawn from this Boston library through local libraries in any outside New England towns, the local libraries being made distributing branches. Any minister in these towns can secure books from the library by mail for the simple cost of the postage necessary to send and return the books. And it is also arranged that, in case a clergyman has access to no public library, he may secure books personally direct from the Boston library. As a result, therefore, from now on there will be few in New England who will be without the opportunity to read the best books upon theology as they appear. It is also hoped that low rates of postage will be secured in the near future on library exchange, which will facilitate the circulation of the books. There can be no question that a great field lies before the libraries already established, and also before libraries which in the future may be established, for the carrying out of this kind of work. The ministers of the United States will appreciate the opportunity which is thus placed before them, and will avail themselves of it in greatly increasing numbers.

Book Reviews.

The Study of Religion. By PROFESSOR MORRIS JASTROW, JR., PH.D., University of Pennsylvania. [Contemporary Science series.] New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902. Pp. 451. $1.50.

This volume will be found refreshing and instructive by everyone interested in the study of religion. It has the feel of having been prepared by a student entirely conversant with the ins and outs of the various attempts during the last century to interpret religion as a world-phenomenon, and warmly in touch with recent developments in the study of religion as embodied in books, university and college courses, and museums. The author has the happy faculty of setting forth the picture in attractive style and in good perspective. There is sufficient organization to save the reader much detail that might have been burdensome in covering such a wide field. The book is not belabored with scholastic paraphernalia, yet shows on every page the result of careful study.

The volume consists of three parts—"General Aspects," "Special Aspects," and "Practical Aspects." Part I treats of the history of the study of religion, and contains a historical summary, together with a constructive statement, of the various attempts at classification, definition, and derivation of religion. The history of the study of religion is a concise résumé of the points of view of writers, not only recent and well known, like Max Müller, Tiele, Réville, and the philosophers from Herder and Lessing to Hegel and Pfleiderer, but also some English and French historians of religion of a century ago, whose researches, important as they have been, are likely to be unknown or forgotten. After reviewing critically, yet sympathetically, the score or more of schemes of classification of religions, the author, while recognizing the artificiality of any clean-cut divisions, proposes a fourfold classification corresponding to four stages of culture: (1) religions of savages, (2) religions of primitive culture, (3) religions of advanced culture, (4) religions which emphasize as an ideal the coextensiveness of religion with life.

The method of arriving at a constructive statement of the character and definition of religion is by analysis of various points of view and

setting one philosophy against another, rather than through the examination of the facts of religion. One feels, however, in the warmth of Professor Jastrow's hold on the subject, the effect of his minute study into the actual history of religions. One feels, too, the strong influence upon the author's conceptions of the conventional school of the historians and philologists who have contributed to the study of religion. In regard to the origin of religion the author's analysis leads him into closer agreement with Max Müller than with any other writer. "Briefly put, then, the origin of religion, so far as historical study can solve the problem, is to be sought in the bringing into play of man's power to obtain a perception of the Infinite through the impression which the multitudinous phenomena of the universe as a whole make upon him."

The second part of the volume further defines the character and place of religion by considering its relation to ethics, philosophy, mythology, psychology, history, and culture. The chief object in this discussion is, however, not the further definition of religion, but the determination of "the part proper to each of these in a sound application of the historical method."

Not less important and original than the first and second parts is the last division of the volume, which takes up the practical aspect of the study of religion. This is destined to render a valuable service to the study of religion, setting forth, as it does, with clearness and persuasion the necessary equipment of the student in the way of sympathy with the facts of religion, thoroughness, technique of the historical method, and right perspective of the field. It will help to discredit much of the work of certain anthropologists and sociologists who have generalized from insufficient data of historians of the older school, and of travelers and missionaries with biased opinions; it will also tend to establish the study of religion on a scientific basis. Written, as it is, when the interest in the study of religion is rapidly increasing; when it is pursued from so many standpoints — sociological, historical, philosophical, and psychological; when it is beginning to win respect and gain dignity through the use of right methods, the volume is a timely one, and is sure to exert a steadying influence on the study of religion throughout.

The status of the study of religion in colleges and universities, the outline of a program for a college course, the description of museums, and the classified bibliography will all be found valuable.

While having a wide scope, the volume has a distinct point of view

that gives it unity — the historical standpoint. Recognizing religion as a growing thing with a history, the author claims that the only right attitude of the student is to seek to follow the actual course of its development. "I take my stand," he says, "as an advocate of the historical method in the study of religion as the *conditio sine qua non* for any results of enduring character, no matter what the particular aspect of religion it be that engages our attention." The philosophy and the psychology of religion have validity only as based upon the history of religion. Their place in the curriculum is in the seminary and the university rather than in the college, or even after the university as individual research by mature scholars.

The average reader will find in this general attitude, which permeates the entire volume, a bit of personal bias to which he will take exception — a bias perfectly natural in one whose chief work has been historical. A fairer attitude would be to assume that the various aspects of the study — historical, philosophical, and psychological — must keep pace with and strengthen each other. Each within certain limits can establish and has established results of permanent value. The chief value of the historical method is that it can break through isolated facts and *see things in relationship.* Through these relationships it finds laws. It interprets facts and so "understands" them. The philosophy and psychology of religion likewise busy themselves with grouping, interrelating, and interpreting facts, though with slightly different technique. It matters little what perspective one has of the many-sided facts of experience, and one could hardly admit that the historians have a larger screen on which to project their data than the psychologist; although, with the already timewise arrangement of facts, a superficial glance would make it seem so.

The fascinating character of the growth process when viewed in the large, while widening our world and giving a tremendously greater hold on reality, has had its accompanying evils. It has caused an undue bias among historians, as well as evolutionists, for their own particular way of approaching the facts of experience. A result more serious is that there has been fostered a false reliance on the developmental series as constituting in itself an efficient and sole instrument for explaining things. The biologists have happily about outgrown their fallacy, and admit that evolution does not explain, but describes. The fallacy of the historians is of a different kind, but equally insidious, and apparently little appreciated. They assume that the objective, "scientific" handling of facts can translate thought movements; while,

on the contrary, the reading of thought history is essentially a matter of psychological interpretation, which should have the combined skill of both historian and psychologist at every point before the real facts are known or their true reading can be given. One finds the volume before us permeated with the idea, and in many respects weakened by it, that history is a sort of substance existing free in nature — a *Ding an sich* which can of itself show what have been the events and movements of religious history.

That is the attitude which makes it impossible for Dr. Jastrow to make a real advance, except in simplicity and cogency of statement, over the conventional historical treatment of the origin, definition, and meaning of religion. He determines the essential nature of religion in terms of the "feeling of dependence" of Schleiermacher, plus certain amplifications (though not the most essential ones) of philosophers and historical students of religion since his time. "Religion may be defined," the author says, "as the natural belief in a Power or Powers beyond our control and upon whom we feel ourselves dependent; which belief and feeling of dependence prompt (1) to organization, (2) to specific acts, and (3) to the regulation of conduct with a view to establishing favorable relations between ourselves and the Power or Powers in question." This is the formulation of the nature of religion made when philosophy was just beginning to feel its way into a relation with science, and when an evolutionary psychology did not exist. It is essentially the formulation that would doubtless be kept, were the mistaken reverence for the self-sufficiency of the historical method shared by all, and did not the fuller grasp of the content of religion which the psychology of religion reaches, cause a new reading of the meaning of the facts of its history. The psychology of religion has been putting us in a position to see that such a definition, while giving a true description of the religious impulse as far as it goes, leaves out of consideration one of the great sources — if not the central spring — of the impulse in question.

Religion is essentially a means of self-expression. It has for its background a large number of instinctive endowments — fear, love, self-preservation, self-enlargement, sociality, etc. — out of which, by a process which Ribot and James have described, the religious instinct has grown, and by which it is fed. Chief among these instincts is, doubtless, *self-expression*, the outgrowth of the primal life-phenomenon — a set of physiological reactions — which by evolution, describable in the various phases of its development in terms of Spencer's "surplus

energy," Baldwin's "excess of discharge," and Groos's "pleasure in being a cause," becomes the great source of the various forms of religious expression. In this respect it is analogous, as regards origin of content, to the art impulse.

Without this consideration, many of the essential characters of religion, while describable in the conventional way, must remain, as heretofore, inadequately understood. In this point of view one appreciates the singing, music, ritual, genuflections, shouting, emotionalism, phallicism, religious dances, propagandism, mysticism, the building of theologies, and the like, all of which, in higher or lower forms, are means essentially of religious activity; and as avenues of spiritual expression they have their reason for being. To define religion in terms of a belief in and sense of dependence on a higher Power or Powers is the outgrowth of a rational psychology which does not take cognizance of what experimental psychology has shown to be true — that beliefs and the higher rational emotions are epiphenomena instead of fundamental mental processes, and that the God-idea or beliefs of any kind are of relatively minor consideration to the individual in his religious growth. One can *describe* it all in terms of theistic conceptions and feelings of relation, but that is not the most fundamental thing. More vital is the point of view of Marshall in his *Instinct and Reason*. He reaches his definition of religion as a "regulative instinct" almost solely through a study of biological and social evolution, and derives the God-idea as a by-product.

A recognition of religion as a means of self-expression would have led Dr. Jastrow to sympathize with Hegel's philosophical construction of religion as in essence freedom and liberty, or with the still fuller definition of it given by Pfleiderer, Biedermann, and Lipsius, in terms of freedom *and* dependence — important developments which the author seems to have overlooked.

But recent psychology furnishes the basis for appreciating the significance of these improvements upon the Schleiermacher definition. Instead of being at bottom a belief in or sense of dependence upon a higher Power or Powers, religion is spontaneous rationalized will, which seeks adequate objects to which to attach itself and proper means through which it may find expression. The Power or Powers come into religion as incidents, although, to be sure, indispensable ones. They result in part from man's "faculty of faith" and "perception of the Infinite," in part from his instinct of sociality, as Guyau has pointed out, by which the heavens are peopled by personalities; but

more especially because the only fitting objects to which the religious instinct may attach itself are found in the personal constructs of the relatively changeless realm of supersensuous experience.

Let it be clear that stress is not laid on this point because the question of the origin and definition of religion is the gist of the volume. The emphasis upon it is to show the fallacy in a fundamental conception of the work, and one upon which the author is insistent, that the historical method is alone the proper means of approach to the study of religion. This point of view brings into the book other distortions than the one specifically examined above, of which it is a fitting illustration. The historical method is essentially a method — an instrument, and a most valuable one. But the interpretation of history is a psychological process, and it is not a different process when directed, checked, and stimulated by facts which are historical, than when dealing with those which are biological or physiological or sociological. Granting that the historical method is able to bring to light an indefinite number of facts of religion, they give no hint of the course of the development of religion. The essential thing is to control them so that they may be manipulated and questioned. Even the use of original documents, together with the help of philology, has no power of itself to "penetrate to the core of religion;" and one is surprised to find the author sharing in Max Müller's superstition for language as the infallible record of the thought life of a people, after Müller's ample illustration of the fact that the philologist, except in so far as he is equipped with critical insight, is as apt to interpret the changes and shades of meaning wrongly as rightly. Professor Kittredge, in the June number of *Harper's Monthly*, has shown clearly the futility of the notion of etymology "as the science of true meanings." It will be fortunate for the growth of science when we come to see that all departments of knowledge must grow together, and that no one of them can fairly be regarded as the sole and absolutely necessary prerequisite for the others.

Let it be clear, too, that the error of this fundamental assumption to which we have taken exception does not mar the value of the volume in most respects. It is beyond question a work of unusual comprehensiveness, unity, clearness, and erudition — a refreshing and timely volume.

EDWIN D. STARBUCK.

LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY,
Palo Alto, Calif.

A Short History of the Hebrews to the Roman Period. By Rev. R. L. Ottley. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1901. Pp. ix + 324. $1.25.

The above work is intended to serve as a text-book for students of Hebrew history. The more important results of modern historical science as applied to the documents of the Old Testament are accepted and made the basis of the work. The point of view is similar to that of Kittel and other scholars of the mediating school; for example, the personality of the patriarchs Abraham and Jacob is held to, but the sons of Jacob are treated as tribal personifications. No allusion is made to Winckler's Muçri, nor to the reconstruction of post-exilic history offered by Kosters, Cheyne, and others. The tone of the work is dogmatic rather than such as to encourage and stimulate investigation. The author is not always sufficiently rigorous and consistent in historical method; in the story of the wilderness wanderings and the events at Sinai, for instance, no attempt is made to distinguish between the historical and the legendary. The treatment of the miraculous element in the narrative is somewhat arbitrary, the accounts being sometimes accepted at their face value, as, *e. g.*, in the case of the story of the crossing of the Jordan (p. 84); while at other times the miraculous features are discredited and explained away, as, *e. g.*, in the case of the falling of the walls of Jericho (p. 85). Reference should be made on p. 169 to Marti's[1] proposed rendering of l. 8 of the Moabite stone which removes the discrepancy as to dates that exists between this monument and 2 Kings 1 : 1 on the basis of the usual rendering. To the list of books on pp. 313 f. the works of McCurdy and Kent should certainly be added.

As an attempt to furnish younger students with a positive, constructive statement of "the actual course of Hebrew history, somewhat more consistent with the present state of our knowledge than the text-books now in use" (p. vii), the book is worthy of much praise and may be numbered among the two or three books of this class that are reasonably safe guides. The excellent maps which illustrate the text are an admirable feature, as are also the appendices on "The Documentary Sources of the Narrative" and "Hebrew Legislation."

John M. P. Smith.

The University of Chicago.

[1] *Encyclopædia Biblica*, Vol. I, col. 792, note.

Current Literature.

[Books marked with an asterisk (*) will be reviewed in subsequent issues.]

OLD TESTAMENT.

BOOKS.

*Harper, Andrew. The Song of Solomon. [Cambridge Bible.] New York: The Macmillan Co., 1902. Pp. 147. $0.50, *net*.

Boehmer, Julius. Der alttestamentliche Unterbau des Reiches Gottes. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902. Pp. 236. M. 4.50.

Torge, Paul. Aschera und Astarte. Ein Beitrag zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902. Pp. 60. M. 2.

ARTICLES.

Sayce, A. H. The Decipherment of the Hittite Inscriptions. *Expository Times*, August, 1902, pp. 490–92.

Brooke, A. E., and McLean, N. The Forthcoming Cambridge Septuagint. *Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1902, pp. 601–21.

It was announced, in connection with the publication of Dr. Swete's manual edition of the *Old Testament in Greek* (1887–94), that a large edition of the same work, containing a complete text-critical apparatus for the Septuagint, was in course of preparation. This extensive work is in the hands of the two Cambridge scholars here mentioned, Messrs. Brooke and McLean, who now state that they hope to begin within a few months the printing of these important volumes. They therefore print here two specimens of text and apparatus, the passages being Gen. 48: 1–9 and Judg. 5: 23 — 6: 24, with the request that they may receive from students of the Septuagint as many criticisms and suggestions as possible for the perfection of the work.

Curtiss, S. I. Discoveries of a Vicarious Element in Primitive Semitic Sacrifice. *Expositor*, August, 1902, pp. 128–34.

Professor Curtiss, of the Chicago Theological Seminary, believes that he has found among the people of Palestine today such remains of the primitive Semitic religion as disprove W. Robertson Smith's hypothesis that the earliest form of sacrifice was the "sacrificial meal." Rather, the vicarious element in sacrifice goes back to the earliest times. It is certain from a great number of examples gathered from all parts of the country that slaughtering was the original form of sacrifice, and that the meal which follows is merely incidental. It is also clear that the life taken is more or less in place of another: the victim dies that man or animal may live; this idea seems to run through every kind of sacrifice where animal life is surrendered. Nor is it less certain that the Bedouins have received from the cradle of the Semitic race the custom of shedding substitute blood; nor is it less true that such vicarious sacrifices, which are counter to the spirit of Christianity and Islam, have had power, in connection with other primitive institutions, to maintain themselves to the present time.

OESTERLEY, W. O. E. The Development of Monotheism in Israel. *Expositor*, August, 1902, pp. 98–105.

The history of monotheism, as portrayed in the Old Testament, shows very distinctly that the belief in One God was the ultimate outcome of an evolutionary process. This fact is now almost universally recognized, the question under discussion being as to who first grasped the idea and promulgated it. Some would say, Abraham; but the picture of Abraham as presented in the Old Testament is not sufficiently definite to permit of the theory that he was the originator of such a stupendous advance in the history of religion as is involved in monotheism. Others would say, Moses; but he was rather the leader and practical legislator of the nation, and evidence is wanting as to any high monotheistic ideas which could be attributed to him. At the same time, in Moses we reach a stage in that evolutionary process which ultimately resulted in pure monotheism; he played an important part in the evolution of religion. But it was not until the eighth century B. C., the period of the great "literary" prophets — Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah — that monotheism in the highest and truest sense became self-conscious and articulate in Israel. A great gulf divides Amos's conception of Jahwe from that of his predecessors, marking off a new era in men's thought of God, and constituting Amos one of the divinely chosen instruments of the progressive revelation of God to man.

NEW TESTAMENT.

BOOKS.

*FEINE, PAUL. Jesus Christus und Paulus. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902. Pp. 312. M. 7.

*HEINRICI, C. F. G. Das Urchristentum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902. Pp. 143. M. 3.

HORT, A. F. The Gospel according to St. Mark. The Greek Text, edited with Introduction and Notes for the Use of Schools. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1902. Pp. 202. $0.75, *net.*

BRANDES, F. H. Unser Herr Jesus Christus. I: Seine Person. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1892. Pp. 117. M. 2.40.

LAKE, K. Codex 1 of the Gospels, and its Allies. [Texts and Studies, VII, 3.] Cambridge: University Press, 1902. Pp. 277. 7s. 6d.

ARTICLES.

GARVIE, A. E. Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus. VII: The Surrender of Home. *Expositor*, August, 1902, pp. 106–16.

BOUSSET, W. Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien. *Theologische Rundschau*, August, 1902, pp. 307–16.

KENNEDY, H. A. A. Review of Wrede's "Das Messiasgeheimniss in den Evangelien." *Critical Review*, July, 1902, pp. 339–44.

CÖLLE, R. Zur Exegese und zur homiletischen Verwertung des Gleichnisses vom reichen Mann und armen Lazarus (Lk. 16: 19–31). *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, Heft 4, 1902, pp. 652–65.

Current Literature.

[Books marked with an asterisk (*) will be reviewed in subsequent issues.]

OLD TESTAMENT.

BOOKS.

*Harper, Andrew. The Song of Solomon. [Cambridge Bible.] New York: The Macmillan Co., 1902. Pp. 147. $0.50, *net*.

Boehmer, Julius. Der alttestamentliche Unterbau des Reiches Gottes. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902. Pp. 236. M. 4.50.

Torge, Paul. Aschera und Astarte. Ein Beitrag zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902. Pp. 60. M. 2.

ARTICLES.

Sayce, A. H. The Decipherment of the Hittite Inscriptions. *Expository Times*, August, 1902, pp. 490–92.

Brooke, A. E., and McLean, N. The Forthcoming Cambridge Septuagint. *Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1902, pp. 601–21.

It was announced, in connection with the publication of Dr. Swete's manual edition of the *Old Testament in Greek* (1887–94), that a large edition of the same work, containing a complete text-critical apparatus for the Septuagint, was in course of preparation. This extensive work is in the hands of the two Cambridge scholars here mentioned, Messrs. Brooke and McLean, who now state that they hope to begin within a few months the printing of these important volumes. They therefore print here two specimens of text and apparatus, the passages being Gen. 48: 1–9 and Judg. 5: 23—6: 24, with the request that they may receive from students of the Septuagint as many criticisms and suggestions as possible for the perfection of the work.

Curtiss, S. I. Discoveries of a Vicarious Element in Primitive Semitic Sacrifice. *Expositor*, August, 1902, pp. 128–34.

Professor Curtiss, of the Chicago Theological Seminary, believes that he has found among the people of Palestine today such remains of the primitive Semitic religion as disprove W. Robertson Smith's hypothesis that the earliest form of sacrifice was the "sacrificial meal." Rather, the vicarious element in sacrifice goes back to the earliest times. It is certain from a great number of examples gathered from all parts of the country that slaughtering was the original form of sacrifice, and that the meal which follows is merely incidental. It is also clear that the life taken is more or less in place of another: the victim dies that man or animal may live; this idea seems to run through every kind of sacrifice where animal life is surrendered. Nor is it less certain that the Bedouins have received from the cradle of the Semitic race the custom of shedding substitute blood; nor is it less true that such vicarious sacrifices, which are counter to the spirit of Christianity and Islam, have had power, in connection with other primitive institutions, to maintain themselves to the present time.

OESTERLEY, W. O. E. The Development of Monotheism in Israel. *Expositor*, August, 1902, pp. 98–105.

The history of monotheism, as portrayed in the Old Testament, shows very distinctly that the belief in One God was the ultimate outcome of an evolutionary process. This fact is now almost universally recognized, the question under discussion being as to who first grasped the idea and promulgated it. Some would say, Abraham; but the picture of Abraham as presented in the Old Testament is not sufficiently definite to permit of the theory that he was the originator of such a stupendous advance in the history of religion as is involved in monotheism. Others would say, Moses; but he was rather the leader and practical legislator of the nation, and evidence is wanting as to any high monotheistic ideas which could be attributed to him. At the same time, in Moses we reach a stage in that evolutionary process which ultimately resulted in pure monotheism; he played an important part in the evolution of religion. But it was not until the eighth century B. C., the period of the great "literary" prophets — Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah — that monotheism in the highest and truest sense became self-conscious and articulate in Israel. A great gulf divides Amos's conception of Jahwe from that of his predecessors, marking off a new era in men's thought of God, and constituting Amos one of the divinely chosen instruments of the progressive revelation of God to man.

NEW TESTAMENT.

BOOKS.

*FEINE, PAUL. Jesus Christus und Paulus. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902. Pp. 312. M. 7.

*HEINRICI, C. F. G. Das Urchristentum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902. Pp. 143. M. 3.

HORT, A. F. The Gospel according to St. Mark. The Greek Text, edited with Introduction and Notes for the Use of Schools. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1902. Pp. 202. $0.75, *net.*

BRANDES, F. H. Unser Herr Jesus Christus. I: Seine Person. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1892. Pp. 117. M. 2.40.

LAKE, K. Codex 1 of the Gospels, and its Allies. [Texts and Studies, VII, 3.] Cambridge: University Press, 1902. Pp. 277. 7s. 6d.

ARTICLES.

GARVIE, A. E. Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus. VII: The Surrender of Home. *Expositor*, August, 1902, pp. 106–16.

BOUSSET, W. Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien. *Theologische Rundschau*, August, 1902, pp. 307–16.

KENNEDY, H. A. A. Review of Wrede's "Das Messiasgeheimniss in den Evangelien." *Critical Review*, July, 1902, pp. 339–44.

CÖLLE, R. Zur Exegese und zur homiletischen Verwertung des Gleichnisses vom reichen Mann und armen Lazarus (Lk. 16: 19–31). *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, Heft 4, 1902, pp. 652–65.

NESTLE, EB. Matt. 27: 51 und Parallelen; Der ungenähte Rock Jesu und der bunte Rock Josefs; Die unverfälschte köstliche Narde; Bethesda. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Heft 2, 1902, pp. 167–72.

HORN, P. Der Kampf um die leibliche Auferstehung des Herrn (Schluss). *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, Heft 7, 1902, pp. 546–65.

ADENEY, W. F. Did St. John Ever Live at Ephesus? *London Quarterly Review*, July, 1902, pp. 75–96.

This question is the first of the whole Johannine problem, for if the apostle John never lived at Ephesus, he cannot have been the author of any of the New Testament books which bear his name, since they had their origin in Asia Minor. Dr. Adeney sets himself to refute the arguments against the Ephesian residence of John which have lately been advanced by Schmiedel, Moffatt, and Bacon. The refutation consists mainly of putting another interpretation upon the patristic testimony, and upon the slight indications of the New Testament upon the subject. He acknowledges much strength in the view he is opposing, but thinks there is greater probability in his reading of the facts; and here he finds himself in the company of the great majority of scholars.

HORT, The late F. J. A. Εὐχαριστία, εὐχαριστεῖν. *Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1902, pp. 594–8.

MOULTON, J. H. "It Is His Angel." *Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1902, pp. 514–27.

Regarding this statement about Peter in Acts 12: 15, the writer thinks that the term "angel" has here a different meaning from that which it commonly bears. Instead of signifying, as usually, a heavenly messenger who has assumed human form, the angel of this passage — and of Matt. 18: 10, he also thinks — is a representative of the human being, dwelling in the heavenly world. These "representative angels" are spiritual counterparts of human individuals or communities, dwelling in heaven, but subject to changes depending upon the good or evil behavior of their complementary beings on earth. This idea came into Judaism from Parsism, where the Zoroastrian *Fravashis* supply exactly the original hint for this later Jewish conception.

BERNARD, T. D. Caesarea: An Expository Study of Acts, chap. 10. *Expository Times*, August, September, 1902, pp. 487–90, 558–61.

RAMSAY, W. M. St. Paul. *Expositor*, August, 1902, pp. 81–92.

That Paul was in many ways the ablest and the greatest, the most creative mind, the boldest originator, the most skilful organizer and administrator, the most impressive and outstanding personage in the whole apostolic circle, is recognized by most people. But it is true also that there is a fascination of Paul's personality; he lies closer to the heart of the great mass of readers than any other apostle; and the reason for this is that he impresses us as the most purely and intensely human of them all. He is the typical, the representative man, who attains in moments of higher vision and inspiration to behold the truth, to commune with the divine nature; he has, too, far more of such visions than other men. But one feels that with Paul the vision lasted no long time, and then he was once more on the level of humanity. Throughout his life we have to study Paul in this spirit. He sees like a man. He sees one

side at a time. He emphasizes that — not indeed more than it deserves, but in a way that provokes misconception, because he expresses one side of the case, and leaves the audience to catch his meaning, to sympathize with his point of view, to supply for themselves the qualifications and the conditions and the reservations which are necessary in the concrete facts of actual life. He manifests a combination of qualities which made him representative of human nature at its best; intensely human in his undeniable faults, he shows a real nobility and loftiness of spirit in which every man recognizes his own best self.

WALKER, DAWSON. The South-Galatian Theory. *Expository Times*, August, 1902, pp. 511–14.

GREGG, J. A. F. The Commentary of Origen upon the Epistle to the Ephesians. Part III: Eph. 4:27—6:24. *Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1902, pp. 554–76.

BATE, H. N. Review of Bigg's "Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude." *Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1902, pp. 622–8.

FALCONER, R. A. Is Second Peter a Genuine Epistle to the Churches of Samaria? *Expositor*, June, July, August, September, 1902, pp. 459–72, 47–56, 117–27, 218–27.

The writer is of the opinion that the canonical Second Epistle of Peter was written by the apostle Peter, through an "interpreter" from Antioch, shortly before he went to Rome, and to the churches of Samaria.

RELATED SUBJECTS.

BOOKS.

STRONG, T. B. Historical Christianity the Religion of Human Life. London: Frowde, 1902. Pp. 98. 1s. 6d., *net.*

*COIT, STANTON. The Message of Man: A Book of Ethical Scriptures. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1902. Pp. 340. $0.75.

DICKINSON, EDWARD. Music in the History of the Western Church. With an Introduction on Religious Music among Primitive and Ancient Peoples. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902. Pp. 426. $2.50, *net.*

*FAIRBAIRN, A. M. The Philosophy of the Christian Religion. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1902. Pp. 583. $3.50, *net.*

COBB, SANFORD H. The Rise of Religious Liberty in America. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1902. Pp. 541. $4, *net.*

ARTICLES.

LOCKYER, T. F. The Bible in English. *London Quarterly Review*, July, 1902, pp. 119–39.

In the course of this article the writer praises the American Standard Edition of the Revised Version (Thomas Nelson & Sons, New York) by saying that it "probably fulfils the various conditions that must be realized in the ideal English Bible more nearly than any other existing work. It is a notable work, destined to become the accepted Bible of the majority of the Anglo-Saxon race; and we are tempted to wish

that it might be adopted as the one final Revised Version (for this century at least) of the English speaking world." This is much the best that has been said in Great Britain about our American Committee's edition, and will be well appreciated here.

MACALISTER, R. A. S. The History and Site of Gezer. *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement*, July, 1902, pp. 227–32. IDEM, Reports on Tombs, Inscriptions, Rock-Cuttings, etc. *Ibid.*, pp. 232–49.

GLAISHER, JAMES. Results of Meteorological Observations Taken at Jerusalem in the Year 1901. *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement*, July, 1902, pp. 250–55. IDEM, Results of Meteorological Observations Taken at Tiberias in the Year 1901. *Ibid.*, pp. 255–60.

GANNEAU, CLERMONT-. Archæological and Epigraphic Notes on Palestine. *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement*, July, 1902, pp. 260–82.

SCHUMACHER, G. Recent Discoveries Near Galilee. *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement*, July, 1902, pp. 301–4.

An interesting account of the important excavations at *K'hirbet* and *Tell Ta'annek* now being carried on by Professor Sellin, of the University of Vienna.

BURKITT, F. C. The Date of Codex Bezae. *Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1902, pp. 501–14.

Since Dr. Scrivener asserted it, Codex Bezae has been assigned by all scholars to the sixth century, almost without argument. But Mr. Burkitt, of the University of Cambridge, has arrived at the conclusion that it belongs to the fifth century. It was a Greek manuscript, accompanied by a Latin translation, and was for the use of some community in the West, where Latin was the vernacular, but the New Testament was read — at least sometimes in public — in the original Greek.

GIBSON, M. D. Four Remarkable Sinai Manuscripts. *Expository Times*, August, 1902, pp. 509–11.

BURN, A. E. The Textus Receptus of the Apostles' Creed. *Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1902, pp. 481–500.

MACKINTOSH, H. R. Lotze's Philosophy, and Its Theological Influence. *Critical Review*, July, 1902, pp. 291–306.

SIMON, D. W. Review of Kaftan's "Dogmatik." *Critical Review*, July, 1902, pp. 310–17.

SOMERVILLE, DAVID. Review of Fairbairn's "Philosophy of the Christian Religion." *Critical Review*, July, 1902, pp. 318–26.

SALMOND, S. D. F. The Immortality of the Soul, and the Scripture Doctrine of the Last Things. *London Quarterly Review*, July, 1902, pp. 140–60.

FINDLAY, G. G. The Better Education of the Ministry. *London Quarterly Review*, July, 1902, pp. 97–118.

MARWICK, WILLIAM. Magic and Religion. *Expository Times*, August, 1902, pp. 495–9.

URQUHART, F. F. The Church of France in the Latter Half of the Nineteenth Century. *Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1902, pp. 528–53.

THE PLAIN OF JEZREEL AND THE MOUNTAINS OF GILBOA.